



INTERNATIONAL POLITICS- BASIC FINANCIAL APPROACHES

DR. DEVENDRA AWASTHI

Associate Professor and Head

Department of Economics

V.S.S.D. College Kanpur India

& DR. UMESH CHANDRA YADAV

Associate Professor

Department of Economics

V.S.S.D. College Kanpur India

John Stuart Mill, a great revisionist of Utilitarianism laid the basis of an economic approach to the International Politics when he stated that “it is the commerce which is rapidly rendering war obsolete, by strengthening and multiplying the personal interests which are in natural opposition to it.”¹ In the recent time many scholars have emerged in the field who has presented different theoretical postulates which have helped in the profuse growth of the discipline in less time. They have contributed in the development theories of International Relations. Their age starts since the start of last century. The golden age of balance of power had come to end and the First World War started in 1914. These developments stimulated the intellectual world in European and North American countries.

New theoretical models were proposed to decode the global politics. Raymond Aron, E H Carr, Robert Gilpin, John Herz, Stephen Krasner, Susan Strange helped in the development of theory of Realism. Morgenthau is leading thinker of realism. The theory of realism has immense value for the study of international politics and relations. It has inferred the principles which govern the states’ behavior in the global politics. “Realism has arguably the most dominant theoretical paradigm in International Relations discourse since 1945. There can equally be little doubt that Hans Morgenthau’s contribution to this body of scholarship singularly dominated the study of international relations until 1970s.”² Norman Angell, Charles Beitz, Michael Doyle, Stanley Hoffman, Woodrow Wilson, Alfred Zimmern etc. have contributed in the development of liberalism. There are many theoretical approaches which have lately emerged in the discipline as for illustration Cynthia Enloe has widely contributed in the International Theory of Gender.

Marton Kaplan has established system theory in the discipline. Kenneth Waltz is leading thinker of neo realism, a theory of contemporary time. “Kenneth Waltz is the most cited author in modern IR (International Relations). One major reason for that is his creation of a coherent set of provocations challenging fashionable viewpoints in significant –though



shifting of the IR community.”³ His contribution in the development of contemporary theory of realism is noteworthy. Many new theories are being presented in the discipline. It shows that discipline has unending path to chart.

At the institutional-academic level “International Relations as a field began in 1919 in the aftermath of the First World War, when the first Department of International Politics was founded at Aberystwyth University in the United Kingdom (at that time called University College, Wales) following a gift of £20,000 by David Davies. Davies’ gift also supported the establishment of the Woodrow Wilson Chair, the first endowed chair in International Relations.”⁴ This was in response to contemporary challenges which had emerged due to First World War. It was realized that intellectual response to the problems need to be evolved. “The discipline of IR was founded as a response to the perceived need to understand and prevent the causes of war in the international system. In the interwar period, this normative motivation behind the creation and early development of IR as an academic discipline meant that liberal and idealist approaches were dominant.”⁵

The major factor was that other theoretical postulates were in their infancy. “Abersystwyth University was not the only university in the United Kingdom to develop expertise in the study of International Relations. In 1920, the London School of Economics followed suit, founding its own Department of International Relations. It established its first Chair of International Relations, the Sir Ernest Cassell Chair, in 1924. In its founding vision, the Department proclaimed that its mission was ‘to be equipped to deal with international affairs from all the three angles of law, history, and administration.’”⁶ This development marks an important phase in the evolution of the discipline because multidisciplinary approach emerged in the discipline.

Moreover the new scholars came into prominence. Realism, Idealism and Institutional approach also took a concrete shape. At the university level research and study approaches were competitive. “While Abersystwyth University became known for its study of idealism in the 1920s and early 1930s and realism thereafter, the London School of Economics developed expertise in the study of institutions, first the League of Nations and later the United Nations, with many of its faculty taking a leading role in developing the theoretical tradition of Institutionalism.”⁷

Besides E H Carr, some other Professors also took lead. Oxford University also gave attention to the studies at Professorship level. “In 1930, the first Professor of International Relations (was) appointed in Oxford.”⁸

Alfred Zimmern although is pioneer in teaching of the discipline at university level. “In 1919 he was appointed to the first independent professorship of international relations in the world at the University College of Wales, Aberystwyth. Scandal propelled him from Wales to Cornell University where he spent two years in 1922-1923. From there, Zimmern worked professionally with the League of Nations and eventually ended up



back at Oxford in 1931 as the university's first Montague Burton Professor of International Relations.”⁹ His wide teaching experience is important in the sense that he was founding father of University College of Wales, Aberystwyth. These professors succeeded in establishing a stream of new researchers and diplomats. A new group of teaching faculty also emerged in due course which contributed in increasing professionalization in the studies of the discipline of International Politics and Relations.

At the research level the, Royal Institute of International Affairs (RIIA or Chatham House) was first noteworthy think tank on the International affairs which grew from peace conferences. The Institute was “founded in 1920.”¹⁰ Its one initial work was to develop an expert treatise on history of peace conference.

The group decided “to begin by writing a history of the Peace Conference. A committee was set up to supervise the writing of this work. It had Lord Meston as Chairman, Lionel Curtis as Secretary. This group picked Harold Temperley as editor of the work. It appeared in six large volumes in the years 1920-1924, under the auspices of the RIIA.”¹¹ This was a major research production in the discipline. At the same time “the concern of most scholars and commentators writing about international relations was how to prevent war and build a more peaceful and cooperative international system. An important political impulse behind this academic approach was US President Wilson's vision of making the world ‘safe for democracy’, outlined in his fourteen-point programme delivered to the US Congress in January 1918.”¹²

This was American approach to International Politics at the discipline level US followed the English experiences and “in the United States a similar development was taking place. In 1919, just months after David Davies' gift in Wales, Georgetown University founded the Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service, the oldest program in International Relations in the country. In contrast to its sister-units in the United Kingdom, its aim was not to better understand the relations of nations so that war could be avoided in the future but rather to better prepare American diplomats for service overseas in light of the United States' increased engagement with the world. For that reason, its emphasis was placed more on contemporary law than past history.”¹³

Although at this time Bentham's thinking on American international Relations had started to influence. “President Wilson became the world's most influential statesman in the immediate aftermath of World War I. His arguments dominated the new discipline of International Relations. They drew heavily (and often unselfconsciously) on a liberal social-contract tradition, and were expressed in tight, legislative arguments which strongly echoed those which Jeremy Bentham had formulated a century before. Wilson and Bentham both emphasized a strong faith in human reason. In the United States, by contrast, the early-nineteenth-century assumptions survived the critique of the 1860s and the economic upheavals of the 1870s.



Indeed, Bentham's utilitarian argument was fortified by the tonic of American Social Darwinism around the turn of the century, and re-emerged in American politics in the nineteen-tens. It was launched into the realm of international politics during World War I, and became a formative force in the new Anglo-American discipline of International Relations in 1920s."¹⁴ It had impact on the teaching curriculum of the institutions. More institutions in the same time emerged but new theoretical formulations as proposed by Morgenthau also came into prominence. Movement of institutional establishment continued in USA and "in 1928, the University of Chicago followed Georgetown's lead, establishing what it called the Committee on International Relations. It was the first department in the world to offer a graduate degree in International Relations. Led by Hans Morgenthau (trained in Law) and Quincy Wright (trained in Political Science), the School approached the study of International Relations not on a humanistic basis (as in the UK), nor with a view to training diplomats (as at Georgetown), but on a theoretical basis. While Carr is viewed as the father of realism in the UK, Morgenthau takes that prize in the US context, particularly with his 1948 publication of 'Politics Among Nations'."¹⁵

Hans. J Morgenthau was great scholar. He contributed much in the development of the discipline. His six principle theoretical model based realism as the leading intellectual theory to define and interpret the dynamism of the global politics. "Morgenthau's main contribution can be found in two separate books. The first, Scientific Man versus Power Politics, establishes the micro foundations of realist theory. The second, Politics among Nations, explains the macro foundations of international behavior as well as detailing the principles and practice of states in a realist world."¹⁶ Morgenthau's influence increased and it was a great development because International Relations theories were now allocated an important stream of the discipline. "In the aftermath of the Second World War, and as the Cold War heated up, International Relations in the United States became dominated by the Morgenthau-led Realism School and as such became a highly theoretic practice (much less so in the United Kingdom)."¹⁷ In UK the J. William Fulbright's influence was more manifest. These thinkers influence in the development of discipline towards a definite path. In this background, this understanding needs not be developed that International Relations' studies are predominantly American by nature.

It is true that "usually International relations' studies have been identified with the scholarship of American theorists. US and UK contributed the most in the discipline but to say that American academic community dominates the 'global discipline' of IR, and about the profound consequences that this dominance has for the discipline as a whole. Yet despite the alleged American hegemony, it is a fundamental mistake to associate the American study of international politics with the "global discipline of IR. While it is often the case that many national IR communities seem to be susceptible to



embracing American theories, trends, and debates, IR, as Waever notes, is quite different in different places.”¹⁸ This viewpoint helps to understand the growth in more inclusive and decentralized manner. In many countries some efforts were made in its discipline. Therefore a more global history of development of International Politics and Relations need to be constructed but it must be accepted that in its evolution, American thinkers are pioneer and more influential, appreciably supported by British intellectuals.

Another approach to study the evolution of International Politics and Relations has been proposed, termed as ‘Growth in phases’. Some historians have attempted to delineate the growth of the discipline in different stages. “Hedley Bull, for example, claimed that it is ‘possible to recognize three successive waves of theoretical activity’: the ‘idealist’ or ‘progressivist’ doctrines that were dominant in the 1920s and early 1930s, the ‘realist’ or conservative theories that developed in the late 1930s and 1940s. and lastly the ‘social scientific’ theories that arose in the late 1950s and 1960s ‘whose origin lay in dis-satisfaction with the methodologies on which both earlier kinds of theory were based’. This story of the field's evolution is, in turn, often buttressed by the closely related account of the field evolving through a series of ‘great debates’; beginning with the discipline-defining ‘great debate’ between ‘idealists’ and ‘realists’ and extending perhaps to the latest debate today between ‘rationalists’ and ‘reflectivists’.”¹⁹ Bulls’ ideas provide an insight into the development of discipline till the modern time.

There are several other dimensions of the evolution of the discipline. Hence, in the evolution of studies on International Relations, further one major aspect needs elaboration. This relates to historiography, the way International Relations developments should be written. This understanding is important because it helps to know the direction of the discipline’s growth. “One of the most significant problems in work on the history of IR is that these histories have failed to address adequately the question of how one should write a history of the field. The tendency has been to describe the history of IR as if a complete consensus existed on the essential dimensions of the field's evolution. In the absence of any significant controversy concerning how the field has developed, there has been little or no attention devoted to historiographical issues. Waever has remarked that the existing literature on the history of the field is usually not based on systemic research or clear methods and that it amounts to little more than elegant restatements of ‘common knowledge’ of our past, implicitly assuming that any good practitioner can tell the history of the discipline.”²⁰

Historiographical issues have contributed in the growth of the discipline because accordingly the books, research papers, monographs, policy reports, encyclopedia were written. In this reference there exists “two historiographical issues: first, presentism, which involves the practice of writing a history of the field for the purpose of making a point about its present character: and second, contextualism, which assumes that exogenous



events in the realm of international politics have fundamentally structured the historical development of IR as an academic field of study.”⁴⁷ These writing approaches have taken different ways but have brought into focus at least a rich subject matter, highly useful in understanding the discipline.

In the recent time there is emergence of new understanding in the discipline. “Beginning in the late 1990s, the conventional events-driven wisdom regarding the evolution of IR was challenged by a new group of disciplinary historians. Rather than focusing on external factors to explain the history of the field, proponents of an internal approach argued that the most relevant context is the immediate one of the conversation that the individuals who self-consciously viewed themselves as members of the field of IR were engaged in and the disciplinary and university setting. In other words, those advocating an internal approach insist that the most appropriate context for investigating the history of IR is its academic setting and not the world at large. It has also been suggested that an internal as compared to an external focus can help to account for the distinct national differences in how the field has developed.”²¹ These developments show that discipline is evolving. The dynamic nature of the discipline emphasizes that this healthy tradition will continue. As long the field of International Politics will expand and exhibit dynamism, the scholarship of discipline will respond accordingly.

With the proper evolution of the discipline of international politics many theoretical approaches have also been proposed by the thinkers. The theoretical postulates establish any discipline to achieve a complete shape. The discipline of International Politics is well established with the availability of several theories which have been proposed to understand the real meaning and to analyse the global events and issues in proper perspective. “Theories include an idea about what sort of actor or unit of analysis is most effective in explaining International Relations (IR). Each theory says that we will be best able to understand world politics past and present, and perhaps future, by focusing our attention on one of the various possible kinds of units.”²²

There are plethora of theories, still inadequacy in the discipline is felt because several problems and issues remain unresolved at theoretical level; or remain unattended. Usually a classification of three types of theories can be for accepted in start. “First, some theories focus on the role of people, either by emphasizing the differences between individuals or the general similarities among them. The second type of theory emphasizes the nature of particular types of states democracies, communist states, or theocracies—or the nature of states in general, which is that they either have a monopoly on the use of force within their borders or seek to survive or maximize power. The third type of theory deals with the international system, either the characteristics of particular systems, such as the Greek system 2,500 years ago, or the cold war system of the twentieth century, or the nature of the international system in general, such as anarchy. Each of these three types of theory selects where to focus attention to produce the best explanation (on the individual, the state, or



the system). These distinct foci of study are sometimes called 'levels of analysis'.²³

At the start idealism and realism are two major theoretical postulates in which Great debate still continues, to understand the Idealist approach which is synonymous with the legal-institutional theory; and Power approach which is linked to realist theory are two major theoretical postulates in the discipline. These two approaches have dominated the discipline in the past and even in the contemporary time they have their relevance. "The realists and the idealists are supposed to study the entire phenomenon of International Politics. They claim to explain the total reality of international relations. Hence they may be grouped as 'total approaches'. The other approaches, such as decision making, equilibrium, bargaining, and game theory do not subscribe to the view that an understanding of the international reality is possible. Hence, they can be treated as 'partial' approaches."²⁴ Hard truth is that "realism and idealism remain the intellectual limits of international relations theory, such as globalism, neorealism, internationalism, structuralism, trans-nationalism, and functionalism, the suppositions of realism and idealism still sustain the roots of its debates, great or otherwise."²⁵ For these reasons, these theories have received much importance in the study of International Politics.

Therefore "Holsti calls (these as) 'grand theory' in international relations (and) these are macro-level attempts to map the terrain of international politics, whose authors have sought to formulate an original approach to the field"²⁶. There is no gainsaying the fact that the Great debate between Grand theories have helped to enrich the discipline. In the opinion of some they have proposed different viewpoints about the International Politics. For some there are clear differences between two, for others no exclusive proposition has been attempted by scholars. They take relative approach, distinct from exact dichotomy between idealism and realism.

Now it is widely accepted that realism and idealism thoughts' cannot be obtained in exclusive way in any theorists. "The study shows that all thinkers of discipline have understood these theories in relative terms. Realism and idealism are relative terms, not absolute dichotomies. They are related to each other in a 'more or less' manner along a continuum."²⁷ In spite of these understandings, they differ at many points. Each one has devoted scholars and theorists of their tradition. In fact a definite difference lies between both. "The crucial point at which the political realism and political idealism are at cross roads with each other is about the problem of power."²⁸ Idealist theory emphasizes the ethical value system in the operation of International Politics. Its major concern is to achieve peace in the global politics. "This approach regards power politics as the passing phase of history and portraits that future international society is based on the notion of reformed international system free from power politics, immorality and violence."²⁹

Major theorists, as Condorcet believes that a global order based on just and peaceful values can be established. "In 1795, Condorcet wrote a treatise

which contained everything considered as essential basis of Idealism in the international relations. He visualized a world order free from war, inequality and tyranny. An ideal world would be marked by progress in human welfare built upon science, reason and morality instead of war, violence and immorality. Idealism can be called as a normative theory, utopianism or value theory.”³⁰

This approach has been supported by Saint Simon, Oppenheim, Kelson, Walzer, Claude etc. All of these are convinced that state has an evolutionary nature, and during process of evolution peace can be attained. There is understanding among its major supporter that “Idealism, if it is to have any real currency in IR, must clearly be more than a synonym for liberalism, a set of approaches that, however, ambitious their prognostication of global change, typically fall far short of Marxist, critical, poststructural and feminist visions of inter-national relations, to name only a few liberationist perspectives. As Michael Banks has suggested, the key to the understanding of inter-national relations consists of ideas, not facts.”³¹

In contrast to this postulate realist have another idea about the international politics. Realism stresses upon the power politics. For realism the power struggle among the nation state is natural and it cannot be controlled or eliminated. The realist ideas find place, first in N J Spykman, Clausewitz is another major contributor who states that ‘war is nothing but a continuation of politics by other means.’ Bernhardt, Butterfield, Waltz, Lippman K.W. Thomson, E.H. Carr, George Kennan, Quincy Wright, Martin Wright etc. are its supporter. Though Hans J. Morgenthau is taller among all, as the main exponent of the theory of realism. Albeit there are different explanations about the realism.

It is stated that “realism is not a theory defined by an explicit set of assumptions and propositions. Rather, as many commentators have noted, it is a general orientation: ‘a philosophical disposition’ (Gilpin, 1986); ‘a set of normative emphases which shape theory’ (Ferguson and Mansbach, 1988); an ‘attitude of mind’ with ‘a quite distinctive and recognizable flavour’ (Garnett, 1984); ‘a loose framework’ (Rosenthal, 1991); and ‘a big tent; with room for a number of different theories’ (Elman. 1996). Realism is an approach to international relations that has emerged gradually through the work of a series of analysts who have situated themselves within, and thus delimited, a distinctive but still diverse style or tradition of analysis.”³² Many scholars of realism have developed their thoughts in specific manner.

They have their own perception about the world politics. They can be surmised as “The state's interest provides the spring of action, the necessities of policy arise from the unregulated competition of states. Calculation based on these necessities can discover the policies that will best serve a state's interests. Success is the ultimate test of policy, and success is defined as preserving and strengthening the state. (Waltz, 1979); Politics is governed by objective laws that have their roots in human nature. The main signpost that



helps political realism to find its way through the landscape of international politics is the concept of interest defined in terms of power. Power and interest are variable in content. Universal moral principles cannot be applied to the actions of states. Political realism refuses to identify the moral aspirations of a particular nation with the moral laws that govern the universe. The autonomy of the political sphere.(Morgenthau, 1954);The international system is anarchic. States inherently possess some offensive military capability, which gives them the wherewithal to hurt and possibly destroy each other. No state can ever be certain another state will not use its offense military capability. The most basic motive driving states is survival. States are instrumentally rational. (Mearsheimer,1994/95);The fundamental unit of social and political affairs is the 'conflict group.' States are motivated primarily by their national interest. Power relations are a fundamental feature of international affairs. (Gilpin,1996); The state-centric assumption: states are the most important actors in world politics. The rationality assumption: world politics can be analyzed as if states were unitary rational actors seeking to maximize their expected utility. The power assumption: states seek power and they calculate their interests in terms of power (Keohane,1986).”³³

All these approaches converge at main point that International Politics is governed certain scientific laws, power is main concern of the realists and national interests are to be protected in the anarchic world system. These understandings help to delineate a basic definition of realism. In this reference at the definitional level, “realism emphasizes the constraints on politics imposed by human nature and the absence of international government. Together, they make inter-national relations largely a realm of power and interest.”³⁴

In conclusion it can be stated that “the realist approach unlike the idealist approach regards power politics as the be-all and end-all of international relations of all the approaches, the one that was widely debated by the students and scholars was the power or realist approach.”³⁵ Different types of realism have emerged in the recent time in the global politics. For these power is central for any understanding of the International Politics. These three although have developed their own conceptual framework. “The classical realist lineage begins with Thucydide’s representation of power politics as a law of human behaviour. The drive to amass power and dominate others is held by classical realists to be a fundamental aspect of human nature. The behaviour of the state as a self-seeking egoist is under-stood to be a reflection of the characteristics of the people that comprise the state. It is, according to classical realists, human nature that explains why international politics is necessarily power politics. This reduction of the driving force behind international politics to a condition of human nature is one of the defining characteristics of classical realism. Hans J. Morgenthau, for example, held that ‘politics, like society in general, is governed by objective laws that have their roots in human nature’ (and) for both Thucydides and Morgenthau,



the essential continuity of states' behaviour is their power-seeking, which is rooted in the biological drives of human beings."³⁶

In contrast to this, Neo realism or Structural realism "gives importance to the structuralists mode of analysis to reinforce, reassert and validate realist premises."³⁷ Kenneth Waltz himself had written that "The idea that international politics can be thought of as a system with a precisely defined structure is neorealism's fundamental departure from traditional realism."³⁸ This statement encapsulates the real basis of the neorealism which makes it different from classical realism.

If it is analyzed in detail "structural realism, which is most often associated with Kenneth Waltz's landmark book, *Theory of International Politics* (1979), shifts the focus away from the laws of human nature and argues that the power-seeking behaviour of states is a function of international anarchy. For structural realists, who find their progenitor in Thomas Hobbes, the condition of anarchy that is, the fact that there is no 'higher power' to ensure the peace among sovereign states is often viewed as synonymous to a state of war. Structural realists argue that because there is always the possibility that any particular state may resort to force, the outbreak of war is a likely scenario in an anarchical environment. According to Waltz, anarchy prevents states from entering into cooperative agreements to end the state of war. More-over, Waltz argues that it is the structure of the system that compels states to seek power. There is, however, a recent controversy among structural realists over the question of whether states are primarily security-maximisers or power-maximisers."³⁹

Neo realism can be treated as an advance over the realism because "neo-realist theory endeavours to provide scientific weight to traditional power-political ideas of hierarchy and the balance of power. It gives primacy to the state as an actor and accords a central position to the notions of power, national interest and inequality of nations. War is regarded as an agency of change."⁶⁷ The introduction of anarchy is also an important contribution of the neo realism.

The third group of realists is known as modified realists. They have proposed a new version of realism. "The modified realist category includes those realist thinkers who have ventured to transgress Waltz's maxim to steer clear of reductionist theory. While accepting the importance of systemic forces, modified realists have sought to move beyond the limiting confines of structural realism and have endeavoured to incorporate unit-level characteristics into their account of the struggle for power among nations. Modified realists, especially neo-classical realists such as Randall Schweller, Fareed Zakaria and William Wohlforth, introduce a variety of intervening variables that stand between the state and international outcomes. By considering the role of variables operating at the domestic and individual level of analysis, neoclassical realists provide a different account of the power-seeking behaviour of states."⁴⁰ The variables are many and they have the



capacity affect the events and policy making process. “It is well defined that the modified realist position holds that domestic political processes can be incorporated into structural realism (Kapstein 1995). Snyder (1991) argues that the incorporation of domestic political factors such as competing interest groups can help to explain foreign policy decisions that cannot be explained by balance of power theories and/or rational choice alone. The selections in Rosecrance and Stein (1993) suggest that in addition to domestic political groupings, factors such as beliefs, constitutions, economic conditions, and ideas are also able to shape national security policy. Garrett and Lange (1995) argue that little attention has been paid to the relations between preference changes in domestic actors and policy outcomes, as a result of a failure to take account of the role of institutions. They focus on bureaucratic politics in order to explain the mediating role of institutions between raw preferences and government behavior.”⁴¹

The contribution of modified realists to the study of International Politics is immense because they have succeeded in establishing new format for understanding and interpreting the events in the international politics. For this reason “the modified realist argument, then, claims the analysis of domestic political factors can enhance the parsimony of structural realism.”⁷⁰ These three classifications have provided a new perception to analyze the course of action of the international politics. Grotian school of realism emerged as another branch of the realism which was initiated by Hugo Grotius; believes that global politics has certain moral principles as nonintervention. Morality has an important component along with the legal system to regulate the interstate behavior.

In the later years the great debate continued with no final result. The behavioural and post behavioural theoretical postulates in the mean time emerged to understand the behavior of the nation states. This development was quite path breaking as the global politics was now being attempted to be understood by discerning the behavior of the nation states in new manner and with new approaches. This development helped to enrich the theories of the international relations. This postulate had direct dependence on the other disciplines too. It frequently borrowed from the other disciplines. Decision making theory, bargaining theory, game theory, rational choice theory, deterrence theory etc. are major theoretical postulates which owe to the behavioralist and post behaviouralist theoretical framework.

System theory is theoretical postulate which has received much acceptance in the international theoretical framework. Kaplan, as leading theorist of the school, has proposed the six model configuration of the world politics. Though in later years he modified it and added two new configurations in his model. Although Kaplan himself did not treat it as theory. “The first thing to be said about system theory is that it is not a theory. It consists of set of concepts. (and) system theory , as a tool, was developed in the area of neurology by scientists interested in brain behavior. The most



concise and most original account of system theory occurs in W. Ross Ashby's book *Design for brain*.⁴¹ Equilibrium is central to his study. His understanding of the International Politics is quite matured.

He classifies the six conditions in the International Politics. He proceeds "to enumerate and explain the characteristics of each of his six systems. These are: (1) the balance of power system, (2) the loose bipolar system, (3) the tight bipolar system, (4) the universal system (5) the hierarchical system, and (6) the unit veto system. He identifies five so-called 'variables' which describe the 'state' of each system. These are: (1) the essential rules of the system, (2) the transformation rules, (3) the actor classificatory variables, (4) the capability variables, and (5) the information variables. His main purpose is to discover each system's equilibrium of power and to explicate the rules of behaviour which the system must observe in order to make the equilibrium a stable one."⁴²

Kaplan's model is well structured but "on Kaplan's own admission, only the first two of his six 'systems', namely, the balance of power and the loose bipolar systems, have some historical relevance, while the other four are purely abstract and hypothetical."⁴³ In spite of these limitations he is credited to have developed a scientific modeling of the discipline.

This helped to look the world as a system and it was easy to comprehend in better form. Morton Kaplan's contribution is tremendous and is widely accepted in the field of International Theory. "When Morton Kaplan published *System and Process in International Politics* in 1957, the field of International Relations (IR) acknowledged it immediately as a groundbreaking contribution to the theorization of world politics. Kaplan proposed a systems approach to international processes that would enable IR to break with its loosely defined political-philosophical tradition and establish a solid, empirical basis for studying a particularly complex realm of reality. This work is still referenced today in IR textbooks, and almost half a century after its first publication the European Consortium for Political Research reprinted it as one of the first three volumes in its Classics series."⁴⁴

Many other theoretical postulates have been proposed in the discipline. These theories have attempted to understand not only on the dynamic nature of the global politics but have also succeeded in providing a particular type of intellectual edifice for the policy makers. These theories are multiple with sub classification. Etzioni is main thinker of Federalist school of thought. This is a sociological approach which believes that there exist common purposes among the different actors in the world politics. "Federalist assume that the anarchic nation-state system is primarily responsible for the war. (and) they feel that through discussion and education people can be convinced that a rational plan for the regulation and governance of human kind should be adopted."⁴⁵

Pluralism is usually associated with Karl Deutsch "This approach, also known as communication approach, seeks to measure the process of

integration by observing the flow of international transactions, such as trade, tourists, letter, and immigrants.”⁴⁶ David Mitrany, Leonard Woolf etc. are main proponents of functionalism. “Functionalism is the oldest theory of integration. it would be appropriate to call it as a precursor of integration theory. After the coming of neo functionalism it became older or classical functionalism. it is different from federalism as it lays emphasis not on creation of a world federal structure with all its constitutional structures but rather on building ‘piece by piece’ through transnational organisations that concentrated on ‘sharing of sovereignty’ rather than on its surrender to supranational institutions.”⁴⁷

References

1. J S Mill, Principles of Political Economy, London, 1929, 582, quoted in Ernst B. Haas and Allen S. Whiting, Dynamics of International Relations, McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 8
2. Gary Chambers, Critical perspectives on Hans Morgenthau’s approach to International Relations, Marmara Universitesi, I I B F Dergisi C I L T XXV, SAYI 2, Y I L 2008, 934
3. Hans Mouritzen, Kenneth Waltz: a critical rationalist between international politics and foreign policy, in Iver B. Neumann, Ole Wæver (ed.), The Future of International Relations: Masters in the Making?, Routledge, New York, 2005, 66
4. About International Relations, Fulbright Programme, University of Arakansa, 2014
5. FJonathan Grix, Approaches to the Study of Contemporary Germany, A&C Black, UK, 2002, 183
6. About International Relations, Fulbright Programme, University of Arakansa, 2015
7. *ibid*
8. Christopher Hood, Desmond King, Gillian Peele, Forging a Discipline: A Critical Assessment of Oxford's Development of the Study of Politics and International Relations in Comparative Perspective, Oxford University Press, 2014, 19
9. Jeanne Morefield, A liberal in muddle, in David Long, Brian C. Schmidt (ed.), Imperialism and Internationalism in the Discipline of International Relations, SUNY Press, New York, 2006, 100
10. Information, About us, Chatham House, <http://www.chathamhouse.org>, accessed on 12 October, 2014
11. Carroll Quigley, The Royal Institute of International Affairs, <http://www.bibliotecapleyades.net>, accessed on 2 July 2014
12. FJonathan Grix, Approaches to the Study of Contemporary Germany, A&C Black, UK, 2002, 183
13. About International Relations, Fulbright Programme, University of Arakansa, 2015



14. Torbjorn L. Knutsen, History of International Relations Theory, Manchester University Press, UK, 1997, 214-215
15. About International Relations, Fulbright Programme, University of Arakansa, <http://ir.uark.edu>, accessed on 8 December, 2014
16. Ariel Ilan Roth, Leadership in International Relations: The Balance of Power and the Origins of World War II, Palgrave Macmillan, 12-Oct-2010
17. About International Relations, Fulbright Programme, University of Arakansa, 2014
18. Brian C. Schmidt, On the History and Historiography of International Relations, in Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse, Beth A Simmons (ed.), London UK, Handbook of International Relations, SAGE, 2012, 8-13
19. *ibid*, 4
20. *ibid*, 8-13
21. *ibid*
22. *ibid*
23. Fred Chernoff, Theory and Meta theory in International Relations Concepts and Contending Accounts, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2007, 41
24. *ibid*
25. Chandra P, Rajni Singh, Theories Of International Relations , Vikas Publishing House Pvt Ltd, New Delhi, 2009, 20
26. Mark F.N. Franke, Global Limits: Immanuel Kant, International Relations, and Critique of World Politics, SUNY Press, State University of New York, 2001, 69
27. Martin Griffiths, Realism, Idealism and International Politics: A Reinterpretation, Routledge, New York, 2013, 8
28. *ibid*
29. Chandra P, Rajni Singh, Theories Of International Relations , Vikas Publishing House Pvt Ltd, New Delhi, 2009, 21
30. Aneek Chatterjee, World Politics, Pearson Education India, New Delhi, 2012, 11
31. *ibid*
32. Robert M. A. Crawford, Idealism and Realism in International Relations, Routledge, New York, 2013, 17
33. Jack Donnelly, Realism and International Relations, Cambridge University Press, UK, 2000, 6
34. *ibid*, 7
35. Jack Donnelly, Realism and International Relations, Cambridge University Press, UK, 2000, 9
36. Vinay Kumar Malhotra, Alexander A. Sergounin, Theories and approaches to International Relations, Anmol Publications Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 2001, 66



37. Felix Berenskoetter, M. J. Williams, Power in World Politics, Routledge, New York, 2007, 45-46
38. Vinay Kumar Malhotra, Alexander A. Sergounin, Theories and approaches to International Relations, Anmol Publications Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 2001, 164
39. Kenneth Waltz, Realist thought and neorealist theory, Journal of International Affairs, 30, <http://classes.maxwell.syr.edu>, accessed on 2 January 2015
40. Felix Berenskoetter, M. J. Williams, Power in World Politics, Routledge, New York, 2007, 46
41. Vinay Kumar Malhotra, Alexander A. Sergounin, Theories and approaches to International Relations, Anmol Publications Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 2001, 168
42. Felix Berenskoetter, M. J. Williams, Power in World Politics, Routledge, New York, 2007, 46
43. Barbara Emadi-Coffin, Rethinking International Organisation: Deregulation and Global Governance, Routledge, New York, 2003, 31
44. *ibid*
45. Morton A. Kaplan, Systems Theory And Political Science, Social Research, Vol. 35, No. 1, Focus—Trends and Issues in American Political Science, Spring 1968, 30
46. Jayantanuja Bandyopadhyaya, A General Theory of International Relations, Allied Publishers, New Delhi, 1993, 218
47. Vinay Kumar Malhotra, Alexander A. Sergounin, Theories and approaches to International Relations, Anmol Publications Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 2001, 19