

Day: Saturday

①

Date: 21-Dec-2024

Mock-6

CSS-2025

International Relation - I

Question No: 4

### Introduction:-

The International Relations (IR) theory seeks to understand the dynamics of international politics by analyzing the behaviour of states, non-state actors and the structure of the international system. Three dominant paradigms are Realism, liberalism and constructivism that provide distinct lenses through which to interpret the causes and consequences of conflict and cooperation in global affairs. Each theory addresses different facets of state behaviour, such as the pursuit of power, institutional cooperation and the influence of ideas and norms.



# Paradigm 1: Realism

## Core Assumptions:-

1. The international system is anarchic, with no overarching authority.
2. States are the primary actors, driven by the quest for power and security.
3. Conflict is inherent due to the competition for limited resources and security concerns.

## Application to Ongoing Conflicts :-

### → Ukraine-Russia War:-

i) Realism explains the conflict as a struggle for power and influence. Russia's invasion reflects its pursuit of regional dominance and its security concerns over NATO's eastward expansion.

ii) The defensive alliances formed by Ukraine and Western countries align with the realist emphasis on balance of power to counter Russian aggression.



2) South China Sea Disputes:-  
Realism underscores China's assertion of territorial claims as a bid to maximize its power and secure strategic resources. Similarly, the U.S.'s freedom of navigation operations aim to preserve the balance of power in the region.

### Limitation:-

Realism often neglects nonstate actors and the role of ideational factors, limiting its explanatory scope in cooperative ventures that transcend power politics.

## Paradigm 2: Liberalism

### Core Assumptions:-

1) Cooperation is achievable despite anarchy through international institutions, economic interdependence and democratic governance.

2) States and nonstate actors can work together for mutual benefits, driven by norms, laws and shared interests.



## Application to Cooperation Scenarios:-

### 1) Paris climate Agreement:-

i) Liberalism highlights the role of institutions (e.g. UN Framework Convention on Climate Change) in fostering cooperation among states to address global environmental challenges.

ii) Economic interdependence encourages states to collaborate on sustainable energy initiatives, as climate change affects all nations.

### 2) European Union (EU):

Liberalism explains the EU as a model of institutionalized cooperation where economic and political integration reduces the likelihood of interstate conflict. Shared norms and values among EU members promote peace and stability.

### Limitations:-

Liberalism may overestimate the willingness of states to cooperate particularly when national interests diverge or in cases of rising populism and nationalism.



# Paradigm 3: Constructivism

## Core Assumptions:-

1) International politics are socially constructed, shaped by shared ideas, norms and identities rather than material power alone.

2) state behaviour is influenced by identity, culture and discourse surrounding global norms.

## Application to Conflict and Cooperation

1) Middle East Relations (Normalization of Ties):

The Abraham Accords, which normalized relations between Israel and some Arab states, can be explained through constructivism. Shared concerns over Iran fostered a collective identity among these states, reshaping traditional adversarial relationships.

2) Global Advocacy for Human Rights:-

Constructivism explains the rise of human rights norms, where international actors, including NGOs, influence state behaviour through ideas and public pressure.

Example:- Campaigns against China's



## Treatment of Uyghur.

### Limitations:-

Constructivism's focus on ideas and norms may underestimate the role of material factors and state-centric interests in shaping outcomes.

### Conclusion:-

The paradigms of Realism, Liberalism and Constructivism, each offer valuable perspectives on international relations. Realism provides insights into power struggles and security dynamics in conflicts like Russia-Ukraine war. Liberalism sheds light on the importance of institutions and cooperation, evident in global climate agreements. Constructivism captures the transformative role of norms and identities, explaining shifts in Middle Eastern relations and human rights advocacy. But, no single Paradigm fully explains the complexities of international relations. Instead, these Theories complement each other when applied collectively.

### References:-

- 1- Politics Among Nations: The struggle for power and Peace. H.J. Morganthau
- 2- Power and interdependence: World Politics in Transition. R.O. Keohane.



# Question No : 5

## Introduction :-

War is one of humanity's most persistent and devastating phenomena. Understanding its causes requires analyzing it through different levels: individual level, state level and international level. This approach, rooted in Kenneth Waltz's three levels of analysis, provides a comprehensive framework for studying why war occur. The ongoing war in Middle East, particularly the Yemen civil war and the Israel-Palestine conflict, can be better understood by applying these lenses.

## Causes of War: levels of Analysis :-

### 1) Individual level:-

i) Focus:- Decisions and actions of leaders, psychological and ideological motivations.



## ii) Key Drivers:-

a) Ambition or Aggression:- Leader's personal goals or worldviews often lead to conflict. eg authoritarian leaders may initiate wars for power.

b) Misjudgment or Miscommunication:- Personal biases or errors in perception can escalate tensions.

Example:- In the Middle East, the influence of leaders like Muhammed bin Salman and Houthis leaders in Yemen demonstrates how individual's ambitions and strategies contribute to sustaining conflict.

2) State level:-

i) Focus :- Domestic politics, regime type, economic conditions and societal cleavages.

## ii) Key drivers:-

a) Regime Type:- Autocrats are more likely to engage in war due to centralized decision making.

b) Ethnic/Religious divisions:- Deep-rooted societal divisions often lead to internal strife.

c) Resource Competition:- States with scarce resources may fight over economic advantages.



(1)  
Example: The Yemen civil war illustrates, how state-level issues, such as sectarian divides (Sunni vs Shia) and weak governance of the Yemeni state, exacerbate the conflict.

### 3) International Level :-

i) Focus: Power distribution in the international system, alliances and global competition.

ii) Key drivers:-

a) Power struggles:-

Conflicts often arise from imbalances in power & competition for dominance.

b) Proxy wars:-

Rivalries between global or regional powers played out in weaker states.

Example:- In Yemen, war is a proxy battle between Saudi Arabia and Iran. The international community's conflicting interests also hinder resolution.

## Applying Causes to Middle Eastern Conflicts :-

### 1) Yemen Civil War :-

i) Individual level:-

Leaders like Muhammad bin Salman



have aggressively pursued military campaigns, viewing Yemen as a critical theater for influence.

ii) State level:-

Yemen's weak state institutions and internal divisions between the Houthi movement and government underpin prolonged conflict.

iii) International level:-

Saudi Arabia and Iran's proxy war dynamics fuel the violence, as both seek regional dominance.

## 2) Israel - Palestine Conflict:-

i) Individual level:-

Leadership decisions, such as Israeli Prime Minister's policies and Hamas's strategy, demonstrate how individual actions perpetuate cycles of violence.

ii) State level:-

Political systems and domestic pressures on both sides make compromise difficult. Israel settlement policies and fragmented governance in Palestine exacerbate the conflict.

iii) International level:-

The United States' strong support for Israel and lack of unified global approach to resolving the conflict underscore international-level barriers.



## Conclusion:-

The causes of war analyzed at individual, state and international levels, reveal the complexity of conflicts, particularly in the Middle East. Leadership decisions, domestic political dynamics and the role of external actors like Saudi Arabia, Iran and global powers intertwine to sustain these wars. Understanding these dimensions is crucial for effective conflict-resolution.

## References:-

- 1 - Man, the state and war: A Theoretical Analysis, Kenneth Waltz
- 2 - "Saudi-Iranian Rivalry and the sectarian Politics in the Middle East." F. Gregory Gause (2015)



# Question No:- 3

## Introduction :-

The landscape of international relations, diplomacy serves as the central tool through which states navigate the complexities of global politics. The "Football Stadium approach to diplomacy" metaphorically represents high profile, large scale events that emphasize spectacle, public appeal, and symbolism over quiet, behind-closed doors negotiations. This approach reflects a shift toward performative and public facing foreign policy strategies, where leaders seek to bolster domestic legitimacy and international influence through grand gestures or media-centric diplomacy.

## Concepts and Dynamics of Foreign Policy and Diplomacy:-

### 1) Foreign Policy: Strategy and Goals.

Foreign policy refers to a state's strategic framework for managing its relationships with other nations. It encompasses a wide range of objectives, including:-



i) National security:- safeguarding territorial integrity and sovereignty.

ii) Economic interests:- Promoting trade, investment and financial stability.

iii) Cultural influence:-

Enhancing soft power and promoting national values abroad.

2) Diplomacy: The Means to Execute.

Diplomacy is the practice of negotiation and dialogue through which foreign policy is implemented.

i) Bilateral diplomacy:-

Direct engagement between two states:-

(e.g. US and China trade talks).

ii) Multilateral diplomacy:-

Engagement with international organizations (e.g. UN).

iii) Public diplomacy:-

Communicating with foreign publics to shape perceptions (e.g. cultural exchanges).

The Football stadium Approach  
in Contemporary International  
Relations :-



The football stadium approach to diplomacy refers to using grand, theatrical gestures to achieve diplomatic goals. It is a blend of foreign policy with spectacle.

### Characteristics of the Approach:-

#### 1) High-profile events:-

Leaders engage in widely publicized summits, speeches or agreements.

#### 2) Symbolism over substance:-

Actions are designed to capture public imagination, often overshadowing tangible outcomes.

#### 3) Nationalistic appeal:-

Leaders showcase strength and unity to domestic audiences through global platforms.

### Examples in Action:-

#### 1) Trump-Kim Jong Un Summits (2018-19).

Highly publicized meeting focused on denuclearization of North Korea while they garnered global attention, they produced limited substantive agreements.



## 2) Qatar's Hosting of the FIFA World Cup (2022):-

Beyond football, Qatar used this event to project itself as a modern, influential state while countering criticisms of human rights practices.

## 3) China's Belt and Road Initiatives (BRI):-

While primarily economic initiative, the large-scale international forums convened by China for BRI-related discussions blend hard power with soft power, showcasing China's leadership in global development.

# Arguments Supporting and Critiquing the Approach:-

## A) Advantages:-

### 1) Public Engagement:-

Large scale events capture global attention, fostering dialogue and engagement among states and citizens alike.

Example:-

G20 Summits on climate change.



## 2) National Prestige:-

Leaders can demonstrate international clout and assert their country's position on global stage.

Example:-

India's G20 Presidency in 2023.

## 3) Soft Power Amplification:-

Symbolic actions reinforce cultural diplomacy and build goodwill.

Example:-

Nelson Mandela's use of Rugby World Cup in 1995 to unite post-apartheid South Africa.

## B) Criticism:-

### 1) Superficial Outcomes:-

These events may prioritize optics over meaningful resolutions.

Example:-

The Paris Peace Forum.

### 2) Resource intensiveness:-

Staging grand gestures often involves significant costs outweighing benefits.

Example:-

Brazil's hosting of Olympics 2016.

Events cost...



Date: \_\_\_\_\_

(11)

3) Potential for Miscommunication:-  
Public diplomacy, when poorly executed, risks alienating audiences.

Example:-

U.S. President Trump's controversial tweets during his term occasionally undermined diplomatic efforts

## Conclusion:-

The football stadium approach to diplomacy reflects a broader shift in the conduct of international relations, where symbolism, public engagement and spectacle often overshadow traditional, behind the scenes negotiations. While this approach can enhance soft power, build national prestige and galvanize public support, it also risks producing superficial outcomes and resource strain. Therefore, a balance between theatrical and substantive diplomacy is necessary.

## References:-

1) Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics. J.S. Nye.

2) "Diplomacy in the 21st century: Evolving strategies and Approaches." International Affairs Journal.