

International Relations

(Paper-1)

(Part-2)

Q2.

English School's thesis of evolution of international society and Fukuyama's thesis of end of history.

Ans: Introduction:

English School's thesis of evolution of international society and Fukuyama's thesis of end of history are undoubtedly remarkable concepts of history.

"English School Theory" which was proposed by Hedley Bull, was the one of initial steps that gave the idea of establishing peace mechanism.

On the other hand, Fukuyama's thesis of "end of history" was an announcement itself that reflected the victory of liberal democracy over any other theoretical and political system.

English School Thesis :

English School Theory was proposed by Hedley Bull, a British Scholar. According to Hedley Bull's English School Theory, there are group of states that have common interests, common values, and common norms, which he called the International Society." He further emphasized that, there is an international anarchical structure due to which conflicts between states arise and in order to incorporate peace in the world, three (3) things need to be followed: according to English School of thought, these three things are:

1. International System (of power politics).
2. International Society (of group of states).
3. World Society (of human centric)

The end goal and main objective of this English School Theory was peace. However,

65

there were two types of philosophers:

1. **Solidarist**, who agreed to follow this theory with full potential means 100%.
2. **Pluralist**, who believed in acceptance of different ideas, different approaches to bring peace.

Fukuyama's thesis of end of history:

At the end of cold war, the USA appeared to be only super power of the world. The cold war was not just war between the states or powers or alliances of mainly USA and USSR, it was also a war between capitalism and communism, liberalism and realism and democracy vs authoritarianism. As the USA appeared to be the only hegemon and super power of this world Francis Fukuyama proposed his thesis of end of history. According to him, the USA is epicentre of liberal democracy and

35

^{the} all states that follow democratic form of government, capitalism will always prevail over any other approach. According to him, this is the **end of history** that no any better option can overtake the concept of liberal democracy and no any other state can be more super-power than USA.

Conclusion:

The English school of theory by Hedley Bull and Francis Fukuyama's thesis of end of history, both were prominent in their respective eras. However, according to **Constructivism**, the world is always ⁱⁿ making, this world is open to change. And it can be seen from the **rise of China** as the super power and the resurgence of **multipolarity**. So, without being rigid, the world needs to move towards new ideas and new approaches to solve the contemporary issues of international relations.

Q3. Neo-Neo Debate in international relations.

Ans: Introduction:

Neo-Neo debate in international relations give us a comprehensive analysis between neo-realism and neo-liberalism. These both theories are from the **third great debate**, held in 1970s. Each theory has its own assumption, mechanism of bringing peace and other characteristics. Both have different approaches, different tools of foreign policy and different way doing politics.

1. Main assumptions:

Neo-realism:

There is an international anarchical structure in this world, which results in conflicts between states.

Neo-liberalism:

The approach of neo-liberalism is similar to that neo-realism, however, the approaches to peace are different.

2. Approaches to peace:

Neo-realism:

According to neo-realism, the approach to peace can be defined as: the politics is struggle for the "pursuit of power" in order to attain the national interests.

Neo-liberalism:

According to neo-liberalism, the approach to peace is: the politics is the struggle for the "pursuit of cooperation" in order to attain the national interests.

3. Game theory:

Neo-realism deals with the "zero-sum (0-1) game", which explains the state's advantage is dependent on opponent state's disadvantage. It is also called as **relative game**.

However, neo-liberalism deals with the **sum-sum (1-1) game**, according to which the states are in cooperation to gain mutual gains, mutual benefits. It is also called as **absolute gain**.

4. Focus of study:

For a neo-realist, the focus of study is high politics, and high politics includes military, arms, weapons, power politics.

On the other hand, neo-liberalism focuses on the study of soft powers, low politics which includes cooperation, economy, rule of law, human development etc.

5. Approach of foreign policy and foreign policy tool:

The foreign policy approach of neo-realist is totally reliant over the national interests and the foreign policy tool that neo-realists use to attain national interests is selfish and competitive nature.

However, the foreign policy approach of neo-liberals is different, that is to enhance interdependence through trade and globalization and the foreign policy tool that they use to

achieve mutual benefit is the dialogues, cooperation by leveraging the international institutions.

6. Domestic politics and role of institutions:

In neo-realism, the domestic politics is over-emphasized where as the institution's role is limited, only favors in terms of zero-sum game.

On the other hand, in neo-liberalism, the domestic politics is under-emphasized and role of institutions is considered as the foreign policy tool.

Conclusion:

This third great debate provides comparative analysis of neo-realism and neo-liberalism. Although, there are many challenges to these perspectives. As critics argue that according to **Critical theory**, these both theories are state centric specifically state in terms of neo-realism and state and non-state actors in neo-liberalism, but the primary actor in today's era is human being, they need to be focused.

National interest are not just the military, but human development, economy, environment etc. are also national interests that need to be attained.

Q4. Concept of foreign policy:

Ans: Introduction:

Foreign policy is a broader term which can be defined as "the policy that is pursued by a state in order to deal with other states to attain the national interests. The dealing of a state with other states depends on the nature of relationships either they are conflicting or harmonial relations. According to Hans J. Morganthau, who wrote a book: "Politics Among Nations", he said: "The objective of foreign policy must be defined in terms of national interests and must be supported with adequate power."

Diplomacy, is a mechanism or a mean through which foreign policy is achieved in terms of practical means.

Other instruments of foreign policy to achieve national interests:

1. Publicity and propaganda
2. Balance of power
3. Collective Security
4. International law and organisations
5. Economic sanctions and political influence
6. War and military approach

Determinants of foreign policy:

Determinants are the factors that helps in shaping or formulating the foreign policy. These factors (determinants) can be of two types:

1. Internal determinants:

These includes:

- a. Military capabilities

- b. Economic size of state

- c. Territorial size of state

- d. Geographical location

- e. Political structure and government

- f. Social structure

- g. Public mood

- h. media

2. External Determinants:

These includes:

1. Geopolitical tensions
2. International organisations
3. World politics and public opinions
4. Polar structure (world order)
5. Globalization
6. Climate crisis and reaction of world

Decision-making and analysis approach:

Graham T. Allison, former USA Secretary of Defence for policy and plans) identified three (3) models of decision making. He was political scientist and leading analyst of national security, he wrote a book: "Remaking Foreign Policy: The Organisational Culture"

According to Allison, the 3 models of decision making are:

1. **Rational Actor Model:** In this model state acts as unitary rational actor to make decisions.

85

2. Organisational Process Model: In this model, different decision-making organisations take decisions as autonomously, not only single entity but collection of government's autonomous and semi-autonomous organisations do this favor.

3. Beauc Bureaucratic Politics Model:

In this model, different decision-makers including stakeholders, lawyers, bureaucrats, government, agencies etc. make a collective decision after bargaining.

Historical Outlook of Pakistan's foreign policy:

Pakistan's foreign policy was based on reactive approach, according to historical outlook. The main areas were: Kashmir issue, India's hostility, Afghanistan border issue, Terrorism, economic vulnerability and defence-centric. It was more of military based foreign policy. There were and there still are several challenge to be addressed in Pakistan's foreign policy.

Conclusion:

Foreign policy is very important tool for any state. It determines any state's stance on any world's issue. It determines how the world actors are reacting to any specific issue. Foreign policy needs to be pro-active, goal-oriented and strategically clear, so that every state can establish harmonial relations and public can easily understand the document.