Chapter I

Introduction

The subject matter of academic discipline of international relations is often thought of as being very much a question of facts: tracing the foreign policy of one country here, the relations between states in a particular region there. More loosely speaking Fred Halliday\textsuperscript{1} considers it as reflective analysis of current affairs. These elements do not constitute the core of the discipline as it has developed after the First World War. Rather, the core of international relations is constituted by two other, more general concerns. One is how and with what concepts to analyse relations between states. What regularities can be observed? How best to explain inter-state conflicts and what was the role of economic factors in international relations? Two paradigms were offered. One was the Realist Paradigm and another was the Behaviouralist Paradigm. However as John Vasquez has pointed out, the work of the behaviouralist was carried out within the theoretical assumptions of Realist Paradigm. These assumptions were: That states were the dominant actors in international relations; that there was a sharp divide between domestic and international politics; and that there was a hierarchy of interests, with military-security issues at the top and economic issues at the bottom.\textsuperscript{2}

\textsuperscript{1} Halliday Fred: "Three Concepts of Internationalism", International Affairs, 1988.

In late 1960s and in 1970s, a challenge to some of the assumptions of the Realist Paradigm developed in U.S.A. The first area of debate concerned the role of the state. The conflicts involved non-state actors. The debate was between state centrism and transnationalism. Mansbach Ferguson and Lambert even went on to say that state was no longer involved in majority of international transactions.

The second area of debate was the domestic—international divide. If one can distinguish between them, then it allows powerful models of state behaviour to be developed by using notions of system unit relations. If states are indeed close units, then it is possible to construct models and theories of behaviour which introduce notions of systemic causation. At this point, international relations theory begins to mean something rather specific, as the internal attributes of states (such as ideology, political system, economic system, culture and values) can be treated as exogenous. As Steve Smith rightly points out, it was this distinction between external and domestic environments that gave Realism such theoretical power. It could claim to be a theory of behaviour of all states and not prone to the type of ethnocentrism that prevailed its main theoretical rival Idealism. Finally, the idea of hierarchy of interests was challenged. Though no Realist ever assumed that actual external...


and domestic environments could be actually separated, only, that
this was possible analytically.

By early 70s, even this idea was given up. There were
two aspects of the argument. One was that the process of
modernization altered the structure of the world society to such
an extent that there was no longer obvious behavioural divide
between domestic and international environments. The other-
argument put forward by theorists of interdependence was that,
the increasing percentage of GNP represented by foreign trade has
created a situation in which economies have become increasingly
sensitive and vulnerable to events in other economies, which
make it even analytically impossible to distinguish between
domestic and international politics, and which again make
systemic accounts of international politics more problematic.

The final area of the Realist Paradigm attacked is the
concept of hierarchy of interests. It was this that made it
possible to develop a power politics model of international
relations. Accordingly, power was a fixed phenomenon, which meant
the same thing to every international actor. Moreover, the most
important aspect of power was the military dimension, thus
making it possible to distinguish between 'high' and 'low'
politics. The existence of such a distinction between high and
low politics made it possible for Realists to claim that their
theory was objective. However, if the economic issues are
accepted as center-stage, then this distinction loses coherence.

5 Morse, E.: Modernization and the Transformation in International
6 Keohane R. and Nye, J.: Power and Interdependence
To describe it in Richard Cooper's phrase, "trade policy is foreign policy". Then it becomes clear that there is no objective measure of power, creating problems for Realist Paradigm. As Mansbach and Vasquez have argued, power politics model is replaced by issue politics model. This challenge has been met by literature on international political economy and by an approach dubbed as Neo-realism. An attempt was by Waltz to develop a truly systemic account of international relations. Again, response to it has come from Keohane.

The second core area of international relations has been the question of values, that is the normative question. What are the obligations of the states to international entities? What forms of relationships are desirable? What forms of association and solidarity are preferable and what appropriate costs? How best to promote closer relationship between states?

The subject of internationalism is a component of such discussion, although as Halliday recognizes it, currently it is an unfashionable concept. Internationalism is also a vague concept. Even those who have used the term have not defined it precisely. In simplest terms according to Halliday "Internationalism is the idea that we both are and should be a

part of broader community than that of the nation or state". It is a cluster-concept in which a number of ideas are conventionally associated without any single one or a group of them constituting a core meaning. According to Halliday, within internationalism it is possible to identify at least three broad themes.

(a) The first of these is the assertion that an allegedly objective process is taking place: the internationalisation of the world - most obviously through economic processes, the growth of communications and increasing sensitivity of hitherto discrete societies to events which occur in each other. It is claimed that we are increasingly living in one world.

(b) The second theme at the heart of internationalism is the idea that these objective processes - that governments and politicians or workers or unions or feminists or opponents of nuclear weapons or intellectuals or givers and takers of aid are tending to collaborate more than was previously the case.

(c) The third assertion is of a more normative or moral character. That these processes are a good thing because they promote understanding, prosperity, peace, freedom, tolerance or whatever the particular advocate holds to be important. The thought is that there is an international interest beyond that of nations and that these objective changes make it easier to promote it. If states are actually not rejected as ineffective or necessarily undesirables, both their effectiveness and their

---

12 *Ibid.*, p. 188.
Legitimacy are seen as conditional to a considerable extent on this international interest. According to Halliday, internationalism is like a prospective idea. It contains an element of aspiration. But it also has a retrospective side, in that many of the themes within it are ones that predate the modern nation and the modern state and have in many ways been superseded by it. Examples are: a cosmopolitan cultural community, transnational political and religious loyalties and trading links which, creation modern frontiers have broken.

It is such skepticism about the nation and such a belief in broader values that has recurred in works of many of those who developed internationalist ideas in European thinking—the thinkers of the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries who called for a union of European states, most notably Abbe St. Pierre in 1713 and then Montesquieu, Rousseau, Kant, Bentham and later liberal and revolutionary thinkers whose internationalism was given encouragement by the appeals and early policies of the French revolution. Marxist tradition put special emphasis on internationalism. The Communist Manifesto's call for World Revolution is well-known. It was Marx's promotion of International Workingman's Association, the First International in 1864 that led to the coining of the world "internationalism", the first recorded usage of which in English dates from 1877.

In the field of political theory, a parallel note can be found in many of the recent writings on nationalism, many of the outstanding examples have come from London School of Economics (the most notable writers are Ernst Gellner, Anthony Smith, Kenneth
The post-Second World War period has witnessed further internationalisation, particularly of economy and communications; also of movements of people across the borders.

This internationalisation has given new impetus, both by academics and others to conceptualise the process. The idea of 'interdependence' has become extremely popular.

However, such internationalisation has its critics as well. Some have found that nationalism is not only not dead but there has been a resurgence of it. The idea of internationalism has suffered heavily in the Communist World. However, there is evidence to the contrary also. There is no denying the fact that states are becoming more interrelated and that this is reflected in a greater opportunity for co-operation and that the trend is a desirable one.

According to Halliday, there are three meanings of the term 'internationalism'. These three ways of looking at the term depends upon the world view of the person advocating it and the character of the societies allegedly being internationalised.

1. Liberal Internationalism

It is an optimist approach based upon the belief that independent societies and autonomous individuals can through greater interaction and co-operation evolve towards common purposes, namely peace and prosperity.

This belief was found in the works of Adam Smith, idealism of Wilson, in League of Nations and the U.N.O. and the

13 Ibid., p. 192.
theories of interdependence. A parallel sustaining of one of the core ideas of liberal internationalism is seen in peace movement.

Ideology of liberal internationalism has been criticised, too. One criticism is that it overstates the compatibility of the economic with political by assuming that growing interaction in trade and finance will yield a new political understanding and that at points of conflict, the political will yield to the economic. The growing trade may be compatible with political conflict, indeed, that it may stimulate political conflict, is evident from modern history. Besides, the growing economic interaction need not necessarily lead to economic co-operation as is evident from the strife witnessed at Uruguay round.

2. Hegemonic Internationalism

Central to the idea of hegemonic internationalism is the belief that economic interaction and co-operation between states may not take place on equal terms but on asymmetrical, unequal terms. History of colonialism is well-known. With the passage of time numerous forms of post-colonial influence have evolved. In an age of imperialism, even the colonial subject peoples believed that colonialism was for their good! For those who benefited from hegemonical internationalism, not only was that internationalism not opposed to nationalism but was an extension of it. Not to talk of political or economic internationalism, even cultural internationalism contains within it elements of new hegemonies. As George Steiner remarks with English

acquiring hegemonistic influence, we have already lost half of the 8,000 languages known to have existed\textsuperscript{15}.

3. Revolutionary Internationalism

Going beyond these two versions of internationalism, one trusting the benefits of interaction, the other assertive of an asymmetrical integration of societies, the third variant Revolutionary Internationalism talks of World Class, World Party and World Revolutionary Movement. This Internationalism has many variants.

It has many weaknesses too. It defies anthropology, history, politics, and philosophy. However, it contains some truth, as well. However, much, the divisions of state and nation impose their own structure, the central thesis of revolutionary internationalism retains a striking validity that conflicts within societies are to a considerable extent determined by international factors and by international alliance and that this internationalisation of internal conflicts does much to explain the contemporary world. In contrast to much of orthodox international relations writing, which argues that what happens within states is irrelevant to the study of relations between states, Revolutionary Internationalism sees internal and international conflicts as recurrently linked.

Revolutions are international events, both in cause and effect. Further, the stress upon transnational or international preconditions for stability within a society, also remains valid. The links between revolutionary states and insurrectionary groups

\textsuperscript{15} Steiner George: \textit{After Babel}
can not be dismissed. Revolutionary thinkers believe that a revolution has to be global in character, if it is to survive. Recent history too provides examples of this. The failure of revolution in Russia as recent events prove the internationalist nature of revolution although it must be admitted that revolutionaries have been forced to be cautious. Examples of this too, can be traced from the past.

Peter Waterman tries to distinguish between 'internationalisation' and 'internationalism'.

Internationalisation according to him means several inter-related phenomena: (1) the serial reproduction of features of dominant capitalist societies and processes (including those of the nation state itself); (2) the global effects of local acts of capital and state (3) the concentration of power in supra-national for a (Multinationals, the I.M.F., the European Economic Community).

Similarly, internationalism according to Waterman also means several interrelated phenomena: (1) recognition of the above process by increasing numbers in all "three worlds"; (2) Expression of such an understanding by new social movements or citizen organisations, locally or nationally (3) creation of an "alternative international relations" or an "international civil society", prioritizing the ethics of solidarity and subverting the capitalist and statist style and practices of the dominant inter-extra or supra-state organs.

Waterman feels that while internationalisation has been subject of much attention, internationalism has not been.

Nairn distinguishes between (1) "Internationality" (2) "Universality" (3) "Cosmopolitanism" and (4) "Internationalism". According to Nairn, "internationality" is the term which can be used for world wide effects of capitalist development. He points out that since this is an essentially capitalist process (one has its dominant by-product nationalism) it can hardly provide an ethical or political foundation for internationalism. "Universalism" is his term for ancient traditional spiritual doctrines of human nature. Since the "great religious verities are counterpoised to sin and evil" in the framework of an essentially unchanging universe, he considers that universalism provides a problematic base for contemporary internationalism. "Cosmopolitanism" for Nairn is the doctrine of pre-industrial elite which considered itself the bearer of a "civilised internationality" fed in from above. However, the idea was killed by the nation-state and international wars. "Internationalism" is considered by Nairn to be both a liberal and socialist creed, though Nairn is interested in the latter; for both forms internationalism is at once antithesis and imagined transcendence (of nationalism and particularism).

Galtauq prefers not to use the word international since he sees it as representing simply the system of states or

countries -- in co-operation and conflict. He rather talks of the "territorial" and non-territorial system, recognizing in latter three types of actors. These are the "inter-governmental organisation" (U.N., I.M.F, E.E.C.), "the inter-non-governmental organization" (INGOs, organizing national political parties, unions, business organizations, TNCs) and the "transnational non-governmental organizations" (TRANGOs in which there is a direct relationship to individuals as with some professional associations). The TRANGOs express and represent non-territorial interests, values and identities.

While other elements may be present, the IGOs and the INGOs tend to reproduce or even intensify territorial events and relations. According to Galtung, traditional territorial (nation state and inter-state) system is static. All geographic space is occupied and nothing can happen but a fusion - fission within it. The non-territorial system is essentially dynamic. Galtung sees a movement away from foreign policies to a "world politics". He sees a movement away from "territorial" to "non-territorial systems" and growing importance of TRANGOs in promoting "internationalism". Although Galtung may not like the word it may be retained because of its sociological and historical roots.

Robert Cox makes a historical analysis of international relations. He identifies three significant periods, each

associated with a specific pattern of capitalist production, with a specific socio-political relationship nationally and with a specific type of imperialism. The last period is - Pax Americana, under which prevails both hegemony maintaining and anti-hegemony forces.

The present world order according to Cox has three processes:

1) Internationalisation of crucial state functions in the form of the World Bank

2) Internationalisation of production through production processes rather than via share ownership but increasingly under influence of finance capital, and

3) An emerging global class structure headed by a transnational managerial class.

He discusses three alternative features. First, is new hegemony based on internationalised production. The second is a non-hegemonic world structure of conflicting power centers. Third option is a counter-hegemony based on a Third World Coalition.

Important for us is recognition by Cox that social forces exist not exclusively within states. It may also be conceived as operating internationally against international capital, the nation-state and the inter-state system. Peter Waterman puts faith in international social movements as forces supporting nationalism and talk of labour internationalism as having gone to periphery. A labour movement has been eurocentric, chauvinist, racist, sexist, age-ist and wage-ist (unrepresentative of the young, old and unwaged). On the

otherhand, international social movements may include labour but
moves beyond the proletariat movement.21

Waterman's new internationalism implies a critique of
nation-state and capitalism, a recognition that capitalist
nation-state was too limited to deal with basic social problems
and human needs. Internationalisation emerged out of experience
of capitalist industrialization and construction of centralized
modern but undemocratic states. They were destroying old
loyalties and communities without providing the masses with any
satisfactory alternative. Internationalism developed particularly
out of relationship between new-artisan based labour movement and
cosmopolitan socialist intellectuals. Generalisation of
internationalisation process meanwhile enables numerous other
categories to recognize themselves as global subjects
(teachers, women and even ethnic and regional minorities).
Internationalisation process has also created increasing social
problems of an increasingly global nature (indebtedness, threat
to ozone layer, AIDS, state terrorism, Chernobyl). Increasingly,
these problems are discussed in international forums, and
solutions sought there.

Finally, to put an assessment of present
internationalism in Waterman's own words: "Contemporary
internationalism is highly complex and differentiated. While the
absence of mass internationalism (workers, women, peasants, ethnic
minorities) remains a problem, the multiplicity and diversity of
internationalism represents considerable potential....

-----------------------------
21 Ibid., p.32.
Internationalism is not opposed to nationalism or to any other identity or to any other identity of a non-dominant and non-exploitative nature. It is on the contrary a condition for existence of national specificity and independence, and even for such subnational identities as those of ethnic and regional minorities"²².

Internationalism has come to include many things for many people. The question of need of internationalism, the shape it is likely to take and it should take, the process and means by which it will come about, obstacles to it, chances of its success has bothered many thinkers belonging to many traditions. Following is a survey of these different traditions with the phenomena of internationalism in mind.

²² Ibid., p.43.