



The history of international relations based on sovereign states and many more types are often traced back to the Peace of Westphalia of 1648, a stepping stone in the development of the modern state system. Prior to this the European medieval organization of political

authority was based on a vaguely hierarchical religious order. Contrary to popular belief, Westphalia still embodied layered systems of sovereignty, especially within the Holy Roman Empire. More than the Peace of Westphalia, the Treaty of Utrecht of 1713 is thought to reflect an emerging norm that sovereigns had no internal equals within a defined territory and no external superiors as the ultimate authority within the territory's sovereign borders. The centuries of roughly 1500 to 1789 saw the rise of the independent, sovereign states, the institutionalization of diplomacy and armies. The French Revolution added to this the new idea that not princes or an oligarchy, but the citizenry of a state, defined as the nation, should be defined as sovereign. Such a state in which the nation is sovereign would thence be termed a nation-state (as opposed to a monarchy or a religious state). The term republic increasingly became its synonym. An alternative model of the nation-state was developed in reaction to the French republican concept by the Germans and others, who instead of giving the citizenry sovereignty, kept the princes and nobility, but defined nation-statehood in ethnic-linguistic terms, establishing the rarely if ever fulfilled ideal that all people speaking one language should belong to one state only. The same claim to sovereignty was made for both forms of nation-state. (In Europe today, few states conform to either definition of nation-state: many continue to have royal sovereigns, and hardly any are ethnically homogeneous.

The particular European system supposing the sovereign equality of states was exported to the Americas, Africa, and Asia via colonialism and the "standards of civilization". The contemporary international system was finally established through decolonization during the Cold War. However, this is somewhat over-simplified. While the nation-state system is considered "modern", many states have not incorporated the system and are termed "pre-modern".

Further, a handful of states have moved beyond insistence on full sovereignty and can be considered "post-modern". The ability of contemporary IR discourse to explain the relations of these different types of states is disputed. "Levels of analysis" is a way of looking at the international system, which includes the individual level, the domestic state as a unit, the international level of transnational and intergovernmental affairs, and the global level.

What is explicitly recognized as international relations theory was not developed until after World War I, and is dealt with in more detail below. IR theory, however, has a long tradition of drawing on the work of other social sciences. The use of capitalizations of the "I" and "R" in international relations aims to distinguish the academic discipline of international relations from the phenomena of international relations. Many cite Sun Tzu's *The Art of War* (6th century BC), Thucydides' *History of the Peloponnesian War* (5th century BC), Chanakya's *Arthashastra* (4th century BC), as the inspiration for realist theory, with Hobbes' *Leviathan* and Machiavelli's *The Prince* providing further elaboration.

Similarly, liberalism draws upon the work of Kant and Rousseau, with the work of the former often being cited as the first elaboration of democratic peace theory. Though contemporary human rights is considerably different from the type of rights envisioned under natural law, Francisco de Vitoria, Grotius and John Locke offered the first accounts of universal entitlement to certain rights on the basis of common humanity. In the 20th

century, in addition to contemporary theories of liberal internationalism, Marxism has been a foundation of international relations.

Scope:

In modern world the scope of IR has a greatly expanded. Initially Initially it was the study of diplomacy. Later, international law became the subject matter of IR. It became more wider with the establishment of league of nations and the study of international organizations was also included in IR. The scope of IR expanded during the second world war with emergence of USA and USSR as super power, the multiplications of nation states, the danger of thermo-nuclear war, increasing interdependence of states and rising expectations in the people of the underdeveloped world. Greater emphasis was made on the scientific study of IR which developed methodologies and introduction of new theories Today IR includes the study of behavior of political actors and groups and it has an extensive scope. On the other hand, the writers seem divided on the scope of IR and as Alfred Zimmern says that IR is not a discipline but a combination of History and political science. It is heavily dependent on other disciplines and has so far failed to develop a coherent body of knowledge.

According to Organski “as a science, IR today is in its infancy, it is still less a science than a mixture of philosophy and history and its theories are shockingly unstable”

Importance of IR:

The world has become a global village due to technological advances. Therefore, an event in one part of the world has an immediate effect on the other part. All the states in the world are now under compulsion to interact with each other.



International relations existed since long among different states like Egypt, Greece and china but they were based on morality and were not scrupulously observed. These earlier relations were among the neighbors and they may precisely be called “regional relations”. It was only in seventeen centuries that the states established relations beyond their regions. The improvement in the means of communications, and the industrial revolution further brought the states together. At this time the study of IR was mainly concerned with

the study of diplomacy, law and philosophy. Today the relations among the states are interdependence, and IR enables us to understand the motives of individual states and problems faced by the world.

IR teaches us that peace could only be achieved if the world actors subjectively solve the problems faced by the world politics like excessive nationalism and narrow national interest. Modern theory of IR demonstrates that the traditional concept of sovereignty has become outdated and needs modification.

Approaches to International Relation:

Idealism (Idealist Approach) and Realism (Realist Approach) have been two competing traditional approaches, each of which wants recognition as the sound approach to the study of international relations.



(I) Idealism in International Relations:

The Idealist Approach:

The Idealist Approach holds that old, ineffective and harmful modes of behaviour i.e., war, use of force and violence should be abandoned in favour of new ways and means as determined by knowledge, reason, compassion and self-restraint.

Idealism stands for improving the course of international relations by eliminating war, hunger, inequality, tyranny, force, suppression and violence from international relations. To remove these evils is the objective before humankind. Idealism accepts the possibility of creating a world free from these evils by depending upon reason, science and education.

“Political idealism in international relations represents a set of ideas which together oppose war and advocate the reform of international community through dependence upon moral values and the development of international institutions and international law.”

“A world full of human happiness is not beyond human power to achieve.” —Bertrand Russell

Idealist approach derives strength from the general idea of evolutionary progress in society and the spirit of liberal idealism which was at the back of American policies, particularly during the inter-war years. During the inter-war years (1919-39), the U.S. President Woodrow Wilson became its most forceful exponent. The Idealist Approach advocates morality as the means for securing the desired objective of making the world an ideal world. It believes that by following morality and moral values in their relations, nations can not only secure their own development, but also can help the world to eliminate war, inequality, despotism, tyranny, violence and force. “For the idealists, politics is the art of good government and not the art of possible. Politics provides for the good life and respect for his fellow humans, both domestically and internationally.” —Coulombis and Wolfe. As such Idealism advocates the need for improving relations among nations by removing the evils present in the international environment.

Main Features of Idealism:

- Human nature is essentially good and capable of good deeds in international relations.
- 2. Human welfare and advancement of civilization are the concerns of all.
- 3. Bad human behaviour is the product of bad environment and bad institutions.
- 4. By reforming the environment, bad human behaviour can be eliminated.
- War represents the worst feature of relations.
- 6. By reforming international relations, war can be and should be eliminated.
- 7. Global efforts are needed to end war, violence and tyranny from international relations.
- 8. International community should work for eliminating such global instruments, features and practices which lead to war.
- 9. International institutions committed to preserve international peace, international law and order should be developed for securing peace, prosperity and development.

The main supporters of idealism have been Mahatma Gandhi, Bertrand Russell, Woodrow Wilson, Aldous Huxley, William Ladd, Richard Cobben, Margret Mead, and others. They strongly oppose the realist view of international politics as struggle for power and national interest and advocate the use of reason, education and science for securing reforms in relations and for eliminating war and other evils from international relations.

Difference between Realist and Idealist

Realist

- ❖ Realists are basically conservative people who follow the convention of the society and thus, are more secure socially.
- ❖ Realism is the theory, of the people who live in the present.
- ❖ Realists, settle for mediocrity. They only aim for achievable targets. That is why to accept some thing extra ordinary from them is out of question.

Idealist

- ❖ Idealist, on the other hand, are nonconformists who are most likely to revolt against the set norms.
- ❖ While idealism is the theory of futurists.
- ❖ Idealists on the other hand, aim for perfection. They set high goals for themselves and others.. They believe that humans have vast potential, which should be bind properly to achieve excellence .

(B) Realism in International Relations or the Realist Approach:

Political Realism stands associated with the names of Max Weber, E.H. Carr, Frederick Schuman, Nicholas Spykman, Reinhold Niebuhr, Arnold Wolfers, Kenneth Thompson, George F. Kennan, Hans J. Morgenthau, Henry Kissinger and several others. Realist Approach follows a power view of international relations.

Political Realism:

Realism regards politics as struggle for power and seeks to explain it with the help of such factors as power, security and national interest. Power is defined as a psychological relationship in which one actor is able to control the behaviour of another actor. A political actor is one who always seeks to secure one's interests as defined in terms of power. Political realism further regards prudence as the guide in politics. Couloumbis and Wolfe explain the basic feature of Realism and observe, "to act rationally (that is, to act in one's interest) is to seek power, i.e., to have ability and willingness to control others."


Key Features of Political Realism:

History gives evidence that humanity is by nature sinful and wicked.

2. Lust for power and dominance has been a major, all important and all-pervasive fact of human nature.
3. Human instinct for power cannot be eliminated.
4. Struggle for power is the incontrovertible and eternal reality of international relations.
5. Each nation always seeks to secure the goals of national interest defined in term of power.
6. Self-preservation is the law that always governs the behaviour of all the states.
7. Nations always seek power, demonstrate power and use power.
8. Peace can be preserved only by management of power through such devices as Balance of Power, Collective Security, World Government, Diplomacy, Alliances and the like.

The first Great Debate between Idealism and Realism




**KEEP
CALM
AND STUDY
INTERNATIONAL
RELATIONS**

KeepCalmAndPosters.com

Conclusion: IR is broader and includes a wide variety of political, non-political, official and unofficial, formal and informal activities and relations (Palmer & Perkins)