



**FACULTY OF JURIDICAL SCIENCES**  
**COURSE: B.A.LL.B**

**Semester II**

**SUBJECT: POLITICAL**

**SCIENCE - II**

**SUBJECT CODE: BAL,201**

**NAME OF FACULTY: DR.INDERJEET KAUR**

# Lecture-4



## LECTURE 4 KIND AND APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF FOREIGN POLICY

The modern state system has been in existence since the treaty of Westphalia in 1648. It includes big, middle and small powers. As mentioned above, the interaction between these states takes place at the international level and as such it plays a significant role in shaping and moulding the foreign policies of those interacting states [12]. The establishment of friendly and cooperative relations between states is the aim of a sound foreign policy. Foreign policy is essentially shaped by one's relative power within the international system. The world is continuously changing, new events and personalities create fresh foreign policy problems for all concerned<sup>12</sup>. To select events at random, the impact of the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917, the rise of Communist Power in China in 1949, the rise of De Gaulle to power in France and Hitler in Germany, and the emergence of new states in Asia and Africa; brought about significant changes in the power structure and that has impacted the foreign policy of many states. A prevalent framework of world politics plays a decisive role in deciding the foreign policy of a country. As such foreign policies of states thus change with shifts in the international power structure. In the traditional multi-polar system, it was easier for states to switch sides and gain maximum interests from both sides. Italy has used this strategy skillfully and switched sides during the height of World War I to gain its share in the post war colonial arrangement<sup>13</sup>. During the 1980s, the international system was characterized with a bi-polar system as witnessed during the Cold War, and now a unipolar with the US as the only hegemonic power. These events have restructured the power system and have a significant effect on the foreign policies of states [12]. During the bipolar world system, it was not easy for states to switch sides easily as the ideological fault lines were clearly marked. The demise of the Soviet Union and the advent of the unipolar world (US hegemony) have its own system dynamics, such as Bush's "either with us or against us". His declaration has made many states from the margins of the system to come forward and play effective roles, especially in the so-called Global War on Terror. At this point therefore, every type of power structure at the international level has its own particular dynamics and has an impact on the foreign policies of states. International law The international law is generally defined as a set of rules that regulate relations between states. Calci Novati defined it as "a system of rules created deliberately and explicitly by states. Where states have expressly willed to be bound by the rules"<sup>14</sup>. The existence of international law and international norms limits the freedom to maneuver of states in the system. It is constituted by interstate agreements and treaties and thus, does not entirely favor every interest a state may have. It limits a state in one way or another [13-15]. As has been said, international law regulates the foreign policy of states, and has a binding function in foreign policy as it offers a legal framework through which states should interact. By foreign policy in this sense, is defined as the objectives that guide the activities and relationships of one state in its interaction with other states. It is believed that states actually obey and comply with international law because it constrains the making and enacting of their foreign policy. However, there is much debate among International Relations theorists about the consequences of international law. Whether states really comply with or observed international law and norms or not and to what extent they do obey international rules; because it is clear that some international norms are obeyed while others are ignored. One side of the debate, proponents of Realism, argue that international law has little or no independent effect on foreign policy. Henkin, for instance argued that one of the major purposes of foreign policy is to "maintain international order so that states can pursue national interests." Thus in a realist view, states have the tendency to give priority to their national interests and then sometimes violate legal norms when fundamental interests are at risk. Leaders are claimed to pursue their national interests (broadly defined to include military security and economic prosperity) without regard for international law. The US invasion of Iraq in 2003, under the Bush administration provides a clear illustration of this [16]<sup>15</sup>. Hence from this it is said, the international law lacks force because the legislative, judicial and executive functions are

fundamentally decentralized. First, each nation in world affairs is its own lawgiver. Second, a nation is its own judge and can interpret the law to serve its own purposes. Finally, each nation in world affairs is its own sheriff, who must enforce the law for itself or organize a sympathetic posse. On the other hand, against this skeptical view, liberal institutionalist argues that international law can be profoundly significant. He\ assert that when states sign a treaty or agreements, it allegedly becomes costlier to take actions the law forbids and less costly to pursue policies the law condones. That is, treaties in the other words “tie the hands of current and future leaders by increasing the cost of renegeing.” According to the Positivist view, international law is a set of rules that regulates and constraints state behaviour. States are constrained to respect international norms if they do not want to face sanctions and avoid ‘naming and shaming’ by international activists (i.e., human rights activists). The Constructivist approach of international law in foreign policy can illustrate the fact that it regulates and gives a roadmap to state’s behaviour, enable them to enter in relationship with each other (thereby limiting their actions); because they are legally bind by customary law and they decide to have legally binding obligations through treaties. In sum, international law defines the status, the rights, the responsibilities, and obligations of the nations in foreign policy. Thus, it is the responsibility of every state to observe the norms and laws, failure to which there are consequences. International organizations Currently, there are over 68,000 International Organizations (both active and inactive) in the world. Many International Organizations (IOs) play an enormous role in the current international system. It is hard to imagine how world affairs would operate without international bodies such as the United Nations (UN) and its affiliates, international financial institutions, such as International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank (WB). Such organizations are considered as actors in the field of International Relations, as they facilitate the interaction between states at the global level. A state’s foreign policies is thus, often affected by its membership of international, regional and sub-regional organizations, since they surrender partially their sovereignty to these organizations. As their operations will be guided by the constitution of the organization; the policies of member states will undoubtedly be affected by the nature of the particular institution. Nevertheless, scholars of international relations still disagree about the role IOs play in the foreign policies of states. The realist approach in the international politics has generally had less confidence in the efficacy\ of international organizations. He\ argue, for example that the United Nations and most other international bodies have no way to implement their decisions and that nation states have all the real power in the international system [17-21]. Mearsheimer for instance, argued that international institutions “are basically a reflection of the distribution of power in the world. He\ are based on the selfinterested calculations of the great powers, and they have no independent effect on state behavior.” IOs are considered as only a marginal factor in world politics. This is otherwise regarded as the ‘bottom-up’ perspective; i.e., how the foreign policies of states impact international organizations. However, the Constructivist and liberal institutionalist account, took a different view; the ‘top-down’ perspective. How international organizations impact the foreign policies of states. In the constructivist account, international organizations to a larger extent serve as modifiers of state behaviour and as independent actor. He\ have profound impact on the determination of the foreign policy of the member states. The realization of mutual independence, has given birth to a large number of international and regional organizations, arrangements, agreements, and trading blocks. The European Union, ASEAN, African Union, OPEC, ECOWAS and several others have been major players in the international system. Hence, it is obvious that the foreign policy of every state is now becoming conscious of these organizations, trading blocks, and economic and trade agreements. Thus, international organization constitute a determinant factor in the foreign policies of states. Alliances Alliance formulation is considered to be one of the most curious aspects of international relations. It is regarded as the cornerstone of security policy; however, conventional wisdom holds that is commitment are notoriously unreliable. Alliance formation is considered as a strategy that states use in the formulation and implementation of their foreign policies. Clinton and Palmer, examined the consequences of alliance formation for other foreign policies of a state, including defense spending and the initiation of militarized disputes, using a theory of foreign policy that is based on several assumptions. First, states pursue two goods-change and maintenance-through their foreign policy. Second, states select a portfolio of policies designed to produce the most preferred mix of the two

goods. Hird, all foreign policy behaviour including alliance requires resources. Fourth, states are rational in their allocation of resources [22]. Together this implies that an observe alliance must have been the most efficient mechanism available for acquiring the most desired and achievable foreign policy portfolio and have implications for the observation of foreign policy substitutability. He added that alliance provide capability on which the state can draw, thereby providing greater opportunity to pursue both maintenance and change. Alliances in their dictum “are the results of agreements that both entail some commitment and allow for increased foreign policy activity.” Finally, they see alliances as part of a state’s foreign policy portfolio, in which the alliance may constrain the state in some areas while allowing it freedom to act in others. Alliances like international law do shape the foreign policies of states, because the member parties to the alliances have to respond to the requests and demands of their allies and refrain from formulating policies or taking actions which are offensive to the alliance partners. Like many scholars in international relations, Dinesh asserted that, alliances serve as instruments of foreign policies. “The extensive and intensive system of alliances that emerged in the post-1945 period had a big impact on the foreign policies of all the nations. During 1945-90, both the United States and USSR, recognized and used alliances as the means for consolidating their respective positions.” Again, during the height of the Cold War, neither the members of the ‘Warsaw Pact’ nor those of ‘North Atlantic Treaty Organization’ (NATO) could pursue any independent foreign policy [23]. Even now, with the demise of the Warsaw Pact, the US still continues to consider NATO as the mainstay of its foreign policy in Europe.

**Military strategy/Arm race** An arm race denotes the quantity or quality of instruments of military and naval power by rival states in peacetime. The first modern arm race took place when France and Russia challenge the naval superiority of Britain in the late 19th century. The buildup of arms, was also a characteristic of the Cold War between the US and USSR. The hostility between the United States and the Soviet Union began near the end of World War I. The profound ideological differences between these two camps were problematic, which eventually had an effect on the international system. The creation of the first atomic bomb in 1945, by the USA had two objectives: a quick end of World War II and possession by US (and not USSR), would allow control of foreign policy in the global stage. However, the discovery and the detonation of an atomic bomb in 1949 by the Soviet Union, ends America’s monopoly of atomic weaponry and launches the Cold War [24]. As such in the 1950s, arm race became the focus of the Cold War. Arm race are a competitive defense spending and military capability building between two states or bloc of states (like the cold war). Examples of such states locked in long-term rivalries with other states include India-Pakistan, China-India, North-South Korea, and Turkey-Greece. In the pursuit of foreign policy objectives, states adopt different strategies, and military strategy is one of those. Scholars assert that one of the main prerequisite of a credible state actor is to develop the military capabilities and political will, to back its diplomacy by force when necessary. As the famous saying, ‘when negotiations fail, confrontation is inevitable.’ Thus, the use of military power is considered as the ultimate tool of international relations following the conception of war as the continuation of politics by other means. However, in either case whether used defensively or offensively, military power lends a measure of international freedom of action to the state involved [25]. Thus, this is affirming the political theory of war which argues that “in a world system of competing states, the basis of diplomacy, and of all contractual obligations beyond the boundaries of the state rest on the capacity to use (diplomacy of) violence, both to protect the state, and to protect one’s interest in the face of oppositionive