



NETAJI SUBHAS OPEN UNIVERSITY
Choice Based Credit System
(CBCS)

SELF LEARNING MATERIAL

HPS
POL-SCIENCE

CC-PS-07

Under Graduate Degree Programme

PREFACE

In a bid to standardize higher education in the country, the University Grants Commission (UGC) has introduced Choice Based Credit System (CBCS) based on five types of courses *generic, viz. core, discipline specific, elective, ability and skill enhancement* for graduate students of all programmes at Honours level. This brings in the semester pattern, which finds efficacy in sync with credit system, credit transfer, comprehensive continuous assessments and a graded pattern of evaluation. The objective is to offer learners ample flexibility to choose from a wide gamut of courses, as also to provide them lateral mobility between various educational institutions in the country where they can carry their acquired credits. I am happy to note that the university has been recently accredited by National Assessment and Accreditation Council of India (NAAC) with grade ‘‘A’’.

UGC (Open and Distance Learning Programmes and Online Programmes) Regulations, 2020 have mandated compliance with CBCS for UG programmes for all the HEIs in this mode. Welcoming this paradigm shift in higher education, Netaji Subhas Open University (NSOU) has resolved to adopt CBCS from the academic session 2021-22 at the Under Graduate Degree Programme level. The present syllabus, framed in the spirit of syllabi recommended by UGC, lays due stress on all aspects envisaged in the curricular framework of the apex body on higher education. It will be imparted to learners over the six semesters of the Programme.

Self Learning Materials (SLMs) are the mainstay of Student Support Services (SSS) of an Open University. From a logistic point of view, NSOU has embarked upon CBCS presently with SLMs in English / Bengali. Eventually, the English version SLMs will be translated into Bengali too, for the benefit of learners. As always, all of our teaching faculties contributed in this process. In addition to this we have also requisitioned the services of best academics in each domain in preparation of the new SLMs. I am sure they will be of commendable academic support. We look forward to proactive feedback from all stakeholders who will participate in the teaching-learning based on these study materials. It has been a very challenging task well executed by the Teachers, Officers & Staff of the University and I heartily congratulate all concerned in the preparation of these SLMs.

I wish you all a grand success.

Professor (Dr.) Ranjan Chakrabarti
Vice-Chancellor

Netaji Subhas Open University
Under Graduate Degree Programme
Under Choice Based Credit System (CBCS)
Subject : Honours in Political Science (HPS)
Course : Perspectives on International Relations and World History
Code : CC - PS- 07

First Print : December, 2022

Printed in accordance with the regulations of the Distance Education Bureau
of the University Grants Commission.

Netaji Subhas Open University
Under Graduate Degree Programme
Under Choice Based Credit System (CBCS)
Subject : Honours in Political Science (HPS)
Course : Perspectives on International Relations and World History
Code : CC - PS- 07
: Board of Studies :

Members

Professor Sobhanlal Dattagupta
Retd. Surendranath Chair Professor
University of Calcutta

Professor Amitava Ray
Retd. Associate Professor
Gurudas College

Dr. Manoj Kumar Haldar
Assistant Professor
Netaji Subhas Open University

Dr. Narayan Chandra Datta
Associate Professor
Netaji Subhas Open University

Professor Krityapriya Ghosh
Retd. Associate Professor
Presidency College (WBES)

Dr. Barnana Guha Thakurta (Banerjee)
Head and Associate Professor
Netaji Subhas Open University

Prof. Sital Prasad Nag
Associate Professor
Netaji Subhas Open University

Dr. Utathya Banerjee
Associate Professor
Netaji Subhas Open University

: Course Writer :

Module - 1	Module - 2
Dr. Sreejita Biswas <i>Research Fellow, JNU</i>	Dr. Gobinda Naskar <i>Assistant Professor of Political Science</i> <i>Sidho Kanho Birsha University</i>
Module - 3	Module - 4
Dr. Utathya Bandyopadhyaya <i>Associate Professor of Political Science</i> <i>Netaji Subhas Open University</i>	Dr. Shreya Moitra <i>Assistant Professor of International Relations</i> <i>Jadavpur University</i>

: Course Editor :

Prof. Sital Prasad Nag
Associate Professor of Political Science
Netaji Subhas Open University

: Editorial Assistance, Formatting, Language Editing & Coordination :

Dr. Manoj Kumar Haldar
Assistant Professor of Political Science, Netaji Subhas Open University

Notification

All rights reserved. No part of this Self-Learning Material (SLM) may be reproduced in any form without permission in writing from Netaji Subhas Open University.

Dr. Ashit Baran Aich
Registrar (Acting)



**Netaji Subhas
Open University**

**UG : Political Science
(HPS)**

**Course : Perspectives on International Relations and
World History
Course Code : CC - PS - 07**

Module I

Unit-1	☐ Nature and Scope of International Relations	9-17
Unit-2	☐ Emergence of International State System	18-26
Unit-3	☐ Pre-Westphalia	27-34
Unit-4	☐ Westphalia	35-44
Unit-5	☐ Post-Westphalia	45-52

**Module II : Perspective on International Relations and
World History**

Unit-6	☐ Classical Realism	55-66
Unit-7	☐ Neo-Realism	67-72
Unit-8	☐ Marxist Approach	73-79
Unit-9	☐ Feminist Perspective	80-85
Unit-10	☐ Eurocentrism and Perspective from Global South	86-92

Module III

Unit-11	☐ World War 1 : Causes and Consequences	95-102
Unit-12	☐ Bolshevik Revolution and its Significance	103-110
Unit-13	☐ The Rise of Fascism and Nazism	111-121
Unit-14	☐ World War II : Causes and Consequences	122-133
Unit-15	☐ Cold War: Different Phases	134-145

Module IV

Unit-16	☐ The Crisis in Socialist Block and Collapse of USSR	149-159
Unit-17	☐ Post-Cold War Developments	160-171
Unit-18	☐ The Emergence of the Third World	172-182
Unit-19	☐ International Relations since 9/11	183-190
Unit-20	☐ Rise of Islam	191-199

Module - I

Unit-1 □ Nature and Scope of International Relations

Structure

- 1.1 Objective**
- 1.2 Introduction**
- 1.3 Meaning of International Relations**
- 1.4 Definition of International Relations**
- 1.5 Nature and Scope of International Relations**
- 1.6 Conclusion**
- 1.7 Summing up**
- 1.8 Probable Questions**
- 1.9 Further Reading**

1.1 Objective

This unit helps us to analyze :

- The significance of international relations as a discipline
- Understanding the nature of the subject-theory and practice
- The contours and the boundaries of international relations as a subject
- The historical evolution and changes in the discipline

1.2 Introduction

The subject of international relations is considered to be a broad field of study that discusses issues affecting the global world order. So, International Relations is the short name for the academic discipline of international relations. It explains the interaction between the states in the global inter-state system and also analyses the behaviour across the boundaries of the states and of all those institutions (governmental, non-governmental and private institutions) that play a crucial role in these interactions.

However, International Relations was considered to be the subset of political science for a long time. As a result of this, in most universities, the subject was not considered as a separate subject in the curriculum but was taught as a part of the course of political science. Moreover, the course that was taught under International Relations during the 19th and the

beginning of the 20th century was mainly the diplomatic history of the various countries (but there were no systematic and regular courses on International Relations that was conducted in the curriculum). It was only after the First World War that international relations began to be considered as a separate academic discipline. The first university chair was the Woodrow Wilson Chair of International Politics that formally established the discipline at the University of Wales in 1919. E.H. Carr, C.K Webster and Alfred Zimmerman were some of the early scholars of the discipline. The seeds of the International Relations as an autonomous discipline were further strengthened in the post-Second World War period and the decolonization process of the Afro-Asian countries with different universities pursuing the subject.

In contemporary times, International Relations has become a vast subject that is acknowledged as an independent discipline in Social Science. It requires knowledge of international history, law, geography, economics and foreign policy—making it a widely inter-disciplinary subject.

1.3. Meaning of International Relations

International relations as a discipline seeks to explain the interrelationship between the states and governments. As an academic discourse, it explains how states cannot survive as a separate, individual entity but are constantly in conflict or cooperation with one another, driven by their national-interests. But while the primary focus of International Relations remains understanding the relation between the states, the subject includes other themes such as poverty, environment, human rights, ethnic identities, terrorism- issues that transcend boundaries of nation-state thereby having global implications. Along with the various themes that forms a significant part of the discipline, it also discusses the growing importance of non-state actors such as non-governmental organizations (NGO's), multi-national Corporations (MNC's), etc.

Therefore, the subject matter of International Relations has two significant attributes :

- **Individual Academic Discipline**

It was widely contested for a long period whether International Relations should be treated as a separate academic field or should be treated as a sub-discipline of political science. Kenneth Thompson has argued in 1952 that scholars and teachers of history and political science did not find anything peculiar to the subject matter of international relations which would fall under a separate category in the field of social sciences. However, in some universities and colleges there was a dissenting viewpoint. Therefore, two views were

prevalent according to Thompson: while some considered it to be a mere duplication of other fields, some felt that a more integrative approach was required towards the field of international relations. Hence, international relations traversed through various stages in history to establish itself as a separate discipline. In the contemporary period, although it is often introduced as a course in the political science curriculum, the academic discipline nevertheless is considered to be an individual discipline with broad subject matter. Specialized courses on theories and area studies in IR are taught in various universities in India and abroad.

- **Inter-disciplinary in Nature**

Contemporary International Relations is not confined to studying the causes of war and peace affecting the nation-states but is concerned with wide set of actors and multiplicity of issues that have a world-wide impact. With the growing inter-connectedness amongst the societies, events of one place affects the societies across the world. Hence, most of the issues that are studied under the rubric of International Relations is truly global in nature affecting everyone. Given the wide range of issues that it covers, International Relations has become a much more complex subject cutting across the boundaries with other subjects in social sciences such as law, history, economics, geography and sociology. It seeks to address a variety of issues-legal, cultural, societal, economic, scientific-technological and strategic. Therefore, the study has come a long way and encompasses a wide range of International Relation's basic themes-such as war and peace, inter and intra group conflicts, development and integration, environmental, human rights, cooperative harmony, etc- thereby having an inter-disciplinary nature-analyzing how the domestic and international politics unfolds and interacts with one another.

1.4. Definition of International Relations

International relations have evolved gradually over the years. As an academic discipline International Relations has acquired new dimensions. As a result, it has been very difficult to pin-point one single definition of International Relations. Experts of the discipline has defined the subject from their own perspective.

Moreover, International Relations have often been used interchangeably with the terms international politics and world politics. This has often created confusion among the authors as the discipline is constantly growing and its scope shifting, overlapping with other fields.

Some of the well-recognized definition of International Relations as provided by the leading scholars of the discipline are as follows :

A more state dominated definition has been provided by Hans J Morgenthau who has used the term International Politics and defined it as “International Politics include analysis of political relations and problems of peace among nations...it “is struggle for and use of power among nations”. His definition mostly addresses the problems of power and peace amongst the nations.

Frankel provides a comprehensive definition as he considers the foreign policies of all the states in their mutual interaction as well as in their interaction with the international system as a whole, with international organizations, and with social groups other than states, the operation of the international system and also the domestic politics of all the states. According to Quincy Wright, International Relations includes “relations between many entities of uncertain sovereignties” and that “it is not only the nations which international relations seek to relate. Varied types of groups-nations, states, government, people, regions, alliances, confederations, international organizations, even industrial organizations, cultural organizations, religious organizations-must be dealt with in the study of international relations, if the treatment is to be realistic” According to Jackson and Sorensen, “at one extreme the scholarly focus is exclusively on states and inter-state relations; but at another extreme International Relations includes almost everything that has to do with human relations across the world. Therefore, International Relations seeks to understand how people are provided or not provided, with the basic values of security, freedom, order, justice and welfare”.

Keeping these diverse definitions in mind, it can be summed up that International Relations is a separate subject matter that deals with the interrelationships of the various states of the world, issues of war and peace, non-governmental organizations, international organizations, disarmament, alliance formation, human rights, climate change, terrorism and the whole international system. As Palmer and Perkins have put it, “International Relations is the objective and systematic study of international life in all its aspects”. They further claim, “It encompasses much more than the relations among nation-states and international organizations and groups. It includes a great variety of transitional relationships, at various levels, above and below the level of the nation-state, still the main actor in the international community.”

1.5. Nature and Scope of International Relations

As the discipline of International Relations evolved, the subject matter has broadened. As a matter of fact, the definition of International Relations itself highlights how the nature

and scope of the discipline has widened. Today, International Relations is considered as a branch of social science that is concerned with relations among nations and other issues like non-state actors, international political economy, international security, foreign policies of major powers, globalization, international terrorism, international environment, and area studies. This is indicative of the fact that IR has become vast today, unlike earlier times when International Relations was mainly concerned with nation-states and their interactions.

The controversy that the modern international relations faced since its inception was regarding its status as an independent academic discipline. Some scholars were unwilling to recognize it as a separate, autonomous academic discipline, and thought it to be largely dependent on subjects such as political science and history. The controversy that existed for almost four decades, till the 1960s, seems to have died down with International Relations getting the recognition of an independent academic discipline. For an autonomous academic discipline to thrive, a systematic body of theory, appropriate methodology, and a distinct subject matter is a necessity. In today's time International Relations is capable of meeting these criteria to exist and flourish as an autonomous discipline. Over the years, interactions between International Relations and other social science disciplines have increased thus helping it to emerge as an autonomous discipline with a distinct set of theories, methodology, and subject matter. Analytical and empirical methods are being used for theory building in International Relations. For example, Idealism and Neo-Liberalism is the result of the analytical study, and Realism and Neo-Realism are the result of an empirical study.

Following are some of the basic themes that International Relations focus upon :

1. Nation-states and their relations

The functioning of the nation-state system and their relation amongst each other forms the core subject matter of International Relations as a discipline. The problem of conflict and cooperation between states and the formation of alliances continues to remain the primary subject matter of the discipline.

2. Role of the Non-State Actors

Apart from focusing on the activities of the State, International Relations also deals with the non-state actors which play a crucial role at the international arena. Non-state actors like the multinational corporations (MNC), international non-governmental organizations (INGO), and the inter-governmental organizations (IGO) exert considerable influence in today's international relations. So, these non-state actors are important ingredients of the study of contemporary International Relations.

3. *International Organization*

The role of national and international organizations in international relations is no less important. UN and WTO are some of the most significant actor of International Relations. It also must not be forgotten that League of Nations played a crucial role in the growth of International Relations during the First inter War period. Similarly, how UN has played a crucial role in maintaining international peace through its various initiatives is an important aspect of the discipline. The non-governmental organizations are crucial factors in contemporars International Relations. Various expert organizations, such as UNESCO, the International Labor Organization and their activities form part of the subject matter of International Relations.

4. *Foreign Policy*

Studying the foreign policies of major powers constitute important subject-matter of International Relations because these powers are the driving force in international relations. When the balance of power system was prevalent, the study of foreign policies of major European powers was considered important. In contemporary International Relations, particularly in the post-cold war order, analysing foreign policies of the US, China, Russia, Japan and India may be useful as these states have become the important power in a multipolar world order in recent times.

5. *Environmental Problems*

Environmental issues have now assumed greater significance within International Relations than ever before because industrialization and technological progress have enhanced concerns for environmental safety all over the world. Environmental issues have made states across the world highly interdependent today because carbon emissions from industrial plants in one part of the world may affect other parts; or shortage of river water in a state may lead it to war with its neighbouring states. Issues of climate change have emerged to be an important area of study in International Relations from the 1990s. To deal with this issue, the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (FCCC), Kyoto Protocol in 1997, the Paris Agreement on climate change, etc, have been initiated.

6. *Role of People*

From focusing upon states, there has also been a shift towards considering human being as

an important actor within International Relations. Issues associated with human rights, gender rights, war have become part of the scope of International Relations.

7. *Issues of Third World*

While International Relations had always been Eurocentric, since decolonization, there has also been a demand to address the issues of Third World. Third World issues have become an important area of study. The growing role of non-aligned countries in building new international systems, easing tensions between the East and the West, disarmament, North-South dialogue etc. is significant.

8. *International Terrorism*

International peace and security are closely related to this issue. Terrorist activities involving citizens of more than one country and having transnational impacts constitute an important area of study in International Relations. It is also referred to as 'cross border' terrorism.

9. *International Security*

Security has always remained the primary concern of nations-states. The concern for security had led to war and peace in the past, and would continue to promote these in the future. A peaceful international order is always linked to the notion of international security that includes, among others factors, non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and reduction of tension among states. Studies on war and peace and strategic studies constitute important part of the subject matter of International Relations.

10. *Globalization*

This primarily refers to economic activities which have serious impact on political and social spheres. With the ascendance of neo-liberal economy since the early 1980s, the term globalization has assumed increasing popularity and usage, and become significant in the study of International Relations. Globalization became an important area of discussion.

1.6 Conclusion

Therefore, International Relations is a constant evolving subject that established itself as a separate branch of study. While before the First World war, the discipline had a regional character i.e. limited to the study of the diplomacy of specific regions, the study branched out as an autonomous discipline after the war. The subject further concretized after the Second World war. As the subject transgressed through the various phases in history, the

nature of issues also changed. From state centric study, the subject gradually became more global in nature dealing with multiplicity of issues and events. So, the scope of International Relations suggests that it is consistently changing as a discipline.

1.7 Summing Up

- There is a historical and social reasoning behind the growth of international relations as an academic discipline. Earlier it was considered to be a part of political science in the Social Science curriculum. The contemporary international relations is considered to be an independent academic discipline.
- International Relations appeared as a structured and comprehensive academic discipline after the First World War; and as a separate branch of study, the subject was offered in European and American universities from the 1920s. The year 1919 was an important marker as it saw the establishment of the International Relations Department at the University of Aberystwyth.
- Traditionally International Relations had a state-dominated approach and most of the studies were confined to explain the problems associated with the state. Contemporary International Relations is broader in its scope and includes a wide range of themes and actors : the NGOs, transnational corporations, issues of terrorism, human rights, environment, disarmament, etc.
- The world has become ever connected than before and the situations of the world is constantly changing. As a result, International Relations has become a multi-disciplinary and dynamic subject.
- The study of International Relations as a discipline developed significantly after the Second World War. With the process of decolonization and the appearance of new states in Asia, Africa and Latin America and rise of nuclear and military installations, contemporary international politics assumed a new dimension after the war, a period when International Relations as a discipline progressed significantly.

1.8 Probable Questions

Essay Type Questions

- 1) What is the meaning of International Relations? What are its attributes?
- 2) Analyse the nature and scope of the discipline of International Relations.
- 3) Explain the reason behind the growing importance of International Relations.

Short Questions

- 1) Explain the role of First World War in the development of International Relations as a discipline.
- 2) How did International Relations spread across universities?
- 3) Analyse the changes that have been brought by the decolonization of the Afro-Asian countries in the development of International Relations.

Objective Questions

- 1) When did the International Relations establish itself as a separate discipline?
- 2) Write the full form of 'MNC'.
- 3) When was Kyoto Protocol was signed?
- 4) Who is the author of the book "Politics Among Nations?"

1.9 Further Reading

- 1) Jackson Robert and George Sorensen, *Introduction to International Relations-Theories and Approaches*, UK: Oxford University Press, 1999
- 2) Baylis John, Smith Steve and Owens Patricia, *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*, UK: Oxford University Press, 2020
- 3) Kegley, Charles William and Blanton, Shannon Lindsey, *World Politics:Trends and Transformations*, Boston:Cengage Learning, 2010-2011
- 4) Palmer, Norman D., and Howard C.Perkins, *International Relations-The World Community in Transition*, India: AITBS Publishers, 1997
- 5) Goldstein, Joshua S., *International Relations*, New Delhi: Pearson Education, 2006
- 6) Ghosh, Peu, *International Relations*,India: Prentice-Hall of India, 2016

Unit-2 □ Emergence of International State System

Structure

- 2.1 Objective**
- 2.2 Introduction**
- 2.3 Overlapping History of International Relations and the growth of International State System**
- 2.4 Thompson's Stages of Development of International Relations**
- 2.5 The Great Debates in International Relations**
- 2.6 Conclusion**
- 2.7 Summing up**
- 2.8 Probable Questions**
- 2.9 Further Reading**

2.1 Objective

After going through this Unit the learners will be able to—

- Grasp the changing nature of inter-state relations
- Analyse the entangled histories of International Relations and the rise of the international state system
- Discuss the different stages which are associated with the rise of the international state system
- Explain the different theoretical debates in International Relations
- Trace how the multidisciplinary nature of International Relations is rooted in the various phases of its development in the world history.

2.2 Introduction

International Relations is often considered to be one of the youngest social science disciplines that came into being after the First World War in Britain. The purpose of this overview has been to explain how the evolution of the discipline of International Relations is closely associated with the history of the rise of the state-system. Hence, the evolution of International Relations has passed through different stages – the pre-Westphalian Treaty, the pre-World War era, the Cold War Period and the post-Cold war period. With the changing dimension of the nation-state system and the consequent reallocation of the international

system, International Relations also advanced as a subject. The journey of International Relation's growth as a subject therefore, is related with the intertwined history of the growth of the modern state system.

The growth of International Relations is intrinsically linked with the emergence and rise of the modern state system. This also give a very Eurocentric notion to International Relations since the subject grew along with Europe's development of the modern state system. However, this progress is not an upright linear phenomenon. Several incidents of religious wars that coincided with each other led to the Thirty and the Eighty Year's war in Europe. The Peace Treaty of Westphalia of 1648 not only concluded and settled these wars but it also played the founding stone in the emergence of the modern state system. Westphalia marked the transition from the dark medieval period of Christianity to that of the modern rationality and reason. It ensured that the state system was not ordained by God or Nature but is a historical institution. It also established the concept of territorial sovereignty which formed the basis of formation of modern state system. The concept of state sovereignty became the primary factor in studying International Relations. The history of modern Europe was the is a history of political and economic conflict and warbetween its sovereign states. As Tilly mentioned, States made war, and war made and unmade states. This mapping and remapping of the state system had a bearing on the development of International Relations. This entire period of the European wars is beset with the theme of war, annexation and domination-the themes central to the formulation of International Relations as a subject. Jackson and Sorenson argue that International Relations theorists have acknowledged states and the state system to be the central point of the study. Even theorists who seek to get beyond the stateusually take it as a starting point: the state system is the main point of reference both fortraditional and for new approaches.

2.3 Overlapping History of International Relations and the growth of International State System

The core of International Relations has to do with issues concerning the development and change of sovereign statehood in the context of the larger system or society of states. Traditionally International Relations goes back to the sixteenth and seventeenth century Europe. The changes that were brought about in the sixteenth and seventeenth century laid the foundation for statecraft and diplomacy. For the longest of time, it was believed that there was a major change in the nature of politics after the Middle Ages. Before that, in the medieval period, there was no conception of the State and hence, it was difficult to conceptualize International Relations during this phase. Medieval Christendom was more

like an empire than a state system. States existed, but they were not independent or sovereign in the modern meaning of these words. There were no clearly defined territories with borders.

Hence, this view stressed upon the role of Peace Treaty of Westphalia as a break from the past that led to the emergence of the international state system. The development of modern state introduced qualitatively different approach to politics. The various wars in Europe and the transition from “medieval” to “modern” state system became a turning point of discussion. While International Relations developed as a subject after the First World War in the early twentieth century, but the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648 was nevertheless a key juncture in the process of growth of International Relations as it led to the emergence of the international state system based on the notions of sovereignty. States became an intrinsic part of discussion in the study of International Relations. Scholars gradually began to analyze why does the States behave in a certain way that leads to conflict and wars. It was realized that through the inter-State relations states seek to realize their interest. The discipline of International Relations thus began with the purpose of preservation of peace and avoidance of war. While International Relations seemed to have established itself with the rise of the modern state and the notion of sovereignty, there was a constant quest to analyze the wars and the question of establishing peace, specifically after the First World War. As the study flourished from pre-Westphalia to Westphalia, Westphalia to Second World war and Cold War to Post cold war order, we see that several other components get included in the scope of the discipline (role of NGOs, MNCs, climate change, etc). Hence, International Relations has grown gradually over a course of time since the birth of the international state system to the present times-becoming much more global in its scope. The growth was not coherent but rather the growth was complex in nature. Ashworth argues that there are three interlocking periods :

- 1) A first phase from Renaissance where there were no specific international writers but the nature of international was explored as part of study of politics and statecraft.
- 2) A period less than a hundred years between 1880 and 1950 when the international begins to be studied in its own right but no specific intellectual International Relations.
- 3) A third phase that has roots in the inter-war world, but does not really gather a full head steam until after 1950, when International Relations becomes a university-based field that eventually was captured by Political Science. It was in the last phase when International Relations becomes a predominantly not exclusively American Social Science.

2.4 Thompson's Stages of Development of International Relations

Kenneth Thompson in late fifties has described the following four stages in the growth of International Relations as a discipline.

- Stage I: The Historical Approach
- Stage II: The Current Events Approach
- Stage III: The Legal Institutional Approach or the Law and Organization Approach
- Stage IV: The Theoretical Approach
- ***Stage -I: The Historical Approach:***

The first stage of the evolution of the subject runs upto the end of the First World War and was dominated by diplomatic historians. More emphasis was laid on historical analysis rather than on the political study of international events. International Relations was presented only in a descriptive and chronological manner without developing any principles from the historical facts. Hence, this historical approach could not develop a theoretical core for the discipline.

- ***Stage-II: The Current Events Approach:***

The First World War focussed attention on the inadequacy of diplomatic approach. Two new approaches emerged simultaneously. One was the Current Events Approach. Emphasis was laid on contemporary issues rather than on history. It emerged after the end of First World War focusing more on the current affairs. It interpreted the immediate importance of current developments and problems. This approach also lacked an integral understanding of International Relations as it only focused on the present neglecting the past.

- ***Stage III: The Legal Institutional Approach or the Law and Organization Approach:***

The third stage emerged simultaneously with the second stage. It began during the inter-war period when there occurred a paradigm shift from the historical and contemporaneous to a idealistic-legalistic approach. Scholars pressed upon a war-free world order and suggested creation of organizations like League of Nations. This stress was inspired by the belief that international community would be able to create institutions by which all international problems would be resolved. Shocked by the suffering inflicted by the First World War, the scholars adopted an idealistic outlook which focussed attention upon the task of reforming international relations by institutionalizing these through the development of international institutions like the League of Nations, and by the codification of the rules of International Law. However, this approach was too idealistic and ignored the hard realities of international life.

- ***Stage IV: Theoretical Approach:***

The fourth stage commenced after the end of the Second World War in 1945. There was a shift from merely praising or condemning different states' behaviour to discover the causes behind such behaviour. The breakdown of the international order with the outbreak of the Second World War led to challenging the previous approaches and search for a new approach to study International Relations. The emphasis was now more on understanding the behaviour of states as an actor of international system. This shift in international relations in the fourth stage was the outcome of decolonisation, emergence of new nation-states, rise of new universal values, demographic change etc. This shift gave birth to the Realist school which believed that power was a means, as well as end in itself. International politics was nothing but a struggle for power. Morgenthau became its chief proponent. EH Carr's book in *Twenty Years Crisis* provided the realist analysis on the basis of power.

- ***Stage V: Scientific Approach:***

The fifth stage started from the 1960s when international organisation, trans-national institutions and multinational corporations were added to the study of International Relations, which resulted in the coming of Neo-liberal school of thought. Neoliberalism in 1970s reflected the ongoing international economic exchange. It formulated complex interdependence in International Relations and introduced transnational relations, economic interdependence, security communities and international organizations and the broader concept of international regimes. Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye emerged as its chief proponents who stressed upon interdependence, security communities, transnational economic cooperation and creation of an international regime.

These changes resulted in increased intervention by the US in the affairs of Third World countries to fulfil her own economic interests. This further widened the gap between the world's rich and poor countries leading to North-South conflict and thus generating new debate on the global political agenda. Thus, for the first time, in this stage, the South demanded the establishment of a New International Economic Order (NIEO) which became a subject of analysis in international relations. The concepts of neo-imperialism, neo-colonialism, structural violence, international political economy, peace and other alternative movements became the part the International Relations discourse.

- ***Sixth Stage: Contemporary Approach:***

The sixth stage or the contemporary stage through which International Relations is passing today presents an effort at modernizing the classical and scientific approaches. It may be counted from the late 1970s to the first half of 1980s. In this period, the efficacy of detente

was questioned and 'New cold war' emerged which changed the whole scenario. On the one hand, the Soviet Union intervened in Afghanistan, on the other, US President Reagan threatened the world by talking of star war programme. The whole world raised concerns on the issues of the environment and ecology. Hence, ecological and environmental issues now became the dominant subjects of international relations. In the same period, Kenneth Waltz formulated the neorealist theory and transformed the abstract principles of classical realism with a more concrete theory of realism making it more acceptable and much closer to a scientific study of international relations. The neorealist theory argued for managing and manipulating the new cold war in the 1980s. With the emergence of the steady process of multi-polarisation, the scholars of the United States especially showed interest in third world countries. Area studies were undertaken by different universities in the US and Britain. In many cases, for field data researchers were sent to the third world countries. But the Western theories of international relations were challenged by the scholars of the third world countries. They questioned the relevance and suitability of these theories to the underdeveloped countries which constitute the two-thirds majority of the UN membership.

- ***Stage VI: Post-Positivism***

The seventh stage began in 1985 with Mikhail Gorbachev's new political thinking, which recognised "balance of interests" in place of the balance of power, co-operation instead of confrontation, disarmament in place of armament, internationalisation instead of nationalisation and détente in place of cold war." With the advent of this 'new political thinking', international relations entered into a new era putting emphasis on peaceful coexistence and equal security for all. At first, the US is suspicious about these new moves, but later on, it responded positively to this 'new political thinking'. During this period, as the realist and liberalist debate faded away, the post-modernists came to the scenario. Post-modernists or reflectivists argued that norms and regimes could not be studied in a positivist framework based on objectivity, but has to be analysed as an inter-subjective phenomenon. This new trend in the 1980s was known as post-positivism. It contained four major currents: critical theory; post-modern Marxism; post-modernism and post-modern feminism.

- ***Stage VIII: Democratizing International Relations***

The eighth stage began with the disintegration of the Soviet Union. The supremacy of the US paved the way for the unipolar world as it remained the only superpower. There were efforts by the other countries such as major European powers, China, Japan, India to create

a multipolar world order. The Post-Cold war era indicated a trend towards the process of democratizing International Relations.

2.5 The Great Debates in International Relations

The above stages are characterized by four significant theoretical debates in International Relations :

- 1) The First Major Debate : Utopian Liberalism/ Idealism vs. Realism (1930s and 1940s): The First Great Debate was also known as the Realist-Idealist Debate and took place between 1930s to 1940s. Realists focussed upon the anarchical nature of international politics and the need for the state while the Idealists focused upon international institutions such as the League of Nations.
- 2) The Second Major Debate : Traditional Approaches vs Behaviouralism (late 1950s and 1960s) : The second debate was a dispute between scientific International Relations scholars who sought to refine scientific methods of inquiry in International Relations theory and those who insisted on more historical/interpretist approach to International Relations. This debate is also known as realist vs behaviouralists or traditionalists vs scientism.
- 3) The Third Major Debate : Neorealism/Neoliberalism vs Neo Marxism (late 1960s and early 1970s) : This phase was also known as the inter-paradigm debate and referred as the Third Great Debate. This was a debate between realism, liberalism and radical international relation theories.
- 4) The Fourth Major Debate : Positivism vs Post-Positivist methodologies (late 1980s and 1990s) : This is a debate between the positivist and the post-positivist theories. The key proponent of this debate was Robert Keohane. This can be considered as an epistemological debate and how can we know things rather than focusing on ontological argument.

2.6 Conclusion

State is the principal actor in international relations. The origin of the state system had a significant bearing on the growth of International Relations as a discipline. Although, historically the growth of International Relations as an academic field of study emerged after the world war, the birth of the discipline is associated with the end of the Medieval period of religious wars in Europe that ultimately led to the birth of the modern state based on sovereign boundaries. Hence, the birth of the state system led to the birth of International

Relations as it laid the foundation to study statecraft and diplomacy. Since then, the quest has been to study war and peace amongst the state. As a matter of fact, as the conflicts in Europe consistently broke out from time to time, the urge to study the state system only deepened. This got entrenched after the First World War that led to the establishment of the discipline as an autonomous subject. Before this, although international state system influenced the study, International Relations was mostly fused with other social sciences, especially history. It can be seen that after the First World War, the boundaries of the discipline only broadened and became much more multifaceted in nature. As it passed through several stages, there seemed to be a widening of the issues that it dealt with and also, raised a number of debates.

2.7 Summing up

- It was the development of the modern state that gives form to what is called as International Relations today. International Relations as a field is the product of the constant mapping and remapping of the concept of the state in the international landscape.
- The emergence of a system of states is the product of the downfall of the old order, usually dated to the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries; the Peace of Westphalia which ended the Thirty Years War in 1648 is often seen as a convenient starting-point for the new order.
- While International Relations evolved as a separate field of study academically in the early twentieth century after the First World War, the laying out of a separate politics of statecraft and diplomacy took place in the sixteenth and seventeenth century.
- Since the birth of the modern international state system, we see International Relations constantly evolving and emerging to be a separate field of enquiry.
- Thompson argues about four stages of growth of the discipline. It was however perceived that there is total eight stages of the growth of the discipline from its historical origin to the present, dealing with multiplicity of issues. Many Scholars argue that International Relations is currently in the sixth phase of transition.
- These stages are characterised by the Great theoretical Debates of International Relations : Utopian Liberalism/Idealism vs. Realism, Traditional Approaches vs Behaviouralism, Neorealism/Neoliberalism vs Neo Marxism, Positivism vs Post-positivist

2.8 Probable Questions

Essay Type Questions

- 1) What is international state system and how did it come into being?
- 2) Explain the overlapping histories of International Relations and the international state system.

Short Questions

- 1) What is the importance of the historical approach in the growth of International Relations?
- 2) What is the significance of the modern state system in International Relation's history?
- 3) What is the Post-Positivist turn in International Relations?
- 4) Explain the difference between the medieval and the modern state system in Europe.

Objective Questions

- 1) When was the Treaty of Westphalia signed?
- 2) How many stages of the growth of International Relations are identified by Kenneth Thompson?

2.9 Further Reading

- 1) Jackson Robert and George Sorensen, *Introduction to International Relations-Theories and Approaches*, UK: Oxford University Press, 1999
- 2) Baylis John, Smith Steve and Owens Patricia, *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*, UK: Oxford University Press, 2020
- 3) Kegley, Charles William and Blanton, Shannon Lindsey, *World Politics:Trends and Transformations*, Boston: Cengage Learning, 2010-2011
- 4) Brown, Chris and Ainley, Kristen, *Understanding International Relations*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005
- 5) Ashworth, Lucian M, *A History of International Thought*, Oxon and New York: Routledge, 2014

Unit - 3 □ Pre-Westphalia

Structure

- 3.1 Objective**
- 3.2 Introduction**
- 3.3 The State system of Ancient Greece**
- 3.4 Structure of Europe in Pre-Westphalia**
- 3.5 Changes During Medieval period**
- 3.6 Conclusion**
- 3.7 Summing up**
- 3.8 Probable Questions**
- 3.9 Further Reading**

3.1 Objective

After going through this unit learners will be able :

- Explain the nature of the world order before the Treaty of Westphalia
- Analyze the state structure that existed in the sixteenth and seventeenth century in Europe
- The structure of feudal society in Europe
- Understand the religious wars in Europe
- Power dynamics of the Holy Roman Empire

3.2 Introduction

It has been argued that the Treaty of Westphalia which brought an end to the Thirty Years' crisis and the Eighty Years' crisis is a watershed moment in the history of International Relations as it led to the establishment of the modern international state system. Subsequently, it is considered that gradually the impetus for studying the 'international' intensified: the First World War acted as catalyst that encouraged greater interest in international affairs and also created institutions at the global and at the domestic level, thereby fostering the study of International Relations.

The rise of the sovereign statehood in the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648 is often treated as the origin of International Relations; however, it is significant to understand that the idea

of the state was a long drawn historical process. Hence, although scholars of International Relations see a clear break from the past that led to the new international system (Westphalian system), the idea of the growth of the state system was not born all of a sudden in 1648 but was a complicated process of development. It was the product of the changes that were going on during the sixteenth and seventeenth century Europe bearing the seeds of statecraft and diplomacy. Hence, for the evolution of the international state system it is necessary to understand : (i) how did the medieval Europe looked like (ii) the profound changes that Europe went through during the Medieval period specifically in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries that led to the rise of the sovereign state system under the Westphalian Treaty (iii) what were the early traces of the seed of the state system that could be seen during this phase of transition in Europe (iv) the nature of the religious wars in Europe and the shifts in balance of power. The operation of these multi-faceted changes culminated in the Peace Treaty of Westphalia.

3.3. The state system of Ancient Greece

The first relatively clear historical manifestation of a state system is that of ancient Greece (500–100 bce). However, it was a system of many city-states. They were far smaller in population and size than most modern states. Greek intercity relations involved distinctive traditions and practices, but they lacked the institution of diplomacy, and there was nothing comparable to international law and international organization. Athens was the largest and most famous, but there were also many other city-states, such as Sparta and Corinth. Together they formed the first state system in Western history. The Greek city-states were facing the problem of managing conflicts between them- the conflict between Athens and Sparta was a significant aspect of international relations that highlighted the issue of power and powerful.

It was on the basis of this power index that the Roman Empire began to prevail over the Greek city-states. Therefore, the ancient Greek state system was eventually destroyed by more powerful neighbouring empires, and over time, the Greeks became subjects of the Roman Empire. The Romans developed a huge empire in the course of conquering, occupying, and ruling most of Europe and a large part of the Middle East and North Africa. At its height, the Roman Empire extended from northern England (Roman Britain) and the lower Rhine in the northwest, to Damascus and Jerusalem in the southeast, surrounding the entire Mediterranean Sea and reaching across North Africa. The Romans had to deal with the numerous political communities that occupied these areas, but they did that by subordinating them rather than recognizing them. Instead of international relations or quasi-

international relations, under the Roman Empire the only option for political communities was either submission to Rome or revolt. Eventually, those communities on the periphery of the empire began to revolt. The Roman army could not contain the revolts and began to retreat. On several occasions, the city of Rome itself was invaded and devastated by the 'barbarian' tribes. In that way, the Roman Empire was finally brought to an end after many centuries of political success and survival.

Empire was the prevalent pattern of political organization that gradually emerged in Christian Europe after the fall of the Roman Empire. Rome's two main successors in Europe were also empires : in Western Europe, the medieval (Catholic) empire based at Rome (Christendom); in Eastern Europe and the near east, the Byzantine (Orthodox) empire centred on Constantinople or what is today Istanbul (Byzantium). Byzantium claimed to be the continuation of the Christianized Roman Empire. The European medieval Christian world (500–1500) was thus divided geographically most of the time into two politico-religious empires.

3.4 Structure of Europe in Pre-Westphalia

There were no clearly recognizable sovereign states before the sixteenth century. The medieval Europe in the sixteenth and seventeenth century was feudal in nature. The feudalism flourished in Europe between the 9th to 15th centuries and it became the main determinant of the structure of relationships on which the society was established. Prior to the Peace of Westphalia, most of the polities in Europe were ruled by an Emperor, a leading clergyman or a feudal lord.

The medieval Europe came under the influence of western Catholic Church. The Church exerted a powerful influence on all aspects of life in medieval Europe. Indeed, such was the Church's place in European society that medieval Europeans defined themselves as living in "Christendom" – the realm of the Christians. Birth, marriage, death which were the significant aspect of life came under the Church's control. Education was dominated by churchmen, and most medieval scholars in Europe were members of the clergy. The members of the clergy were often senior advisers to the kings and other secular rulers. Kings were sometimes 'Defenders of the Faith'—such as Henry VIII of England. Armed knights often thought of themselves as Christian soldiers. The Knights Templar and the Teutonic Knights were Christian soldiers.

The ideal of the *Respublica Christiana* was the first manifestation of a system making it possible to conceive of a certain unity within diversity. The universal mission of Christianity and the heritage of Roman law provided the foundation for a structure that could not yet be

qualified as international, but that at least made it possible to introduce a certain order in the coexistence of political units. The first forms of regulation for state relations, whether they focused on negotiation methods or the normalization of treaties, demonstrate the spread of certain practices. They indicate the existence of a culture of cohabitation of sovereignties. Christianity as a system of states was based on shared values, chief among them was the ideal of peace.

During the Middle Ages, the notion of empire was an essential reference in conceiving relations between different political units. Therefore, medieval Christendom was more like an empire than a state system. States existed, but they were not independent or sovereign in the modern meaning of these words. There were no clearly defined territories with borders. Power and authority were organized on both a religious and a political basis: in Latin Christendom, the Pope and the Emperor were the heads of two parallel and connected hierarchies, one religious and the other political. Kings and other rulers were subjects of those higher authorities and their laws. They were not fully independent. And much of the time, local rulers were more or less free from the rule of kings : they were semi-autonomous but they were not fully independent either. Therefore, territorial political independence as known in the modern world order was absent in medieval Europe.

As a result, the medieval Europe was in considerable disarray. Lack of clearly delineated territorial political organization and control led to constant wars. These wars were less fought over the exclusive control of territory or over state or national interests. In medieval Europe, there was no exclusively controlled territory, and no clear conception of the nation or the national interest. Sometimes wars were fought between religious civilization. For example, the Christian Crusades against the Islamic world (1096–1291). Sometimes wars were fought between kings—for example, the Hundred Years War between England and France (1337–1453). But often war was feudal and local, and was fought between rival groups of knights whose leaders had a quarrel. The authority and power to engage in war was not monopolized by the state; kings did not control war as they were later able to do. Instead, war-making rights and capacities belonged to members of a distinctive caste—the armed knights and their leaders and followers—who fought sometimes for the Pope, sometimes for the emperor, sometimes for their king, sometimes for their master, and sometimes, and, indeed, quite regularly, for themselves. Cities were fortified and they also had armed forces. Some religious orders of the Catholic Church—the Knights Templar and the Teutonic Knights, among others—consisted of what we would call professional soldiers devoted to defending the Christian religion against its enemies.

3.5 Changes during the Medieval Period

Although the Middle Age in European history was marked by ignorance, superstition and social oppression, it was also a period of dynamic transitions. Before the Protestant Reformation in the sixteenth century, Western Europe had been Roman Catholic for about 1000 years. During the sixteenth century, the dream of Christian unity permanently evaporated with the advent of the Reformation, the crystallization of national identities, and the increasingly forceful affirmation of various sovereignties. The notion of the Empire, was still present during the first half of the sixteenth century. Undoubtedly, the changes that were going on in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were laying out a separate politics of state craft and diplomacy.

While in the early Middle Age, political, social, economic and cultural structures were profoundly reorganized as Roman imperial traditions gave way to Germanic people who established kingdom in former Western Empire, the population of Europe was gradually Christianized and monasticism was established as the ideal form of religious life. In the 15th and 16th centuries Europe experienced an intellectual and economic revival called as Renaissance that laid the foundation for the subsequent expansion of European culture throughout the world. In the sixteenth century religious critics and reformers began to realise that Christian Church has become corrupt and now needed to be reformed. Therefore, in the pre-Westphalian world order, Europe remained Catholic for about 1000 years. During the Protestant Reformation, a number of princes were converted to Protestantism.

As a result of the Protestant Reformation, there were series of European war of religion that was waged in Europe in the 16th, 17th and early 18th centuries. These wars disrupted the religious and political order in the Catholic countries of Europe or Christendom. The war maybe called as ‘religious wars’ but most religious wars-were also about land, power and money. Many German princes saw the Roman Church as an obstacle for power. Hence, throughout the period Europe’s princes and kings rode for power using religion as a pretext. For a German Prince, there was three big reason to break away from Rome : 1) opposing the pope, princes could rule without meddling of the bishops (who were above secular laws) 2) princes could hold onto tithes formerly sent to Rome-leading to huge drain in economy and 3) the biggest landowners were the Church and by joining forces with the Protestants, princes could confiscate Church lands. Martin Luther unleashed a chaotic series of war that lasted for centuries. On the Catholic side, the pope was supported by the powerful Holy Roman Emperor. The emperor had Europe’s leading army and was more

willing to put down the Protestants in Germany. Hence, the wars which mainly emerged to be religious had actually mixed motives.

Although there have been religious conflicts in the sixteenth century, the Thirty Years' War was an extended brutal conflict. In the early modern era, European rulers liberated themselves from the overarching religious–political authority of Christendom. The Thirty Years' War (1618-1648) was an important turning point in the emergence of an international European system. It was the first conflict with a genuine continental dimension, and its resolution at the Congress of Westphalia brought together representatives from virtually every state of the continent. Through their simultaneity and the scope of their dispositions, the peace treaties of 1648 validated certain principles of relations among European powers. What has retrospectively been called the “Westphalian order,” marked the birth of an interstate system based on the sovereignty of states, and on their equality in law. The power of the Holy Roman Empire was broken and the German states were again able to determine the religion of their land. The Reformation which shook up Europe, led to a hundred years of war over religion, land and power that ended in 1648.

The development of the modern state led to a qualitatively different approach to politics—what came into existence was the state with centralized and absolute authority. The fiscal-military state that emerged in early modern Europe therefore, gradually became increasingly centralized from late seventeenth century and by the end of the early eighteenth century ideas of popular sovereignty was challenging these arrangements. Hence, the establishment of the Westphalian order took place gradually in practice and not immediately after signing of the Peace Treaty. While there were profound changes from the past, there was also some kind of continuity and state owed much to past practices as it did to new innovations. The idea of sovereignty emerged as a part of absolutism but it ultimately became an attribute of the state.

3.6 Conclusion

The Pre-Westphalian period which was medieval in nature was a very dynamic period where Empires fought for the control of land and power at the heart of Europe. From the disintegration of the Ancient Greece city-states, it saw the emergence of the Roman Empire which subsequently broke up to form the Western Catholic Europe and the Eastern Byzantine Empire. The societal structure was feudal under the influence of Catholic Church or the Christendom. The political units did not have territorial independence during this period. The transitions in the 15th and 16th century were accompanied by the Protestant Reformation in the 1500s. The Reformation brought about conflicts which were driven by both political

and religious motives and it torn apart Europe for decades. The Thirty Years' War which was one of the most significant amongst these, lasted from 1618-1648 and ended with the Peace Treaty of Westphalia establishing the states as sovereign entities.

3.7 Summary

- There was a widespread transformations in society, religion and reason in the pre-Westphalian era of Europe which was medieval in nature that reached its peak in the 1600s, ultimately culminating into the Peace of Westphalia of 1648 giving rise to modern international state system.
- Ancient Greece was one of the earliest manifestations of the state system. However, these states were not sovereign entities that we have seen in modern Europe, but they were mainly city-states. With the changes in the power dynamics, Greece was replaced by the Holy Roman Empire. However, soon the Holy Roman Empire too disintegrated and led to the formation of the Western the medieval (Catholic) empire based at Rome (Christendom); in Eastern Europe and the near east, the Byzantine (Orthodox) empire centred in Constantinople or what is today Istanbul (Byzantium).
- Medieval Europe in the fifteenth and sixteenth century was feudal in nature. Feudalism flourished in Europe between the 9th to 15th centuries and it became the main determinant to decide upon the structure of relationships on which the society was based upon. The Church had a superior influence on all aspects of life in medieval Europe. Indeed, such was the Church's place in European society that medieval Europeans defined themselves as living in "Christendom".
- There was also a constant change in power during this entire phase and the power and authority were organized on both religious and a political ground. States existed, but they were not independent or sovereign in the modern meaning of these words and hence, the concept of territorial independence was largely absent. Medieval Europe was consistently in a state of flux and in the sixteenth century, the Protestant Reformation further brought about transitions in the European world order dominated by the Church.
- The Protestant Reformation was a religious reform movement that swept through Europe in the 1500s. It resulted in the creation of a branch of Christianity called Protestantism which separated from the Roman Catholic Church. The Renaissance (which was a cultural movement in Italy and spread across Europe) stimulated the Reformation (religious fragmentation) encouraging people to reform the present.

- The Protestant Reformation brought about almost 150 years of religious conflict in Western Europe. One such extended conflict was the Thirty Years' war which lasted from 1618-1648.

3.8 Probable Questions

Essay Type Questions

- 1) Write an essay on the power structure in medieval Europe.
- 2) Examine the significance of Renaissance and Reformation in the process of development of International system.

Short Questions

- 1) Why did the German Princess support the Protestant Reformation purely religious?
- 2) How did the Roman Empire disintegrate?
- 3) What is *Respublica Chirstiana*?

Objective Questions

- 1) What is meant by westphalian order?
- 2) What was the basis of christianity as a system of states?

3.9 Further Reading

- 1 Jackson Robert and George Sorensen, *Introduction to International Relations-Theories and Approaches*, UK: Oxford University Press, 1999
- 2 Kegley, Charles W. and Raymond, Gregory, *Exorcising the Ghost of Westphalia: Building World order in the New Millennium*, Prentice Hall, 2002
- 3 Ashworth, Lucian M, *A History of International Thought*, Oxon and New York: Routledge, 2014
- 4 Baylis John, Smith Steve and Owens Patricia, *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*, UK: Oxford University Press, 2020
- 5 Whaley, Joachim, *Germany and the Holy Roman Empire: Volume I: Maximilian I to the Peace of Westphalia 1493-1648*, UK: Oxford University Press, 2012

Unit - 4 : Westphalia

Structure

- 4.1 Objective**
- 4.2 Introduction**
- 4.3 The Thirty Year's War**
- 4.4 The Eighty Year's War**
- 4.5 Peace Treaty of Westphalia**
- 4.6 Myth of Westphalia**
- 4.7 Conclusion**
- 4.8 Summary**
- 4.9 Probable Questions**
- 4.10 Further Reading**

4.1 Objective

After going through this unit, the learners will be able :

- To understand the significance of the Peace Treaty of Westphalia of 1648
- To explain the changes brought about by the Treaty
- To what extent the changes brought about by Westphalia is crucial in the context of International Relations
- To understand the 'Myth of Westphalia'

4.2 Introduction

The Westphalian world order was based on the Treaty of Westphalia of 1648. It established the concept sovereign nation state. The states became the central point of analysis after the birth of the sovereign state system under the Westphalian model. The period from 1648 to 1919, was the first phase of International Relation's growth rooted in European politics. Westphalia was the marker of the transition from feudal structure to the arrangement of states based upon sovereignty. Although some scholars, like Stephan Krasner has questioned the significance of the Westphalian world order others have questioned the continuity of

sovereign state system (as the Holy Roman Empire did not disappear until the Napoleonic Wars). Yet, the Treaty of Westphalia did bring about some fundamental political changes which has significance in the evolution of International Relations both as an academic subject and in its practical application. It was often referred to as a concrete historical event attached with a variety of meanings, such as the triumph of state sovereignty, the establishment of a community of states, and even the beginnings of collective security. Beginning in the late 1960s, phrases like “Westphalian system” came to convey a package of ideas about international politics limited to the supremacy of state sovereignty, territoriality, and non-intervention, to the exclusion of other. Moreover, it brought about a decline in the Habsburg Empire which has already lost power in Western Europe owing to the revolt in Netherlands and defeat of Spanish Armada. The end of Habsburg dominance changed the power dynamics of Europe. It also weakened the Papal authority throughout Europe. Therefore, it becomes essential to study the turning point of events that the Treaty of Westphalia of 1648 brings about in the context of the rise of international state system.

The centrality of the Westphalian concept of International Relations literature has given rise to two important discussions : (a) how did the Peace Treaty of 1648 in Westphalia become associated with a particular conceptual understanding of the international system? and (b) what are the implications of this development?

However, before delving into this further, it is important to explore the two fundamental wars that has led to the emergence of the Westphalian state system : The Thirty Years’ War and The Eighty Years’ War.

4.3 The Thirty Years’ War

The Thirty Years’ War was a long and deadly continental struggle that has devastated seventeenth-century Europe and killed a quarter of Germans. The horrifying conflict which continued from 1618 to 1648 has indeed transformed the map of the modern world. These events shattered one pattern of the international system and introduced another. The period between the Thirty Years’ War and Westphalia is like a bridge between the ‘old’ and the ‘new’, between the ‘medieval’ and the ‘modern’.

The Thirty Years’ war was a series of war between the various Protestant and Catholic states in the fragmented Holy Roman Empire between 1618 and 1648. Initially a war

between the various Protestant and Catholic States in the fragmented Empire gradually developed into a power struggle amongst the great powers—so with the evolution of the war, it became less about religion and more about who will govern Europe. The war got initiated as soon as Ferdinand II of Holy Roman Empire tried to impose religious uniformity on his domains by imposing the Roman Catholicism in the region. Ferdinand II was a staunch Roman Catholic and his policies were heavily pro-Catholic. But after Catholic Habsburg Emperor Ferdinand's decree on religion, the Bohemian nobility of present-day Austria and the Czech Republic rejected Ferdinand II and showed their displeasure by throwing his representatives out of a window at Prague Castle in 1618. This was called as the Defenestration of Prague which marked the beginning of open revolt in Bohemian states.

By the end of this war, much of Germany was in ruins, the Habsburgs were no longer the master of the continent and the religious wars that was raging in Europe since the 16th century was finally over. The immediate cause of the conflict was a crisis within the Habsburg family's Bohemian branch, but the war also owed much to the religious and political crises caused by Reformation, and the competition between the Monarchs, particularly the Habsburgs of the Holy Roman Empire, various German princes and the Monarchs of Sweden and France.

● Underlying causes

The Thirty Years' War can be considered as a product of the profound long-term changes that were sweeping Europe in the twilight of the medieval period. The war emerged from multiple issues ongoing during the sixteenth century. The clash of cultures in the sixteenth century Europe set the stage for the war. The Renaissance and Reformation that ushered in the modern age provoked intense controversies about ideas, institutions, religious beliefs, and the distribution of political and religious authority. In order to understand the causes, evolution, and impact of the Thirty Years' War, it is necessary to consider how the mixed motives have come into action as the actors in this human tragedy tried to balance their concerns about security, reputation, liberties, and many other ideals and interests. Hence, some of the key factors that has led to the war were : (a) One of the most significant causes of the war was the Protestant movement which was both religiously divisive and politically destabilizing in nature that divided Europe, despite efforts to ease out the tensions, such as Peace of Augsburg in 1555 (that granted each ruler religious freedom within their domain). (b) In the late sixteenth century, the Catholic Habsburgs tried to establish a new Holy

Roman Empire by gaining political and religious control in the north over Germans and Dutch. This led to the wars of religion and conquest culminating in Thirty Years' War (c) War began as a conflict between the Catholic Habsburg emperor and his Bohemian subject over religion and imperial power. (d) The imperial civil war became linked to other wider conflicts which extended to other parts of Europe and prolonged it.

The war went through the following evolutionary phases and each of these phases reflect the entry or the impact of a specific state. However, the alliance formation was much complicated than these categories. For example, France was supporting Sweden before its own entry in 1635 in the conflict. The phases are :

- 1 The Bohemian Phase (1618-1620)
- 2 The Palatinate Phase (1620-1624)
- 3 The Danish Phase (1625-1629)
- 4 The Swedish Phase (1630-1635)
- 5 The Franco-Swedish Phase (1635-1648)

The Thirty Years' War, played a crucial role because it formed the base from which the existing architecture for twenty-first century international order still derives much of its inspiration and texture. This war made states, and these newly made states became the basic building blocks in the Westphalian Peace settlement which transformed international relations.

4.4 The Eighty Years' War

The Eighty Years' War on the other hand, was the Dutch War of Independence from 1568-1648 and was a revolt by seventeen provinces against Philip II of Spain, the Habsburg of Netherlands. Therefore, the War was a series of battles and campaigns of Dutch independence fighters against the Spanish, who ruled there during that time. As the name suggested, the war spanned over for eighty years with some truces in between. The War resulted in the independence of the United Provinces (a predecessor to the Netherlands we know today) from Spanish rule. The longevity of the war was the result of the determination of the Dutch rebels and the strength of the Spanish army.

Problem arose when the Philip II inherited the Spanish throne from his father Charles and introduced Spanish Inquisition into Netherlands in order to prevent Protestantism to spread

further. Riots erupted in 1566 against Philip's cruel policies. Hence, as a result of the misrule by Spanish Habsburgs, Netherlands(modern day Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg and the French provinces of Flanders and Artois) combined to provoke the Dutch into rebellion. Through eighty years of warfare, the provincial states and the Calvinists gained upper hand in the north and the Spanish rulers and the Catholic Church rose in South. Philip II and his successors failed to win a conclusive victory over their rebellious Dutch subjects, and Spain was compelled to admit their military defeat at the negotiating table at Münster. So, the war was persecuted by both sides over a period of 80 years, ending in the Treaty of Münster in 1648 which formally recognised the Dutch Republic.

The period 1609-1621 was however, the period of Twelve Year's Truce where ceasefire was observed between the United provinces and the Spanish controlled southern states, mediated by France and England at the Hague.

4.5 Peace Treaty of Westphalia

The Peace Treaty of Westphalia was a series of peace treaties signed between May and October in 1648 in Osnabrück and Münster thereby bringing a halt to the Thirty Year's War (1618-1648) in the Holy Roman Empire and the Eighty Years' War (1568-1648) between Spain and Dutch Republic. The key principles that were established by the Treaty of Westphalia are :

1. The Peace of Westphalia institutionalized the sovereignty of states and the fundamental right of political self-determination. Although the treaties could not restore peace throughout Europe but it did create the basis for national self-determination
2. The principle of legal equality between the states.
3. The Treaty prevented external powers from intervening into the internal affairs of another state thereby establishing territorial boundaries and non-interference.
4. Along with the territorial adjustments, the terms of Peace of Westphalia also included a return to the Peace of Augsburg of 1555 in which each prince would have the right to determine the religion of his own State.
5. It also created the basis for the German States to conduct their own diplomatic relations.

The end of the Thirty Years' War can be seen as one of the major turning points in modern history. The Peace Treaty brought to a close the wars of religion that followed in the wake

of Reformation. Moreover, Germany which was the primary battleground was completely devastated and depopulated throughout. It got further fragmented as a result of the war. Additionally, the Habsburg dynasty survived, but no longer ruled. New States such as the Dutch Republic, that could cope up with the war successfully, and France, came into new prominence.

The Westphalian settlement has seemed to have initiated a system of sovereign states that came to have structured international relations across the globe. Politically, the war seemed to have furthered an era of absolute monarchy that dominated much of the continent of Europe until the French Revolution.

With the end of the wars of religion in Europe, the Holy Roman Empire no longer threatened to establish hegemony over the continent, and the modern state system based on sovereignty came into being. The Peace of Westphalia not only brought the Thirty Years' War to a conclusion but ushered in a new diplomatic era which still has influence on contemporary world politics. Indeed, the rules for statecraft drafted in the mid-seventeenth century still define the basic norms governing relations between nations, and the diplomatic vocabulary used to discuss international affairs today was born from the crucible of this system-transforming treaty. The Peace of Westphalia illustrates the fateful consequences of hard choices about the means to lasting peace. The settlement legitimized a commonwealth of sovereign states. It marked the triumph of the *stato* [the state], in control of its internal affairs and independent externally. This was the aspiration of princes [rulers] in general—and especially of the German princes. Some regard the Westphalian system as an innovative response to chronic European crises, a source of stability for successive generations at a time when conditions were not hospitable to that achievement.

● *The Concept of Westphalia in International Relations*

Schmidt mentions how the references to the Peace in early International Relations literature including the “Realist turn” of the late 1930s and 1940s showcases three distinct significances of Westphalia for international politics : (i) the Peace as a source of international order and community, (ii) the Peace as the origin of state sovereignty, and (iii) the Peace as a forerunner of the League of Nations

(i) the Peace as a source of international order and community

The view that the Peace imparted a certain order to the interaction of states has been one of the most common interpretations of the significance of the Peace in International Relations

literature during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and was shared by scholars who expressed a broad range of opinions regarding the possibility for cooperation in international affairs. For example, this view of Westphalia surfaces in the work of Heinrich von Treitschke, the father of *Realpolitik*.

(ii) the Peace as the origin of state sovereignty

The characterization of the role of the Peace as securing the sovereign independence of states finds its relevance in the contemporary Westphalia concept, with its description of the state system as one in which state sovereignty and autonomy are the rule. From a more theoretical perspective, the discourse of the Peace as ushering in the sovereign independence of states that faced little or no social, legal, or otherwise ideational constraints on their behavior is particularly compatible with a Realist (and by extension, Neorealist) perspective of international politics. This discourse has also been extended with the Realist critiques of Idealist views of international cooperation during the First Debate

(iii) The Peace as a forerunner of the League of Nations

Several International Relations authors after the First World War compared the Peace to the League of Nations Charter, an interpretation which runs counter to the Westphalia concept and the current dominant understanding of the significance of the Peace. For example, Quincy Wright has compared the Peace of Westphalia with the League of Nations in a discussion of the history of “collective instruments for the maintenance of peace” that often - similar as in the case of Westphalia - included provisions for collective enforcement.

4.6 Myth of Westphalia

While the Westphalian model of state system has been considered as the focal point from which International Relations originated. Scholars like Krasner have differed from this vision. According to Krasner, the Westphalian sovereign state model based on the principles of autonomy, territory and mutual recognition has never been the accurate description of many of the entities that are regarded as the state. This is because the defining principle of the sovereign state model - non-intervention and mutual recognition of juridically independent entities has often been ignored. Principle of autonomy has often been violated in name of other important norms like human rights, minority rights, democracy etc. The sovereign model though has cognitive script but its basic rules are always violated. Hence,

the sovereign model is not a stable equilibrium as the actors often have the tendency and the power to deviate from it. Rather, sovereign state model is an organized hypocrisy in the international environment as : i) actors whether the states or empires have different levels of power. ii) rulers in different political entities are governed by different domestic norms which might not be often compatible with international norms and iii) situation arise in which it is unclear that what rule should be applied and there in no authority structure that can resolve this issue.

The myth of Westphalia consists in the assumption that international orders are long periods of relative stability punctuated by short bursts of instability that has again in turn led to a stable period. The basic concept of state or sovereignty have changed dramatically over the years. Moreover, scholars like Ashworth and Teschke raise questions whether there was a fundamental break from the medieval to modernity with the Treaty of Westphalia. Teschke argues that the transition to modern system of states did not emerge suddenly but was actually a long drawn process because of class conflict, economic development and rivalry.

4.7 Conclusion

The basis of modern international relations was established by 1648 Westphalian Peace Treaties which mark the birth of nation states as the privileged and primary actors by replacing the medieval system of centralized religious authority. The competition and sharp practices that became entrenched between 1618 and 1648 had a direct bearing on the code of foreign policy conduct that was crafted at Munster and Osnabriick and guide state behaviour for the next three and a half centuries. It anchored international politics on the tenets of national interests. In the absence of any higher systemic authority, power became the center of the system to regulate inter-state relations. Though some scholars question the Westphalian emergence of the state system, and also whether the model brought about any fundamental break from the past or not the historical moment remains as one of the crucial bases to study International Relations.

4.8 Summary

- The Eighty Years' War which took place from 1568-1648 and the Thirty Years' War which took place from 1618- 1648 changed the political landscape and balance of power in Europe.

- The Thirty Years' War started at central Europe when the emperor of the Holy Roman Empire tried to impose Catholic absolutism on his domains and the Protestant nobles of Bohemia and Austria rose up in rebellion.
- The Thirty Years' War started between the German Protestants and Catholics and later included the political rivalries with France, Sweden and Denmark opposing the Holy Roman Empire and Spain.
- The Eighty Years' War was the Netherlands struggle for independence from Spain, which led to the separation of the northern and southern Netherlands and led to the formation of the United Provinces of Netherlands (Dutch Republic)
- The Peace Treaty of Westphalia signed in 1648 formed the founding pillar of the modern international state system as it organized the European order on the basis of sovereign states. Hence, the new state-centric system was based on the principles of sovereignty, sovereign independence, equality of nation-states, territoriality, non-intervention in others' domestic affairs.
- Scholars such as Stephen Krasner have considered the Westphalian origin of nation-states as a myth. He argues that Westphalian model has never been the accurate description of many of the entities that are called as states. Also, there has been consistent breaches in the Westphalian model.

4.9 Probable Questions

Essay Type Questions

1. What changes are brought about the Westphalian model of state system?
2. Mention the significance of the Treaty of Westphalia in the growth of International Relations discipline.

Short Questions

1. What are the underlying causes of the Thirty Years' War.
2. Briefly explain the implication of the Eighty Year's crisis.
3. Examine the key features of Westphalian concept International Relations.

Objective Questions

- 1) When did the Dutch War of Independence begin?
- 2) Which treaty formally recognized the Dutch Republic?

4.10 Further Reading

- 1 Jackson Robert and George Sorensen, *Introduction to International Relations-Theories and Approaches*, UK: Oxford University Press, 1999
- 2 Krasner, Stephen, "Rethinking the sovereign state model", vo.27, 2001, pp.17-42
- 3 Kegley, Charles W. and Raymond, Gregory, *Exorcising the Ghost of Westphalia: Building World order in the New Millennium*, Prentice Hall, 2002
- 4 Farr, Jason, "Point: The Westphalia Legacy and the Modern Nation-State." *International Social Science Review*, vol. 80, no. 3/4, 2005, pp. 156–59
- 5 Wilson, Peter H., *The Thirty Years War: Europe's Tragedy*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2009
- 6 Ashworth, Lucian M, *A History of International Thought*, Oxon and New York: Routledge, 2014
- 7 Baylis John, Smith Steve and Owens Patricia, *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*, UK: Oxford University Press, 2020
- 8 Teschke, Benno, *The Myth of 1648: Class, Geopolitics and the Making of Modern International Relations*, London: Verso Publications, 2003

Unit-5 □ Post-Westphalia

Structure

- 5.1 Objective**
- 5.2 Introduction**
- 5.3 Shift from the Westphalian System**
- 5.4 Globalization**
- 5.5 Rise of Non-State Actors**
- 5.6 Conclusion**
- 5.7 Summary**
- 5.8 Probable Questions**
- 5.9 Further Reading**

5.1 Objective

After reading this unit the learners will be able to—

- Explain post-Westphalian era.
- Analyse the changes it has brought about to the state-centric focus of International Relations.
- Examine the significance and the characteristics of this post-Westphalian world order.

5.2 Introduction

This segment deals with the emerging post-Westphalian world order. With the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648, the sovereign system of state model came into existence. As a result, state-centric approach based on absolute sovereignty dominated the domain of International Relations. States became the main actors of international politics and the fact that sovereignty was vested in nation states gave impetus to the idea of national self-determination. This principle dominated Europe particularly during the 19th and 20th century. However, with the passage of time, particularly in the post-cold war era, new organizations, actors began to dilute the state-centric model of Westphalia. There has been a growing tendency to abandon the Westphalian model and embrace these transformative agencies as a crucial component in International Relations. The post-Westphalian world is confronted with multiplicity of issues and transnational activities challenging the Westphalian format. However, difference scholars differ in their opinion on the question of transition from

westphalian to post westphalian system. But it is seen that in the post-cold war decade, fundamental changes have brought about a shrink in the role of the state thereby contesting the structural framework of the world order brought by the Westphalian model. From an international system of state, the world has gradually moved towards a more global system of arrangement. Therefore, the transition that the world order was undergoing through from the Westphalian model and towards the post- Westphalian era needs to be highlighted in details.

5.3 Shift from the Westphalian System

Despite the debates regarding the ‘myth’ of Westphalia it definitely brought about some crucial aspects of international law and politics at the forefront. There has been a near consensus in the field of International Relations that Westphalia and its treaties of 1648 are still considered to be a benchmark, particularly for the European international system. Therefore, the Westphalian system with the sovereign system of states as its central focus dominated the heart of international politics. But with the end of cold war politics, these dynamics have undergone a change.

- ***The State-Centric Order***

From the middle of the seventeenth century, states were seen as the only legitimate political systems of Europe, based on their own separate territories, their own independent governments, and their own political subjects. The Westphalian system was sustained by its primacy of the territorial state as political actor on a global level, the centrality of international warfare, the autonomy of the sovereign state to govern affairs within recognized international boundaries, the generalized tolerance of “human wrongs” committed within the scope of sovereign authority, the special leadership role in geopolitics claimed by and assigned to leading state(s), and the absence of strong institutions of regional and global governance. However, the paradoxical nature of the Westphalian model continues to challenge its formulation of being the driver of the absolutist sovereignty. The Westphalian model was not only a Eurocentric establishment but also brought about a turbulent phase in international politics with war and imperialistic tendencies. This inequality generated its own distinctive form of “global governance” relying on the performance of special managerial roles by leading state actors, known as “the Great Powers”, and more recently discussed as “hegemonic geopolitics”. Such a model was historically conditioned by the evolutionary dynamics of a Eurocentric world that included imperial forms of multistate governance, and was gradually challenged in the 20th century by the rise of the US and the Soviet Union. These states emerged as the “superpowers” in the era of the cold war,

dominating tight alliances designed to deter expansion by their rivals and possessing weaponry of mass destruction.

Therefore, two contradictory logics operate under the Westphalian system (i) on the one hand it talks about equality of states (ii) on the other hand there has been a hierarchy of states when it comes to the actual operation of international relations. Due to this contradiction, while state centric approach fixated with sovereignty remained the core principle of Westphalia, there was constant conflict in the nineteenth and twentieth century with the First and Second World War followed by the Cold war decade. Therefore, the peace which the Westphalian order spoke of never occurred in practice due to the constant instability and conflict. As a result, the golden age of sovereignty based on non-intervention and equality never occurred when it comes to the actual behaviour of states. The constant wars during the nineteenth and twentieth century was suggestive of the fact that the principles of sovereignty and juridical autonomy had consistently faced violations. This different aspect associated with the behaviour of the states remained the main central focus of study during this entire span of time.

● *The Changes in Post-Cold War Era*

The end of the cold war brought the closure of the bipolar world and was marked by a fundamental shift in the international world order. States as the basic, principal and sole legitimate actors in the international system continued their privileged status till the late 1980s when state sovereignty and the state-centric Westphalian system began to face the challenges of the newly emerging international order. The international system has become much more interdependent, due to the emerging partnerships between states and non-state actors. The difference between internal and external sovereignty has lost its validity. The distinction between domestic politics and foreign policy began to get blurred in this period. The collapse of the Soviet Union and the dissolution of the Eastern European communist governments in 1989 transformed the international system by not only altering the governing rules of the superpower conflict but also the norms underpinning the international system. Thus, the end of the Cold War characterized the end of modern international relations and state-centric ideology along with the weakening of the core state-centered tasks. This phase is marked by increasing interdependence and multiplicity of actors playing a crucial role in this enmeshed network. According to Kegley and Raymond, the Westphalian world order which gave rise to national interests of states started shifting in the contemporary world order.

The concept of *raison d'etat* that “ushered in the modern state system is changing because state sovereignty is being undermined by a series of challenges. At the same time

interdependence is ushering in a nascent sense of universalism. Hence, questions have been raised whether the Westphalian international order would continue to be applicable in the 21st century. Contemporary world is shaped by the centripetal and centrifugal forces underlined by the process of globalization pulling many of the planet's inhabitants together and fragmenting, pushing people apart. It would be fair to suggest that the world is seemingly becoming more cosmopolitan but at the same time more parochial. Intricate patterns of transnational exchange compete with emotional ties of national identity. Nation-states are enmeshed in a complex network of transitional governance that includes corporations, banks, intergovernmental and non-governmental organization. In sum, the new world order is shaped by those forces that challenges the Westphalian state-centric view of international politics.

As a result, the post-Westphalian international system has two major characteristics :

First, sovereignty has been eroding in the process of globalization and we are moving towards a more cosmopolite world. Nation states have become enmeshed in a complex network of global governance including regional and international organizations, transnational and sub-national entities, multi-national corporations and non-governmental organizations, citizen movements and individuals that emerged as the independent actors with the assumed capacity to compete with states.

Second, the horizon of International Relations has expanded as it includes new areas such as human rights, gender, women, the environment, democratization, population movements and energy politics, among many others. The inclusion of these subject matters in the field suggests that it is no longer confined to the limits of the nation states, inter-state relations and state-centred tasks and topics.

Hence, a full-fledged Westphalian order has not been achieved, but it is nevertheless underway. Although there is a gradual erosion of the state sovereignty, there is no dissolution of the state. State has become an integral aspect of the multi-actor and multi-network system and a complete dilution of the state sovereignty does not take place. Instead, the state has become entangled and integrated with a more globalized world order in the post-cold war decade. There has been a network of global governance composing of both state and non-state actors.

Every historic period is marked by some change. Analysts have questioned whether the Westphalian system is capable enough to make a contribution to the world order in the twenty-first-century. As the challenges multiply-environmental deterioration, human security threats, sufficient allocation of resources-they have become more intertwined, and, the logic of unilateralism has weakened. A new trend in international system is unfolding.

Unlike the governments of sovereign states, networks are not wedded to an established chain of command or a fixed geographic space. They contain multiple nodes of interaction, where different combinations of people coalesce for different purposes. Globalism, democratization, and humanitarianism are reducing the relevance of the Westphalian territorial state in world politics during the new millennium.

5.4 Globalization

The Westphalia inspired notion of state sovereignty, but a potential threat has emerged in the form of the phenomenon of Globalization that has gripped the world since the 1990s. Steve Smith, Patricia Owens and John Baylis define it as “a process of increasing interconnectedness between societies such that events in one part of the world increasingly have effects on people and societies far away”. Despite the differences amongst the scholars regarding the definition of globalization, they are largely united on the fact that it implies greater interconnectivity across the world. Baylis and others argue that this interconnectedness is present almost all spheres of social existence, whether one considers international organisations like the IMF and WTO, the activities of Microsoft (through the rapid advancements of technology), Hollywood (through cultural globalization and the internet), as well as spreading of harmful microbes like SARS, Ebola and Zika (through easier transport facilities) and the trade of arms and weapons of mass destruction (through international smuggling).

Transcontinental communication has existed since the ancient times and is not a new phenomenon that emerged suddenly in the 20th and 21st centuries. However, the modern world is witnessing a level of interconnectivity that has never been experienced before. Thus, there has been an increase in the global scope. This increasing interconnectedness has definitely challenged the territorial supremacy of the state and as a result we witness a shrinking of the state-centric dominance.

5.5 Rise of Non-State Actors

In the post-Westphalian world, powerful non-state actors are the new emerging players who are challenging the territoriality of the nation-states. The growth of non-state actors has in large part been fuelled by the perceived inability of both domestic and international institutions to respond to the social, economic and political consequences of rapid advances in science and technology, growing economic interdependence and political fragmentation. Further, with the increase in transnational threats (pandemics, global warming, terrorism, the proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction, humanitarian issues and environmental

degradation) that require a coordinated response have created a need for new partners and approaches in solving global issues. The rise of MNC's have internationalized the means of production. However, increasingly transnational networks based on collective action are replacing the MNC's as mode of organization of the trade. The transnational corporations or the TNCs differ from the traditional MNC's in the sense that while the MNCs are national companies with foreign subsidiaries, TNCs spread out their operations in many countries with high levels of local responsiveness. Along with the rise of MNC's and TNC's embedded in a network facilitating international trade and business, there has also been the rise of the non-governmental organizations or the NGO's. They are private voluntary organisations whose members are individuals or associations that come together to achieve a common purpose. Some organisations are formed to advocate a particular cause such as human rights, peace and environmental protection; while others are established to provide services such as disaster relief, humanitarian aid or development assistance, especially in conflict affected societies. They are playing a crucial role in formulating the global public policies- Amnesty International, Earth Action and Medicins sans Frontieres are some of the examples.

Further, another trend shaping world politics can be found in the rising emphasis on humanitarian intervention which allows intervention by external forces in domestic domain when there is gross human right violation. This has challenged the Westphalian model which was dominated by twin principles of sovereignty and non-intervention. Hence, the only accepted exception to the prohibition against interfering in the domestic affairs of other nation-states was military intervention to liberate one's own nationals when they were being held hostage. As expressed in Article 7 of the Universal Declaration of Human Responsibilities, proposed by the InterAction Council of twenty-four former heads of state from five different continents: "Every person is infinitely precious and must be protected unconditionally." When massive human rights violations occur, "intervention from the outside is not only legally justified but also morally required.

5.6 Conclusion

The Westphalian world order has been drastically transformed in the post-cold war decade. The forces of globalization along with the rise of non-state actors have fundamentally challenged the territorial boundaries of the nation-states. As a result, the golden age for state sovereignty has never been reached. Hence, states are not the sole contenders in

international politics. While the role of the state has faced challenges in the new emerging world order, there is not a complete withering away of the state. Rather, the role of the state has undergone changes in the twenty first century embedded in a network of interconnectedness in order to deal with issues affecting everyone rather than being confined to one-singe state. Hence, in the post-Westphalian era, those activities which were under the sovereign authority of the states are now taking place through cooperation and coordination of a number of different actors.

5.7 Summary

- The Westphalian model dominated by the state as the primary actors began to face challenges in the post-cold war era as new trends started to challenge the world order.
- Moreover, the peace which the Westphalian model claimed to have brought about never occurred in practice. States were consistently in conflict with one another in the nineteenth and the twentieth century. In the post-cold war decade, new threats from terrorism, human rights abuses, weapons of mass destruction and climate change have further made the international system volatile.
- Further, globalization and the rise of non-state actors have facilitated the growth of a new interconnectedness that crosses the boundaries of a single state.
- Despite the challenges and the changes, the weakening of state power has only remained rhetorical. States continue to remain important but in a different way. States co-exist together in an embedded network at multi-level.

5.8 Probable Questions

Essay Type Questions

- 1) Explain the key features of post-Westphalian order.
- 2) Do you think that globalization has led to the erosion of territoriality? Elaborate.

Short Questions

- 1) Explain the role of the state in the post-cold war decade.
- 2) What is globalization? Discuss in brief the role of the non-state actors in contemporary world politics.

Objective Questions

- 1) Write the full form of FDI.
- 2) What are the two basic principles of the westphalian model?

5.9 Further Reading

- 1 Jackson Robert and George Sorensen, *Introduction to International Relations-Theories and Approaches*, UK: Oxford University Press, 1999
- 2 Krasner, Stephen, “Rethinking the sovereign state model”, vo.27, 2001, pp.17-42
- 3 Kegley, Charles W. and Raymond, Gregory, *Exorcising the Ghost of Westphalia: Building World order in the New Millennium*, Prentice Hall, 2002
- 4 Falk, Richard. “Revisiting Westphalia, Discovering Post-Westphalia.” *The Journal of Ethics*, vol. 6, no. 4, 2002, pp. 311–52
- 5 Baylis John, Smith Steve and Owens Patricia, *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*, UK: Oxford University Press, 2020

Module - 2

Unit : 6 □ Classical Realism

Structure

- 6.1 Objective**
- 6.2 Introduction**
- 6.3 Realists of Ancient and Modern Times and their Ideas**
- 6.4 Classical Realism and Thomas Hobbes**
 - 6.4.1 Morgenthau's Six Principles of Realism**
- 6.5 Realism : Realities of International Politics**
- 6.6 Basic features of Realism**
- 6.7 Major Elements of Realism**
- 6.8 Offensive and Defensive Realism**
- 6.9 Conclusion**
- 6.10 Summing Up**
- 6.11 Probable Questions**
- 6.12 Further Reading**

6.1 Objective

After studying this unit, learners will be able :

- To explain the Importance of theory building in International Relations.
- To discuss the several aspects of theories of International relations especially the realist theory.
- To explain the relationship between nations and how they connect in the world.
- To understand the power relations among international actors.

6.2 Introduction

The term 'international relations' may be used both for a 'condition' and a 'discipline'. International relations, as a condition, refers to the actual conduct of relations among nations through diplomacy based on foreign policy. It also includes actual areas of cooperation,

conflict, and War. It is also an accepted fact that international relations has its focus on the study of all relations, political, diplomatic, trade, and academic relations among sovereign states which constitute the subject matter of the discipline. International Relations is a study of the interaction of states, more precisely Western nation-states that are caught in a power struggle. International relations theory is a West-centric discourse that tries to pass off as a global phenomenon. The reliance of international relations theories on the knowledge that emerged from Western experiences makes them culture-bound and somewhat biased. It is based on western political theories and social realities that mostly emerged with the Age of Enlightenment and the Industrial Revolution. Thus, international relations theories can be seen as social constructs from the West that were imposed through colonialism in other parts of the world. There is the presence of strong epistemological issues that relate to how knowledge is generated. International relations theories are specific knowledge that emerged from the West. There is a strong value embedded within the discipline of International Relations which is ethnocentric.

Realism has been the most important approach to the study of international relations over the years. It has been the dominant way of explaining international behavior. Realism emphasizes relations among nations, as they have been and as they are. It is not concerned with the ideal world. Individuals are essentially selfish, and they seek power to serve their interests and prevail over others. Thus, there is an ever-present struggle for power in society. The same is the true of nations that are guided by the same considerations like the individuals.

Realism as an approach to the study of international relations has evolved over the centuries. Prominent among its earlier advocates were Indian scholar Kautilya, Chinese strategist Sun Tzu and Greek scholar Thucydides. Much later, Italian scholar Nicolo Machiavelli and English Philosopher Thomas Hobbes also contributed to the evolution of realism. Their ideas may be called *classical realism*. Morgenthau was the most systematic advocate of realism. British Professor E.H.Carr, who wrote *The Twenty Years' Crisis*, prepared the ground on which Morgenthau developed his theory of realism.

Realism is a school of thought that explains international relations in terms of power. The exercise of power by states towards each other is often called *realpolitik*, or just *power politics*. Realism developed in reaction to a liberal tradition that realists called idealism, though idealists do not consider their approach unrealistic. Idealism emphasizes international law, morality, and international organization rather than power. Idealists think human nature is basically good. They suggest that with good habits, education, and effective international organization, human nature can become the basis of peaceful and cooperative international relationships. For them, the principles of international relations must flow from morality.

Idealism presents a picture of a future international society free from power politics.

Realism emerged as a reaction to idealism both in the classical period and in the 20th century, after the First World War, and again during the Cold war. It derives its name from its advocates' belief that they are realistic and look at the world as it is. The security of the state is the primary motivation for a government's actions. The fact remains that the reality of world politics is the search and struggle for power, the existence of conflict more than cooperation, and the frequent occurrence of wars. Realists insist on studying world politics as it is and as it has been.

6.3 Realists of Ancient and Modern Times and Their Ideas

Many scholars and statesmen contributed to the evolution of realism since ancient times. The most notable among them are Kautilya, Sun Tzu, Thucydides, and Machiavelli.

Kautilya

The ancient Indian scholar-statesman Kautilya contributed to the origin of realism by making power the focal point of his theoretical framework. Kautilya probably made the first systematic effort to formulate the rules of statecraft. He concentrated on the concept of power in terms of goal attainment, leading to the development of an intricate set of rules whereby a 'conqueror' could maintain and expand his domain. He defined power as derived from three elements : Knowledge, Military Strength, and Courage.

Sun Tzu

The Chinese strategist realist Sun Tzu, who lived some two thousand years ago, advised the rulers of states on how to survive in an era when war had become a systematic instrument of power. Sun Tzu argued that moral reasoning was not very useful to the ruler confronting constantly armed and dangerous neighbours.

Thucydides

The famous Greek thinker Thucydides saw the inevitable competition and conflicts between Greek city-states. He stated that justice has a special meaning in international relations. It is all about knowing your proper place and adapting to the reality of equal power and not about equal treatment for all. Thucydides further stated that before any decision is made, a decision-maker should carefully think about the consequences, both bad, as well as good. He emphasized the ethics of caution and prudence in the conduct of foreign policy in a world of great inequality, restricted foreign policy choices, and ever-present dangers and opportunities.

Machiavelli

Italian realist scholar Niccolo Machiavelli asked the Prince (rulers) to concentrate on expedient action to *stay in power* and to *pay attention to war* more than anything else. Machiavelli wrote that power and deception are the two essential means for the conduct of foreign policy. The leaders of states should be both lions and foxes. The supreme political value is national freedom. The main responsibility of rulers is to seek the advantage and to defend the interests of the states and thus ensure their survival. Therefore, the ruler must be a lion. That also requires cunning and rather ruthlessness in the pursuit of self-interest. Thus, the ruler must be a fox. If rulers are not crafty and clever, they cannot bring benefits to themselves and their states. The prince should be prepared to engage in pre-emptive war and similar initiatives.

6.4 Classical Realism and Thomas Hobbes

English philosopher Thomas Hobbes made an important contribution to the theory of realism in the 17th century. Hobbes is popularly known as a contractarian. He discussed the free-for-all situation that exists when the government is absent and people act in their self-interest. In the process, they violently clash among themselves. He called this state of perpetual warfare a 'state of nature', where there is no rule of law. Hobbes advocated that an all-powerful monarchy alone could prevent chaos. Thus, power would be the sole weapon of orderly behavior. In his state of nature, people live in extremely insecure conditions in which every man is against every man. In this condition of perpetual war, every man, woman, and child is endangered by everyone else. Nobody is sure of his or her survival for any reasonable length of time. To get out of the miserable state of nature, people enter into a contract and make a sovereign. Unlike men and women who gave up their rights to set up sovereign states, modern states are not willing to give up their independence for the sake of any global security arrangement. The international state of nature of modern times is anarchy based on sovereign states.

For Hobbes, as for Thucydides and Machiavelli, security and survival are values of fundamental importance, but the core value of Hobbesian realism is domestic peace. So, we can say that all the classical realists of pre 20th century period believed that the state is organized and equipped for war to provide domestic peace for its people.

Classical Realism of the 20th Century

E.H.Carr and Hans J Morgenthau are the two most prominent realists of the 20th century.

E.H. Carr

Carr's work, *The Twenty Year's Crisis*, was published in 1939 on the eve of the Second World War. It was a response to the failed belief of post-First World War idealists led by US President Woodrow Wilson. Carr called the idealists 'utopian', or 'utopian liberals'. Carr could be easily described as the forerunner of the great realist, Hans. J Morgenthau. A brief discussion of utopianism and Carr's realist approach will be appropriate at this stage. In response to the horrors of the First World War, liberal internationalists, or 'utopians' as Carr called them, sought to abolish war as an instrument of statecraft. Liberals were convinced that the forms of international diplomacy could be restructured to make them more peaceful. Self-determination and statehood would be available to all nationalities. Secret diplomacy would be abolished and replaced by public consent in the conduct of foreign policy. The balance of power principle would give way to a system of collective security, where individual acts of aggression would be met by the collective force of world opinion and military power. Finally, international fora, such as the League of Nations, would be established to mediate for the peaceful resolution of conflicts. Idealism presented a picture of a future international society free from power politics, immorality, and violence.

Carr believed that realism was 'a necessary corrective to the exuberance utopianism' which had ignored the central element of power in its consideration of international politics. Until the unequal distribution of power in the international system became the central focus of dispassionate analysis, the root causes of conflict and war would not be properly understood. Carr believed the liberal utopians were so concerned with eradicating the blight of war they had completely neglected its underlying rationale. According to Carr, 'just as the ruling class in a community prays for domestic peace, which guarantees its security and predominance, and denounces class war, which might threaten them, so international peace becomes a vested interest of predominant powers'. For a state which wishes to revise its territorial boundaries or its economic and strategic power, 'international peace' is an oppressive tyranny camouflaged as universal harmony. It is the slogan of those players powerful enough to impose their will on subordinate societies. War may be the only way in which power can be recalibrated in the international system.

The liberal utopians wanted to eliminate power as a consideration for states in the international system. On the other hand, Realists believed the pursuit of national power was a natural drive that states neglected at their risk. Nation-states that shunned the pursuit of power on principle simply endangered their security. Whatever may be its final form, Carr was convinced that a new international order would be shaped by the realities of global power rather than by morality. He was not arguing that morality was an irrelevant

consideration. He believed that international peace was most likely when the dominant power was generally accepted as tolerant and non-oppressive as preferable to any practical alternative. But this was the closest he came to conceding that there might be a moral basis for the international order. He preferred to stress that 'power is a necessary ingredient of every political order'. This conviction exposed Carr to critics who claimed he was privileging power and its pursuit by states above all other factors.

Hans J Morgenthau (1904-1980)

Morgenthau founded the 'realist school of international relations'. He described politics as a struggle for power. Many Americans, immersed in legalism and moralism, did not relish Morgenthau's emphasis on national interest, which, according to them, smacked of the old evil 'power politics'. But, for Morgenthau national interest alone made sense in international relations. Any action of the states should be based on prudence and practicability.

Morgenthau defined national interest in terms of power. Therefore, it was largely objective and rational. He said, 'International politics, like all politics, is a power struggle.' Therefore, he argued, 'when facing authoritarian and aggressive rulers like Germany's Hitler and Japan's Tojo, America needed power, not legalism and moralism'. According to Morgenthau, 'men and women are, by nature, political animals. They are born to pursue power'. The craving for power dictates a search not only for relative advantage but also for a secure political space within which to maintain and enjoy oneself free from the political dictates of the other. The ultimate political space within which security can be arranged and enjoyed is the independent state. Security beyond the state is impossible.

In a world where conflicts are perpetual, moral principles can never be fully realized. They can only be approximated through a temporary balancing of interests. Absolute good can never be achieved, but a system of checks and balances can be deduced from historical experience rather than abstract moral or ethical codes. Like E.H. Carr, Morgenthau began his approach by defining his position in opposition to what he sees as the influence, if not the dominance, of the liberal Utopian principles. Morgenthau listed six principles of political realism, which, when taken together summarize his theoretical approach to the study of international relations. In the first chapter of his famous book *Politics Among Nations* (1948), Morgenthau states that his theory is called realism because it is concerned with human nature as it is and with the historical processes as they take place. Thus, realism revolves around power politics, which is real and not the utopian ideal of world peace through morality and education.

6.4.1. Morgenthau's Six Principles of Realism

Morgenthau developed his theory in the form of six principles of political realism.

- 1. Self-preservation is the principle of human nature :** The first principle of Political realism is that Politics is governed by objective laws which have their roots in human nature. Man is a mixture of good and bad, selfishness and altruism. Loving and quarrelsome traits and possessive and sacrificial qualities. Above all this is the story of the struggle for survival and human history is an account of war contests and peaceful settlements. And state's primary interest is self-preservation. Therefore, the state must seek power and must always protect itself.
- 2. Strong Power is only in existence :** Interest and power are no doubt the key concept in Morgenthau's Theory, but the meaning attached to them is not inert and fixed once and for all. The states' interests are fluid and change with the ever-changing situation in the world at large. The only certainty in the world is power. A powerful state will always be able to outdo - and outlast - weaker competitors.
- 3. Concept of National Interest :** The main element of Political realism is the concept of national interest which Morgenthau defines in terms of power. He assumes that statesmen think and act in terms of interest defined as power. Power is not only a tool of analysis but also a guide to policy. According to Morgenthau, a foreign policy should concern more with the political requirement of success rather than anything else.
- 4. Prudence is the supreme virtue :** Political realism, though aware of the moral significance of political action, maintains that universal moral principles should not be applied to the action of states in their abstract universal formulation. It must be modified by the time and place. Realism, considers prudence to be the supreme virtue in politics. There can be no political morality without prudence.
- 5. No importance to Morality :** As political realism does not identify national interests with universal morality and defeats its purpose, it does not treat what is right and justifiable for a certain nation as good for all countries. It refuses to identify the moral aspirations of a particular nation with the moral law that governs the universe.
- 6. Autonomy in Political Sphere :** Political realism maintains the autonomy of the political sphere. It thinks in terms of interest defined as power. It puts all other standards in subordination to political standards. It should not be mixed up with the legalistic, moralistic approach to international politics.

6.5 Realism : Realities of International Politics

The doctrine of realism, as evident from the views of various thinkers beginning with Kautilya, is based on the belief that international relations must study the world as it is. It was generally accepted as the study of the struggle for power till the beginning of the 20th century. Balance of power was regarded as the expression of realistic politics. After the First World War, there was some disenchantment with realism. The realists' concern with the state comes from the concern with security and issues of power. States are the only organizations that can direct military power on any significant scale. The emphasis on security and potential violence derives from a pessimistic argument. The situation is aggravated when states acquire armaments in anticipation of threats. Even when their intentions are sincerely peaceful, suspicious neighbours might mistake their behavior as preparation for offensive rather than defensive war. This can be easily illustrated by the Indo-Pak security rivalry.

6.6 Basic Features of Realism

The basic tenets of realism can be summarized as follows :

- States are the dominant actors in the international system;
- States pursue power; they do this both in the sense of trying to get more powerful positions at the cost of opponents and by defending themselves against the encroachments of those rivals; and
- As the relationships of the states with each other are dependent entirely on their power relationships, they have nothing to do with the internal structure of the state or the type of regime.

6.7 Major Elements of Realism

Statism and Survival are the two major elements of realism.

Statism : Realism is state-centric, and the state is the embodiment of power. As Donelan writes, 'every state is fundamentally a *machstaat*', which means a power state. And the state, in the words of Max Weber, has 'the monopoly over the legitimate use of physical force within a given territory'. The state possesses and manages power and ensures the security of its borders and its people. However, externally the states coexist in an anarchic system. Thus, a state is organized power internally and seeks to accumulate power internationally. Power is the monopoly of the state. For realists, states are the only actors

that count. Transnational corporations, international organizations, and religious groups do possess influence, but they lack power. Drawing inspiration from Hegel and others, realists like Morgenthau and Nicholson identified the state as the guardian of the political community.

Survival : All realists agree that in international politics the most important goal is security. Survival is a precondition for attaining all other goals, whether these involve conquest or the welfare of the people and nations' development. Leaders of states need to distance themselves from traditional morality. For Machiavelli, the principles of morality were positively harmful to observe by the leaders of a state, who, according to him, must aim at power not only to protect but, if necessary, even to conquer others. The statesmen needed to learn a different kind of morality that 'accorded not to traditional Christian values, but political necessity'. As Morgenthau had insisted, 'prudence is the most important virtue'. Former US Secretary of State Henry Kissinger said, 'a nation's survival is its first and ultimate responsibility, it cannot be compromised or put to risk'.

6.8 Offensive and Defensive Realism

These are different types of realisms like 'offensive or aggressive realism' and 'defensive realism'. The differences between the two define the differences in the policies of the states.

- i. The primary attention of aggressive realism is centered on security. It believes that states generally do, and should, ensure their security and expand their resources by coercive means. If a state fails to do so, then other states would use coercive means and expand their power. The country that loses this opportunity has its security threatened and endangered and may often lose its resources. In the case of aggressive realism, offensive military activities are increased and international rivalry is encouraged.
- ii. On the other hand, states that believe infinite security exists in the international system adopt defensive strategies in their policies. The countries that believe in defensive realism emphasize maintaining their security and do not adopt coercive means for the enlargement of their resources. Defensive realists try to maintain only as much military capability as to ensure their minimum credible deterrent power.

Aggressive realists generally create a new crisis and often help increase crises. Their attitude can be termed proactive. The defensive realist states, on the other hand, adopt only reactive strategies. Both strands of realism accept the reality of international relations being

influenced by human nature. They believe that each state gives the highest priority to the protection and promotion of its national interests. They also believe that national interests are protected only through power. Realism believes that conflict among states is an eternal truth and each state tries to turn the balance of power in its favour or to acquire a preponderance of power. But the basic difference between aggressive and defensive realism is that aggressive realists seek to enhance power with the help of coercive means at their initiative and adopt aggressive policies to increase their military strength and economic prosperity. The defensive realists are happy and content if its territorial integrity and sovereignty are well protected. The defensive realist is satisfied with a minimum credible deterrent, as is the case with India's nuclear policy. But aggressive realism does not hesitate in making use of force, as was evident in America's Iraq policy pursued by President George W. Bush. Kenneth Waltz is considered as the pioneer of neo-realism. His views (1979) may be described as defensive realism. Waltz argues that different countries compete with each other to increase their power to ensure security. Against the defensive realism of Waltz, aggressive realism was advocated by Mearsheimer (2001). He argues that the structure of the world is such that powerful nations are encouraged to take initiative to enhance their relative power to achieve their objective.

6.9 Conclusion

Power is the core of realist politics. Struggle for power may lead to either military conflict, including war, or an attempt to secure acceptance of one nation's views by others. Failure to secure compliance by other states is the failure of the power of the state. It disturbs the balance of power. Realism has had periods of setback as during the inter-war period when Wilsonian idealism put faith in the League of Nations, which failed miserably.

Objections to realism are based on the picture that it paints of a world perpetually on the edge of war. It presumes that national interest involves readiness to violence. Besides, liberals have always been against realists' emphasis on the power struggle. Morgenthau has been criticized for his assumptions about human nature. Burchill says, 'He makes several claims about the biological basis of the human drive for power and domination, without explaining other aspects of the human condition which are not as egoistic'. These claims are found to be flawed and do not necessarily conform to any reality. From the Marxist point of view, Morgenthau largely ignores economic considerations in the formulation of foreign policy and says little about the nature of capitalism and its effects on international order. Finally, the neo-realists question the wisdom of traditional realism and its emphasis on human nature to the exclusion of the structure of global order.

Some liberals criticizing realism argue that changes in the way international relations work have made realist assumptions untenable. Unlike the period of balance of power when kings and queens of Europe played war and traded territories as property, we live today in a globalized world in which states are interconnected. Borders are becoming fluid and the norms regarding the use of military force have substantially changed. Human nature is no more accepted as the gospel of truth in world politics. New realist thinkers pay far more attention to the structure of the world, which is anarchic, and the strategies adopted in foreign policy decision-making.

6.10 Summing Up

- The realist school of thought believes that power is the most fundamental of all political activity. As Morgenthau says that is an all-permeating fact that is the essence of human existence.
- Realism believes that each state is trying to destroy the other and as such, each one must be ready to protect itself.
- Realist theory also believes that power struggle is an ongoing and continuing struggle and it is a never-ending process.
- Each state directly or indirectly follows expansionist policy on the one hand and self-preserving policy on the other hand.

6.11 Probable Questions

Essay Type Questions

- 1) Do you think Realism represents the reality of international politics?
- 2) What is the core concern of realism in International Relations?
- 3) Examine and evaluate the six principles of Political Realism.

Short Questions

- 1) How do you define 'power' in International relations?
- 2) What is Offensive realism?
- 3) Indicate the basic features of Realism.

Objective Questions

- 1) Who is the author of the book 'The Twenty Years Crisis'?
- 2) Name one prominent realists of the 20th century.
- 3) 'Men and women are, by nature, political animals' —Who said this statement?

6.12 Further Reading

- a. Linklater A. 1990. *Beyond Realism and Marxism*. Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- b. Waltz, Kenneth N. 1979. *Theory of International Politics*. Addison-Wesley, London.
- c. Kumar, L.K. 2014. *Introduction to International Politics*. Open University of Sri Lanka, Colombo.
- d. Reus-Smit, C.2013. *Theories of International Relations*. Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- e. Wendt, A. 1999. *A Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Unit - 7 □ Neo-Realism

Structure

- 7.1 Objective**
- 7.2 Introduction**
- 7.3 Kenneth Waltz : Neo-Realism**
- 7.4 Strategic Realism**
- 7.5 Conclusion**
- 7.6 Summing Up**
- 7.7 Probable Questions**
- 7.8 Further Reading**

7.1 Objective

After studying this unit, learners will be able :

- To discuss the several aspects of the neo-realist theory.
- To explain neo-realist trends in contemporary world politics.
- To understand the differences between classical realism and contemporary realism (neo-realism).
- To explain power struggle and struggle for peace in the international sphere.

7.2 Introduction

Since the 1970s, scholars like Kenneth Waltz and Thomas Schelling have given new construals of realism. The ‘Neo-Realist Theory’ of Waltz and the ‘Strategic Theory’ of Schelling together sought to modify the traditional realism as explained by writers such as Thucydides, Machiavelli, Hobbes, and Morgenthau. According to the views expressed by Robert Jackson and Georg Sorensen, traditional realism may be divided into the classical realism of earlier thinkers and the neo-classical realism of Morgenthau. However, it would be better to avoid this distinction and put traditional or classical realism in one category, and neo-realism in another category. Power remains the focal point of all variants of realism, yet there are different approaches adopted by 20th century realists. Power is understood to be not only a fact of political life but also a matter of political responsibility. Balance of power is not only a fact of world politics, but it is also a basic value. For classical realists, the balance of power is a desirable institution and a good thing to strive for because it prevents hegemonic domination by any one great power. For all realists, it upholds the basic values of international peace and security.

New realist thinkers have adopted, with modifications, the basic tenets of orthodox or traditional realism. We will discuss two strands of realism that evolved since the 1970s. These are the strategic realism of Thomas Schelling and the structural or neo-realism of Kenneth Waltz.

7.3 Kenneth Waltz : Neo-realism

Neo-realism, advocated mainly by Kenneth Waltz in his book *Theory of International Politics* (1979), is also known as 'structural realism'. Waltz's theory focuses centrally on the structure of the international system, its interacting units, and the continuities and changes of the system. Waltz takes some elements of traditional or classical realism as the starting point of his theory. But he departs and, unlike Morgenthau, gives no account of human nature. He ignores the ethics of statecraft. He has tried to present a scientific theory of international relations. In neo-realism, the structure of the system, in particular, the relative distribution of power is the central focus of analysis. Actors (states) are less important because structures compel them to act in certain ways. The structures, more or less, determine the actions of the states and their leaders. Waltz insists on an anarchical international system, which is decentralized. In the anarchical world, several transnational economic actors threaten to undermine the authority of the states.

According to Stephen Kragner, realism is a theory about international politics. It is an effort to explain both the behavior of individual states and the characteristics of the system as a whole. The ontological argument given for realism is that sovereign states are the constitutive components of the international system. Sovereignty is a political order based on territorial control. The international system is anarchical. It is a self-help system. No higher authority can constrain or channel the behavior of the states. Sovereign states are rational self-seeking actors resolutely, if not exclusively, concerned with relative gains because they must function in an anarchical environment in which their security and well-being ultimately rest on their ability to mobilize their resources against external threats.

Kragner gives a brief yet accurate description of neo-realism. Burchill calls it a 'modern variant of realist tradition', which had been pioneered by Carr and Morgenthau. It was a response partly to the challenges posed by the interdisciplinary approach and partly as a restatement of the importance of bipolarity and systematic factors in international politics. Robert Gilpin and Stephen Krasner had sought to reclaim a role for the state in a world that was increasingly coming under the impact of bodies like religious groups, multinational corporations, and international governmental and non-governmental organizations (IGOs and NGOs). Neo-realism of Kenneth Waltz is both a critique of traditional realism and a

substantial intellectual extension of a theoretical tradition that was in danger of being outflanked by rapid changes in world politics.

Kenneth Waltz insists that to understand the behavior of the international system, we have to start with the system and then move down to individual actors rather than the other way around. This is in contrast to realists like Morgenthau who laid emphasis on innate human nature and then proceeded to build the classical realist theory. Waltz based his argument explicitly on the economists' analysis of individual markets and their interactions with the economy as such. The argument is that we can only study the price and the behavior of individual actors in the market by analyzing the system as a whole. Structural realists like Waltz argue that, in effect, states are in a similar situation. They have to react to the system as it is given, although it is the commutation of their reactions that determines the system. As Michael Nicholson sums up, 'structural realists argue that states, power, and security are central as with classical realism, although they also recognize the importance of economic actors'. However, these economic actors are ultimately subordinate to states. Thus, to quote Nicholson, "... all states are pursuing power. The situation in which any given state is placed broadly determines the sort of policy it must follow. It has very little freedom of choice and this applies to big, powerful states as well as small ones". Waltz presented a radically revised realist theory. This neo-realist theory is based on the assumption that the international system is essentially anarchical and that, in such anarchical systems, states are primarily interested in their survival. To ensure their survival the states have to maximize power, particularly their military capability. Hence, the will of the states to maximize their power to the point of securing a dominant position becomes an enduring feature of international relations and conflict endemic. In such a world, cooperation between states is precarious, if not non-existent. Kenneth Waltz reinvigorated realism, giving it a new identity and new confidence. But, this new identity was soon challenged by neo-liberal institutionalists led by Robert Keohane.

Waltz differs from classical realists in some fundamental ways. There is no discussion on human nature such as the one given by Morgenthau. As Jackson and Sorenson wrote, 'The focus is on the structure of the system and not on the human beings who create the system or operate the system. State leaders are prisoners of the system and its deterministic logic, which dictates what they must do in their conduct of foreign policy. There is no room in Waltz's theory for foreign policy making that is independent of the structure of the system'. For Waltz, structure determines policy. In Waltz's theory, there is an implied recognition of the ethical dimension of international politics. Waltz operates with a concept of state sovereignty. But, for him, all states are equal only in a formal - legal sense. They are

unequal in a substantive or material sense. That too indicates that neo-realism is all for security and survival. Waltz operates with the concept of national interest. This conforms with the classical realism of Morgenthau. Waltz wrote, "... each state plots the course it thinks will best serve its interests". For classical realists, national interest is the basic guide of responsible foreign policy. It is a moral idea that must be defended and promoted by state leaders. However, for Waltz, the national interest seems to operate like "an automatic sign commanding state leaders when and where to move". Here, the difference is that, for Morgenthau, statesmen are duty-bound to conduct their foreign policy guidelines provided by the national interest, while, for Waltz, leaders will always do that more or less automatically. Waltz tried to present a scientific explanation of international politics. Reiterating that international relations may be thought of as a system with a precisely defined structure, Waltz argued that classical realism was unable to conceptualize the international system in this way because it was limited by its behaviorist methodology which explains political outcomes through examining the constituent parts of the political system. By this logic, the characteristics and the interactions of behavioral units are taken to be the direct cause of political events. Waltz argues that classical realists fail to conceive of structure as a force that shapes and shoves the units. To conclude, as Scott Burchill wrote, ... Morgenthau argued that power is rooted like humankind, neo-realists such as Waltz point to the anarchical condition of the international realm, which imposes the accumulation of power as a systematic requirement of the states. If classical realism considered human nature as the main source of this inevitability of conflict, neo-realism looks for it in the very nature of how the international society is constituted. But, except for this shift of emphasis, the overall approach remains more or less the same. The basic principles of orthodox or traditional realism, like the supremacy of national interest, the inevitability of conflict, power as an instrument of policy, and the irrelevance of morality, retain their importance in neo-realism also. It may be a mere coincidence but both realism of Morgenthau and the neo-realism of Waltz had one Common background, Morgenthau's theory propounded after the commencement of the Cold War, and Waltz's neo-realism was written in 1979 at the beginning of the new Cold War, both called for vigorous involvement of the United States as a super power to turn the balance of power in its focus.

7.4 Strategic Realism

Strategic realism, like neo-realism, is a product of the behavioral revolution of the 1950s and 1960s. Many contemporary realists seek to provide an empirical analysis of world politics. But they avoid normative analysis of international politics because that is considered subjective and, thus, unscientific. Strategic realism is associated with the name of Thomas

Schelling who propagated his views in 1980. Schelling's strategic realism focuses its attention on foreign policy decision-making. Leaders of states are obliged to think strategically when they confront basic diplomatic and military issues. They have to think strategically, i.e., instrumentally, if they hope to be successful. Schelling views diplomacy and foreign policy as a rational instrumental activity that can be more clearly understood by the application of game theory. As Schelling says, 'diplomacy is bargaining'. It seeks outcomes that, though not ideal for either of the parties, are better for both as compared to some of the alternatives. He wrote, "Bargaining can be politics or can be rude, entail threats as well as offers, assume a status quo or ignore all rights and privileges, and assume mistrust rather than trust". But Schelling says that there must be some common interest to avoid mutual damage.

The central concept that Schelling employs is that of a 'threat'. He analyzes how state leaders can deal with the threat and dangers of nuclear war. He wrote, "the efficiency of ... (a nuclear) threat may depend on what alternatives are available to the political enemy, who, if he is not to react like a trapped lion, must be left some tolerable recourse. We have come to realize that a threat of all-out retaliation ... eliminates a lesser course of action and forces him to choose between enemies ... may induce him to strike first. Strategic realists are concerned with how to employ power intelligently to get the adversary to do what we desire and, more importantly, to avoid doing what we fear". This is a simple explanation of the concept of power in the context of strategies that political leaders adopt. Schelling suggests various mechanisms, strategies, and moves that can enable state actors to generate collaboration and avoid disaster in a conflict-ridden world of nuclear weapon states.

One of the crucial instruments of foreign policy for a major power is that of the armed forces. Thus, strategic realism highlights the use of armed might in foreign policy. Schelling makes an important distinction between brute force and coercion, between 'taking' what you want (by brute force) and making someone give it to you (by coercion). He says that brute force succeeds when it is used, whereas the power to hurt is most successful when held in reserve. It is the threat of damage that can make the opponent yield or comply. One must know what the adversary's possessions are, and what cares for him.

7.5 Conclusion

Contemporary realists do not go into the nature of man which, according to Morgenthau, is selfish and lustful. They find the structure of the international system anarchical, where power is sought to be used for meeting selfish ends. For strategic realists, the emphasis is on a strategy that state leaders adopt while formulating foreign policy and conducting diplomacy. They use power to achieve what they want either by taking it or making the opponent give what they desire.

7.6 Summing Up

- The state may be a significant actor in international relations but it is not the sole actor.
- In the absence of higher authority in the international system, there is no other way to secure oneself other than self-help.
- This kind of self-help ultimately leads to a security dilemma because a security build-up of one would lead to the insecurity of others.
- The presence of a system characterized by the absence of a higher power over the sovereign states causes war and conflict in world politics.

7.7 Probable Questions

Essay Type Questions

- 1) What is the difference between realism and neo-realism?
- 2) Write an essay on Kenneth Waltz's Strategic Realism.

Short Type Questions

- 1) What do you mean by 'Security Dilemma'?
- 2) Examine the pluralist challenge to Neo-realism.

Objective Questions

- 1) Name any one theorist associated with Neo-realism.
- 2) Who is the pioneer of the 'Strategic Theory'?

7.8 Further Reading

- a. Linklater A. 1990. *Beyond Realism and Marxism*. Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- b. Keohane, Robert O. 1986. *Neorealism and its critics*. Cambridge University Press, New York.
- c. Baldwin, David. 1993. *Neorealism and Neoliberalism: The Contemporary Debate (New Directions in World Politics)*, Columbia University Press, USA.
- d. Waltz, Kenneth N. 1979. *Theory of International Politics*. Addison-Wesley, London.
- e. Khanna, V. N. and Kumar, Leslie K. 2022. *International Relations*. Vikas Publishing House, New Delhi.

Unit - 8 □ Marxist Approach

Structure

- 8.1 Objective**
- 8.2 Introduction**
- 8.3 Basic Elements of Marxism**
- 8.4 Critical Theory**
- 8.5 New Marxism**
- 8.6 Conclusion**
- 8.7 Summing Up**
- 8.8 Probable Questions**
- 8.9 Further Reading**

8.1 Objective

After studying this unit, learners will be able :

- To understand materialistic interpretation of International relations.
- To apply Marxist theories to explain contemporary world politics.
- Differentiate Marxist theories from mainstream theories of IR.

8.2 Introduction

Marxism is a critical approach that wants always to question the mainstream policy-driven approaches to International relations. Of the range of great thinkers available to us, Marx (1818-1883) may not automatically qualify as being the most internationalist. Most of Marx's work was not primarily concerned with the formation of states or even the interactions between them. What connected their interests to International relations was the industrial revolution, as this event was ultimately what Marx was witnessing and trying to understand. He, with Engels, developed a revolutionary approach and outlined a set of concepts that transcended national differences while also providing practical advice on how to build a transnational movement of people. Workers from factories across the world - the proletariat - were to organize themselves into an organised revolutionary movement to counter the exploitative and unequal effects of capitalism, which were accelerated and

expanded by the industrial revolution. This vision of a potential link between the bulk of humanity as a global proletariat is where, and how, Marxism enters International relations from a different vantage point.

8.3. Basic Elements of Marxism

Marxist concepts are all connected by the common goal to contribute to what they perceive as the greater good of humankind and its environment. To borrow the words of Adrienne Rich, the theory is the seeing of patterns, showing the forest as well as the trees - theory can be a dew that rises from the earth and collects in the rain cloud and returns to earth over and over. But if it doesn't smell the earth, it isn't good for the earth.

To understand Marxism, we need to grasp the basic elements of Marx's interpretation of the origins and functioning of capitalism. In addition, we must understand that those origins and functioning can simultaneously happen at the domestic and international levels. Combining these tasks leads to arguably the most important contribution Marxism offers to International relations: that the capitalist mode of production and the modern sovereign states system is not natural or inevitable events. They are interdependent products of particular historical conditions and social relations. The work of Marxists is to map and retrace those conditions and social relations and to figure out how the capitalist mode of production and the sovereign states system emerged - as two sides of the same coin, as different coins, or maybe as different currencies. Debates on the degree of interdependence between these two major historical phenomena may be ongoing, but Marxism's achievement in International relations has been to stop us from thinking about them separately. Marxism also advises that concepts are not just meant to help us understand the world - they should also help us to change it.

Marxism asserts that material conditions can be changed by the actions of human beings as well as by events - think of climate change for example, which depends on physical phenomena as well as human behaviour. In other words, these material conditions are historical. But they are also always dependent on and often hampered by the processes and ideas that preceded them, as the past weighs on the present. A Marxist would stress that international relations are not just about states' foreign policy or the behaviour of politicians, but more about survival, reproduction, technologies, and labour. If this is correct then the separation between the political and economic, or public and private is problematic because those categories hide how states and foreign policies are determined by the social relations

and structures of the global economy. However, this ignores the endurance of regional inequalities and the structural and historical links between states, violence, and the key actors of the global political economy.

The first application of Marxist ideas to explain international processes was by communists and revolutionaries in the early 20th century such as Rosa Luxemburg, Rudolf Hilferding, and Vladimir Lenin. These authors developed what we now call the classical theories of imperialism to understand how capitalism expanded and adapted to a world of inter-imperial rivalry leading to the First World War and the slow disintegration of the European empires.

Immanuel Wallerstein developed the world-systems theory to incorporate the changes of the late twentieth century and counter the way traditional approaches tended to understand imperialism as a state-led process. His approach used different units of analysis and took a much longer-term view of the history of states and their interactions. He distinguished three groups of state regions: the core, the semi-periphery, and the periphery. The aim was to understand how states have developed since the 16th century thereby creating relations of dependency between different groups of states. Therefore, these relations of dependency and groups required that we understand the world through broader units than states. These units - or world systems - helped to address the dilemma of why states all became capitalist, even though in very unequal and different ways. The core group of states (e.g. in Western Europe and North America) refers to democratic governments providing high wages and encouraging high levels of investment and welfare services. The semi-periphery states (e.g. in Latin America) are authoritarian governments that provide low wages and poor welfare services for their citizens. Periphery states (e.g. sub-Saharan and Central Africa, South Asia) refer to non-democratic governments where workers can mostly expect wages below subsistence levels and where there are no welfare services.

The core can produce high-profit consumption goods for itself as well as for the semi-periphery and periphery markets because the periphery provides the cheap labour and raw materials to the core and semi-periphery necessary to make these high-profit consumption goods. In other words, although historically some states have changed their group (e.g. from the periphery to semi-periphery), capitalism always needs a peripheral region that provides the means for the core to sustain a high level of consumption and security. Thus, relations of dependency and inequality are essential to capitalism and cannot be significantly reduced.

Antonio Gramsci's (1891-1937) concept of hegemony is thought to be more useful today than the concept of imperialism. It emphasizes two things : First, the domination of some groups of individuals (or groups of states) workers in Western Europe did not 'unite' to lose their chains, as Marx and Engels had predicted. A neo-Gramscian concept of hegemony focuses on the consensual ways in which transnational classes, organizations, and international law reproduce capitalism and its inequalities. However, vast inequalities and human rights violations are increasing across and within many societies despite the dominance of neoliberalism globally. This shows that although neo-liberal hegemony is far from producing the success it originally projected, this perceived success remains one of the main drivers of capitalism because it convinces people to consent to capitalism without the threat of force.

8.4 Critical Theory

Critical theory is one of the various directly inspired Marxist theories of IR whose influence has begun to be felt on the discipline of IR very recently. The theory has developed out of the work of the Frankfurt school. The leading members of the first generation of the school included Max Horkheimer, Theodor Adorno and Herbert Marcuse. The theory has been developed in important and innovative ways by subsequent generation. The most influential of all contemporary critical theorists is Jürgen Habermas. The focus of critical theory is almost entirely superstructural.

Critical theorists through their search for meaning of the concept of emancipation have made significant contribution. Critical theorists of the first generation conceptualized emancipation in terms of reconciliation with nature. This is in sharp contrast to the more traditional Marxist thinking which equated emancipation with greater human control over nature. Horkheimer, Adorno and Marcuse, however, argued that greater human control over nature had been attained at a very heavy price. Greater human control over nature has been utilised to establish domination over other human beings.

Recent generation of critical theorists, Particularly Habermas highlighted the centrality of communication and dialogue to the process of emancipation. His central point is that route to emancipation lies through radical democracy, that is a system in which widest possible participation is encouraged. For him participation is not to be confined within the border of a particular sovereign state. Rights and obligations extend beyond state borders.

Andrew Linklater, one of the most distinguished contemporary International Relations theorists, has made the most systematic attempt to think through some of the key issues in world politics from Habermasian perspective. For him emancipation in the realm of international relations should be understood in terms of expansion of the moral boundaries of a political community. In his formulation borders of the sovereign state lose their ethical and moral significance in the process of emancipation. According to Linklater development of the European Union represents an emancipatory tendency in contemporary world politics.

8.5 New Marxism

New Marxists derive their ideas directly from Marx's own writings. British Marxist Bill Warren in his book, *Imperialism: Pioneer of Capitalism* argued that Lenin had been both empirically and theoretically mistaken. For Lenin the character of capitalism had changed by the beginning of the twentieth century. As a result capitalism could no longer be regarded as playing a progressive role in the colonies. It was not developing the productive base of the third world countries. Profits extracted through the exploitation of the colonies was used to deflect the revolutionary potential of working classes in the developed capitalist countries. In contrast Warren argued that capitalism was playing its historic role in the colonies by rapidly developing the means of production. Hence imperialism should be seen as pioneer of capitalism rather than its highest and final stage.

Similarly, according to Warren, the picture of North-South relations presented by dependency theorists and world systems theorists is incomplete. The introduction of capitalism throughout the world, though costly, is not leading to the development of underdevelopment. Making direct reference to Marx, Warren argues that capitalist development is increasing the levels of productivity and making material improvements to living standards, thereby fulfilling its historic mission as a precursor to a transition to socialism. However, Warren's argument is contentious. World Bank reports suggest growing impoverishment of much of the third world.

Resenberg uses Marx's ideas to criticize realist theories of IR and globalisation theory. For him anarchy is a condition of capitalist relations and not a set of circumstances confined to international relations. Turning to globalisation he argues that globalisation theory should

be rooted in classical social theory. He seeks to develop an alternative approach which understands historical change in world politics as a reflection of transformations in the prevailing relations of production.

8.6 Conclusion

Marxism has made several inroads in the development of the discipline of international relations by being fundamentally concerned with how people and groups interact and produce things across borders, as well as how they organize themselves through institutions to manage and contest the production and distribution of things across the world. It also argues that the construction of modern borders is determined by the development of capitalism. Therefore, it makes us question the natural or inevitable character we tend to ascribe to our economic and political systems. If a system is not as real and fixed as we first thought, because it has a particular and relatively short history in the broader course of humanity, then it becomes much easier for us to imagine the various ways it is challenged and how it could be transformed to a system that will better reallocate the wealth of the world.

8.7 Summing Up

- The centrality of the concept of class and class struggle is evident in International relations.
- The capitalists seek economic exploitation and political subjugation of the weaker states in international politics.
- War erupts as a result of the clash between capitalist nations themselves in their bid to establish colonies. The First World War is a glaring example in this context.
- Critical theorists have made significant contribution through their search for meaning of the concept of emancipation. Recent generation of critical theorists highlighted the centrality of communication and dialogue to the process of emancipation.
- New Marxists want to develop an alternative approach to understand historical change in world politics as a reflection of transformation in the prevailing relations of production.

8.8 Model Questions

Essay Type Questions

- 1) How do Marxists view international relations?
- 2) What are the key arguments in the Marxist perspective?
- 3) Mention the basic assumption of the critical theory of International Relations.

Short Questions

- 1) What does Habermas mean by radical democracy?
- 2) Write a short note on New Marxism.

Objective Questions

- 1) What does Wallerstein mean by periphery?
- 2) Who developed the world-systems theory?

8.9 Further Reading

- a. Ghosh, Peu. 2012. *International Relations*. PHI Learning Private Limited. New Delhi.
- b. Linklater A. 1990. *Beyond Realism and Marxism*. Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- c. Anievas, Alexander. 2010. *Marxism and World Politics: Contesting Global Capitalism*, Routledge, London.
- d. Griffiths, Martin. 2007. *International Relations Theory for the Twenty-First Century: An Introduction*. Routledge, London.

Unit - 9 □ Feminist Perspectives

Structure

9.1 Objective

9.2 Introduction

9.3 Feminism and International Relations

9.4 Three Strands of Feminism

9.5 Women, Power, and State

9.6 Gender In War and Peace

9.7 Women and Development in International Relations

9.8 Conclusion

9.9 Summing Up

9.10 Probable Questions

9.11 Further Reading

9.1 Objective

After studying this unit, learners will be able :

- To understand the contribution of feminist thinkers in International relations.
- To understand feminist interpretation of international relations through the post-modern point of view.
- To explain the relevance of feminist perspective in International Relations.

9.2 Introduction

The feminist approach to international relations is a phenomenon of the post-Cold War period. In the post-Cold War era, there has been rapid growth in feminist literature. Some of the prominent feminist scholars include Joshua S Goldstein (War and Gender, 2001), Peterson Spike and Anne Sisson Runyan (Global Gender Issues, 1999), Ann Tickner (Gendering World Politics, 2001), and Jill Stearns (Gender and International Relations, 1998). Feminism is the advocacy of the rights of women. It explains that women have been disadvantaged as compared to men and are subordinated to men because of a system of

patriarchy. Patriarchy is a system of social structures and practices through which men dominate and exploit women. It should be clear that it is a social, not a biological characteristic. Feminism analyzes equations of masculinity and femininity. It has nothing to do with the biological male-female differences. Masculinity is associated with autonomy, sovereignty, and the capacity for reason and objectivity, whereas femininity is associated with the absence of these characteristics and these are called gender identities. Under gender construction, military services are viewed as the natural domain of masculinity. Feminism, as mentioned above, is not a concern with biological characteristics. It is the social systems that are at the root of gender inequality. The feminist movement involves the struggle for political and legal rights and equal opportunities for women.

9.3 Feminism and International Relations

To be able to appreciate the feminist approach, one has to be familiar with the nature of international studies as they evolved during the 20th century. Feminists argue that the boundaries of the state have historically excluded women from domestic and international political life, and have treated international relations as the exclusive preserve of men, where masculinity thrives through domination 'over' women. According to feminists, the phenomenon of family subordination and male domination has always remained unchanged, whether from the absolute to the modern state, from feudalism to capitalism, or from nature-state to global governance.

Feminist scholars like Rosemary Grant argue that the realist theory endorses patriarchy, because, for it, patriarchy is necessary for maintaining social order and the state. It is for this reason that women are excluded from many prevailing definitions of the state. The international relations theory favours men and excludes women because it is a 'man' who is identified with the state. Feminist writers find fault with this approach. Further, it is argued that international relations have exclusively focused on conflict and anarchy, as well as on fear and competition, precisely because women's lives and experiences have not been properly researched.

9.4 Three Strands of Feminism

There are several such approaches or 'strands of the theory of international relations. They are generally interwoven, yet they often run in different directions. These are :

1. **Difference Feminism** : This strand of feminism tries to value the unique contribution

of women as women. These feminists do not think that women do all things, as well as men, do. The opposite is also true in certain other activities. Thus, because of their greater experience with nurturing and human relations, women are seen as potentially more effective than men in resolving conflicts and in group decision-making. Some of these feminists believe that it is not just social construction, but there is also core biological essence to being male or female. This view is sometimes called essentialism.

2. **Liberal Feminism :** For liberals, ‘men and women are equal’. They condemn the exclusion of women from positions of power but do not believe that including women would change the nature of the international system. Liberal feminists would rather like the inclusion of women more often as subjects of study such as the study of women as political leaders, as women soldiers, and other women operating outside the traditional role. So, for liberal feminists, the study of women’s roles is more significant than their inclusion in positions of power.
3. **Postmodern Feminism :** Postmodern feminists have tried to deconstruct the language of realism, especially as it reflects the influences of gender and sex. For example, the first atom bombs were male. They were named ‘Fat Man’ and ‘Little Boy’. The coded Telegram sent to US authorities about the hydrogen bomb simply said, ‘It is a boy’. But the aircraft that dropped the atomic bomb on Hiroshima was called ‘Enola Gay’, a female gender. It was named after the pilot’s mother. These efforts find sex and gender throughout the sub-text of realism.

9.5 Women, Power and State

The state as an institution is the symbol of power, and the struggle for power is the essence of politics. Feminist scholars are of the view that power relations are organized based on gender. The concept of power is given a masculine treat. Those who are unable to exercise power in a war or conflict are often termed as ‘impotent’, which is associated with femininity. Power is masculine, and its absence is treated as feminine. The state ensures the organization of power relations based on gender. The states have formalized gender power relations by retaining male domination at the top level. Even where a woman (like Indira Gandhi or Margaret Thatcher) is chief executive, gender differentiation is evident as men dominate the state structure in its executive, police, and armed forces. Even though the state has a substantial amount of autonomy, it is structural in a patriarchal way.

9.6 Gender in War And Peace

Realism has been equated with masculinity. Besides its emphasis on autonomy, sovereignty, and anarchy, realism lays stress on military force as a tool of power. Here too, many feminists see a hidden assumption of masculinity. They consider war as a male occupation. In their view, men are the more war-loving gender and women are more peaceful. A possible link between the male sex hormone and war, according to biologists, is the aggressive behavior in male animals. Even some feminists who consider gender differences as strictly cultural, and not biological at all, view war as a masculine construction. Some feminists emphasize women's unique abilities and contributions as peacemakers. They stress women's role as mothers or potential mothers. Because of such caring roles, women are presumed to be more likely than men to oppose war and more likely to find alternatives to violence in resolving conflicts. For women, destruction follows quickly after the war. Yet, their role in the war efforts, to give their sons or husbands to the nation 'remains a gendered role.' Wartime sexual violence against women has been a common phenomenon in all wars, inter-community conflicts, as well as ethnic and sectarian conflicts. It is used against innocent women of the enemy in war, or of the other community, or ethnic group in civil dissension. Crimes against women are the worst aspects of war or civil conflicts. But critics argue that biologically and anthropologically there is no firm evidence connecting women's caregiving functions with any kind of behaviour such as reconciliation or non-violence. The role of women varies from one society to another. Although they seldom take part in actual fighting, women sometimes provide logistical support to male warriors and sometimes help to drive men into a war frenzy by dancing, singing patriotic songs, and other such activities supportive of the war. In some other situations and cultures, women discourage men from war or play a special role as mediators in bringing the war to an end. It has been reported by independent bodies such as the United Nations Commission for Human Rights (UNCHR) that 70 to 80 % of the world's refugees are women and children. In such situations, women are the only caretakers of children. They support the family, play a central economic role, and take care of traumatized children and families.

9.7 Women and Development in International Relations

According to the feminist perspective, globalization has intensified the social and economic division of society. This has resulted in an increased level of inequality between men and women. The two most important manifestations of this polarization are poverty and gendered international division of labour. Moreover, national and international economic policies

have increasingly been governed by global imperatives of export earnings, financial matters, and comparative labour costs. But, states have failed to deliver social welfare services and keep their commitments to provide near full employment.

Feminists are of the view that women have received the benefits of empowerment generated by structural changes. Therefore, feminist scholars are concerned with the analysis of the subtle forms of empowerment of women. Women's empowerment is seen particularly regarding the fact that women now occupy high positions, such as foreign ministers, ambassadors, and heads of a large number of organizations. They have served as prime ministers, for example, Indira Gandhi (India), Margaret Thatcher (UK), Srimavo Bandaranaike (Sri Lanka), and Golda Meir (Israel). Vijaylakshmi Pandit was the first woman president of the UN General Assembly. In 2006, the General Assembly elected a fourth as its president - Sheikha Haya of Bahrain. The British House of Commons had Betty Boothroyd as its first woman speaker and the US House of Representatives chose Nancy Pelosi as its first woman Speaker (2007). All of this indicates a breakdown of male domination of high political positions and major offices in international affairs. It is believed that women are likely to oppose the use of force in international relations and will be more supportive of humanitarian intervention.

9.8 Conclusion

The primary concern of feminism is to emphasize that women should be recognized as fundamental players in economic and political processes. It is only then that they will share an equal role in social decision-making. By redressing the neglect of women and gender injustice, the feminist scholars of international relations will improve the understanding of global politics and put women's voices, concerns, and contributions on the global agenda. In fact the entire field of international relations has been gender-biased. Thus, the notions of power, sovereignty, autonomy, anarchy, security, the state, and the international system suffer from gender bias because they are all identified with men's experiences and the exclusion of women and feminine attributes. So much so that even theories like realism and neo-realism, which claim to explain the world reality as it is, do justify the reality as shaped by the males. These theories are also responsible for the global hierarchies engendered by gender bias. In so far as the feminist approach condemns the neglect of the contribution of women, it can be regarded as an emotional upsurge inspiring the feminist critique of the global socio-political system. It is argued that feminism can be viewed only as a movement, but not a theory.

9.9 Summing up

- The actual practice of international politics has suffered from serious neglect of the feminist perspective.
- Mainstream visions which feminists regard as ‘malestream’ visions distort our knowledge of both the existing relations and the ongoing transformation of international relations.
- These ‘malestream’ perspectives define power as ‘power over others’, autonomy as reactive rather than ‘relational’, international politics as the absence of women and negation of domestic politics, and objectivity as the lack of feminized subjectivity.
- Lastly, feminists argue that the male-dominated perspectives render women invisible because they fail to see the political significance of fundamentally gendered divisions of institutions by the state system.

9.10 Probable Questions

Essay Type Questions

- 1) Discuss the Feminist approach to the study of International Relations.
- 2) Mention the different strands of Feminism in International Relations.

Short Questions

- 1) What do you mean by Post-Modern feminism?
- 2) Write a short note on ‘gender and war’.

Objective Questions

- 1) What is meant by patriarchy?
- 2) Who was the first woman to serve as Speaker of the United States House of Representatives?

9.11 Further Reading

- a. Tickner, Ann J. 2011. *Feminism and International Relations: Conversations about the Past, Present and Future* . Routledge, London.
- b. Sylvester, Christine. 2001. *Feminist International Relations: An Unfinished Journey*. Cambridge University Press, London.
- c. Sylvester, Christine. 2001. *Feminist theory and international relations postmodern era*. Cambridge University Press, London.

Unit-10 □ Eurocentrism and Perspectives from Global South

Structure

- 10.1 Objective**
- 10.2. Introduction**
- 10.3 Eurocentrism and Division of Knowledge**
- 10.4 International Relations Theory and Eurocentrism**
- 10.5 Non-Western/ the Global South International Relations Theory**
- 10.6 International Relations Theory from the Global South**
- 10.7 Limitations and Problems with International Relations Theories from the Global South**
- 10.8 Conclusion**
- 10.9 Summing Up**
- 10.10 Probable Questions**
- 10.11 Further Reading**

10.1 Objective

After studying this unit, learners will be able :

- To understand the concept of Eurocentrism.
- To understand Global South and its approach towards European trends.
- To explain the impact of Eurocentrism on global politics.
- To understand so-called developed and underdeveloped controversy in international relations.

10.2 Introduction

International relations theories are a highly Eurocentric narrative. Eurocentrism is the idea that all knowledge emerged in Europe in the context of European modernity. And this knowledge has been produced through the values and institutional systems that were universalized in Europe. According to Sujata Patel, there are two master narratives in Eurocentrism - the superiority of Western civilization and the belief in the continuous growth of Capitalism. These master narratives are all ethnocentric. It needs to be understood that European knowledge saw itself to be superior to the other which was to be colonized,

turned into an object of control, and through which it became modern. Through this lens, Europe saw itself as the origin point of modernity, which became the point of reference for other cultures and civilizations. Europe and the West were painted in terms of the master civilization that had modernity, reason, culture, and science while the East was painted as inferior, which was enclosed in space, nature, religion, and spirituality. The binary created was one of modernity and tradition. So, the western European countries were all torchbearers of the modern while the countries of the East were traditional and backward.

10.3 Eurocentrism and Division of Knowledge

Eurocentrism makes Europe the centre of the narrative and also the analysis of growth. It was Europe's superiority and its control of the world that provided the conditions for Europe's mount and also created a scientific language that legitimized this perspective and made it into a universal truth. This truth creation becomes important as it emerged as the standard for understanding all forms of realities in different parts of the world. The two important foundations of Eurocentrism are :

i) Evolutionism : The belief that Western societies evolved higher than non-Western societies. It follows the logic established by Charles Darwin in *On the Origin of Species* which looked into how species have progressed over the years. The logic entrenched in his writing is the survival of the fittest.

ii) Dualism : It stresses the idea of Europe and the West being the source of knowledge, making them more powerful, which in turn is highlighted against the non-West, which was traditional. Thus, we see the creation of binary oppositions which are hierarchized leading to the formation of a dualism of the 'self' and the 'other'.

Eurocentric scholars divided knowledge regarding Indian religion, making a distinction between the 'great traditions' that are Hinduism and the 'little traditions' that are the folk cultures. Though South Asia had thousands of distinct cultural practices and ideas that have lived and experienced existence in various forms and unequal, subordinated relationships with each other. Eurocentric understanding of Indian religion led to the imposition of homogenization. One can say that Western categories and norms were used in the study of non-Western societies.

10.4 International Relations Theory and Eurocentrism

International relations theory is dominated by mainstream International relations theories which have originated from Western philosophy, political theory, and history. History as a

discipline is also deeply Eurocentric. International relations theory is deeply Eurocentric as it originated from a history that is traced to the West and it ignores vast swaddles of history. But the real fact is that Western powers both fight amongst themselves and take over the rest of the world. It is seen to be developing categories that are imposed on the non-West. One such category is the nation-state, which is considered the norm for all of world history. International relations theory is seen to be homogenizing its ideas and norms throughout the world. International relations theory as a Eurocentric principle is seen to be remaking the world in its image of sovereign territorial states, diplomacy, and international law. Even the critical theories in international relations are all of European origin. They have been influenced by western political and social practices. These theories have universal assumptions, but in many cases, seek to understand each situation on its terms. Even the perspectives from the Global South are seen to be much influenced by the critical theories from the West.

10.5 Non-Western International Relations Theory

The idea of the 'Global South' can be dubbed as a creation of the West. This happens on two levels, the first on a conceptual and psychological plane with the West creating the non-West or the Global South as the 'other'. Edward Said in *Orientalism* (1978) writes about how the West managed and produced the non-West or the Global South. Thus, the non-West or the Orient is termed as a complete European invention, through which there is a strong degree of domination imposed by the West through restructuring and having authority over the Orient/non-West. The second way through which the non-West or the Global South has been created is colonialism. The European countries, which constitute the core West had colonized much of Asia, Latin America, Africa, and Australia, turning them into colonies for extracting resources to fuel the industrial revolution back in Europe. In these colonies, the European imperial powers transplanted their mode of governance, which was eventually adopted by these countries after independence. A majority of the non-West or the Global South are also seen to be poor and underdeveloped as they remained victims of neo-colonialism as practiced by the United States. After the Second World War, the US emerged as a superpower, replacing the European powers. It, however, continued the earlier policies of imperialism and domination that had been carried out by imperial Europe. Through the Bretton Woods international economic system that established financial institutions such as the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and subsequently the World Trade Organisation, the US-dominated the world. It is these policies that led to the formation of the Global North and the Global South.

The Global South is generally the economically less developed countries, which consists of a variety of states with diverse levels of economic, cultural, and political influence in the international order. As mentioned earlier, these countries have remained poor due to the enforcement of centuries of colonialism and imperialism. Hence, Europe and the West are directly responsible for their 'subaltern' position, a process that continues. Their subordinate position is also reflected in them being not studied in the theories of International Relations. Still, colonial dominations profoundly shape the state of the current global order. Under this, issues of race and empire are missing from mainstream theories despite the presence of postcolonial and post-structural studies. It needs to be understood that the non-West or the Global South can build their understandings of international relations theory based on their histories and social theories.

10.6 International Relations Theory from the Global South

According to Amitav Acharya and Barry Buzan, non-Western contributions to international relations theories can be divided into four major types of work. (i) The first is similar to the Western international theory's focus on key figures such as Thucydides, Thomas Hobbes, Machiavelli, Kant, etc, whereby there are Asian classical traditions and the thinking of classical religious, political, and military figures such as Sun Tzu, Confucius, and Kautilya, on all of which some secondary 'political theory' type literature exists. Even Kautilya's work, *Arthashastra*, can be a good example of understanding the presence of strong international relations theories from the Global South. He has elaborated on the ways through which a kingdom can preserve its sovereignty. Termed as Rajamandala, it describes the different ways through which a state can interact with neighbouring states to increase its power and authority. (ii) The second category of work relates to the thinking and foreign policy approaches of Asian and non-Western leaders such as Nehru, Mao, Aung San of Myanmar, Jose Rizal of the Philippines, and Sukarno of Indonesia. However, it needs to be stressed that their thinking may be sourced from training in the West or training in Western texts at home. Still, they came up with ideas and approaches independent of Western intellectual traditions. (iii) Aung Sang's ideas offered something that can be regarded as a liberal internationalist vision of international relations, stressing independence and multilateralism rather than the isolationism that came to characterize Myanmar's foreign policy under military rule. He rejected regional blocs that practiced discrimination, such as economic blocs and preferences. In the 1960s, Sukarno developed and propagated some ideas about the international order, such as 'old established forces' and 'new emerging forces', which drew upon his nationalist background as well as his quest for international

leadership. (iv) There is also Mao Zedong's three worlds theory and his ideas about war and strategy. There is a need to give importance to the theoretical significance of these ideas, especially from Asia's nationalist leaders.

Post-Colonial scholarship has recently begun to make an impact in the discipline of IR. The diverse subject matter of post-colonialism is intimately connected to the structure and processes of world politics. Much Post-colonial scholarship highlights the important degree of continuity and persistence of colonial forms of power in contemporary world politics. The level of economic and military control of the west in the global south is in many ways greater now than it was under colonial rule. Post-colonial writers claim that positivist theories of IR have helped secure the domination of the west over the global south. Edward Said in his influential book *Orientalism* argued that hegemonic ways of representing the East have been absolutely crucial to the success of the economic and military domination of west over the East and the construction of identities in both.

10.7 Limitations of International Relations Theories from the Global South

Several limitations and problems are seen in the creation and analysis of international relations theories from the Global South. Siba Grovogui writes that one of the main problems with international relations theories from the Global South is that it does not have a central structure, no central command, and no appointed spokesperson. It has multiple custodians, all of them self-selected, which is also a result of a lack of a coherent historical identity and conjoined agendas. Also, many of the countries in the Global South are nation-states, having adopted Western models of governance and state-building. Hence, they are seen to be functioning on the same lines as states in the West. Mainstream international relations theories emerging from Western societies largely seek rational explanations for states' interactions. On similar lines, interactions between states in the Global South are studied from a relational perspective. Benabdallah and others have provided examples of China and its interactions with various African states. Presently, China is the largest trading partner of Africa and both countries' economies are mutually interdependent.

The main argument is how much of these initiatives from the Global South are different from the Global North. Whether these new spaces of thinking in the Global South are completely new, pathbreaking, and can be understood as non-Western international relations theories is an issue up for debate and discussion. Still, in recent years a lot has been done

to highlight the important contributions that actors from the Global South make and have always made. International Relations have come a long way in incorporating aspects, actors, and concepts that represent the world more widely. This has emerged with the dynamics of the international system also changing with the rise of new economic powers such as India, China, Brazil, Turkey, South Africa, and others. Hence, international relations theories have to take into consideration the perspectives of these new powers in the Global South.

10.8 Conclusion

International relations theories as a discipline are highly Eurocentric, due to their emergence from experiences of Western countries. However, it assumes a universal position and imposes itself in the non-Western world. Thus, it is a deeply hegemonic act leading to a process where the values and norms of the West are implemented in the non-West. This takes place through colonialism and cultural imperialism where the ideas of the West are claimed to be rational, scientific, and normal. The non-Western ideas are dubbed as traditional, religious, and unscientific. The various interactions among states are defined in lines of the interaction that happened in Europe, among the European states. Eurocentrism turns the West into the centre of modernity and power. The unit gives an example of how this is seen in the context of development and progress. Through international organizations such as the IMF, World Bank, and World Trade Organisation, the west is seen to be imposing the Western sanctions and policies on the non-West. The model of state-building in the West is in the form of the Westphalian nation-state, which has its origins in Europe.

10.9 Summing Up

- The unit looked into the Perspectives from the Global South, which has remained scattered and somewhat incoherent.
- There is a steady rise in voices from the Global South which is highly important as it is needed to bring about notions of equity and justice in international relations theories.
- There has been an export of the same model throughout the world, with ideas of state interaction such as realism, liberalism, or Marxism emerging from knowledge traditions in the West. Even the criticisms against the Western international relations theories are coming from Western social, and political theories.

10.10 Probable Questions

Essay Type Questions

- 1) Examine the impact of Eurocentrism on International Relations studies.
- 2) Analyse the non-western theories of International Relations.
- 3) Examine the foundations of Eurocentrism.

Short Questions

- 1) What do you mean by Eurocentrism?
- 2) What is the basic theme of post-colonialism?

Objective Questions

- 1) Who is the author of the book “On the Origin of Species”?
- 2) Who is the originator of the three world theory?

10.11 Further Reading

1. Acharya, Amitav, and Barry Buzan. (2010). *Non-Western International Relations Theory – Perspectives on and beyond Asia*. London. Routledge.
2. Benabdallah, Lina, Carlos Murillo-Zamora and Victor Adetula. (2017). *Global South Perspectives on International Relations Theory*. <https://www.e-ir.info/2017/11/19/global-south-perspectives-on-international-relations-theory/>
3. Khanna, V.N. and Leslie Kumar. (2021). *International Relations*. Noida, Vikas Publishing House.
4. Malhotra, Jyoti. (2016). *International Relations: theory and practice*. New Delhi. Adroit Publishers.
5. Patel, Sujata. (2015). ‘Beyond divisions and towards Internationalism: Social Sciences in the Twenty-first Century’ in Carol Johnson, Vera Mackie and Tessa.
6. <http://egyankosh.ac.in/handle/123456789/71854>

Module - III

Unit : 11 □ World War 1 : Causes and Consequences

Structure

11.1 Objective

11.2 Introduction

11.3 Causes of the World War 1

11.3.1 Economic Rivalries

11.3.2 Conflicting Alliance Systems

11.3.3 Militarism

11.3.4 Nationalism

11.3.5 Imperialism

11.3.6 Immediate Cause : Assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand

11.4 End of the War

11.5 The Conference of Paris, 1919

11.6 The Treaty of Versailles

11.7 Effects of first World War

11.8 Conclusion

11.9 Summing Up

11.10 Probable Questions

11.11 Further Reading

11.1 Objective

After reading this particular unit learners will be able to

- get an idea about First World War as a major international conflict in world history
 - discover the main causes of the war
 - unfold the timeline and sequence of events of the war
 - illustrate the impact and implication of this Great war
-

11.2 Introduction

World War I was an armed conflict that began in 1914 and ended in 1918. During this period dozens of countries clashed in different areas around the planet. It was the first

global conflict of the 20th century and one of the bloodiest. It was produced by a series of economic, political, and social causes that together were eroding relations between European countries.

The First World War that occurred in the third quarter of 1914 was caused by a chain of events and confined to Europe in the initial stage. The chain of events ultimately led to the fighting all over the world. It had tremendous impact on the existing socio-economic and political scenes across the globe. The war generated new ideologies, founded new institutions and gave birth to new leaderships in the world. This unit gives an overview of the circumstances that led to the Great War, its proceedings and important consequences.

11.3 Causes of the First World War

The causes of the war is much more complex than simple list of causes and understanding the causes are as important as the devastating effects. The assassination of Archduke Francis Ferdinand on 28th June 1914 directly led to the declaration of the war. This assassination, however is not the single cause of the war, but many other important factors operating for a long time across Europe led to the Great War. These causes are :

11.3.1 Economic Rivalries

Most of the European powers were involved in tariff war that occurred between Italy, France, Russia and Germany, Austria and Serbia and so on. Moreover there was a tough competition between Germany and Great Britain for overseas markets. Throughout the 19th century, Britain being the supreme power had a powerful navy and army. The sudden emergence of Germany put other European powers into great stakes. The competing countries started developing strong navies for protecting trade routes and merchant shipping. Germany having a big army built up a large and powerful navy that intensified the rivalries with Britain and other European countries.

11.3.2 Conflicting Alliance Systems

The struggle for colonies in different parts of the world divided Europe into rival armed camps which confronted each other. Following diplomatic talks between British and French officials in 1903 king Edward VII's Successful visit to France in 1904 led to the Entente cordiale. It provided France with additional Security against German attack and For Britain it offered an end to European isolation. Similarly, Anglo-Russian Entente was agreed in 1907 to counter German threat. The Anglo Russian Entente tied France, Britain and Russia together in a series of friendly alliances. This became known as the Triple Entente. It signed the Dual Alliance with Austria-Hungary (1879). This Alliance aimed at strengthening

Germany against a possible French attack for recovering Alsace-Lorraine. The Triple Alliance was signed in 1882 linking Germany with Austria-Hungary and Italy to ensure the protection of Austria-Hungary against possible Russian attack. This alliance also supported Italy in her struggle for colonies against France and hence was explicitly defensive, in part against France, in part against Russia. The partners of the Triple Alliance attempted to maintain the status quo in the continent. The other countries considered this alliance as an attempt to dominate Europe and to isolate other states from each other. They, therefore, took steps that acted as counterweights to the Triple Alliance. Bismarck's attempt to ensure German Security led to a series of alliances.

11.3.3 Militarism

Militarism was one of the important causes of the war. During the beginning of the 20th Century an armed race had begun. This system of large armies was efficiently developed by Bismarck. Germany had the greatest increase in military build-up. It created fear and suspicion among the nations. Great Britain also expanded their navies in this period. Further, in Germany and Russia the military establishment began to have a greater influence on public policy. The increase in militarism propelled the countries to get involved in war.

11.3.4 Nationalism

The spread of intense nationalism all over the Europe was a very important cause of the war. Italy and Germany were unified mainly because Cavour and Bismarck aroused the spirit of nationalism. Intense nationalism made the people imperious in their attitude towards their neighbours and invoked racial pride to consider their country as supreme power. The drive for greater power and influence created competition and rivalries between states like Germany and Great Britain. Moreover, the subject minorities residing in different regions of Europe remained hostile towards their respective imperial rulers. The feeling of nationalism made them intolerant against foreign rule. The French people in Alsace-Lorraine were hostile to German rule over their territory. Much of the origin of the war was based on the desire of the Slavic peoples in Bosnia and Herzegovina to be no longer part of Austria-Hungary but instead be part of Serbia. Slavic Serbs sought independence from Austria-Hungary and the Ottoman Empire. In this way, the spirit of nationalism in various countries throughout Europe triggered not only the beginning but the extension of the war in Europe.

11.3.5 Imperialism

Imperial disputes were an important contributory Factor to the outbreak of war in 1914. Imperial domination was carried out by the powerful European nations in Africa, Asia and

Latin America in the decades before World War I began. Before World War I, Africa and parts of Asia were points of contention among the European countries. This was especially true because of the raw materials these areas could provide. In general, European domination of Africa created tensions in that Germany felt left out of territory in the region. In 1884, the Berlin Conference called by Otto von Bismarck the European powers meet to discuss the division of Africa into regions controlled by the European nations. The aim of the meet was to avoid a major European conflict. The peace created at the Berlin Conference did not last as the competition between the European countries increased as they approached 1914. Britain and France had control over the largest regions of Africa. Germany, which was industrially more powerful than France, was slower in occupying colonies. But Germany wanted to be supreme power in Europe. This increasing competition and desire for greater empires led to an increase in confrontation that helped push the world into war.

11.3.6 Immediate Cause : Assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand

The immediate cause of World War I was the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand of Austria-Hungary. What might have been a local incident quickly sparked a general war. The complicated alliance system built up over the previous two decades ensured that Austria-Hungary and Germany on the one side, confronted Britain, France, and Russia on the other. The ensuing war was to last for over four years. Thus a combination of imperial, nationalist and economic tensions ultimately resulted in the First World War.

11.4 End of the War

The striking power of the Allies became stronger after participation of America into the war. By July 1918 the number of American soldiers in the different fronts rose to more than 300,000. The Central Powers failed to get fresh supplies. Consequently they had no other option but to surrender during the latter half of 1918, one by one. As Germany surrendered, the war thus ended with the victory of the Allied powers.

11.5 The Conference of Paris, 1919

After the First World War was over, the Allied powers started considering several plans and proposals for a lasting peace in the world. The Allies took necessary steps for holding a peace conference which was called in Paris in January 1919. It continued for about six months. Thirty two nations participated in this conference. None of the defeated nations has been invited to take part in the peace talks. The representatives of Great Britain, France, the United States, Italy and Japan became known as the “Big Five.” But the conference

was mainly conducted by the Big Three - the USA, Great Britain and France. These 'Big Three' were represented by President Wilson of USA, Premier Clemenceau of France and Prime Minister Lloyd George of Britain. Wilson and Clemenceau had conflicting views. Wilson was an idealist, committed to the principles of democracy and the covenant of the League of Nations. Clemenceau, on the other hand, was an old-fashioned realist obsessed with hatred for Germany. Germany was held responsible for the declaration of the war and the huge destruction of lives and property. The peace conference in Paris, appointed committees of experts to encounter different problems and make best possible solutions. The conflicting demands and objectives made them unable to reach to rational conclusion. President Wilson had to yield to the pressure of the European powers who were bent upon taking revenge on Germany. Germany objected to agree with the given terms and conditions but she was asked to sign the treaty or face the consequence. Ultimately Germany was forced to sign the treaty. Thus this treaty invoked a desire for revenge and paves the path for another war.

11.6 The Treaty of Versailles

Many of the terms of the Versailler Treaty were shaped by the 'Fourteen Points' supplied by the American President, Woodrow Wilson. This included among others no more secret treaties and alliances between countries Freedom of the sea for all nations; removal of trade barriers between nations; reduction of armaments; the adjustment of colonial claims; justice for the colonies; right to self-determination and creation of a League of Nations to ensure future peace. However, what emerged from the Paris peace talks bore only a limited resemblance to Wilson's vision of a fair and just settlement. Germans expected a reasonable agreement based on the Fourteen Points. They were horrified at the terms of the treaty. Despite its objections, Germany had no alternative but to sign the treaty. In doing so it accepted the loss of some 70,000 square kilometers of land.

In addition to land losses, the treaty imposed several other humiliating terms on Germany. German armaments were limited to a maximum of 100,000 troops, with no tanks, military air craft or submarines and a maximum of six battleships. Union between Germany and Austria was forbidden, in an effort to prevent the two German speaking countries uniting to pose a threat to other nations in the future.

Another devastating condition of the Treaty of Versailles was the war guilt clause. This

blamed Germany and its allies for the outbreak of the war and allowed victorious nations to impose reparations for the damage the war had caused.

Many historians are critical of the peace settlement of 1919-1920. They argue that the settlement was based on a series of compromises that satisfied none of the countries involved. German resentment at the harsh terms imposed by Versailles Treaty had far-reaching consequences. France, Russia, and Italy—countries that had played a significant role in the Allied victory—were also disappointed. In redrawing the map of Eastern Europe, the peacemakers left around 30 million people belonging to minority groups under foreign rule. This made border disputes inevitable.

11.7 Effects of first World War

1. During world war, four monarchs fell : Germany, Turkey, Austria-Hungary and Russia.
2. People became more receptive to various ideologies as a result of the World War I consequences, including the Bolsheviks' coming to prominence in Russia and fascism's success in Italy and, subsequently, Germany.
3. As people became more patriotic, one country after the other began colonial uprisings in Southeast Asia, the Middle East, and Africa. First World War mainly signalled the end of colonialism.
4. The war altered the world's financial equilibrium, dumping European countries deeply in debt and establishing the United States as the world's dominant economic powerhouse and lender.
5. In most nations, inflation soared, and also the German economy was severely harmed by the need to make reparations.
6. With troops going all over the continent, influenza spread quickly, resulting in a pandemic that killed over 25 million individuals globally.
7. With all of the new weapons deployed First World War irrevocably transformed the face of contemporary combat.

Numerous more impacts may be attributed to first world war, but the truth is that the globe would never be the same after this catastrophic conflict. Many historians feel that World War I established an environment that permitted the Nazi Party to ascend to power and the outbreak of World War II.

11.8 Conclusion

Eric Hobsbawm has suggested that the 20th century really began in 1914 with devastating war which destroyed the 19th century status whereby a handful of European States dominated the world affairs. The world, had never experienced a conflict that enmeshed so many countries and peoples. In fact, it was the century's First Total War during which the major players mobilized virtually their whole populations. The effects of the First World War were enormous. Diplomats and Political leaders who gathered at Versailles in 1919 to arrive at a peace settlement were adamant to make war impossible in the future. And yet only twenty years after the Treaty of Versailles another World War, even more global in its reach than the first was under way.

11.9 Summing Up

- The First World War was the most critical event in the world history as never before so many countries joined the war. This war is marked as a great war, as it is different from the earlier localized wars. Several factors like economic interest, nationalistic feelings, colonial disputes, militarism.
- Imperialism was responsible for the outbreak of the First World War. The war created an important impact in European as well as world politics. Most important consequence of the war was that it expands the idea of liberalism as a result of which democracy established in many European countries.

11.10 Probable Questions

Essay Type Questions

- 1) Discuss the causes of the First World War.
- 2) Discuss the main effects of First World War.

Short Questions

- 1) Discuss the immediate cause of the First World War.
- 2) Write a note on Treaty of Versailles.

Objective Questions

- 1) In which year Paris Conference was summoned?

- 2) Who called for the Berlin Conference in the year 1884?
- 3) How long the First World War continued?

11.11 Further Reading

- Ashford, E. Montgomery. 2009. *A Pocket Guide to European History*. London : Umbrella Books.
- Ashworth, Tony. 1980. *Trench Warfare, 1914-1918 : The Live and Let Live System*. London: Macmillan Press.
- Clark, Christopher. 2012. *The Sleepwalkers : How Europe Went to War in 1914*. London : Allen Lane.
- Duiker, William J. 2015. *Contemporary World History*. 6th ed. Boston, MA : Cengage Learning.
- Evans, Richard J. 2016. *The Pursuit of Power : Europe 1815-1914*. London : Penguin Books.
- Heywood, Andrew. 2011. *Global Politics*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Johnston, William M. 1987. 'Some Causes of World War I and Historians' Taboos'. *Journal of General Education* (2): 77-84.
- Lambert, Nicholas A. 2012. *Planning Armageddon: British Economic Warfare and the First World War*. London Harvard University Press.
- Mansbach, Richard W, and Kirsten L. Taylor. 2018. *Introduction to Global Politics*. 3rd ed. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Roskin, Michael G., James A. Medeiros, Robert L. Cord, and Walter S. Jones, eds. 2017. *Political Science: An Introduction*. 14th ed. Karnataka: Pearson India Education.
- Scheck, Raffael. 2008. *Germany, 1871-1945: A Concise History*. New York, NY: Berg.
- Shepley, Nick. 2015. *The Paris Peace Conference 1919: A Students Guide to the Treaty of Versailles*. Altham: Andrew UK Limited.

Unit-12 □ Bolshevik Revolution and its Significance

Structure

- 12.1 Objective**
- 12.2 Introduction**
- 12.3 Message of peace and withdrawal of army from the First World War**
- 12.4 Establishment of a Communist Government**
- 12.5 Introduction of New Economic Policy**
- 12.6 Collectivisation of Farming**
- 12.7 Nationalization of Industries**
- 12.8 Regeneration of Agriculture**
- 12.9 Effect of Bolshevik Revolution in the Developed Countries of the West**
- 12.10 Impact of the Bolshevik Revolution on National Liberation Movements in the Colonies**
- 12.11 Conclusion**
- 12.12 Summing Up**
- 12.13 Probable Questions**
- 12.14 Further Reading**

12.1 Objective

After going through this unit learners will be able to :

- explain the nature of the Bolshevik Revolution
- understand implications of the various reforms taken by the Bolshevie Government
- realise the significance of Bolshevik Revolution

12.2 Introduction

The Bolshevik Revolution in Russia in 1917 is considered as one of the most significant epoch making event in the history of mankind. This revolution not only ended the three hundred years despotic and reactionary monarchical rule of the czar and established the

dictatorship of the proletariat but also put an end to the power of aristocrats, capitalists and landlords in social, economic and agricultural fields. It gave a concrete shape to the ideology of Marxian socialism for the first time in the world history. Newly formed communist government based on Marxist principles posed a challenge to the existing liberal capitalist system and the realist theory of international politics. The objective of the Russian Revolution was not confined to freedom and socialism in Russia but to bring about worldwide revolution. According to Harold Laski it was the most important event after the birth of Jesus. The October Revolution heralded a new era by creating a state of the workers and poor peasants whose interest was opposed to economic exploitation, wars, aggressions, colonization and racial discrimination. The revolution brought into existence a socialist state that could work as a bulwark against war and imperialism. It also began a process of creation of an alternative world socialist system based on equality and free of exploitation, renounced any form of aggression, colonization and racial prejudice, as opposed to world capitalist system that is based on colonization, economic exploitation, racialism. The Bolshevik Revolution in Russia led to major economic and political changes in domestic and foreign policy. These changes created a significant impact not only among the people of Russia but also outside Russia.

12.3 Message of Peace and withdrawal of army from The First World War

Repeated defeats of Russia at the hands of Germany turned the people against war. The enormous cost of the war was too heavy for Russia, which still was relatively backward as compared to other imperialist powers. The state could not sustain such an expensive war and the burden was borne by the working people and the peasants. Workers and even soldiers were up in arms against the State. The Revolutionary, government without consulting the allied nations signed the treaty of Brest-Litovsk with Germany and withdrew Russia out of World War I.

Not only the Bolsheviks in Russia but also the socialist organisations all over Europe opposed the war, which proved to be the immediate cause of the Russian Revolution. During the war the belligerent countries passed through economic crisis which added to the distress and misery of the common people. This provided an international perspective to the socialist movement. This decision was jubilantly welcomed in Russia. The people in other belligerent nations also exerted pressure on their respective governments to withdraw

from the war. Consequently, the World War I came to an end just after eight months of Russia's withdrawal.

12.4 Establishment of a Communist Government

The Bolshevik Revolution of Russia gave a practical shape to the ideology of Marx, which aimed at establishing the sovereignty of the proletariat. This Revolution gave birth to a classless society in which the ability and labour of an individual was fully valued. The Bolshevik Revolution paved the way for the rise of communism as an influential political belief system around the world. It led to the establishment of world's first communist or socialist government in Russia which set the stage for USSR to rise as a world power that would go head-to-head with the United States. The Socialist Government announced the nationalisation of all industries, private lands, banks, mines, railways, telephonics etc. These were declared as state's property. The Socialist Government sought to make a society of equals in all possible respects, by overriding all legal designations of civil inequality, such as estates, titles, and ranks etc.

12.5 Introduction of New Economic Policy

Russia also introduced a five-year plan to strengthen its economy. The collective farming system was introduced by ruthless dictatorial methods. In a way, in 1921 Lenin inaugurated a new policy known as the NEP in order to deal with the situation of economic crisis in the USSR. In order to stabilize conditions at home, Russia adopted the policy of one step backward and two steps forward. It meant that it could not detach completely from the previous system. In order to revive its economy, it sought the western countries help and therefore promised to abandon its mission of expanding communism abroad. After Lenin, Stalin also used the policy of stabilizing communism at home rather than trying to expand it abroad. From 1921, Lenin wanted to revive and rebuild the Russian economy but considering, the gravity of the situation, the soviet leaders decided to remove the Causes of discontent as well as to adopt a stern policy for the suppression of hostile movements. Lenin was a far-sighted and realistic leader. He announced a new economic policy which continued till 1928. Lenin realized that to save communism he must follow capitalist method. His policy was realistic and he had to face enough theoretical opposition while implementing it. Before enunciating the basic principles of the New Economic Policy he analysed all the steps taken by the soviet government in the field and talked to the workers and peasants and carefully read the letters of the peasants that had appeared in the newspaper *Bednot (the Pauper)*. All this helped him a lot in deciding the bases of his new economic

policy and the methods of implementing it. The most dramatic and far reaching effect of this policy was that it made the reconstruction of Russia possible.

Thus the aim of new economic policy was to strengthen the economic contribution of workers and peasants, to encourage all the workers in rural and urban areas to improve the economy of the country and to allow partial capitalism while keeping the main sources of economy in the hand of the government.

12.6 Collectivisation of Farming

The agricultural policy of the Soviet Union had two objectives—to increase the production of foodgrains and to check the growth of an individual’s right to property on land. The core of the New Economic policy was to amalgamate millions of small farms which were the basis of the Russian agricultural economy into large socialised agricultural units called Kolkhoj. According to the new plan for the regeneration of agriculture an attempt was made to destroy the present structure of farms. The Bolsheviks at that time raised the slogan “Attack the affluent farmers”. Consequently, by 1929 all more or less good farming enterprises were dissolved. Farmers were permitted to join collective farms at their will. In January 1930, the government liquidated the whole class of affluent farmers. Their houses were allotted to labourers or homeless peasants and their cattle and other property were transferred to collective farms. Thus the Bolshevik administration rose from bottom to top. It was like a huge pyramid whose base consisted of thousands of soviets from which the central government derived all its power. It was a new experiment in the field of administration.

12.7 Nationalization of Industries

For raising the level of production of war materials, rapid industrialization was a must, but unfortunately Russia possessed very few heavy machines and very little capital, In November 1917, the Bolshevik government issued an order and put an end to the ownership of factories by capitalists. It was decided to constitute management boards of workers to run the factories. But these boards failed to manage the industries successfully. In the new economic policy, the Bolshevik government decided to continue capitalism together with nationalisation. The owners of small factories were allowed to retain their factories and to make their products. The government controlled large industries but permitted some decentralisation there too. The factories producing the same goods were brought under one head. For

example, all the textile mills were put under a central organization called syndicate. Such syndicates were constituted for iron, steel, paper, sugar, and chemical industries. All such syndicates were put under a central business organisation so that all industries could develop in cooperation with one another.

The new economic policy transformed all the industries in Russia. The production of coal which was 1,15,00,000 tons in 1922-23 rose to 2,45,00,000 tons in 1925-26. The production of cotton textiles doubled during this period. The soviet government paid more attention to the development of large industries, especially heavy industries. Old factories were renovated and some new ones were built.

12.8 Regeneration of Agriculture

The Russian peasants welcomed the New Economic Policy and enthusiastically devoted themselves to the regeneration of national economy. First of all, the compulsory procurement of the excess yield of the peasants was stopped and they were permitted to sell it in the open market. This started retail trading and the retail traders made market transactions with a view to earning profit. From 1924 the government started accepting tax in cash instead of kind. This was done when the currency had become stable. There were two revolutions in the field of agriculture. The first did away with the landlords and the second replaced individual farming by cooperative farming. The first change was brought about by circulating an order through which the government nationalized land and decided to redistribute it among the peasants. So the redistribution of the landlords' took place. Land among the peasants increased their holdings by one third of what they already possessed but it did not change the status. It had only wiped out the big landlords.

By the 1950s and 1960, the fruits of industrialisation, mechanisation and long term planning began to mature. Much remained primitive and backward by any western measurement. But standards of living substantially improved social services, including health services and education became more effective and spread from the cities over most parts of the country. The pattern of life of ordinary people changed for the better.

12.9 Effect of the Bolshevik Revolution in the Developed Countries of the West

The immediate effect of the Bolshevik revolution had been a sharp polarisation of western attitudes between Right and Left. The revolution was a bugbear to conservatives and beacon

of hope to radicals. Belief in this fundamental dichotomy inspired the foundation of Comintern. But, in the international revolution conceived by Marx and Lenin as a mass movement of the united European proletariat, no Marxist would have claimed a predominant role for the weak Russian contingent. When the European revolution failed to materialize, and when socialism in one country became the official ideology of the Russian party, the increasingly assertive demand to treat the USSR as the model of socialist achievement, and Comintern as the repository of socialist orthodoxy, led to a new polarisation between east and west within the Left. Communists and Western Socialists confronted one another, first as mistrustful allies, then as open enemies of International revolution as conceived in Moscow from 1924 onwards was a movement directed from above by an institution claiming to act in the name of the only proletariat which had made a victorious revolution in its own country. The corollary of this re-orientation was the assumption that the First and overriding interest of international revolution was the defence of the one country where revolution had been effectively achieved. This assumption proved totally unacceptable to a majority of the workers of Western Europe, who believed themselves far more advanced and could not close their eyes to the negative aspects of soviet society.

12.10 Impact of the Bolshevik Revolution of National Liberation Movements in the Colonies

Lenin was the first to discover a link between the revolutionary movement for the liberation of the workers from capitalist domination in the advanced countries and the liberation of backward and subject nations from the rule of the imperialists. The identification of capitalism with imperialism was the fruitful theme of soviet propaganda and policy almost everywhere in Asia, and enjoyed its most dramatic success in stimulating the Chinese national revolution in the 1920s. As the USSR consolidated its position its prestige as the patron and leader of colonial peoples increased rapidly. It had achieved, through the process of revolution and industrialization, a spectacular growth of economic independence and political power – an achievement worthy of emulation. The defence of the USSR meant the deference of the most powerful ally of the backward countries in their struggle against the advanced imperialist countries.

The methods which aroused revulsion in countries where the bourgeois revolution was a matter of history and where strong workers' movements had grown up within the framework of liberal democracy did not prove seriously incompatible in countries where bourgeois

revolution was still on the agenda and where no sizable proletariat yet existed. Where poor and illiterate masses had not yet reached the stage of revolutionary consciousness, revolution from above was better than no revolution at all, while in the advanced capitalist world the Bolshevik revolution was primarily destructive and provided no constructive model for revolutionary action. In the colonies it proved more pervasive and more productive. The Bolshevik revolution of 1917 fell far short of the aims which it set for itself and of the hopes which it generated. Its record was flawed and ambiguous. But it has been the source of more profound and lasting repercussions through the world than any other historical event of modern times.

12.11 Conclusion

Bolshevik Revolution is considered as one of the significant turning points in the history of international politics. It was a first successful revolution which declared the building of a socialist society as its objective. The success of the Revolution popularised the Communist ideology of Marx, especially among the peasants and workers, the downtrodden and the oppressed. Efforts were made to propagate these ideas of communism in the countries of Europe and Asia. Communist government in Russia also began a process of creation of an alternative world socialist system based on equality and free of exploitation. Soviet planned economy was recognised everywhere as a challenge to capitalism. Bolshevik Revolution sent a message of hope to all the toiling masses of the world that revolution is their natural right to fight against exploitation, inequality and injustice. Newly formed Soviet Union extended its friendly assistance to the national liberation struggle of Africa, Latin America and Asian countries to defeat imperialism.

The Bolshevik Revolution ushered in a new era of creating an alternative to the capitalist system. It paved the way for the rise of communism as an influential political belief system. The revolution set the stage for USSR to rise as a world power. It has been the source of more profound and more lasting repercussions throughout the world than any other historical event of modern times.

12.12 Summing Up

In the west the revolution was a bugbear to conservatism and a beacon of hope to radicals. Lenin discovered a link between the revolutionary movement of the workers in the advanced countries and liberation of subject nation from the rule of the imperialists. With the

consolidation of the position of the USSR its prestige as the patron and leader of colonial people increased rapidly.

12.13 Probable Question

Essay Type Questions

1. What are four governmental reforms introduced by Lenin.
2. Discuss the contribution of the Bolsheviks to the anti-colonial struggles?

Short Questions

1. Briefly discuss the effect of the Bolshevik Revolution in the developed countries of the West.
2. Write brief note on New Economic Policy.

Objective Questions

1. Who led Bolshevik Revolution in Russia?
2. In which year Bolshevik Revolution took place?
3. Whose philosophical idea worked behind the success of Bolshevik Revolution?

12.14 Further Reading

Acher, Abraham; *The Russian Revolution : A Beginner's Guide*. Oneworld Publication, London, 2014.

Acton, Edward, Cheriniaev, Vl adimir and Rosenberg William (ed.); *Critical Companion to the Russian Revolution*, Bloomsbery Academic, London, 2001.

McMeekin, Sean; *The Russian Revolution : A New History*. Kindle Edition, New York, 2017

Reed, John; *Ten Days that Shook the World*. Bony and Liveright, New York.

Dhar, Sailendra Nath; *International Relations and World Politics since 1919*. Kalyani Publication, New Delhi, 1965

Unit-13 □ The Rise of Fascism and Nazism

Structure

- 13.1 Objective**
- 13.2 Introduction**
- 13.3 Meaning of Fascism**
- 13.4 Meaning of Nazism**
- 13.5 Similarities between Fascism and Nazism**
- 13.6 Difference between Fascism and Nazism**
- 13.7 Rise of Fascism in Italy**
- 13.8 The main features of Mussolini's Style of governance**
- 13.9 Impact of Fascism**
- 13.10 Rise of Nazism and its impact**
- 13.11 Fascist Challenge to the International World Order**
- 13.12 Conclusion**
- 13.13 Summing Up**
- 13.14 Probable Questions**
- 13.15 Further Reading**

13.1 Objective

After reading this unit learners will be able to :

- understand the concept of Fascism and Nazism and their essential features
- realise the importance of domestic and international environment for the emergence of Fascism.
- explain the impact of Fascism and Nazism in the world politics.

13.2 Introduction

Fascism is an ideology that emerged in the unique circumstances in interwar Europe. It found its roots in Italy in the early 1920s with the rise of Benito Mussolini and later spread to other countries such as Germany and Spain. It is a totalitarian worldview which perceives the nation state as one collective organism. Along with international communism, it was one of two ideological challengers to the prevailing liberal world order and represented a uniquely 20th-century way of organizing societies. It emphasized nationalism, organized around personality cults and contrived theories of racial purity that overlapped with eugenics. Fascism and Nazism are quite often considered to be the same or at least refer to the same ideologies. However, the two are entirely dissimilar from each other, despite the fact that they are both totalitarian ideologies and closely related in design. Both sprung up after the First World War in Europe.

13.3 Meaning of Fascism

Politically, fascism is an ideology that presents itself as third way and borrows from both communism and ultra-nationalist imperial regimes. What it borrows from communism is a popular concern with distribution of wealth, revolutionary spirit and concerns over workers' rights. Both see parliamentary liberalism as representing the interests of the bourgeois money-minded elite, outdated, inefficient and chaotic, balances. The two ideologies (communism and fascism), on the other hand, believed in mobilizing state power in totality in order to bring revolutionary changes in society. What fascism borrows from older imperial regimes are ultra-nationalism, spiritual politics, obsession over national honour and greatness antipathy towards the Enlightenment and progressive politics, scepticism towards mass enfranchisement and anxiety over the spread of communism.

Fascism was a unique blend of the feudal and the modern features. It saw liberalism as an outdated 19th-century political doctrine that had evolved in response to unjust monarchs and churches. But in the modern world of mass franchise, heavy industries, mass mobilization and snowballing technological innovations, it inhibited the rational and scientific organization of all aspects of society due to its dogmas regarding limited government, checks and balances, and individual rights.

Fascism entailed the establishment of type of State popularly called totalitarian, in which all aspects of citizens lives were subject to comprehensive regulation. It glorified violence

and struggle within society and between states as natural. War is the ultimate test of individual manhood and state's authority.

13.4 Meaning of Nazism

Nazism is a form of fascism, with disdain for liberal democracy and the parliamentary system. Nazism's roots lay in the tradition of Prussian militarism and discipline and German Romanticism, which celebrated a mythic past and proclaimed the rights of the exceptional individual over all rules and laws.

Nazism was shaped by Hitler's beliefs in German racial superiority and the dangers of communism. It rejected liberalism, democracy, the rule of law, and human rights, stressing instead the subordination of the individual to the state and the necessity of strict obedience to leaders. It emphasized the inequality of individuals and "races" and the right of the strong to rule the weak.

Politically, Nazism favoured rearmament, reunification of the German areas of Europe, expansion into non-German areas, and the purging of "undesprables", especially the Jewish people. Nazism was characterised by extreme nationalism, dictatorship, racism, expansionism, religious and racial expulsion, and Anti-Semitism.

13.5 Similarities between Fascism and Nazism

Fascism and Nazism had striking similarities.

- Both Fascism and Nazism were dictatorial and anti-democratic.
- They were immensely anti-communist and both managed to draw solid support from all classes.
- Both tried to organise totalitarian states where the state could control the way of life of its people and curtail their personal freedom.
- Both tried to make their countries self-sufficient.
- Both tried restoring the national pride their countries had lost after the First World War.
- Both pushed for colonial expansion.

13.6 Difference between Fascism and Nazism

The two ideologies are closely related and began around the same time. However, they have the following differences between them :

- Fascism originated in Italy in 1919 led by Benito Mussolini while Nazism sprung in Germany in 1920. The later was led by Adolf Hitler.
- While Nazism extolled the purity of the blood and race of the Aryan people to show proof of white superiority, Fascism did not have such racial ideologies.
- Fascism much of the Italian culture survived under it. Benito's administration never applied official doctrines to purge arts, literature, and universities except when it wanted to control its opponents. As such, most of Italy's most prolific writers and artists remained in the country. Nazism, on the other hand, forced German artists and writers into exiles or silence. The European sculptures, paintings, and other arts were confiscated, sold, destroyed, taken to the Exhibition of Decadent Art, or hidden in Nazi's private collections.
- Hitler's Nazism was more successful in its atrocities based on religion while Fascism had less interest in segregating people based on religion.

13.7 Rise of Fascism in Italy

Fascism arose in Europe after World War I when many people yearned for national unity and strong leadership. In Italy, Benito Mussolini used his charisma to establish a powerful fascist state. Italian fascism emerged in the economic crisis of the 1920s and 1930s. It started with a string of violent clashes in the northern part of Italy beginning in 1920. Among the most important of the circumstances surrounding Mussolini's rise to power were the social and economic conditions in Italy after World War I. Although Italy had been a member of the victorious side during the war, its participation had been costly and disproportionate to its size and wealth. Italy spent nearly 15 billion dollars on the war effort and lost more than 600,000 people. In addition, Italy received fewer rewards than it had expected during post-war negotiations with its allies. These factors increased the unpopularity of Prime Minister Vittorio Orlando and the Italian government in Rome.

As economic conditions worsened after the war, popular discontent increased sharply and Italians began to look for new alternatives. Many workers and peasants turned to socialism,

and some even attempted to enact their own reforms such as appropriating and collectivizing factories and the estates of rural landowners. In response, numerous landowners and middle-class Italians turned to a new militant group—the Fascists—led by Mussolini, a former Socialist.

Formed in early 1919, the Fascists were a small but militant movement that attracted radicals, nationalists, and workers. At first the group advocated a relatively progressive agenda that included broad economic reforms, but the fascists quickly discarded these reforms for a more conservative agenda that promoted nationalism and foreign expansion. Soon Fascist groups, known as the Black shirts, began to attack rival groups, most notably Socialists. The use of violence enabled the Fascists to weaken the Socialists, an accomplishment that won them support among the upper and middle classes, the army, and the police throughout Italy. This support subsequently enabled Mussolini and an army of 50,000 Fascists to march into Rome in October 1922 and assume control of the government unopposed.

13.8 The main features of Mussolini's Style of Governance

The main features of Mussolini's Style of government can be summarised as follows :

- (i) **Lack of democracy** : Italy became a one party state. Members of the fascist party were seen as the elite of the nation and great emphasis was placed on the cult of their leader.
- (ii) **Totalitarianism** : The interests of the state is more important than the interests of the individual. Therefore, the government attempted to control as many aspects of peoples lives as possible.
- (iii) **Autarky** : The idea that Italy should become economically self-sufficient. In order to achieve this, the government sought to control and direct all parts of Italy's economy.
- (iv) **Exterme nationalisam** : Although Italy had once been the heart of the great Roman empire, its power and prestige had been allowed to decline. Mussolini was determined to restore Italy to its former glory.
- (v) **The use of violence** : Mussolini believed that violent methods were the key not only to maintain control in Italy but also to ensure a successful and glorious foreign policy. According to him 'Peace is absurd; Fascism does not believe in it'.

13.9 Impact of Fascism in Italy

Italian fascism initially positively benefited Italian society in 1922. Italian industries and agriculture made great progress under the fascist regime. Mussolini developed Hydro-power projects and facilitated industries to raise their productions. However, it quickly evolved into a brutally violent and totalitarian dictatorship that continued to negatively impact the Italian society and influence other European dictators until 1943. From 1922 to 1943 the Fascist Party under the dictatorship of Mussolini, gave the nation the appearance of being converted to the Fascist ideology, though in reality a small minority of confirmed fascists alone were active while most people simply submitted by accepting a new regime of Mussolini who started terrorising opponents making most of them to flee Italy. He gradually transformed the weak foreign policy of the previous government and tried to make Italy a world power. He adopted aggressive foreign policy which brought him close to Hitler. Finally he joined hands with Hitler.

13.10 Rise of Nazism in Germany and its Impact

Adolf Hitler, an Austrian-born corporal in the German army during World War I, capitalized on the anger and resentment felt by many Germans after the war as he entered politics in 1919, joined the small German Workers' Party, and quickly became the party's leader. By February 1920, Hitler had given it a new name : the National Socialist German Workers; Party (*Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei*), or Nazi, for short.

Originally drafted in 1920, the Nazi Party platform reflects a cornerstone of Nazi ideology; the belief in race science and the superiority of the so-called Aryan race (or "German blood"). For the Nazis, so-called "German blood" determined whether one was considered a citizen. The Nazis believed that citizenship should not only bestow on a person certain rights (such as voting, running for office, or owning a newspaper); it also came with the guarantee of a job, food, and land on which to live. Those without "German blood" were not citizens and therefore should be deprived of these rights and benefits.

Fueled by post-war unrest and Hitler's charismatic leadership, thousand joined the Nazis in the early 1920s. In an attempt to capitalize on the chaos caused by runaway hyperinflation, Hitler attempted to stage a coup (known as the Beer Hall Putsch) in Munich to overthrow the government of the German state of Bavaria on November 23, 1923. The attempt failed and resulted in several deaths. Hitler and several of his followers were arrested, but rather

than diminishing his popularity, Hitler's subsequent trial for treason and imprisonment made him a national figure.

At the trial, a judge sympathetic to the Nazis' nationalist message allowed Hitler and his followers to show open contempt for the Weimar Republic, which they referred to as a "Jew government." Hitler and his followers were found guilty. Although they should have been deported because they were not German citizens (they were Austrian citizens), the judge dispensed with the law and gave them the minimum sentence—five years in prison. Hitler only served nine months, and the rest of his term was suspended.

During his time in prison, Hitler wrote *Mein Kampf* (My Struggle). In the book, published in 1925, he maintained that conflict between the races was the catalyst of history. Because he believed that the "Aryan" race was superior to all others, he insisted that "Aryan" Germany had the right to incorporate all of Eastern Europe into a new empire that would provide much-needed *Lebensraum*, or living space, for it. That new empire would also represent a victory over the Communists, who controlled much of the territory Hitler sought. Hitler, like many conservative Germans, regarded both Communists and Jews as enemies of the German people. He linked the Communists to the Jews, using the phrase "Jewish Bolshevism" and claiming that the Jews were behind the teachings of the Communist Party. (The Bolsheviks were the communist group that gained power in Russia in 1917 and established the Soviet Union). The Jews, according to Hitler, were everywhere, controlled everything, and acted so secretly and deviously that few could detect their influence.

By 1925, Hitler was out of prison and once again in control of the Nazi Party. The attempted coup had taught him an important lesson. Never again would he attempt an armed uprising. Instead, the Nazis would use the rights guaranteed by the Weimar Constitution—freedom of the press, the right to assemble, and freedom of speech—to win control of Germany.

However, in 1924 the German economy had begun to improve. By 1928, the country had recovered from the war and business was booming. As a result, fewer Germans seemed interested in the hatred that Hitler and his Nazi Party promoted. The same was true for other extreme nationalist groups. In the 1928 elections, the Nazis received only about 2% of the vote.

Then, in 1929, the stock market crashed and the worldwide Great Depression began. Leaders

around the world could not stop the economic collapse. To an increasing number of Germans, democracy appeared unable to rescue the economy, and only the most extreme political parties seemed to offer clear solutions to the crisis.

Many saw the Nazis as an attractive alternative to democracy and communism. Among them were wealthy industrialists who were alarmed by the growth of the Communist Party and did not want to be forced to give up what they owned. Hitler was a powerful speaker and his words moved people. In his speech, he promised to build a strong nation, undo the injustice of the Versailles Treaty and restore the dignity of the German people. He also promised employment for those looking for work and a secure future for the youth. He promised to weed out all foreign influences and resist all foreign 'conspiracies' against Germany. Hitler started following a new style of politics and his followers held big rallies and public meetings to demonstrate support. According to the Nazi propaganda, Hitler was called a messian, a saviour, as someone who had arrived to deliver people from their distress. In 1932, Hitler became a German citizen so that he could run for president in that year's spring election. The people re-elected President Hindenburg. Hitler finished second. But in elections for the Reichstag four months later, the Nazis' popularity increased further.

President Hindenburg offered the Chancellorship, on 30 January 1933, the highest position in the cabinet of ministers, to Hitler. The Fire Decree of 28 February 1933 suspended civic rights like freedom of speech, press and assembly that had been guaranteed by the Weimar constitution. On 3 March 1933, the famous Enabling Act was passed which established dictatorship in Germany. The state took control over the economy, media, army and judiciary. Apart from the already existing regular police in green uniform and the SA or the Storm Troopers, these included the Gestapo (secret state police), the SS (the protectio squads), criminal police and the Security Service (SD). Hitler's rise to power was completed in August 1934 when President Paul von Hindenburg died. Hitler merged the Chancellorship with the Presidency and became the Fuhrer. Thus, Hitler established his supreme authority in Germany.

Once in power as Reich Chancellor, Hitler moved to consolidate the grip of his party over both the organs of the State and the German people as a whole. Nazis assumed power in central and local government; the state directed industry and controlled the German mass media. opposition parties were abolished and dissent suppressed, either by physical punishment or the fear of it. Hitler's particular targets of intense hate the Jews, Gypsies

and homosexuals – were sent in ever increasing numbers to concentration camps. No aspect of German life was left untouched by Nazi Party and ideology. Even the most intimate aspects of private life were subordinated to the imperatives of the Third Reich. German women were accordingly exhorted to produce genetically pure children for the greater good of the Reich.

In this regard, as in others, Nazism closely resembled Italian Fascism. Mussolini also insisted that ‘Maternity is the patriotism of women’. But Nazism exhibited distinct, and more virulent, especially in its genocidal anti-Semitism. At the heart of Hitler’s worldview was his racist belief in the superiority of the Pure German people. Not only did he believe that Germany had been unfairly robbed of land and people in 1919, but his territorial aims beyond mere rectification of the wrongs of Versailles. In pursuit of more living space Aryan Germans must fulfil racial and historical destiny, by expanding eastwards. Hitler’s worldview thus rested on a debased Social Darwinism, in which the fittest race was compelled to expand at the expense of its genetically inferior neighbours.

13.11 Fascist Challenge to the International World Order

The rise of Hitler had serious implications not only for Germany’s domestic politics but also for international order. Much of the efforts to contain Germany became futile. After the rise of Hitler, Germany followed the expansionist policy by violating the Treaty of Versailles and provisions of the League of Nations. Hitler rejected the reparation and disarmament clause and became successful in his endeavour due to a variety of reasons such as American isolationism, French low morale, Soviet disengagement from the West and the weakness of League of Nations. The Appeasement policy followed by Britain and France was primarily instrumental in the rise of Germany from the weakest country in the world to the most powerful country. Britain followed the policy of Appeasement towards Fascist powers in Europe because it was operating in a strategic context marked by war disillusionment at home, concerns regarding Soviet expansionism, uncertainty about German choices. One structural factor that allowed Germany to play different powers against each other was the tendency of the status quo powers to offload the burden of containing Germany to each other; it is known as a strategy of bloodletting in international relations theory.

Stalin’s overarching take away from the First World War was that the Western powers were capable of fighting a long war of attrition against Germany, and hence the Soviet

Union would be wise to stay out of the war, encourage the two sides to fight and then swoop in at an appropriate time to dictate the terms of peace from an advantaged position. Britain was conscious of this strategy but still considered worth an attempt to bring in the Soviet Union into a broad alliance aimed at Germany. Both France and Britain also saw Italy as crucial in determining the balance. Italy also had significant reasons to fear increasing German power. Hence, Britain and France decided to win over Italy. It is this strategic objective that paralysed British and French counter efforts when Italy decided to invade Abyssinia, thereby leaving the League of Nations even weaker. Traditional alliances and balance of power politics considerations won over collective security considerations.

13.12 Conclusion

Fascism and Nazism as practised in Italy and Germany, led to complete reordering of those societies eliminating any notion of a private sphere. In foreign policy terms ambitious territorial plans were mapped which went beyond the revision of aspects of the treaty of Versailles. Fascism / Nazism emerged out of complex range of historical forces that were present during the interwar period. The combination of economic crisis, political instability and frustrated nationalism has provided fertile ground for the emergence of fascism and Nazism in the past. Hence, it would be foolish to discount the possibility of their resurgence in the future.

13.13 Summing Up

Both Fascism and Nazism, the two ideological movements established a dictatorial and authoritarian state in Italy and Germany respectively. They were contrary to democracy, and socialism. After coming to the power, they tried to organise totalitarian state, make their country self-sufficient, restore country's glorious pride and pushed for territorial expansion. This all led to the outbreak of World War II. The end of the Second World War was the final death-nail into their coffins.

13.14 Probable Questions

Essay Type Questions

1. What are the salient features of Fascism?
2. Discuss the rise of Nazism in Germany.

Short Questions

1. Define the historical background that helped Hitler to come to power.
2. Discuss the impact of Nazism in international politics.

Objective Questions

1. Who led the Fascist party in Italy?
2. Who is the leader of Nazi party in Germany?
3. In which year Hitler came to power in Germany?

13.15 Further Reading

Carste, F. L., (1967), *The Rise of Fascism*, London, Methuen

Nester, W. R., (2010), *Globalisation: A Short History of the Modern World*, Palgrave, Macmillan

Langsa, W.C., (1971), *The World Since 1919*, London, Macmillan

Carr, E.H., (1964), *The Twenty Year's Crisis, 1919-1939: An Introduction to the Study of International Relation*, New York, Harper and Row

Stone, Dan, (2021), *Fascism, Nazism and the Holocaust Challenging Histories*, London, Routledge

Spielvogel, Jackson J. (1996), *Hitler and NAZI Germany: A History* New York, London, Routledge

Orlow, Dietrick (2009), *The Lure of Fascism in Western Europe: German Nazism, Dutch and French Fascists, 1933-1939*, London, Palgrave Macmillan

Dev, A. And I. A. Dev (2009), *History of the World*, Hyderabad, Orient Blackswan

Unit-14 : World War II : Causes and Consequences

Structure

14.1 Objective

14.2 Introduction

14.3 Historical debate over the origin of the second world war

14.4 Causes of the Second World War

14.4.1 Harsh Terms and Conditions of the Treaty of Versailles

14.4.2 World Economic Crisis and Rise of Nazism and Fascism

14.4.3 Failure of League of Nations

14.4.4 Japan's Imperialistic Attitude

14.4.5 Failure of the Appeasement Policy

14.4.6 Discontent of Minorities

14.4.7 Failure of Disarmament process

14.4.8 Spirit of Extreme Nationalism

14.5 Consequences of World War II

14.5.1 End of Eurocentricism and beginning of Cold War

14.5.2 End of Colonialism and Emergence of the Third World Countries

14.5.3 Change in the Techniques of Warfare

14.5.4 Emergence of Non-alignment

14.5.5 Massive Destruction

14.5.6 Establishment of the United Nations Organization

14.6 Conclusion

14.7 Summing Up

14.8 Probable Questions

14.9 Further Reading

14.1 Objective

This unit deals with the causes and consequences of Second World war and after studying this the learners will be able to :

- trace the causes of the Second World War.
- discuss the consequences of the Second World war and
- analyse the impact of the Second World War in International Relations.

14.2 Introduction

The Treaty of Versailles did not bring peace but only armistice for twenty years. It had solved none of Europe's fundamental problems. The inter-war years saw Europe's economic position decline further relative to that of the United States, which emerged from the war as the net beneficiary. The Treaty of Versailles was bound to fail. The apprehension of war had begun after the Paris Peace Conference of 1919 when the German delegates were forced to sign the dictated and 'humiliating treaty' of Versailles. They considered the Treaty of Versailles a profane document and wanted to overthrow the restrictions imposed on them. Though Germany had been defeated and crushed, it could not be neglected. At the time of Paris Peace Treaty, the German delegate Erzberger had said with great confidence, The nation with 60 million oppressed people could never perish.

The 'German problem' which remained one of the most complicated and disturbing problems of Europe during the period between the World Wars finally became the most prominent cause of the Second World War. At the Paris Peace Conference Germany was not treated in a befitting manner. The French policy of extracting reparation from Germany in a harsh manner intensified her indignation. US had gradually adopted the policy of isolationism. Discontented with the peace treaties, Italy joined the revisionists. France wanted to reduce Germany to a state of extinction but Britain wanted to see her a prosperous nation able to maintain balance in Europe, and act as a shield against communism. Thus Germany got an opportunity of violating the conditions of the Treaty of Versailles.

14.3 Historical debate over the origin of The Second World War

In many ways the second world war was a continuation of the First World War. It was another manifestation of Europe's deep rooted instability and a reflection of the imbalance

of power which had existed on the continent ever since the unification of Germany. The controversy among historians regarding the causes of the second world war concerns the longterm motives and ambitions of Hitler. Many historians argue that besides the profound structural forces which were at work undermining the stability of Europe, human agency also played a role in bringing about the war. To them the second world war was quite simply Hitler's war, which he planned and which was the conscious result of his determination to achieve world mastery.

Historian Hugn Trevor-Roper argued that Hitler had always intended for Germany to become involved in a major war. Infact, his long-term aim was the conquest of Russia. In Mein Kamph he stated clearly that the German population was too large for the boundaries. His solution was living space for the Germans.

Other historians, most notably A. J. P. Taylor writing in 1961, challenge this theory, arguing that Hitler had never intended a major war. They argued that Hitler was an opportunist, taking advantage of situations as they occurred and that his foreign policy had not been based on a step-by-step plan of conquest. The idea of living space for the Germans was merely a propaganda tool to gain further support for the Nazi party and was never intended as a plan for aggressive action.

Alan Bullock suggests that Hitler never wanted a world war and, least of all, a war against Britain. The weak British response to Hitler's aggression between 1933 and early 1939 has convinced him that Britain would not interfere with his design on Poland, leaving the way open for a German attack on the USSR. He had every reason to believe that Britain and France would do nothing to support Stalin's communist regime.

Martin Gilbert, on the other hand, argues that Hitler did intend to fight a major European war in order to remove the stigma attached to Germany's embarrassing defeat in the First World War. Hitler believed that Germany's future could only be determined through war.

The German historian Eberhard Jackel argues that Hitler consistently worked for the establishment of a greater Germany than had existed before. The way to this greater Germany was a war of conquest fought mainly at the expense of Soviet Russia. It is probably true to say that Hitler had a long term fixity of purpose coupled with a short term flexibility in his tactics and timing.

14.4 Causes of The Second World War

Most of the historians agree that the Second World War appeared to be an off shoot of First World War. The ground for this great war had been prepared since the end of World War I. Germany, Italy and Japan formed an alliance against the allied powers and were primarily responsible for the Second World War. The fundamental causes of this great war may be discussed in the following way.

14.4.1 Harsh Terms and Conditions of The Treaty of Versailles

The Treaty of Versailles has been considered as the most humiliating, harsh and forcefully imposed treaty in world history. The common people of Germany were not happy with this treaty because it was dictatorial, revengeful and one sided. Germany was held responsible for the First World War and Treaty of Versailles aimed at weakening Germany economically, territorially and militarily so that it would never be able to raise her head. Germany had to lose one-eighth of her territories which were distributed among the Allied Powers. Her naval force was almost destroyed and Germany was allowed to keep only six battleships. Germany's army was reduced to only one lac. Further, it was burdened with reparation which was beyond its capacity. An amount of one billion pound was imposed on Germany which it had to pay within 1st May, 1921. A Reparation committee was also set up for fixation of exact amount that would be paid only by Germany within next fifteen years. Historians like George Kennan, David Andelman and Jay Winter argued that the Treaty of Versailles was supposed to ensure peace. On the contrary, it was more about punishment than about peace. It was difficult on the part of self-respecting country like Germany to bear such harsh and humiliating conditions for a long time. Germany thus started to prepare its army for the war to get rid of the humiliating and dictated.

14.4.2 World Economic Crisis and Rise of Nazism and Fascism

The great economic depression of 1929 gave rise to anti-government feelings in Germany. Discontent of people had been fully exploited by Hitler who established National Socialist party (Nazi Party) with a view to topple the ruling party. The National Socialist Party promised to reject the Treaty of Versailles, resurgence of German economy and restoration of German Glory. Hitler became the German chancellor in 1933. He wanted to make Germany the most powerful country in the world. To fulfill this purpose, Hitler propagated

narrow nationalism in Germany and geared up the whole nation for preparation of a war against allied nations. He denied and rejected the reparation and disarmament provisions of the Treaty of Versailles. In 1936 Hitler defied the Treaty of Versailles and recovered Rhine land without any retaliation from France and Great Britain.

The rise of Hitler had also encouraged the rise of Italy as a revisionist power. Fascism in Italy had emerged in 1922 but it became powerful in 1930 due to worsening economic conditions. Mussolini established dictatorship in Italy. He was not satisfied with the Treaty of Versailles territorial distribution of power and wanted to bring the days of Roman glory back. Italy attacked Ethiopia due to its strategic and economic significance. League of Nations failed to take any actions against Italy.

14.4.3 Failure of League of Nations

League of Nations was established in the year 1919 to save world from further war. All the member states were agreed to settle their disputes by discussion and negotiation rather than by use of force. The collective security system and disarmament were the backbone of League of nations for the maintenance of peace and order in the world. But at the time of Japan's attack on Manchuria in 1931 no action was taken by the league of Nations. In 1935, Italy waged war against Abyssinia, defeated her and formally annexed Abyssinia into Italian Empire. This time also League of Nations failed to take actions against Italy due to major power's inability to use the Collective Security System. The league had no permanent army to implement its decision and the abstention of the United States from the League were major causes for the failure of League of Nations. Due to lack of response from the League, Imperial Japan, Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy were successful to form an alliance to continue their own expansionist policy and setting the stage for a new world war.

14.4.4 Japan's Imperialistic Attitude

During First World War, Japan took the side of allied powers but felt humiliated and disappointed as it was not rewarded by the Treaty of Versailles. Japan was determined to secure its position as a great power in the East and decided to build a powerful sophisticated formidable modern army. On the other hand, Frustrations had been building for decades in Japan over the country's role in the international arena. Discriminatory laws in several Western countries tangled Japanese immigration. Japan ultimately unfolded her imperialistic desires and invaded Manchuria, a Chinese province in 1931 for fulfilling

its economic and strategic goals. Allied countries asked Japan to withdraw its army from Manchuria. But Japan refused to do so, instead, withdrew from League of Nations and this drastic step left the League ineffective and paralyzed. The invasion of Manchuria by Japan may be considered as a booster of the Second World War.

14.4.5 Failure of the Appeasement Policy

In 1930s political leaders in Britain and France started to believe that the Treaty of Versailles was an unjust act against Germany. This idea led Britain and France to follow an appeasement policy. Britain, France, Italy and Germany signed the Munich Agreement and this was a policy of appeasement to prevent the possibility of war with Germany. In this Agreement Britain and France allowed Germany to annex particular areas of Czechoslovakia where German speaking people reside. In exchange, Germany agreed not to invade the rest of Czechoslovakia or any other country. However, there was no attempt on the part of the allied nations to stop the rising aggressive powers and their expansionist desires due to their belief that Germany was preparing to fight war against Soviet Union. This appeasement policy led Hitler to invade not only Sutherland and Austria but occupy of Poland. In fact, British Prime Minister Chamberlain followed appeasement policy with a view to avoid a war. But in practice, he failed to understand Hitler's desire. Germany invaded Poland in September 1939 which caused the outbreak of Second World War.

14.4.6 Discontent of Minorities

Treaty of Versailles shifted boundaries of the states and naturally different races were left uncared. President Wilson of United States desired to prepare the Peace Treaty on the principle of self-determination. But due to economic, military, social and religious reasons it was not possible for the makers of the Peace Treaty to implement the principle of self-determination. Large German minorities in Poland and Czechoslovakia were left under foreign rule. Under the circumstances, massive discontent developed among the minorities in many countries. Hitler took the advantage of the situation and on the pretext of 'misrule upon the minorities' he occupied Austria and Sutherland almost by force and finally invaded Poland. Therefore, issues related to minorities appeared as a major excuse for the war.

14.4.7 Failure of Disarmament process

Politicians world over believed that to ensure peace and security the arms race should

be ceased. After the Treaty of Versailles in 1919, the arms and armed forces of the vanquished nations had been greatly reduced. The Allied Powers had assured Germany that after some time general disarmament would be implemented to ascertain collective security, but the policies adopted by different nations only encouraged armament.

The German Disarmament Conference held in 1932 made efforts to reduce the arms and to put a check on them. The Five Power Conference, the Four Power Pact and the Mac Donald Plan were some of the important steps taken in the direction of establishing peace and implementing disarmament, but because of the differences between France and Germany no decisions could be taken and when Hitler announced to walk out of the conference, it totally fizzled out. After this all big and small states began to augment their military power and the world once again sank into the same international chaos in which Europe had been before the First World War began. The atmosphere that developed made a future war seem imminent.

14.4.8 Spirit of Extreme Nationalism

The spirit of extreme nationalism was one of the important causes of the conflict. Because of industrial revolution, economic competition had been growing in the world. This economic nationalism was responsible for the War. The need for controlling this nationalism had been felt since World War I came to an end. The spirit of internationalism failed to grow. The influence of extreme nationalism was pre-eminent in Italy, Germany and Japan. Nationalism there aimed at making the nation strong and glorious. Hitler made the concept of 'master race' the basis of national greatness. The economic depression played an important role in accentuating the spirit of nationalism.

14.4.9 The Immediate Cause of War

Hitler suddenly stormed Poland on September 1, 1939. On September 3, Britain and France warned Germany to stop war, but Hitler turned a deaf ear. Consequently, Britain and France declared war against Germany. In a short time the war spread like wild fire. This was the origin of World War II.

14.5 Consequences of World War II

World War II was, arguably, most significant and influential event of the twentieth century. The end of the Second world war ushered in a new era in the history of international relations because a large number of countries of the world became successful in decolonizing

themselves from the European Imperialist powers. The post Second World War period witnessed the end of the era of Eurocentricism and beginning of international politics. The world politics was replaced by international politics. Consequences of the Second World War are discussed in the following texts.

14.5.1 End of Eurocentricism and beginning of Cold War

After the Second World War traditional Eurocentric power structures came to an end and a new bipolar structure with two super powers—United States (US) and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (U.S.S.R.) emerged. Britain, France and Germany have lost their position to control the world and instead U.S.S.R appeared as a major threat to liberal democratic countries. On the other hand, US with its nuclear capability had emerged as the first superpower that aimed to contain the expansionist policy of communist Soviet Russia. After the end of the World War, people hoped that an ever lasting peace would reign in the world and the Allied Powers would be able to solve manifold post war problems. But people's expectation did not come true. After the war two great powers, the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R., appeared on the international stage. Both the US and USSR had been involved in the competition to expand their sphere of influence and indulged in the strategic arms race to achieve their objectives. These differences generated so much tension and animosity that a fierce war of charges and counter-charges, and propagation of mutually contradictory ideologies continued for many years. This is known as the 'Cold War'. Thus the nations which opposed each other maintained diplomatic relations and did not resort to overt clashes, but treated each other with suspicions. The press in these countries continued to hurl charges and counter-charges till 1991. With the disintegration of the USSR the Cold War came to an end. The bipolar system of the Cold War days is changing into a unipolar one and this can be seen in America's anxiety for evolving a global economy. However, Communist China obdurately obstructs her efforts.

14.5.2 End of Colonialism and Emergence of the Third World Countries

After the Second World War the process of decolonization of Afro Asian countries accelerated. World War II generated the spirit of independence and freedom movements in Asian countries and forced the imperialist powers to grant freedom to the occupied countries. The British government changed her policies and as a result, India, Burma, Malaya, Lanka, Egypt and other countries became independent. Several countries like

Cambodia, Laos, Vietnam etc. got rid of French domination and became independent. The Dutch colonies-Java, Sumatra and Borneo etc. formed a federal state of Indonesia and overthrew the Dutch domination. Decolonization first began in Asia which led to demands for independence in Africa and Middle East. The newly independent countries were categorized as Third World countries on the basis of their socio-economic, political, and military conditions. However, these countries were not insignificant as they existed as independent actors in the international system. No doubt they became a victim of Cold war politics and neocolonialism; their role in the United Nations (UN) and in shaping the global order for four decades can not be ignored.

14.5.3 Change in the Techniques of Warfare

Beginning of the Nuclear Age—The techniques used in this war greatly differed from those used in the previous wars. Hitler's technique of Blitzkrieg surprised the whole world. The victories that required years and months to accomplish were now attained in weeks and days. Army and navy did not have as much importance in this war as the air force and airplanes. New methods of attack and counter-attack were successfully tested. The use of the atom bomb brought the world on the verge of disaster. Modern States have developed intercontinental, supersonic jet planes, missiles carrying nuclear heads as well as planes and submarines powered with nuclear weapons.

14.5.4 Emergence of Non-alignment

In the post-Second World War period, some of the newly independent countries adopted the policy of non-alignment to keep themselves away from the Cold War politics and to fight against colonialism, imperialism and racialism. Nonalignment can be defined as not entering into military alliances with any country, either of the Western bloc led by the U.S. or the communist bloc led by the Soviet Union. It is an assertion of independence in foreign policy. Non-alignment was not a policy of neutrality but a policy of an active participation—to fight for justice, freedom, equity and global peace.

14.5.5 Massive Destruction

Second World War continued for a period of seven years and turned to be the most destructive event in the history of mankind both in terms of loss of human beings and material. Due to second world war more than 40 million people were killed of which half were Russians. Many people were uprooted from their homes. The German industrial areas and cities were destroyed. Similarly, cities in France and West Russia were devastated

by air strikes. Holocaust was another feature of the war. Hitler engaged in systematic execution of six million Jews in the concentration camps. The nuclear bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki killed and disabled countless Japanese and continued to affect the health of succeeding generations.

14.5.6 Establishment of the United Nations Organization

During the Second World War this universe witnessed horrible destruction and there was huge cry for peace among the people of the world. As a result, some prudent politicians felt an urgent need for creating an international organization to ensure security of mankind and establishment of permanent peace. Efforts in this direction had already started while the war was still going on. During the Moscow Conference held in October 1943 the need for establishing an international organization for general security was discussed and accepted. Then in several meetings the outline of its organization and constitution was prepared and was given a final shape in the San-Fransisco Conference held in April-June, 1945. It was decided that this forum would act to resolve the conflict by discussion mediation and conciliation. It granted the right of self-determination to all the countries of the world. Most of the newly independent countries became member of the UN and had been playing a significant role in democratizing the international order. The constitution of the United Nations Organization was put into practice on October 24, 1945. The 51 states which signed the Charter in the San-Fransisco Conference, were considered the founder members of the U.N.O.

14.6 Conclusion

Second world war was a turning point in the history of international relations. The allied power's appeasement policy and failure of the League of nations to take appropriate actions were responsible for this devastating war. After the end of second world war some major European countries like Great Britain, France, Spain, Italy which were at the forefront in the 1930s suffered economic setback and lost their influence in the international politics. On the other hand, Soviet Union and United States emerged as the two super powers. A new hostility began between the Soviet Union and the United States based on the ideological and geopolitical struggle for global dominance. This is known as cold war.

14.7 Summing Up

World War II was a global war that lasted for a period of six years from 1939 to 1945. Several factors were responsible for this most disastrous, devastating and decisive event of the twentieth century. The second world war was considered as a off shoot of the first world war. The treaty of Versailles signed in 1919 has been regarded as the most important reason for the beginning of second world war. This treaty was most humiliating for the Germans and Germany under the leadership of Hitler wanted to get read of this dictatorial treaty. Japan was also humiliated for the Versailles Treaty. It wanted to become an imperial power. Japan's imperialistic attitude preceptitated Second World War. Other factors include world economic crisis, failure of the League of Nations, rise of Nazism and Fascism in Europe, French and British appeasement policy, and discontent of different National Minorities. Post Second World War witnessed the end of era of Eurocentric structure and emergence of two super powers namely United States and Soviet Union. Further, after the war a large number of colonies became independent. In the post Second World War period these newly independent countries adopted non-alignment as their foreign policy to keep themselves aloof from the Cold War Politics. The most significant effect of the post Second World War was the establishment of United Nations as an international organization to maintain peace and save the world from war.

14.8 Probable Questions

Essay Type Questions

1. Account for the outbreak of the Second World War.
2. Analyse the important consequences of Second World War.

Short Questions

1. How did Treaty of Versailles lead to the second World War?
2. Why did League of Nations fail to take actions against Japan and Germany?
3. Was the Appeasement policy a strategic failure?

Objective Questions

1. In which year Second World War was commenced?
2. Which Countries constituted to Axis Power?
3. Which countries constituted Allied Powers?

14.9 Further Reading

- Decuscher, Isaac. 1972. *Stalin : A Political Biography*. Oxford : Oxford University Press
- Domarus, Max. 1990. *Hitler : Speeches and Proclamations 1932-1945. The Chronicle of a Dictatorship*. Chicago, IL : Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers.
- Frieser, Karl-Heinz, and John T. Greenwood. 2005. *The Blitzkrieg Legend : The 1940 Campaign in the West*. Annapolis, II MD : Naval Institute Press.
- Gilbert, Martin. 1991. *Churchill : A Life*, New York : Holt Paperbacks.
- Gioldstein, Joshua. 2005. *International Relations*. New York, NY: Pearson-Longman Publications.
- Irving, David. 1977. *Hitler's War*. New York, NY : Viking Press.
- Jindal, Nirmal. 1987. *War as a Political Weapon in the Nuclear Age*. Delhi : Intellectual Publishing House.
- Keegan, John. 1789. *The Second World War*. London : Penguin Books.
- Kershaw, Ian. 2007. *Fateful Choices : Ten Decision that Changed the World 1940-1941*. New York, NY : Penguin he* Books.
- Kruszewski, Charles. 1940. 'International Affairs: Germany's Lebensraum'. *The American Political Science Review* 34 3WC (5) : 964-975.
- Macmillan, Margaret. 2001. *Peacemakers : Six Months That Changed the World*. London : J. Murrary Publishers,
- Mann, Robert. 1974. 'The British Decision for Alliance with Russia, May 1939'. *Journal of Contemporary History* ((3): 3-26.
- Mason W. Timothy. 1995. *Nazism, Fascism and the Working Class*. New York. NY : Cambridge University Press.
- Ned Lebow, Richard. 2010, *Why Nations Fight : Past and Future Motives for War*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Palmer, Gladys L. 1914. 'Women's Place in Industry'. *Current History* 4 : 19-24.
- Ross, Graham, ed. 1984. *The Foreign Office & the Kremlin British Documents on Anglo-Soviet Relations, 1941-1945*. New York, NY : Cambridge University Press.

Unit : 15 ☐ Cold War: Different Phases

Structure

15.1 Objectives

15.2 Introduction

15.3 Meaning of the cold war

15.4 Different Phases of Cold War

15.4.1 First Phase : Beginning of the cold war

15.4.2 The Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan

15.4.3 Impact of Cold on Asia

15.4.4 The Korean War

15.4.5 Civil War in Indo-China

15.4.6 Hungarian Crisis and Cold War

15.4.7 Soviet Policy of peaceful existence coupled with conflict and confrontation

15.5 Rise and fall of detente

15.5.1 The Second cold war (1979-1986)

15.5.2 The end of the cold war

15.6 Conclusion

15.7 Summing up

15.8 Probable Questions

15.9 Further Reading

15.1 Objective

This unit discusses the Cold War, its meaning, and its different phases. After going through this Unit students will be able to :

- understand the concept of the Cold War
- identify different phases of the cold war
- realise the major events during each phase of the cold war
- assess the impact of the cold war throughout the world

15.2 Introduction

At the beginning of the Second World War the Soviet Union, strongly believing in Communist ideology and the United States following the path of capitalism joined hands together to fight against fascism. But towards the end of the Second World War, the harmony between the Soviet Union on one hand and the United States and Great Britain, on the other hand, began to wither away and all the suspicions appeared on the fore again. Foundations of a new hostility, emerged. This intense hostility was based on the ideological and geopolitical struggle for global dominance. Two superpowers Soviet Union and the United States started to attack each other with propaganda and economic measures and with a general policy of non-co-operation. The United States and the Soviet Union gradually built up their own zones of influence dividing the world, particularly Europe into two camps namely the Eastern Block and the Western Block. The Cold War was a bitter state of tension between the two blocs, more dangerous than the armed conflict. The term cold is used because there was no face-to-face war between the two superpowers on the battlefield but both United States and the Soviet Union supported major regional conflicts known as proxy wars.

15.3 Meaning of The Cold War

Cold War was a peace-time war fought without weapons. It was based on ideological conflict and political distrust. Both the sides tried to humiliate each other and reduce their sphere of influence. The term cold war was first used by George Orwell, a British Novelist in an article published in the Tribune on 19th October 1945. The cold war since then has been described as “peace time unnamed warfare” between the Soviet Union and the United States. It is illustrated as a war that is fought not on the battlefield but in the minds of men. Another person who popularised this term ‘Cold War’ was Bernard Baruch. Baruch in a speech in April 1947 used the term cold war to describe the relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. Baruch who acted as an adviser of the American President warned. “Let us not be deceived—we are today in the midst of a cold war”. In an open war, enemies are familiar, and war is fought openly. The two superpowers became hostile to each other and applied indirect means such as psychological warfare, political manoeuvring, military coalition, espionage, arms build-up, economic aid and proxy wars. Political expert Raymond Aron perfectly defined the cold war system with an appropriate phrase ‘impossible peace, improbable war.’ The cold war may be also regarded as a bipolar confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union. It expressed itself through ideological hatred, political distrust, diplomatic manoeuvring, military competition, espionage, psychological warfare and bitter relations.

Walter Lippmann called the Cold War a pseudo war which, according to Fleming, was fought in the minds of men.

15.4 Different Phases of Cold War

For analytical convenience we can divide the development Cold War in following phases.

The issue of when the cold war began is closely bondup with the question of who was responsible. Some historians date the origins of the cold war back to Bolshevik revolution of 1917, while most focus on various events between 1945 and 1950. Whether the cold war was inevitable, whether it was the conseance of mistakes and misperception by political leaders are central issues in debat about the origin of the cold war.

15.4.1 First Phase : Beginning of the Cold War

Origins of the Cold War can be noticed from the period of geographical tension which started in 1945 after the Second World War between the United States and the previous Soviet Union.

Some major European countries like Great Britain, France, Spain, and Italy which were at the forefront in the 1930s have faced economic setbacks due to war and lost their influential role in international politics. As a result, the end of the Second World War witnessed major shifts in the international field. The world became bipolar from multi-polar. In this new phase, the United States and the Soviet Union engaged in creating buffer zones. The basic aims of these two countries are to build up their own area of influence by checking the influence of the other. Cold war thus, became an international conflict that affected the whole world particularly European countries. The whole of Europe is divided into two blocks. Countries of Western Europe came under the influence of the USA where as Eastern Europe became satellites of the Soviet Union. In the same way, Germany was divided into East and West Germany. East Germany known as the German Democratic Republic was under the influence of the Soviet Union and West Germany familiar as the German Democratic Republic was under the control of the US and its allies. West Germany where a pro-west governmet came to power started to receive massive financial assistance from the US. However, amidst this reality, the US and its allies particularly Great Britain and France planned to restructure the economy of their zones. They introduced Deutsche as a new currency with an aim to improve the economy of the concerned zones. The Soviet Union opposed this initiative and imposed a total blockade on the Western sectors of Berlin. This blockade was known as the 'Berlin Blockade' and was one of the first major international confrontations of the cold war. Due to such actions by the Soviet Union access to Berlin by road, rail and water

became impossible. Finding no other way, Western powers adopted a policy of round the clock airlift of supplies and fuel to the two million embattled residents of West Berlin. The blockade was lifted on 12 May 1949. Western powers felt it was a moral victory over the Soviet Union which gave them opportunities to expand their influence.

15.4.2 The Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan

The cold war was further stimulated by an American Foreign policy known as Truman Doctrine. The basic aim of American foreign policy was to contain Soviet geopolitical expansion. In the light of the deteriorating relationship with the Soviet Union and its meddling in internal matters of Greece and Turkey, Truman Administration reoriented its foreign policy. The American foreign policy became interventionist instead of isolationist. Thus, both Greece and Turkey received a massive amount of financial aid from the US. By 1949 Communists who were trying to overthrow the Monarchy in Greece were defeated.

Europe suffered massive destruction due to the Second World war. European national economies and industries were struggling for their existence and at the same time members of communist parties in these countries were increasing. It was in this backdrop that U.S. Secretary of State, George Marshall put forward his European Recovery Programme (ERP) which is known as the 'Marshall Plan' in June 1947. Our policy, Marshall declared is directed not against any country or doctrine, but against hunger, poverty, desperation and chaos'. The plan considered the American transfer of more than ten billion dollars to Europe over a period of twenty years. In the next four years, Marshall Aid flowed into Europe. Ultimately Europe was able to stabilize its material as well as a political condition. Many American Historians claimed that Europe's rapid recovery from economic and political disaster was entirely due to the Marshall plan. On the other hand, Russian Foreign Minister Molotov denounced it as dollar 'imperialism'.

In response to Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan, the Soviet Union revived the 'Cominform', which was set up in September 1947 to draw together various European communist parties together in the Soviet sphere of influence in line with Moscow's policies. In fact, this was an attempt to further consolidate Communism in Eastern Europe. Formation of Cominform on 5th October 1947 by 9 communist countries of Europe aggravated Cold War. In response to stern Russian attitude and rapid expansion of communism, the western nations constituted on April 4, 1949 the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. For this purpose a twenty year treaty was signed in Washington by U.S.A., Canada and ten European countries. Later on Greece, Turkey and West Germany also joined it.

This treaty was no doubt a military alliance against the Soviet Block which remained a major feature of the cold war. Article five of the NATO treaty is the central provision

that states that an attack on any member of NATO would be considered an act of aggression against all others. What NATO indicates is the security of Western Europe is under the security umbrella of the United States. In response to NATO, the Soviet Union signed a treaty known as the Warsaw Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance with other communist countries in May 1955. The treaty provided for a unified military command and for the maintenance of Soviet military units on the territories of the other participating states. The formation of NATO and WARSAW entailed a growing military and specifically nuclear threat.

15.4.3 Impact of Cold on Asia

The Cold War was not confined only to Europe, it created impact on Asia too. Russia wanted to extend its influence in Turkey and Iran but they successfully resisted it with the help of western powers. The formation of Communist Republic of China on October 1, 1949 intensified Cold War. America did not recognize this government and opposed her a seat in the Security Council of the U.N.O. It caused bitterness between Russia and America. However, the problem was resolved on October 7, 1971 and China was made a permanent member of both Security Council and the General Assembly.

15.4.4 The Korean War

After 1945 developments in China and Korea intensified the cold war. The cold war expanded for the first-time outside Europe, particularly in Asia. In China, Communist under the leadership of Mao-Tse-Tung came to power. The National Government of General Chiang Kai-Shek had to leave the mainland in 1950 and take shelter in Taiwan (Formosa). The victory of the communists in China had major impact on Asian affairs and on perceptions in both Moscow and Washington.

After the defeat of Japan in World War II. Korea was divided into North Korea under Soviet control and South Korea under American control in accordance with the Potsdam Conference. In 1950, North Korea invaded South Korea. The United Nations, declared North Korea the invader and set up a unified UN command to repel the North Korean attack. General Mac Arthur of the USA was named its commander. The UN troops pushed North Korean forces out of South Korea and entered deep into the North Korean territory, reaching the Chinese border. China then joined the North Korean troops to push the UN troops into South Korea. Ultimately, the matter was resolved by the UN and India played an important role to put an end to the threat of open war. The Korean crisis was the first military conflict of the Cold War. One consequence of the Korean war was the building up of American Conventional Forces in western Europe. The idea that communism was a monolithic political entity controlled from Moscow became a lasting American fixation.

15.4.5 Civil War in Indo-China

In the struggle against French imperialism in Indo-China, the two blocs supported different sides but both advocated a peaceful agreement for the resolution of the problem and Geneva Agreement on Indo-China was signed in 1954. Vietnam was divided into communist North Vietnam and Democratic South Vietnam but guerrilla warfare between the two broke out within 24 hours of signing the agreement. The Vietnam war remained a significant cause of tension between America and the Soviet Union from 1953 to 1970. Cold War between them deterred any resolution of the Vietnam problem.

15.4.6 Hungarian Crisis and Cold War

The death of Stalin in 1959 was an important event, and had significant consequences for the USSR. Nikita Khrushchev, Stalin's Successor strove to modernize Soviet society, but brought about reformist tendencies in Eastern Europe while Polish reformism was controlled, the position in Hungary threatened Soviet hegemony Soviet intervention in 1956 brought bloodshed to the streets of Budapest and international condemnation on Moscow.

The western powers strongly resisted Soviet intervention in Hungary in 1956, but the Suez Canal dispute the same year unexpectedly brought them closer. International condemnation of the Soviet action in Hungary was deflected by final spasm of European imperialism.

America did not approve the Anglo-French-Jewish invasion of Egypt to keep the Suez Canal under their control and Russia threatened to use nuclear weapons if they did not vacate the invasion. The dispute came to an end but the Cold War between America and Russia continued and found a new centre in the Middle East.

15.4.7 Soviet Policy of peaceful existence coupled with conflict and confrontation

Khrushchev's policy towards the west was a combination of seeking coexistence while pursuing confrontation. Soviet support for movements of national liberation aroused fears in the west of a global communist challenge America adopted the policy of supporting friends and subverting enemies in the Third World. The Cold War witnessed the growth of large intelligence organizations engaged with the task of discerning the intention and capabilities of enemies and covert intervention in the affairs of other states. Crises over Berlin in 1961 and Cuba in 1962 marked the most dangerous moments of the Cold War. There was risk of direct military confrontation and in Cuba the possibility of nuclear war.

Those crises were followed by a more stable period of coexistence and competition.

Nuclear arsenals continued to grow and both superpowers continued to support friends and subvert enemies. At the same time Soviet-Chinese relations were deteriorating. Despite these tensions the foundation for detente were laid between the USA and USSR and for rapprochement between China and the USA. Soviet-American detente had its roots in mutual recognition of the need to avoid nuclear war.

15.5 Rise and Fall of Detente

Detente represented an attempt by both superpowers to manage their relations with each other within a framework of negotiation and agreement. This new phase in Soviet-American relations did not mark an end to political conflict. Both side sought to pursue political goals, some of which were to prove in compatible with the interests of the other super power. Both sides maintained support for friendly regimes and movements. For America, Soviet support for revolutionary movement in the Third World constituted an act of duplicity. The perception that USSR was using arms control agreement to gain military advantage was linked to Soviet behaviour in the Third World. Soviet perception was different. The overthrow of the Shah of Iran in 1979 resulted in the loss of an important western ally. Though the ensuing militant Islamic Government was as hostile to the USA as to the USSR.

In December 1979 Soviet armed forces intervened in Afghanistan to support their revolutionary allies. Soviet aggression was bitterly condemned in the West and the Third World. Soon USSR became involved in a protracted and bloody struggle. In the USA Republican and other critics had used domestic and foreign policy issues to attack Carter Presidency. In 1980 Ronald Regan was elected President with the promise to carry out a more confrontational approach with the Soviet Union on arms control, Third World conflicts and East-West relations in general.

15.5.1 The Second cold war (1979-1986)

The tension and confrontation between the two Superpowers that followed Soviet occupation of Afghanistan has been described as the 'Second Cold War'. In Western Europe and Soviet Union there was real fear of nuclear war generated by the rhetoric and policies of the Regan administration. American Policy regarding nuclear weapons and military intervention in Grenada in 1983 and against Libya in 1986 were seen as evidence of new aggression. Regan's policy towards Central America and support for the rebels contras in Nicaragua were sources of controversy. The Soviet leadership took very seriously the American policy and believed that the US leadership was planning a nuclear first strike. In 1983 Soviet air defences shot down a South Korean civilian air liner in Soviet air space. The US response and the imminent deployment of US nuclear

missiles in Europe created a climate of great tension in East-West relations. The world became potentially a global battle field in which both superpowers could strike each others territory from their own. The global dimension was increased by the emergence of other nuclear weapon states like Britain, France and China.

There was growing concern at the spread of proliferation of nuclear weapons and in the 1960s a nuclear Non Proliferation Treaty was negotiated in which states having nuclear weapons committed themselves to halt arms race. Both America and Soviet Union attempted to develop weapons that could shootdown incoming ballistic missiles. However, both sides relied on offensive nuclear weapons for their security. In 1972, an agreement was concluded which limited ABM defences to a token level. US President Regan, however, in 1983, cast doubt on the principles of this agreement by launching Strategic Defence Initiative. The fear that one side would have sufficient weapons to destroy the other sides nuclear arsenals became a mutual fear. For much of cold war both sides feared that the other was moving to a position of meaningful superiority.

Infact, nuclear weapons provided the context and pretext for their more dangerous confrontations, particularly, when USSR deployed nuclear mission in Cuba, 1962. When political confrontation gave way to Soviet-American detente, agreements on nuclear weapons became, the most tangible achievement of detente. Infact, detente was a way of managing East-West conflict, and did not resolve the basis of disagreement. Similarly arms control was a means of regulating the growth of nuclear arsenals, not eliminating them.

As detente broke down inthe 1970s, Strategic Arms Limitation Talks gave way to renewed conflict. In the west, critics of detente and arms control argued that the Soviets were acquiring nuclear superiority and proposed that the US should pursue policies based on the idea that victory in nuclear war was possible. The period of second cold war marked a new phase in the political and nuclear relationship between East and West. NATO's decision to deploy landbased missiles, capable of striking Soviet territory created a period of great tension in relations between NATO and the USSR on arms control Regan was not interested in agreements that would freeze the status quo. Soviet and American negotiators were incapable of making progress in talks on long range and inter mediate range weapons.

The situation changed dramatically when Mikhail Gorbachev became President in 1985. Gorbachev travelled to Washington to sign the Intermediate Nuclear Forces Treaty banning intermediate range nuclear missiles. Regan's Successor, George Bush concluded a Strategic Arms Reductions Treaty agreement that reduced long-range nuclear weapons. By the time that a follow-on START agreement was reached, the USSR disintegrated. Gorbachev's

attempts for internal reforms in the USSR, as also the efforts of the two countries to curtail their nuclear weapons and to stop nuclear proliferations, besides other factors, contributed to the end of the cold war.

15.5.2 The end of the cold war

Cold war refers to the whole period from the late 1940s to the late 1980s. Thus detente was part of the cold war rather than a departure from it. This is because while there was behavioural change in period of detente, the fundamental structure of US-Soviet relations remained constant. Therefore, end of the cold war means end of that structural condition which was defined by political and military rivalry between the USA and USSR, ideological antagonism between capitalism and communism, the division of Europe and extension of conflict from the centre to the periphery of the international system. Internal development in the Soviet bloc and external forces in the form of Western Policies contributed to the end of the cold war.

The sudden collapse of communism in the Soviet Union was a surprise as much to the experts on international politics as to political leaders and the public. Gorbachev's accession to power in March 1985 was an event of considerable importance. It was not his intention to dismantle Soviet Union. His political credo Perestroika was anti-Stalinist but not anti-Socialist. He believed that through Perestroika and Glasnost the ideals of socialism will gain fresh impetus. The sense of renewal which Gorbachev projected did not seem to indicate the end of the cold war. Sudden disintegration of the USSR had long term and short term causes. Structural weaknesses were built into the system of the Soviet command economy which relied on inflexible central planning, rewarded gross output of goods rather than productivity and offered no incentives to innovation in management and production techniques. Agriculture was a notoriously weak sector of the Soviet economy. A serious decline in harvests in the late 1970s and a slowdown in production in some key industries created a general climate of economic stagnation. Gorbachev took specific initiatives to turn these systemic problems into a systemic crisis. The first of these initiatives was the decision to permit dissemination of knowledge about the realities of Soviet life (Glasnost), the second and third were political and economic restructuring (Perestroika) The essentials of Glasnost were : Freedom to criticise, loosening of controls on media and publishing and freedom of worship. The main elements of Perestroika were : new legislature, two thirds of which was to be elected on the basis of popular choice, creation of an executive Presidency, ending leading role of the Communist Party allowing state enterprises to sell part of their product on the open market, and allowing foreign companies to own Soviet enterprises.

A combination of Glasnost and political restructuring undermined the role of the Communist

Party and ultimately the Soviet Union itself, which by the end of 1991 had dissolved into Separate republics. Economic reforms managed to cut the ground from under the old system without putting viable alternative mechanisms in its place.

There are many in the west who believed that Ronald Reagan's hard line, especially his refusal to compromise on the development of the Strategic Defense Initiative, had been decisive in forcing the Soviet Union to negotiate and subsequently bringing about the fall of communism. Others argue that Reagan's policy actually prolonged war. Gorbachev's determination to reform an economy crippled in part by defense spending and far more by structural rigidities propelled him to search for an accommodation with the west.

These two responses, however, share common conviction that internal factors were primarily responsible for the end of the cold war. At the same time, neither response discounts external pressure. Soviet-American relations did not change overnight with the advent of Gorbachev. Of course, Gorbachev's new thinking in foreign policy overthrew the conventional wisdom of Soviet foreign policy. His concessions which generally improve the climate of Soviet-American relations, promoted initially in a controlled fashion but tended to become more unilateral and sweeping as the pace of domestic reform quickened. In response United States also made some significant movement.

15.6 Conclusion

The period of history since 1945 has witnessed the end of European empires and has also witnessed the rise and fall of the cold war. The end of the cold war has also been followed by the collapse of one of the two superpowers, the USSR. There is close relationship between the cold war and the history of nuclear weapons. The unprecedented threat of devastation is crucial to understanding the mutual hostility and fear of leaders in the nuclear age. Now both the cold war and the age of empire are over, but their legacies, good and bad, persist. The age of nuclear bomb and of other weapons of mass destruction continues. The problem of nuclear weapons remains a common and urgent concern.

15.7 Summing Up

Soon after the Second World War, the erstwhile friends and allies turned into the foes. Two power blocs were formed led by the two super powers, USA and the USSR. Both sides blamed each other for the cold war. There were periods of acute conflict and also periods of relative calm and cooperation. The relaxation of tension was described as detente. Following the most serious crisis of Cuba, efforts were initiated for detente. However, with the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan in 1979 cold war erupted again.

Numerous factors were responsible for ending the cold war. Gorbachev's attempts for internal reforms in the Soviet Union, as also the efforts of the two superpowers to curtail their nuclear weapons, besides other factors contributed to the end of the cold war.

15.8 Probable Questions

Essay Type Questions

1. Discuss four reasons for the outbreak of the Cold war.
2. What is detente? Why was it important?

Short Questions

1. Why did detente collapse?
2. What was the core basis of rivalry in the cold war?

Objective Questions

1. In which year Korean war took place?
2. In which country Nuclear Missile Crisis occurred?
3. Who was Henry Kissinger?

15.9 Further Reading

Baylis, John, Steve Smith, and Patricia Owens, 2010. *The Globalisation of World Politics : An Introduction International Relations*. Oxford University Press.

Callinicos, Alex. 1991 'Marxism and Imperialism Today'. In *International Socialism* at <https://marxists.org/history/etol/writers/callinicos/1991/xx/imperialism.html> (accessed on 16 May 2020)

Chatterjee, Aneek. 2018, *International Relations Today : Concepts and Applications*. Bengaluru : Pearson.

Deutsch, Karl W., and J. David Singer. 1969. 'Multipolar Power Systems and International Stability'. In *International Politics and Foreign Policy : A Reader in Research and Theory*, edited by James N. Rousseau. New York Free Press.

Kennedy, Robert F. 1969. *Thirteen Days : The Cuban Missile Crisis of October 1962*. London : Macmillan.

Morgenthau, Hans J. 1952. *Politics among Nations : The Struggle for Power and Peace*. New York, NY : Knopf.

Nicholson, Michael 2005. *International Relations : A Concise Introduction*. New York, NY : Palgrave Macmillan.

Paige, Glenn D. 1968. *The Korean Decision, June 24-30, 1950*. New York, NY : The Free Press.

Reveron, Derek S. 2016. *Exporting Security : International Engagement, Security Cooperation and the Changing Face of the US Military*. Washington, DC : Georgetown University Press.

Scott, Len. 2001. 'International History : 1950-1990'. In *The Globalisation of World Politics : An Introduction to International Relations*, edited by John Baylis, and Smith Steve, 96, New York, NY : Oxford.

Viotti, Paul R., and Mark V. Kauppi, 1993. *International Relations Theory : Realism, Pluralism, Globalism*. 2nd ed. Boston, MA : Allyn & Bacon.

Module : IV

Unit - 16 □ The Crisis in Socialist Block and Collapse of USSR

Structure

16.0 Objective

16.1 Introduction

16.2 The Socialist Block and its Significance

16.3 The Cold War Context

16.4 Internal Crisis of the Socialist Bloc and Soviet Union

16.5 Internal Crisis of USSR

16.6 Crisis in Socialist bloc and its disintegration

16.7 The Revolutions in Eastern Europe

16.8 Conclusion

16.9 Summing Up

16.10 Probable Questions

16.11 Further Reading

16.0 Objective

The objective of this unit is to examine the internal and external dynamics which caused crisis in the socialist block leading to the ultimate disintegration of the United Soviet Socialist Republic (USSR) and the end of the bipolar world order which had defined the Cold War years.

This unit will help learners to :

- Understand the exact scope of the term socialist bloc and locate the dominant position of the USSR within it
- Examine the dynamics of the crisis in the socialist bloc
- Trace the events and reasons for the disintegration of the USSR
- Appreciate the impact of the collapse of the USSR on world politics

16.1 Introduction

The ‘socialist bloc’, also informally known as the Eastern bloc or Communist bloc is used to refer to regions in Central and Eastern Europe, where communist regimes were established towards the end of the Second World War. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) (also known as the Soviet Union) which had been established as a communist state in 1922 after the *Bolshevik revolution* comprised of fifteen Soviet socialist republics—Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belorussia, Estonia, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kirgiziya, Latvia, Lithuania, Moldova, Russia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan. These comprised of more than hundred ethnic nationalities. The USSR held substantial political control and influence over the entire socialist bloc, with a highly centralized government and economy till 1989, when the entire bloc collapsed and the USSR broke up. While the USSR was economically and militarily very powerful after the Second World War, it began to suffer losses due to the pressures of constantly competing with the United States of America during the Cold War years (1945 to 1989). This, along with the change in the political leadership and domestic policies, gradually propelled the fifteen republics to revolt and break away, ultimately leading to the disintegration of the USSR.

16.2 The Socialist Block and its Significance

In 1922, the Communists formed the Soviet Union with the unification of the Russian, Transcaucasian, Ukrainian, and Byelorussian republics. Following Lenin’s death in 1924, Joseph Stalin came to power in the mid-1920s. Stalin suppressed all political opposition to his rule, committed the state ideology to Marxism-Leninism and initiated a centrally planned command economy. As a result, the country underwent a period of rapid industrialization and collectivization which laid the foundation for its victory in World War II and post-war dominance over Eastern Europe.

During the opening stages of World War II, the Soviet Union created the Eastern Bloc by invading and then annexing several countries as Soviet Socialist Republics by agreement with Nazi Germany in the 1939 *Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact*. This pact enabled Stalin to annex western Belarus and western Ukraine, as well as Bessarabia. By the time of its demise, the USSR included 53 national-state entities. The defining characteristic of communism in the Eastern Bloc was the unique symbiosis of the state with society and the economy, resulting in politics and economics losing their distinctions and autonomy. While more than 15 million Eastern Bloc residents migrated westward from 1945 to

1949, emigration was effectively halted in the early 1950s, with the Soviet approach to controlling national movement emulated by most of the Eastern Bloc. The Soviets mandated expropriation of private property. Stalinism was ruthless, showing no mercy to any manifestations of initiative not sanctioned by Soviet Russia or to any displays of local nationalism. The Soviet-styled “replica regimes” that arose in the Bloc not only reproduced Soviet command economies, but also adopted the brutal methods of Stalinism and Soviet secret police to suppress real and potential opposition. Stalinist regimes in the Eastern Bloc saw even marginal groups of opposition intellectuals as a potential threat because of the bases underlying Stalinist power therein. The suppression of dissent and opposition was a central pre-requisite for the security of Stalinist power within the Eastern Bloc, though the degree of opposition and dissident suppression varied by country and time throughout the Eastern Bloc. Furthermore, the Eastern Bloc experienced economic mismanagement by central planners resulting in extensive rather than intensive development, and lagged far behind their western European counterparts in per capita gross domestic product. In addition, media in the Eastern Bloc served as an organ of the state, completely reliant on and subservient to the communist party. The state-owned radio and television organizations while print media was usually owned by political organizations, mostly the ruling communist party.

16.3 The Cold War Context

The context of the Cold War is very crucial for understanding the rise as well as collapse of the USSR. This is because, it was the onset of the Cold War which defined the abilities of the USSR to become the next superpower of the world, challenging the United States of America. Although the USSR had been hit hard by the Second World War, particularly in 1941 when heavy war broke out in the Soviet territory, it was able to emerge as a superpower after the War and was able to overcome the damages to its economy and people. There are many reasons for this. Firstly, the Soviet Union was the largest country in the world with a huge territory. The attack by Hitler could not shake the entire country. It was limited mainly to the European parts. Other areas of the country remained unaffected by the attack. Although Hitler’s attack gave a jolt to the Soviet economy, it could not paralyse the industrial and economic infrastructure of this vast land, as it did to many small European nations. Secondly, under Joseph Stalin, the Soviet Union emerged as an industrialized state, with particular emphasis on heavy industries. A sound industrial base helped the country emerge as a military power as well, which in turn, paved the way for its becoming a superpower. Also, by 1949, the USSR became a nuclear power

which established its claim to superpower status. During the entire duration of the Cold War, the countries of Eastern Europe became Soviet satellite states—they were “independent” nations, one-party Communist States whose General Secretary had to be approved by the Kremlin, and so their governments usually kept their policy in line with the wishes of the Soviet Union.

The Cold War years defined the domestic as well as foreign policies of the USSR which ultimately led to its internal collapse. Till the end of the 1970s, the USSR remained heavily invested in its contestations with the USA. Threats, counter-threats, appeals and diplomatic negotiations—all were applied by the USSR as per the demands of the situation. However, the events between 1968 and 1979 shook the strong position of the USSR and exposed its growing socio-economic and political weaknesses. It was no longer able to retain its position in the competition with the USA. Just as Hungary had revolted against the excesses of the Stalinist government in November 1956, a similar uprising for democratic rights emerged in Czechoslovakia in 1968. The Soviet military took no chance and crushed the uprising at the outset. But this was severely condemned by the USA and its Western allies.

In 1979, the Soviet Union decided to send its troops to Afghanistan to install a Moscow-backed government there and challenge the USA further. But several rebel groups opposing Soviet presence surfaced throughout Afghanistan, backed by the USA and got engaged in armed insurgencies against the Soviet army in different parts. The prolonged engagement in Afghanistan drained the Soviet Union economically, broke the morale of the army and ultimately became a huge embarrassment, undermining the international credibility of the USSR. Also, as President Ronald Reagan announced the Star Wars or Strategic Defense Initiative to re-launch the nuclear war in 1983, the political leadership in Soviet Union realized that it was in no way capable of financing the superpower competition any longer. Thus, by the early 1980s, the USSR was already in turmoil internally as well as externally.

16.4 Internal Crisis of the Socialist Bloc and Soviet Union

The collapse of the USSR and the crisis in the socialist bloc are essentially linked to one another. It was due to the change in leadership in the Soviet Union and its radical reluctance to maintain the centralized control over the socialist bloc, which caused the Eastern bloc to ultimately break up into fifteen independent republics. Thus, the examination of the crises of the socialist bloc and the collapse of the Soviet Union may be divided into two inter-related issues. First, the short-term and long-term factors which led to the internal crisis of the Soviet Union and the effects of the change in political leadership.

Second, the crisis and disintegration of the socialist bloc. Before we discuss how the collapse took place we may discuss why it happened.

16.5 Internal Crisis of USSR

In 1985, Mikhail Gorbachev assumed power in the Soviet Union. He showed interest in reviving a decaying Soviet economy and liberating the closed, party-controlled Soviet society, than in continuing the Cold War. He embarked on a policy of radical reform in both domestic and foreign policy. At home, in the early stages of his administration, he introduced the terms ‘glasnost’ and ‘demokratizatsiya.’ Glasnost literally means open air; Gorbachev wanted to introduce a sense of openness in Soviet society, which had so far operated under strict restrictions on freedom of speech and expression. Gorbachev sponsored unparalleled critical debate, multi-candidate elections and an end to the Communist Party of Soviet Union’s constitutional right to rule. In foreign policy, Gorbachev abandoned the international class struggle as the centrepiece of Soviet foreign policy and adopted a more positive attitude towards the West. In his book, ‘Perestroika’, Gorbachev was able to express the view openly that the West did not pose a threat to the Soviet Union. Thus, it was no longer necessary to base Soviet defence policy on purely military power. Political and collective security could replace the old ideas of military parity and balance of power. Gorbachev spoke regularly of the need to improve East-West understanding and build up trust on both sides. In a speech defending ‘perestroika’, Gorbachev said that the Soviet society was in turmoil in the early 1980s and there was no alternative to a program of radical reform. The people were increasingly aware of the gap between living standards in the Soviet Union and in the West. Economically, the USSR had entered a period of terminal decline since the 1970s. Growth rate fell from an average of 5 % annually in the period 1966-70 to 1.8% during 1980-85. Consumer goods and services had been neglected in favour of heavy industry and defence during the pre-Gorbachev era. There was a persistent shortage of most basic commodities like food, clothes and housing. Technology and telecommunications lagged behind. Also, due to its closed economy, the Soviet Union could not benefit from the trends of globalization and expanding markets; its share of world trade dropped.

Thus, by the 1980s, it was clear that the cost of the empire was simply too burdensome and a radical reorientation was the need of the hour. Gorbachev was successful in freeing the Soviet economy and opening it up to the world through the policy of perestroika. Private business was allowed for the first time and foreign investments were welcomed.

USA and western investments into the huge Soviet market dampened the Cold War rivalry between the two blocs.

16.6 Crisis in Socialist Bloc and its Disintegration

Unlike in the USSR, where political collapse of the socialist style of governance was caused by a conscious decision of the leadership, in the rest of the Eastern bloc, much pressure for change came from the people themselves. The forcible imposition of a system of communist government and an ideology, lack of democratic space, lack of a free media and access to information had alienated the citizens of these countries and the feeling grew stronger with the passage of time. The USSR was perceived by most East European states as an occupying force imposing its will like an imperialist power. In the post-imperialist era, the governments of the region had great difficulty in gaining any public legitimacy without cutting their dependency on Moscow. Also, the economic turmoil caused by the communist style of governance prompted people to question the system and compare themselves with those in the West. Not only were they dissatisfied with the socialist system which was increasingly seen as bankrupt, their belief that the Socialist system could in any way catch up with the capitalist West withered away.

Economic failure within a forcibly imposed, non-democratic style of regime not only stimulated but also consolidated the societal tensions and opposition in most of the East European countries, eroding the legitimacy to rule by the communist government. This finally erupted in a major upsurge of nationalism in the different countries. It brought together workers and intellectuals, many young people and all sorts of underground organisations, and this unity proved to be an extremely effective and strong threat to the ruling elite. In some countries, such as East Germany, Czechoslovakia and Poland for e.g., as a result of all these pressures and lack of support, and in the face of mounting economic crisis, the ruling party began to lose confidence in its ability to rule. Also, the Gorbachev regime did not use any force to retain these regions back into the bloc.

By 1988 and 1989, the dissent and opposition became very active, began multiplying and in a surprisingly short period, became a tidal wave and conclusively swept away the old regimes. Both the time in which these events took place as well as the manner in which they occurred, were different in all the countries. What took a year in Poland and Hungary, took a few weeks in the GDR, a few bloodless days in Czechoslovakia and a few bloody days in Romania, While in Bulgaria, the orthodox Communist rulers went quietly in a couple of months. In retrospect, we can see that the rapid expulsion of the Communist Party and the total rejection of its role in society was the one common factor in all these countries. For it was with the weakening of these parties, that the popular forces and pluralistic elements came to the front. And, by withdrawing the

Soviet troops, Gorbachev greatly facilitated this process of the weakening of the ruling Communist parties.

16.7 The Revolutions in Eastern Europe

Now let us make a more detailed examination of the manner in which the Communist regimes were opposed and overthrown in individual countries of the Socialist Bloc. The series of revolutions in 1989 resulted in the end of communist rule in Central and Eastern Europe and beyond. The period is often also called the Fall of Communism. It was followed by the breakup of the Soviet Union and the abandonment of communist regimes in many parts of the world, some of which were violently overthrown. The events marked the end of the Cold War and signalled the beginning of the Post-Cold War era. The main centre of these revolutions was in Eastern Europe.

□ **Poland :**

The Polish workers conducted a mass strike movement in 1988. On 4 June 1989, the trade union *Solidarity*, headed by Lech Walesa won an overwhelming victory in a partially free election in Poland. The Polish United Workers Party, which was the official title of the Communist Party headed by General Jaruzelski, ceased to form the government. This led to the peaceful fall of communism in Poland.

□ **Hungary :**

Hungary began dismantling its section of the physical Iron Curtain, while the opening of a border gate between Austria and Hungary in August 1989. While this decision obviously had the approval of the Soviet Union, it meant that for the first time, a country of the Socialist bloc was declaring its preference for the West during a time of crisis. An agreement was also reached between the Hungarian government and the opposition parties on the creation of a multiparty system. Finally in October 1989, the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party (as the Communist Party was called) renamed itself the Hungarian Socialist Party (HSP) and abandoned Leninism as its ideology. The HSP also declared its country to be a 'republic', and not a "people's republic", in which bourgeois democracy and democratic socialism would apply and we can see the degree to which this decision influenced public life; as many as 51 parties were expected to contest the parliamentary elections scheduled for 1990.

□ **Fall of the Berlin Wall :**

The events in Hungary set in motion a peaceful chain reaction, in which the Eastern Bloc disintegrated. This led to mass demonstrations in the cities such as Leipzig and

subsequently to the fall of the Berlin Wall in November 1989, which served as the symbolic gateway to the German reunification in 1990. One feature common to most of these developments was the extensive use of campaigns of civil resistance, demonstrating popular opposition to the continuation of one-party rule and contributing to the pressure for change. In September, the Hungarian Government took an unprecedented foreign policy decision: they opened their borders and permitted several thousand East German citizens (who were spending their vacation in Eastern Europe and who refused to return to the GDR) to cross over into Austria and from there to West Germany, i.e., the FRG.

□ **German Democratic Republic :**

The regimes in the GDR and the Czech Republic were the next to crumble. Erich Honecker was removed as party leader and head of the State of GDR on 11 October 1989, and widespread public demonstrations for democracy took place. The emigration of the country's youth and other professionals also continued in large numbers so that finally in November, the GDR announced an end to travel restrictions for its citizens and threw open its borders with FRG, allowing direct emigration to the West. The Berlin Wall - which was the most important symbol of the East-West divide for so long - came crashing down, as thousands of people poured across - most of whom did not return. The entire *Politbureau* and the government resigned in December and the leading role of the Communist Party was scrapped and its name was also changed. In early January 1990, the official name of the party became party of Communist Democratic Socialism and all the time, the mass exodus of East Germans into the West continued. More than 4000 people were leaving every day, creating serious problems for both the GDR and FRG. Increasingly, reunification of the two Germanies was seen as the only solution to the problem and finally as the East German crisis deepened, both Moscow and the wartime allied powers of the West - United States, Great Britain and France - agreed to hold meetings and conferences to discuss all the aspects of reunification of the two Germanies.

□ **Czechoslovakia :**

The Czech government tried unsuccessfully to suppress the popular demonstrations and rising opposition in October, and finally in November, 1989 the government and party leadership were overthrown. On 27th November a two-hour general strike took place in cities and towns all over the country which finally resulted in the rejection of the leading role of the Communist Party, and on December 29, a special joint session of the Czech Federal Assembly unanimously elected Vaclav Havel - the man who barely eleven months earlier was arrested with 800 others for human rights protests in January 1989 - as the first Czech non-Communist President since 1943.

□ Bulgaria :

Disintegration of the Socialist Bloc in Bulgaria occurred next. The first independent demonstration by more than five thousand people (after forty years of the Bulgarian Communist [BCP] rule) outside the National Assembly occurred on November 3, 1989 and a week later. The Bulgarian Central Committee accepted the resignation of the 78 year old BCP Secretary - General Zhikov. The new Bulgarian Party Politburo condemned the 1968 Soviet-led invasion of Czechoslovakia and in this manner tried to reverse the then existing view of history. In early December, nine independent organisations joined together to establish the Union of Democratic Forces in Bulgaria (UDF). The UDF later announced that it would campaign for political pluralism, a market economy and follow the rule of law. Finally, in January 1990, in an extraordinary Bulgarian Communist Party Congress, the orthodox conservatives were totally defeated, the Central Committee and Politburo were abolished and replaced with a 153 members Supreme Council.

□ Romania :

In Romania, the Communist Party regime continued to resist the popular uprisings and also attempted to organise “joint action” with other socialist countries to crush the opposition movements. Here, the downfall of the ruling elite was the bloodiest. At the 14th Congress of the Romanian Communist Party in November 1989, Nicolai Ceaucescu strongly resisted the idea that reform was necessary. At a time when the entire Socialist base was in turmoil, this resistance to change was truly surprising. The critical point came in December when the government’s attempts to arrest a priest who defended the rights of ethnic Hungarians in Romania led to massive demonstrations, which quickly turned into anti-government protest. Security and army troops were ordered to open fire on crowds in two cities and when the Defence Minister refused to cooperate in this killing of innocent people, he was executed. This led to the Army joining ranks with the demonstrators, which ended with the fall of the government. A short but bloody civil war ensued which ended with the capture and trial of Nicolai Ceaucescu and his wife by a military tribunal after which they were executed by a firing squad. National Salvation Front, which had been created earlier, was recognised by the Soviet government, which promised a return to democracy.

16.8 Conclusion

The dramatic upheavals in Eastern Europe resulting from both mass democratic pressures from below and long overdue reforms and liberalization contributed to the crisis of the

socialist system ruled by Communist parties. Mikhail Gorbachev's acceptance of the desperate urgency for fundamental political and economic reforms transformed the Soviet and Eastern European socialist system. However, political reforms in the Soviet Union came to a screeching halt in August 1991 when a group of high-level Conservative communists in the party, the army and the KGB (the Soviet intelligence and security agency) deposed Gorbachev and began to restore the old system. But Boris Yeltsin, a reformist leader who had withdrawn from the Communist party and established legitimacy by winning a free election for the presidency of the Russian Republic, took the lead in resisting the coup attempt which collapsed under the combined pressure of popular resistance and its leaders' incompetence and indecision. By 26th December 1991, not only was the Communist Party of the Soviet Union deprived of its powers, the Soviet Union itself disintegrated and was replaced by its constituents, fifteen formerly Soviet socialist republics, such as Russia, Ukraine and Tajikistan.

16.9 Summing Up

- The internal crisis within the socialist bloc as well as the strategic demands of the Cold War generated the conditions for the fall of the eastern, socialist bloc.
- The disintegration of the Soviet Union was aided by the political decisions taken by Mikhail Gorbachev and his two new principles of *perestroika* and *glasnost*.
- As the Soviet Union decided to open up its borders and integrate with the international liberal economy, the communist countries of eastern Europe declared their independence one by one.
- Fifteen independent republics were established.
- The collapse of the eastern socialist bloc marked the end of the Cold War and bipolar politics.

16.10 Probable Questions

Essay Type Questions

1. What were the main reasons for the collapse of the USSR?
2. Write a note on the dramatic upheavals in Eastern Europe in the 1980s.
3. Describe the domestic and international factors which contributed to the fall of the socialist bloc.

Short Questions

1. What do you understand by Perestroika and Glasnost?
2. Describe the events which led to the revolution in Czechoslovakia.
3. Discuss the only revolution in eastern Europe which turned bloody.

Objective Questions

1. What does the term Glasnost literally mean?
2. What was the primary reason for disintegration of the Eastern socialist bloc?

16.11 Further Reading

Aneek Chatterjee, *International Relations Today: Concepts and Application*, Pearson, New Delhi, 2010

Mike Bowker, "Soviet Foreign Policy in the 1980s," in *From Cold War to Collapse: Theory and World Politics in the 1980s*, Mike Bowker and Robin Brown (eds.), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993.

Peter Calvocorressi, *World Since 1945*, Pearson Longman, England, 2009.

Peu Ghosh, *International Relations (Fourth Edition)*, PHI Learning, Haryana, 2019.

Shannon Lindsey Blanton and Charles William Kegley, *World Politics: Trend and Transformation (2016-2017 edition)*, Cengage Learning, Boston, MA, 2014.

Unit-17 □ Post-Cold War Developments

Structure

- 17.1 Objective**
- 17.2 Introduction**
- 17.3 What does Post-Cold War mean?**
- 17.4 Features of the Post-Cold War Era**
 - 17.4.1 From Bi-polar to Unipolar System**
 - 17.4.2 Multipolarity**
 - 17.4.3 Ideological Triumph of Capitalism**
 - 17.4.4 Liberal Individualism**
 - 17.4.5 Democratization of the State System**
 - 17.4.6 Relevance of NAM**
 - 17.4.7 International Financial Organizations**
 - 17.4.8 Regional Organizations**
 - 17.4.9 The War on Terror**
- 17.5 Redefining security in the Post-Cold War Era**
- 17.6 Ethnic and identity movements**
 - 17.6.1 Rise of non-state actors**
 - 17.6.2 Region centric and global centric interests**
- 17.7 Other Emerging Centres of Power**
- 17.8 The European Union**
- 17.9 Conclusion**
- 17.10 Summing Up**
- 17.11 Probable Questions**
- 17.12 Further Reading**

17.1 Objective

After going through this unit the learners will be able :

- to understand the meaning of post-Cold War
- to understand the features of the international system in the post-Cold War period
- to identify the new power centres which emerged and challenged American hegemony in the post-Cold War era

17.2 Introduction

The historic upheavals experienced between 1989 and 1991 in Europe and other parts of the world brought the Cold War to an end. The system of international relations that had influenced the Cold War period lost its validity in only a few years. The search for a new world order became a pressing issue. During the early 1990s, many hoped that global security and global governance would be achieved by international organizations such as the United Nations. There was a conviction that the process of economic globalization would underpin a peaceful world order. It was this phase of dynamic rediscovering and moulding of global politics, which is termed as the post-Cold War era.

17.3 What does Post-Cold War mean?

The term 'Post-Cold War' refers to one of the significant phases in the history of international politics which not only depicts the end of the Cold War and bloc politics that led to a serious rivalry between the two distinct ideological camps followed by the two superpowers (USA and USSR) and their respective allies but also marked a global power shift in the world politics. In the post Cold War era, significant changes took place. The features of international politics became very different than it was immediately after the Second World War. Environmental concerns and climate change, nuclear proliferation, menace of global terrorism, rise of ethnic conflicts, globalization and threat to nation-state, human rights and refugee issues have emerged as new, non-traditional issues of global concerns which are consistently prioritised in national security agenda as well as foreign policy.

17.4 Features of the Post-Cold War Era

Globalization, technological advancements, emergence of non-state actors rise of international (inter-governmental and non-governmental) organizations, regimes on disarmament and arms control, sanctity of international law and conventions and neoliberal

capitalist world order are some of the chief, characteristic features of the post-Cold War era.

17.4.1 From Bi-polar to Unipolar System

In the post-Cold War era, the balance of power system and bipolar system that existed for a long period gave way to unipolar world order where American hegemony seemed to reign supreme. Unipolarity refers to the concentration of power in a single preponderant state. With the end of the Cold War, the United States stood alone at the summit of the international hierarchy. It seemed like this was the ‘unipolar moment’ of post-Cold War international relations where it seemed that the international agenda would be set by the lone remaining superpower, that is, the US. It remained as the only country with enormous military, economic, and cultural assets to play a decisive role in any part of the world as it wished. Its military was not just stronger than anybody else’s; it was stronger than everybody else’s. With less than 5 percent of the global population, the United States accounted for over a fifth of global income and almost one-third of the entire world’s combined spending on research and development. Further, America wielded enormous soft power because it was the hub of global communications and popular culture.

17.4.2 Multipolarity

However, America’s unipolarity did not last. Instead, the international system assumed characteristics of a multipolar political system in which several middle powers and many small states began to pursue their own national interests. The principles ordering the international system began to be determined by centres of power which were distributed on a global scale and no longer limited to a particular region. Thus, the post Cold War international relations could at best be described as ‘unipolar with multi-polar tendencies.’ The world continues to be characterized by diffusion of power since the post-Cold War era set in motion.

17.4.3 Ideological Triumph of Capitalism

The Cold War world order was divided based on the ideologies of capitalism and communism. The end of Cold War brought an end to this ideological division. This also gave way to the preponderance of the neo-liberal system and the dominance of free market capitalism. It is seen as a major tool, approach and an important means to achieve economic development. Majority of the countries which adopted communism or socialism to achieve economic development have turned around to embrace the capitalist ideology.

17.4.4 Liberal Individualism

The post-Cold war era upheld the values of freedom and democracy. The nature of freedom includes a wide range from economic, social, cultural and political. All these freedoms are to be supported by rights. Both freedoms and rights are to be supported by political institutions which are basically democratic. Thus, in the post-Cold War era, democracy is as much as a political system as way of life.

17.4.5 Democratization of the State System

In the 1990s, democracy spread through out the world very rapidly as many post-conflict societies and post-colonial nations adopted it as a form of government. The outbreak of the ‘third wave’ of democratization, as Samuel Huntington put it, is thus a characteristic feature of the post-Cold War world. Liberal democracy, with the minimum feature of free and fair, periodic elections spread to South East Asia, North Asia, South Asia, Africa and Latin America. East European countries underwent varieties of ‘colour’ revolutions. As recently as in 2010, the ‘Arab spring’ bloomed in the West Asian region too, which had been ruled by authoritarian regimes and dictatorships. Elections were held in many countries for the first time. New constitutions were adopted which allowed for the sovereignty of the state, an independent judiciary, the rule of law, universal adult franchise and an entrenchment of the sense of freedom in the people.

17.4.6 Relevance of NAM

In the post-Cold War era, questions have been continuously raised by some scholars regarding the relevance of Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) as the superpower rivalry gets over with the end of Cold War. Nevertheless, NAM countries, in the post-Cold War scenario, are continuing to use this forum to achieve a set of agendas which are relevant in the post-Cold War world, especially bargaining for a level playing field with the Global North. It includes, among others, independence in foreign relations, sustainable development, protection of environment, international cooperation in political, economic and cultural fields, equity in trade relations, democratization of the United Nations along with its long standing goals of international peace and security, disarmament and arms control, and protection of human rights.

17.4.7 International Financial Organizations

The current international world order which is primarily driven by neo-liberal and capitalist ideology, supports the rise and significance of international financial organizations like the World Bank, International Monetary Fund, World Trade Organization and other trans-

National Corporations as significant economic actors in international politics. These organizations have created financial regimes with their policies of structural adjustments, and continue to dominate developing and developed countries of the Southern-hemisphere in the post-Cold War era. The World Trade Organization (WTO) came into existence on 1st January 1995 during the Uruguay Round of 1986-1994 and Ministerial Meeting at Marrakesh, Morocco. The WTO which is a successor of GATT (General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs) was established with the aim to liberalize the world trade and to promote economic growth, development and welfare of the people all around the globe. It contributed to the creation of a rule-based multilateral order. Interdependence based on trade and economic exchanges encouraged the rise of private players, opportunities for cooperation and softening of state boundaries to allow flow of goods, capital, human resources. Bilateral relations based on security and defence were now complemented by a host of economic and political strategies.

17.4.8 Regional Organizations

The post-Cold War world also witnessed an increased regional integration and growth of regional arrangements such as the European Union, South Asian Association of Regional Cooperation (SAARC), Brazil, Russia, India, China, South Africa (BRICS), Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN), Organization of Petroleum Exporting Corporations (OPEC), North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), Organization of American States (OAS), African Union (AU) among many, which challenged the concept of unipolarity of the world order. It also entrenched a multilateral world order.

17.4.9 The War on Terror

The War on Terror, being carried out by the US initially against Afghanistan and thereafter against Iraq since 9/11, ushered in the global war on terrorism. It brought countries of the world under one umbrella to fight the menace of terrorism and Islamic fundamentalism.

17.5 Redefining Security in the Post-Cold War Era

With the end of the Cold war, the concept of 'security' and 'development' has also increasingly come to be scrutinized by scholars and practitioners of international relations. In other words, the end of Cold War enforced a redefinition of security and development. In the classical formulation, security and development refer to the physical safety and integrity of the nation. It was defined strictly in military terms. But in the post-Cold War era, security has been broadened to mean not just survival but the absence of threats and

the freedom from want, disease and hunger; the freedom from all constraints. The paradigm of human security has been ushered which interprets the idea of security as empowerment. Like security, the idea of development also gets broader dimensions in the post-Cold War phase. Traditionally development was understood as an economic process or condition. But in the 1990s, the discourse on sustainable development (which had been debated since the 1970s) gained further ground. In this context, scholars like Amartya Sen, relate the idea of development with enhancing capabilities and choices of citizens as consumers. According to Sen, development is both a process and a product; it is a process of empowering the citizens with certain entitlements that will help them to enter in the market with adequate purchasing power to buy products of their choice as consumers. Besides the notion of security and development, the idea of human rights also gets a very comprehensive dimension which is now not only limited to political and socio-economic rights but also includes cultural and community-based rights of human.

17.6 Ethnic and Identity Movements

The late 1980s and 1990s witnessed a string of complex ethnic and identity movements. Notable examples are former Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Angola, Cyprus, Somalia, Ethiopia, Rwanda, Burundi, Russia, Georgia. There was also the rise of fundamentalist forces gradually spreading all over the world and often assuming the character of international terrorism jeopardizing international peace and security.

17.6.1 Rise of non-state actors

Another characteristic of post-Cold War era is the rise of new actors who are mostly non-state actors. International non-governmental organizations like Amnesty International and Greenpeace emerged championing specific issues like protection of human rights and environment. The emergence of these non-state actors created several multiple linkages between the states and non-state actors. These linkages supported 'cobweb paradigm' to understand international relations. The idea of international relations looking like a cobweb emphasizes transnational relations supported by various civil society organisations, multinational corporations which create new forms of international society and which are not bound by Realist idea of national interest and sovereign state. The interactions between the non-state actors prioritise the individual and community interests pertaining to the actors rather than national interest. The state here would not act independently rather plays a supportive role. The result of this multiple interactions at multiple levels slowly but steadily replaces the word 'international relations' with 'world relations' in understanding the phenomenon and outcomes.

17.6.2 Region-centric and global-centric interests

There has been a shift from world-centric to region-centric interests. These interests ranged from environmental issues to issues of human migration. These interests are common in nature and have major impact on human civilisation itself. Identifying, understanding and collective efforts to address the issues have become priority areas in state actions. These issues, for instance the COVID-19 pandemic call for lots of concerted action at regional and global level; and even demand setting up of regional mechanisms to fight these new types of non-traditional security threats. State interests are submerged in common interests and states have become part of collective actions at regional and global levels.

17.7 Other Emerging Centres of Power

China, Russia, European Union, Brazil, India, Germany, Japan

World order, in the modern period, is being shaped by a number of multipolar trends. The most significant of these is the rise of so-called ‘emerging powers’. These are the new, aspiring great powers of the twenty-first century. Some states already have a significant measure of regional influence – Brazil, Argentina, Chile, Mexico and Venezuela in Latin America; South Africa and Nigeria in Africa; Israel, Egypt, Saudi Arabia and Iran in the Middle East; India, China, South Korea, Indonesia, Pakistan and Australia in Asia and Oceania. Of these, Brazil, Japan, Germany, China, Russia, India and the European Union have acquired global significance and deserve special attention.

□ China :

Of all the powers that may rival, and even eclipse the USA, the most significant is undoubtedly China. Indeed, many predict that the twenty-first century will become the ‘Chinese century’, just as the twentieth century had supposedly been the ‘American century’. The basis for China’s great power status is its rapid economic progress since the introduction of market reforms in the mid-1970s under Deng Xiaoping (1904–97), the most dramatic phase of which began only in the 1990s. Annual growth rates between 8 and 10 per cent for almost thirty years (about twice the levels achieved by the USA and other western states) have meant that China became the world’s largest exporter in 2009, and in 2010 it overtook Japan to become the world’s second largest economy. By 2010, the Chinese economy was 90 times larger than it had been in 1978. With the world’s largest population (1.3 billion in 2007), China has a seemingly inexhaustible supply of cheap labour, making

it increasingly the manufacturing hub of the global economy. The resilience of the Chinese economic model was further demonstrated by the ease with which it weathered the 2007–2009 global financial crisis. China also has a growing military capacity, being second only to the USA in terms of arms expenditure. China’s emerging global role is evident in the influence it now exerts within the WTO and G-20 and over issues such as climate change, as well as in its much-strengthened resource links with Africa, Australia and parts of the Middle East and Latin America. An often-neglected aspect of China’s growing influence is the extraordinary rise of its ‘soft’ power. This reflects both the significance of Confucianism in providing a cultural basis for cooperation in Asia, and the attraction of its anti-imperialist heritage in Africa and across much of the developing South. By contrast, the reputations of the USA and western powers are usually tainted by colonialism in one form or another.

□ **Other Asian Powers :**

Nevertheless, the rise of China is often seen as part of a larger shift in the balance of global power from West to East, and specifically to Asia, and maybe from the USA to the BRICs countries, sometimes dubbed ‘the Rest’. Some argue that the twenty-first century will not so much be the ‘Chinese century’ as the ‘Asian century’, with India and Japan in particular also being viewed as key actors. The transformation of India into an emerging power has been based on economic growth rates only marginally less impressive than China’s. It is estimated that if current trends persist, by 2020 China and India will jointly account for half of the world’s GDP. However, the Indian economic model differs markedly from China’s ‘market Stalinism’. As the world’s largest liberal democracy, India’s increased growth rates stem from the introduction of liberal economic reforms in the early 1990s, more than a decade after China began its market reforms. India has become a world leader in industries such as computer software and biotechnology, and its soft power has also gained credibility with traditions such as World Yoga Day and cultivating the Indian diaspora through the Pravasi Bharatiya Divas.

□ **Japan :**

Japan emerged as a major power through its post-1945 ‘economic miracle’, becoming the second largest economy in the world during the 1970s. Indeed, until the 1990s, Japan, together with Germany, was widely seen as an economic superpower and perhaps as a model for the ‘de-militarized’ great powers of the twenty-first century. The Japanese

economy stalled badly in the 1990s (Japan's 'lost decade'), and its economic and political significance in the twenty-first century may largely depend on its developing relationship with the other emerging powers of Asia, notably China and India. Japan's record of 10 per cent growth rates in the 1950s, progressively declining in each subsequent decade, may also contain lessons for China and India about the long-term sustainability of their high growth rates.

□ **India :**

Geo-politically, India is regarded as a world largest democratic and secular country. It also has a stable economy and nuclear weapons power. In the wake of the policy of economic liberalization in 1991, followed by India's entry into a globalized world, it has become an avenue for the investment of foreign capital by other countries of world. But India's emergence as a great power is constrained by a number of factors. India still suffers from acute problems of poverty and illiteracy, which are being fuelled by a population growth crisis that is fast getting out of hand. India has also been less interested than China in projecting itself militarily, despite having joined the 'nuclear club' in 2001. In part, this is because significant regional tensions, mainly with Pakistan but also with China, tend to divert India's attention away from a larger world role.

□ **Russia :**

Russia's re-emergence as a great power has been evident in two major respects. First, since the sharp economic decline witnessed in the 1990s, associated with the 'shock therapy' transition to a market economy, a notable revival has taken place. This has largely been driven by the substantial expansion of oil and gas production, itself made possible by the fact that, at 7 million square kilometres, the Russian land mass is significantly greater than any other country and is still largely unexplored, and by steadily rising commodity prices. Although its economy is in serious need of diversification and remains heavily dependent on world commodity markets, Russia has emerged as an energy superpower. This allows it, for instance, to exert influence over the states of Eastern Europe and beyond by controlling the flow and price of oil and gas resources. Second, fuelled by growing economic confidence and strengthened nationalism, Russia has demonstrated a renewed appetite for military assertiveness, especially in relation to the so-called 'near abroad'. This was particularly demonstrated by the 2008 war with Georgia. Nevertheless, Russia's military spending

lags a long way behind NATO's, with much of its equipment still stemming from the Cold War era, and extensive and exposed borders make Russia strategically vulnerable at a number of points.

□ **Constraints of the Emerging Powers :**

Despite these rising powers, it remains to be seen whether the USA would actually be eclipsed in its powers in the near future. This is because the emerging powers still suffer from certain challenges in asserting themselves. Three broader developments have supported the fragmentation and pluralization of global power, and perhaps suggest that all state-centric models of world order (bipolar, unipolar or multipolar) and the distribution of global power are outmoded. The first of these developments is unfolding globalization. As all great powers are embedded to a greater or lesser extent in global economic arrangements and participate within an interlocking capitalist system, the pursuit of national self-interest can only mean, globalists argue, increased integration and cooperation. This implies that great power rivalry in terms of major geopolitical conflicts and certainly world war may be a thing of the past. In a context of increased interdependence and inter-connectedness, economic rivalry may have displaced military conflict (at least amongst great powers). The second development is the growing trend towards global and sometimes regional governance. This stems from the fact that the principal challenges confronting-states-climate change, crime, migration, disease and so on are increasingly transnational in character and so can only be tackled through transnational cooperation, emphasizing that power is as much about collaboration as it is about conflict.

17.8 The European Union

The European Union (EU) formerly known as the European Community (EC) or the European Economic Community (EEC) is a geo-political entity based on a unique economic and political partnership among 28 European countries that together cover a large portion of the European continent. It is founded upon numerous treaties and has undergone expansions from the original, six member states to 28. The European Union (EU) was created to foster better economic, political and social cooperation among the member countries by the Maastricht Treaty on November 1st 1993. Despite the recent exit of Great Britain (BREXIT) from the European Union, it continues to be the second largest economy in the world, after the US. Its GDP represents one-sixth of the global economy. It is the largest political union, single market and aid donor in the world.

17.9 Conclusion

In the post Cold War world, the bipolarity of two super powers gave way to many pairs of great powers who became active trade partners but also military rivals. In the coming days, the key question is whether economic cooperation will help to reduce the potential for military competition in the future and prevent the world from witnessing another Cold War-like period. The opportunities and challenges we face in the world today call for a multilateral approach, with all the great powers working cooperatively to achieve global solutions. Although the US could clash with the emerging powers, like China, armed rivalry need not develop; cooperation could increase instead. The danger of polarization could be managed if the great powers develop international rules and institutions to manage their fluid, mixed-motive relationships.

17.10 Summing Up

- The end of Cold War has added uncertainty and a degree of unpredictability, along with the transformative structural changes, to international relations.
- The period was also marked by a more dynamic and intense nature of relations between the states.
- The old Westphalian-dominated model of the international system gave way to a more fluid system where inter-governmental organizations, non-state actors as well as transnational corporations, all developed to develop a complex web of interdependence among states and private players, under the influence of globalization.
- The priorities of states expanded from military, physical security of borders to the peace and human dignity of the people and bilateral relations were complemented by multilateral frameworks and associations.
- The US unipolarity was a fleeting moment, to be followed quickly by emerging powers like China, Russia, India, Brazil, Germany and the European Union which steadily grew in economic strength and global influence.

17.11 Probable Questions

Essay Type Questions

1. How would you explain the nature and features of the post-Cold War era?
2. What are the emerging centres of power in the post-Cold War era?

Short Questions

1. What do you understand by the term 'post-Cold War'?
2. Is NAM still relevant in the post-Cold War era?
3. What is the European Union?

Objective Questions

1. What do you mean by unipolarity?
2. What does Amartya Sen mean by development?

17.12 Further Reading

Andreas Wenzel and Doron Zimmermann, *International Relations: From the Cold War to the Globalized World*, Viva Books, New Delhi, 2006.

Aneek Chatterjee, *International Relations Today: Concepts and Application*, Pearson, New Delhi, 2010

Shannon Lindsey Blanton and Charles William Kegley, *World Politics: Trend and Transformation (2016-2017 edition)*, Cengage Learning, Boston, MA, 2014.

Andrew Heywood, *Global Politics*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2011

Unit-18 □ The Emergence of the Third World

Structure

- 18.1 Objective**
- 18.2 Introduction**
- 18.3 Reasons for the Emergence of the Third World**
 - 18.3.1 Waves of Imperialism**
 - 18.3.2 Decolonization**
- 18.4 Characteristic features of the Third World**
- 18.5 The North-South divide**
- 18.6 Role of the Third World Countries**
- 18.7 The New International Economic Order**
- 18.8 Theories that explain the Third World**
 - 18.8.1 Modernization theory**
 - 18.8.2 ECLA**
 - 18.8.3 Dependency Theory**
- 18.9 Conclusion**
- 18.10 Summing Up**
- 18.11 Probable Questions**
- 18.12 Further Reading**

18.1 Objective

This unit deals with the emergence of the third world. After going through this unit, learners will be able to :

- Understand what is meant by the term third world
- Explain the characteristics of the third world state
- Examine the role and significance of the third world states during the Cold War bipolar world order
- Understand the relevance of the third world in the current global order

18.2 Introduction

The term 'third world' is used to describe the political, economic, social and cultural condition of a group of countries mainly belonging to Asia, Africa and Latin America, which emerged from the end of colonization between the 1940s and 1960s. These countries were considered to be 'developing' or 'underdeveloped', having faced colonial exploitation for centuries. It was understood that they would be unable to participate in the bipolar politics and race for superiority, being led by the United States of America on the one hand, and the Soviet Union on the other, as they were economically weak and politically unstable. Thus, they remained non-aligned and outside the great power blocs. Alfred Sauvy, a French demographer and economic historian used the term for the first time in the early 1950s.

It must be noted that the term third world is only one of the many labels which have been developed to describe the poor and underdeveloped countries. Sometimes it is referred to as the 'South', sometimes as 'developing countries' and sometimes as 'less developed countries.' There are others who refer to these countries as 'underdeveloped'. However, no one has coined a term as yet which has gained universal acceptance. It is generally understood that the third world is a geopolitical concept based on inclusion in a geographical area comprising of the Southern hemisphere, sharing the common colonial past and put under similar circumstances of underdevelopment.

Providing one of the most authoritative understandings of the third world, B.C Smith defines it as a group of countries which have colonial histories and which are in the process of developing economically and socially from a status characterized by low incomes, dependence on agriculture, weakness in trading relations, social deprivation of large segments of society, and restricted political and civil liberties. According to the World Bank report of 2001, the third world comprises approximately of 100 states in Africa, Asia, the Middle East, Latin America and the Caribbean. Their combined population of over 4 billion accounts for 77 per cent of the world's total and their territories cover nearly 58 per cent of the world's land area.

The differences and variations among the third world countries should not be ignored. Some third world countries like those in the Middle East are extremely rich, with abundant natural resources like oil, while others like Somalia or Burundi are very poor. Also, the countries within the third world have adopted different forms of government—democracy, authoritarian dictatorships, military junta with caretaker governments and so on. There are also differences among these countries in terms of social formations ranging from tribal societies to capitalist societies.

While studying the third world, it is important to keep both the similarities and dissimilarities in mind.

18.3 Reasons for the Emergence of the Third World

Most analysts of international politics would agree that the roots of the wide gap between the North and the South, and the emergence of the third world lay in the historical relationship between the colonial rulers and the regions they conquered during the sixteenth century to the early twentieth centuries. Colonialism was extremely disadvantageous for the ruled countries because their minerals and other natural resources were continuously exported, profit was appropriated by the colonial powers, and the economy was only allowed to develop to the extent that it served the narrow interests of the colonial powers. The colonial powers, or the North, industrialized with the help of the resources extracted from the South, continued to grow economically. The South, or the third world countries, were forced to remain agrarian, their economic and political structures were moulded to suit the needs of the colonial masters and the lagged behind in development. However, after the Second World War was over, the continuous struggle for liberation in the third world countries created a widespread pressure for decolonization which finally led to the freedom of these countries. Choosing to stay away from the compulsions of Cold War bipolar politics, and focusing on the agenda of development, these countries formed the third world, or the third force in international relations.

18.3.1 Waves of Imperialism

It is believed that there are two waves of European imperialism which paved the way for the creation of the poor, underdeveloped countries of the third world. The first wave began when the European empire began building in the late fifteenth century, as the powerful, ambitious communities like the Dutch, English, French, Portuguese, and Spanish used their naval powers to conquer new regions purely for commercial interests. In time, the ability to control the economy of these poor countries gave the scope to actively manage their government and politics. By the end of the eighteenth century, the European powers had spread themselves throughout the world. However, this wave of colonial empires dissolved as imperialism was defeated by nationalist movements for independence. Countries in North America, South America and nearly one hundred more colonial relationships ceased to exist by 1825. The second wave of imperialism began from the 1870s, when the European powers along with the United States of America and Japan started aggressively colonizing the new territories till the outbreak of the First World War. Africa, regions in the Far East and in the Pacific were captured. Factors which fuelled this

wave of imperialism were economic greed following industrial revolution, and the battle for power and prestige among the great powers. The ultimate impact of this was devastating for the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

18.3.2 Decolonization

After the end of the First World War, the international sentiment was against imperialism. National self-determination was given weightage which meant that indigenous nationalities would have the moral right to decide which authority should rule them. The colonial territories of the powers defeated in the First World War were not handed over to the victorious allies; rather the territories controlled by Germany and the Ottoman empire were transferred, under the League of Nations to countries that would govern them as mandates, until they would eventually learn to self-rule. This concept of 'mandate' gave rise to the idea that colonies were a trust rather than simply a property to be exploited and treated as if its peoples had no rights of their own. This set an important precedent so that after World War II the defeated powers' territories placed under the United Nations trusteeship system were not absorbed by others but were promised eventual self-rule. This lent support to the idea of self-determination.

By the end of the eighteenth century, the Third World struggle for independence could be witnessed in many countries like the Tupac Amaru revolt in Bolivia and Peru, the Pontiac rebellion in North America, and the Great Slave revolt in Haiti against the Spanish, the British and French colonial powers. Among other examples, the Indian Sepoy mutiny, the Save the Emperor Movement in Vietnam, the Boxer rebellion in China and others showed the growing resistance to European imperialism. Nationalist movements matured between 1914 to 1945 as traditional leaders like chiefs and royal princes were replaced by nationalist leaders who spread their messages on the basis of western, rationalist education and liberal ideology. The decolonization process accelerated after 1947, when the British consented to the independence of India and Pakistan.

In the late 1940s a number of countries emerged from colonization like Philippines (1946), India and Pakistan (1947), North and South Korea (1948), Myanmar (1948), Ceylon (1948), and Indonesia (1949). Middle East witnessed struggle for independence with the expulsion of the French from Syria in 1946. Indo-China (Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia) became independent from the French in the 1950s. North Africa saw a wave of political independence in the 1950s, like in Libya in 1951, Sudan in 1956, and the French colonies of Morocco and Tunisia in 1956. Egypt remained a British protectorate till the overthrowing of the monarchy in 1952 and the proclamation of the Republic in 1953. Iraq gained freedom

following a nationalist revolution in 1958. In Sub-Saharan Africa, Ghana got independence in 1957 and Guinea in 1958. By the late 1960s, almost all the colonies in Africa were able to establish their political independence. This entire generation of newly freed countries formed the third world, forcing the theories and analysts in international relations to note their distinct typology, patterns and needs. The Cold War blocs, namely the United States and Soviet Union, both encouraged the decolonization process as they both stood against imperialist exploitation. Additionally, the United States was keen on arresting the spread of communism in the newly independent countries. It championed the principles of self-determination and efforts to establish democratic governments that gave further impetus to the struggle against colonial powers. The Soviet Union, on the other hand was a strong votary of nationalist revolutions against imperial domination. It inspired anti-colonial movements in Asia and Africa and boosted the nationalist spirit to fight.

18.4 Characteristic features of the Third World

There are some ideas which are associated with the concept of the 'Third world' and these are directly related to Cold War bloc politics. The first idea is 'non-alignment' in the military and diplomatic spheres. This stance was represented by the Bandung Conference attended by the representatives of twenty-nine African and Asian countries in 1955.

Another idea associated with the Third World implies solidarity among the developing countries based on their agriculture-dependent economy, primary production, relative poverty and distinct forms of economic regime which followed neither the Western free market system nor the Eastern bloc of planned economy. The third world countries, it was understood, fall outside the 'First world', which comprises of advanced capitalist democracies and the 'second world' which consists of industrially advanced communist regimes. However, this does not mean that the countries which neither fitted in the first world or the second world formed the third world. Rather, it meant that these are a significant group of countries which lay outside of Europe, practised agriculture-based economy, were much poorer than the northern states and had been subjected to either colonialism or 'deep diplomatic and economic penetration by the Western powers.'

The third world countries are opposed to imperialism in its different manifestations, imperialism, anti-colonialism, neo-colonialism and racialism. They stand against the continuing intervention and involvement of the great powers in the developing or underdeveloped countries for their vested interests. Since these countries had newly formed governments, independent from their colonial masters, they realized that political freedom did not guarantee freedom from external constraints. Economic sovereignty was important

for them to maintain their political autonomy. Thus, rising against the challenge of neo-colonialism was imperative for all countries within the Third World.

The third world countries also experienced certain pan-nationalist movements based on shared interest cutting across national boundaries. The pan-Arab world and the pan-African movements found encouragement by political leaders, for whom the national boundaries were artificially imposed by the colonial rules. Thus, the third world countries support internationalism and institutions which reflected this. The term third world stands for a certain degree of regional coherence.

18.5 The North-South divide

Willy Brandt chaired the Independent Commission for International Developmental Issues, first established in 1977 with the aim to review internal development issues. The reports published by Commission were known as the Brandt reports which popularized the idea of 'North-South' divide. Although it seems that the world is divided into two hemispheres, the north and the south, the 'North-South divide' and the fate of the third world countries of the 'South' is invariably linked with their poverty and lack of industrial development. Rich, industrial economies are considered to be located in the 'North'. Moreover, the concept of North-South divide draws attention to the way in which aid, debt and the practices of Transnational Corporations (TNCs) help perpetuate structural inequalities between the North and the South. The Brandt Commission reports also highlighted the interdependence of the North and the South by pointing out that the prosperity of the North is dependent on the development of the South.

18.6 Role of the Third World Countries

The rise of the third world countries challenged the very basic framework of international relations. They induced provisions to be adopted in the United Nations (UN) which would support giving the respect, dignity and scope to these countries which they both needed and deserved. For example, Articles 73 and 74 in the United Nations Charter contained Declaration regarding Non-Self-Governing territories, which clearly imposed an obligation on the members of the UN regarding the administration of territories, whose people had not yet attained a full measure of self-government. Also, by the 1960s, the third world countries gained membership in the UN General Assembly and enjoyed numerical superiority. They utilized this platform to create an international pressure to promote decolonization. To that end, in December 1960, a *Declaration on the Granting of*

Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples was adopted which asserted the need to unconditionally end colonialism in all its forms and manifestations. Also, the participation of the third world nations changed the balance of power within the United Nations as its membership increased. In 1946, there were 35 member states in the United Nations but by 1970, the membership had increased to 127.

The third world countries launched the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) which played a crucial role in providing support to the people fighting for liberation from colonial bondage. Realizing that they face the dual tasks of nation-building as well as gaining political stability, they asserted their need to stay away from the compulsions of joining political, military blocs, which would draw them into military pacts, increase the allocation of budget for defence and military spending, and open the possibility of once again getting exploited for the vested interests of the bloc they joined. Thus, choosing to focus on their own problems of development, the NAM adopted the policy of maintaining equal distance from the two blocs.

The advent of non-alignment was clearly evident when Indian Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru convened a conference in New Delhi in January 1949 to support the cause of Indonesian independence and shun bipolar bloc politics. The idea was further consolidated at the Bandung Conference of 1955. The Afro-Asian nations like Burma, India, Indonesia, Sri Lanka discussed peace, role of the Third World, economic development, and decolonization process. They tried to chart out a diplomatic course as nonaligned to either Russia or America in the Cold War. In many ways, the 1955 Bandung Conference was the first attempt at the creation and establishment of a third force in global politics. Together, the third world countries conveyed the spirit of nonalignment as positive action for protecting the interests of the weak and achieving positive aims, which included peace and public regulation of the international regime, on the basis of active alliance and formation of trans-border solidarity. It was based on the principles of political self-determination, mutual respect for sovereignty, non-aggression, non-interference in internal affairs, and equality. There were other priority areas as well such as anti-imperialism, anti-colonialism, non-violence and conflict resolution via the United Nations.

Throughout the 1960s, the third world countries entrenched themselves as a strong centre of political will and determination in world politics. Ghana's Prime Minister Kwame Nkrumah promoted the idea of pan-Africanism; a way for the African continent to place itself on a par with the rest of the world. Egyptian President Gamal Abdal Nasser advocated a brand of democratic socialism that was neither Western nor Soviet-inspired; Egypt retained its neutrality even as it became drawn into the Cold War. Nehru blended democratic politics

and state planning to promote India's quest for political independence and economic autonomy.

The 1961 Belgrade Non-Aligned Summit conference established an alternative platform for promoting the diplomatic solidarity of the third world countries. In 1966 a Tri-continental Conference of Solidarity of the Peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America was convened in which delegates from across Asia, the Middle East, Africa and Latin America participated. This conference called for a radical anti-imperial agenda.

18.7 The New International Economic Order

Most of the third world countries were categorised as the Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and they urgently need to develop economically and to lift their people out of poverty. Economic development was crucial for sustained political stability of the newly freed nations. The idea of a New International Economic Order (NIEO) originated from this realisation.

During the 1970s, the collective identity of the majority of the third world countries in Latin America, Asia and Africa became expressed through demands for reform in the institutional structure of the international economy. The main thrust came from the Group of 77 (G77), which had been created at the first United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) meeting held in 1964. The G77 demanded that structural imbalances be removed to allow economic exchanges on a more level playing field. These objectives were to be realised in ways that would guarantee the states' economic sovereignty, including their right to control any exploitation of their natural resources. The vision was for a new and revised international economic order called the New International Economic Order (NIEO).

The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) brought out a report in 1972 entitled *Towards a New Trade Policy for Development*. The report proposed a reform of the global trading system so as to: (i) give the LDCs control over their natural resources exploited by the developed Western countries, (ii) obtain access to Western markets so that the LDCs could sell their products and, therefore, make trade more beneficial for the poorer countries, (iii) reduce the cost of technology from the Western countries, and (iv) provide the LDCs with a greater role in international economic institutions. But these proposals were never actually put into execution. This is because by the beginning of the 1980s, the waves of globalization posed a strong challenge to any possibility of restructuring of the global economy and addressing the North-South divide in any meaningful way. The

third world received huge impetus from the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, which gradually pushed them towards the privatization of public sectors, liberalization of the trade and the deregulation of financial sectors. Thus, the idea of NIEO simply faded with the end of the Cold War.

18.7 Theories of the Third World

With the emergence of the third world as a new force in international relations, different theories were formulated explain their rise, dilemmas and predict their fate.

18.8.1 Modernization Theory

Modernization theorists argued that major barriers to development of the third world or the global South emanate from its own internal characteristics. To overcome these barriers, classical theorists recommended that the wealthy countries supply them with investment capital through foreign aid or private foreign direct investment. Once sufficient capital was accumulated to promote economic growth, its benefits would eventually “trickle down” to broad segments of society. Walt W. Rostow (1960), an economic historian and U.S. policy maker, argued that economic growth followed a pattern in all economies as they went through industrialization. Their economies developed in the shadow of more developed economies until they reached the stage where they were capable of self-sustained economic growth. Even though the rich are likely to get richer, it was argued, as incomes in the world as a whole grow, the odds increase that a pre-industrialized economy will grow faster and eventually reduce the gap between it and richer countries.

18.8.2 Commission for Latin America (CLA)

By the 1960s it was obvious that the Third World countries were not passing through a stage of underdevelopment, as explained by modernization theory, but rather continuing to remain underdeveloped. Thus, a structuralist thesis was advanced by a group of intellectuals from Chile, Argentina, Brazil, and Peru brought together by the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA; today known as Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean, ECLAC). They claimed that developing countries are structurally different from the advanced countries and so they will have to develop along different lines. Colonization as a process had restructured former colonies' economies so that they specialized in producing raw materials, cash crops, and foodstuff for export at low prices to the colonizers' home countries. These structures created a dynamic that was continuing to impoverish former colonies and to compromise their modernization. This perspective provided the basis for dependency theory.

18.8.3 Dependency Theory

Dependency theory emphasizes international factors and the dependence of the third world countries on the dominant great powers through colonial exploitation. In other words, dependency theory suggests that the structure of the capitalist world economy is based on a division of labour between a “dominant core” and a “subordinate periphery”. Due to colonialism, the third world countries which actually stay as the “subordinate periphery” are forced into an economic role by which they export raw materials to the colonial countries and import their finished goods. Global inequalities cannot be reduced as long as developing countries continue to specialize in producing primary products for which there are often numerous competing suppliers and limited demand. Breaking out of their dependent status and pursuing their own industrial development remains the greatest foreign policy priority for countries in the third world. For that purpose, some countries in Latin America have pursued development through an “import-substitution industrialization strategy” where domestic players manufacture their own goods.

18.9 Conclusion

Third World is a useful shorthand term to refer to more than 120 countries in the world, which accounts for more than two-thirds of the world’s total. But analytically, the term has limited use; it is more a descriptive concept which is useful to understand the features and characteristics of a group of countries which were colonized at one point in time, and share stagnant levels of development. The most important contribution of the theoretical and analytical conceptualization of the third world is that it offers a non-Western, non-Eurocentric perspective of international relations, which has dominated the theories and ideas for centuries. Today, the term is used more to denote a solidarity and united front among these nations, and as a bargaining platform to gain a level playing field in interactions with the developed countries or the ‘North’.

18.10 Summing Up

- Third world countries are characterized by what the states lack; that is satisfactory, sustained levels of economic growth, real government concern with redistribution of wealth to reduce poverty, democratic politics characterized by regular elections of representative governments, satisfactory standard of human rights, equal position for men and women in politics and development and adequate standards of education and literacy.

- Their common problems and deficiencies paved the way for mutual cooperation and a sense of solidarity amidst the bipolar Cold War politics, leading to a unique third front.
- Today, while these countries have achieved varied levels of development, they are still countering the developed countries in various multilateral platforms and trying to gain equal terms of trade and engagement.
- The use of the term Third World has now diminished and phrases like the Global South are more in vogue.

18.11 Probable Questions

Essay Type Questions :

1. Give an account of the emergence of the Third World in international politics.
2. Examine the theories formulated to explain the rise of the Third World.

Short Questions :

1. Examine the Dependency Theory.
2. What do you understand by the term NIEO?

Objective Questions

1. What according to the Modernization theorists are the major barriers to development of the Third World?
2. What is the basic assumption underlying the concept of North-South divide?

18.12 Further Reading

Jeff Haynes, *Third World Politics : A Concise Introduction*, Blackwell Publishers, Cambridge, U.K,1996.

Peu Ghosh, *International Relations (Fourth Edition)*, PHI Learning, Haryana, 2019.

Shannon Lindsey Blanton and Charles William Kegley, *World Politics : Trend and Transformation (2016-2017 edition)*, Cengage Learning, Boston, MA, 2014.

Juliet Kaarbo and James Lee Ray, *Global Politics*, Wadsworth, Cengage Learning, Boston, MA, 2011.

Unit-19 □ International Relations since 9/11

Structure

- 19.1 Objective**
- 19.2 Introduction**
- 19.3 9/11 Attacks**
- 19.4 The Features of International Terrorism after 9/11**
- 19.5 The US War on Terror**
- 19.6 Critical Assessment of the War on Terror**
- 19.7 Lasting Effects in International Relations**
- 19.8 Conclusion**
- 19.9 Summing Up**
- 19.10 Probable Questions**
- 19.11 Further Reading**

19.1 Objective

After reading this unit the learners will be able to :

- Understand the meaning of the phrases 9/11 and post-9/11
- Critically examine the US-led global war on terror
- Understand the impact of 9/11 on international relations

19.2 Introduction

9/11 is actually the date, 11th of September 2001 when a series of airline hijackings and suicide attacks were committed by 19 militants associated with the Islamic extremist group Al-Qaeda against targets in the United States. It is claimed to be the deadliest terrorist attack ever conducted on America, with the entire world as a helpless spectator. The attacks against New York City and Washington, D.C. caused massive civilian deaths and destruction. More importantly, it reminded the world in the largest scale possible what the irrational, menacing force of terrorism means and how it threatens everyone as a target, especially the innocent. Post-9/11 international world was thus, scared by the traumatic

memories of the terrorist attacks and a number of new initiatives were launched to combat terrorism, secure borders against illegal migrants, stricter laws of citizenship, strengthen collective security of nations in inter governmental organizations like the United Nations. Another unfortunate outcome of the 9/11 attacks was mass phobia against Islamic fundamentalism and the targeting of Muslims in different parts of the world, in the name of protecting state security.

19.3 9/11 attacks

Over three thousand people were killed in the attack launched by 9/11; 2,750 people were killed in New York, 184 at the Pentagon, and 40 in Pennsylvania. All 19 terrorists died as it was a suicide attack by the hijackers. Police and fire departments in New York were especially hard-hit, hundreds had rushed to the scene of the attacks, and more than 400 police officers and firefighters were killed. Evidence gathered by the United States intelligence soon revealed that the Islamic militant group Al-Qaeda had been responsible for the attacks. The group had previously been involved in other attempted terrorist strikes against Americans. Records showed that Osama bin Laden as the leader of Al Qaeda had been making numerous anti-American statements for a long time. Al-Qaeda was headquartered in Afghanistan and had forged a close relationship with that country's ruling Taliban militia. The success of the 9/11 attacks proved that Al-Qaeda was an organization of global reach because the planning had been played out across the globe with meetings in Malaysia, operatives taking flight lessons in the United States, coordination by plot leaders based in Hamburg, Germany, money transfers from Dubai, and recruitment of suicide operatives from countries around the Middle East—all activities that were ultimately overseen by Al-Qaeda's leaders in Afghanistan. Although the United States tried its best to get Osama Bin Laden extradited from Afghanistan, the Taliban refused to cooperate or even stop Al Qaeda's activities on its soil.

19.4 The Features of International Terrorism after 9/11

With the invention of nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction (WMDs), the face of international terrorism had changed much before the 9/11 attacks. Even during the Cold War years, the world lived through the possibility of the terrorists producing WMDs through easily available information on the internet, as well as the use of it in the form of a nuclear suicide bomb, gas attacks or as a biological weapon, decimating the entire population of a region. But with 9/11, the distinct feature of terrorism which became obvious was the lack of a clear motive behind conducting a terrorist act. In other words, the

responsibility of terrorist acts became diffused, motives were generic, the method was decentralized and based on a globalized network, involving agents and a complex financial support structure. The new terrorist organizations, especially Islamic radicals justify their acts on wide grounds such as jihad to clean up hallowed ground, to get rid of US and Zionist forces from the Holy Land, facilitate the establishment of a Palestinian state and militant opposition against globalization. Most importantly, the 9/11 attacks started the era of asymmetric strategy of terrorism. The idea remains to convey effective communication and dissemination of the terrorists' capability to inflict directed violence in the name of, or against, a set of beliefs. But taking the help of globalization, the 9/11 attacks asserted the age of targeting and destroying critical infrastructure and systems and gaining maximum symbolic value through televised footages.

19.5 The US War on Terror

After the 9/11 attacks, combating terrorism and countering terrorism became extremely topical and integral to the national security policies of countries across the world, especially the U.S which had been directly affected. The George W. Bush government launched the 'Global war on terror' program, which described the America-led global counter-terrorism campaign. The day after the attacks, Bush said, "Every nation in every region now has a decision to make," he declared in a national address. "Either you are with us or you are with the terrorists." This basically implied that the U.S was seeking solidarity and cooperation of all the nations in its efforts to eradicate terrorism and punish the masterminds of the 9/11 attack. In its scope, expenditure, and impact on international relations, the war on terrorism was comparable to the Cold War. In other words, it was a watershed moment in international relations and its impact and consequences were intended to represent a new phase in global political relations with particular significance for security, human rights, international law, cooperation, and governance.

The success of the initial years of the war on terrorism included the arrest of hundreds of terrorist suspects around the world. For example, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) invoked Article 5, allowing its members to respond collectively in self-defense, and on October 7 the U.S. and allied military forces launched an attack against Afghanistan. Meanwhile, security measures within the United States were tightened considerably at such places as airports, government buildings, and sports venues. To help facilitate the domestic response, Congress quickly passed the USA PATRIOT Act (the Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act of 2001), which significantly but temporarily expanded the

search and surveillance powers of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) and other law-enforcement agencies. Additionally, a cabinet-level Department of Homeland Security was established. Under the Operation Enduring Freedom, US and its allies began the aerial bombing of Afghanistan on 7 October 2001. US Special Forces targeted Kandahar. Several other nations like Britain, Turkey, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, France and Poland joined the military campaign to overthrow the Taliban regime and destroy all Al-Qaeda infrastructure in Afghanistan. Before the year end, rule of Taliban was over; and the US-backed Hamid Karzai had taken over as interim president in June 2002. The retaliation launched against terrorist activities through the war on terror also prevented further large-scale terrorist attacks on the American mainland, the toppling of the Taliban regime and subsequent closure of terrorist-training camps in Afghanistan, and the capture or elimination of many of al-Qaeda's senior members. Even though the years went by, there was no waning of the memories of 9/11; rather international cooperation in global counter-terrorism efforts continued to increase. On 2 May 2011, US Special Forces raided a safe hideout in Abbottabad, Pakistan and killed Al Qaeda supremo Osama bin Laden. US officially declared end to the war in Afghanistan on 28 December 2014.

19.6 Critical Assessment of the War on Terror

The US-led war on terror is a multi-dimensional global phenomenon as well as a key foreign policy too, which ruled the American political lexicon for nearly a decade. In its scope and impact on global politics, it is comparable with Cold War as it redefined national security priorities as well as international alliances. It had very significant consequences for human security, national security, bilateral and regional security initiatives, human rights, international law, inter governmental cooperation, and domestic governance.

In its military dimension, the war on terror involved US-led multinational military campaigns in Afghanistan and Iraq, covert operations in Yemen and many other places; and military assistance and cooperation with friendly regimes. In terms of intelligence operations, the US reorganized and expanded its 143-Non-Traditional Security Threats intelligence agencies. New technologies were inducted to gather information so as to preempt and prevent terrorism. It cut off financial resources of the terrorists and captured terrorist suspects and detained them in Guantanamo Bay without trial. In its diplomatic dimension, the war on terror campaign sought to build and maintain a global coalition with partner countries and a public diplomacy campaign to counter anti-American sentiments in the Islamic world.

Critics however are of the opinion that the war on terror was a massive, planned assault on

human rights and human dignity for innocent civilians around the world. It gave a free hand to security officials and agents to detain ‘suspects’ without any fair trial or representation. The horrific images of Guantanamo Bay and other illegal detention camps which surfaced in the media, failed to find any justification in public sentiments despite the killings of 9/11. Torture through interrogation and violence became an accepted practice due to the war on terror, especially in its domestic impact. Besides, US used unmanned combat drones to kill lots of suspected enemies far away from Afghanistan and Iraq including some who were US citizens. Taliban regime was eventually overthrown but it took 18 years since 9/11, and after a hasty exit of the US troops, Afghanistan has once again fallen back into the hands of the Taliban in 2021.

Al Qaeda suffered setbacks but quickly regrouped. Its affiliates continued with their terrorist mission with bombings in Madrid and London. Moreover, the growth of ISIS (Islamic State of Iraq and Levant) and the continued wars in Iraq and Syria mean that neither the threat of terrorism has declined nor anti-American sentiments in the Muslim world have disappeared. Some critics also argue that the US war on terror was actually a ploy for the US to advance its expansionist geopolitical agenda of interfering in the weak or failing states of Asia and Africa through its military presence and advance its democracy-promotion agenda. For countries like Afghanistan, Iraq and Middle East, this was additionally rewarding as these are regions rich in energy sources and crucial trade routes. Other critics also point out that in its international coalition in the war on terror, Pakistan, which sided with the US since the beginning, is known for being a major safe haven of international terrorism. It was reported late in 2002 that there still existed number of Al-Qaeda training camps in Pakistan.

By the last years of George Bush’s presidency, public opinion had turned strongly negative concerning his handling of the Iraq War and other national security matters. This discontent helped Barack Obama, an outspoken critic of Bush’s foreign policy, win the presidency in 2008. Under the new administration, the expression war on terrorism quickly disappeared from official communications. Obama made the rejection explicit in a 2013 speech in which he stated that the United States would eschew a boundless, vaguely defined “global war on terrorism” in favour of more focused actions against specific hostile groups. Under Obama, the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan were gradually wound down, although at the end of Obama’s presidency in 2016 there were still U.S. troops in both countries.

19.7 Lasting Effects in International Relations

The effects and consequences of the 9/11 attacks on international relations continue to reverberate till the present times. The international coalition of combating terrorism which was formed on the understanding that all states are vulnerable to terrorism, continues to operate although the initial momentum of the first decade has waned. Regional organizations continue to express their solidarity to fight the menace of international terrorism. For example, NATO's work on counter-terrorism focuses on improving awareness of the threat, developing capabilities to prepare and respond and enhancing engagement with partner countries and other international actors. It ensures shared awareness of the terrorist threat through consultations, enhanced intelligence-sharing and continuous strategic analysis and assessment. Similarly, ASEAN came forward late in 2002 to issue a declaration to underline its commitment to fight this menace. The ASEAN efforts were fully supported by China, Japan and South Korea. India indeed welcomed this commitment. Meanwhile, the countries of Asia-Pacific Rim extending from Japan to Australia, along with the United States have sworn to eliminate terrorism. Yet, it is not an easy task because terrorism continues to be seen as a revolutionary in some other part of the world. For the US, the 9/11 attacks signified a drastic reorientation in foreign policy. For other countries, it has underlined the importance of non-traditional security threat and shaping of foreign and domestic policies to that extent. Combating terrorism is now an integral part of every democratic country's objective and agenda.

United Nations and the Fight against Terrorism :

The United Nations has been seriously concerned with the spread of international terrorism. The determination of the UN to defeat this evil was expressed in the Security Council Resolution No.1373 adopted in the wake of the attack on the World Trade Centre in September 2001. The resolution had called upon the international community to fight this scourge through international cooperation, through political, diplomatic, financial and other means. Meanwhile, as many as 12 conventions have been authorised by the UN General Assembly to the humankind to unite and 23 conventions to fight the curse. However, the General Assembly was conscious of the fact that in the process of fighting terrorism, human rights violation must not be allowed to take place, though at times the reconciliation between the two may be a difficult problem. The action that was initiated by a coalition led by the US in October 2001 against terrorist mastermind was in accordance with the authorisation done by the United Nations. Accepting the Nobel Prize for Peace, UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan said in December 2001, that the UN General Assembly and the Security Council has provided a solid foundation for the struggle against terrorism. Kofi Annan said: "I

would urge all Member States to sign the 12 conventions that have been authorised by the General Assembly.” He urged, “Sign, ratify and implement them so that we all have common framework as we move forward.” However, it is not easy to have all the conventions signed and ratified as there are many elements in the world who still talk of the United States as the “killer” of people of a certain faith, who still declare moral support, and give material aid, to the so-called freedom fighters in Jammu and Kashmir, and those who consider the very existence of Israel as a curse. Besides, the over-enthusiastic supporters of human rights, even in case of terror creators, are not easy to be convinced that rights of vast majority of civilised world, of innocent women, children and disabled must get precedence over the rights of the *fidayeens* and other terrorists.

19.8 Conclusion

While it is debated whether terrorism has deepened in its intensity following 9/11, it is usually agreed upon that the attacks brought about a profound shift in the significance and priority accorded to terrorism. The threat posed by terrorism was suddenly accorded a historically unprecedented level of importance, based on the belief that terrorism was a manifestation of new fault lines that would define global politics in the twentieth century. The war on terror reflected this to a great extent. However, the war on terror itself caused an affront to human rights and human dignity, which led to its removal from being the centrepiece of US foreign policy by 2008. Today, the memories of the 9/11 attacks linger in international relations, with this consciousness that modern terrorism is magnified and supported by global, transnational linkages and systems. Also, secular motivations behind terrorist attacks have mostly been replaced by Islamist or jihadist terrorism, which in itself is a violent response to political conditions and crises that have found expression in politico-religious ideology.

19.9 Summing Up

- Terrorism is not a new phenomenon, but the 9/11 attacks rendered it truly global. The threat to humanity posed by terrorism is now a concern for every nation and it unites everyone in one common agenda.
- However, the difficulty remains that one man’s terrorist may be another man’s revolutionary. As long as the justification for terrorist attacks would be condoned by certain countries and in certain parts of the world, the intention to carry out terrorist acts would always find its scope.

- A multidimensional menace which requires a large, transnational system and network to operate, modern terrorism post 9/11 has changed the priorities and hierarchy of threats in the international order forever.

19.10 Probable Questions

Essay Type Questions

1. How have the 9/11 attacks changed the face of terrorism?
2. What were the international responses to the 9/11 attacks? Discuss with special reference to the US response.

Short Questions :

1. What do you understand by the term 9/11?
2. How has the United Nations responded to the menace of global terrorism?

Objective Questions

1. What is the distinct feature of 9/11 terrorist attack?
2. What does American war on Terror imply?

19.12 Further Reading

Andreas Weyner and Doron Zimmermann, *International Relations: From the Cold War to the Globalized World*, Viva Books, New Delhi, 2006.

Aneek Chatterjee, *International Relations Today: Concepts and Application*, Pearson, New Delhi, 2010

Shannon Lindsey Blanton and Charles William Kegley, *World Politics: Trend and Transformation (2016-2017 edition)*, Cengage Learning, Boston, MA, 2014.

Andrew Heywood, *Global Politics*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2011

Unit - 20 □ Rise of Islam

Structure

20.1 Objective

20.2 Introduction

20.3 Break-out of Islamic Fundamentalism

20.4 Difference between Islam as a Religion and a Political Islam

20.5 Fundamentalism as the ‘Rise of Religious Revivalism’

20.5.1 Rise of Religious Revivalism

20.6 Impact of Militant Islam

20.6.1 Political Islam and its Ideological Roots

20.6.2 Islamic Threat and its Impact on International Relations

20.7 The West and Islamic Fundamentalism

20.7.1 Muslims and their perception of Islamic resurgence

20.8 Conclusion

20.9 Summing Up

20.10 Probable Questions

20.11 Further Reading

20.1 Objective

After going through this unit the learners will be able to :

- to understand the issue of the rise of Islam
- explain what is Islam and how one of its forms challenges the world
- to understand alternate perceptions of Islamic fundamentalism

20.2 Introduction

The rise of political Islam or the spread of Islamic fundamentalism is a phenomenon of the post-Cold-War international system. Particularly after 9/11 and the advent of the 'war on terror', political Islam has revived the deep civilizational clash between Islam and the West, seen before during the Arab Crusades (eleventh to thirteenth centuries). The justification exists on both sides. For the Christians, political Islam, and possibly Islam itself, is anti-western, committed to the expulsion of western influences from the Muslim world and maybe to the wider overthrow of western secularism. In this view, the West is subject to an 'Islamic threat' that must be combated, not simply through the defeat of terrorism and jihadist insurrection, but also through the destruction of the fundamentalist ideas and doctrines that have nourished and inspired them. For the Muslims, this clash is an outcome of the Arab world being consistently victimized by western interventions and manipulation, supported by demeaning and insulting forms of 'Islamophobia'.

20.3 Break-out of Islamic Fundamentalism

The defeat of USSR in its Afghanistan campaign in 1979 led the Soviet Union to retreat from the country. The geostrategic policies adopted by the USA and USSR in the region gave birth to a new threat to peace in the form of rise of Islamic fundamentalism and terrorism. Various Mujahedeen, militant groups which were primarily based along ethnic and sectarian lines started conflicting with each other to secure the power in the country. This process of grabbing the power also witnessed the birth of Taliban, another fierce Islamic fundamentalist group. The birth of Taliban started a new chapter in the history of Afghanistan. In the war against Soviet occupation, many foreign fighters were brought to Afghanistan. One such group was Al-Qaeda headed by the Saudi-born Osama bin Laden. Al-Qaeda had its foreign fighters who were trained and armed by the US. They fought against Soviet army in Afghanistan. Once the Soviets withdrew from Afghanistan, many of these militant and terrorist groups began looking beyond to spread their ideology and influence. It was Al-Qaeda which carried out the terrorist bombings in US on September 2001, also known as the 9/11 terrorist incidents. Although there are several Islamic outfits like Hezbollah in Lebanon, Palestine Liberation Army in Palestine, their cause was political in nature, that is, securing independence and sovereignty for the regions they are based in. The US intervention in Afghanistan after 9/11 attacks and the declaration by President George Bush of 'war on terrorism' led to US interventions and regime change. The 'war on terrorism' and US and NATO intervention in Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya and Syria also witnessed the birth of several organisations like Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS). Some argue this is a backlash against the compromises on human dignity and human

rights launched on the Muslims by Americans in different parts of the world, in the name of security. Others argue that terrorism in itself has become a lucrative, transnational global industry which lures thousands of educated, young men and women around the world and gives them an economic opportunity as well as a religious mission to accomplish in life.

20.4 Difference between Islam as a Religion and a Political Islam

Islam is the world's second largest religion. Muslims constitute approximately one-fifth of the world's population and are spread over more than seventy countries. The strength of Islam is concentrated geographically in Asia and Africa. However, it has also spread into Europe and elsewhere. Islam is often considered more than just religion; it is a complete way of life, with instructions on moral, political and economic behaviour for individuals and nations alike. The 'way of Islam' is based on the teachings of the Prophet Mohammed (circa 570–632), as revealed in the Quoran, which is regarded by all Muslims as the revealed word of *Allah*, and the Sunnah, or 'beaten path', the traditional customs observed by devout Muslims and said to be based on the Prophet's own life. There are two principal sects within Islam, which developed within fifty years of Mohammed's death. The Sunni sect represents the majority of Muslims, while the Shi'a or Shi'ite sect (sometimes called Shi'ism) contains just over one tenth of Muslims, concentrated in Iran and Iraq.

Fundamentalism in Islam does not mean a belief in the literal truth of the Koran, for this is accepted by all Muslims, and in that sense all Muslims are fundamentalists. Instead, it means an intense and militant faith in Islamic beliefs as the overriding principles of social life and politics, as well as of personal morality. Islamic fundamentalists wish to establish the primacy of religion over politics. In practice, this means the founding of an 'Islamic state', a theocracy ruled by spiritual rather than temporal authority, and applying the Shari'a. The Shari'a lays down a code for legal and righteous behaviour, including a system of punishment for most crimes as well as rules of personal conduct for both men and women. In that sense, Islam should be distinguished from 'Islamism'. Islamism refers either to a political creed based on Islamic ideas and principles, or to the political movement that has been inspired by that creed.

20.5 Fundamentalism as the 'Rise of Religious Revivalism'

The core aims of the fundamentalist Islam are three-fold. First, it promotes pan-Islamic unity, distinguishing Islamism from traditional political nationalism. Second, it seeks the purification of the Islamic world through the overthrow of 'apostate' leaders of Muslim

states (secularized or pro-western leaders). Third, it calls for the removal of western, and especially United States, influence from the Muslim world, and possibly a wider politico-cultural struggle against the West itself.

However, the relationship between Islam and Islamism or political Islam is complex and contested. While Islamists have claimed that their ideas articulate the deepest insights of Islam untouched by western and colonial influence, critics argue that Islamism is a political distortion of Islam, based on a selective and perverted interpretation of religious texts.

20.5.1 Rise of Religious Revivalism

Although the revival of Islamic fundamentalism can be traced back to the 1920s, and particularly, the founding of the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt in 1928, its most significant developments came in 1979 in Iran with the popular revolution that brought Ayatollah Khomeini to power and led Iran declaring itself an Islamic Republic. The Soviet war in Afghanistan, 1979–89, led to the growth of the *Mujahideen*, a loose collection of religiously inspired resistance groups that received financial or military support from the USA, Iran and Pakistan. The Taliban, who ruled Afghanistan, 1996–2001, developed out of these Mujahideen groups. Islamists have also seized power, usually temporarily, in states such as Sudan, Pakistan, Somalia and Lebanon (through the influence of the pro-Iranian Hezbollah movement). A range of new *jihadi* groups have also emerged since the 1990s, the most significant of which is *Al-Qaeda*, led by Osama bin Laden, which was responsible for the 9/11 terror attacks. It has given expression to a particularly militant form of Islamism. For these groups, a commitment to Islam takes the form of a jihad, carried out especially against the USA and Israel (the ‘Jewish Christian crusaders’), which seeks to remove western influence from the Arab world in general and from Saudi Arabia in particular.

20.6 Impact of Militant Islam

Regarding the persistence of Islamic fundamentalism in international relations, three interpretations have been offered by experts. First, the source of Islamist militancy has been seen to lie within Islam itself. In this view, there is a basic incompatibility between Islamic values and those of the liberal democratic West. Islam is inherently totalitarian: the goal of constructing an Islamic state based on Shari’a law is starkly anti-pluralist and irreconcilable with the notion of a public/private divide. However, according to the central Islamic tenets, greater jihad is not a political struggle against the infidel, but an inner struggle; the struggle to become a better person through moral and spiritual discipline. Thus, Islamic fundamentalism may be a distortion of the Quran itself.

Second, resurgent Islamism has been portrayed as a specific response to particular historical circumstances. The decline and stagnation of the Middle East due to the collapse of the once powerful Ottoman empire and its carve-up by the UK and France after WWI brought instability and humiliation to the Islamic world. This was aggravated by the powerlessness that has been engendered by the protracted Arab–Israeli conflict since the late 1940s. Furthermore, the end of colonialism in the post-1945 period brought little benefit to the Arab world, both because Middle Eastern regimes tended to be inefficient and corrupt, and because formal colonialism was succeeded by neo-colonialism, particularly as US influence in the region expanded. In the final decades of the twentieth century, due to the population growth across the Arab world, combined with economic stagnation, growing foreign interference and the failure of Arab socialism, Islamist ideas and creeds attracted growing support from amongst the young and the politically committed.

20.6.1 Political Islam and its Ideological Roots

The significance of World War I was that it exploded the optimistic belief in progress and the advance of reason, fuelling support for darker, anti-liberal movements. In this light, political Islam shares much in common with fascism and communism, in that each of them promises to rid society of corruption and immorality and to make society anew as a ‘single blocklike structure, solid and eternal’. Islamism does not have a single doctrinal or political character. The two most influential forms of political Islam have stemmed from Wahhabism and Shi’a Islam. Wahhabism (or, as some of its supporters prefer, Salafism) is the official version of Islam in Saudi Arabia, the world’s first fundamentalist Islamic state. Its origins date back to the eighteenth century and an alliance between the supporters of a particularly strict and austere form of Islam and early figures in the Saudi dynasty. Wahhabis seek to restore Islam by purging it of heresies and modern inventions; amongst other things, they ban pictures, photographs, musical instruments, singing, videos and television, and celebrations of Mohammad’s birthday. Wahhabi ideas and beliefs had a particular impact on the Muslim Brotherhood, whose influence spread from Egypt into Jordan, Sudan and Syria, most uncompromisingly expressed by its leading theorist, Sayyid Qutb. The Egyptian writer Mohammad Abd al-Salam Faraj, who was implicated in the assassination of President Anwar Sadat and executed in 1982, developed a revolutionary model of ‘Qutbism’, in which jihad, as the ‘neglected obligation’ or ‘forgotten duty’, was understood literally as the struggle for Islam against God’s enemies. Such militant ideas influenced Osama bin Laden and al-Qaeda, as well as the Taliban regime in Afghanistan and the subsequent Taliban insurgencies in Afghanistan and Pakistan. Shi’a fundamentalism stems from the quite different temper and doctrinal character of the Shi’a sect as opposed to the Sunni sect. Shi’as believe that divine guidance is about to re-emerge into the world with the

return of the ‘hidden imam’, or the arrival of the Mahdi, a leader directly guided by God. Such ideas of revival or imminent salvation have given the Shi’a sect a messianic and emotional quality that is not enjoyed by the traditionally more sober Sunnis. This was evident in the mass demonstrations that accompanied Iran’s ‘Islamic Revolution’, and it has also been apparent in popular agitation in Iran against the USA and western influence, as well as the campaigns against Israel by Hezbollah and Hamas. It would nevertheless be a mistake to suggest that all forms of Islamism are militant and revolutionary. By comparison with Christianity, Islam has generally been tolerant of other religions and rival belief systems, a fact that may provide the basis for reconciliation between Islamism and political pluralism.

20.6.2 Islamic Threat and its Impact on International Relations

There are two versions of the idea of an ‘Islamic threat’, one internal and the other external. The idea of Islam as the ‘enemy within’ emerged not so much through the growth of Muslim immigration but through the emergence, from the late 1980s onwards, of a Muslim identity that gradually took on political overtones. This applied particularly amongst second-generation Muslim immigrants in Europe and the USA, who felt less attached than their parents to the culture of a ‘country of origin’ while feeling socially and culturally marginalized within their host society. Such circumstances favoured the emergence of religious consciousness, investing Islamic identity with a renewed fervour and pride. Whereas the Iranian Revolution and Afghan resistance to Soviet occupation provided evidence of Muslim self-assertion, the failure to resolve the Arab–Israeli conflict, western inaction over genocidal attacks on Bosnian Muslims in the 1990s, and the ‘war on terror’ post 9/11 generally and the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq in particular fuelled a sense of outrage and injustice, sometimes seen to reflect the wider ‘Islamophobia’ of western society. In cases such as the London bombings of 2005 (also-called the ‘7/7’) such pressures have contributed to the growth of so-called ‘home-grown’ terrorism.

20.7 The West and Islamic Fundamentalism

It is also notable that many of those who established al-Qaeda and those involved in the 9/11 attacks knew the West and, in some cases, had received a western education. Western societies have reacted to the growth of Islamic consciousness in a variety of ways. In some cases, it has led to a backlash against multiculturalism based on the belief that, as Islam is essentially anti-pluralist and anti-liberal, Muslim communities can never be properly integrated into western societies. This is an approach that has received particular support in France where the wearing of religious symbols and dress in state schools has been prohibited largely in an attempt to prevent the adoption of Islamic headgear by Muslim girls. In other cases, it has led to attempts to support the emergence of moderate Muslim

groups and ideas, while radical Islamic organizations, such as Hizb al-Tahrir (the Party of Liberation), have been banned or subject to restrictions. However, such attempts to defend liberal society, sometimes in the name of counter-terrorism, may also be counter-productive, in that they contribute to the idea that Islam is being demonized and that Muslim communities are under attack.

Islam is also sometimes portrayed as an ‘enemy without’, confronting the West from beyond its own geographical boundaries. This idea has certainly been strengthened by the development of the ‘war on terror’ into counter-insurgency wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, aimed at the eradication of Islamic terrorist organizations and the radical ideologies that they adhere to. For example, the notion that democracy has to be ‘imposed’ on the Middle East through US military intervention may reflect the belief that Muslim, and particularly Arab societies are so entrenched in their backwardness that they are incapable of bringing about democratization through their own efforts. This reflects the emphasis that has been placed by US policy-makers since the 1990s on ‘democracy promotion’ as a strategy for bringing peace to the Middle East and, in particular, for countering the spread of militant Islam and the associated threat of terrorism. Such thinking has in part been informed by the ‘democratic peace’ thesis, and can be traced back to Woodrow Wilson or even, some argue, to Kant. A greater emphasis on promoting democracy was evident under the Clinton administration, partly in an attempt to counter the criticism that the USA routinely propped up unpopular, authoritarian regimes in the Middle East in return for secure oil supplies. This indicated a shift from President Bush Senior’s conception of the post-Cold War ‘new world order’, in which the norms of non-intervention and non-aggression were applied regardless of a state’s constitutional structure (the 1991 Gulf War was, for instance, waged to defend autocratic Kuwait). However, Clinton’s ‘soft’ Wilsonianism turned into ‘hard’ Wilsonianism under George W. Bush after September 11, as a policy of militarily-imposed ‘regime change’ was justified in terms of the promotion of democracy across the troubled Middle East. The issue of democracy promotion has nevertheless remained highly contentious, especially because of its link to the ‘war on terror’.

20.7.1 Muslims and their perception of Islamic resurgence

For a vast majority of Muslims, the resurgence of Islam is a reassertion of cultural identity, formal religious observance, family values and morality. The establishment of Islamic society is seen as requiring a personal and social transformation that is a prerequisite for true Islamic government. Effective change is to come from below through a gradual social transformation brought about by the implementation of Islamic Law-the shari’a. Yet, a significant minority views the societies and governments in Muslim countries as hopelessly

corrupt. They believe that un-Islamic societies and their leaders are no better than infidels and that the religious establishment has been co-opted by the government. A fairly long history of communal riots and their marginalization and exclusion has facilitated radicalization of a section of Muslim community. The scale of radicalization and potential to carry out terrorist attacks is not clear, but seems to be limited.

20.8 Conclusion

The emergence of a significant number of Islamic extremist groups supported by various Islamic states, either as political satellites or to forcibly export Islamic revolution, has created a perceived threat to large parts of the non-Islamic world in the post-Cold War world order. The Western reaction has often blurred the distinction between Islamic revivalism and extremism. There has been a sharp, virulent backlash of the West and it has been compounded by the feeling that the reactionary fervour exhibited by Islamic revivalism has no place in the modern, secular international order. Though prominent in the Western threat assessment of global politics, Islamic extremism and the creation of Islamic theocracies in Iran and Afghanistan merely constitute elements of a larger matrix.

20.9 Summing Up

- Rise of Islam refers to the rise of political Islam or Islamic revivalism in the post-Cold War international order, mainly triggered by the terror attacks of 9/11.
- Islamic extremism or fundamentalism is a perception, shaped through the events of radicalism demonstrated by certain religious outfits like the Mujahideen, Taliban, Al Qaeda and Al Jazeera.
- The West has equated Islamic fundamentalism with fascism and created a discourse of Islamophobia which looks at Muslims as threats within the Western countries (as residents, citizens or immigrants) as well as internationally (beyond the borders of the West).
- Muslims view the rise of religious radicalism as a backlash against years of victimization of Islamic countries by the West and creation of political instabilities for narrow, geopolitical interests.
- The rise of political Islam has reshaped the international order and given rise to non-state actors like the terror outfits which threaten to destabilize the world politics at any time. It has fractured the scope of cooperation between the liberal Western countries and the Islamic nations by creating phobia and trust deficit.

20.10 Probable Questions

Essay Type Questions

1. Give an account of the roots of Islam and comment on the scope of fundamentalism in Islam.
2. Can you justify the western reaction to the rise of political Islam? Give reasons for your answer.

Short Questions

1. Which events led to the rise of political Islam?
2. What are the radical, Islamic organizations in world politics since the 1980s?
3. How does the West view Islamic fundamentalism?

Objective Questions

1. What does fundamentalism in Islam mean?
 2. What is the central theme of the revolutionary model of Qutbism?
-

20.11 Further Reading

Andreas Weyenagel and Doron Zimmermann, *International Relations: From the Cold War to the Globalized World*, Viva Books, New Delhi, 2006.

Aneek Chatterjee, *International Relations Today: Concepts and Application*, Pearson, New Delhi, 2010

Shannon Lindsey Blanton and Charles William Kegley, *World Politics: Trend and Transformation (2016-2017 edition)*, Cengage Learning, Boston, MA, 2014.

Andrew Heywood, *Global Politics*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2011

Notes
