

Concepts in International Politics.

Key concepts

- Concept of power
- National interest
- Balance of power
- Collective security
- Deterrents

Concept of power in intⁿ politics.

- Meaning of power
- Types of power
- Elements of power
- Measurement of power
- Management of power
 - Balance of power
 - Collective Security

Meaning of Power

Power has been the central concern in theory of intⁿ politics. One of the major objectives of the nations is to acquire power. Realists define intⁿ politics as struggle for power.

For Morgenthau, power is both the end as well as means in intⁿ politics. For Kenneth Waltz, nations are "Security maximizers", that is why they acquire power. K. Waltz talks about defensive realism whereas Mearsceimer suggests that nations are "Power maximizers". Thus he talks about offensive realism.

In intⁿ politics power becomes so important that nations are categorised as powers. Nations are classified as

- Superpower *is in decline*

It means having exceptional power. Superpower can't be challenged by other nations either alone or in combination.

- Great powers (China)

Great powers come second in hierarchy. They are in a position to protect their national interest.

- Middle power (India)

- Small powers (Bhutan, Nepal)

Elements of power

- Geography (size, population, topography, location).

- Economy

prime factor in age of globalisation

- Political factor

- Leadership

- Ideology *It gives soft power.*

- Intelligence

- Military

- Technology

Determinants of Power

Elements & determinants are same. When elements are used properly so that they contribute to comprehensive national power, they become determinants of power.

hard.
what you can
soft
what you can't

Measurement of power

Nations go for measurement of their power as well as power of other nations. However, exact measurement is not possible because nations do not disclose all facts related to elements of power.

- o Discuss how the nature of power in the sphere of intⁿ politics has been changing.
- o What are the limitations of hard & soft power?
- o Write a short note on smart power & fast power.

Traditionally power has been understood in the form of hard power. Hard power implies carrot & stick. It means economic inducements & the military power. Realists have supported hard power. The nature of hard power is coercive.

something
that you
can see.

Hard power gives ability to the nation to get things done from other nations even against their wish. Military power is the ultimate hard power. According to the supporters of hard power, soft power alone may not be sufficient in influencing the behaviour of nations. e.g. As suggested by Chommay Ghare Khan India can't influence the behaviour of other nations simply on the basis of yoga, bollywood & butter chicken. C. Rajamohan has also held that the world understands argument of power & not rather than power of argument.

It can be said that there has been a decline in the relative importance of hard power.

in present century. We live in the age of complex interdependence where it is not possible for a country to use hard power, at least the military power. It is true that in present times, economic power has become more important type of hard power. According to C Rajamohan, world started taking India more seriously since 1998 after India acquired nuclear weapons. There has been a distinct change in USA's foreign policy towards S. Asia.

Though world started taking India seriously after it declared itself as de facto nuclear power, but another reason for increased importance of India has been its economic attractiveness. In present times, ^{relevance of} economic power has increased. Economic power itself is not the soft power but it can be a basis to build a soft power.

Soft power

The term soft power has been popularised by Joseph Nye. Joseph Nye has analysed the present status of USA. According to him, there has been a decline of US hegemony. He has studied rise & decline of US hegemony. According to him, soft power of USA has played significant role in building its hegemony. Overreliance on hard power where USA has overstretched itself in war against Iraq & in Afghanistan has been responsible for decline in its hegemony. According to him, it is not important how many enemies you kill,

8/10/14

It is more important, how many friends you have won.

- Distinguish Hard power vs Soft power
- Why relevance of soft power has increased
- Why Options for using hard power is losing its relevance
- Benefits of soft power over hard power.
- Defence of soft power against hard power
- Examples of soft power employed by nations.
- Understanding decline of US hegemony.

Present world order does not permit nations to rely on hard power alone. Soft power is less costlier. It is true that in some situations soft power may not work. But it is also true that hard power may also not work. At least the negative consequences of use of soft power will be comparatively less than the use of hard power. Soft power suggest that nations should learn to coopt others rather than command over others.

(Hye)
He has analysed the decline of US hegemony in post-cold war world order. He holds Bush doctrine responsible for decline of US hegemony. US has overstretched itself militarily. US also moving in the same directions like that of Soviet Union & Soviet Union also overstretched itself and neglected the economic & ideological aspect of power. US can arrest its decline by going for greater reliance on soft power. US still has great attraction. The Silicon Valley,

Obama: Cairo

Journal: foreign affairs
Foreign Affairs

- Harvard, Hollywood generates lot of appeal for US culture, values. US should promote reform in global governance, co-opt like minded countries. The biggest threat to USA comes from terrorism or radicalism. This threat to be met not by arrogance but wisdom of humility.

● Smart Power

- Later on Joseph Nye further modified his views on power & started talking about smart power. Smart power is the proper combination of hard & soft power. Former US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton had popularised the idea of smart power.

● Fast Power

- John Chipman has added a new concept i.e., fast power. According to him, it is not enough whether nation has hard power or soft power, major determinant of our times is the speed with which we take action. Our world has become extremely dynamic. Nation's security or insecurity is directly affected by the speed with which various events are taking place in the world. Our security will depend on our readiness to act with speed if we want to shape the world order rather than being shaped by others. He proposes neo-darwinism. Today it's not survival of fittest alone, it is the survival of most agile. It is speed rather than heft that will determine

foreign policy more shaped by domestic policy.

lecturer John Chipman

I.E.: India as a fast power

Sanjay Barua

the victory. Today speed has become attribute of power. In the present fast moving world absence of ability to take decisive actions with speed may cost national interest.

At present we can see that foreign policy in India is also becoming fast track. India is moving towards emerging fast power but we have to sustain the momentum & for that strategic patience is required.

have longer vision
& act fast

Management of Power & Concept of Balance of power.

- What are the basic assumptions of theory of balance of power?
- Do you think the golden age of balance of power has gone?
- What are the challenges in front of balance of power theorists and how they have responded?
- What are the limitations of balance of power?
- Techniques of balance of power

Balance of Power: Introduction

One of the oldest principles in intⁿ politics Balance of Power achieved the status of common sense in intⁿ politics. In contemporary world order the relevance of balance of power as the foremost strategy to secure national interest has come under various challenges.

Balance of Power is realist prescription for peace. Balance of Power as a concept belongs to

the Westphalian world order.

Key assumptions of Balance of Power

- They are based on the manner in which European nations conducted their relations from 1648 till WWI & even in intermediate years leading to WWII. The model of Balance of Power is based on following beliefs
 - States are the actors in international politics
 - They do not take into consideration any intⁿ actor like League of Nations or United Nations.
 - Intⁿ politics is anarchical in structure.
 - Security & survival is the chief aim of nations.
 - Nations have to depend on self help. The only way to protect national interest is by increasing power.
 - Though all actors are state actors, but actors differ in capabilities.
 - Intⁿ politics is shaped by great powers
 - Small power are like the weights in the balance
 - The ideal setting of operation of Balance of Power is there should be around 4-5/5-6 great powers.

Techniques of Balance of Power

2 Types of techniques

- Internal balancing

Developing nation's power, going for acquiring more weapons, developing economic power, i.e., self help.

- External balancing

forming alliances & counter alliances.

However alliances are not dependable, they are very fluid.

Objective of Balance of Power

To protect sovereignty & territorial integrity.

Principles / Maxims / Unwritten Rules of BoP

- Nations should not allow any actor to gain preponderance of power.
- In case of aggression against any state, other countries should come together to punish the aggressor.
- It is based on the belief that collective might of nations will deter the aggressor.

If any nation commits aggression, other nations will punish that actor. Nations can adopt following methods to stop that nation from committing similar act again.

- Division of territory
- Impose disarmament
- Create buffer states (e.g. Poland)

Criticisms of Balance of Power

- It is based on wrong assumptions. It seems as if Balance of Power in itself is an aim of nations. Balance of power may be a means not an end. It appears as if nations will forget their long term national interest & will come to the rescue of any nation whomsoever it is. Nations will not join the war until & unless they are not convinced that it is impacting their national interest. Balance of Power gives

Afghanistan - External
Similar Congress of Vienna
US vs USSR
Ind vs Pak.

nervous state of peace. It creates conditions for war. It promotes arms-race. It generates suspicion because nations go for alliances.

It is said that it inoculates against measles, but create conditions for plague.

Hence nations started thinking about alternatives to the Balance of Power.

Balance of Power works only in regional settings. Balance of Power may not be applicable at intⁿ level. Balance of Power is based on Westphalian notion of sovereignty which may not work in our times. Rise of superpowers challenged the concept of Balance of Power.

Emergence of nuclear weapons further challenged the relevance of Balance of Power.

Nuclear weapons provide ultimate deterrence.

Balance of power first failed with rise of Napoleon. In 1815, Prince Metternich of Austria called Congress of Vienna & proposed Concert of Europe. It is a first formal & official recognition of Balance of Power. Concert of Europe gave around 100 years of peace to Europe.

Challenges to Balance of Power

The first challenge to BoP politics came from Woodrow Wilson's proposal of collective security. Anyway collective security system under league of nations was not an effective challenge to Balance of Power. It could not force nations.

realists: nuclear weapons ultimate peace.

to leave old politics of alliances & counteralliances.

see secret pacts & arms race. Collective security was a new concept which could not be digested by states at that time. & BOP politics continued till WWII

After WWII, 2 challenges emerged

- Rise of superpowers / Emergence of bipolar world order

In a situation of bipolarity the status of other states was reduced to that of satellites. Bipolarity also established strategic bipolarity. In ^{place} of Balance of Power, collective defence pacts like NATO, Warsaw Pact, SEATO (South-East Asia Treaty Organisation) came into existence.

- Nuclear weapons made conventional BOP techniques irrelevant.

For peace in above scenario, the two superpowers have to establish nuclear balance & a new term was invented, i.e., Balance of Terror or MAD (Mutual assured destruction).

Developments in Europe like emergence of European Union also made Balance of Power useless in European situations. During Cold War, Balance of Power remained important consideration in Middle East & in S. Asia.

At present BOP is important consideration in Middle East.

Relevance of BOP politics in post-coldwar world order.

- Change in the nature of world order, i.e., emergence of complex interdependence.

No first use.

Complex interdependence minimizes the scope of use of hard power. In

In our times, economy dominates the agenda among states.

Nuclear balance has been established in S. Asia

Many regions are moving towards greater integration & security community. The unipolar movement immediately after the end of Cold War also challenged Balance of Power.

The biggest threat to the security of nations now come from asymmetrical actors, i.e., terrorist actors. Neither balance of power nor deterrence in conventional sense can work against these actors. Realists have given new proposals, e.g., preemptive wars (Bush doctrine) against non-state actors.

However liberals propose greater cooperation among states, strengthening of international treaties, global conventions against terrorism, Nuclear Security Summit to deal with the threat of nuclear terrorism.

In context of terrorist actors, realist scholars have proposed a new type of balancing, i.e., asymmetrical balancing.

Asymmetrical Balancing: Nations coming together against non state actors. & even non state actors also forming trans-national linkages.

Realists have also invented concept of soft balancing. Soft balancing has become common / norm today.

9/10/14

Collective Security

Introduction

First proposed by Woodrow Wilson in his 14 points speech to US Congress as an alternative to Balance of Power politics.

R Why alternative to Balance of Power?

Balance of power could establish peace in Europe but it was not enough to contain wars. So Europe has witnessed wars. The scale of destruction which was witnessed during WWI forced nations to go for exploring alternatives to BOP more seriously. Environment was also conducive for acceptability of any such idea which can avoid recurrence of another World War.

Idea of Collective Security

According to Woodrow Wilson, security should not be viewed as a concern of the nation alone. It should become collective concern.

Self help needs to be replaced by collective action. The guiding principle of collective security is "One for all & all for one"

Difference betn Collective Security & BOP

→ Collective security is both contradictory as well as similar to Balance of Power politics.

Similarities:

- Both the ideas believe in inevitability of war

in intⁿ sphere.

- Both Collective security & BoP justify the use of power & view power as a means to establish peace. The collective might of nations will deter aggression. institutionalized
power
- Both the concepts believe in management of power rather than elimination of power.

Differences:

- BoP is an adhoc system whereas collective security is institutionalized. This is the major advantage of collective security as it minimizes uncertainty that prevails in BoP system.
- In BoP there is no international actor but in Collective Security, intⁿ actor (League of Nations or UN) is necessary.
- BoP promotes arms race as it is based on concept of self help & Collective security promotes arms control as it is based on Collective action. Thus specifically useful for smaller countries / small powers.
- BoP may provide peace at regional level, we can't think the operation of BoP in its ideal sense at global level. Collective Security can work at global level. Thus it is universal in its approach.

Limitations of Collective Security

- On paper it appears to be a convincing argument, but in practice we have seen that

collective security remained disfunctional concept.

Uptil now collective security have been tried under 2 institutions, first under League of Nations.

Art 10 to Art 16 of Charter of League of Nations dealt with Collective Security. However League of Nations could not stop WW II.

→ Shortcomings in League of Nations' collective security system.

- USA could not join the League of Nations.

USA was in a best possible situation to carry forward the idea as it was away from continental politics.

- In the absence of USA, the responsibility for success of Collective Security experiment was on shoulder of France & Britain. Collective Security was something very new & they had been dealing with BoP for centuries.

Thus they could not develop the required commitment for the success of League of Nations & continued with their ^{faith} ~~faith~~ in Balance of Power.

- League of Nations lacked any standing military force. It was dependent on the contribution of member countries.

- Charter lacked the mechanisms necessary for operationalisation. It was not clear how to determine the act of aggression.

- Collective security could be implemented only with consensus of all members.

Thus collective security system under League of Nations was very idealistic in its approach.

Diversity in UNSC required
Representatives from all continents

"Responsibility to Protect" has come into existence.

Today Collective Security actions of UN are modified into responsibility to protect (R2P) doctrine. UN record w.r.t. R2P also remains controversial. The way these operations have been conducted has further challenged the legitimacy of international community's intervention in the affairs of the nations. UN Security Council resolution 1973 authorising NATO action in Libya has come under criticism. Action was not supported by Russia & China. However they preferred to abstain rather than vetoing the action. No R2P action could be taken w.r.t. Syria as in case of Syria, Russia & China have used veto. This shows that until & unless P5 nations have a consensus, Collective Security in any form can't be operationalised.

Analysis of Collective Security system.

Collective Security seems to be an idealistic notion. It is based on some assumptions which are unrealistic.

- Nations can think that there is some collective interest which needs to be protected.
- Nations should be ready to commit their resources & forces for Collective Security, even when it is not directly related to their national interest.
- It assumes that nations will have freedom to support Collective Security actions all time.

Barbent
UN issues: Kashmir
Palestine

Kashmir
Palestine

US: end US
means CD.

Nehru against NATO
- promotes arms race
- compromises sovereignty
of newly independent states.

It also assumes that nations will forget their long term partnerships/interest simply for the sake of Collective action.

National interest continues to be the prime consideration of the actions taken by nations.

The institutions of global governance like UN have become mechanisms for promotion of narrow national interest. These institutions suffer from legitimization crisis because they are not representative in proper sense.

UN requires standing military force. It also requires veto reforms. It requires that R2P actions should also ensure the accountability of those who are operationalising these actions.

Diff. betⁿ Collective Security & Collective Defence

- NATO is an example of Collective Defence.

Collective defence pacts show that nations do not have faith in UN Collective Security system. Collective Defence pacts like NATO Warsaw Pact challenged Collective Security system. Defence pacts are only for members, whereas Collective Security is universal. Defence Pacts are regional arrangements, whereas Collective Security is a global idea.

What relation betⁿ Collective Security & Collective Defence, there are 2 perspectives.

→ US Perspective

Collective Defence is permissible under

UN charter as it gives right to self defence to every state.

Collective Defence is the only way in which Collective Security can be operationalised effectively

— Nehruvian Perspective

It Undermines faith in Collective Security.

Collective Security will promote arms control & disarmament whereas Collective Defence Pact results into arms race.

Collective Security is a prescription for peace whereas Collective Defence is a threat to peace.

Nuclear Deterrence as an ultimate way to achieve peace.

What is idea of deterrence?

Deterrence is also a realist approach to peace. Deterrence is as old as human civilization. However it became important after invasion & use of nuclear weapons.

Deterrence has been the prime means for protection of national security after WWII.

Nuclear deterrence is considered as the major factor that prevented Cold War betⁿ the 2 superpowers turning into the Hot War. Supporters of nuclear deterrence believe that there is no better alternative to peace than nuclear deterrence.

Pak protected irrational. Pak pro

Indira Gandhi did not inherit the democratic DNA of Nehru.

Rogue states: don't care for living their own people.

Meaning of deterrence

Deterrence is a strategy to prevent attack.

Attack against itself by convincing the adversaries that the cost of aggression shall exceed the probable gain.

Cost benefit analysis.

Means to achieve deterrence

There can be 2 ways of achieving deterrence

- Through conventional weapons
- Through nuclear weapons

Deterrence through conventional weapons are not as effective as deterrence through nuclear weapons. Nuclear deterrence works on the logic of MAD (Mutually Assured Destruction).

Criticisms of deterrence

- Deterrence theory is based on the assumption that 2 parties in conflict are rational actors.
- Deterrence to be successful requires
 - Ability of nation to convince the adversary about nation's capabilities
 - Deterrence will work only when the other party believes in the credibility of the party aiming to deter.
- Deterrence may work betⁿ states. However in 21st century the real security threat comes from asymmetrical actors, i.e., terrorists actors. In situation of these actors, deterrence may not work. Reasons
 - They may operate from anywhere
 - They are ready to sacrifice their lives

- In case of deterrence if the other party is able to convince that they are not rational, the utility of deterrence goes.

- One view is deterrence is not useful for small states like N. Korea because they will never have capacity to deter.

- In the West, scholars believe that only Western countries should possess nuclear weapons because they value human life & rogue states should not be permitted to possess nuclear weapons because their value system (non-western value system) does not respect human rights or right to life. Most of these countries have authoritarian rulers & they are hardly concerned with the wellbeing of their own people.

10/10/14

• What is the relevance of nuclear deterrence in 21st century?

Challenges:

Rise of non-state actors, i.e., terrorists

Against terrorists it may not work.

Terrorists may prefer to operate from a friendly country. They are not to be treated as rational actors. They are able to convince that they are irrational. e.g. Mumbai Terror Attack, 9/11. This implies that nuclear deterrence is not enough.

Suggestion for 21st century

- Supporters of nuclear deterrence

• They believe that deterrence will remain relevant always. They give following examples.

No direct ^{full scale war} confrontation betⁿ USA & Russia.

• It also minimizes chances of coercive diplomacy against a particular state having nuclear weapons & may force countries to talk.

However according to the critics, nuclear deterrence has lost relevance for realists.

we have to go for preemptive wars. Preemptive wars mean destroying the capacity of a state before it develops nuclear weapon capabilities. Bush doctrine & US war invasion of Iraq is an example of preemptive war.

However, according to liberals, preemptive wars will generate more insecurity, will force nations to acquire nuclear weapons in a clandestine manner. Nuclear watchdog (secretive)

India economic growth $\rightarrow$ other advanced nations' stake in India will increase
 $\downarrow$
Pakistan will try to stop this

institutions like IAEA does not have sufficient mandate & resources.

From liberals point of view, the scenario where so called Rogue states or failed states of 3rd world countries go for acquiring nuclear weapons against preemptive strikes will make the security scenario worse.

It also enhances the danger of proliferation of nuclear weapons in the hands of terrorists.

For liberals, solution is not nuclear balance or preemptive wars but serious efforts for nuclear disarmament. Countries should take initiatives to deal with scenario where terrorist actors acquiring nuclear weapons, nations have to cooperate in this context. Nuclear Security Summit is one such effort.

Why nuclear deterrence is not relevant in 21st century? The other reason is complex interdependence. Complex interdependence minimizes the chance of the probability of use of nuclear weapons and full scale conventional war.

National Interest

- o Any theory of national interest is a pseudo theory.
- o What are the core national interests & secondary national interest.
- o Whether national interest is a constant or dynamic concept?

Concept of national interest originally belongs to the realist theory of intⁿ politics. For Morgenthau, national interest is the prime motivation of foreign policies. National Interest is dynamic concept. The only way to secure N.I. is through power. He even prefers to explain N.I. in terms of power.

Theory of N.I. is called as pseudo theory

N.I. is an amorphous ~~con~~cept. There is no agreement over what all constitutes the core national interest. Nations use national interest for legitimisation of their action which may be against intⁿ law & morality.

One of the most misused & misunderstood concept. For realists, national interest is sacred above morality & law. For feminists, national interest needs to be defined differently & not without morality & law. For liberals, there is no incompatibility betⁿ national & intⁿ interest. For Marxists, nation, nationalism, national interest is false consciousness. For emancipatory school, we have to develop trans-national linkages & new moral boundaries.

Security

- Explain the nature of security in context of 21st century.
- Prepare a security matrix taking into consideration the nature of present world order.
- Discuss different schools of security.

Security is one of the earliest notions in theory of intⁿ politics. Concept of security is evolving. Means of acquiring security are changing. Challenges to nation's security are also changing their forms. One of the earliest notion of security was Balance of Power.

The other concept include collective security, security community, economic interdependence, deterrence, preemptive wars, reflective theories like social constructivism, critical school.

Today security is understood in a broad sense.

Earlier it was strategic, i.e., military security.

Now it has social, economic, ecological & other dimensions also. (space, cybersecurity).

Today nations also face insecurity dilemma due to rise of ethnic politics. Concept of security has become too amorphous & interdisciplinary.

Security matrix

Time	Space	Issue
Immediate	Domestic	Pakistan
	External	Economic
Short term	Regional	Ecological
	Continental	Social
Long term	Global	Political
	Space	
	Cyberspace	

Role of trans-national actors in intⁿ politics

- Explain how trans national actors have impacted the theory & practice of intⁿ politics.

What are trans-national actors?

Their area of operation is beyond the territorial boundary of a particular nation.

Difference in trans-national & international actors.

- United Nations, WTO are examples of intⁿ actors. Here nations are the members.
- Transnational actors: MNCs, Civil Society network, ~~per~~ terrorists

Originally intⁿ politics was supposed to be politics among nations but in our times it has become increasingly pluralistic. Joseph Nye talks about the 3 layers in intⁿ politics.

Trans-national actors form the 3rd layer.

3rd layer is more diffused.

Complex interdependence theory includes other

actors also besides state actors, as actors in intⁿ politics.

Role of transnational actors.

Role of MNCs

- Realists do not give any importance to MNCs.
- Liberal theory : Economic interdependence views MNCs as a source of peace & stability. Specially beneficial for 3rd world countries because they bring capital, technology, employment.
- Marxists :
For Marxists, MNCs undermine democracy. They undermine autonomy of the state & primarily responsible for weakening of democracy in 3rd world countries. MNCs.
Role of MNCs results into development of underdevelopment, drain of wealth.

Role of Civil Society Networks.

- Realist : No role of Civil Societies
- Marxists : Proletarian internationalism.
- Sociological liberalism recognises role of civil society networks
- Critical theory / emancipatory theory.
trans-national linkages have to be developed.
- Role of these networks
NGOs, Charitable org have been playing their role silently since very beginning. They have been the means of soft power.

Today, they have also become means of bargaining. Globalisation & information & communication revolution has enhanced the no. & significance of these organisations. They have been means of propagation of geoculture (HR, liberalism, democracy).

In some countries they have also undermined sovereignty of the state. They have been benefited out of rolling back policies. Intⁿ donors prefer to channelise aid through voluntary associations rather than through the state. There is a dominance of developed countries in this sphere.

There has been lot of criticism of the activities of these groups in non western countries. e.g.

Recently Russia has asked USA ~~and~~ to leave the country. Recently leaked report of Indian Intelligence Agency (IB) has accused certain NGOs and persons associated with them as having anti-national agenda & even estimated loss to GDP because of their activities.

w.r.t. the role of these groups, there have been lot of controversies. They are viewed as agencies of the West propagating the agenda of developed countries.

Role of Terrorist actors

They have been successful in impacting the theory as well as politics in international sphere.

- Realist theory: For long, realists view of intⁿ politics

Andre Heywood
Role of nonstate actors.

has been a monistic view. Now they also recognise the role of terrorists along with states. It has brought lot of changes in basic concepts and security theories. In realist literature, they are treated as asymmetrical actors. Realists have invented the term asymmetrical balancing as a theoretical innovation to Balance of Power theory. They have also challenged the wisdom of nuclear deterrence. Realists have responded with the concept of preemptive wars.

- Complex interdependence model also includes terrorist actors in the description of intⁿ politics. The threat to security of all nations due to these actors have actually contributed for the growth of complex interdependence among the nations. We see some cooperative exercises like National security Summit, Global Conventions against terrorism & nuclear terrorism, Bilateral agreements betⁿ states, etc.