More Quick Notes, Telegram: @campus_handout / https://t.me/campus_handout

Chapter One: Understanding International Relations

1.1. Conceptualizing Nationalism, Nations and States

- the words “nation” “state” and “country” are used interchangeably and this is not correct
  - ➢ Nationalism
    - the most influential force in international affairs
    - It is noted as a factor for
      - ✓ outbreak of revolutions and wars across the globe
      - ✓ collapse of age old empires
      - ✓ marker for new borders & emergence of new states
    - used to reshape and reinforce regimes in history
    - nationalism is the doctrine that asserts the nation as the basic political unit in organizing society
  - ➢ nations
    - historical entities that evolve organically out of more similar ethnic communities and they reveal themselves in myths, legends, and songs
    - A nation, in contrast to a state:
      - ✓ constitutes a community of people joined by a shared identity and by common social practices

    - nation was a soul added to the body of the early modern state machinery
- The revolutions that took place in Britain‘s North American colonies in 1776, and in France in 1789, provided models for other nationalists to follow
    - In the revolution of 1789, the old regime was overthrown and with it the entire social order
    - French nation was from now on to be governed by the people, the nation
- The Congress of Vienna of 1815, where a settlement was reached at the end of the Napoleonic Wars, was supposed to have returned Europe to its pre-revolutionary ways, Yet, nationalist sentiments were growing:
    - Europe national communities demanded to be included into the politics of their respective countries
    - Nationalism in the first part of the nineteenth century was a liberal sentiment concerning self-determination – the right of a people to determine its own fate
    - the idea of self-determination undermined the political legitimacy of Europe‘s empires
    - Although the nationalist revolutions of 1848 were defeated by the political establishment, the sentiments themselves were impossible to control
- In 1861 Italy too – long divided into separate city-states and dominated by the Church – became a unified country and an independent nation
- it was only with the conclusion of the First World War in 1918 that self-determination was acknowledged as a right

- After the First World War most people in Europe formed their own nation-states
- the word "international" itself was coined only in 1783, by the British philosopher Jeremy Bentham
  - In most respects, however, the inter-national system continued to operate in much the same fashion as the Westphalian inter-state system
- In international politics, nevertheless, the implication of nationalism and its essence is highly questioned, current:
  - ✓ nation states are put under pressure and their role in world politics is significantly challenge
  - ✓ However, revival of nationalism is happening across the world with the post-cold war assertions of religion, culture and ethnicity as potent forces in world politics

1.2. Understanding International Relations

- We now live in a world where it is impossible to isolate our experiences and transactions from an international dimension
  - ✓ The limits to how international relations will continue to impact your life is tremendous
- Studying international relations enables students and professionals to better comprehend the information we receive daily from newspapers, television and radio
  - ✓ It provides the necessary tools to analyze events, and to gain a deeper comprehension of some of the problems that policy-makers confront and to understand the reasoning behind their actions
- The world is interconnected – geographically, intellectually and socially

- Originally, the study of international relations was seen largely as a branch of the study of law, philosophy or history
  - ✓ the first university chair of international relations was founded at the University of Wales in 1919
- there is no one accepted way of defining or understanding international relations
- Today, international relations could be used to describe a range of interactions between people, groups, firms, associations, parties, nations or states or between these and (non) governmental international organizations
  - ✓ Example;
  - sending international mail
  - buying or selling goods abroad
  - choosing an Olympics host or awarding a film Oscar
  - ✓ events such as:
  - international conflict
  - inter-national conferences
    - ❖ This all play a fundamental part in the study of international relations
- Participation in international relations or politics is also inescapable
  - ✓ No individual, people, nation or state can exist in splendid isolation or be master of its own fate
  - ✓ None can maintain or enhance their rate of social or economic progress or keep people alive without the contributions of foreigners or foreign states
- Every people, nation or state is a minority in a world that is **anarchic**:

- ✓ that is, there is an absence of a common sovereign over them
- ✓ politics among entities that have no ruler and in the absence of any ruler

- there are legal, political and social differences between domestic and international politic
  - ➢ Domestic law
    - ✓ is generally obeyed, and if not, the police and courts enforce
    - ✓ a government has a monopoly on the legitimate use of force
  - ➢ International law(politics)
    - ✓ rests on competing legal systems, and there is no common enforcement
    - ✓ no one has a monopoly of force, and therefore
      - international politics has often been interpreted as the realm of self-help
      - BUT some states are stronger than others
    - ✓ in international politics, divided peoples do not share the same loyalties – people disagree about what seems just and legitimate; order and justice
- domestic incidents can become international and can lead to foreign policy changes and commitments
  - ✓ Example: SARS and avian flu
- At Glance: International relations is too important to be ignored but also too complex to be understood
- There are philosophical disputes about the fundamental nature of international relations:

- ✓ Hobbesian versus the Lockean
- ✓ Realist versus Idealist

➢ Hobbes
- state of society to be continual fear, and danger of violent death; and the life of man, solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short

➢ Locke
- optimistic view
- suggested that sociability was the strongest bond between men – men were equal, sociable and free
- that nature did not arm man against man, and that some degree of society was possible even in the state preceding government
  - ❖ Hobbes and Locke are still able to divide approaches to the study of the nature of international relations

- International politics is pre-eminently concerned with the art of achieving group ends against the opposition of other groups
- International politics involves the delicate adjustment of power to power
  - ✓ If physical force were to be used to resolve every disagreement there would result an intolerable existence for the world‘s population
    - Sometimes this happens on the international stage
      - 2003 invasion of Iraq by a US coalition of the willing as a prime example
  - ✓ Although difficult to establish; there are non-violent options available to states.

- International politics is also about maintaining international order. But that order has to be maintained in an anarchical world
- The arena of international relations and politics seems to be continually expanding
  - ✓ In 1800 there were no international organizations, but now there is one for almost every activity– both governmental and non-governmental
  - ✓ United Nations Charter was signed in October 1945, 51 states signed it. In the first decade of twenty-first century the UN grew between 189 and 192 member states
  - ✓ Interdependence implies that people, businesses and organizations rely on each other (and their rivals)
- International relations and politics are necessary for all states, but political power is not centralized and unequal. That is why power, coercion and bargaining still hold sway

1.3. The Nature and Evolution of International Relations

- The rise of the sovereign state in medieval Europe consisted of a complicated pattern of overlapping jurisdictions and loyalties:
  - Life and political power was local
  - there was an enormous diversity of political entities:
    - ✓ feudal lords
    - ✓ cities made up of independent merchants
    - ✓ states ruled by clerics and smaller political entities such as principalities and duchies

- In medieval Europe there were two institutions with pretensions to power over the continent as a whole:
  1. the (Catholic) Church
     - the spiritual authority, with its centre in Rome
     - the influence of the Church spread far and penetrated deeply into people‘s lives
     - occupied a crucial role in the cultural and intellectual life of the Middle Ages
  2. Empire
     - known as the Holy Roman Empire
     - established in the tenth century in central, predominantly German-speaking, Europe
     - derived legitimacy from the Roman Empire, but had none of its political power.
     - It is best compared to a loosely structured federation of many hundreds of separate political units
- The political system of medieval Europe was thus a curious combination of the local and the universal
  - ➢ Yet, from the fourteenth century onward this system was greatly simplified as the state emerged as a political entity located at an intermediate level between the local and the universal
    - ✓ new states simultaneously set themselves in opposition to popes and emperors on the universal level
- This is how the state came to make itself independent and self-governing:

- ✓ The process started in Italy: began playing the pope against the emperor, eventually making themselves independent of both
- ✓ in Germany, the pope struggled with the emperor over the issue of who of the two should have the right to appoint bishops
  - ✓ While the two were fighting it out, the constituent members of the Holy Roman Empire took the opportunity to assert their independence
- ✓ the kings of France and England began acting more independently, defying the pope‘s orders
  - ✓ Between 1309 and 1377, the French even forced the pope to move to Avignon, in southern France
  - ✓ In England, meanwhile, the king repealed the pope‘s right to levy taxes on the people

- With the Reformation in the sixteenth century the notion of a unified Europe broke down completely as the Church began to split apart:
  - ✓ followers of Martin Luther and John Calvin had formed their own religious denominations which did not take orders from Rome
  - ✓ the new churches aligned themselves with the new states
  - ✓ various kings, such as Henry VIII in England or Gustav Vasa in Sweden, took advantage of the religious strife in order to further their own political agendas

- ✓ All over northern Europe, the new “Protestant” churches became state-run and church lands became property of the state

- the increasingly self-assertive states were not only picking fights with universal institutions but also with local ones
  - ➢ In order to establish themselves securely in their new positions of power, the kings rejected the traditional claims of all local authorities
    - ✓ It led to extended wars in next to all European countries
  - ➢ Peasants rose up in protest against taxes and the burdens imposed by repeated wars
    - ✓ There were massive peasant revolts in Germany in the 1520s
    - ✓ In the latter part of the sixteenth century, there were major peasant uprisings in Sweden, Croatia, England and Switzerland
  - ➢ In France, in the middle of the seventeenth century, the nobility rose up in defense of its traditional rights and in rebellion against the encroachments of the king
- From the sixteenth century onwards the states established the rudiments of an administrative system and raised armies
  - ✓ fight their own peasants and in order to defend themselves against other states
- The early modern state was more than anything an institutional machinery designed to develop and extract resources from society

- ✓ state-building was expensive, the search for money became a constant concern
- ✓ In return for their taxes, the state provided ordinary people with defense and a rudimentary system of justice

- military confrontation of the era
  - ✓ in early modern Europe it was no longer the competing claims of local and universal authorities that had to be combated but instead the competing claims of other states
  - ✓ The Thirty Years‘ War, 1618–1648
    - was the bloodiest
    - As a result of the war Germany‘s population was reduced by around a third, Swedish troops destroyed
    - It was often called a religious conflict since Catholic states confronted Protestants
  - ✓ Yet, Protestant and Catholic countries sometimes fought on the same side
    - the war concerned which state should have hegemony (or dominance) over Europe
    - The main protagonists were two Catholic states, France and Austria
    - Sweden – a Protestant country – intervened on France‘s side and in the end no dominant power emerged
- The Treaty of Westphalia, 1648
  - ✓ concluded the 30 years of warfare

- ✓ symbolize the new way of organizing international politics
- ✓ From this point onwards
  - international politics was a matter of relations between states and no other political units
- ✓ All states were sovereign:
  - they laid claims to the exclusive right to rule their own territories and to act, in relation to other states, as they themselves saw fit
  - All states were formally equal and they had the same rights and obligations
  - states interacted with each other in a system in which there was no overarching power
- ❖ Sovereignty and formal equality led to the problem of anarchy

- The practices of diplomacy
  - ✓ relations had become vastly more complicated
  - ✓ In order to avoid misunderstandings and unnecessary conflicts, the different rulers began dispatching ambassadors to each other‘s courts
  - ✓ This diplomatic network provided
    - a means of gathering information, of spying
    - also a way of keeping in touch with one another, of carrying out negotiations and concluding deals
  - ✓ The practices of diplomacy soon expanded to include a number of mutually advantageous provisions:
    - embassies were given extraterritorial rights and legal immunity

- diplomatic dispatches were regarded as inviolable
- ambassadors had the right to worship the god of their choice

✓ Diplomatic practices were never powerful enough to prevent war, indeed wars continued to be common

✓ it was the European model of statehood and the European way of organizing international relations that eventually came to organize all of world politics.

✓ It was only in the nineteenth century that relations between Europe and the rest of the world were irrevocably transformed

❖ Reason was economic changes taking place in Europe itself

- As a result of this so called "industrial revolution" the Europeans could produce many more things and do it far more efficiently
- As cheap, mass-produced goods flooded European markets, the Europeans began looking for new markets overseas.

- Towards the end of the nineteenth century, other European countries joined in this scramble for colonies, not least in Africa

✓ Colonial possessions became a symbol of "great power" status

✓ by the time of the First World War in 1914, most parts of the world were in European hands

❖ There were some exceptions to this rule – China, Japan, Siam, Persia, Ethiopia and Nepal, among

others – but even in these ostensibly independent countries the Europeans had a strong presence

- ❖ But this was not how the European state and the European way of organizing international relations
- ❖ came to spread to the rest of the world, at least not directly

- a colonized country is the very opposite of a sovereign state
  - ✓ the colonized peoples had no nation-states and enjoyed no self-determination
  - ✓ Since the Europeans only would grant sovereignty to states that were similar to their own To create such Europe-like states was thus the project in which all non-European political leaders engaged
- Once they finally made themselves independent in the decades after the Second World War, as an international climate of decolonization took hold, all new states had a familiar form
  - ✓ They had their respective territories and fortified borders
  - ✓ their own capitals, armies, foreign ministries, flags, national anthems
  - ✓ and all the other paraphernalia of European statehood
    - ❖ Whether there were alternative, non-European, ways of organizing a state and its foreign relations was never discussed

1.4. Actors in International Relations

- International Relations (IR) traditionally focused on interactions between states

- ❖ However, this conventional view has been broadened over the years to include relationships between all sorts of political entities (polities) including:
  - ✓ international organizations
  - ✓ multinational corporations
  - ✓ societies citizens
- IR captures a vast array of themes

1.4.1. State Actors

- there are no fewer than 195 states
- they have a territorial extension
- Are surrounded by borders which tell us where one state ends and another begins
- all states have their own capitals, armies, foreign ministries, flags and national anthems
- All states call themselves "sovereign", meaning:
  - ✓ they claim the exclusive right to govern their respective territories in their own fashion
- According to a time-honoured metaphor, we can talk about international politics as a "world stage" on which the states are the leading actors
- international politics come to be defined in terms of interactions between states
- "international" is structurally differentiated from the "domestic"
  - according to "realist" perspective
  - ✓ international – anarchical
  - ✓ domestic – hierarchical

- State sovereignty comes to be the defining element in the study of international relations, even where other perspectives challenge the primacy of the state

1.4.2. Non-State Actors

- Includes: global firms, international governmental institutions, non-governmental organizations
- multinational corporations (MNCs)
  - ✓ often with headquarters in one state and operational capability in a range of others
- trans-governmental organizations
  - ✓ relations between players are not controlled by the central foreign policy of the state
  - ✓ such as the exchange rate of a state's currency being determined by the money markets.
    - ❖ However, despite all the challenges and many new theories of international politics/relations the state remains, for many, the primary actor in international politics
- the term "international relations" has for centuries inferred a particular concern with relations between nations, it does not have to remain so confined
  - ✓ Thus, contrary to the narrow traditionalist realist view of international relations and foreign policy/relations, which focuses on the physical security and protection of the territory of the state and its people, one needs to look wider.
- the traditional conception of the state as the main framework of political interaction and the main point of reference for both

society and the individuals within it has lost a lot of its meaning and importance

- ✓ If we look at the world around us, state borders do not seem to accurately delimitate global affairs
- ✓ majority of global interactions – be they related to global finance, production, education, personal and professional travel, labor migration or terrorism – no longer occur via state channels the way they once did

- the increased focus on non-state actors and cross-border issues has marked a close-to-revolutionary turn in IR
  - ✓ could be interpreted as a shift away from the "inter-national" (between-states) to the "trans-national" (across/beyond-states and their borders)
  - ✓ In today's world, few societal and political issues, challenges and problems are neatly confined by the borders of individual states or even groups of states
  - ✓ Thinking about world affairs in "trans-national" rather than in purely "inter-national" terms therefore seems more of an analytical necessity than just a choice
- The following dramatically altered the general dynamics in politics and global affairs
  - Individuals and groups interact across borders
  - International commercial aviation and the rapid spread of information technologies
    - ✓ increased people's mobility and the rate at which interactions occur across and beyond state borders
  - ability for common people to store, transfer and distribute large amounts of information

- possibility for data to travel across the world in virtually no time
- increasing availability of high-speed internet

- Social media
  - provide accessible platforms of communication
  - allow for the projection and promotion of ideas across borders at virtually no cost to the individual or group generating and advocating them
  - Various political agendas – be they progressive, revolutionary or outright dangerous – can unfold in a relatively uncontrolled and unregulated way
    - ✓ posing real challenges to governmental agencies and the political leaders that try to improve and direct them
  - Random individuals can potentially start a revolution from their homes, bypassing any conventional conceptions of power and transcending spatial and material boundaries to the point where political activity and even confrontation become weightless and immaterial altogether IR and you

1.5. Levels of Analysis in International Relations

- traditional or conventional IR was not concerned with any potential distinctions between different levels of analysis or theoretical perspectives
- J. David Singer: highlights another value in thinking of IR as something that can be studied from different and distinctive perspectives

- ✓ Being clear about our level of analysis can prevent us from indulging in analytical “cherry-picking”, that is to say, from randomly gathering evidence across different levels in pursuit of an answer to our research questions

- the analytical consequences of drifting between levels: that our search for evidence will need to be comprehensive and that we might have to look at a different set of data or material for each additional aspect
- From the 1950s onwards, more and more IR scholars endeavored to specify the focus of their analysis more clearly
  - ✓ Kenneth Waltz‘s Man, the State and War: A Theoretical Analysis (1959) which introduced an analytical framework for the study of IR that distinguished between what he referred to as different “images” of an issue:
    - the individual
    - the state
    - the international system

1.5.1. The individual level

- we would look at the behaviors, motivations, beliefs and orientation of the individual in affecting a particular international phenomenon
- the psychology and emotions behind people‘s actions and decisions
  - ✓ their fears
  - ✓ their visions
  - ✓ their access to information
  - ✓ their capacity to make a difference

- Psychological factors are also an important factor in the analysis of foreign policy
  - ✓ particular mindsets and perceptions of political leaders and key actors might influence their decisions and behavior
- Focusing on the individual level and, say, particular actions of specific personalities in the public realm–be they politicians, diplomats or bankers – would lead us to drawing different conclusions again about the causes and consequences that phenomenon

1.5.2. The group level

- break the analysis down into certain kinds of groups, how they relate to the state level and where they position themselves with respect to the global dimension of the issues they are dealing with
- A group-level analysis focusing on foreign policy would look, for example, at the role of lobbying groups and the way they influence national decision-making on an issue.
- A group-level analysis could be interested in activist/pressure groups like “Anonymous” that seek to influence the global debate about the winners and losers of globalization and capitalism, and so forth

1.5.3. The state level

- the main focus remains on the state as the dominant unit of analysis
- This enduring focus on the state, and therefore, on the state level of analysis, is referred to as the relative “state-centrism” of the discipline

- IR scholars conceive of the state as a point of reference for other types of actors
- the state acts as the arena in which state officials, politicians and decision-makers operate.
- The state is seen as the framework that encapsulates society and as the main point of reference for the individual
- an assumption IR scholars have made about the state also being the main location of power within the international sphere
  - ✓ state is where power is primarily concentrated and located
- today's political life remains managed in the state framework, based on issues like national security, domestic cohesion or internal stability
- States form the primary kind of actor in major international organizations such as UN
- states still hold monopoly on violence – the exclusive right to the legitimate use of physical force.
- A state level analysis might be interested to look at any one of the following:
  - ✓ consider states as actors in their own right
  - ✓ how states interact with each other to deal with the crisis/ their foreign policy
  - ✓ how they build off each other's suggestions and react to international developments and trends
  - ✓ how they cooperate
  - ✓ how we look at them as competitors and antagonists

- A state-level study would also require careful consideration of what kinds of states we are looking at
  - how they are ordered politically
  - their geographical position
  - their historical ties and experiences
  - their economic standing
- It would likely also look at the foreign policy of states, Key indicators of the foreign policy of states:
  - policies proposed and decided by governments
  - statements of top-level politicians
  - role and behavior of diplomats and their adjoining bureaucratic structures.

1.5.4. The system level

- conceive the global system as the structure or context within which states cooperate, compete and confront each other over issues of national interest
- It is a level above the state
- the distribution of power amongst states is
  - unipolarity - is one main concentration of power
  - bipolarity – two
  - multipolarity – several
- global circumstances are seen to condition the ability and opportunity of individual states and groups of states to pursue their interests in cooperative or competitive ways
- international system is “anarchic” - lacks a central government (or international sovereign) that regulates and controls what happens to states in their dealings with each other

- international system can be conceived of as made up of states, groups of states, organizations, societies or individuals within and across those societies
- IR generally distinguishes between three levels of analysis:
  - ➢ the system, the state, the individual.
    - but the group level is also important to consider as a fourth
- A system-level study would need to consider
  - ✓ global linkages that go beyond single interactions between states
  - ✓ balance of power between states and how that determines what happens in global politics
  - ✓ include developments that are even outside the immediate control of any particular state or group of states, such as
    - ○ global economy
    - ○ transnational terrorism
    - ○ the internet
- A global level would give us the big picture and help us to grasp wide ranging dynamics that emerge from the global economic system to affect its various components, states, national economies, societies, and individuals

1.6. The Structure of International System

- political power is usually distributed into three main types of systems
  - ✓ they reflect the number of powerful states competing for power and their hierarchical relationship
    1) uni-polar system

- there is one state with the greatest political, economic, cultural and military power and hence the ability to totally control other states

❖ in both bipolar and multipolar systems there is no one single state with a preponderant power and hence ability to control other states

❖ states in such systems are forced to balance each other's power

2) bipolar system
   - there are two dominant states (super powers)
   - less powerful states join either sides through alliance and counter alliance formations
   - problem with bipolar system is that it is vulnerable for zero-sum game politics because when one superpower gains the other would inevitably lose
   - Example: the world was under bipolar system is the cold war period

3) multipolar system
   - the most common throughout history
   - reflects various equally powerful states competing for power
   - In such system, it is possible to bring change without gaining or losing power
   - Example: During the period around World War I

- Power
  - It is the currency of international politics. As money is for economics

- It determines the relative influence of actors and it shapes the structure of the international system
- international relations is essentially about actors‘ power relations in the supra-national domain
- Hans Morgenthau, a famous thinker of realism theory in IR, argues that International politics, like all other politics, is a struggle for power
- power is the blood line of international relations
- Power can be defined in terms of both relations and material (capability) aspects
  - ➢ relational definition of power:
    - ✓ formulated by Robert Dahl
    - ✓ understands power as “A‘s” ability to get “B” to do something it would not otherwise do
    - ✓ wherever capabilities are equal, power tends to vanish totally
    - ✓ However, a small rise in the capabilities of one of the two nations could translate into a major advantage in terms of power balance
    - ✓ historical example: The United States and Soviet Union
      - United States emerged as more powerful than Russia and in consequence managed to exercise power over Russia- meaning the USA owned the ability to get Russia to do what Russia would not otherwise do.

- Anarchy

- a situation where there is absence of authority (government) be it in national or international/global level systems
  - ✓ Within a country “anarchy” refers to a breakdown of law and order
  - ✓ In relations between states “anarchy” refers to a system where power is decentralized and there are no shared institutions with the right to enforce common rules.
- anarchical world is a world where everyone looks after themselves and no one looks after the system as a whole
  - ✓ states had to rely on their own resources or to form alliances through which the power of one alliance of states could be balanced against the power of another alliance
  - ✓ such power balances were precarious, easily subverted, and given the value attached to territorial acquisitions, states had an incentive to engage in aggressive wars
  - ✓ As a result, the new international system was characterized by constant tensions and threats of war

- Sovereignty
  - it can be defined as
    - ➢ internal sovereignty - a state‘s ultimate authority within its territorial entity

- ➢ external sovereignty - state's involvement in the international community
  - sovereignty denotes double claim of states from the international system
    - ✓ autonomy in foreign policy
      And
    - ✓ independence/freedom in its domestic affairs

1.7. Theories of International Relations

- politics of global interactions is more accessible now in the present age than it ever has been in the past
- Relationships which take place across state boundaries seem, therefore, to include interactions involving not only the diplomatic core or representatives of our individual states, but the business community, the media, charitable organizations and so on
- Theories of international relations allow us to understand and try to make sense of the world around us through various lenses, each of which represents a different theoretical perspective

1.7.1. Idealism/Liberalism

- was referred to as a "utopian" theory
- view human beings as innately good and believe peace and harmony between nations is not only achievable, but desirable
- Immanuel Kant developed the idea:
  - states that shared liberal values should have no reason for going to war against one another

- the more liberal states there were in the world, the more peaceful it would become
  - ✓ since liberal states are ruled by their citizens and citizens are rarely disposed to desire war
- His ideas have resonated and continue to be developed by modern liberals, most notably in the democratic peace theory, which posits that democracies do not go to war with each other, for the very reasons Kant outlined

- liberals have faith in the idea that the permanent cessation of war is an attainable goal
- US President Woodrow Wilson addressed his famous "Fourteen Points" to the US Congress; the last of his points was to create a general association of nations, which became the League of Nations
  - ✓ It was created largely for the purpose of overseeing affairs between states and implementing, as well as maintaining, international peace.

liberal internationalism

- from 1919 to the 1930s, the discipline was dominated by what is conventionally referred to as liberal internationalism
- primary concern of this approach was that:
  - ✓ conditions which had led to the outbreak of the First World War and the devastation which followed should not be allowed to occur in the future
- It suggested that the prospects for the elimination of war lay with a preference for:

- ✓ democracy over aristocracy
- ✓ free trade over autarky
- ✓ collective security over the balance of power system

- The two interrelated ideas that emerge from Kant's reflections on a perpetual peace centered on
  - democratic governance and
  - institutionalized law-governed relations of cooperation between states.
- two formative pillars of liberal internationalism
  - ➢ democracy
  - ➢ free trade
- A system of "collective security" was advocated to replace antagonistic alliance systems with an international order based on the rule of law and collective responsibility

the League of nations collapse

- When the League collapse due to the outbreak of the Second World War in 1939, its failure became difficult for liberals to comprehend, as events seemed to contradict their theories
- liberalism failed to retain a strong hold and a new theory emerged to explain the continuing presence of war

international law

- It refers to the body of customary and conventional rules which are binding on civilized states in their intercourse with each other

- Liberals argue that international law offers a mechanism by which cooperation among states is made possible
- It provides the normative framework for political discourse among members of the international system
- the purpose of international law is thus to regulate the conducts of governments and the behaviors of individuals within states
- states are the subjects of international law in the sense that they are in principle obliged to implement the decisions of international tribunals or courts
- international law provides the normative framework for political discourse among members of the international system
  - ✓ The framework does not guarantee consensus, but it does foster the discourse and participation needed to provide conceptual clarity in developing legal obligations and gaining their acceptance
- international law performs two different functions:
  i. provide mechanisms for cross-border interactions
     - It is "operating system" of international law
  ii. to shape the values and goals these interactions are pursuing
     - It is "normative system" of international law
- the legal standing of international law is a contentious issue among scholars. There are three competing views on this matter
  - ➢ international law is not a law at all but a branch of international morality

- ➢ it is a law in all senses of the term
- ➢ it is a matter of definition

- As a result, the operating system of international law functions in some ways as a constitution does in a domestic legal system and not as law proper - i.e
  - ✓ it does nothing beyond setting out the consensus of its constituent actors on distribution of authority, rights and responsibilities for governance within the international system

1.7.2. Realism

- international law and diplomatic history, was transformed to an intellectual agenda which placed power and self-interest at the forefront of concern

➢ E.H. Carr

- Carr‘s “Twenty Years‘ Crisis”, published in 1939
- Carr called for a “science” of international relations, one which would move away from what he saw as the wishful thinking of liberal internationalism
- Carr‘s text called for a move away from utopian doctrine which, he suggested, was based on an unrealistic negation of power and its impact on international politics

- Realists argue that values are context bound, that morality is determined by interest, and that the conditions of the present are determined by historical processes

- The formative assumptions of realism as a school of thought centre on the view that the international system is “anarchic” in the sense that it is devoid of an all-encompassing authority
  - ✓ inter-national law are non-binding and ultimately ineffectual in the regulation of relations between states
- realism locates its roots further back, citing Thucydides, Machiavelli and Hobbes as its founding voices

➢ Hans Morgenthau
- asserts that “realism” assumes that its key concept of interest defined as
  - ❖ power is an objective category which is universally valid, but it does not endow that concept with a meaning that is fixed once and for all
- international politics, like all politics, is a struggle for power
- the realism expressed by Morgenthau purports to be scientific and explanatory
- Theories of international relations must be consistent with the facts and it is these which must be the ultimate test of the validity of theoretical statements
  - ✓ like other realists, hence assumes a clear separation of fact and value, of theory and practice

➢ Hedley Bull
- criticized Morganthau‘s approaches. His concern was that relations between states could not be reduced to

measurable attributes of power or models of decision-making
    - Bull‘s, “The Anarchical Society” first published in 1977, came to represent what subsequently has been referred to as the “English School”, demarcated from the United States-dominated realist and scientific perspective mainly through its normative approach to the subject

- By the late 1950s and into the 1960s we see a discipline dominated by realist conceptions of international relations
- Realism gained momentum during the Second World War when it appeared to offer a convincing account for how and why the worst conflict in known history originated after a period of supposed peace and optimism
- As its name suggests, advocates of realism purport it reflects the “reality” of the world and more effectively accounts for change in international politics

➢ Thomas Hobbes
    - He described human beings as living in an order-less state of nature that he perceived as a war of all against all
        - ✓ To remedy this, he proposed that a “social contract” was required between a ruler and the people of a state to maintain relative order

➢ Kenneth Waltz

- define a neo-realist agenda and absolutely dominated the discipline and some would argue do so to the present day
- Waltz focuses on the international system itself and seeks to provide a structuralist account of its dynamics and the constraints it imposes on state behavior
- international system is, for Waltz, anarchical and hence perpetually threatening and conflictual
- What is of interest to Waltz is the imperatives of the international system and the distribution of capabilities within it
  - ✓ This is hence a structural account, but it is an account that markedly differs in approach and substantive content from the neo-Marxist structuralism
  - ✓ It has much akin to realism and must therefore be placed within that perspective

- war seems more common than peace to realists indeed they see war as inevitable
- One central area that sets realism and liberalism apart is how they view human nature
  - ➢ Realists
    - ✓ do not typically believe that human beings are inherently good, or have the potential for good, as liberals do. Instead, they claim individuals act in their own self-interest

        - ✓ people are selfish and behave according to their own needs without necessarily taking into account the needs of others
        - ✓ believe conflict is unavoidable and perpetual and so war is common and inherent to humankind
- For realists
    - politics is primarily about domination as opposed to cooperation between states
    - realist lens magnifies instances of war and conflict and then uses those to paint a certain picture of the world
    - they arrive at a more pessimistic view
        - ✓ due to their focus on the centrality of the state and its need for security and survival in an anarchical system where it can only truly rely on itself
    - describe IR as a system where war and conflict is common and periods of peace are merely times when states are preparing for future conflict.
- For Liberals
    - Liberals lens blur out areas of domination and instead bring areas of cooperation into focus
    - share an optimistic view of IR
    - believing that world order can be improved, with peace and progress gradually replacing war
- It is important to understand that there is no single liberal or realist theory
    - ✓ Scholars in the two groups rarely fully agree with each other, even those who share the same approach

- both realism and liberalism have been updated to more modern versions (neoliberalism and neorealism) that represent a shift in emphasis from their traditional roots
- Both liberalism and realism consider the state to be the dominant actor in IR and typically regarded as possessing ultimate power, although liberalism does add a role for non-state actors such as international organizations
  - ✓ This includes the capacity to enforce decisions, such as declaring war on another nation, or conversely treaties that may bind states to certain agreements

➢ Liberalism
  - ✓ argue that organizations are valuable in assisting states in formulating decisions and helping to formalize cooperation that leads to peaceful outcomes

➢ Realists
  - ✓ believe states partake in international organizations only when it is in their self-interest to do so

❖ Many scholars have begun to reject these traditional theories over the past several decades because of their obsession with the state and the status quo

1.7.3. Structuralism/Marxism

- Marxism is an ideology that argues that a capitalist society is divided into two contradictory classes:
  - ➢ the business class (the bourgeoisie) and
  - ➢ the working class (the proletariat)
    - ○ proletariats are at the mercy of the bourgeoisie who control their wages and therefore their standard of living

- Marx hoped for an eventual end to the class society and overthrow of the bourgeoisie by the proletariat
- It concentrated on the inequalities that exist within the international system, inequalities of wealth between the rich "North" or the "First World" and the poor "South" or the "Third World"
- the structuralist paradigm focused on dependency, exploitation and the international division of labor which relegated the vast majority of the global population to the extremes of poverty, often with the complicities of elite groups within these societies
- As many in this tradition argued, most states were not free they were subjugated by the political, ideological and social consequences of economic forces
- The basis of such manifest inequality was the capitalist structure of the international system which accrued benefits to some while causing, through unequal exchange relations, the impoverishment of the vast majority of others
- pluralism and its liberal associations had viewed networks of economic interdependence as a basis of increasing international cooperation founded on trade and financial interactions
    - ➢ neo-Marxist structuralism viewed these processes as the basis of
        - ○ inequality, the debt burden, violence and instability
- Major writers in the structuralist perspective emerged from Latin America, Africa and the Middle East, primary among

which were Andre Gunter Frank and Samir Amin, both of whom concentrated on dependency theory

1.7.4. Constructivism

- commonly viewed as a middle ground between mainstream theories and the critical theories
- constructivists highlight the importance of values and shared interests between individuals who interact on the global stage
- Alexander Wendt
  - ✓ described the relationship between agents (individuals) and structures (such as the state)
  - ✓ His famous phrase "anarchy is what states make of it"
- the core of constructivism, is that the essence of international relations exists in the interactions between people
  - ❖ After all, states do not interact; it is agents of those states, such as politicians and diplomats, who interact
- International anarchy could even be replaced with a different system if a critical mass of other individuals (and by proxy the states they represent) accepted the idea
- IR is, then, a never-ending journey of change chronicling the accumulation of the accepted norms of the past and the emerging norms of the future. As such, constructivists seek to study this process

1.7.5. Critical Theories

- refer to a wide spectrum of theories that have been established in response to mainstream approaches in the field, mainly liberalism and realism
- critical theorists share one particular trait – they oppose commonly held assumptions in the field of IR

- Critical theories are valuable because they identify positions that have typically been ignored or overlooked within IR
  - ✓ also provide a voice to individuals who have frequently been marginalized, particularly women and those from the Global South
- Critical theorists who take a Marxist angle often argue that the internationalization of the state as the standard operating principle of international relations has led ordinary people around the globe becoming divided and alienated, instead of recognizing what they all have in common as a global proletariat

Post-colonialism

- It differs from Marxism by focusing on the inequality between nations or regions, as opposed to classes
- effects of colonialism are still felt in many regions of the world
- This approach acknowledges that politics is not limited to one area or region and that it is vital to include the voices of individuals from other parts of the world
- Edward who developed the prominent “Orientalist” critique, said describing how the Middle East and Asia were inaccurately depicted in the West
- more focus within the discipline was placed on including the viewpoints of those from the Global South to ensure that Western scholars no longer spoke on their behalf
- Postcolonial scholars are, therefore, important contributors to the field as they widen the focus of enquiry beyond IR‘s traditionally “Western” mindset.

- Generally, realists believe that international organizations appear to be successful when they are working in the interests of powerful states. But, if that condition is reversed and an organization becomes an obstacle to national interests, then the equation may change
  - ✓ A contemporary example would be the United States invading Iraq in 2003 despite the Security Council declining to authorize it
  - ✓ On the other hand, liberals would argue that without the United Nations, international relations would likely be even more chaotic
  - ✓ A constructivist would look at the very same example and say that while it is true that the United States ignored the United Nations and invaded Iraq, by doing so it violated the standard practices of international relations
  - ❖ Examining the difficulties the United States faced in its international relations following 2003 gives considerable weight to the constructivist and liberal viewpoints
- Marxists would argue that any international body, including the United Nations, works to promote the interests of the business class
- After all, the United Nations is composed of (and was built by) states who are the chief protagonists in global capitalism – the very thing that Marxism is opposed to
- United Nations can be said to be dominated by imperial (or neo-imperial) powers

- ✓ Imperialism, according to Marxist doctrine, is the highest stage of capitalism

- he United Nations, then, is not an organization that offers any hope of real emancipation for citizens
- post-colonialists would argue that the discourse perpetuated by the United Nations is one based on cultural, national or religious privilege
  - ✓ it has no African or Latin American permanent members, the Security Council fails to represent the current state of the world
  - ✓ also point to the presence of former colonial powers on the Security Council and how their ability to veto proposals put forward by other countries perpetuates a form of continued indirect colonial exploitation of the Global South

More Quick Notes, Telegram: @campus_handout / https://t.me/campus_handout

Chapter Two : Understanding Foreign Policy and Diplomacy

Foreign policy

- It is the actions, decisions and goals that states pursue towards the outside world
- the deriving motives behind foreign policy is the pursuit of **national interest**
  - ✓ States adopt foreign policy to achieve and promote their national interests
- Foreign policy is shaped by both external/systemic factors and internal factors
  - ➢ **external/systemic factor**
    - International regimes, international organizations
    - the prevalence of great powers at international level
  - ➢ **internal factors**
    - economic, technological and military capabilities of states

2.1. Defining National Interest

National interest

- the raison de`tat, (the reason of state), to justify its actions and policy towards other states at international level

- set of values, orientation, goals and objectives a given country would like to achieve in its international relations

controversies on the exact meaning, scope and contents of national interests

- ➢ According to A. K. Holsti
  - ✓ an image of the future state of affairs and future set of conditions that governments through individual policy makers aspire to bring about by wielding influence abroad and by changing or sustaining the behaviors of other states
  - ✓ Power or the ability to influence the behaviors of other states is underscored as the primary instrument to implement national interest
- ➢ According to Seabury
  - ✓ In normative sense - set of purposes which a nation…should seek to realize in the conduct of its foreign relations
  - ✓ descriptive sense - those purposes which the nation [states] through its leadership appears to pursue persistently over time

whether national interest can be defined objectively(science) or whether it is a subjective enterprise (art)

- ➢ For Plato

- the good of the polis (that is the public good) could best be arrived at by **philosopher king** aided by a few highly learned, detached and fair-minded advisors
- Plato's ideas have been used as the inspiration for **dictatorial forms of government**
  - ✓ assuming that they should emphasize substance and wisdom of policies rather than procedural issues such as public debate, consultation, participation and criticism
  - ✓ **one person** with strength, wisdom, knowledge, and, above all, power can make good decisions than participatory decision making

Note

- foreign policy decision is not necessarily a clear-cut and rational process, Policies are often generated through great internal political and bureaucratic debates

criteria used in defining national interest

1. **Operational Philosophy**
   - Depending on time, location, your orientation toward the world around you, and in particular the action of your predecessors, you may choose one of two major style of operation
     - ➢ act in a bold and sweeping fashion/ **synoptic orientation**

- ✓ Up on taking office, introduce major new practices, policies, and institutions and discontinue
- ✓ assuming there is enough information to develop a major policy with some confidence that its consequence can be **predicted** or **controlled**

➢ act in caution, probing, and experimental fashion/ **incremental**

- ✓ following the **trial and error approach**
- ✓ assuming complexity of political and economic problems and worrying about their consequence
- ✓ seeks to perfect existing legislations, policies, institutions and practices

2. Ideological Criteria

- identify their friends or enemies countries using the litmus test of ideology
- Example: During cold war, the ideology of communism and capitalism

3. Moral and Legal Criteria

- act **morally**
- moral behavior, in international politics involves
  - ✓ keeping your promise –treaties
  - ✓ living and letting others live (the poor and the disadvantaged)
  - ✓ avoiding exploitation and uneven development between the developing countries and the developed ones

- Generally standing up for the principles to which you are morally committed and that are widely accepted in your culture

4. **Pragmatic Criteria**
   - **orientation is low key, matter of fact**, not on emotions and professions
   - look at issues and events around you and the world with sense of prudence and with sort of rationality
   - Act on the basis of the scientific analysis of cost and benefit or merit and demerit to your country interest
   - **without considering normative issues**, issues that involves judgment, be it bad or good
5. **Professional Advancement Criteria**
   - consideration of your professional survival and growth, in short your **personal** success
   - leaders might choose conformity to either to popular pressure or to strong elites whose support they consider indispensable for their political survival
   - This attitude has been referred to cynically as the "**go along to get along effect**"
6. **Partisan Criteria**
   - equate the survival and the success of **your political party**, or **ethnic** or **religious origin** with the survival and success of your country

- equate the interest of **your organization** (the army, the foreign office, and so forth) with the national interest

7. Foreign Dependency Criteria

- usually applies to **less developing countries**, who had **fallen under the yoke of colonialism**, and now, even after political independence, kept the colonial ties with their ex-masters intact
- **dependent on their ex-colonial states** for technical aid, expertise and technology, sometimes even for their security
- As a result of this state of dependency, the less developing countries face **difficulties to defend and promote their national interest**

Views on determination of national interest

A.Realist view

- ✓ **prioritize pragmatic criteria** when defining national interest and employing foreign policy
- ✓ defines national interest in terms of **pursuits of power**
  - **power** is about establishing control or influencing the behaviors of others, either diplomatically or use of coercion
- ✓ International politics is a struggle among states and thus **the prime interest of state is survival and security among other things**
- ✓ national interest - ensuring survival and security of a state, than talking about justice and morality

- ✓ Leaders must be aware of that scope of national interest and their foreign policy should be proportional to their capabilities
  - prudence should be the virtue of leaders
  - **Prudence** is the ability to assess one's needs and aspirations while carefully balancing them against the needs and aspirations of others

B.Idealists view

- ✓ strong belief in the relevance of **legal**, **ideological** and **moral elements**
- ✓ They don't see legal and moral factors **apart from the so called "reality"**
- ✓ specific actions and objective of foreign policy have often been derived from **general moral and legal guidelines and principles** etc.

Note

- **Realists fail to recognize and prescribe solutions for addressing global problems** because of the exclusive emphasis given to state and national interest
- **Idealists believe on the prevalence of common problems of human beings** as environmental pollution, ecological imbalance, depletion of resource
  - ❖ The establishment of new institutions with global orientation may play vital role in addressing global problems, instead of the state-centric

particularism, States could no longer be viable actors in addressing cross-cutting problems by themselves

2.2. Understanding Foreign Policy and Foreign Policy Behaviors

2.2.1. Defining Foreign Policy

Foreign policy

- ✓ It is **something that a state would like to achieve** in its external relations with others
- ✓ It involves the **general purposes** and **specific strategies** a state employs to achieve or promote its national interest
- ✓ According to Rochester, foreign policy refers to
  - the **set of priorities and percepts** established by national leaders to **serve as guidelines** for choosing among various courses of action in specific situations in international affairs
- ✓ These objectives, **visions and goals state aspire to achieve** is commonly referred as national interest
  - All states would like to promote their national interest as their capability or power allows them to do
  - scope and content of foreign policy of a state is often determined by the **capabilities** of the concerned state

- ✓ **minimum goal a state would like to achieve is survival** - protect their physical, political, and cultural identities against any encroachment by other states
- ✓ Foreign policy also involves **specific instruments and tactics** that must be employed to realize those objectives and goals. The most widely employed **instruments** include
  - diplomatic bargaining
  - economic instruments
  - propaganda
  - terrorism (sabotage)
  - use of force (war)
  - ❖ Each instrument is used to **affect** the behaviors of other states, and **has an element of power**
- ✓ **Diplomacy** - states attempt to affect the behavior of others through bargaining that involves **less element of power** as compared to other instruments

2.2.2. Foreign Policy Objectives

- Foreign policy, just like any policy, sets **short term**, **middle term** and **long term goals and objectives** to be achieved in proportion to a state's capability
- Such classifications of foreign policy objectives is based on the combination of the three criteria

- the **value** placed on the objective
- the **time** element placed on its achievement
- the kind of **demands** the objective imposes on other states in international system

- **the foreign policy objectives of states categorizes in to three**

1. **Core Interests and Values (Short Range Objectives)**
   - those kinds of goals for which most people are willing to make ultimate sacrifices
   - stated in the form of **basic principles of foreign policy** and become article of faith that society **accepts without any questioning it**
   - related to the **self preservation** of political and economic systems, the people and its culture, and the territorial integrity of a state
     - ✓ **core interests and values**, is to ensure the **sovereignty** and **independence**
   - **others goals cannot be realized if the existence of the state and its political units are not ensured**
   - The exact definition of core value or interest in any given country depends on the attitudes of those who make foreign policy
     - Some governments place great values on controlling or defending neighboring territories

- ✓ **Extraterritoriality** - when the national interest and claims of a country is projected **beyond the limit of its geographic boundary**. Example: Israel and the United States

- States may think that their national interest is at risk when the interests and security of citizens, or kin ethnic or religious groups living in the neighboring states and other states are threatened
  - ✓ So, liberating or protecting the interests of such individuals and groups might be considered as part of its core national interest

2. Middle Range Objectives

- Unlike, the short range objective, the middle range objectives drastically varies across states, **due to** difference in the level of economic and technological progress, as well as the military capability
- Yet, **bottom point** that a state would like to achieve in its medium term is
  - ➢ to take a course of actions that have the highest impact on the **domestic economic and welfare** needs and expectation
- Social welfare and economic development, ca not be achieved through self-help, as most states have only limited resources, administrative services, and technical skills.

- ✓ **Interdependence** means that to satisfy domestic needs and aspirations, states would have to interact with others
- ✓ Trade, foreign aid, access to communication facilities, sources of supply, and foreign market are for most states necessary for increasing social welfare

3. Long- Range Objectives

- Long range goals are those plans, dreams, and visions concerning the ultimate political or ideological organization of the international system, and rules governing relations in that system

Note: In pressing for middle range goals , states make particular demands against particular interest

- in pursuing long range goals, states normally make **universal demands**, **for their purpose is no less than to reconstruct an entire international system** according to a universally applicable plan or vision
- long range visions and dreams may have **international repercussions** as far as they are complemented by the capabilities and powers
- Every country has its own visions and ambition proportional to its relative strength and capabilities to be realized in the long run

2.2.3. Foreign Policy Behavior: Patterns and Trends

- **Foreign policy behavior** refers to the **actions states take** towards each other
  - ✓ these actions usually are not as ends in themselves, but are **tied in some way with larger purposes**, from long range objectives to short term objectives
- **all foreign policy behavior ultimately boils down to three possible pattern**
  1) **self-preservation (maintaining the status quo)**
     - **maintaining** the status quo/ the existing reality **for one own benefit**
     - Example: USA
       - ✓ international institutions (IMF, World Bank, GATT/WTO) that were established following Second World War have been strongly shaped by United States
       - ✓ underlying philosophy of such institutions, and even the decision making procedures are all shaped to serve the global interests of the country
       - ✓ These days U.S has become the sole defender of the international system and the liberal economic-political order
  2) **self-extension (revising the status quo in one‘s own favor)**
     - **Changing** the reality **for one own benefit**

- Newly emerging powers such as China, India, Brazil, Germany and others are competing to **restructure** the international institutions and different regimes so as to **create enabling environment** to **promote their national interest**

3) **self-abnegation (revising the status quo in some else's favor)**
   - reflects the foreign policy trends that are being **displayed in Less Developing Countries**
   - Such countries may succumb to such challenges and **compromise** its long lasting national interest **for temporary and immediate benefits**

2.2.4. Foreign Policy Dimensions

- behavior can change over time and with different style of leaderships and circumstances
- **There are three Foreign Policy Dimensions**
  - **I. Alignment**
    - **alignment tendencies** - whether national leaders choose to ally with certain countries or to remain neutral
    - A country's alignment behavior can vary from time to time during its history in response to changing circumstances and policy decisions
    - alignment tendencies classified in to three
      - **A. Alliances**
        - ✓ formal **agreements** to provide mutual military assistance

- ✓ Allied countries can pool their military resources, acquire access to foreign bases and stake out territories that enemies are on notice
- ✓ alliance state also risks interference by allies in its domestic affairs, the possibility being dragged

B. Neutrality

- ✓ stance of formal **non partisanship** in world affairs
- ✓ **keeping a low profile, neutrals** may avoid some of the problems associated with alliances, particularly the generating of potential enemies and counter alliances
- ✓ Example: Switzerland - neutrality to an extreme case in refusing membership to United Nations till 2002

C. Nonalignment

- ✓ foreign policy pattern of most **developing state during cold war**
- ✓ movement-Non Alignment Movement (NAM) in which they called for a new foreign policy path/choice/ to be followed disregarding the both the West and East bloc politics and alliances
- ✓ Although that was practically impossible, NAM had noble agenda that called for the South-south cooperation

II. Scope

- Refers the scope of a country‘s activities and interests
- There are three kind of actors regarding scope
  1. **Global actors –** act in Global terms
     - interacting regularly with countries in nearly **every region of the world**
     - Example: USA, China
  2. **regional actors** – Act in regional terms
     - interacting primarily **with neighboring states in the same geographical area** except for contacts, frequently concerning economic issues such as trade
     - Example:
       - ✓ South Africa - in Africa in general and in Southern Africa in Particular
       - ✓ India - in South Asian region
  3. **Isolationism**
     - scope of a country‘s foreign policy to become **so narrow** that isolationism
     - Result by Some moments in history, such as **key weakness** or **geographic remoteness**
     - Few countries have ever been totally cut off from the outside world

- in an age of interdependence, isolationism becomes an increasingly **less viable foreign policy orientation**
- Example: Burma in 1960 and 70s,

III. Mode of Operation/ "Modus Opernadi'

✓ the method of operation to address different issues

➢ **Multilateral means**

✓ greater its tendency to seek solutions to problems through diplomatic forums in which **several states participate, such as the United Nations**, rather than utilizing purely bilateral, country to country approaches

✓ **Most developing countries** used the multilateral approaches because

- multilateral forum would enhance collective barraging power of these countries vis-a-vis other developed countries
- establishing bilateral relations (establishing Embassies and assigning diplomatic staffs) are often found to be costly

✓ **Regardless of the power and capability question**, countries may opt to use multilateral frameworks as the best strategy to address issues. Example: Germany, Scandinavian countries

➢ **Unilateral means**

- ✓ They play the **carrot and stick diplomacy** to affect the outcomes of events or influence the behaviors of others
  - like Intervention, threat of use of force and some time, use of force
- ✓ The **more unilateral a state** is the more likely to **initiate actions in international relations or to resist initiatives taken by others**

2.2.5. Instruments of Foreign Policy

1. Diplomacy

- **Diplomacy** - process between actors (diplomats, usually representing a state) who exist within a system (international relations) and engage in private and public dialogue
  - ✓ diplomacy can promote exchanges that enhance trade, culture, wealth and knowledge
- Diplomacy is not foreign policy but part of foreign policy
- state‘s foreign policy has two key ingredients; its actions and its strategies for achieving its goals
  - ➢ The interaction one state has with another is considered the act of its foreign policy. This act typically takes place via interactions between government personnel through diplomacy

- Diplomacy is a **complex game of maneuver** in which the **goal is to influence the behaviors of others in ones interest**

Past democracy

- practiced in formalistic and somewhat rigid manner that was limited to the bilateral relations of countries

Now days democracy

- involves powerful actors that are not states like international non-governmental organizations (INGOs) and international governmental organizations (IGOs), These actors regularly partake in areas of diplomacy and often materially shape outcomes.
- There arose multilateral diplomacy, public diplomacy, leader-to-leader (summitry diplomacy) in sharp contrast to secret diplomacy and bilateral diplomacy.

- The essence of diplomacy is **bargaining**
  - a means of settling differences over priorities between contestants through an **exchange of proposals** for **mutually acceptable solutions**
  - Diplomatic bargaining is used primarily to reach agreements, compromises, and settlements where governments objectives conflict

- The attempt to change the policies, actions, attitudes and objectives of other government and their diplomats by persuasion, offering rewards, exchange concessions, or making threats
  - ✓ Thus, like any foreign policy instruments, diplomatic bargaining also espouses an **element of power or influence**
- **Rules of Effective Diplomacy**
  - ➢ Be realistic - have goals **that much your ability** to achieve them
  - ➢ Be careful about what you say - **plans out** and **weighs** words carefully
  - ➢ Seek common ground - maintain a degree of **flexibility**
  - ➢ Understand the other side - Like appreciate an opponent‘s perspective even if you do not agree with it
  - ➢ Be patient - Being overly anxious can lead to concessions that are unwise and may convey weakness to an opponent
  - ➢ Leave avenues of retreat open - it is important to leave yourself and your opponent an “**Out**”
- In general, states make considerable use of what are known to be **“carrot and stick” approaches**
  - ➢ **stick approach**
    - ✓ Threats - involve hypothetical action
    - ✓ Punishment involve - area action
  - ➢ **carrot approach**

- ✓ Promise - is hypothetical action, aims at influencing the behaviors based on the future hope of giving something
- ✓ Reward - is a promise in action

2. Economic

- modern states rely up on each other for resources and commodities that enable them to develop and sustain viable economies
- degree of dependence and interdependence varies across states
- states often uses their **economic muscle to influence the behavior (action, perception and role) of others**
  - ✓ States may reward or punish states through the manipulation of economic policies
- economic, particularly trade instruments of foreign policy are normally used for three purposes, namely
  1. to achieve any foreign policy objective
  2. to increase a state‘s capability or deprive a potential enemy‘s capabilities
  3. to create economic satellites (guaranteed markets and resources of supply)
- When rewards are offered or economic punishment are threatened, at least two conditions must be fulfilled to make the exercise of influence effective

- the target of the influence or act must **perceive** that **there is a genuine need** for the reward or for the avoidance of the punishment
- **no alternative market or source of supply must be easily available** to the target

- **Techniques of economic reward and punishment**

1. Tariff

- Almost all foreign made products coming into a country are **taxed** for the purpose of raising revenue, protecting domestic producers from foreign competition, or other domestic economic reasons
- tariff structure can be used effectively as an inducement or punishment

2. Quota

- To **control** imports of some commodities
- supplier usually sends his goods into the country at a favorable price, but is **allowed to sell only a certain amount** in a given time period

3. Boycott

- **eliminates** the import of either a specific commodity or the total range of export products sold by the country against which the boycott is organized

4. Embargo

- to **deprive another country of goods prohibits its own business men from concluding its transactions** with commercial organization in the country against which the embargo is organized
- An embargo may be enforced either on specific category of goods or on the total range of goods that private businessmen normally send to the country being punished

5. Loans, Credits and Currency Manipulations

- Rewards may include **favorable tariff rates and quotas**, **granting loans** (favorable reward offered by the major powers to developing countries) or **extending credits**
- The choice of a technique or combinations of techniques to be used will be influenced by
  - ✓ the goals being pursued
  - ✓ the type of economic sensitivity &vulnerability

6. Foreign Aid

- **transfer** of money, goods, or technical advice from donor to recipient
- There are main type of aid program including, military aid, technical assistance, grants and commodity import program, and development loans
- **Note**
  - Most aid programs are obviously **not undertaken solely for humanitarian purpose**

- vast portion of the aid goes to a few countries-and sometimes not the countries with the most pressing needs Because their **strategic and symbolic importance in world politics**
- **Donors can easily manipulate economic and military aid program** to **change the internal and external policies of a government**

7. Military Aid

- probably the oldest type of aid which had been used for **buttressing alliances**
- In this aid scheme, the donors supply money and material, while the recipient provided most of the man power
- By helping recipients build up modern forces, the **donors hope to obtain some immediate political or security objective**
- military aid is used **to create local power balances** or preponderances, thus **reducing the likelihood that the donor will have to station troops abroad or intervene militarily to protect its interests**

2.3. Overview of Foreign Policy of Ethiopia