

Q: How does definition and scope of International Relations evolve in the light of ongoing war situation in Ukraine and Palestine? What insights do these conflicts give into the complexities of global diplomatic, political and socio-economic interactions?

THE EVOLUTION OF DEFINITION & SCOPE OF IR:

INTRODUCTION: IR IN A PERIOD OF INTENSIFYING

GLOBAL CONFLICT: The war in Ukraine and Palestine make a turning point in how International Relations is defined and studied. As Baylis et al. argue IR evolves with major global crisis and today's conflicts highlights a shift from traditional state-centric concerns to wider issues of identity, norms, alliance and globalised economics. These wars reveals that IR now incorporates humanitarian pressure, information warfare, sanctions politics and civil society activism. The conflict demonstrate how the discipline must adapt to analyze military, diplomatic and economic entanglements across regions. Thus IR's definition and scope expand as modern wars reshape global interactions.

REDEFINING IR: Ukraine and Palestine illustrate that IR is no longer limited to state to state relations

Bolter conflicts involve global media networks, non-state actors, international courts, multinational corporations and transnational advocacy groups. This reflects Bayley's argument that globalization widens IR's subject matters to include multiple layers of authority and influence. The conflict shows how states, institutions and civil societies jointly shape outcomes. Therefore IR now examines how local wars create global reverberations across markets, law, diplomacy and humanitarian systems.

SHIFTING ROLE OF THE STATE IN CONTEMPORARY CONFLICTS:

The centrality of the state resurfaces despite globalization's predicted erosion of the sovereignty. Ukraine demonstrates state resilience under external aggression, while Palestine highlights contested statehood and asymmetrical control. These cases show the sovereignty, recognition and territorial legitimacy remain core IR concerns. The war reveals that non-state actors matter, but state authority remains decisive in conflict outcomes. Thus IR continues to prioritize state-centric analysis even in interconnected world.

1. EVOLUTION OF GLOBAL DIPLOMACY UNDER CRISIS

Diplomacy increasingly blends traditional negotiation with coercive bargaining, sanctions and internationalized mediation. Ukraine has seen intense Western diplomatic mobilization, whereas Palestine diplomacy struggles against veto politics at the UNSC. These conflicts prove that diplomacy is no longer neutral but embedded in structural power. As GWP explains, diplomacy now involves network of states, IGOs and NGOs interacting simultaneously. The war highlights diplomacy as fragmented, competitive and deeply politicized.

IMPACT ON MULTILATERAL INSTITUTIONS AND COLLECTIVE SECURITY:

Bolter conflicts expose institutional paralysis, especially within the UN Security Council. Veto power blocks meaningful actions in Ukraine and Palestine, revealing limitations of the collective security in a unipolar to multipolar transition. This supports the institutionalist critique in GWP that global governance suffers when great powers' interest diverge. The credibility of humanitarian law and UN peace mechanisms is weakened. Consequently IR now studies institutional

as contested arenas rather than neutral regulators

CHANGING NATURE OF ALLIANCE AND

STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP: Ukraine triggered the revival of NATO and unprecedented Western cohesion, while Palestine reshaped Middle Eastern alignments (Saudi-Iran thaw, shifting Arab diplomacy). These dynamic alliances support the GWP argument that IR alliances are fluid and interest-driven. Great power ~~realism~~ realigns strategy around energy, security and regional influence. The conflict underscores alliances as evolving, issue-based partnerships rather than rigid cold war blocs. Thus IR increasingly analyses networks, not fixed alliances.

REASSERTION OF MILITARY FORCE IN INTER-

NATIONAL POLITICS: Both wars show that military power remains relevant despite globalization's economic interdependence. Russia employs conventional warfare, while Israel uses technologically advanced precision warfare. The reliance on kinetic force challenges liberal expectations of the conflict decline. This supports realist theory that

military capability remains a primary determinant of outcomes. Consequently, IR's scope now includes hybrid warfare, drone warfare and cyber enabled operations as essential analytical tools.

RISE OF NORMATIVE CONTESTATION IN

GLOBAL ORDER: Debates over sovereignty, human rights and self-determination intensify IR's normative dimension. Ukraine receives strong Western support based on rule-based order rhetoric, whereas Palestine reveals selective application of norms. This reflects the constructivist lens in GWP that norms evolve through political contestation. Competing narratives shape legitimacy and international support. The conflict shows that norms are influential but not uniformly applied, complicating global ethical standards.

HUMANITARIAN CRISIS AND SOCIO ECONOMIC

IMPLICATIONS:

Gaza casualties, displacement, and infrastructure collapse redefine IR's humanitarian agenda. Gaza faces catastrophic humanitarian failure, while Ukraine experiences mass displacement into Europe. This crisis expands IR beyond state security to human

security as emphasized in GWP. Humanitarian aid becomes politicized and conditional or strategic alliances. The socio economic fallout underscores that conflict now reshape global migration, development pattern and public health.

INFORMATION WARFARE AND GLOBAL

PERCEPTION MANAGEMENT: Both conflicts demonstrate how digital platforms influence international legitimacy. Ukraine uses strategic communication to mobilize global support, while Palestinian reality circulate through decentralized digital activism. This aligns GWP's discussion of the global communication networks shaping conflict narratives. Information warfare now act as a parallel battleground determining diplomatic outcomes. IR thus includes media ecosystem as determinant of global politics influence.

STRUCTURAL IMPACT ON GLOBAL ECONOMY

AND ENERGY GEOPOLITICS: Sanctions on Russia disrupts global energy markets, while Gaza war effects Middle Eastern regional stability and trade routes. IR's economic dimension

expands to include supply chain, maritime choke-points and food security. As GWP highlights, economic interdependence does not prevent conflict but redistributes vulnerabilities. These wars reshape global energy diversification, inflation trends and international commodity flows. Hence IR increasingly studies geoeconomics as core to conflict analysis.

INSIGHTS INTO COMPLEXITIES (DIPLOMATIC, POLITICAL, SOCIOECONOMIC):

1) INSIGHTS INTO DIPLOMATIC COMPLEXITY:

Ukraine and Palestine reveal fragmented, multilevel diplomacy. UNSC vetoes, mediation efforts and regional negotiations illustrate the limits and possibilities of the global diplomacy. Baylis et al. argue that contemporary diplomacy is networked, involving states, IGOs and NGOs simultaneously. This conflict shows how negotiations are shaped by power asymmetries, public opinion and international legitimacy. Diplomacy is no longer linear, it is competitive, layered and deeply politicized.

2) INSIGHTS INTO POLITICAL COMPLEXITY:

Both conflicts highlight the contradictions and rivalries among great powers. NATO cohesion contrasts with selective support for Palestinian causes, reflecting asymmetries in norms and legitimacy politics. Domestic politics, regional alliances and historical narratives complicate decision making. As GWP notes, IR now examines interactions between domestic politics and international structures. These conflicts illustrate that political complexity arises from intersecting local, regional and global interests.

3) INSIGHTS INTO SOCIOECONOMIC COMPLEXITY:

Wars in Ukraine and Palestine have far reaching economic consequences. Sanctions, trade disruptions, energy shocks and humanitarian crises demonstrate global interdependence. The conflict reveals that socio-economic vulnerabilities influence diplomatic bargaining and political stability. According to GWP IR, now studies economic linkages alongside military and normative dimensions. Humanitarian consequences further demonstrate the inseparability of social and economic system in global politics.

4. INTEGRATED LESSON: MULTI DIMENSIONAL COMPLEXITY:

The conflicts demonstrate that military, diplomatic, political and economic dimensions are interconnected. Realism, Liberalism and Constructivism coexist in analyzing outcomes. Networks of states, institutions and non-state actors simultaneously shape events. Baylis et al emphasize that IR has evolved into a hybrid, multi-level discipline capable of analyzing both material and ideational forces. Ukraine and Palestine serve as real world laboratories for understanding the complexity of global interactions.

CONCLUSION:

The Ukraine and Palestine war collectively reshape the definition and scope of IR. They reaffirm the relevance of power politics, reveal institutional weakness, expand normative considerations, and highlight multi-level, interdependent interactions. As discussed in The Globalization of World Politics, contemporary IR is broader integrating military, economic, humanitarian and technological factors. These conflicts demonstrate that understanding modern global politics requires a hybrid, multi-dimensional, analytical approach, confirming the evolution of IR and complexities it seeks to explain.

Q3: How do the thoughts of Woodrow Wilson, Norman Angell and Alfred Zimmer contribute to the development of Liberal Internationalism? Analyse and discuss various aspects of Liberal Internationalism, considering the perspectives of these thinkers and examining their respective belief on global governance, peace and cooperation.

LIBERAL INTERNATIONALISM AND ITS EVOLUTION THROUGH WILSON, ANGELL & ZIMMERN:

INTRODUCTION: In the 20th century the global crisis convinced scholars that war was neither inevitable nor rational, inspiring new ways to organize global politics. Liberal Internationalism emerged as a response to the failure of power politics, promoting cooperation, institutions and rule based order. Woodrow Wilson, Norman Angell and Alfred Zimmer each articulated ideas that shaped this intellectual tradition. Their thoughts laid the groundwork of modern global governance, collective security and cooperative interdependence. This answer examines how the three thinkers shaped Liberal Internationalism and analyses its major aspects - peace, cooperation and global governance.

KEY THINKERS & THEIR CONTRIBUTION TO LIBERAL INTERNATIONALISM:

WOODROW WILSON AND THE IDEA OF COLLECTIVE SECURITY: Wilson argued that the war could be prevented through an organized international society where aggression triggers collective response. His fourteen points and advocacy of the League of Nations institutionalized the liberal belief in peace through multilateralism. He shifted IR from power balancing to cooperative security. According to GWP, Wilson transformed liberal thoughts into a global political project rather than a moral aspiration.

Wilson's Emphasis On Democracy & Open Diplomacy: Wilson believed democracies are less likely to fight due to public accountability and shared values. He promoted open diplomacy to replace secret alliance thereby removing mistrust. These ideas form the basis of the modern democratic peace theory and transparency norms. Contemporary organizations like the EU reflect Wilsonian assumptions that democracy and openness produce stability.

NORMAN'S ANGELL'S ARGUMENT : WAR IS FUTILE IN AN INTERDEPENDANT WORLD:

Angell famously argued in *The Great Illusion* that conquest brings no economic benefit in an interconnected global economy. He viewed war as irrational because industrial societies dependant on trade and financial flows. His economic liberalism remain central to liberal theories of interdependence. Baylis ~~et al~~ highlights Angell's major impact in shifting IR away from military zero sum thinking towards mutual gains.

Angell's Contribution To Rational Cooperation:

Angell argued that global peace requires spreading rational understanding of interdependence. He believed that political education, not military deterrence, prevents war. This reflects a core liberal assumption:

Conflict stems from misperceptions not structural inevitability. His influence is visible in institutions like WTO and global trade regimes that prioritize shared prosperity.

ALFRED ZIMMERN AND THE INTELLECTUAL FOUNDATION OF INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS:

Zimmerman emphasized the stable peace require

strong international organization with moral authority. As an early scholar of the League of Nations, he argued that institutions shape state behavior through norms, procedures and shared values. His thinking anticipated ^{modern} institutionalism. GNP credits Zimmerman for conceptualizing global governance as a civilizing mechanism on world politics.

Zimmerman's Belief In Education; Ethics & International Community:

Zimmerman argued that peace depends on cultivating ethical responsibility among nations. He saw international law, civic education and moral development as key elements of global order. His ideas prefigure today's emphasis on human rights, norms and international rule of law. Zimmerman helped liberalize international moral and social dimensions alongside institutional design.

ASPECTS OF LIBERAL INTERNATIONALISM:

GLOBAL GOVERNANCE THROUGH INSTITUTIONS.

(ZIMMERN + WILSON): Liberal internationalism

argues that institutions reduce uncertainty, enable cooperation, and enforce norms. Wilson's League of Nations and Zimmer's academic frameworks laid the structural foundation for the UN and modern multilateralism. These institutions promote mediation, collective decision-making and peacekeeping. Today's UN, WHO and IMF reflects this institutional architecture.

PEACE THROUGH COLLECTIVE SECURITY: WILSON

Wilsonian collective security rests on the idea that the international community must deter aggression collectively. The UN charter particularly chapter VII, embodies this logic. Peacekeeping missions in Kosovo, Sierra Leone, or South Sudan operationalize Wilsonian ideals. Liberal internationalism believes that rule, not rivalries should govern conflict resolutions.

PEACE THROUGH ECONOMIC INTERDEPENDENCE

(ANGELL): Angell's logic underpins modern liberal economic order. Trade frameworks like WTO and regional blocs (EU and ASEAN) create mutual dependence, reducing incentives of war. Empirical evidence of low conflict between major trading partners

supports his thesis. The economic peace theory remains one of the strongest pillars of modern liberal IR thought.

COOPERATION THROUGH INTERNATIONAL LAW AND NORMS (ZIMMERN):

Liberals argue that International Law governs behavior even without a central authority. Zimmer's emphasis on law, rights and ethical standards shapes contemporary norm based governance. International courts, treaties and conventions reflects this legal institutional tradition. Human right norms, Geneva Conventions, and ICC jurisprudence exemplify liberal legalism.

DEMOCRATIC PEACE & INTERNAL GOVERNANCE (WILSON):

Liberal internationalism links domestic system to global outcomes. Wilson believed democracies are peaceful due to accountability, transparency and shared norms - a belief supported by empirical IR studies. Institutions like the Community of Democracies reflect continued Wilsonian influence. Modern peacebuilding also relies heavily on democratization and governance reforms.

EDUCATION, DIALOGUE & RATIONALITY:

(ANGELL & ZIMMERN): Liberals argue that ignorance, nationalism and misperception fuel conflict. Angell emphasized political education. Zimmermann stressed moral development. Liberal internationalism therefore promotes cultural exchange, international conferences and academic cooperation. UNESCO and global academic networks embody this belief in knowledge as a peacebuilding tool.

MULTILATERALISM AS THE OPERATIONAL

LOGIC OF LIBERALISM: For liberals peace is shared responsibility requiring multilateral decision making. Wilson's diplomacy, Zimmermann's institutional design and Angell's interdependence logic converge in the practice of multilateralism. Whether climate agreements or nuclear negotiations, liberalism assumes that collective action solves shared problems better than unilateralism.

CONTEMPORARY RELEVANCE: UKRAINE, GAZA

AND THE LIMIT OF LIBERALISM: Current conflicts reveal both the strengths and weaknesses of liberal internationalism. UN paralysis, selective

norms and great power rivalry challenges Wilsonian ideals. Yet humanitarian law, sanction regimes and global diplomatic mobilization show liberal norms remain influential. The tension between ideals and power politics keep liberal theory evolving.

CONCLUSION: Liberal internationalism emerged from the intellectual contributions of Wilson, Angell and Zimmermann who reimagined global politics around law, cooperation and interdependence. Together they advanced ideas that shaped the League of Nations, the UN system and modern multilateralism. Their perspective highlights that peace is attainable not through power but through institutions, economic links, democratic governance, and moral development. Liberal internationalism thus remains a foundational lens for exploring global governance, cooperation and the pursuit of peace even amid contemporary crises.