

1.1. Meaning of International Relations (IR)

Participation in international relations or politics is inescapable, given that no country/state/ in the world are self-sufficient/self-reliant/. Some are endowed with abundant resources, some are not. Some may have the potential to growth but may not tap its resources effectively due to lack of appropriate technology. Whether big or small, rich or poor, powerful or weak, the existence and development of one is highly dependent on the supply of resources or technology from others. Hence, entering into relations with other countries is inevitable.

A practical discipline that studies the multifaceted relations of different actors is International Relations (IR). The conventional definition of the field IR is the study of the relations of states, and that those relations are understood primarily in *diplomatic*, *military* and *strategic* terms – this is certainly the way in which diplomats, historians and most scholars of IR have defined the subject. It is devoted to the study of how the system of states could be made to work more effectively to enhance the power of law, peacefully manage interstate affairs, preserve order and minimize the prospect of war. International Relations as a discipline thus chiefly concerned with *what states do on the world stage and, in turn, how their actions affect other states*. This has the advantage of clearly identifying and limiting the subject matter and core concerns of the discipline, by concentrating on states as the central actors and limiting our study to how states conduct their relations with ‘others’, through foreign policy, diplomacy and war, for example. This definition is relatively state-centric since it confined the relevant unit of analysis to the state.

What is wrong with this *state-centric* (an ugly but useful piece of jargon) definition of the subject? The definition do not subsumed the roles of other non-state actors like NGOs, IGOs, MNCs and the private individuals on global politics. States may still be, much of the time, the dominant actors, but this is a pragmatic judgment rather than a matter of principle and, in any event, they must always acknowledge that on many issues other players are in the game. Thus the classical definition of IR is exclusive since it excludes the roles of other non-state actors in international arena. So, finding alternative definitions of IR became the preoccupations of scholars and the following are some of its contemporary understandings.

- ⇒ IR is the study of all human interactions across national boundaries and the factors that affect those interactions. These relationships linked with other actors such as intergovernmental organisations (IGOs), non-governmental organizations (NGOs), transnational corporations (TNCs) and notable individuals make them interdependent.
- ⇒ It is the study of the political and social interaction of states, non-state actors, and individuals in international arenas. **It** deals with the nature, conduct, and influences upon of various actors operating in a particular arena within the framework of anarchy.
- ⇒ It can also be defined as the study of **who gets what, when and how** in matters external to states or matters crossing national boundaries. The **who** of international relations refers the actors (states and non-states) who influence the conduct of international events whereas the **what** of international relations denotes goals actors sought to achieve from their intercourses. The **when** of international relations refers the time actors pursue goals (whether through continuous or episodic activities) and the **how** of international relations represents the instruments actors use to achieve goals like the use of military force, propaganda, foreign aid, diplomacy and others.

1.2. Foundational Questions of International Relations

- ☞ How can human nature be characterized?
- ☞ What is the relationship between the individual and the society?
- ☞ What are the characteristics and the roles of the state?
- ☞ How is the international system organized?

Nardy Digital Copy

1.3. Historical Development of International Relations

International Relations as a formal discipline is a relatively young discipline compared to other social sciences and humanities to which it is closely related. Although historians, international lawyers and political philosophers have written about international politics for many centuries, the formal recognition of a separate discipline of International Relations is usually thought to have occurred at the end of the First World War, 1919, with the establishment of a Chair of International Relations at the University of Wales. Other Chairs followed in Britain and the United States. Their central preoccupations was dealing with international conflict/war and secure peace and cooperation at international levels. Scholars of the day found war as the gravest problem facing humanity and articulation of how and why war began prioritized in their academic discourse. To give answers to these questions, they base their inquiry on WWI;

- ✓ What were the main causes of the First World War, and what was it about the old order that led national governments into a war which resulted in misery for millions?
- ✓ What were the main lessons that could be learned from the First World War? How could the recurrence of a war of this kind be prevented?
- ✓ On what basis could a new international order be created, and how could international institutions, and particularly the League of Nations, ensure that states complied with its defining principles?

In response to these questions, many members of the first 'school' or 'theory' of international relations maintained that war was partly the result of 'international anarchy' and partly the result of misunderstandings, miscalculations and recklessness on the part of politicians who had lost control of events in 1914. The field has got wide recognition and due attention across several European universities and elsewhere in the world following the conclusion of the Second World War.

1.4. Nature of International Relations

To some extent, IR is an interdisciplinary field of study. It is becoming eclectic in nature and the discipline enriched its subject matter by borrowing knowledge and theoretical ideas from such diverse fields as economics, history, law, philosophy, geography, sociology, anthropology, psychology, and cultural studies from time to time. New subject matters are frequently added to this field of study from time to time. Some universities offer separate degrees or departments for IR. Most, however, teach IR in political science classes, in which the focus is on the politics of economic relationships, or the politics of environmental management to take two examples. (The domestic politics of foreign countries, although overlapping with IR, generally make up the separate field of comparative politics).

1.5. Scopes of IR

International Relations as a field of study have its own scope and its scope can be defined by the *subfields* it encompasses. As hinted above, traditionally, the study of IR has focused on questions of war and peace—the subfield of **international security** studies. A concern with arms race, the crafting of treaties and alliances, the development and deployment of military capabilities, crisis and wars, and the causes of wars became logic extensions of these interests. If war gave birth to academic IR, the establishment of peace was its first mission. These are the subjects that dominated the study of IR in the past, especially in the 1950s and 1960s, and they continue to hold a central position in the field. Since the Cold War,

regional conflicts and ethnic violence have received more attention, while interdisciplinary peace studies programs and feminist scholarship have sought to broaden concepts of “security” further.

Moreover, the other prominent subject in the field of international relations in recent years has been the international political economy. IPE concerns trade and financial relations among nations and focuses on how nations have cooperated politically to create and maintain institutions that regulate the flow of international economic and financial transactions. Although these topics previously centered on relations among the world’s richer nations, the widening of globalization and multilateral economic institutions such as the World Trade Organization has pushed IPE scholars to focus on developing states as well. In addition, they pay growing attention to relations between developed and developing nations (often labeled North-South relations), including such topics as economic dependency, debt, foreign aid, and technology transfer. Also newly important are problems of international environmental management and of global telecommunications. The subfield of IPE is expanding accordingly. This subject involves the interactions of political and economic phenomena and the two affect each other. The international closely looks at the political effects of economic phenomena such as international monetary exchange rate, international loans and debt, intellectual property rights, and foreign direct investment. IR also emphasized on international trade, monetary exchange, debt, aids and FDI. Specifically, international political economy as one branches of IR uncovers how politics plays a role on international economics.

Other scholars have taken a special interest in human welfare at the global levels. They investigate how to improve the human condition in decentralized world with limited resources. What can be done with the refugees fleeing war and famine across national boundaries, what human rights standards can apply globally, how can the economic conditions of the poor countries improve as they confront with the problems of overpopulations, these and other related questions occupied the teaching of IR scholars with concern for human welfares.

Similarly, global warming might be regarded as an ‘issue’ in international relations which is slowly finding its way onto the agenda of international politics, but one which is at best a secondary concern for the world’s great ‘players’ like the USA or Japan. However, global warming might be perceived as a pressing concern to people living in small island Pacific states, which are facing the threat of rising sea levels. In this case, global warming is likely to be viewed as a vital security concern.

The other newer subject that have risen recently in international relations are **gender perspectives**, environmental issues, ethnicity and identity politics, terrorism, religious revivalism of fundamentalism. A feminist perspective has shed light on several international subjects, in particular drawing attention to male control culture as the cause of war and problems. Feminists are, in turn, entitled to point out that women constitute over 50 per cent of the world’s population and that the **marginalization** of women and their lives is a consequence of the indifference and, perhaps, self-interest of the already powerful, who for the most part are men. Though the topic emerged as recent issue in the field of IR, ethnicity or nationalism has becomes a potential force that might lead to disintegrations and ongoing civil wars if not well managed. The USSR and Yugoslavia can be a good example.

1.6. Actors of International Relations

Actors are individuals or a group that seeks to achieve goals by either *cooperating* or *conflicting* with others in a policy context in international relations. As introduced above, IR traditionally focused on interactions between states and studied decisions and acts of those governments in relation to other

governments. However, the traditional view that states dominate international relations has to give way to the recognition that multiple actors are now competing for authority and influence in the world. New actors now undertake roles alongside the state on the international stage. This makes the state not as the sole actor but as the primary actor among other influential actors. Consequently, we have two major actors in international relations: state and non-state actors.

1.6.1. State Actors

States are considered as the primary actors in international relations. According to Henderson, the term state can be defined as a **sovereign actor** with a central government ruling over a population and territory as well as representing and protecting that population in the international context. It can also be understood as a set of institutions that possess the authority to make the rules that govern the people, having internal and external sovereignty over a definite territory. In Max Weber's influential definition, it is that organization that has a "monopoly on the legitimate use of physical force within a given territory." It thus includes such institutions as the armed forces, civil service or state bureaucracy, courts, and police.

Modern states are unique from the traditional political systems or states in that modern states exercise **sovereign** power over its territory and people. Modern states are the highest and supreme institutions both at domestic and international level. Domestically the rules or government decisions and actions are supreme over other institutions such as religious or family or any kind of human association. Citizens obey the rules and dictates of the state. Sovereignty also infers state autonomy in its external/international/relations. There is no any power that can intervene in the internal and external affairs of the state. Thence, a state government answers to no higher authority; it exercises *sovereignty* over its territory—to make and enforce laws, to collect taxes, and so forth.

With few exceptions, each state has a capital city—the seat of government from which it administers its territory— and often a single individual who acts in the name of the state. We will refer to this person simply as the “state leader.” Often he or she is the *head of government* (such as a prime minister) or the *head of state* (such as a president, or a king or queen). In some countries, such as the United States, the same person is head of state and government. In other countries, the positions of the president or royalty, or even the prime minister, are symbolic. In any case, the most powerful political figure is the one we mean by “state leader,” and these figures are the key individual actors in IR, regardless of whether these leaders are democratically elected or dictators. The state actor includes the individual leader as well as bureaucratic organizations such as foreign ministries that act in the name of the state. (What the United States calls *departments* are usually called *ministries* elsewhere. U.S. *secretaries* are *ministers* and the State Department corresponds with a *foreign ministry*.)

1.6.2. Non-state Actors

National governments may be the most important actors in international relations, but they are strongly influenced by a variety of **non-state actors**—defined as actors that cross national boundaries and frequently jostle with states over policy outcomes. These include actors like ethnic groups, local governments, and individuals; Inter-Governmental Organizations (IGOs), International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGOs), Multinational Corporations (MNCs), various churches and terrorist organizations. All these actors, in one way or another, influences our every day lived experience, the conduct of interstate interaction and the global politics.

1.7. LEVELS OF ANALYSIS IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

The many actors involved in international relations contribute to the complexity of competing explanations and theories. One way scholars of IR have sorted out this multiplicity of influences, actors,

and processes is to categorize them into different *levels* or chunks, enables us to determine *what* decisions are made by *whom*, and under *what* constraints. A level of analysis is a perspective on IR based on a set of similar actors or processes that suggests possible explanations to “why” questions. IR scholars have proposed various level-of-analysis schemes, most often with three main levels (and sometimes a few sublevels between). These are: the *individual*, *state* and the *international system*, as K. Waltz identified in his work *Man, the State and War: A Theoretical Analysis* (1959). One thing that you should bear in mind is that no consensus among scholars over the most appropriate level of analysis.

A. Individual (Micro or First Image) Level Analysis

Every international event is the result, intended or unintended, of decisions made by individuals. So, all social explanation can be reduced to the level of individual actors. Here we would look at the behaviors, motivations, nature of humans, choices, abilities, unique personality, biographies, aims, beliefs and orientation of the individual from where we can create an *account* of world events. In doing this we are arguing that certain choices and decisions made by different people at different times are the things that we need to be looking at in explaining international relations. This level analysis might ask various questions like: Are there special political personalities? Do power seekers or belligerent personality types appear who, once positioned as leaders, are more likely to lead countries to war? Do people have innate biological characteristics that induce them, through herd like instincts, to follow an authoritarian leader, or are people individualistic by nature and resist authority altogether? How do individual decision makers process information and make decisions? And who make decisions? Are the biographies of “great leaders” worthy of study? Can they shape an era as Napoleon did? This level of analysis might explain World War II by examining the role of Hitler. It might look at the end of the cold war by studying Gorbachev. It might suggest that the economic reforms in China are a result of the transition from Mao Zedong’s leadership to Deng Xiaoping’s rule.

B. State (Meso or Second Image) level Analysis

One way to understand state-level analysis is to contrast it with system-level analysis. Both state-level analysts and system level analysts recognize that states have long been and continue to be the most powerful actors on the world stage. Unlike system-level analysts, however, who believe that the international system pressures states to behave in certain ways, state-level analysts contend that states are relatively free to decide what policies to follow. According to Singer, international system is the most comprehensive level of analysis that encompasses interactions of system alongside component parts of the system. International level of analysis helps in understanding patterns of interaction and also helps to make generalizations and therefore predictions. In other words, the systemic level of analysis creates the opportunity to study international relations in the whole. He argues that the main weakness of systemic level is its lack of details. In other words, in systemic approach, students have no choice but to ignore some details in favor of studying the whole. He argued that the strengthening characteristic of systemic orientation is its ability of prediction. Behaviors of actors, in systemic approach, can be predicted generally in terms of pressure structure of system force (Singer, 1961).

The state level analysis focuses on states. It exists between the international system and individual levels. It might be interested to look at any one of the following: it can consider states as actors in their own right as if they were clearly defined entities that have certain preferences, and accordingly, look at their actions and decisions to find an answer to our analytical questions; it may look at how states interact with each other to deal with the crisis – in other words, their foreign policy; how they build off each other’s suggestions and react to international developments and trends; how they cooperate, say, in the

framework of international organizations; or how we look at them as competitors and antagonists, each of them pushing for a stronger position in what makes up the world economy.

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 and their economic standing. It would likely also look at the foreign policy of states, meaning their approach to and practice of interacting with other states. Key indicators of the foreign policy of states would be the policies proposed and decided by governments, statements of top-level politicians but also the role and behavior of diplomats and their adjoining bureaucratic structures.

C. System (Macro or Third Image) Level of Analysis

This level of analysis involves a top down approach to the study of world politics. It examines state behavior by looking at the international system. In this level of analysis, the international system is the cause and state behavior is the effect. Characteristics of the international system cause states to behave the way they do. The following are some of the variables that we take into account to create explanations about the occurrences of international events.

☛ Characteristic of the international System

The international system is one such system with a mostly **horizontal authority** structure. It is based the idea that there is no higher authority that exercises power over a sovereign states. As such, the international system is anarchic; it has no overarching authority to make rules, settle disputes, and provide protection. Waltz (1959: 159), in this regard, argues that, with many sovereign states, with no system of law enforceable among them, with each state judging its grievances and ambition according to the dictates of its own reason or desire—conflict, sometimes leading to war, is bound to occur.

☛ Nature and Influences of Actors

Another characteristic of any system is its actors. What organizations operate in the system, and what impacts do they have on the course of international relations? We can answer these questions by dividing actors as state and non-state actors. Here we are advised to base our explanation on what roles all these actors contribute to the occurrence or resolution of international phenomena like war.

☛ Roles and Number of System Poles

Many analysts believe that a pivotal determinant of how any given system operates is the number **of** major power poles that it has. Some political scientists believe that the pattern of interaction varies according to the number of poles that a system has. It is possible, for example, to identify patterns or rules of the game for unipolar, bipolar, and multipolar systems. .

1. **Unipolar System**- a system dominated by one super power/empire. The hegemonic actor prevents or resolves conflicts by serving as “the Police Agent of the World.” *The distribution of power* is determined by the single super power. Unipolar system is similar with an inter-state structure governed by a government because one state tries to assume a world government while other states become dependent and less influential. *Power structure* is hierarchical in that power is concentrated in the hands of one powerful nation/empire. Using such powers, the hegemon assures international order and stability through punish violators and giving rewards to obedient actors. *No alliances* exist because the hierarchy is ruled by one centre of power. In history, we have experienced the emergence of single empires like the Romans and the Ottoman-Turks which assumed sorts of world

powers at various epochs. It is also argued that immediately after the Gulf War in 1991, many states, including the United States' closest allies and virtually all developing states, grew concerned that the international system *had* become unipolar.

2. **Bipolar System-** a system dominated by two contending super powers which in turn dominate other states and the international system at large. There are *two coalitions/alliances* formed and headed by the two super powers. In fact, there are ideological ties within the blocs. Alliances are *hierarchically* organized with the two powers as the leaders of their respective alliance. There is *conflict* between the two coalitions/blocs and especially between the bloc leaders. In our contemporary world, the **Cold War** (1947-1991) period can be an example. The states that allied to either of the two became the “**satellites**” and acquired huge military, financial and political support/assurances. The era is called cold war for the two super giants never fought full-scale “hot war” or real war. What they did fight was simply “**proxy war**” in a form of helping their respective client/satellite states when the latter were engaged in conflicts/war.
3. **Multipolar System-** is any system in which the distribution of the power to conquer is concentrated in more than two states. It comprises of four or more powerful actors in the international system with relative equal political, economic and military powers. There is *no significant hierarchy* among actors. Blocs/Coalitions are formed where there is *limited cooperation* within each bloc and *limited conflict* between blocs. A second possible impact of the number of poles is the *propensity of a system for instability and war*. The importance of this effect has increased with the current change of the system from a bipolar to a multipolar configuration. Several factors are important to mention. One study found that a system with **two poles** (bipolar) has a **medium** chance of war; and that systems with **four or more poles** (multipolar) have the highest probability of war. Systems with five poles were found to be the most unstable. It has also been argued that global unipolar systems are relatively peaceful. Rasler and Thompson, for instance, suggest that a multipolar may be one of the most dangerous of the systemic structure because of the possibilities of war looming on the international horizon. In the system preceding World War I, five states, Great Britain, Russia, Prussia, France, and Austria-Hungary, comprised a multipolar system that had evolved from the balance of power after the Napoleonic wars.

☛ **Economic Patterns**

Yet another key determinant of the operation of any system is its economic patterns. We can gain a sense of the impact of these patterns by touching on just three of them: interdependence, natural resource location and use, and the misdistribution of development.

- **Economic interdependence:** is one pattern that we have noted repeatedly. There is some controversy over whether interdependence promotes peace or creates tensions, but there is no disagreement that it profoundly affects the international system.
- **Natural Resources Location and Use:** the pattern of where natural resources are produced and consumed also influences the operation of the system. The strong reaction of the industrialized and petroleum import-dependent nations to Iraq's aggression in 1990 was based significantly on the distribution of resources. Turmoil in the Persian Gulf region threatened needed oil supplies.
- **The Maldistribution of Development:** is a third economic pattern that has consequences for the international system. The main actors, the states, in the system are divided into relative **haves** and **have-nots**. At the most general level, this economic division puts the LDCs of the **South** and their demands for equity against the DCs of the **North** along the North-South Axis. More specifically, there is a connection between the poor economic conditions in LDCs and such

problems as political oppression and instability, population growth, and environmental degradation. These problems harm the people of the South and, by their spillover effect, are detrimental for the people of the North as well.

1.8. Theories of International Relations

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. In order to consider the field as a whole for beginners it is necessary to simplify International Relations theory.

1.8.1. Idealism/Liberalism

Idealism, also called Liberalism, arose after World War I in response to the inability of states to control and limit war in their international relations. Idealists focused much of their attention on understanding the *causes of war* so as to find a remedy for its existence. They have the following assumptions:

- ❖ Idealists believe that human nature is essentially “good” or altruistic, and people are therefore capable of mutual aid and collaboration. They hold that human nature is basically good and that people can improve their moral and material conditions, thus making societal progress— including establishment of lasting peace as possible. Bad or evil human behavior, such as injustice and war, is the product of inadequate or corrupt social institutions and misunderstandings among leaders.
- ❖ They also argued that there is a greater potential of cooperation among states even if the international system is anarchic. From this cooperation, states drive absolute or mutual gains.
- ❖ Regarding the view about state, idealists considered states as entities enjoying sovereignty but is not an autonomous actor. Just as liberals believe that the international system is a process occurring among many actors, they see the state as a pluralist arena whose function is to maintain the basic rules of the game.
- ❖ Liberals have faith in the idea that the permanent cessation of war is an attainable goal. Injustice, war, and aggression are not inevitable but can be moderated or even eliminated through; strengthening norms, creating regimes, forming economic interdependence, building democracy etc.. Liberalists are thus more optimistic than realism about the prospects for peace
- ❖ International institutions (such as IGOs) are important in terms of reducing the dangers of war. They considered IGOs as important actors for collective action.
- ❖ They found international law and morality as Key source of order in the International system. They offer a mechanism by which cooperation among states is made possible. They provide mechanisms for cross-border interactions, and the other is to shape the values and goals these interactions are pursuing. States comply because law and morality ensures order.
- ❖ NGOs are also increasingly key actors that represent different interests and facilitate collective action.

Woodrow Wilson is one of the famous proponents of liberalism/idealism. Following World War I, Wilson came up with the ‘Fourteen Points’ of 1917, some of which are discussed below:

- ✓ Democracy should be promoted in all countries. This arises from the assumption that “democracies do not fight one another” since parliamentary accountability and public opinion control the ambitions and desires of leaders.
- ✓ Self-determination of subjected people and nations should be encouraged, because if they are not allowed, they may opt for violent responses.
- ✓ Lowering barriers (like unhindered flow of people, removal of obstacles for trade, information, etc.) between countries to encourage interdependence.

- ✓ Strengthening international law and creating international organizations would be so important. Respect for international law is emphasized by Wilson because he believed that it is reliable to predict the behavior of actor, especially states.

1.8.2. Realism

Idealists were active particularly between World War I and World War II. They placed hopes for peace in the League of Nations as a formal structure for the community of nations. Those hopes however dashed when that structure proved helpless to stop German, Italian, and Japanese aggression in the 1930s. Consequently, the realists argued that the inter-war scholars' approach was flawed in a number of respects. For example, they ignored the role of power, overestimated the degree to which nation -states shared a set of common interests, and were overly optimistic that humankind could overcome the scourge of war. The outbreak of the Second World War in 1939 confirmed, for the realists at least, the inadequacies of the idealists' approach to studying international politics. A new approach, **one based on the timeless insights of realism**, replaced the discredited idealist approach.

Basically, the realist tradition goes back to many centuries. It can be traced back to the thoughts of Thucydides (Peloponnesian War) in the 5th Century. This school of thought has also been the predominant way of characterizing international politics throughout the 18th, 19th and 20th Centuries. Niccolo Machiavelli (Princes), Thomas Hobbes (*Leviathan*) and J.J. Rousseau are the most prominent of these thinkers. E.H. Carr and Hans Morgenthau are considered to be modern realist thinkers. They were among the first scholars to use the term 'realism' and to elaborate its fundamental assumptions by contrasting with the allegedly **idealists**. Particularly, Morgenthau is considered to be the "father of realism".

Indeed, the three core elements that identify with realism-**statism, survival, and self-help**-are present in the work of a classical realist such as Thucydides and structural realists- K. Waltz.

As a counter response to idealism, realists chiefly denying the assumption that states seek to cooperate. They further maintained that idealists ignored the role of power and overestimated the degree to which human beings were rational, mistakenly believed that states shared a set of common interest, and were overly passionate in their belief in the capacity of human beings to overcome the scourge of war. They claimed that there was no natural harmony of interests among states and that it was foolish and even dangerous to hope that the struggle for power among states could be tamed by **international law, democratization, and international commerce**. Since World War II, realists have blamed idealists for looking too much at how the world *ought* to be instead of how it *really* is.

What are the key arguments of realism?

- ✓ Characterized human nature as flawed, egoistic and power seeking. The instinctive lust for power and the desire to dominate one another is the dominant character of human nature and this characters and desires of human being inscribed in states. Individuals are organized into states, each of which acts in a unitary way in pursuit of its own national interests, defined in terms of power.
- ✓ They also considered states as the unitary, autonomous, power seeking and rational actors. For realists, the state is the main actor and sovereignty is its distinguishing trait. There are no sub-national actors trying to overturn the decisions of government or subvert the interests of the state. They believe that the state is an autonomous actor constrained only by the structural anarchy of the international system. Although other actors, such as international institutions, may participate, their impact on the system is marginal. Individuals are essentially rational beings who make decisions by weighing the

strengths and weaknesses of various options against the goal to be achieved. Likewise, rational decisions advance the national interest—the interests of the state. The behaviour of the state as a self-seeking egoist is understood to be a reflection of the characteristics of human beings. It is human nature that explains why international politics is necessarily power politics.

- ✓ Realists are skeptical of the idea that universal moral principles exist, and therefore warn state leaders against sacrificing their own self-interests in order to adhere to some indeterminate notion of 'ethical' conduct. Moreover, realists argue that the need for survival requires state leaders to distance themselves from traditional notions of morality. Machiavelli argued that these principles were positively harmful if adhered to by state leaders.
- ✓ Furthermore, realists characterized international system as anarchic. By **anarchy**, what is most often meant is that international politics takes place in an arena that has no overarching central authority above the individual collection of sovereign states. There is no higher power than that of a sovereign nation-state. It is states that are sovereign and autonomous actor pursuing its own national interests in international system.
- ✓ The absence of a supreme power capable of enforcing order across the entire system means that individual states are in a permanent state of insecurity. So, war is always a possibility because there is nothing that can prevent a state from using force against another state. The overriding goal of all states in the anarchic international system is ensuring survival (perpetuate their existence): How? Through self help techniques, balance of power and alliance formations.
- ✓ Cooperation in anarchic world is difficult due to the concern of relative gains. If cooperation to happen, states should when they are sure to gain more power than other states (relative gain). Realists claim that, in anarchy, states compete with other states for power and security. The nature of the competition is viewed in zero-sum terms; in other words, more for one actor means less for another.
- ✓ Realists are skeptical about intergovernmental organizations, international law, and nongovernmental organizations, though they do not completely discount their place.

1.8.3. Marxism

A fundamental critique to economic liberalism comes from the 19th century German philosopher and economist, Karl Marx. Marx rejected the liberal's view of the economy as a positive-sum game with benefits for all. Marx rejected the assertion that exchange between individuals necessarily maximizes the welfare of the whole society. Marx takes a zero-sum argument and applies it to relations of classes instead of states. He saw the economy as a site of human exploitation and class inequality. Marx saw capitalism and the market as creating extremes of wealth for capitalists and poverty for workers. Contrary to the classical economics that viewed the free market as natural and necessary system, Marx began with belief that free market system was an aberration and has to be destroyed by revolution.

For Marx, capitalism is characterized by two major divisions within society; the 'bourgeoisie' who own the means of production, and the 'proletariat' who do not (own only its labor power which it must sell to the bourgeoisie). The 'proletariat' has no property and share from the means of productions. The only way that the proletariat can survive is to sell their labour, i.e. to work for a wage. **The** theory that holds that the more powerful classes oppress and exploit the less powerful by denying them their fair share of the surplus they create. The oppressed classes try to gain power in order to seize more of the wealth for themselves. This process, called *class struggle*, is one way of looking at the political relationships between richer and poorer people, and ultimately between richer and poorer world regions.

Even if capitalist economy is controlled by the bourgeoisie is exploitative of labor, Marx did not see the growth of capitalism as a negative or retrogressive event. According to him, capitalism means progress since it destroys previous relations of production such as feudalism, which were even more exploitative, with peasant subsisting under slave like conditions. Marx further argues that Capitalism paves the way for a socialist revolution where the means of production will be placed under social control for the benefits of the proletariat who are the majority. That is the revolutionary goals of Marxist economic thought.

Marxist approaches to IR hold that both international and domestic politics arise from unequal relationships between **economic classes**. This emphasis on classes—implying that the domestic and economic attributes of societies shape external relations with other states—contrasts with the realist approach to IR with its separation of domestic and international politics.

- ✓ The human nature is motivated by self-interest, egoism and the readiness to dominate others. Due to this, some get rich at the expense of others and hence this gives rise to a system of exploitation. Marxists saw it as a product of capitalism.
- ✓ Actors of International Relations are the class. Classes are more important than society and states. The state is an agent of international capitalism; and the international system is highly stratified, dominated by an international capitalist system. But states reflect the interests of the dominant/rich class.
- ✓ The role of the state- State as “Executive Committee of the Ruling (Corporate) Class,” doing the bidding of corporations. Marxist view sees the state as the executing agent of the bourgeoisie. Ensuring overall stability of global capitalist economy as the roles of the state.
- ✓ International cooperation among the working class/proletariat will eventually bring about a just and fair international system where everyone equally benefits. There could not be peace in the world unless the proletariat class wages proletarian internationalism and seizes power.
- ✓ There is no anarchy; rather there is hierarchy in international system. This is to mean that some states (dominant classes within them) dominate other states and peoples of the world. States are unfinished but categorized into different classes that also dominate the international system.
- ✓ Economic power is the most crucial power to dominate others.
- ✓ Skeptical about IGOs, international law, and many NGOs-contemporary international law and organization as the product of a specific time and historical process. Emerging from Western capitalist state experiences, international law and organization serve the interests of the dominant capitalist classes. The actions by the United Nations following the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait in 1990, including a series of resolutions condemning Iraq and imposing sanctions on that country, were designed to support the position of the West, most notably the interests of the hegemonic United States and its capitalist friends in the international petroleum industry.
- ✓ International law is biased against the interests of socialist states, the weak, and the unrepresented. For example, international legal principles, such as the sanctity of national geographic boundaries, were developed during the colonial period to reinforce the claims of the powerful. Attempts to alter such boundaries are, according to international law, wrong, even though the boundaries themselves may be unfair or unjust.
- ✓ NGOs are largely based in the North and are dominated by members of the same elite that run the state and international organizations. They see NGOs as falling under the exigencies of the capitalist economic system and as captive to those dominant interests.

Chapter II: National interest, Foreign Policy and Diplomacy

Nardy Digital Copy

2.1. Defining National Interest

The term 'national interest' is used very frequently in politics; its exact meaning remains vague. National interest may refer to several things at the same time. The following can be among the possible definitions:

- ❑ Objectives, visions and goals state aspire to achieve is commonly referred as national interest.
- ❑ It may mean the aspirations of a country, its policies and programs, as also emotions and debates surrounding them.
- ❑ National interest is the *raison de`tat*, (the reason of state), to justify its actions and policy towards other states at international level.
- ❑ National interest refers to set of values, orientation, goals and objectives a given country would like to achieve in its international relations.

All states would like to promote their national interest as their capability or power allows them to do. Morgenthau suggests that the minimum goal a state would like to achieve is survival. Every state should protect their physical, political, and cultural identities against any encroachment by other states. Translated into more specific objectives, the preservation of physical identity is equated with the maintenance of the territorial integrity of a state. Preservation of political identity is equated with the preservation of existing politico-economic systems. And the preservation of cultural identity is equated with ethnic, religious, and linguistic and historical norms of the peoples residing in the state.

2.2. Understanding Foreign Policy and Foreign Policy Behaviors

2.2.1. Defining Foreign Policy

Many writers and scholars in international relations in general and experts of foreign policy in particular have defined foreign policy in many forms and ways:

- ❑ Foreign policy refers to the sets of objectives and instruments that a state adopts to guide its relation with the outside world.
- ❑ Foreign policy involves general purposes, priority of goals to be realized and achieved. It also encompasses specific strategies and instruments, economic and diplomatic tools that states employ to achieve their objectives.
- ❑ Foreign Policy is a system of **activities** evolved by communities for changing the behavior of other states and for adjusting their own activities to international environment.
- ❑ Foreign Policy: is an external (out ward) oriented **policy**.

The study of foreign policies includes understanding of the various states' substantive policies. The *substantive* foreign policies of states strongly influence the international relations. In the foreign policy process, how policies are arrived at and implemented is prominently determined. As a result, states establish various organizational structures and functional relationships to create and carry out foreign policies.

2.2.2. Foreign Policy Objectives

National interest is often considered as the objectives of foreign policy of a state. And these objectives can be classified as long range, middle range and short range. Such classification of foreign policy objectives is based on the combination of the **three** criteria:

- (1) The value placed on the objective;
- (2) The time element placed on its achievement; and
- (3) The kind of demands the objective imposes on other states in international system.

Core Values and Interests (Short Range Objectives)

They are usually stated in the form of basic principles of foreign policy and become article of faith that society accepts without questioning. Core interests and values are most frequently related to the self-preservation of political and economic systems, the people, and the territorial integrity of a state. These are short-range objectives because other goals cannot be realized if the existence of the state and its political units are not ensured.

Middle Range Objectives

These are less important and less immediate compared to core objectives. They are mostly of broad concerns of economic development and social welfare. These include fulfilling material needs, economic needs, prestige of the nation, scientific and technological advancement and so forth. Unlike, the short range objective, the middle range objectives may drastically varies across states.

Long- Range Objectives

These are the least immediate ones to policy makers. They include future plans, thoughts, and visions concerning the ultimate political and ideological organization of the international system, and rules governing relations in that system.

2.2.3. Foreign Policy Behavior: Patterns and Trends

Foreign policy behavior refers to the actions states take towards each other. It is important to note that these actions usually are not as ends in themselves, but are tied to foreign policy objectives. It is not easy to label countries as simply peace loving or war-like or to use other such categorizations. Nevertheless, patterns of foreign policy behavior can be identified. Arnold Wolfers, a famous specialist in the field of International Relations, suggested that all foreign policy behavior ultimately boils down to three possible patterns:

- ❑ self-preservation (maintaining the status quo)
- ❑ self-extension (revising the status quo in one's own favor)
- ❑ self-abnegation (revising the status quo in some else's favor)

Seen from the above perspective, the foreign policy patterns of countries such as United States can be categorized as self-preservation. United States, following Second World War emerged as one of the strongest actor, super power in international relations. One can say, with no doubt, that the international institutions (IMF, World Bank, GATT/WTO) that were established following Second World War have been strongly shaped by United States. The underlying philosophy of such institutions, and even the decision making procedures are all shaped to serve the global interests of the country. Even the United Nations has been serving the interest of United State as the country has key position in the Security Council as one of Veto power among the few. Thus, USA strives for maintaining the status quo.

On the other hand 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. Such policy trend can be equated with Wolfers' model of self-extension.

The third model, i.e. self-abnegation reflects the foreign policy trends that are being displayed in Less Developing Countries (LDC). This can be seen in the weak states of the world which fail to defend and promote their national interests in their external relations. States that are weak and very much dependent on foreign aid are profoundly caught with many problems in order to pursue an autonomous policy. 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 and Orientations

The analysis of foreign policy behavior and orientations can also be done along a number of specific dimensions, keeping in mind that behavior can change over time and with different style of leaderships and circumstances. These dimensions include **alignment, scope and mode of operation**.

1. Alignment

One can first speak of alignment tendencies, in particular 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. Yet one can identify the alignment tendencies such as alliance, neutrality and non-alignment.

- ❏ **Alliances**-are formal agreements among independent states to achieve mutual interests; it can be military, economic, other interests. Example, NATO, OPEC, NAFTA, etc.
- ❏ **Neutrality**- is a stance of formal non-partisanship in world affairs. By keeping a low profile, neutrals may avoid some of the problems associated with alliances, particularly the generating of potential enemies and counter alliances.
- ❏ **Nonalignment**-has been the foreign policy pattern of most developing state during cold war. Most developing countries had a 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.

2. Scope

A second foreign policy dimension is the scope of a country's activities and interests. Some countries have extensive, far-reaching international contacts, while other countries have more limited activities abroad. One can identify at least **three** patterns of foreign policy behaviors. Some actors act in *Global* terms, others in *Regional* terms, and those that follow policy of *Isolationism*.

- ❏ **Global terms**- Major Powers in international relations have historically been those defined their interest in global terms, interacting regularly with countries in nearly every region of the world. A country such as U.S.A has often defined its national interest in global terms.
- ❏ **Regional terms**-Most countries in the world are essentially regional actors, interacting primarily with neighboring states in the same geographical area. For example, South Africa is a regional actor in Africa in general and in Southern Africa in Particular. It is the most important actor in regional organizations such as SADDIC and AU. India can also be considered as the most important actor in South Asian region, so is China in entire Asia.
- ❏ **Isolationism**-Some moments in history, such as key weakness or geographic remoteness, may cause the scope of a country's foreign policy to become so narrow that isolationism results. This was the case with Burma in 1960 and 70s. Few countries have ever been totally cut off from the outside world, and in an age of interdependence, isolationism becomes an increasingly less viable foreign policy orientation.

3. Mode of Operation/ "Modus Opernadi"

In addition to the alignment and scope dimensions of a country's foreign policy, we can also identify certain patterns of foreign policy behaviors on the basis of the modus operandi-the method of operation. Thus states employ **unilateral, Bilateral** and **multilateral** means to solve the problems.

2.2.5. Instruments of Foreign Policy

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), and use of force (war). Each instrument is used to affect the behaviors of other states, and has an element of power.

A) Diplomacy

Diplomacy has probably existed for as long as civilization has. Diplomacy can be defined as a process between actors (diplomats, usually representing a state) who exist within a system (international relations) and engage in private and public dialogue (diplomacy) to pursue their objectives in a peaceful manner.

Nowadays the nature and strategy of diplomacy has been radically different from the old practices, which was limited to bilateral and formalistic ambassadorial relations. After WWI and formation of the League of Nations, the old style of diplomacy has been reformed and there arose multilateral diplomacy, public diplomacy, leader-to-leader (summitry diplomacy) in sharp contrast to secret diplomacy and bilateral diplomacy.

The basic **principle** of diplomacy is **bargaining**. Bargaining can be defined as 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 states objectives are in conflict.

Though diplomacy is being conducted for the most part between states and the applicable international law that governs diplomacy – the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations (1961) – only references states as diplomatic actors; the modern international system also involves powerful actors that are not states. These tend to be international non-governmental organizations (INGOs) and international governmental organizations (IGOs).

Rules of Effective Diplomacy

The following are some of the basic rules that diplomats have employed with greater effectiveness over the years:

- **Be realistic:** It is important to have goals that much your ability to achieve them
- **Be careful about what you say:** The experienced diplomats plans out and weighs words carefully.
- **Seek common ground:** finding common ground ends dispute and negotiation successfully. Almost any negotiation will involve some concession, so it is important to maintain a degree of flexibility.
- **Understand the other side:** There are several aspects to understanding the other side. One is to 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 axiomatic that even a rat will fight if trapped in a corner. The same is often true for countries. Call it honor, saving face, or prestige; 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 when they rely on such diplomatic tactics such as threats, punishment, promise, and rewards.

B) Economic Instruments of Foreign Policy

Just as modern states are politically and technologically interdependent, so do they rely up on each other for resources and commodities that enable them to develop and sustain viable economies. There hardly exists a state that is self-sufficient. There is a considerable degree of dependence up on trade among states. Cognizance of such dependency situation, 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. Some of these economic instruments are: tariffs, quotas, boycotts, embargos, and aid.

- ❏ **Tariff:** It is raising or lowering the amount of taxes on foreign made products coming into a country.
- ❏ **Quota:** Setting an amount restriction on imported and exported commodities.
- ❏ **Boycott:** A trade boycott is restriction or ban of either a specific or total range of import commodities.
- ❏ **Embargo:** It is putting limit on the export commodities.
- ❏ **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 manipulation of currency rates is also used to create more or less favorable terms of trade between countries.
- ❏ **Foreign Aid:** The transfer of money, goods, or technical advice from donor to recipient-is an instrument of policy that has been in international relation.

C) Psychological Instruments

Psychological techniques are those mechanisms which are opted for arousing mob psychology, and hence acceptance as well as to positively or negatively influence the minds of its own people or the peoples of other states to accept policies favorable to themselves. These techniques primarily include **propaganda**. It is a process of appealing to emotions rather than logical reasons by creating fear, doubt, sympathy, anger, or a variety of other feelings to influence another state/s.

D) Military Instruments

Military techniques are usually used as final option immediately after diplomacy (or negotiation) fails. Overtly threatening an opponent, demonstration of violence and direct action may be employed to influence an opponent.

2.3. Overview of Foreign Policy of Ethiopia

2.3.1. Foreign Policy during Tewodros II (1855-1868)

Throughout his reign Tewodros tried to develop a dynamic foreign policy that reached out beyond the Horn Region. He sought the Western Christian world to recognize his country and help him to modernize his country. He appealed to Britain, France and Russia as Christian nations to assist him in whatever ways possible in his fight against the Turks, Egyptians.

The emperor attempted to establish his diplomatic relations to fight his immediate enemies claiming Christianity as instrument of foreign policy. However, the emperor's passionate demand for modern technology and skilled man power from Britain was not concluded to his satisfaction as the latter sent religious missionaries. Despite his demand to be recognized as the emperor of Ethiopia and treated with respect and equal footing with the British Queen that was not reciprocated by Queen Victoria. Consequently Tewodros took desperate measures by taking hostage of several British missionaries including the consul which was responded with the British Military Expedition (Keller). Tewodros's Troops were easily defeated and the King did not surrender but tragically committed suicide.

2.3.2. Foreign Policy during Yohannes IV (1872-1889)

Yohannes IV succeeded Tewodros II. Like his predecessor, Yohannes considered Egypt and European expansionism as a national threat. Indeed Egypt tried to put a serious security threat in its continued attempt to invade the country under many pretexts, yet its motive was to control the source of Blue Nile.

These, however, were not successful as Egypt faced subsequent defeat both in 1875 and 1876 at the Battle of Gundet and Gura respectively. In addition, European expansionism threat has turned out to be real as Italy got a foot hold at the port of Massawa in 1885. This colonial ambition of Italy was reflected by the Foreign Minister Speech —The Red Sea is the key to the Mediterranean implicating the strategic importance of Ethiopia (Novati). However, the emperor died fighting with the —Mahadists. The Sudanese resistance groups against British rule happened to invade Western Ethiopia because of their presumption that Yohannes IV was collaborating with the British.

2.3.3. Foreign Policy during Menelik II (1889-93)

Following the death of Yohannes, Menelik II of Showa has assumed to the throne, however, Italy continued to be the main challenge in the North. Moreover the King saw the other colonial powers surrounding all four corners of the country as the scramble of Africa was heightened. The emperor followed double track diplomacy to contain or reverse Italy's expansion and maintain the territorial integrity of his country. On the one hand, he entered many treaties and agreements to solve the challenge amicably. On the other hand, he was accumulating military ammunitions to defend the aggression from any side of colonial powers, British, French and of course Italy.

However, the emperor's diplomatic endeavor with Italy failed to result in peace due to Italy's misinterpretation of the controversial article 17 of the '*Wuchalle*' treaty and waged a war that Adowa victory became Ethiopian proud.

The significance of the Adowa victory is loud and clear as many European powers recognized Ethiopia as an independent African state on similar footing with the Europeans. Indeed Britain, France, Russia and the vanquished Italy came to Menelik's Palace to arrange formal exchange of Ambassadors. Moreover, these powers signed formal boundary treaties with the emperor. In fact the present boundary of Ethiopia vis -a-vis its neighbors had been defined at least on paper. With the exception of Sudan and of course present day Eritrea (being ex-colony of Italy) the boundary of the country with French Somaliland-Djibouti, Kenya (former British colony), and present Somali (Italian Somaliland and British Somaliland) had been defined on paper, yet were not demarcated. As the boundary issue was not settled, there have been disputes and counter claims with the neighboring countries especially with Sudan, Somalia and Eritrea. Of course Somalia claims huge portion of the territory inside Ethiopia. What so ever the case may be, Ethiopia's foreign policy of the forth coming rulers has significantly been informed by the notion of territorial integrity of the country. And the issue of outlet to the sea remained the burning question determining its policy and role in the region.

2.3.4. Foreign Policy during Emperor Haile Selassie I (1916-1974)

Menelik died in 1913 and it was not until 1930 that the next strong emperor Haile Selassie I, assumed the throne. He was dedicated to the creation of a stronger, centralized and bureaucratic empire with unquestioned respect by the international community. This was clear as early as 1923, when as Regent to the Crown, Teferi Mekonen, facilitated Ethiopia's entry to the League of Nations. Ethiopia's membership in the League of Nations was clearly instigated by the ever present danger of invasion by Italians. The imperial government has established relationships with Britain to aid the War against Italy between 1936 and 1941. When Italy has moved out of the Horn Africa, Ethiopia regains its colonized territories and the Red Sea coast after a series diplomacy. Latter, with the fear of total dependence on Britain, the emperor turned face to USA.

Through diplomacy, Haile Selassie was able to regain complete administrative control over the territory he claimed and more by 1954. In 1952 a U.N. resolution had made possible a federation between Ethiopia

and the former Italian colony of Eritrea. Eritrea was to have regional autonomy within the federation, but Haile Selassie was not content with only administrative control. He was not satisfied until he secured the endorsement of both the Eritrean and Ethiopian Assemblies in 1962, which allowed him to incorporate Eritrea fully in to the Empire, making it a province of Ethiopia instead of a trustee-ship.

Ethiopia also played significant role in Africa in fighting for African independence and to end colonialism and apartheid. In the United Nations, Ethiopia played its part in raising agendas and pressing for resolutions against colonialism in collaboration with some countries that supported the cause. India was strong partner in that regard. In this manner, the emperor can be considered as one of the founding fathers of African Unification. The establishment of the organization of African Unity in the capital of Ethiopia witnessed the prominent role of the emperor in African affairs as well. There was a time when the emperor resolved the perennial conflict in Sudan through His Good Offices. Ethiopia also played a significant role in maintaining international peace and security by committing its troops for peacekeeping operations in Korea in 1951 and the Congo in 1961.

2.3.5. Foreign Policy during the Military Government (1974—1991)

The military regime that took control of state power in 1974 adopted a foreign policy largely oriented to socialist ideology. The primary objectives of the foreign policy were survival of the regime and maintaining the territorial integrity of the country. Apart from these, restructuring the society along socialist lines was also considered as the foundation for the foreign policy motives at home. The major strategy to achieve the stated objectives heavily focused on building the military capability of the country. And force had been employed as the best strategy to silence dissent at home and deter the perceived external enemies of the country.

The corner stone of Ethiopia's foreign policy at the time was maintaining continuing friendship with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Apart from socialism, Ethiopia's strategic locations and other questions, such as; Eritrea, Somalia, and the issue of the Nile, had also shaped the foreign policy orientation and behavior of military government. Ethiopia being located in the Horn of Africa is at the cross roads to the oil rich middle East region and Indian Ocean. As a result of this the U.S.S.R was keen to have stronghold over the area, replacing the United States. U.S.S.R came at the right time when the Dergue called for military aid to reverse the aggression from Somalia in the East and quell the Eritrean nationalists in the north part of the country. It should be noted that U.S.S.R was used to be a friend of Somalia, yet all of a sudden, it made a swift change of policy when it came to Ethiopian side; while the U.S.A piped in to Somalia. That was a time of cold war whereby the two super powers, U.S.S.R and U.S.A were pitting each other to have a sphere of influence in the region.

In general the adoption of socialism and its subsequent impact on the foreign policy of the country could be considered as a departure from its predecessors; however the policy objective of the country remained unchanged. The country's policy towards its neighbors, the region, and the Arab world remained unchanged. Such continuity in the era of dynamic world teaches us the determining role of geography in the making and implementation of foreign policy of Ethiopia. The issue of Nile River, boundary issues, the strategic location of the country, unique culture (Christianity) amid the Islam religion and Arab culture had cumulative effect in shaping the foreign policy of the country

2.3.6. The Foreign Policy of Ethiopia in the Post 1991

With EPRDF's ascent to power the country adopted a new foreign policy orientation and objectives. In the post 1991 period, Ethiopia's foreign policy is driven primarily by the quest to ensure national interest and security. As such, one of the goals of the foreign policy is to ensure the survival of the multi-national state. National interest of the country is understood in terms of realizing the real interest of the people

mainly democracy and development. It refers to the primary interest of the people to live freely from poverty, disease and ignorance.

The primary strategy in realization of these goals is to put the focus on domestic issues first. Addressing domestic political and economic problems requires forging national consensus about the problems and exit strategies. Especially in the age of globalization emphasizing on external issues such as; seeking financial aid, loans or technical issues would subject the country to dependency and vulnerability. That will limit not only the diplomatic leverage of the country but also will neglect the crux of the matter at home, viz., the issue of democratization and good governance and issues of development would not be addressed. This strategy is called an inside-out approach. If we solve our domestic problems the country would not be vulnerable and its peace and survival can be ensured.

The other foreign policy strategy is building up the military capability of the country. Diplomatic solutions can always be taken prior attention when dealing even disputes. But above all building up military capability would have a deterrence effect. Countries may no venture to pose a threat if the military capability of the country is scale up and modernized.

Nardy Digital Copy

Chapter Three

International Political Economy (IPE)

3. Introduction

The study of Political economy has always been dominated by a national or/and international level debate over the responsibilities of the state with regard to the economy. This debate still continues to occupy a central place in political economy of the 21st century. Should the state be responsible for determining how the economy of a given country is to be organized and run? Or should such responsibility be left to the market which is populated by self-serving individuals acting as private agents? Should, for example, housing, medical care, education, welfare be provided by private citizens using the resources they have available to them? Or should they be provided by the state?

At the international level of analysis, the debate also poses such pressing questions as: how should international trade be governed? How should international investment be governed? How should international finance be governed? Or more specifically what should/not be the role of international institutions like the IMF, WB and WTO in the governance of international finance, investment and trade? With these debates in mind, this chapter briefly discusses the meaning and nature of International Political economy and presents the most influential theoretical perspectives of International Political economy.

3.1. Meaning and Nature of IPE

Like most disciplines of social science, defining International Political Economy is subject to serious complexity. As a matter of fact, there is no universal agreement on how IPE should be defined. For the purpose of understanding the central concept of IPE, however, it is better to capture some of its definitions. To begin with, IPE is a field of inquiry that studies the ever-changing relationship between governments, businesses, and social forces across history and in different geographical areas. While political economy is the study of the intersection between politics and economics within a given country, IPE is the study of this at the international level. In other words, IPE is concerned with the way in which political and economic factors interact at the global level. Political economists usually undertake two related kinds of investigations. The first concerns how politics constrains economic choice, whether choices by governments or choices by actors or social groups. The second concerns how economic forces motivate and constrain political choices such as individuals' voting behavior, unions' or firms' political lobbying, and governments' internal and external policies. Addressing such concerns at the global level, IPE studies the political battle between the winners and losers of global economic exchange.

According to Michael Veseth, IPE is the rapidly developing social science field of study that attempts to understand international problems. IPE is a field that thrives on the process that Joseph Schumpeter called "creative destruction". The growing prominence of IPE as a field of study is a result of the continuing breakdown of disciplinary boundaries between economics and politics in particular and among social sciences generally. In general, IPE is a study of a problematique, or set of related problems. The traditional IPE problematique includes analysis of the political economy of international trade, international finance, north-south relations, multinational corporations, and hegemony. This problematique has been broadened in recent years as many scholars have sought to establish a New IPE. The emerging IPE subjects include international development, regional cooperation and integration, environmental problems, and globalization and its consequences.

Two abstract and considerably broader questions typically shape IPE scholarship. These are:

1. How exactly does politics shape the decisions that societies make about how to use the resources that are available to them?

2. What are the consequences of these decisions?

These two abstract questions give rise to two different traditions within IPE. The first is explanatory studies, which relate most closely to the first questions. It is oriented directly toward explaining the foreign economic policy choices that governments make. Such studies most often attempt to answer 'why' questions. The second is evaluative studies, which relate most closely to the second question. It is oriented toward assessing policy outcomes, making judgment about them, and proposing alternatives when the judgment made about particular policy is a negative one.

3.2. Theoretical perspectives on IPE

Scholars within the field of IPE have developed a large number of theories to answer the two key questions posed earlier. Three traditional schools of political economy- Mercantilism, Liberalism and Marxism- have predominantly shaped the development of these theories. Hereunder, discussed is the three mainstream school of thought of IPE in brief.

3.2.1. Mercantilism

In the early modern world of the 16th and 17th centuries the economic policies of the great powers and the overall economic systems are often referred to by the term mercantilism. During this phase of history international economic relations were very much carried out within the context of imperialism. A small number of states controlled most of the world both economically and politically. Great powers constructed their own international economic system in which they imported what they needed from their colonies whilst also using those territories as market for their own surplus products. These imperial powers also traded with each other where it was necessary but, in general, saw other trading giants as commercial rivals rather than partners.

Mercantilists advocated self-serving states of favouring exports so that wealth could be accumulated. The basic tenets of mercantilism include:

- The government should involve in international trade. The involvement of the government in the matters of international commerce is for the purpose of protecting the interest of the state and their citizens. Mercantilist fears that an unregulated economy leads to anarchy and exploitation as greed individual enrich themselves without regard to the suffering this may inflict on others. This is because, according to the beliefs of mercantilism, the world is anarchic and states are, by necessarily, self-serving and inward looking entities. States' economic resources are a key source of its power and should not be subject to the vagaries of the international market place. As such, mercantilism advocates limiting imports to those absolutely necessary while exporting what you can in order to profit from it.
- International economics is competitive not cooperative. Mercantilist rejects the notion of comparative advantage due to their more pessimistic assessment on human nature and the behavior of governments.
- Self-sufficiency: the pessimistic assumption of human nature and state behavior that underpin mercantilism also mean that they advocate governments holding what they have and trying to reduce rely on other states. An extreme manifestation of self-sufficiency is the policy known as autarky, which is the pursuit of total self-reliance. Autarky has tended to be associated with state driven by ultra-nationalist ideology. This can take the form of simply stealing resource from others. It also includes isolationist policy of states in order to jealously guard their own resources.
- Protectionism: the most prominent form of mercantilism in the contemporary world is protectionism, which refers to a variety of economic policies employed by governments to

insulate their domestic industries from foreign competition. The most common of such strategies includes:

- ✓ Tariffs: the taxing of imports.
- ✓ Currency devaluations: change of the value of state's currency so as to make imports cheaper and exports dearer.
- ✓ Quotas: allowing imports only up to a certain number.
- ✓ Export subsidies: giving government's support to exporters to help them sell abroad.
- ✓ Red tape: using domestic laws to unofficially restrict foreign competition by insisting on particular product standards more likely to be achieved by domestic goods.

To be more precise, classical mercantilism is based on three central propositions. These include:

- National power and wealth are tightly connected.
- Trade provides countries one way for countries to acquire wealth from abroad. This is, however, possible if the country ran a positive balance of trade. That means if the country sold more goods to foreigners than it purchased from foreigners.
- Some economic activities are more valuable than others. Manufacturing activity should be promoted, whereas agriculture and other non-manufacturing activities should be discouraged.

Modern mercantilism applies these three propositions to contemporary international economic policy in the following propositions.

- Economic strength is a critical component of national power.
- Trade is to be valued for exports, but government should discourage imports whenever possible.
- Some forms of economic activities are more valuable than others.

Mercantilism, in general, argued that state should play a large role in determining how society's resources are allocated.

3.2.2. Liberalism

This school has emerged in the 18th century in Britain to change the dominance of mercantilism in government circles. It challenged all three central propositions of mercantilism. Challenged mercantilist propositions, liberalist argues that:

- The purpose of economic activity was to enrich individuals, not to enhance the state's power.
- Countries do not enrich themselves by running trade surpluses. Instead, countries gain from trade regardless of whether the balance of trade is positive or negative.
- Countries are not necessarily made wealthier by producing manufactured goods rather than primary goods. Instead, countries are made wealthier by making products that they can produce at a relatively low cost at home and trading them for goods that can be produced at home only at a relatively high cost. As a result, governments should make little effort to influence the country's trade balance or to shape the types of goods the country produces.

Liberalism as a school is underpinned by the core liberal tenets that people are naturally inclined to cooperate with each other and can be trusted by governments to control their own destiny. This logic applied to the economic sphere manifests itself in a belief in the following key principles;

- Free trade: it advocates the minimization of government involvement in the affairs of international trade. Businesses are not restricted from their production of goods and imports from other countries are not restricted by government measures.
- Invisible hand: it refers to what is more commonly today known as market forces, meaning the way businesses and trade operate in the absence of government interferences. It posits that

society would be better off without government interference. Government interference in the economy, rather than protecting its citizen, actually serves to impoverish them by stifling their potential to enrich themselves and their fellow citizens.

- **Comparative advantage:** the theory of comparative advantage lends support to the notion of the invisible hand by offering an economic rationale for why free trade produces more trade and more wealth for all nations. If a country or individual is relatively more efficient in the production of a good than another country or individual then we say that she has comparative advantage in production of that good. Comparative advantage measures efficiency in terms of relative magnitudes. Since countries have limited resources and level of technology they tend to produce goods or services in which they have a comparative advantage. Comparative advantage implies an opportunity cost associated with the production of one good compared to another. That is why countries tend to specialize in production of certain products. This notion is called international division of labor.
- **Trade brings peace:** this is based on the argument that economic interdependence brings international peace.

Liberalism, in general, argued in favour of market based system of resource allocation. Giving priority for the welfare of individuals, liberalism argued that social welfare will be highest when people are free to make their own decisions about how to use the resources they possess.

3.2.3. Marxism

This school originated in the work of Karl Marx as a critique of capitalism. It assumes that the concentration of capital and capitalists' control of the state are transformed into the systematic exploitation of the developing world by the large capitalist nations. In some instances, this exploitation takes the form of explicitly colonial structures, as it did prior to World War II. The systematic exploitation of poor by the rich implies that the global economy does not provide benefits to all countries; all gains accrue to the capitalist countries at the top of the international hierarchy.

Global economic structures are the chief determinants of international political behavior and events, hence, see IPE as being synonymous with International Relations, rather than a mere subset of the discipline. Marxist agrees with mercantilists that capitalist's economics is a zero-sum game of losers and winners rather than liberal's sum-sum game of comparative advantage. As such, dependency theorists have advocated that governments of the 'zero' (losers) countries adopt protectionist measures to save themselves from exploitation. However, as neo-Marxism approaches have evolved and economic globalization has intensified, the emphasize has shifted to seeing the competition in the global economy as not being between states but between transnational classes of 'haves' and 'have not's'. Neo-Marxists see IPE as based on a global bourgeoisie systematically exploiting a global proletariat. Some of the bourgeoisie is composed of small elites in poorer states who operate in 'enclave economies' profiting from the proceeds of exporting their countries to the richer states. Some of the exploited transnational class resides in the richer states as underpaid workers or unemployed beggars also short-changed by the global system.

The three traditional schools of political economy thus offer three distinctive answers to our question of how politics shapes the allocation of society's resources. Mercantilists argue that the state guides resource allocation in line with objectives shaped by the quest for national power. Liberals argue that politics ought to play little role in the process, extolling instead the role of market-based transactions among autonomous individuals. Marxists argue that the most important decisions are made by large capitalist enterprises supported by a political system controlled by the capitalist class.

Each traditional school also offers a distinctive framework to evaluate the consequences of resource allocation. Mercantilists focus on the consequences of resource allocation for national power. The central question a mercantilist will ask is: “Is there some alternative allocation of resources that would enhance the nation’s power in the international system?” Liberals rely heavily upon economic theory to focus principally upon the welfare consequences of resource allocation. The central question a liberal will ask is: “Is there some alternative allocation of resources that would enable the society to improve its standard of living?” Marxists rely heavily upon theories of class conflict to focus on the distributional consequences of resource allocation. The central question a Marxist will ask is: “Is there an alternative political and economic system that will promote a more equitable distribution of income?” Thus, liberalism emphasizes the welfare consequences of resource allocation, whereas mercantilism and Marxism each emphasize a different aspect of the distributional consequences of these decisions.

Chapter Four: Globalization and Regionalism

4.1. Defining Globalization

Globalization can be defined as a multidimensional process characterized by: (1) the stretching of social and political activities across state (political) frontiers so that events, decisions, and activities in one part of the world come to have significance for individuals and communities in other parts of the world. For instance wars and conflicts in developing countries would increase the flow of asylum seekers and illegal migrants in to the developed countries; (2) the intensification or the growing magnitude of interconnectedness in almost every aspect of social existence from the economic to the ecological, the spread of HIV-AIDS, from the intensification of world trade to the spread of different weapons; (3) the accelerating pace of global interactions and process as the evolution of worldwide systems of transport and communication increases the rapidity of or velocity with which ideas, news, goods, information, capital and technology move around the world; (4) the growing extensity, intensity, and velocity of global interaction is associated with a deepening enmeshment of the local and global insofar as the local events may come to have global consequences and global events may come to have serious local consequences creating a growing collective awareness of the world as shared social space, i.e. globality or globalism.

4.1.2. The Globalization Debates

Globalization is a contentious issue in international relations. There has been intense debate as to the direction, nature and effect of globalization on states. In this regard, there are three perspectives: the hyper-globalists, the skeptics, and transformationalists.

4.1.2.1. The Hyper-globalists

For the hyper-globalists, globalization today defines a new epoch in human history in which nation states become obsolete to regulate their economy and boundary. This view of globalization privileges the economic over the political, the market over the state, and prefigures the decline of states. It argues that economic globalization is bringing about a de-nationalization/ de-territorialization of economies through the establishment of transnational networks of production, trade and finance. In this borderless economy national governments are relegated to little more than transmission belts for global capital or ultimately powerless institutions marginalized by the growing significance of local, regional and global mechanisms of governance. In this respect economic globalization is bringing about the decline of states. Thus for the hyper globalists, the authority and legitimacy of states thereby is undermined as the national governments become increasingly unable to control the trans-boundary movements and flows of goods, services, ideas and different socio-economic activities inside their borders. The cumulative effects of these forces would make the state ineffective to fully fill the demands of its citizens. Hyper-globalists further argue that globalization is imparting new liberal ideas and implant culture of modernization replacing the traditional

culture having an impetus towards creating a new global order marked by uniform cultural values or way of life.

4.1.2.2. The Skeptics

The skeptics rejected the view of super- globalist as a myth, flawed and politically naïve since it fundamentally underestimate the enormous power of national governments to regulate international economic activities. For them, rather than being out of control, the force of globalization, which is synonymous to internationalization, very much dependent on the regulatory power of the state to ensure the continuation of economic liberalism. States are central actors and agents of globalization playing central role in shaping and regulating the economic activities including the Trans-boundary flows of ideas, goods and peoples.

Skeptics also undermine the view that the world is interconnected and moving into a village where by there exists a free flow of goods and services, investment and circulation of money from one corner of the world in to another. For them, the so called globalization is not more than regionalization that is being manifested in the emergence of financial and trading blocs in Western countries, North America, in Asia and to some extent in Africa.

For the Skeptics, globalization brings nothing new; rather it is just the crystallization the already existing realities of the world which has been marked by the North-South gap reflected in terms of the deeply rooted patterns of in equality and hierarchy.

4.1.2.3. The Transformationalist

Central to the transformationalist perspective is the conviction that globalization is a critical driving force behind the rapid social, political and economic changes which are reshaping societies and international politics. Transformationist believe that globalization is reconstituting or reengineering the power, function and the authority of the state, Even though the state has ultimate legal power to control events inside its boundary, it can't command sole control over trans-boundary issues, actors, resource movements. Under globalization, national economic space no more coincides with state boundary.

They reject both the hyper globalist view of the end of the sovereign state as well as the skeptics claim that nothing much has changed. Instead they assert that a new sovereignty regime is displacing traditional conception of state power as an absolute, indivisible, territorially exclusive power. Accordingly, sovereignty today is the best understood as "...less a territorially defined barrier than a bargaining resource for a politics characterized by complex transnational network. Under globalization, there are non-state actors as Multinational Corporation, transnational social movements, international regulatory agencies.

In this sense world order can no longer be conceived as purely State-Centric or even primarily state managed as authority has become increasingly diffused amongst public and private agencies at the local, national, regional and at global levels i.e. down ward, up rewards and sideways. This does not mean that the power of national government is necessarily diminished but on the contrary it is being redefined, reconstituted and restructured in response to the growing complexity of process of governance in a more interconnected world.

4.1.3. Pros and Cons of Globalization

Merits of Globalization

- ✓ Expansion of democratic culture, human right and the protection of historically minority and subaltern groups.
- ✓ Innovation in science, medicine, and technology and information communication which enabled the improvement of quality of life.
- ✓ Agricultural technological expansion which could be helpful in alleviating poverty
- ✓ Technological and social revolution that resulted in human security and safety.
- ✓ The free movement of good, service, people, ideas, expertise, knowledge and technology which has brought international interdependence.
- ✓ New sense of global society and the perspective of global citizenship.

Demerits of Globalization

- ✓ Western imperialism of ideas and beliefs eroding and inroads the sovereignty of non-Western countries.
- ✓ Global capital and international financial institutions like WB and IMF made free inroads into countries of the south
- ✓ Brings different way of life and cultural values.
- ✓ Has made the globalization of risks, threats and vulnerabilities like global terrorism, religious fundamentalism, proliferation of Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALWs), arms and human trafficking.
- ✓ It has stimulated the emergence of a simultaneous but opposite process of *Glocalization*, which involves a process of integration to the world and differentiation to the local.
 - ❖ This process has contributed to the rise of radical nationalism and ethnicity, which set the context for the emergence of the era of identity and identity conflicts.

4.2. Regionalism

Regionalism is an ideology focusing on the formation and development of a political or social system of cooperation among states within one or more regions. It refers to the proneness of governments and peoples of two more states to establish voluntary associations and to pool resources together to create common functional and institutional arrangements. It is a phenomenon that depends on the ingredients of identifiable geographical region, geographical proximity and an organization with a common sense of identity and purpose (economic, political, security/military, etc.) among the member states. Furthermore, regionalism is a process occurring in a certain geographic region that involves many actors by sharing certain fundamental values and norms. Regionalism, as a voluntary and comprehensive process, is predominantly dominated after World War II. It emerged in Western Europe in the late 1940's, and subsequently spreading to the developing world. However, the orientation of regionalism is quite different from time to time. Generally, regionalism can be:

4.2.1. Old-Regionalism:

It is understood as a regional form of association and protection from the forces of globalization and trade liberalization. It advocates a protectionist policy against the forces of globalization and competition. In this notion of regionalism, cooperation and integration is limited to members within the bloc. It represented efforts on national protectionism at a regional level, which is usually associated with the protectionist provisions of embedded liberalism. Old regionalism has spread across the world economy

namely since 1950's and, however, it gave birth to some of the most impressive cases of new regionalism in the early 1970's.

4.2.2. New-Regionalism:

It is called open and outward-oriented regionalism. It is driven more by market and less by policy because globalization changes the balance from state regulation to market competition. It bridges the traditional division between developed and developing countries from win-lose to win-win approach of integration. It is more diverse in its geographical coverage and becoming truly a global phenomenon. New and outward-oriented regionalism can firstly promote the necessary structural and economic reforms at national level and secondly, encourage progress multilaterally. It is a new wave of regionalism needed to be related to the multitude of often inter-related structural changes in the global system of the post cold war era.

4.3. Regional Integration

Regional integration is a process where states enter into a regional agreement to enhance regional cooperation through regional institutions and rules. The objectives of the agreement could range from economic to political, from economic to social and from environmental to cultural. It could be organized either at a supranational or intergovernmental decision-making institutional order, or a combination of both. Thus, regional integration is a voluntary linking of different states in various domains to extend authority over key areas of domestic regulation to the supranational level by providing common rules, regulations and policies of a region. It basically depends on the willingness and commitment of sovereign states and labeled as the highest stage of cooperation. It demands uniformization or standardization or synchronization of all arrangements and sacrifice of some area or powers out of the ultimate decision making power of the national states. Generally, regional integration is the joining of individual states within a region into a larger whole to attain mutual gains.

4.4. Major Theories of Regional Integration

There are different theories about regional cooperation and integration. These are:

4.4.1. Functionalism Theory

Functionalism considered regionalism as a functional response by states to regional problems arising from interdependence. The theory views that cooperation must be started in areas of low politics where peace is more likely to grow through doing things together in workshops and marketplace than by signing pacts in chancelleries. It insists on sectoral and practical approach of solving common problems which spill over into political fields. A successful cooperation in a particular functional setting creates incentive for collaboration in other fields, which gradually replaced mutual suspicion into mutual trust. It insists that in a world of economic interdependence, common economic interests create the need for international institutions and rules. It rejects the emphasis on political aspects of cooperation as elites and politicians fear of losing sovereignty; hence, it neglects anticipated problems like conflict, hard power decision and political mobilization. It suggests the presence of technical issues in the recent world that necessitates collaborative efforts among states where these issues are addressed via technicians /specialists than politicians. However, the theory further advocates that technocrats should solve technical issues through apolitical considerations. Supranationality is assumed to be the only method available to states to secure maximum welfare because the nation state is increasingly incapable of fulfilling its basic social, economic and political tasks. This necessitates more and more shared aims and functions should be delegated to the more efficient integration organizations; thus, the main endeavor of functionalist is to create supranational institutions. Generally, functionalism theory viewed that integration should be pragmatic, technocratic, flexible and apolitical.

Spillover is the key explanation of functionalism theory of regionalism. There are two sorts of spillover. These are: 1/ functional spillover: it assumes that cooperation in one area would broaden and deepen in further areas. 2/ political spillover: it argued that the existence of supranational institutions would set in motion a self reinforcing process of institution building. The end result would be a shift in loyalties from nationalism towards regionalism, a new center whose institutions possesses jurisdiction over the pre-existing national states.

4.4.2. The Theory of Neo-Functionalism

It is emerged in 1960's and developed by the works of Earnest Haas and Leon Lindberg. It views that integration is a process developed through time. Typically, political integration is the process whereby political actors in several distinct national settings are persuaded to shift their loyalties, expectations and political activities towards a new centre by possessing a jurisdiction over the pre-existing national states.

The theory of neo-functionalism hinged on three main processes; i.e., the actors, motives, the process and contexts of integration. Firstly, the theory views interest groups, political parties, nation states and supra-national institutions are important actors in the integration process. But supra national institutions spins the webs of binding integration, fosters the growth of interest groups and promotes closer cooperation between member states and fellow technocrats within the parties. Member states remain important actors in the process of setting the terms of the initial agreement, but they do not exclusively determine the direction and extent of subsequent change. In order to avoid the pit falls of functionalism, the theory upgraded the importance of nation-states by insisting that states are the primary actors in an integration process, within which are interest groups and political parties.

Secondly, the theory postulates that good will and common interests will ultimately leads to greater integration. As integration progresses, the neo-functionalists expected a shift in loyalties to the new centre which is called spillover effect. They viewed integration as an outcome of joint action by all parties as problems in one area could only be solve through recourse to action in other sectors. It is spillover which is the motor or dynamics of integration. This can be achieved by upgrading the common interests of states under the guidance of a regional supra-national body. Finally, the theory contends that the context in which integration takes place is economic, social and technical; however, the joint activities in the non political areas would gradually permeate the political. The theory had exaggerated both the expansive effect of increments within the economic sphere and the gradual politicization of spill over.

Finally, the Neo-functionalist contend that the context in which integration takes place is economic, social and technical and to a lesser extend political but assumes that joint activities in the non political areas would gradually permeate the political. Linberg [1963] illuminates on conditions necessary for the success of the Neo-functionalist hypothesis: Central institutions and policies would have to be present and assigned the capacity to initiate social and economic processes thereby taking their remit beyond the normal mandate of an international organization. Tasks assigned to the institutions should be expansive and member states need to perceive some congruence between their interests and the project associated with the new institutions, and common policies. The Neo-Functionalist assumption was part of an ongoing debate on integration in Europe at the time but seem to have overshoot its projections of possibility of spill over from one area to other areas in an integration process. The theory had exaggerated both the expansive effect of increments within the economic sphere and the gradual politicization of spill over.

4.4.3. Intergovernmentalism

It is a theory that postulates that integration takes place within domestic politics and entirely a logical consequence of intergovernmental negotiations while down grading the importance of supra-national institutions in the process of integration. The theory views that the effectiveness of integration is determined by the role of the state. It considers the state as main actor in the integration process and the international system. Integration is considered as part of the rational choice of state actors. Its basic assumptions placed too much emphasis on heads of states as major players in the integration process. This rationalist framework disaggregates the process of integration into three stages: national preference formation, inter-state bargaining and institutional choice. In the first stage, the degree of integration depends on the interests of influential domestic constituents exercising pressure over their governments. For example, national governments may pursue international agendas in the fields of trade and agriculture to satisfy domestic producer groups.

Nardy Digital Copy