



International Relations

ARTI

Independent Scholar

arti50625@gmail.com

Abstract

International Relations is a field of study that focuses on the relationships and interactions between countries, as well as non-state actors, on a global scale. It encompasses a broad range of topics, including diplomacy, international law, international organizations, foreign policy, globalization, and security.

The study of International Relations seeks to understand the dynamics of power, conflict, cooperation, and interdependence among different actors in the international system. It examines how states and other actors interact with each other, negotiate agreements, engage in trade and commerce, and cooperate to address common challenges such as climate change, terrorism, and human rights abuses.

The field of International Relations also analyzes the role of international institutions, such as the United Nations, World Trade Organization, and International Criminal Court, in shaping international norms and regulating global behavior. It also explores the historical and cultural factors that influence the behavior of states and other international actors.

International Relations has both theoretical and practical dimensions, with scholars and practitioners working to develop theories and models of global politics, as well as implementing policies and strategies to advance national interests and promote international cooperation.

The development of new technology, the lack of certain resources, and so on have all contributed to the view that international relations are a crucial area for national development. As a result of globalization's effects, ties between India and the rest of the globe have strengthened. India is actively transitioning from a more domestically focused economy to one that is increasingly globally connected.

Keywords: International Relations, Development, Theories, Behavioural Sciences, Objectives, Communication

Introduction



International relations (IR) is a relatively new academic area. Its origins date back to the time period after World War I. European and American philanthropists, academics, and diplomats, in the wake of World War I, attempted to better understand the root causes of conflict and devise strategies to foster global stability. In its earliest stages, IR research combined normative and empirical approaches. Policymakers, diplomats, and other players may use normative IR theory's guiding ideals to make the world a better place. The goal of empirical IR theory is to provide an explanation for the factors that lead to political developments. Originally, IR's normative goal was to establish peaceful relations among nations, while its empirical focus was on discovering the root causes of war and conflict.

The first academics to study international conflicts did so through the lenses of philosophy, history, law, and economics. Those who were first to study international relations (IR) often looked to the works of philosophers like Thucydides, Niccolo Machiavelli, Hugo Grotius, Thomas Hobbes, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Immanuel Kant, and others to help them make sense of what led to war and what could be done to prevent it in the future. Conflict resolution guidelines for the present and the future were derived from analyses of historical occurrences. Scholars in the field of international relations would utilise the increasing relevance of international law as a tool for governments to shape theoretical approaches favouring stability and peace. In the decades after World War I, universities in Britain, Switzerland, and the United States established IR programmes to educate future diplomats and politicians via coursework and research.

Human rights, migration, environmental cooperation, economic development, ethnic conflict, nationalism, terrorism, and international crime are all examples of topics that IR has expanded its focus to include due to the complexity of world politics and the emergence of globalising forces throughout the 20th century. Experts in international relations (IR) nowadays use complex theories and models to investigate a wide range of topics. As one of the most prominent areas of study in the discipline of politics, international relations (IR) provides compelling evidence of how political power shapes these ever-expanding concerns and problems.

The following discussion delves into the origins and intellectual breadth of international relations by tracing the evolution of IR theory during the 20th century and discussing the growing number of empirical subjects studied by IR experts. Next, we'll talk about where IR is going from here.



Historical and Theoretical Developments in International Relations

Liberal Beginnings

David Davies, a rich Welsh manufacturer, donated money to the University of Wales at Aberystwyth in 1919 so that students might concentrate on international relations. Mr. Davies, moved by the horrors of World War I, donated money to establish the Woodrow Wilson Chair of International Politics on the hope that humanity may one day find a way to cease violent conflict. In accepting the Wilson Chair, the British historian Sir Alfred Zimmern made history as the field's first international politics specialist. His research is representative of the field's early studies and focuses on the importance of international treaty law in fostering economic cooperation and interdependence. Zimmern, like other liberals of his period, believed that academics could make a difference in the world and set out to find institutional answers to the world's issues of conflict. A hallmark of liberal IR theory is the emphasis placed on institutions as the primary means of resolving international issues. He was enthusiastic about the League of Nations' potential to maintain international peace and prosperity. Liberal international relations scholars at the time, such as Alfred Zimmern and Norman Angell, accepted the political position of modern leaders like Woodrow Wilson, who believed that self-determination for peoples and state membership in organisations like the League could create the foundation for international cooperation and the transcendence of war as a policy of the state. The Kellogg-Briand Pact, also known as the Pact of Paris, is an international treaty that prohibits the use of force in international politics. This pact represents the apex of liberal IR theory, which sees law as the foundation for peace. More than 60 governments ratified this convention, and it serves as a historical record of the international community's efforts to resolve conflicts via law. The pact provided a legal foundation for pursuing state actors who violated the requirements of the treaty since it criminalised war among the signatories. In addition, the treaty laid the groundwork for a body of principles governing the use of force in international conflicts and the responsibilities of nations.

International organisations, international treaty law, and state diplomacy were all seen as tools that might be used by the international community to address issues by early liberal academics of international relations. Diplomatic agreements, codified in law, and administered by competent agencies have the potential to end protracted international disputes. The political problems of World War II and the cold war necessitated certain revisions to liberalism in the



1970s, but liberal thinkers retained their underlying conviction in the possibility of change and the capacity to overcome conflict.

Realist Critics

The period from 1919 to 1939 is known as the interwar period, and it was during this time that liberal international relations theorists were challenged by scholars concerned with institutional mechanisms to overcome interstate violence. These scholars pointed out how the persistence of laws of power and the inevitable consequences of an international environment defined by the absence of a global government (anarchy) undermined the effectiveness of these mechanisms. Realist IR theory, for instance, emphasised the security concerns of states and the incessant desire for power. Realists have long worried that liberal academics and diplomats had an unrealistic view of the world and an overconfidence in the power of law and institutions to resolve international disputes. As a result, liberals failed to account for the possibility that nations might ignore their legal (treaty) obligations and withdraw from international institutions when the national interest ran counter to doing so”.

The realists maintained that academics needed to get a deeper comprehension of the factors that lead to conflict. While it's admirable to want to avoid conflict in principle, doing so obscures the true nature of its origins. Realists in the field of international relations advocated for further research into the root causes of conflict. Academic work is seen utopian because liberals place too much faith on state-run organisations to solve problems. These realists proposed an approach to global politics that emphasised the need for academics and diplomats to work on mitigating the impacts of war rather than trying to transcend it.

The peace treaty that concluded this European war established sovereignty as a defining concept of each state and compelled each state to fight against foreign invasion rather than depend on other nations for protection, which realists claimed policymakers should realise and absorb. The concept of sovereignty—that nations have complete authority and jurisdiction over their area and the people who live there—would come to dominate realism in the academic world.

Marxist Alternatives

Emerging as a criticism of liberal and realist approaches to international relations theory, a third method to understanding the causes of conflict and the procedures for peace emerged during this early phase of theory development. Scholars who identified with the Marxist school of thought, which emerged from the writings of Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, and others in the



second half of the nineteenth century, presented a radical reimagining of international relations. Scholars in this camp analysed how influential social groups co-opt state institutions and influence foreign policy to further their own goals. This perspective challenged liberal and realist views of the state as disinterested in its people or subjects. Expansion and imperialism were governmental policies when they were seen to benefit the propertied (or bourgeois) class. One interpretation of war as state strategy is that it is used by nations to gain entry to new resources and consumer markets elsewhere. In addition, the prospects for escalating earnings during times of conflict made it a lucrative business for the capitalist elite. Marxist IR academics focused on how war was a product of a specific economic system since the poor bore the brunt of conflict.

Economic Interdependence and Global Security Challenges

Two major variables in post-war global politics changed the course of international relations history. First, academics have revised liberal and realist ideas in response to the rise of a new international economic order, which has increased trade and financial flows among nations. Bretton Woods, New Hampshire, in the United States was the site of a 1944 conference when Allied state leaders negotiated the framework for a postwar international monetary system. Countries at this conference agreed to establish the World Bank (then called the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development), the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Scholars of international relations (IR) now have new institutions to examine, together with the principles of free trade, financial transparency, monetary stability, and economic integration that support them.

This historical setting highlights the significance of the liberal economic theory that international stability may be improved via state cooperation in areas such as trade and monetary policy. Some academics, dubbed neoliberals, have investigated how nations foster multi-decade cooperative relationships in international affairs. The effects of today's highly interdependent economic system are still being studied by academics like. The tangled labyrinth of administrative regulations is their main concern. When there is no central authority, as in anarchy, decisions are made at the international level. However, neoliberals show how governance standards spread across nations in international relations and organise their conduct even in the absence of formal government. These governance standards tend to multiply because international regimes have been established to facilitate better collaboration between



nations. When people talk about international regimes, they're referring to the consensus-building principles, norms, regulations, and decision-making processes that players use to address a certain problem. It is not necessary to have a centralised government for these types of regimes to function. Regimes serve to establish a standard for government among nations that can be relied upon for stability and predictability. The following is an illustration of how collaboration across regimes has helped prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Human rights, security, the environment, commerce, finance, and cultural preservation are only some of the worldwide issues governed by many regimes. "Research on international regimes has grown in importance in the field of international relations. The study of regimes is becoming more important for our comprehension of both conflict and cooperation. Many important books and articles on international relations (IR) were written in the '80s and '90s, expanding our knowledge and appreciation of these systems. This research elucidates the feasibility of decentralised governance and the regularity and predictability of international politics. When compared to the theoretical work done during the interwar era, sophisticated analyses of regimes give a more complete view of international politics. The study of regimes gives theorists a more nuanced picture of international relations since they include various players (such as nations, IGOs, NGOs, and multinational companies). In addition, examining regimes allows for a more holistic examination of continuity and change in international politics, since they incorporate both institutional regulations (such as international law) and socially acceptable actions (such as international standards).

Alternative Challenges to Mainstream International Relations Theory

Scholars critical of the field's predominant focus on states rather than individuals and national security rather than human security have criticised the treatment of these and other issues by mainstream scholars as inadequate, despite the fact that they provide a new set of factors to include in studies of international affairs. Throughout the 1980s, there was a growing chorus of critics of the mainstream realist and liberal IR academia and the foreign policies it examined. Even while these critics don't all agree on a single theory or method for studying international relations, they do share a worry that state sovereignty and the state system have been overemphasised in IR and practise. This state-centered focus minimises a range of issues that require more attention if theorists are to propose convincing and all-encompassing solutions to today's and tomorrow's pressing challenges.

Feminist International Relations



Feminists have been able to shed light on gender problems that have been ignored by conventional methods by simply asking different questions. Gender disparity was pushed to the sidelines as the field primarily studied war and economics. Traditional gender norms, according to feminist researchers of the 1970s, hampered women's participation in international politics. Women were expected to stay at home and raise children while males went out into the public arena of both modern industrial and more traditional countries. Women and the problems that mattered most to them would be ignored during war and diplomacy since they were public activities. For the same reason, feminism's emphasis on family, education, health care, and children would be downplayed in favour of addressing the state's gross domestic product and promoting more international commerce. Feminist international relations (IR) academics posed novel issues in both instances, casting doubt on established IR research.

Think about the case in point below. Both liberal and realist students of international relations agree that states are essential players on the global stage, with the former arguing that states' existence improves individual security by shielding its citizens from threats posed by the latter. This is argued by realists using concepts like national interest, and emphasised by liberals using concepts like collective security under international law. Both theoretical frameworks agree that the role of the state in preserving global stability is crucial. Feminist international relations study explores whether the state perpetuates oppressive and exploitative social institutions. At home, advocates of international relations (IR) theories that argue governments should prioritise national security spending are contributing to a public discussion over how best to allocate scarce public funds. It has the effect of diverting funds away from social programmes that might otherwise be used to educate children, offer welfare and child care assistance, and promote health care for disadvantaged populations, given the limited quantity of state funds available to be spent on all public goods. When government budgets are unable to cover the costs of providing these necessities, women are frequently left to shoulder the resulting financial burden.

Constructivist International Relations

Scholars who question the foundation of state interests provide a second option to the canonical study of international relations. Constructivists believe that it is necessary to examine the process of national identity construction before any attempt can be made to explain or even comprehend national interests. Mainstream methods to IR presume a set and predefined national interest exists among all nations, which masks issues of identity and the norms that



form and restrict it. Like feminists, these academics pose important issues that force us to reconsider long-held beliefs. Constructivist International Relations (IR) literature seeks to disprove the assumptions made by liberal and realist IR academics about the goals of state actors while pursuing foreign policy objectives”. By questioning the foundations of these dominant ideas, constructivists are doing more than just mending a hole in IR research; they are reinventing how international relations are conducted and opening the door to new ways of looking at the past.

Think about the case in point below. During the height of the cold war, the United States and the Soviet Union formed their respective national identities around their respective enemies. Each nation disapproved of the other because of the ways in which it was different from the other. The United States has a strong self-image due to its reputation for defending political and civil liberties and democratic norms. Because it believed the Soviet Union lacked these qualities, it formed an unfavourable impression of the country. The Soviet Union had a favourable self-image due to its commitment to racial and gender equality in the workplace and in society at large. It had a poor impression of the United States because it felt that the country did not share its values. Each nation made the other out to be its adversary, and as a consequence, its citizens began to see the other's activities as dangerous and unfriendly. For constructivists, this situation is what traditional IR experts have been lacking in their pursuit of an explanation of national interest. Understanding national interests requires first tracing their origins to a clear understanding of national identities

Environmental International Relations

As a third way of looking at the world, academics should reconsider the state and the state system's capacity to address ecological crises that are global in scale and call for the collaboration of many different groups. The first global environmental conference was organised in Stockholm, Sweden in 1972 in response to the growth of national environmental movements in the United States, western Europe, and New Zealand in the 1960s and 1970s. In 1967, Sweden suggested what would become the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, which the United States eventually backed. Economic activity in one section of the globe was influencing the quality of the environment in other places, raising growing concerns among scientists and politicians.

As experts in the field of international relations began to focus on environmental challenges, it became clear that the standard theoretical approach centred on states, state sovereignty, and the



national interest was insufficient to address the transnational nature of the issues at hand. State sovereignty limited the scope of both realism and liberalism in international politics. Both ideas centre on a political worldview. There are distinct international boundaries between each nation-state. But ecosystems and pollutants are not territorial and cross all boundaries. Theorists in the field of environmental international relations questioned the discipline's emphasis on a political global map and attempted instead to redefine the map as physical. Cooperation between nations, NGOs, scientific groups, and multinational businesses, among others, is essential to finding political solutions to environmental challenges, something that realists and liberals may downplay. Environmental challenges often need the participation of more than simply state players, unlike peace accords after big wars or security alliances during times of peace. To join a security alliance, for instance, needs the support of a state's foreign and military ministries, the president, and the legislature, but not much from the common person. However, if we really want to put an end to transnational environmental pollution, it may need the combined efforts of national governments, regional bodies, businesses, and concerned citizens to bring about the necessary cultural shifts. Environmental concerns are also often related to monetary ones. In order to achieve long-term environmental sustainability, it may be necessary for governments to renounce economic growth goals and restrict short-term economic advantages in order to address pressing environmental issues.

Future Directions in International Relations

At the turn of the new millennium, the study of international relations is evolving to meet fresh problems. Terrorism, cybercrime, and interethnic conflict are just a few of the new security challenges that nations must face. Uneven development, poverty, inequality, and starvation are significant challenges that cannot be adequately addressed by relying just on the actions of individual states. To effectively respond to humanitarian catastrophes brought on by political violence, corruption, and natural calamities, international players must work together on a massive scale. Practitioners, academics, and regular people alike need to rethink international politics in light of an increasing knowledge of ecological interconnectedness. Some of these new difficulties stem from globalisation, which has been going on for millennia. Even while globalisation takes numerous forms, it is often defined as the reduction of barriers in both time and place that facilitates more interaction between people. Groups that were formerly constrained by geography and time now play a larger role in international politics because to advances in communication and information technology. These non-state entities push



international relations (IR) researchers to include more nuanced factors in their models of global politics.

New Security Threats

Terrorism is not new to international politics, but the same globalising factors that have led to greater economic commerce and prosperity have also made it easier for terrorists to attack at broader targets. International relations (IR) experts have been worried about state-backed terrorism for decades. The new kinds of terrorism are often carried out by non-state terrorist organisations with political grievances against sovereign nations. The common understanding of terrorism is that it is a politically motivated violent act committed with the express intent of inspiring fear in the hearts and minds of the general populace. Non-state terrorist organisations pose a dual threat to nation-states. When terrorist organisations strike at the heart of domestic communities, they do so in a number of ways. First, they undermine the political fabric by stoking widespread fear and casting doubt on the state's ability to preserve order and safety. The second reason why terrorism is a threat to world stability is because it undermines national boundaries. Terrorism is now included into standard theories of international relations. In order to reduce terrorism, the current stage of study is trying to grasp the logic behind terrorist groups and the security measures used by nations.

Scholars in the field of international relations have started looking at cybercrime as a new and potentially dangerous security concern. As time goes on, more and more domestic and international business and communication will be conducted online. National economies and social well-being are both at risk when the global commerce's technological infrastructure is disrupted. Additionally, nations are responsible for safeguarding electronic databases that house sensitive information. To better comprehend and account for the difficulties that nations experience in dealing with cybercrime, new avenues of research have been established in the field of security studies.

Ethnic strife inside individual states is more common than war between nations. This poses a potential threat to an area of study that was developed to overcome or lessen the effects of international war. Conventional IR theories, as we have seen, have endeavoured to decipher the causes of and promote viable solutions to international conflict. Academics in the field of international relations (IR) acknowledge the need of expanding our current understanding of conflict to include both domestic and international factors. investigate the inner workings of strife and offer a nuanced explanation of how the intricate process of state formation may give



rise to nations with endemic internal struggle. These studies also show how these countries threaten regional peace and security. More study is needed in this area so that more accurate theoretical models may be created to foresee possible hotspots for conflict and deploy international resources in advance of their emergence.

Development Strategies and Humanitarian Crises

United Nations member states enacted a set of millennium development objectives in September 2000 with the aim of eliminating extreme poverty, expanding access to healthcare, and promoting gender equality by the year 2015. These development objectives demonstrate how attention in international politics is moving away from more conventional problem spaces. More and more countries are realising they need to work together on problems that were earlier seen as strictly local. With the emerging security risks and an increased understanding and respect for cosmopolitan ideals, state actors understand the need of sharing development ideas to better the human condition worldwide. Prior normative concerns in IR are challenged by this interest in the well-being of all people and a general focus on humanitarian duty. Scholars in the field of international relations (IR) have recently seen a change in the norms and values they investigate, and it seems to be related to recent research on problems of economic development, poverty, inequality, malnutrition, and humanitarian disasters. The obligation to defend people in states who are not being safeguarded by their own governments is an example of the new values that have been codified. Given this divergence from conventional wisdom, a fresh discussion is developing among practitioners and theorists regarding the nature of appropriate sovereignty.

Ecological Challenges

The first global environmental difficulties emerged in the 1970s, prompting governments to create elaborate institutional systems to deal with them. These issues have persisted and spread, heightening the need of researching collaborative approaches to solving them. Threats to sufficient food supply, a potential energy crisis, and dwindling biodiversity are three major environmental issues. However, it looks that global climate change is the most challenging environmental challenge to fix. Nations need to overcome long-standing collective action difficulties in order to establish successful treaties for managing climate change, as shown by the fact that Kyoto Protocol compliance is inadequate and the development expectations of industrialising states like China, India, Brazil, and Russia. The most reasonable decisions performed by individuals in a collective action dilemma may not be the best choice for the



success of the group as a whole. To put it another way, what's best for the group could not be what's best for each one member of that group. Many people consider global warming to be a typical example of an issue requiring group effort to solve. International relations (IR) experts that care about this issue are looking for more nuanced theoretical frameworks that might effectively address climate change by using a wide range of incentives to encourage nations to work together.

Conclusion

Despite being a relatively new academic field, international relations has been more adept at describing the causes of and solutions to international conflict throughout the last century. Contemporary academics of international relations (IR) must explore more difficult themes than those who founded the field because of the increasing complexity of international politics and the quick pace of globalisation". Alternative theoretical focus on gender, norms, and environmental interdependence compel researchers to explore a set of crucial theoretical problems left unanswered by conventional methods to the study of international politics, which are still essential in the field today. Moreover, emerging security, humanitarian, and ecological issues seem to undercut state-centric methods in the subject, necessitating researchers to push the frontiers of the field in new ways.

Bibliography:

1. Angell, R. N. (1910). *The great illusion: A study of the relation of military power in nations to their economic and social advantage*. New York: Putnam.
2. Art, R. A., &Waltz, K. N. (1971). *The use of force: International politics and foreign policy*. Boston: Little, Brown.
3. Ayoob, M. (1995). *The third world security predicament: State making, regional conflict, and the international system*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
4. Bennett, J. C. (Ed.). (1962). *Nuclear weapons and the conflict of conscience*. New York: Scribner.
5. Bull, H. (1977). *The anarchical society: A study of order in world politics*. New York: Columbia University Press.
6. Carpenter, R. C. (2006). *Innocent women and children: Gender, norms, and the protection of civilians*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.
7. Carr, E. H. (1940). *The twenty years' crisis, 1919-1939: An introduction to the study of international relations*. London: Macmillan.



8. Clancy, W. (Ed.). (1961). The moral dilemma of nuclear weapons. New York: Council on Religion and International Affairs.
9. Brown, C., & Ainley, K. (2004). Understanding International Relations. Palgrave Macmillan Retrieved April 5, 2017 from
10. Cox, M., & Campanaro, R. (2016). Introduction to International Relations. University of London. Retrieved April 5, 2017 from
11. Elias, J., & Sutch, P. (2007). International Relations. The Basics. Routledge Taylor & Francis
12. Group. London & New York. Retrieved April 6, 2017 from
13. Scott, D. (ed.) (2011). Handbook of India's International Relations. The Basics. Routledge
14. Taylor & Francis Group. London & New York. Retrieved April 6, 2017 from