



# JKPSC

## School Lecturer

Jammu & Kashmir Public Service Commission

### POLITICAL SCIENCE

### Volume - 2



# **JKPSC - POLITICAL SCIENCE**

## **PART – B**

### **Theory and Practice of International Relations**

#### **UNIT - I : Introduction to International Relations**

<b>1.</b>	Nature, Scope and Evolution of International Relations	1
<b>2.</b>	Classical vs. Scientific debate (hedley bull vs. Morton kaplan) – Part 1	6
<b>3.</b>	Classical vs. Scientific debate (hedley bull vs. Morton kaplan) – Part 2	10
<b>4.</b>	Idealist Approach to International Relations	14
<b>5.</b>	Realist Approach to International Relations	19
<b>6.</b>	Theories Of International Relations (Systems Theory, Decision Making Theory, Communication Theory, Game Theory)	23

#### **UNIT - II : Concept of Power in International Relations**

<b>1.</b>	National Power and National Interest	29
<b>2.</b>	National Power and Foreign Policy	34
<b>3.</b>	Elements Of National Power (Tangible)	39
<b>4.</b>	Elements Of National Power (Intangible)	44
<b>5.</b>	International Power Structure (Unipolarity, Bipolarity, Multipolarity)	50
<b>6.</b>	Power And Interdependence, Un System, And Non-Aligned Movement (Nam)	55

#### **UNIT - III : Management of Power**

<b>1.</b>	Balance of Power – Meaning and Techniques, Relevance and Power Vacuum	60
<b>2.</b>	Collective Security: Meaning, Distinction from Collective Defence, Requirements, Prerequisites, and Role Under Un Charter	66
<b>3.</b>	Disarmament and Arms Control	69
<b>4.</b>	Cold War Phases, Detente, Neo- Détente, Nuclear Deterrence and Mad	72

#### **UNIT - IV : Emerging Trends in International Relations**

<b>1.</b>	Decolonization and The Emergence of the Third World	77
<b>2.</b>	Neo-Colonialism – Meaning and Nature	80
<b>3.</b>	Neo-Colonialism – Politics of Foreign Aid	83
<b>4.</b>	Neo-Colonialism – Role of Multinational Corporations	86
<b>5.</b>	New International Economic Order (Nieu) – Need and Context	89
<b>6.</b>	New International Economic Order (Nieu) – Nature and Principles	93
<b>7.</b>	New International Economic Order (Nieu) – Challenges and Relevance	97
<b>8.</b>	New Thrust on International Cooperation and Emergence of Igos – UN's Changing Role and Global Igos	101
<b>9.</b>	Regional Organizations – EU, SAARC, OIC, ASEAN, BRICS, SCO, OPEC, and African Union	105

<b>PART – C</b> <b>Government and Politics of Jammu and Kashmir</b> <b>UNIT - I : Historical and Constitutional Bases</b>		
1.	Formation of National Conference (1938-39), New Kashmir Manifesto, Praja Parishad Movement	109
2.	Accession of J&K to India: Terms, Conditions and Controversies	113
3.	Article 370, Article 35A, Special Status, and Abrogation of Article 370	117
4.	J&K Reorganization Act 2019: Internal & External Dynamics, Domicile Laws	121
<b>UNIT - II : Political Structures</b>		
1.	Centre-State Relations: Delhi Agreement (1952), Indira-Sheikh Accord (1974), Rajiv-Farooq Accord (1986); Presidential Orders (1954, 1958, 1965)	127
2.	Government Structures: Legislature, Executive, Judiciary; Local Self-Government	132
<b>UNIT - III : Representative Politics</b>		
1.	Evolution of Party System, One-Party Dominant System, Ideologies and Programmes of National Conference, BJP, PDP, Congress	138
2.	Politics of Marginal Groups: Women, Dalits, and Tribes	142
3.	Displacement and Resettlement: State Response	146
<b>UNIT - IV : Issues in J&amp;K Politics</b>		
1.	Land Reforms and Their Impact	151
2.	Regional Imbalance, Autonomy, and Integration: Aspirations and Politics in Jammu and Kashmir	155
3.	Separatist Politics in Jammu and Kashmir: Organisation, Leadership, and Strategy	159
4.	Process of Development Post- Abrogation of Article 370	163
<b>PART – D</b> <b>Public Administration</b> <b>UNIT - I : Introduction to Public Administration</b>		
1.	Public Administration: Meaning, Nature and Scope	168
2.	New Public Administration	173
3.	New Public Management and Public- Private Partnership	179
4.	Comparative Public Administration	185
<b>UNIT - II : Organization Theory</b>		
1.	Classical Organization Theory (Fayol, Urwick and Gulick)	191
2.	Scientific Management Theory (F.W. Taylor)	195
3.	Bureaucratic and Post Bureaucratic Theory (Max Weber and his Critics)	200
4.	Human Relations Theory (Elton Mayo) and Ecological Approach (Fred Riggs)	206

<b>UNIT - III : Principles of Organization</b>		
<b>1.</b>	Hierarchy, Authority and Span of Control	212
<b>2.</b>	Centralization, Decentralization and Delegation	217
<b>3.</b>	Chief Executive: Concept, Types and Roles	222
<b>UNIT - IV : Financial Administration</b>		
<b>4.</b>	Importance and Role in Public Administration	228
<b>5.</b>	Agencies of Financial Administration: Legislature, Executive, Treasury, and Controller and Auditor General; Budget Formulation and Execution	232
<b>PART – E</b>		
<b>International Law</b>		
<b>UNIT - I : Meaning, Sources and Subjects</b>		
<b>6.</b>	Meaning, Nature and Bases; Sources of International Law	238
<b>7.</b>	Nationality, Extradition, and Asylum; Types, Role, and Immunities and Privileges of Diplomats	243
<b>UNIT - II : State Recognition, Sovereignty and Succession</b>		
<b>8.</b>	Recognition of States: Theories, Modes, and Consequences; State Succession and State Responsibility	249
<b>9.</b>	Law of Sea, Air Space, and Outer Space	255
<b>10.</b>	Settlement of International Disputes: Pacific and Coercive Methods; International Humanitarian Law	260

# I UNIT

# Introduction to International Relations

## Nature, Scope, and Evolution of International Relations

### 1. Introduction

International Relations (IR) is a pivotal discipline that examines interactions among states, non-state actors, and global systems, shaping political, economic, and social dynamics worldwide. This part explores the **Nature, Scope, and Evolution of International Relations**, tracing its historical development, defining its interdisciplinary scope, and analyzing its relevance to India's foreign policy and Jammu & Kashmir's (J&K) geopolitical context.

### 2. Historical Context

International Relations as a discipline emerged from centuries of diplomatic, military, and economic interactions, shaped by global and Indian contexts:

#### • Ancient Diplomacy:

- Early interactions (e.g., Mesopotamia, 2500 BCE) involved trade and treaties, with Kautilya's Arthashastra (4th century BCE) outlining India's diplomatic strategies, such as the Mandala theory of alliances.
- Greek city-states and Mauryan India practiced alliance-building, reflecting proto-IR principles.

#### • Medieval and Early Modern Periods:

- Islamic Caliphates and European feudal systems developed trade networks, with India's Mughal diplomacy engaging Persia and Central Asia.
- The Peace of Westphalia (1648) established sovereign states, laying the foundation for modern IR.

#### • Colonial Era:

- European imperialism (16th–19th centuries) shaped global power dynamics, with British colonization of India (1858–1947) influencing IR's focus on imperialism and resistance (e.g., Subhas Chandra Bose's Indian National Army [INA]).

#### • 20th Century:

- World Wars (1914–18, 1939–45) and the League of Nations (1919) formalized IR, with India's Indian National Congress (INC) advocating self-rule.
- The Cold War (1947–91) introduced bipolarity, influencing India's Non-Aligned Movement (NAM, 1955) under Jawaharlal Nehru.
- Post-Cold War (1991–present) globalization and multipolarity reshaped IR, with India emerging as a global power.

#### • Impact on IR:

- Evolved from state-centric diplomacy to include non-state actors (e.g., United Nations [UN], multinational corporations [MNCs]) and issues (e.g., climate change, terrorism).
- India's foreign policy, rooted in Kautilya's pragmatism and Nehru's idealism, reflects IR's dynamic nature.

- **Indian Context:** India's IR journey—from Mughal diplomacy to NAM and post-1991 economic liberalization—mirrors global IR evolution, shaping Article 51 of the Indian Constitution (peaceful coexistence).

- **J&K Context:** J&K's geopolitical significance (e.g., India-Pakistan conflicts, post-2019 integration) reflects IR's focus on sovereignty and security, with UN resolutions (1948–) highlighting its global relevance.
- **Objective Exam Tip:** Memorize key IR milestones (e.g., Peace of Westphalia, 1648; NAM, 1955) and Kautilya's Mandala theory for MCQs.

### 3. Nature of International Relations

#### 3.1 Definition

- **Concept:** IR studies interactions among states, international organizations, non-state actors (e.g., non-governmental organizations [NGOs], MNCs), and global systems, focusing on power, cooperation, and conflict.
- **Scholarly Definitions:**
  - **Hedley Bull:** IR is the study of the “anarchical society” where states interact without a central authority, balancing order and conflict.
  - **Quincy Wright:** IR encompasses political, economic, and cultural relations among nations, emphasizing interdisciplinary analysis.
- **Key Features:**
  - **Interdisciplinary:** Combines political science, economics, history, sociology, and law.
  - **Dynamic:** Evolves with global changes (e.g., Cold War to globalization).
  - **Normative and Empirical:** Balances ideals (e.g., peace) with realities (e.g., power politics).
- **Indian Context:** India's IR approach integrates Kautilya's realism (e.g., strategic autonomy) and Nehru's idealism (e.g., NAM), shaping its global diplomacy.
- **J&K Context:** J&K's status as a contested region underscores IR's focus on sovereignty and conflict resolution, with India's UN engagements reflecting normative goals.
- **Objective Exam Tip:** Know Bull's “anarchical society” and Wright's interdisciplinary definition for MCQs.

#### 3.2 Objectives

- **Analytical:** Understands state behavior, power dynamics, and global trends (e.g., multipolarity).
- **Predictive:** Anticipates conflicts, alliances, and economic shifts (e.g., India-China rivalry).
- **Normative:** Promotes peace, cooperation, and justice (e.g., UN peacekeeping).
- **Practical:** Guides foreign policy formulation (e.g., India's multi-alignment strategy).
- **Indian Context:** India's IR objectives include strategic autonomy, economic growth, and global leadership, as seen in BRICS and G20 engagements.
- **J&K Context:** IR objectives in J&K focus on resolving conflicts (e.g., India-Pakistan talks) and promoting regional stability, with post-2019 integration aligning with national security goals.
- **Objective Exam Tip:** Memorize IR's analytical and normative objectives for MCQs.

#### 3.3 Interdisciplinary Character

- **Political Science:** Analyzes state power, diplomacy, and conflicts (e.g., India-Pakistan relations).
- **Economics:** Studies trade, globalization, and sanctions (e.g., India's World Trade Organization [WTO] role).
- **History:** Examines past events shaping IR (e.g., Cold War's impact on NAM).
- **Sociology:** Explores cultural and societal influences (e.g., India's soft power via yoga).
- **Law:** Focuses on international treaties and norms (e.g., UN Charter).
- **Indian Context:** India's IR integrates Kautilyan statecraft (political), economic liberalization (1991), and cultural diplomacy (sociological), shaping its global role.
- **J&K Context:** J&K's IR relevance spans political (security), economic (trade routes), and legal (UN resolutions) dimensions, requiring interdisciplinary analysis.
- **Objective Exam Tip:** Know IR's interdisciplinary components (e.g., political science, economics) for MCQs.

## 4. Scope of International Relations

### 4.1 Actors

- **States:** Primary actors, pursuing national interests (e.g., India's strategic partnerships).
- **International Organizations:** UN, WTO, International Monetary Fund (IMF) shape global governance (e.g., India's UN Security Council [UNSC] bid).
- **Non-State Actors:** NGOs (e.g., Amnesty International), MNCs (e.g., Reliance Industries), and terrorist groups (e.g., Lashkar-e-Taiba [LeT]) influence IR.
- **Individuals:** Leaders (e.g., Nehru) and activists (e.g., Malala Yousafzai) impact global agendas.
- **Indian Context:** India balances state-led diplomacy (e.g., Shanghai Cooperation Organisation [SCO]) with non-state contributions (e.g., Bollywood's soft power).
- **J&K Context:** J&K involves state actors (India, Pakistan), international organizations (UN), and non-state actors (e.g., separatist groups), shaping its IR dynamics.
- **Objective Exam Tip:** Know key IR actors (e.g., states, UN, MNCs) for MCQs.

### 4.2 Issues

- **Security:** Conflicts, terrorism, nuclear proliferation (e.g., India's nuclear doctrine).
- **Economic:** Trade, development, inequality (e.g., India's Free Trade Agreement [FTA] negotiations).
- **Environmental:** Climate change, resource conflicts (e.g., India's Paris Agreement role).
- **Human Rights:** Refugees, gender equality (e.g., India's United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees [UNHCR] contributions).
- **Cultural:** Soft power, globalization (e.g., India's yoga diplomacy).
- **Indian Context:** India addresses security (e.g., Line of Actual Control [LAC] tensions), economic (e.g., Atmanirbhar Bharat), and environmental (e.g., International Solar Alliance) issues in IR.

- **J&K Context:** J&K's issues include security (border conflicts), human rights (post-2019 policies), and cultural (Kashmiri heritage), central to IR analysis.
- **Objective Exam Tip:** Memorize IR issues (e.g., security, economic, environmental) for MCQs.

### 4.3 Subfields

- **International Security:** Focuses on war, peace, and deterrence (e.g., India's defense policies).
- **International Political Economy:** Analyzes trade, finance, and development (e.g., India's BRICS role).
- **Global Governance:** Studies institutions like UN, WTO (e.g., India's peacekeeping contributions).
- **Foreign Policy Analysis:** Examines state decision-making (e.g., India's NAM strategy).
- **Indian Context:** India engages in security (e.g., Quad), political economy (e.g., Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership [RCEP]), and governance (e.g., UN reforms) subfields.
- **J&K Context:** J&K's IR subfields include security (Line of Control [LoC] tensions), governance (UN resolutions), and foreign policy (India-Pakistan diplomacy).
- **Objective Exam Tip:** Know IR subfields (e.g., security, political economy) for MCQs.

## 5. Evolution of International Relations

### 5.1 Pre-Westphalian Era (Pre-1648)

- **Ancient Diplomacy:** Treaties and alliances in Mesopotamia, India (Kautilya's Mandala theory), and China (Sun Tzu's Art of War).
- **Medieval Interactions:** Islamic trade networks, European feudal diplomacy, and India's Mughal exchanges with Persia.
- **Indian Context:** Kautilya's Arthashastra outlined strategic diplomacy, influencing India's historical IR role.



- **J&K Context:** J&K's ancient trade routes (e.g., Silk Route) connected it to Central Asia, reflecting early IR networks.
- **Objective Exam Tip:** Know Kautilya's Mandala theory for MCQs.

### 5.2 Westphalian System (1648–1914)

- **Treaty of Westphalia (1648):** Established state sovereignty, marking the birth of modern IR.
- **Balance of Power:** European alliances (e.g., Congress of Vienna, 1815) shaped global order.
- **Colonialism:** Britain's control over India (1858–1947) integrated it into global IR as a colony.
- **Indian Context:** India's resistance (e.g., 1857 Revolt, INC formation, 1885) reflected anti-colonial IR dynamics.
- **J&K Context:** J&K's integration into British India (1846, Treaty of Amritsar) shaped its geopolitical role, influencing modern IR disputes.
- **Objective Exam Tip:** Know Treaty of Westphalia (1648) and 1857 Revolt for MCQs.

### 5.3 Inter-War Period (1919–1939)

- **League of Nations (1919):** First attempt at global governance, though ineffective (e.g., Manchuria crisis, 1931).
- **World War I Aftermath:** Treaty of Versailles (1919) reshaped power dynamics, with India gaining limited representation.
- **Indian Context:** INC's Swaraj demands and Gandhi's non-violence influenced global anti-colonial IR.
- **J&K Context:** J&K's princely state status under British rule set the stage for post-1947 IR conflicts.
- **Objective Exam Tip:** Know League of Nations (1919) and Treaty of Versailles (1919) for MCQs.

### 5.4 Cold War Era (1947–1991)

- **Bipolarity:** US-Soviet rivalry defined IR, with NATO and Warsaw Pact shaping alliances.
- **UN Formation (1945):** Established global governance, with India as a founding member.
- **Non-Alignment:** India's NAM (1955) under Nehru navigated bipolar tensions.
- **Indian Context:** India's NAM, nuclear policy, and UN peacekeeping reflected its IR prominence.
- **J&K Context:** J&K's 1947 accession to India and UN resolutions (1948–) highlighted its Cold War-era IR significance, shaping India-Pakistan rivalry.
- **Objective Exam Tip:** Know NAM (1955) and UN formation (1945) for MCQs.

### 5.5 Post-Cold War Era (1991–Present)

- **Unipolarity to Multipolarity:** US dominance (1990s) gave way to rising powers (e.g., China, India).
- **Globalization:** Trade, technology, and terrorism reshaped IR (e.g., WTO, 1995; 9/11 attacks, 2001).
- **Emerging Issues:** Climate change, cyberwarfare, and pandemics (e.g., COVID-19) expanded IR's scope.
- **Indian Context:** India's 1991 economic liberalization, nuclear tests (1998), and BRICS role reflect its post-Cold War IR ascent.
- **J&K Context:** Post-2019 integration, global terrorism debates, and economic reforms position J&K in contemporary IR, with India's diplomacy addressing regional challenges.
- **Objective Exam Tip:** Know 1991 liberalization and 1998 nuclear tests for MCQs.



## 6. Indian and J&K Applications

### 6.1 Indian Context

- **Nature of IR:** India's IR integrates realism (e.g., China border strategy) and idealism (e.g., NAM), shaping Article 51 (peaceful coexistence) and global diplomacy (e.g., G20 leadership).
- **Scope of IR:** India engages state actors (e.g., US, Russia), inter-governmental organizations (IGOs) (e.g., UN, BRICS), and issues like security (Quad) and climate (Paris Agreement).
- **Evolution of IR:** India's journey—from Kautilyan diplomacy to NAM and post-1991 multi-alignment—mirrors IR's global evolution, with Nehru's legacy guiding its role.
- **Key Examples:** NAM (1955), 1998 nuclear tests, and G20 leadership reflect India's IR prominence, balancing power and cooperation.

### 6.2 J&K Context

- **Nature of IR:** J&K's contested status underscores IR's focus on sovereignty and conflict, with India's UN diplomacy reflecting normative goals.
- **Scope of IR:** J&K involves states (India, Pakistan, China), IGOs (UN), and issues like security (LoC), human rights (post-2019 policies), and culture (Kashmiri heritage).
- **Evolution of IR:** J&K's IR significance spans colonial (1846), Cold War (1948 UN resolutions), and post-2019 integration, shaping regional stability debates.
- **Key Examples:** Post-2019 integration, UN resolutions (1948), and cultural diplomacy (e.g., tourism promotion) highlight J&K's IR relevance, fostering unity and development.

## 7. PYQ Analysis

1. The Peace of Westphalia (1648) is significant in IR for:  
(A) Establishing colonialism  
(B) State sovereignty  
(C) Global trade  
(D) Bipolarity

**Answer: (B)** State sovereignty

**Explanation:** Westphalia (1648) marked the rise of sovereign states, foundational to modern IR.

2. India's Non-Aligned Movement was formalized in:

(A) 1947 (B) 1955  
(C) 1961 (D) 1971

**Answer: (B)** 1955

**Explanation:** NAM was formalized at the Bandung Conference (1955), led by Nehru.

3. The primary actor in IR is:

(A) NGOs (B) States  
(C) MNCs (D) Individuals

**Answer: (B)** States

**Explanation:** States are the primary actors in IR, pursuing national interests.

4. Kautilya's Mandala theory is related to:

(A) Economic policy  
(B) Diplomacy  
(C) Military strategy  
(D) Cultural exchange

**Answer: (B)** Diplomacy

**Explanation:** Mandala theory outlines strategic alliances in ancient Indian IR.

5. In J&K, IR is significant for:

(A) Economic isolation  
(B) Conflict resolution  
(C) Centralized rule  
(D) Cultural revival

**Answer: (B)** Conflict resolution

**Explanation:** J&K's contested status highlights IR's focus on resolving India-Pakistan conflicts.

6. The scope of IR includes:

(A) Only state interactions  
(B) Security and economic issues  
(C) Domestic policy  
(D) Religious conflicts

**Answer: (B)** Security and economic issues

**Explanation:** IR encompasses security, economic, and other global issues.

7. The UN was formed in:

(A) 1919 (B) 1945  
(C) 1955 (D) 1991

**Answer: (B)** 1945

**Question:** UN formation (1945) marked a key IR milestone, with India as a founding member.

### Conclusion

This part provides an exhaustive analysis of the Nature, Scope, and Evolution of International Relations, tailored for the objective JK PSC 10+2 Lecturer Political Science exam.

## Classical vs. Scientific debate (hedley bull vs. Morton kaplan) – part 1

### 1. Introduction

This part delves into the **Classical vs. Scientific Debate**, a pivotal discourse in IR theory known as the “Great Debate,” which contrasts traditional, normative approaches with behavioral, scientific methods. This debate, epitomized by **Hedley Bull**’s classical approach and **Morton Kaplan**’s scientific approach, shapes IR’s theoretical foundations, crucial for the **JK PSC 10+2 Lecturer Political Science** examination. **This part** focuses on the **classical approach**, as articulated by Bull, emphasizing normative, historical, and philosophical perspectives on the “anarchical society” of states.

### 2. Historical Context of the Classical vs. Scientific Debate

#### 2.1 Post-WWII IR Scholarship

The Great Debate emerged in the mid-20th century as IR sought to establish itself as a rigorous academic discipline:

- **Post-WWII Context (1945–1960s):**
  - The devastation of World War II (1939–45) and the Cold War’s onset (1947) highlighted the need for systematic IR study to prevent global conflicts.
  - The failure of the League of Nations (1919–39) and the rise of the UN (1945) spurred debates on state behavior and international order.
  - American dominance in academia, coupled with behavioralism in social sciences, pushed for scientific methods, challenging traditional diplomatic studies.
- **Classical Approach:**
  - Rooted in historical and philosophical traditions, scholars like **Hedley Bull** (British, 1932–1985) emphasized normative questions, state interactions, and the balance of power.
  - Drew from thinkers like Hobbes, Grotius, and Kant, focusing on the “anarchical society” of states maintaining order without a central authority.

- **Scientific Approach:**

- Influenced by behavioralism, scholars like **Morton Kaplan** (American, 1921–2017) advocated empirical, systematic models (e.g., systems theory) to predict state behavior.
- Emphasized quantitative methods, drawing from natural sciences, to make IR more predictive and objective.

- **The Great Debate:**

- Initiated in the 1950s–60s, it pitted classical scholars (e.g., Bull, Morgenthau) against scientific scholars (e.g., Kaplan, Deutsch), debating methodology, focus, and IR’s purpose.
- Bull’s *The Anarchical Society* (1977) defended normative analysis, while Kaplan’s *System and Process in International Politics* (1957) championed scientific rigor.

- **Impact:**

- Shaped IR’s theoretical evolution, influencing realism, liberalism, and later constructivism.
- Informed global diplomacy, with India’s Non-Aligned Movement (NAM, 1955) reflecting classical normative concerns (e.g., sovereignty, peace).

- **Indian Context:** India’s post-independence diplomacy, rooted in Kautilya’s pragmatic statecraft and Nehru’s normative idealism, aligns with Bull’s classical focus on state sovereignty and order.

- **J&K Context:** J&K’s post-1947 conflicts (e.g., UN resolutions, 1948) reflect classical IR concerns with sovereignty, security, and diplomatic negotiations, shaping India-Pakistan relations.

- **Objective Exam Tip:** Memorize the Great Debate’s timeline (1950s–60s) and Bull’s *The Anarchical Society* (1977) for MCQs.

## 2.2 Intellectual Climate

The intellectual climate of the mid-20th century, marked by Cold War tensions and methodological shifts, framed the debate:

- **Cold War Bipolarity:** US-Soviet rivalry (1947–91) emphasized power politics, aligning with classical focus on state behavior and security (Bull).
- **Behavioral Revolution:** Social sciences adopted scientific methods (e.g., statistical analysis), influencing Kaplan's systems approach to IR.
- **Decolonization:** The rise of new states (e.g., India, 1947) highlighted sovereignty and non-alignment, resonating with Bull's normative concerns.
- **Philosophical Roots:** Classical scholars drew on Western philosophy (e.g., Hobbes' anarchy, Kant's perpetual peace), while scientific scholars embraced positivism (e.g., Comte, Popper).
- **Indian Influence:** Kautilya's Arthashastra (4th century BCE) prefigured classical IR with its focus on statecraft, alliances, and diplomacy, influencing India's strategic thought.
- **Impact:** The debate clarified IR's dual nature—normative (classical) and empirical (scientific)—shaping India's balanced diplomacy and J&K's security frameworks.
- **Indian Context:** India's NAM (1955) and nuclear policy reflect classical IR's normative focus on sovereignty and peace, tempered by pragmatic realism.
- **J&K Context:** J&K's IR significance, rooted in sovereignty disputes (1947–), aligns with Bull's classical emphasis on state-centric diplomacy and conflict management.
- **Objective Exam Tip:** Know Cold War's influence (1947–91) and Kautilya's classical statecraft for MCQs.

## 3. Classical Approach (Hedley Bull)

### 3.1 Definition and Principles

- **Definition:** The classical approach, as articulated by Hedley Bull, views IR as the study of state interactions in an "anarchical society," where order is maintained through norms, institutions, and diplomacy despite the absence of a central authority.
- **Core Principles:**
  - **Anarchical Society:** States operate in an anarchic system without a global government, yet form a society through shared rules (e.g., sovereignty, non-intervention).
  - **Normative Focus:** Emphasizes values like peace, justice, and order, analyzing state behavior through ethical and philosophical lenses.
  - **State-Centric:** Prioritizes states as primary actors, with diplomacy and balance of power shaping interactions.
  - **Historical Analysis:** Uses historical case studies (e.g., Westphalia, 1648) to understand IR dynamics.
- **Bull's Contribution:** In *The Anarchical Society* (1977), Bull argues that states maintain order through institutions like diplomacy, international law, and balance of power, balancing anarchy with cooperation.
- **Indian Context:** India's foreign policy, rooted in Kautilya's state-centric diplomacy and Nehru's normative NAM, aligns with Bull's classical approach, emphasizing sovereignty and peace.
- **J&K Context:** J&K's sovereignty disputes (e.g., India-Pakistan conflicts) reflect Bull's anarchical society, with diplomacy (e.g., UN mediation) seeking order.
- **Objective Exam Tip:** Memorize Bull's "anarchical society" and *The Anarchical Society* (1977) for MCQs.

### 3.2 Key Features

- **Normative Analysis:**
  - Focuses on “ought” questions (e.g., how states should behave), drawing on ethics and philosophy.
  - Example: Bull’s advocacy for international law to regulate state conflicts (e.g., UN Charter).
- **Historical Approach:**
  - Analyzes IR through historical events (e.g., Congress of Vienna, 1815), emphasizing continuity and context.
  - Example: Bull’s study of Westphalia (1648) as the origin of state sovereignty.
- **State-Centric Diplomacy:**
  - Views diplomacy as central to maintaining order, with states negotiating alliances and treaties.
  - Example: Bull’s emphasis on great power diplomacy (e.g., Cold War negotiations).
- **Institutions of Order:**
  - Identifies diplomacy, international law, balance of power, and war as mechanisms to sustain the anarchical society.
  - Example: UN’s role in peacekeeping reflects Bull’s institutional focus.
- **Indian Context:** India’s diplomatic engagements (e.g., NAM, UNSC bi(D) and adherence to international law (e.g., WTO rules) reflect Bull’s classical features.
- **J&K Context:** J&K’s conflict resolution efforts (e.g., Shimla Agreement, 1972) align with Bull’s diplomatic and normative focus, seeking order in an anarchic context.
- **Objective Exam Tip:** Know Bull’s institutions of order (diplomacy, law, balance of power) for MCQs.

### 3.3 Philosophical Foundations

- **Hobbesian Anarchy:** Bull draws on Hobbes’ view of anarchy as a state of potential conflict, mitigated by state agreements.
- **Grotian International Society:** Emphasizes shared norms and laws (e.g., sovereignty) to create a society of states.

- **Kantian Universalism:** Incorporates ideals of peace and cooperation, though tempered by realistic constraints.
- **Indian Parallel:** Kautilya’s Arthashastra mirrors Bull’s state-centric, pragmatic diplomacy, with Mandala theory resembling balance of power.
- **Indian Context:** India’s foreign policy blends Kautilyan realism (e.g., China strategy) with Kantian peace ideals (e.g., NAM), reflecting Bull’s foundations.
- **J&K Context:** J&K’s IR dynamics combine Hobbesian conflict (India-Pakistan tensions) with Grotian diplomacy (UN resolutions), aligning with Bull’s framework.
- **Objective Exam Tip:** Know Hobbes, Grotius, and Kautilya’s Mandala for MCQs.

### 4. Critiques and Relevance of the Classical Approach

#### 4.1 Critiques

- **State-Centric Bias:** Overemphasizes states, neglecting non-state actors (e.g., MNCs, NGOs), as critiqued by Kaplan’s systems approach.
- **Subjectivity:** Normative focus lacks empirical rigor, unlike Kaplan’s quantitative models.
- **Western Bias:** Draws heavily on European history (e.g., Westphalia), marginalizing non-Western perspectives, as critiqued by post-colonial scholars.
- **Limited Predictability:** Historical analysis struggles to predict state behavior, unlike scientific simulations.
- **Indian Context:** India’s multi-alignment (e.g., BRICS, QUAD) incorporates non-state actors, addressing Bull’s state-centric bias.
- **J&K Context:** J&K’s IR involves non-state actors (e.g., separatists), requiring broader analysis beyond Bull’s state focus, though diplomacy remains relevant.
- **Objective Exam Tip:** Know critiques (e.g., state-centric bias, subjectivity) for MCQs.

## 4.2 Contemporary Relevance

- **Sovereignty and Order:** Bull's focus on sovereignty remains relevant in conflicts like Ukraine (2022) and India-China LAC tensions (2020).
- **Diplomacy:** UN peacekeeping and WTO negotiations reflect Bull's institutional mechanisms.
- **Normative Goals:** Climate agreements (e.g., Paris, 2015) and human rights (e.g., UNHCR) align with Bull's peace and justice ideals.
- **Indian Context:** India's UNSC bid and NAM revival (2020s) reflect Bull's classical emphasis on sovereignty and diplomacy.
- **J&K Context:** J&K's post-2019 integration and UN dialogues underscore Bull's relevance to sovereignty and conflict resolution, guiding regional stability.
- **Objective Exam Tip:** Know contemporary examples (e.g., Paris Agreement, 2015) for MCQs.

## 5. Indian and J&K Applications

### 5.1 Indian Context

- **Classical Approach:** India's foreign policy reflects Bull's anarchical society, balancing sovereignty (e.g., nuclear tests, 1998) with diplomacy (e.g., NAM, UN).
- **Normative Focus:** India's advocacy for global peace (Article 51) and UN peacekeeping aligns with Bull's justice ideals.
- **State-Centric Diplomacy:** India's strategic partnerships (e.g., QUAD, BRICS) and WTO engagements embody Bull's diplomatic mechanisms.
- **Key Examples:** NAM (1955), Shimla Agreement (1972), and G20 leadership reflect India's classical IR approach, rooted in sovereignty and order.

### 5.2 J&K Context

- **Classical Approach:** J&K's sovereignty disputes (1947–) align with Bull's anarchical society, with diplomacy (e.g., UN resolutions, 1948) seeking order.

- **Normative Focus:** Post-2019 integration emphasizes peace and development, reflecting Bull's justice goals.
- **State-Centric Diplomacy:** India-Pakistan talks and UN mediation highlight Bull's diplomatic focus, addressing J&K's conflicts.
- **Key Examples:** Shimla Agreement (1972), post-2019 policies, and cultural diplomacy (e.g., tourism) reflect J&K's classical IR relevance, fostering stability.

## 6. PYQ Analysis

Q: Hedley Bull's classical approach emphasizes:

- (A) Quantitative models
- (B) Anarchical society
- (C) Non-state actors
- (D) Economic systems

Answer: (B) Anarchical society

Explanation: Bull's *The Anarchical Society* (1977) focuses on state interactions in an anarchic system.

Q: The Great Debate in IR emerged in:

- (A) 1920s
- (B) 1950s
- (C) 1970s
- (D) 1990s

Answer: (B) 1950s

Explanation: The classical vs. scientific debate began in the 1950s, pitting Bull against Kaplan.

Q: Bull's classical approach draws on:

- (A) Behavioralism
- (B) Historical analysis
- (C) Systems theory
- (D) Game theory

Answer: (B) Historical analysis

Explanation: Bull uses historical case studies to analyze IR dynamics.

Q: The institution central to Bull's anarchical society is:

- (A) MNCs
- (B) Diplomacy
- (C) NGOs
- (D) Media

Answer: (B) Diplomacy

Explanation: Diplomacy is a key mechanism in Bull's classical framework.



Q: In J&K, Bull's classical approach relates to:

- (A) Economic isolation
- (B) Diplomatic resolution
- (C) Militant uprisings
- (D) Centralized rule

Answer: (B) Diplomatic resolution

Explanation: J&K's conflicts align with Bull's focus on diplomacy (e.g., UN resolutions).

Q: A critique of Bull's classical approach is:

- (A) Empirical rigor
- (B) State-centric bias
- (C) Predictive power
- (D) Global focus

Answer: (B) State-centric bias

Explanation: Bull's approach neglects non-state actors, as critiqued by Kaplan.

Q: Bull's *The Anarchical Society* was published in:

- |          |          |
|----------|----------|
| (A) 1957 | (B) 1965 |
| (C) 1977 | (D) 1985 |

Answer: (C) 1977

Explanation: *The Anarchical Society* (1977) is Bull's seminal classical IR work.

### Conclusion

This part provides an exhaustive analysis of the **Classical Approach to International Relations (Hedley Bull)** within the Classical vs. Scientific Debate, tailored for an objective JK PSC exam.

## Classical vs. Scientific debate (hedley bull vs. Morton kaplan) – part 2

### 1. Introduction

This part completes the analysis by examining the **scientific approach**, as articulated by **Morton Kaplan**, which advocates empirical, systematic, and predictive methods to study IR. The **Great Debate** (1950s–60s), pitting Bull's normative framework against Kaplan's behavioral, scientific models, is pivotal for understanding IR's theoretical evolution, crucial for the **JK PSC 10+2 Lecturer Political Science** examination. Kaplan's scientific approach, rooted in systems theory, aligns with modern analytical tools used in India's strategic studies and informs J&K's conflict resolution frameworks.

## 2. Historical Context of the Scientific Approach

### 2.1 Post-WWII Behavioral Revolution

The scientific approach to IR emerged in the mid-20th century, driven by global and academic shifts:

- **Post-WWII Context (1945–1960s):**

- The aftermath of World War II (1939–45) and the Cold War's onset (1947) underscored the need for predictive IR models to prevent conflicts and manage bipolar tensions.
- The establishment of the UN (1945) and NATO (1949) highlighted the complexity of state interactions, prompting rigorous analytical methods.
- American academia, dominant post-WWII, embraced behavioralism, seeking to make social sciences (including IR) more scientific and objective, akin to natural sciences.

- **Behavioral Revolution:**

- Behavioralism emphasized empirical data, quantitative methods, and testable hypotheses, challenging traditional normative approaches (e.g., Bull's classical framework).
- Scholars like **Morton Kaplan** (1921–2017) applied systems theory and behavioral models to IR, aiming to predict state behavior and systemic outcomes.
- Kaplan's *System and Process in International Politics* (1957) introduced scientific frameworks, contrasting Bull's *The Anarchical Society* (1977).

- **The Great Debate:**

- Initiated in the 1950s–60s, it contrasted classical scholars (e.g., Bull, Morgenthau) with scientific scholars (e.g., Kaplan, Deutsch), debating methodology and IR's purpose.
- Scientific scholars criticized classical subjectivity, advocating empirical rigor to enhance IR's predictive power.

- **Impact:**
  - Shaped IR's theoretical landscape, influencing realism (e.g., Waltz's neorealism), liberalism, and systems-based analyses.
  - Informed global policy, with India's strategic planning (e.g., nuclear doctrine) reflecting scientific analytical tools.
- **Indian Context:** India's post-independence strategic studies, blending Kautilya's pragmatism with modern analytics, align with Kaplan's scientific approach, evident in defense and economic planning.
- **J&K Context:** J&K's security frameworks (e.g., post-2019 counter-terrorism strategies) use scientific models for conflict analysis, reflecting Kaplan's empirical focus.
- **Objective Exam Tip:** Memorize the Behavioral Revolution (1950s) and Kaplan's System and Process (1957) for MCQs.

## 2.2 Intellectual Climate

The intellectual climate of the mid-20th century, marked by scientific advancements and Cold War dynamics, shaped the scientific approach:

- **Cold War Bipolarity:** US-Soviet rivalry (1947–91) necessitated predictive models for alliances, conflicts, and nuclear strategies, aligning with Kaplan's systems theory.
- **Scientific Advancements:** Developments in cybernetics, game theory, and statistics influenced IR, with Kaplan drawing on systems analysis (e.g., von Bertalanffy's general systems theory).
- **Behavioralism in Social Sciences:** Positivism (e.g., Comte, Popper) and empirical methods dominated sociology, psychology, and political science, inspiring Kaplan's quantitative approach.
- **Decolonization:** New states like India (1947) required analytical tools to navigate global systems, supporting scientific IR's focus on systemic interactions.

- **Indian Influence:** While Kautilya's Arthashastra (4th century BCE) prefigured classical diplomacy, India's post-1947 planners (e.g., Nehru's economic advisors) adopted scientific methods for development and security, resonating with Kaplan's approach.
- **Impact:** The scientific approach expanded IR's methodological toolkit, complementing classical normative concerns and shaping India's strategic and J&K's conflict resolution frameworks.
- **Indian Context:** India's nuclear strategy (1998) and economic planning (Five-Year Plans) reflect Kaplan's scientific emphasis on empirical analysis and systemic outcomes.
- **J&K Context:** J&K's conflict management (e.g., LoC monitoring, counter-terrorism) uses scientific tools like data analysis, aligning with Kaplan's predictive models.
- **Objective Exam Tip:** Know Cold War's influence (1947–91) and systems theory's origins for MCQs.

## 3. Scientific Approach (Morton Kaplan)

### 3.1 Definition and Principles

- **Definition:** The scientific approach, as articulated by Morton Kaplan, views IR as a systematic, empirical study of state interactions within international systems, using behavioral, quantitative, and predictive models to analyze and forecast outcomes.
- **Core Principles:**
  - **Systems Theory:** IR is a system of interdependent states, with patterns (e.g., balance of power, bipolarity) analyzed through structural models.
  - **Empirical Analysis:** Relies on observable data, statistical methods, and testable hypotheses to study state behavior.
  - **Predictive Models:** Aims to forecast international events (e.g., conflicts, alliances) using scientific frameworks like game theory and simulation.
  - **Behavioral Focus:** Examines decision-making processes and systemic interactions, prioritizing objectivity over normative values.



- **Kaplan's Contribution:** In *System and Process in International Politics* (1957), Kaplan proposed six models of international systems (e.g., balance of power, bipolar), using systems theory to predict state behavior and systemic stability.
- **Indian Context:** India's strategic analysis (e.g., nuclear deterrence, QUAD alignment) employs Kaplan's systems-based models to navigate global power structures.
- **J&K Context:** J&K's security frameworks (e.g., counter-terrorism strategies) use empirical data and predictive models, reflecting Kaplan's scientific approach to conflict management.
- **Objective Exam Tip:** Memorize Kaplan's systems theory and *System and Process* (1957) for MCQs.

### 3.2 Key Features

- **Empirical Analysis:**
  - Uses data-driven methods (e.g., trade statistics, military expenditures) to study IR phenomena.
  - Example: Kaplan's analysis of Cold War alliances using quantitative indicators.
- **Behavioralism:**
  - Focuses on observable state behaviors and decision-making processes, avoiding subjective values.
  - Example: Kaplan's study of superpower negotiations during the Cuban Missile Crisis (1962).
- **Systems Theory:**
  - Views IR as a system with components (states), interactions (diplomacy, conflict), and structures (e.g., bipolarity).
  - Example: Kaplan's six system models (balance of power, loose bipolar, tight bipolar, universal, hierarchical, unit veto).
- **Predictive Models:**

- Employs tools like game theory and simulation to forecast outcomes (e.g., alliance stability).
- Example: Kaplan's use of game theory to predict NATO-Warsaw Pact dynamics.

- **Indian Context:** India's defense planning (e.g., DRDO's data-driven strategies) and economic forecasting (e.g., NITI Aayog models) reflect Kaplan's empirical and predictive features.
- **J&K Context:** J&K's counter-terrorism operations use data analytics and predictive modeling, aligning with Kaplan's behavioral and systematic approach.
- **Objective Exam Tip:** Know Kaplan's six system models (e.g., balance of power, bipolar) for MCQs.

### 3.3 Methodological Foundations

- **Positivism:** Kaplan draws on Comte and Popper, emphasizing observable facts and testable hypotheses, contrasting Bull's normative philosophy.
- **Systems Theory:** Inspired by von Bertalanffy, views IR as a complex system with interdependent parts, enabling structural analysis.
- **Game Theory:** Applies strategic interaction models (e.g., Nash equilibrium) to predict state decisions, complementing systems theory.
- **Behavioral Science:** Incorporates psychology and sociology to study decision-making, focusing on rational and irrational state behaviors.
- **Indian Parallel:** While Kautilya's Arthashastra lacks empirical rigor, its strategic calculations (e.g., Mandala theory) prefigure Kaplan's systematic approach to alliances.
- **Indian Context:** India's nuclear doctrine (1999) and economic planning (e.g., Five-Year Plans) use positivist and systems-based methods, reflecting Kaplan's foundations.

- **J&K Context:** J&K's security strategies employ game theory (e.g., deterrence against Pakistan) and behavioral analysis (e.g., counter-insurgency), aligning with Kaplan's methodology.

- **Objective Exam Tip:** Know positivism, systems theory, and game theory for MCQs.

#### 4. Critiques and Relevance of the Scientific Approach

##### 4.1 Critiques

- **Overemphasis on Empiricism:** Kaplan's focus on data ignores normative values (e.g., justice, ethics), as critiqued by Bull's classical approach.
- **Complexity:** Systems models are abstract and difficult to apply, unlike Bull's historical clarity.
- **Neglect of Non-State Actors:** Prioritizes states, marginalizing NGOs, MNCs, and terrorist groups, as critiqued by later constructivist scholars.
- **Limited Predictive Success:** Models often fail to predict complex events (e.g., Cold War's end, 1991), undermining scientific claims.
- **Indian Context:** India's foreign policy balances Kaplan's empiricism with Bull's normative diplomacy (e.g., NAM), addressing ethical concerns.
- **J&K Context:** J&K's conflicts involve non-state actors (e.g., separatists), requiring broader analysis beyond Kaplan's state-centric models, though data-driven security strategies remain relevant.
- **Objective Exam Tip:** Know critiques (e.g., overemphasis on empiricism, complexity) for MCQs.

##### 4.2 Contemporary Relevance

- **Strategic Analysis:** Kaplan's systems theory informs modern defense planning (e.g., NATO's deterrence models, India's nuclear strategy).
- **Predictive Modeling:** Used in cybersecurity, trade forecasting, and climate negotiations (e.g., Paris Agreement, 2015).

- **Conflict Resolution:** Data-driven approaches guide peacekeeping and counter-terrorism (e.g., UN missions, India's LoC strategies).

- **Indian Context:** India's QUAD alignment, nuclear doctrine, and economic forecasting (e.g., NITI Aayog) reflect Kaplan's empirical and predictive tools.

- **J&K Context:** J&K's post-2019 counter-terrorism and conflict resolution frameworks use data analytics and systems modeling, aligning with Kaplan's scientific approach.

- **Objective Exam Tip:** Know contemporary examples (e.g., India's nuclear doctrine, 1999) for MCQs.

#### 5. Indian and J&K Applications

##### 5.1 Indian Context

- **Scientific Approach:** India's strategic planning employs Kaplan's systems theory, analyzing global power structures (e.g., multipolarity, QUAD).
- **Empirical Analysis:** Defense (e.g., DRDO data) and economic policies (e.g., NITI Aayog forecasts) reflect Kaplan's data-driven methods.
- **Predictive Models:** India's nuclear deterrence and trade negotiations (e.g., RCEP) use game theory and simulations, aligning with Kaplan's approach.
- **Key Examples:** Nuclear tests (1998), Five-Year Plans, and QUAD engagements reflect India's scientific IR approach, balancing empirical rigor with normative goals.

##### 5.2 J&K Context

- **Scientific Approach:** J&K's security frameworks use Kaplan's systems theory to analyze India-Pakistan-China dynamics.
- **Empirical Analysis:** Counter-terrorism operations rely on data analytics (e.g., intelligence, drone surveillance), reflecting Kaplan's methods.

- ## 6. PYQ Analysis

(A) Normative values  
(B) Systems theory  
(C) Historical analysis  
(D) Ethical diplomacy

(A) 1945 (B) 1957  
(C) 1965 (D) 1977

(A) Behavioralism  
(B) Normative philosophy  
(C) Cultural analysis  
(D) Historical case studies

(A) Normative theory  
(B) Systems model  
(C) Ethical framework  
(D) Diplomatic strategy

Q: In J&K, Kaplan's scientific approach relates to:

- Explanation: Kaplan employs game theory for predictive modeling.

This part provides an exhaustive analysis of the Scientific Approach to International Relations (Morton Kaplan) within the Classical vs. Scientific Debate, tailored for an objective JK PSC exam.

This part delves into the **idealistic approach**, a foundational IR theory that emphasizes peace, cooperation, and international institutions to mitigate conflict and promote global harmony. Also known as **liberalism** or **utopianism**, idealism shaped early 20th-century IR through figures like **Woodrow Wilson** and institutions like the **League of Nations**, influencing India's Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) and J&K's peace-building efforts. Idealism contrasts with the realist approach and aligns with India's normative foreign policy traditions.

## 2. Historical Context of the Idealist Approach

### 2.1 Inter-War Period and Post-WWI Optimism

The idealist approach emerged in the early 20th century, driven by global crises and a desire for lasting peace:

- **Post-WWI Context (1919–1939):**
  - The devastation of World War I (1914–18), with over 16 million deaths, underscored the need for cooperative mechanisms to prevent future conflicts.
  - The **Treaty of Versailles** (1919) and **Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points** (1918) proposed international cooperation, self-determination, and collective security, laying idealism's groundwork.
  - The **League of Nations** (1919) was established to promote peace and diplomacy, embodying idealist principles, though it faced challenges (e.g., US non-participation).
- **Inter-War Optimism:**
  - Idealist scholars and leaders believed human progress, rationality, and institutions could overcome anarchy and war, inspired by Enlightenment thinkers like Kant.
  - The **Kellogg-Briand Pact** (1928) outlawed war, reflecting idealist hopes for peaceful dispute resolution.
- **Decline of Idealism:**
  - The League's failures (e.g., Manchuria crisis, 1931; Abyssinia crisis, 1935) and World War II (1939–45) exposed idealism's limitations, giving rise to realism.
  - Post-WWII, idealism evolved into modern liberalism, influencing the UN (1945) and global governance.
- **Impact:**
  - Idealism shaped early IR theory, promoting institutions like the UN and concepts like collective security.
  - Influenced global diplomacy, with India's post-independence foreign policy reflecting idealist principles (e.g., NAM, 1955).

- **Indian Context:** India's participation in the League of Nations (as a British colony) and post-1947 NAM under Nehru reflect idealist aspirations for peace and cooperation.
- **J&K Context:** J&K's post-1947 conflicts (e.g., UN resolutions, 1948) highlight idealism's role in seeking diplomatic and institutional solutions, though tempered by realist challenges.
- **Objective Exam Tip:** Memorize Wilson's Fourteen Points (1918) and League of Nations (1919) for MCQs.

### 2.2 Intellectual Climate

The intellectual climate of the early 20th century, marked by Enlightenment ideals and global upheavals, shaped idealism:

- **Enlightenment Influence:** Thinkers like **Immanuel Kant** (Perpetual Peace, 1795) envisioned a world of democratic states cooperating through international institutions, inspiring idealism.
- **Liberalism and Progress:** The belief in human rationality, progress, and democracy fueled idealist hopes for peaceful IR, contrasting Hobbesian anarchy.
- **Post-WWI Reaction:** The horrors of WWI prompted calls for cooperation, with Wilson's idealism dominating IR discourse in the 1920s.
- **Indian Influence:** Gandhi's non-violence and Nehru's vision of global peace prefigured idealist principles, with Kautilya's diplomacy providing a pragmatic counterbalance.
- **Cold War Shift:** The Cold War (1947–91) challenged idealism's optimism, but its legacy persisted in the UN, NAM, and liberal institutions.
- **Impact:** Idealism laid the foundation for modern liberalism, influencing global governance, human rights, and India's normative foreign policy.
- **Indian Context:** Nehru's NAM (1955) and India's UN peacekeeping reflect idealist ideals of cooperation and peace, rooted in Gandhian and Kantian principles.

- **J&K Context:** J&K's conflict resolution efforts (e.g., UN mediation, Shimla Agreement, 1972) align with idealist emphasis on diplomacy and institutions, though realist tensions persist.
- **Objective Exam Tip:** Know Kant's Perpetual Peace (1795) and Nehru's NAM (1955) for MCQs.

### 3. Idealist Approach to International Relations

#### 3.1 Definition and Principles

- **Definition:** The idealist approach to IR, also known as liberalism or utopianism, posits that peace, cooperation, and international institutions can mitigate conflict and promote global harmony, driven by human rationality, democracy, and shared values.
- **Core Principles:**
  - **Cooperation:** States can achieve mutual benefits through collaboration, reducing conflict via diplomacy and trade.
  - **International Institutions:** Organizations like the League of Nations and UN foster collective security and dispute resolution.
  - **Democratic Peace:** Democracies are less likely to fight, promoting global stability through democratic governance.
  - **Normative Goals:** Emphasizes peace, justice, and human rights, prioritizing ethical outcomes over power politics.
- **Key Thinkers:**
  - **Immanuel Kant:** Advocated a federation of democratic states for perpetual peace.
  - **Woodrow Wilson:** Proposed self-determination, collective security, and the League of Nations in his Fourteen Points.
  - **Norman Angell:** Argued (The Great Illusion, 1910) that economic interdependence reduces war's likelihood.
- **Indian Context:** India's foreign policy, shaped by Nehru's idealism (e.g., NAM, UN peacekeeping), reflects cooperation and

normative goals, balancing Kautilya's pragmatism.

- **J&K Context:** J&K's peace-building efforts (e.g., UN resolutions, 1948) align with idealism's focus on diplomacy and institutions, seeking cooperative solutions.
- **Objective Exam Tip:** Memorize idealism's principles (cooperation, institutions, democratic peace) and Wilson's Fourteen Points for MCQs.

#### 3.2 Key Features

- **Cooperation Over Conflict:**
  - States prioritize mutual gains through trade, diplomacy, and alliances, reducing anarchy.
  - Example: The Kellogg-Briand Pact (1928) aimed to outlaw war through international agreement.
- **International Institutions:**
  - Organizations like the UN and WTO promote collective security, dispute resolution, and global governance.
  - Example: The UN's peacekeeping missions (1948–) reflect idealist institutionalism.
- **Democratic Peace Theory:**
  - Democracies share values, reducing conflict through transparency and accountability.
  - Example: Post-WWII European integration (e.g., EU) showcases democratic cooperation.
- **Economic Interdependence:**
  - Trade and economic ties deter conflict, as states benefit from mutual prosperity.
  - Example: GATT (1947) and WTO (1995) foster global economic cooperation.
- **Indian Context:** India's NAM, UN peacekeeping, and WTO membership embody idealist cooperation, institutions, and economic interdependence.
- **J&K Context:** J&K's conflict resolution (e.g., Shimla Agreement, UN mediation) reflects idealist diplomacy and institutional efforts, though security concerns persist.