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ABSTRACT

Paradigms offer different perspectives of reality and therefore manipulate facts to accentuate some issues and take away from others. Until recently, the dominate Realist paradigm held sway by explaining international relations in terms of garnering and distributing power. The paradigm contends domestic polity and ethics are separate and distinct from global conditions. This notion reinforced and rationalized colonial struggles and imperialist methods of control. Transnationalism is currently challenging Rationalism's dominance by offering a world that is more complex than just the drive for national security. According to Transnationalism, nation-state politics are influenced by non-state actors, individuals and increased state integration.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION
The Role of Paradigms

According to Thomas Kuhn a paradigm relates to "research firmly based upon one or more past scientific achievements, achievements that some particular scientific community acknowledges for a time as supplying the foundation for its practice". Paradigms then are the set of beliefs, concepts, theories, methods and instruments that help guide scientific communities to truth testing data, selection of hypotheses and advocating one theory over another. In short a paradigm is an intellectual framework that structures one's thinking about a set of phenomena.

Kuhn argues that paradigms are impacted by four phases. The first, is the preparadigmic phase in which there is no dominate or overwhelming approach that is agreed on by the scientific community. The second is the paradigmic phase which occurs when the body of community subscribes to a dominate paradigm. The third phase, and one which concerns this study, is the "crisis phase". During this phase challenges and revision to the dominate paradigm transpire and new paradigms appear and old ones are revived. The fourth and final phase is the phase of scientific revolution which takes place when the community exchanges one paradigm for another. This study attempts to confirm Kuhn's view that paradigms are transitory and that the
third phase is presently occurring among practitioners of political science.⁴

Paradigms offer different perspectives of reality and therefore manipulate facts to accentuate some issues and take away from others. There have been four major paradigms that have shaped the discipline of international relations in the 20th century: the Idealist paradigm, the Marxist paradigm, the Realist paradigm, and the Transnationalist paradigm. These paradigms are of significant importance to the study of international affairs because governments have operationalized them to construct policy. While this study focuses on Realism and Transnationalism, Idealism and Marxism are worthy of note and will be discussed below for the purpose of lending theoretical continuity to this study.

The Idealist Paradigm

According to Graham Evans and Jeffrey Newnham, Idealism is also referred to as "Liberalism" in international relations and, as a paradigm, stresses international law and moral values.⁵ Thus, Idealism concerns itself with how the world ought to be as opposed to how it has been and contends that a "harmony of interests" should guide issues of foreign policy rather than national interest, power and state survival.
Practitioners of Idealism were attacked by E.H. Carr in his pivotal work *The Twenty-Years' Crisis, 1919-1939: An Introduction to the Study of International Relations,* for their propensity to ignore what was and indulge in wishful thinking. As a result of the Idealist focus on the abstract they were unable to comprehend nor control events during the paradigm's zenith between World War I and World War II. According to Carr, Idealists such as Woodrow Wilson, Arnold Toynbee, Norman Angell and Alfred Zimmern, failed to recognize that nation state behavior was directly related to national interest and power as opposed to universal mores. Thus foreign policies based on good will and disarmament were naturally doomed to failure because "these supposedly absolute and universal principles were not principles at all but the unconscious reflections of national policy based on a particular interpretation of national interest at a particular time." While Carr was correct in identifying the Idealist approach as taking place between the early 1900's and 1940's, this school of thought was rooted in earlier philosophies. Indeed, John Lock, Jean Jacques Rousseau, Immanuel Kant and John Stuart Mill are considered to be Idealists since they all asserted that conscience and reason are both paramount in achieving world peace and harmony. In an example of Kuhn's crisis phase, Idealism was superseded by the Realist paradigm during the 1950's because the former
was discredited in part by the inability of the League of Nations to prevent World War II.

The Marxist Paradigm

It is very difficult to illuminate a Marxist theory of international relations since Karl Marx died prior to constructing an explicit theory on international relations. A John Atkinson Hobson contributed to the construction in Marxist theory in his notable work on Imperialism in 1902. Hobson argued that British imperialism was the result of surplus capital and diminishing returns at home. Therefore, rather than increase local wages industrialists expanded their markets—often forcefully—into foreign lands. Thus British imperialism "was directly linked to overseas investments". Rudolf Hilferding continued the Marxian tradition by incorporating Hobson's work into Marx's theory of historical materialism. Lenin added to these works in his now famous Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism in 1916.

Lenin held that imperialism was the final dying stage of capitalism which contained five essential features: (1) the concentration of production by the few which intern created monopolies; (2) an oligarchy was formed by the fusion of banking and industrial capital; (3) capital is exported from impoverished nation states; (4) the world
has been shared by international capitalists; and (5) the
earth is divided by the greatest capitalist powers.\textsuperscript{12}

Although there is no specific Communist approach to
international relations we can, by combining Lenin's works
along with those found in Marx's \textit{Das Kapital}, safely outline
the Marxist paradigm as follows:

1. All history is the history of class struggle
   between a ruling group and an opposing group.

2. Capitalism gives rise to antagonistic classes,
   the bourgeoisie and proletariat, with bourgeoisie
   control.

3. Capitalism uses war to further its own ends.

4. Socialism, which destroys classes, must also
   destroy war.

5. Once the state has withered away, so too must
   international relations.\textsuperscript{13}

In sum, the Marxist paradigm argues that economies dictated
the establishment and maintenance of the state. Once the
accumulation of private capital, which was held in the
hands of a few, was transferred, and held collectively
by the many via a world wide revolution, there would be
global harmony and the state would disappear. This paradigm
as practiced by the Soviets and East Europeans has failed.
One could argue that Marxism never truly existed in those
otherwise "Communist" states therefore the paradigm has
not been sufficiently tested.
Setting the Analytical Framework

Consistent with Kuhn's paradigmatic phase, and as a result of certain analytical weaknesses and practical failings of both the Marxist and Idealist paradigms, the Realist and Transnationlist perspectives took on a more elevated status. However, I believe that contemporary Realism is an extension of, if not a refinement of colonialist policies. Therefore chapter two concentrates on the legacy of colonialism and its impact on international relations as expressed in Realism. The purpose of this chapter, then, is to demonstrate that the world which was born of Machiavellian principles and expressed later in Realist theory is slowly changing. Indeed, there are alternatives to the often inflexible doctrines associated with Realism. Realists are often eager to point out that the present state of international confusion or confrontation is justification of their theory. However, I contend that this is a reaction to Realism likened to the rattling of the egg prior to the Phoenix. This chapter is dedicated to an elaboration of the specific weakness of the Realist paradigm. In summary, it can argued with some confidence that the discipline of international relations has generally, and Western foreign policy specifically, has been influenced by certain Machiavellian principles of power which have formed the philosophical
bases of the Realist paradigm. The relative "correctness" or weakness of International Relation's theories and practices must, then, be addressed through an objective analysis of the Realist paradigm.

The Realist model, which came to dominate international relations theory in the West, is the subject of the third chapter of this study. In an effort to illuminate the positions and elements pertaining to the Realist paradigm the chapter draws on the major works of Realists Hans Morgenthau, Hedly Bull, Klaus Knorr, Kenneth Waltz, Edward L. Morse and Rienhold Neibuhr. Basically, Realism can be summarized as the struggle for power. Realists argue that states seek security in an otherwise hostile and anarchical world. Thus a state's international policy is determined and reinforced by the drive for power in order to guarantee the survivability of the state. The dominate states tend to be more conservative and support policies that maintain the status quo, while subordinate states expressing their dissatisfaction, become more expansionistic. The result is that alliances are made and broken and friends become enemies in the quest for national security. Accordingly, universal principles of morality do not apply within the sphere of international relations. Realists contend like Machiavelli writing in the sixteenth century and Thomas Hobbs writing a century later, that is necessary for leaders to have a different set of morals.
for governing in an anarchical world.¹⁴

In contrast to the long established Realist view, the forth chapter of this work turns to the Transnationalist paradigm. Drawing on Kuhn's notion of scientific revolution--and because Transnationalism will be considered as a challenge to the predominate paradigm--there are some general rules of analysis that must be followed if a rival paradigm is to gain acceptance in the academic community. According to Imre Lakatos the contending paradigm must: "(1) explain everything the old theory explained, (2) explain at least part of what the old theory failed to explain, and (3) have some explanations under and empirically corroborated by research."¹⁵ Because in the spirit of offering an alternative, Transnationalism is more complex and posits more elements than Realism, this chapter will provide additional information and in greater depth than the chapter on Realism.

Transnationalism contends that the world of international politics is more complex than states being driven by the need for national security. Theorists such as James Rosenau, Richard Falk, Joseph Nye and Robert Keohane posit that other non-state actors, aside from the military, diplomats, and official policy makers also influence the international polity. Transnationalists argue that international relations are becoming increasingly more integrated.¹⁶ They claim that separate national
entities which have political and economic power are merging into supranational authorities such as the European Community. Although this process is slow, multi-layered, and tends to grow in spurts, many scholars contend that the merging of economies is usually the first step toward greater interdependence. Accordingly, Transnational integration occurs under the influence of many different variables which hasten or impede the process. For example, integration of militaries is made easier under the threat of war, such as in the establishment of NATO, while recessions reduce the likelihood of merging economies. James Rosenau identifies these variables as "environments" which he classifies as contiguous, regional, cold war, racial, resource, and organizational. Thus, in around about way, chapter two seeks to build upon Rosenau's thesis by contributing an additional environment the colonial legacy.

The basic premise of this paper focuses on the idea that increased integration and cohesion, as illustrated by the Transnationalist paradigm, is leading the world to a brighter future while at the same time the persistent behavior related to the memory and/or extension of colonial policies often thwart efforts of integration. By studying Colonialism, Realism, and Transnationalism the arena of world politics can be seen with greater comprehension and the actual transition from one paradigm to another might be eased.
We now turn our attention to a discussion of Colonialism and its relevance to the study of Realism and Transnationalism.
CHAPTER TWO

THE LEGACY OF COLONIALISM AND ITS IMPACT ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
The colonial legacy has a greater role to play in contemporary political affairs and subsequent theory building than is currently addressed in Western literature. That is, the colonial experience has left a lingering impact on the politics, economics and psychological make up of the Third World countries.¹ As Jacqueline Braveboy-Wagner suggests, these effects have lingered because of the length and intensity of the colonial experience.² Thus, the rearrangement of Third World power, the redefinition of national borders, and associated conflicts will continue for some time and may not end until they finally arrive at a point of indigenous geographic and social equilibrium rather than one imposed upon the land and people by colonial design.

Indeed, most interstate confrontation that has occurred in the last forty years has been between underdeveloped countries (UDC's). While there are, quantitatively, more UDC's than developed countries, Braveboy asserts that "these countries exhibit a proportionally higher level of both verbal and physical conflict behavior."³ Therefore, one might conclude that there must be some shared factors between the states which can be directly attributed to the high frequency of social unrest, revolutions and wars among them.⁴ It has been suggested that conflict in the underdeveloped world can be sorted into patterns of national development including: "confrontations as anti-colonial
conflict, territorial disputes, irredentist conflicts and class agitation involving subgroup nationalism" and second, the impact of modernization.5

This section of the thesis draws on the Braveboy hypothesis and will attempt to underscore its strengths by outlining the broad historical trends and conditions that have influenced UDC political growth. This will be accomplished by: (1) defining colonialism; (2) illuminating methods of suppression used by imperialists; (3) examining the effects of colonialism on UDC's; (4) surveying the UDC's responses to colonialism; (5) exploring origins of racism and (6) concluding observations.

Colonialism and Imperialism: Questions of Definition

Bruce Wetteran defines colonialism as a "policy or program by which a state seeks political or economic control over other territories."6 Concomitantly Harry Ritter defines imperialism as "the expansion of a state beyond its own frontiers with the aim of dominating other states or societies."7 Due to the similarity of domination by one state over another within these definitions and others examined, there appears to be no difference in practice, between colonialism and imperialism. If there is difference to be found it is not in the actual effects but rather rooted in historical distortions or in the semantics of
the aggressive forces. For example, when Americans consider the term 'colonialist' it brings back moments of national glory rooted in the early foundations of the Plymouth and Jamestown colonies, and later the Revolutionary War; it does not focus on the slaughter of the indigenous inhabitants. Therefore, colonization in America carries the romantic image of forging a new nation as opposed to the contrasting view of domination which is held throughout the Third World. Concomitantly, William Appleman Williams contends that Americans hold the principle of self-determination in high esteem while imperialism has, over time, become seen as a negative element by freedom loving Americans. This distinction surprises many individuals in the Third World who see the open door policy—the notion that American moral and ideological expansion would promote democracy and curtail world unrest—as a clear case of American imperialism. In addition, the expansion of developed economies have made it nearly impossible for other underdeveloped countries to achieve economic independence, and its logical extension, political independence. This sequence of events is seen by many in the underdeveloped nations as yet another form of imperialism and while denied by the developed nations, this schism continues and further complicates any hope of establishing definitional clarity between colonialism and imperialism. However, if we were to make any distinction
between the two terms we might argue for imperialism being the tools used by the colonialists.

COLONIALISM

Colonialism has a long history, spanning over 400 years, encompassing nine percent of the earth's surface by 1492, and expanding to include eighty-five percent of the globe by 1935. During those 400 hundred years colonialism passed through three periods.

The first expression of early colonialism was mercantilism. With mercantilism European monarchies saw their economies as a zero sum. That is, any flow of goods or services outside the realm weakened the nation. Therefore the European powers felt compelled to expand their economies by licensing companies to gather raw materials from foreign lands and returning them to the homeland where factories turned them into finished products. To safeguard their investment the Europeans built a series of military complexes.

Neo-Mercantism was the second period of colonialism, and lasted from the 1700's until 1890. During this period Europeans increased their dominions. To pay for the expansion, two methods of economic extraction were used: (1) tribute, either directly through taxation or indirectly
through a captive market for home based goods; and (2) slavery.

The third period occurred from 1890 to the middle of the 20th Century. There was a dramatic rise in the conquest of unexplored territory based on anticipated economic gain which subsequently effected the European balance of power. Unique to this phase was a change in the style of domination. Unlike the periods listed above, entire governments were not taken over but became protectorates. Protectorates were allowed to carry some semblance of traditional control while subservient authorities were actually manipulated for European interests. This phase is often referred as economic imperialism.

Influenced by the work of Karl Marx, John Atkinson Hobson, who wrote the notable work Imperialism in 1902, contended that British imperialism was the result of surplus capital and diminishing returns at home. Therefore, rather than increase local wages industrialists expanded their markets-- often forcefully-- into foreign lands. Thus British imperialism was "directly linked to overseas investments." While Karl Marx died prior to constructing an explicit theory on the economic aspects of imperialism, Rudolf Hilferding continued in the Marxian tradition by incorporating Hobson's work into Marx's theory of historical materialism. Lenin added to these works in his now famous
Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism in 1916.

Lenin held that imperialism was the final dying stage of capitalism and as such it contained five essential features:

(1) The concentration of production and capital developed so highly that it creates monopolies which play a decisive role in economic life.

(2) The fusion of banking capital with industrial capital and the creation, on the basis of this financial capital of a financial oligarchy.

(3) The export of capital, which has become extremely important as distinguished from the export of commodities.

(4) The formation of the international capitalist monopolies which share out the world among themselves.

(5) The territorial division of the whole earth completed by the greatest capitalist powers.

According to René Maunier (1949), imperialism takes four forms: spiritual, power, material and cultural. By using his framework we can examine the various tools of colonialism.

First, Maunier argues that "spiritual imperialism is domination of the religious nature. Spiritual or religious imperialism is the first phase of all colonial imperialism". Religion has the unique ability to motivate its proponents and champions by both fear and hope. In the case of conquest, crusader mindset, that of moral obligation, is the rationalization behind religious domination. That is, by not suppressing the anti-Christ views of the heathen, the conqueror perpetuates evil and
indirectly transfers the blame onto himself for neglecting his duty. Thus justifying his aggressive actions. Moreover, religious fear protects the champion from accruing lists of sin by allowing them to reduce their crimes through the destruction of evil and thus receiving absolution.

The crusader motivation also perpetuates the myth that the dominating religious believers are possessed by a deity and are therefore superior to non-believers. Needless to say, those members of the dominant "superior" faith are hostile to all others outside their religion. Because the "native" believes in a 'false god,' the result is either extermination or forced assimilation. While extermination is at best inhumane, assimilation through conversion subjects the converted to long term racial and cultural contempt by those who see their role as one of raising or uplifting the heathen.

Maunier claims that spiritual imperialism contains "two constant features: duty and domination." Of these factors, the duty to save men's souls is the fundamental difference between spiritual imperialism and all other types of imperialism. As a corollary of salvation, it can be convincingly argued that, at one time or another, most of the world's religions have relied upon violence as their chosen method to impose their teachings rather than cerebral persuasion (See Figure 2.1).

Religious missions have been effectively used by
All colonial nations are imperialistic but degrees of domination may vary. Likewise, nations can use the tools of Imperialism without being colonial.
regimes to suppress indigenous peoples. This is because missionaries are generally transplanted from the home country and upon entering into a 'backward' society the infusion of their religious principles destroys the social matrix of the traditional culture. Because missionaries received state support, tacit or otherwise, when rebellion seemed imminent they reciprocated by proclaiming the revolt as an act against God, and effectively reduced the indigenous peoples' psychological advantage of having God on their side. On the other hand, religion can act as a unifying force behind revolutions by helping revolutionaries galvanize support behind a single issue. Accordingly, "all through Asia and Africa the imperial governments were identified as Christian and hostility to these governments was transferred to their religion." According to Braveboy, anti-Christian sentiment was easily introduced among indigenous peoples because of the discrepancy between Christian teachings and actual colonial behavior. Therefore Christianity became nativized or, conversely, traditional religions and cultures became strengthened. The focus on traditional religions became a rallying point used by many nationalistic leaders to foster group cohesion and build up 'home' appeal. Having learned their lessons well, some former colonies now find it to their advantage to portray the enemies of the state as enemies of God. Indeed, the linkage between religious hierarchical status and national
leadership in many states is inseparable.

The second form, "power-imperialism is, in a word, the wish to dominate for the sake of dominating." This element can be seen throughout recorded time as societies experience an upsurge in the level of nationalism. Because of the quantitative increase in nationalism and its transmission into force, Maunier believes that the joy of force itself becomes a good. For power imperialism to arise, racial primacy and cultural superiority must be a publicly held ideology. Thus, due to a collective and a reverent sense of primal superiority, the group seeks to reaffirm its greatness through the search for glory. Therefore, group superiority or 'primacy' gives power imperialism its dimension to alter, rule, convert or to enslave. Pivotal to group primacy is its foundation in mystical beliefs. For example, the dogma of being a son of God has led individuals to think that they are chosen among men to lead mankind or, at maximum, they follow the fallacy to the conclusion that they too are gods. Ultimately this mystical primacy in the western world led to the fallacious racial doctrine of Albinism or the superiority of the white man.

The third form in Maunier's theoretical construct is, "material imperialism" which is based on self-interest rather than spiritual, cultural, or power primacy. Simply put, it is the acquisition of booty and tribute taken away...
from the colonies and transferred to the motherland where luxury goods are produced for the wealthy elite and the petty bourgeois. There were two ways in which nation-states increased their national wealth during most of the colonial period: either through tribute or profit. Tribute includes direct taxation or indirect taxation such as the high cost associated with the importation of finished goods from the home county. In order to exact the latter form of tribute, most colonies were restricted to products manufactured in the motherland. By law, this greatly increased profits at home thus the extension of export tribute, both in terms of increased markets and home industrial growth, reinforced the domination of larger land masses, better trade routes and the suppression of colonial industrial growth.

Yet another factor behind material imperialism is the transplantation or settlement of colonies with excess members of the motherland's population. "If a state is suffering from having too many citizens, you must make your choice; either produce more food or emigrate."21 If, however, the nation is unable to produce more food on available lands, it was forced into importing goods which at that time led to need for conquest.

Maunier's fourth and final form, "cultural imperialism," lays claim to territory based on the superiority of the conqueror's civilization. Cultural
imperialism is not a new phenomena and is probably related to notion of tribalistic primacy. Maunier believes that cultural imperialism contains two reinforcing elements those of feelings and judgement.  

Feelings lend support for the concept of national superiority and the concomitant contempt for the inferior. "When you despise the foreigner (native) you are led to wish to re-mold him"...."which leads to the idea that this inferior can be, and ought to be, civilized." This judgment provides yet another rationalization to rule. Thus the indigenous peoples became linked to the perception of development. By casting the natives as savages, at the bottom of development, or as barbarians (not quite savages but could be civilized with a little help), increased intervention and ultimate domination was buttressed.

A question then arises concerning the desirability of assimilation as a method of conquest. I believe that this method of conquest-- particularly for the French who viewed being French the best thing they could do for you-- was rooted in the philosophy of the times. Between the late 1800's and early 1900's the colonialists believed that they had a moral obligation as civilized people to force the subjugated to accept the Western ideology of progress and rule of law. This meant the abolition of some local customs and laws. These changes were buttressed in later colonialism by the imposition of education and
A factor that Maunier does not address is the relative ease in which racism transcends socioeconomic development as the primary factor for labeling individuals as savages and making skin color the paramount criterion. Louis Snyder argues that "racialism" is a recent phenomena and is the direct result of modern nationalism and imperialism. He contends that prior to the 16th century antagonisms between people were based on "cultural, religious and linguistic differences." Racial differences were noticed as an indirect result of the colonial neo-mercantilist class. It is believed that white Europeans became increasingly aware of their racial differences while subjugating black, brown and red men. In the spirit of Sir Charles Dilke, who argued that "the gradual extinction of inferior races is not only a law of nature but a blessing to mankind", the 19th century the British began to see themselves as racial saviors of the world. The myths that gave rise to racial primacy were the mystical relationship to the teutonic peoples and later, Social Darwinism. Social Darwinism as a theory suggested that social systems were governed by survival of the fittest both in terms of health and development. Therefore, the weaker races would eventually be replaced by the stronger and more efficient ones.

The British were not the only nation to focus on
cultural primacy. The French had believed in their racial and cultural superiority. Indeed, they set their mystic national identity on somatic and psychic characteristics. Not to be outdone, the Americans joined into the fray. Senator Albert Beveridge a conservative Republican from Indiana, in making the case for American annexation of the Philippines in 1900, claimed that we should not abandon the Orient because to do so would be to abandon the mission of our "race, trustee, under God, the civilization of the world." Hence, the paternal nonsense of "our little brown brother."

These racist theories culminated in the popular supremacist belief that the other races were "the white man's burden", and that the Anglo-Saxon males had an obligation to "the weak, black races, the same sort of obligation owed to women, children and dumb animals." Thus, race further legitimized European and American rule and influence and gave order to societies based on racial stratification. To support their divine right to rule Westerners put on the air of being "God-like themselves in the eyes of the natives. And if not quite God-like, then at least in the relationship of masters to servants or, a common theme, parents to children." One of the more successful tools used by colonial powers to suppress indigenous self-rule took advantage of the divisive properties found in racism itself and the sense of cultural
superiority. The tool is known as divide and rule.

Divide and rule was an instrument of domination and consisted in two forms: First, there was the political division of linguistic groups into various smaller units and then, the reassemblage of them into larger groups that spoke different languages so that collusion against the oppressor was made difficult. Secondly, old rivalries among indigenous peoples were rekindled which further divided the region into smaller units. Fundamental to the central thesis of this paper, is the notion that the colonialists were actively involved in undermining indigenous unity through divide and rule. As Gladwin explains:

By administrative action, colonial officers isolate separate cultural or linguistic groups which are competing for power or territory, or even encourage such when it scarcely exists; sometimes pairs of individual leaders of factions can be used in the same way. Help is usually given to the weaker of the two, thus making the struggle even more intense. By carefully controlling the amount of aid and encouragement so that the two groups remain about even and neither side can win, the energies of both will be dissipated without any being left over to combat the larger enemy.30

Divide and rule was also accomplished indirectly. Indirect rule occurred in administrative systems where existing native chiefs implemented colonial policies at the village level rather than white colonial officers.31 This form of rule used the remnants of the traditional indigenous systems and, as such, needed to be implemented
immediately prior to the disintegration of that society. Recruitment of local chiefs involved using a "combination of pressure, perhaps threats, inducements and playing upon the chiefs sense of responsibility to his tribe."32 Because the indirect method deceptively responded to the demand for local traditional control, it insured a reasonable amount of safety for the foreign administrators. Even if problems arose, native troops from elsewhere in the region handled the unrest. The damage inflicted by this form of rule had profound psychological and, later, political effects.

Often indirect rule was established through a series of treaties in which liquored chiefs signed away the control of their lands to foreign owned companies. In signing the treaties, the chiefs pledged not to deal with any strangers except the company and, in return, the company pledged to protect the chiefs from outside attacks and not to change the native laws or customs. But the chiefs did have to submit to the company's demand of being a court of last appeal; a move that gave the company almost deity status.

Lastly, divide and rule takes its final form in the arbitrary manner in which borders were drawn. Often the colonial borders cut across tribal boundaries causing states to be formed by combining cultures that were not compatible with each other. This was done more often than not to protect colonial real estate rather than human investment.
As George Shepherd points out, "Almost every new nation --and not a few old ones-- is now more or less painfully hung on this kind of centrifuge." Examples of but a few states with diverse and hostile populations including: (1) the Sudanese civil war between the light skinned Arab northerners and the black non-Muslim southerners; (2) engagements between the Kurds and Iran, Iraq and Turkey; (3) the reemergence of Christian and Muslim struggles in the Russian Federation; in addition to the indigenous separatists movements among the republics; and (4) the divisions among light-skinned northerners and dark-skinned southerners in India. Isaacs contends that if we were to examine further evidence of strife induced by the impact of colonial boundaries on tribes and other groups we would have to consider "Nigeria, the Congo, India in Assam and Nagaland, Indonesia in Borneo, the Ethiopian-Somali-Kenyan irredentism,(and) the high permeability of the frontiers of all the countries of the Indochina peninsula." These policies and the flagrant disregard for indigenous boundaries adumbrate and act on the borders of many modern nation states; states whose borders and future were designed and sealed by colonial powers.
THE EFFECTS OF COLONIALISM ON THE PRESENT NATION STATE SYSTEM

Border Conflicts

As alluded to above, nations, and often political organizations, are based on divisions of the earth's surface. In most cases these borders are represented by geographic barriers such as lakes, mountains and rivers, and sometimes these lines have been drawn irrespective of cultures or linguistic groupings. Perhaps more cases of homogenous societies being forced into heterogeneous states are found on the continent of Africa than anywhere else. Furthermore, Duchaek holds that when the Europeans "were in the process of establishing their colonial empires in Africa, they subdivided the whole continent arbitrarily among themselves, usually proceeding from the coast into the interior, and in doing so they cut across all traditional boundaries." 36

The General Act of the Berlin Conference held in 1885 is responsible for much of the face of modern Africa. Under the Treaty, Europeans divided Africa into spheres of influence which ultimately led to the creation of borders for many modern nation states. The compact resolved and established: (1) free trade among nations in the Congo Basin; (2) the suppression of slave trade and slave markets; (3) established neutrality for the territories of the Congo;
(4) navigation on both the Congo and Niger rivers; and
(5) the rules for additional occupation of the coasts of
Africa.  

By the end of 1917 the future of Muslim lands in the
Middle East had been determined by European powers. The
first commitment was given by the British to Sharif Husayan
and his three sons. In the Husayan-McMahon correspondence
(1915-1916), the British agreed to divide up the Arabian
peninsula and reward Husayan for his help in defeating
the Ottoman Empire. The second, was the Sykes-Picot
(1915-1916) agreement, which divided the Ottoman Empire
between the British, French and Russians into spheres of
influence, while actual borders were drawn at the San Remo
conference in 1920. The first two agreements were made
in secret, but the future of the Middle East struggle was
sealed in 1917 by the British Balfour Declaration, which
in effect promised Palestine to the European Jewish Zionists
as a national home. 

When borders imposed by foreign powers cut through
ethnic or tribal groups, two problems are produced. The
first conflict is irredentist, that is, a group's desire
to reunify with its ethnic counterpart located within
the borders of another country. The second conflict involves
separatist elements that wish to succeed from the malformed
state and press their demands through civil unrest and
terrorism. Both the Kurds and the Armenians are good
examples of both the irredentist and separatist movements. The Kurds have fought to unify their tribal region, which has been divided between Iran, Iraq and Turkey. The same holds true for the Armenians who are separated by the Turkish and Armenian borders. The focus for Armenian autonomy may be shifting since the struggle between Armenians with Azeris has emerged within the Russian Federation over Nagorno-Karabakh. Conversely, border disputes help national leaders garner public support by waving the flag of nationalism. The motive behind border wars may be to shift the focus away from the real problem and/or to unite factions behind new policies. Therefore, most border disputes are placed on the back burner until a dose of nationalism is called for. This is particularly true where economics is involved and commodities are just across the border (see table 2.1).

Aside from the principle of consent, state authority is often the result of people being forced to recognize the state's domination either through the state's progressive use of force or through a power transfer. Thus, "the existence of a political boundary is itself a major contribution to a sense of solidarity. Among the most important experiences that can unite a group is that they share the same government." Although some nations share the same languages and cultural heritage, if the divisions between the states are externally imposed the divisions
may harden into place and win general acceptance. For example homogenous populations split and become new political states, such as, North and South Korea, and Taiwan and the Peoples Republic of China. Nevertheless, there is the propensity for homogenous groups to reunite, such as East and West Germany.

Racial strife

The existence of racism is an important element that is frequently passed by Western scholars. Indeed, Middle Eastern scholar Edward Said attacks the Western scholars in his book Orientalism (1978) for not recognizing the role of racism. He holds that this omission is rooted in the perpetuation of European Imperialism. The study of racism is also important because our modern world "took its political shape when racialism was at its height."41 "It was, after all, well into this century, and not at the height of Victorian imperial enthusiasm, that President Franklin Roosevelt put forward his schemes for the inter-breeding of European and Asian stock to produce a less delinquent Asian race..."42 Moreover, after WWII all of the seventy-five newly formed nation states were non-caucasoid. Hugh Tinker claims, "that today, transcending everything (including the nuclear threat), there is the confrontation between races."43 In fact, U.S. policies
### TABLE 2.1

Some Territorial Disputes of Third World States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postwar Disputes Involving Armed Conflict, with Years Begun&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over creation of new states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India-Pakistan, 1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India-Hyderabad, 1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab States-Israel, 1948, 1956, 1967, 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia- Malaysia, 1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan-Kashmir, 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India/Bangladesh-Pakistan, 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eire-Northern Ireland, 1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan-Pakistan, 1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia-Abu Dhabi and Muscat, 1952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia-Thailand, 1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China-India, 1954 (full-scale war 1962)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China-Burma, 1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua-Honduras, 1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt-Sudan, 1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq-Kuwait, 1962, 1990&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco-Algeria, 1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia-Kenya, 1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia-Ethiopia, 1963, 1977&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina-Chile, 1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco (/Mauritania to 1978)- Western Sahara, 1976&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China-Vietnam, 1979, 1983&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran-Iraq, 1980&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador-Peru, 1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina-Britain/Falkland Islands, 1982</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2.1  
(continued)

Some Other Disputes/Claims

- Iran, to Bahrain
- Somalia to Djibouti
- Philippines, to Sabah (Malaysia)
- Libya, to northwest Chad
- United Arab Emirates, to islands currently held by Iran
- Bolivia, to a corridor to the sea through Chile
- Argentina and Chile, to islands in the Beagle Channel
- Venezuela and Colombia, to Gulf of Maracaibo
- Venezuela, to two-thirds of Guyana
- Nicaragua, to islands held by Colombia
- Argentina and Chile (among others), to Antarctica

---


* Situations in which armed conflict is still occurring.

* Formally dropped in 1970 but still occasionally noted.

have been partially impacted by the outbreak of tribal and racial wars which have forced the Western nations to make choices based on racial grounds in rather than the rule of law. For example, the current suppression of the Palestinian people is similar to that of the black South Africans. Both of the combatants are basically indigenous peoples struggling against primarily European racial stock, however the U.S. policy partially embargoes only the white ruled apartheid. Some have observed that the policy probably has more to do with pressure from America's large black population than a commitment for social justice held by our leaders.

Racism is an emotional attitude, a symptom of insecurity, which transforms itself into a creed. The causes of racial prejudice are: (1) economic needs or rivalries; (2) its manipulation by political leaders to extend their own power; (3) social-cultural differences between groups of people; (4) an us versus them xenophobic mentality; (5) religious differences that fester into racial conflicts and (6) the physical traits of other peoples. It is also important to include language in this category since groups may share common customs, but disdain another's language. An example of this linguistic form of prejudice is presently occuring in Canada where the French speaking Quebecois and English Canadians have long expressed differences, sometimes violent, over the use, role and
application of language in Canada.

Language plays an important role in determining the way individuals and cultures perceive the world around them through the use of description and idioms. Language can act as a hindrance to state unification, while on the other hand, linguistic commonalities often forge closer ties. Shared languages also tend to draw citizens of one state closer to those in another state because, unlike others, they share something in common. As Snyder points out there are, however, several fallacies concerning language and race: "(1) that language ties people together with the same characteristics; (2) the ability to speak the language represents a superior mental and physical capabilities of the race; and (3) a language that is widely spoken throughout the world reveals a higher level of civilizing by those who speak it." Most of these fallacies were believed to be true under Social Darwinism and can still be found.

Modernization

I address the process of modernization because I think that its effects on the social structure of the underdeveloped world are largely the result of colonial policies that have contributed to the suppression of local industry and have inhibited access to Western technology.
As I have noted, colonial policies were designed to maintain economic dominance even after departure and, although these policies are no longer directly enforced, they continue to exert a certain degree of influence.

Social and economic theorists have long thought that as science advanced so too would mankind. But men are advancing technologically while still retaining their traditional social structures keyed to indigenous religious and mystic belief systems. Moreover, much of the earth's population has renewed its interest in re-tribalizing into distinct ethno-linguistic blocks which has the effect of further fragmenting states. Pivotal to this tribal renaissance is the availability, use and application of technology and mass communication. No other factor divides the world like technology. It appears as though a small percentage of the earth is pushing full tilt into the technological age, with computers, tractors, and high speed transportation, while others use yesterday's calculators, bullock-drawn implements and inadequate transportation systems. Still others, lost in confusion, remain aloof and use evenmore primitive levels of technology.

The problem with technology is particularly acute in the developing world where rapid modernization is taking place. Unlike industrialized states, where change has been absorbed gradually and successfully over two-hundred years, the developing world has had to adjust in a brief period
of thirty years! In addition, technological catch-up becomes increasingly more difficult for underdeveloped nations because of geometric increases in both information and the advance of technology.

As Deutcht points out, the effects of modernization can be characterized as, a "process by which major clusters of old social, economic and psychological commitments are eroded or broken and people become available for new patterns of behavior." The change of these cultural factors directly ties too and impacts social stability. Writing in 1982 Chalmers Johnson suggests that, several factors contribute to the maintenance of social stability. He believes that for societies to remain stable, members must realize there will be inequities in wealth, power and status and that they willingly accept these inequities. He further contends that men accept these inequalities because social values have taught them to do so. Thus, the key factor for stability in a society is the maintenance of existing values. Any change in the system that is not in harmony with the social norms places the society in a state of disequilibrium.

Johnson argues that, on the other hand, societies that have long term equilibrium have fulfilled the following four functions: (1) values and norms have been effectively transmitted to children and immigrants; (2) society has adapted to changes in terms of both economics and the
physical setting of the society; (3) there has been effective allocation of resources and policies which best reflect the good of society as a whole; and (4) there is integration of basic values between the layers of society and a desire for restraint of those deviating from the norm. All of these social functions were, of course, destroyed or largely disrupted under colonial rule. Most societies are able to remain in equilibrium in spite of change; but in societies that have experienced little change for a long time, even a minor change can be quite destabilizing. The problem facing these societies is that changes, and their reaction to them, tend to continue and multiply rather than die out after the original disturbance thus throwing the society into further disequilibrium. Johnson has concluded that disequilibrium and multiple dysfunctions result in either new policies or revolution as societies seek equilibrium.

Responses to colonialism and Third World solidarity

In 1955 twenty-four countries met in Bandung Indonesia and held a conference on Asian-African affairs. Represented were: Burma, Ceylon, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gold Coast, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Nepal, the Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, North Vietnam and Yemen. The
conference addressed economics, culture, human rights and the most important issue of its time, self-determination.

With respect to colonialism the Conference agreed:

(A) that colonialism in all its manifestations is an evil which should speedily be brought to an end;

(B) affirmed that subjugation, domination, and exploitation, constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and cooperation;

(C) declared its support of the cause of freedom and independence for all such people, and;

(D) called upon the powers to grant freedom and independence to all such peoples.  

The importance behind the Bandung Conference was that it represented the beginnings of the Non Aligned Movement. These political forces later evolved into regional as well as international Pan Arab, Pan Islam and Pan African movements.

The second expression of Third World solidarity was the 1958 All-African People's Conference. The participants came from twenty-eight countries and non-government entities. Meeting in Ghana to discuss their respective
problems, they declared that the African Continent had been arbitrarily divided up by foreign powers to the detriment of indigenous Africans. The participants concluded that Africans had gone through two phases of colonialism. In the first phase, their lands were taken and owned by foreigners and, in the second, they were suppressed by white immigrants who effectively used their own black military to crush indigenous revolutionary forces. The Conference concluded with the condemnation of "colonialism and imperialism in whatever shape or form these evils are perpetuated." Finally, the conference sanctioned:

its full support to all fighters for freedom in Africa, to all those who resort to peaceful means of non-violence and civil disobedience as well as to all those who are compelled to retaliate against violence to attain national independence and freedom for the people.

Reactions to indigenous self-determination and independence

Neocolonialism signifies colonialism gone full circle because, like mercantilism, it represents economic dominance or control as the force behind conquest. It uses newer techniques than traditional forms of imperialism but with the same destructive results. As Walter Langsam points out the tools imperialists use are: "leaseholds and concessions, spheres of influence and interest, protectorates, financial and tariff control, extraterritoriality and, finally mandates." The chief
institutions of neocolonialism have been the transnational corporations which are generally based in the developed world.

Neocolonialism as an adjustment to earlier policies began after WW II when most of the industrialized nations recognized that unrest and cries for independence by their colonies was imminent. As a result, they redesigned their policies toward their colonies to assure themselves of economic primacy after colonial independence. In preparation for withdrawal, imperialist nations followed several steps to insure their continued economic dominance over their colonies. Professor Chinweizw assigns these steps to certain geographic locations but they may be correctly viewed as global:

(1) Africanizing the colonial administrative bureaucracy- a process whereby the central colonial administrative machinery as well as the various native administration, would be delivered into the hands of an educated African petite-bourgeois mandarate.
(2) Training the cream of the African petite-bourgeois politicians in the ways and means of European liberal capitalist democracy;
(3) Selecting and guiding into power some faction of the petite-bourgeois to whom the legitimizing instruments of colonial power would be transferred at the end of the tutelage; and
(4) Creating the most controllable political units by federating some colonial units here and breaking up others there.
CONCLUSIONS

Colonialism and the tools of Imperialism have left a legacy of: border wars; racial wars; irredentist conflicts; wars for national liberation that are often fought unconventionally; notions of cultural supremacy of the white race; meshed religion with nationalism; and deprived underdeveloped countries of new technology early on in their societies development and then later indirectly reduced the time for them to readjust to newer innovations. All of the above have led to a path of multiple dysfunctions in the underdeveloped world which produces a seemingly never ending cycle of coups, mass revolutions, and elite intransigence.

In order to correct past injustices, industrialized nations need to recognize their roles in establishing and contributing to many of the aggressive forces found in the Third World today. Colonization has set a chaotic course for the world by arbitrarily drawing lines across the planet which often divide indigenous peoples into separate and hostile nations. Moreover, the implementation of divide and rule has set those tribes and families who are in power against the wishes of indigenous inhabitants causing additional social dysfunctions which are then reflected in regional disputes.

Contemporary affairs are the logical extension of
colonial policies buttressed by Realism. It could be argued that one of the functions served by Realism is to legitimize colonial rule. Realists contend, national interest can be defined as national power. Accordingly, for nation-states to maintain their viability they must pursue their military and economic interests. Thus, realists assert there are no morals that can be applied universally to govern an anarchical world. In fact, the only "good" policy is one that maintains state sovereignty. These precepts effectively dismiss colonial domination and serve as the subject of the next chapter.
CHAPTER THREE

REALISM
The purpose of this chapter is to shed light on the predominant school of international thought known as Realism. The section discusses what Realists believe in general by: defining the keystone on which their argument bears, namely that national power is national interest; examines the Realist position on international trade; and concludes with the Realists' stance on morality and international politics.

Classical European theory assumes the state is the fundamental unit of international politics and exists as a hard-shelled unit with all human activities, political and nonpolitical, occurring in isolation and unrelated to events transpiring beyond their borders.¹ Classicism buttressed strategic balance of power theories which saw the international arena as an anarchic environment in which each state sought to maintain or maximize its power for fear of military domination by outside forces.² These thoughts are reflected in the writings of, international relations theorists known as Realists.

Realists believe history has taught us that international laws and organizations are limited in worth. They contend that there are no mutual long-term interests that can galvanize nation-states together because states have conflicts in their national objectives, that is, conflicts that are reinforced by states asserting international policies that are dictated by the different
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capabilities which they posses. These capabilities consist of many elements besides military power including: levels of technology, geography, demographics, national resources, potential leadership, type of government, and national ideology.

In addition, Realists claim that international politics cannot act as any standard bearer of ethics. They presume that man is an evil creature who hungers for power and whose nature has been set by divine providence. Therefore little can be accomplished through voluntary forms of international law or education to change man's greedy nature. Furthermore, Realists assert that the best way for men to achieve peace is by instituting a system that pits their nasty and brutish natures against each other as depicted by Niccolo Machiavelli and Thomas Hobbes. Through this interplay, it is assumed that nations become motivated by self interest to maintain the equilibrium and refrain from attacking each other. What follows is a discussion of each of the pertinent elements outlined above. This will be accomplished by first addressing the Realists' concerning the international polity.

According to Richard Mansbach, the Realist paradigm can be broken into three fundamental assumptions:

(1) Nation-states and/or their decision-makers are the most important set of actors to examine in order to account for the behavior in international politics.
Political life is bifurcated into "domestic" and "international" spheres, each subject to its own characteristic traits and laws of behavior.

International relations is the struggle for power and peace. This struggle constitutes a single issue occurring in a single system and entails a ceaseless and repetitive competition for the single stake of power. Understanding how and why that struggle occurs and suggesting ways for regulating it is the purpose of the discipline.

In addition to Mansbach's findings, I believe that Realists share a fourth assumption which focuses on the notion that history has, and is, an active teacher of foreign policy. That is, the behavior of states in their relations with other states have conformed to certain patterns throughout history and will continue to do so. This assumption is accentuated in the works of Realist George Kennan who bases his theory on historical materials from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. However the recurring patterns of historical behavior should not be misinterpreted as contributing to science. Nor is this historical issue to be construed that there is a single cause that determines international relations. Rather, causes might more rightfully be seen as multiple, and the result of anarchy or the struggle for power. In fact, Idealists and the so-called reformers are faulted for seeking a "single cause and the scientific formula to remedy it...."

Hans Morgenthau further clarifies the Realist's position
in his book *Politics Among Nations* where he outlines six principles of realism. First he claims, "that politics, like society in general, is governed by objective laws that have their roots in human nature." Accordingly, to understand or even improve man's condition we must focus upon the fact that societies are governed by laws that have been determined by human nature and cultural mores in some objective manner no matter how imperfect they might seem. This leads Morgenthau to deduce that politics is rooted in human nature which lends to the former's character. Thus, politics is at best imperfect, reflecting man's imperfect nature. While he acknowledges that the law of human nature was built upon the philosophies of ancient civilizations, he hastens to add that scholars should not discard the theory simply because of the passage of time. Realism then, seeks objectivity and to distinguish truth from opinion. To accomplish this objectivity, Realists garner facts and give them meaning through reason. However, the dissection of facts does not in itself complete nor satisfy the inquiry into human nature. Morgenthau suggests that when we study foreign policy an eye must be kept on the humaness of statesmen pursuing policy. By inserting the human factor into the discipline of international relations we not only add to the factual meaning of the field but can also, through role playing, determine what alternatives are open and most likely to be chosen by
Mogenthau's second assumption is that under the realist paradigm the fundamental unit of analysis "is interest defined in terms of power."\textsuperscript{10} This concept links reason with facts and separates politics aside from other non-political issues "such as economics (understood in terms of interest defined as wealth) ethics, aesthetics or religion."\textsuperscript{11} Thus, for a politician to be called a statesman he ought to act in terms of interest defined as power. Thinking as a statesman Realists must then must reject "the concern with motives and the concern with ideological preferences" since a politician may act on morally good motives yet, nevertheless, produce morally indefensible results.\textsuperscript{12} Morgenthau claims, such is the case of Neville Chamberlain, who acted on moral grounds of pursuing peace and subsequently, made World War II inevitable. Thus Morgenthau argues, that while "good motives give assurance against deliberately bad policies; they do not guarantee the moral goodness and political success of the policies they inspire."\textsuperscript{13} Concomitantly, Realists avoid philosophic penchants and focus upon the "official duty" as compared to the more normative "personal wish" which would expand personal moral and political values. Separation from this normative desire aids in fostering rationality as opposed to coloring academic inquiry.

Third, Morgenthau contends that the operational
definitions of national interests and national power are not static. While men are motivated by self interests, these interests are changed periodically along with foreign policy and the movement of time. Likewise, power may also change its tactics while retaining the simple premise that power is the "domination of man by man". \(^\text{14}\) Lastly, he makes the case that prevailing political conditions are not fixed and will continue to fluctuate with the ever changing balance of power as the international political system seeks new equilibriums.

Fourth, Morgenthau believes that universal principles are not abstractly applicable to foreign policy. They argue that the state has a responsibility to safeguard the lives and property of its citizens even though individuals within the state may opt to perish over pursuing policies of injustice as a matter of conscience. But, as Morgenthau points out, "successful political action itself (is) inspired by the moral principle of national survival."\(^\text{15}\) Further, he claims there can be no political morality without prudence and believes "the weighing of the consequences of alternative political actions-to be the supreme virtue in politics" \(^\text{16}\) and as such replaces morality with reasoning.

The fifth postulate holds that any affirmation of universal morality and its impact on political actions is spurious. In fact, to equate morality with policy making
is to distort sound judgment and subject states to self
destruction. Destruction which is foreshadowed by the moral
principle of god himself. However, Morgenthau recognize
that few nations have been able to resist the temptation
to equate their political actions as the result of high
moral aspirations or divine inspiration.

Sixth, Morgenthau argues that politics ought to have
primacy when compared to other spheres such as economics,
law and moral principles. Therefore, in the words of
Morgenthau, "political realism takes issue with the
'legalistic-moralistic approach' to international
politics."17 This is not to discard other disciplines but
that Realists must examine them in there proper function.
Because this issue is difficult for some readers to grasp,
Morgenthau uses three historical examples of which two
are summarized as follows. In the first example, he
illustrates the legalistic approach by discussing the Soviet
attack on Finland in 1939 and the responses elicited from
France and Great Britain. Both states were legally
responsible for the joint defense of Finland under the
Covenant of the League of Nations, however Sweden refused
to allow troops to pass through their territory. Had Sweden
permitted entry, France and Great Britain would have been
at war with the Soviet Union and Germany simultaneously.
From the Realist perspective, France and Great Britain
errored in that, "instead of asking both questions, that
of law and of power, they asked only the question of law; and the answer they received could have no bearing on the issue that their very existence might have depended upon."

The second example, the moralistic approach, examines the rise of Communist China and the Western reaction. Morgenthau believes that the Western world was confronted with two questions, one moral, and the other political. Rather than rely on power to determine policy, the negative answer came in the moral refusal to accept China's rejection of Western morality. Morgenthau asserts this egregious error "to arrive at this conclusion by neglecting this test altogether and answering the political question in terms of the moral issue was indeed a classic example of the 'moralistic approach' to international politics."

Hedley Bull agrees with Morgenthau's second assumption and contributes to the Realist school by identifying order as the common theme shared among nation-states. He posits that five elements effect international order "first there is the goal of preservation of the system and the society of states itself." Whatever differences there may be between nation-states, the states have always clung to the belief that each shares the responsibility for protecting the system itself. The second element Bull offers is that nation-states share the common goal of maintaining their individual independence and national sovereignty. But collectively they may see the demise of individual
states as "subordinate to preservation of the society of states itself: this reflects the predominant role played in shaping international society by the great powers, which view themselves as its custodians."\(^{21}\) As a result many small weaker states have been fed to the opposition in hope of preserving the balance of power.

The third element of Bull's hypothesis is that the states share desire for peace. This is not an establishment of universal or lasting peace but only the absence of war which may, from time to time, be breached as needed to re-establish an international balance of power. Thus he claims societies recognize and value the right to wage war in order to maintain the survivability of the system itself; juxtaposing peace with common safety and security.

Fourth, and common to all states, is the protection and limitation of violence which results in "death or bodily harm, the keeping of promises and the stabilization of possession by rules of property."\(^{22}\) By this Bull means that: (1) states cooperate to maintain their monopoly of violence, and deny the right to employ it to other groups.; (2) accept that using violence against embassies as taboo; and (3) have consistently agreed to the rules of war. International promises, on the other hand, are usually entered into with good intent. However, if the treaty dissolves the international sphere readjusts and continues
to accept treaties by "salvaging the principle itself." \(^23\)

Finally, Bull assumes that states operate by a "mutual recognition of sovereignty (property)" which has been derived from a historical past in which "certain territories and peoples were the property or patrimony of the ruler." \(^24\)

In sum, what Bull's theory argues is that states have established a system of order from chaos and, like Morgenthau, he believes that "man responds to social situations with repetitive patterns." \(^25\) He argues that while the present system is not utopian it is the best we can hope to achieve relegateing man to reoccurring patterns of institutional behavior and thus implying that history is "static" or "circular".

Defining National Power as National Interest

The efficient use of power by nation-states is the cornerstone on which the Realist argument bears. Therefore, it is necessary to define national power and national interest in the Realist context. Although there is no consensual definition of power we can safely assume as does Morgenthau, that it involves domination of man over man. \(^26\) By operationalizing this definition we can see similarities among Realists in their application of power. For example, Nicholas J. Spykman claims that power moves mankind through "persuasion, purchase, barter, and
coercion."  

27 Klaus Knorr contends that power is "only (the) exercise of coercive influence" and is primarily the domain of the military.  

28 Although K.J. Holsti's specific definition consists of three parts in which he identifies power as: 

"(1) The acts by which one actor influences another actor; (2) the capabilities utilized for this purpose: and (3) the response elicited." He too claims that by-in-large it is the "general capacity of a state to control the behavior of others."  

29 If power is only exercised coercively, as Knorr suggests, and it is primarily military, then the preservation of a militarily defeated state would be an act of magnanimity by the victor. However, if we hold to Holsti's action-reaction hypothesis we find that self-interest motivates the victor as it searches for order while, on the other hand, self-preservation motivates the defeated state. Such is the case of the recent defeat of Iraq by the allied forces. Rather than suffer instability and perhaps an even greater nemesis, the allies withheld military support at the early end of the war to both the Shi'ites of the south and the Kurds of the north.

Having defined power we must link it to the, often in defiance concept of, "national interest". However, we must illuminate the term national interest because as Jack Plano points out in the following definition it ought to referred to as national interests.
The national interest of a state is typically a highly generalized conception of those elements that constitute the state's most vital needs. These include self-preservation, independence, territorial integrity, military security, and economic well-being. Because no single interest dominates the policy-making functions of a government, the concept might be referred to more accurately in the plural as national interests.

How then is power linked to interest? Simply it is the need or desire to protect any of the interests listed above by whatever means are efficient and necessary. Also, the contrapositive is true. That is, when national interests are strong, national power is strengthened. Thus, one cannot exist without the other and when one is weakened the other follows. In fact, one might conclude that a state's objectives expand after an increased levels of power have been attained and therefore a country's objectives are or ought to be reduced after it suffers a loss of power. This premise gives credence to periods of colonialism that were followed by intense periods of nationalism and creation of international organizations to control power.

International Organizations

Realists believe international organizations and international trade are limited in their ability to provide international order and global cohesion. Kenneth Waltz asserts that many economists and political scientists have incorrectly assumed that interdependence between nations
is on the rise due to the growth of the multinational corporations.  

Waltz believes that scholars have made an error in assuming that international trade will promote international detente. He claims that theorists make a mistake by looking at international trade as though it was fixed in time and by not contrasting present day volume of trade with those of previous economic periods. For example, current trade among the two super powers is meager; this was not the case in the years prior to WWI when the two major powers Great Britain and Germany were primary trading partners. He reasons that additional trade between countries will not solve international struggles for power. Moreover data shows that interdependence between developed and lesser developed nations has actually been reduced when we take into account GNP growth. According to Waltz there has been a rise in GNP among the developed nations while there has been a simultaneous decrease in the demand for primary products produced in Under Developed Countries (UDC's). As a result of GNP growth, "trade among developed countries accounted for 37.2 % of world trade; 12 years later the amount had increased to 46.5 % (during the same period) trade of less-developed with developed countries accounted for 19.3 % (and later) decreased to 14 %." Therefore, Waltz is claiming that current ties between developed and UDC's are less strong than those fostered
under imperialism.

Waltz further rebuffs those who lay claim to the importation of raw materials from UDC's as a case for interdependence. Although developed nations do import large quantities of raw materials "the quantity of imports is not just a function of scarcity it is also a matter of price." Thus, trade between developed and underdeveloped nations do not constitute dependence but may in fact represent: (1) reliability of supply rather than exclusive possession of a resource; (2) a vast number of suppliers which means fewer profits for the exporters and less dependence by importers; (3) the hoarding of raw materials which has rekindled production from many local producers; and (4) using trade as a catalyst to substitute previously imported goods with locally produced items.

Finally, Waltz attacks theorists who believe there is a high degree of interdependence among nation-states. He claims that for many theorists, "the rhetoric of interdependence has taken on some of the qualities of an ideology." This is accomplished when scholars by-pass inequalities associated with an uneven national capabilities and assume that trade arrangement are reciprocal. Interdependence he says, forces each state to treat the other's "acts as though they were events within its own borders" while dependence places each state in the role of an adversary. Finally, he faults theorists for not
taking into account the near self-sufficiency of many nation-states; many of whom have become insulated from extreme shifts in the global economy.

In concert with Waltz, theorist Edward L. Morse claims in his article "The Politics of Interdependence", given the increased modernization of UDC's, there are two ways theorists can view recent movements in international relations: Either world politics is becoming more interdependent or they are becoming more independent. Those theorists that believe that the world is being shaped by independence contend that the state remains the primary actor and that increased levels of domestic transactions act to buttress state sovereignty. Many theorists hold that modernization and concomitant increases in world trade have made the world more interdependent and as such leave nations more secure and better off than they were before. Morse believes these theorists are mistaken in their assumption because growth in international trade does not necessarily imply growth in national security. He argues that this is because international trade perpetuates the "absence of overarching structures of authority, and the competition for survival, and the maximization of power results inevitably in conflict." Therefore, nations focus on, and are preoccupied with, national security.

In contrast to Waltz and Morse, Klaus Knorr argues
less stridently that international trade is not producing greater interdependence. In fact he states that "the exercise of international power and influence takes place in an increasingly interdependent world." He qualifies his position by contending that:

To assume that growing international enmeshment means the ascendance of global or regional over national politics is very dubious, because the process of modernization also strengthens domestic integration and generates more demands for domestic state action. Nor is it true that the process has, so far at least, made interstate relations more peaceful and accommodative.

His studies have led him to conclude that international interdependence is characterized by asymmetries of wealth that result in a disadvantage of poor and weaker states. This causes the latter states to worry and be apprehensive regarding the wealthier's motives. In addition, economic spillover effects from wealthier nations exacerbate conditions further complicating the issue. Departing from the mainstream of Realism, Knorr argues that the weaker and poor nations should enjoy protection from poverty and uneven power, "and that this protection should be rooted in new universal norms and, based on these, administered by international institutions."

Morality and the Realist

When discussing what some might label as an amoral
point of view, it must be noted that Realism takes its philosophical bearings on the works of Machiavelli's *The Prince*, and Hobbes' *The Great Leviathan*. Both argue that it was necessary for leaders to have a different set of morals for governing in an anarchical world. It is not surprising that contemporary theorists and practitioners take their philosophic mandates from these men because like Machiavelli and Hobbes, they too see the need for a strong state. More recently, and equally important, are the works of Rienhold Neibuhr who, among others based his arguments on the Bible. According to Neibuhr the Bible assumes that all men were inherently evil. Thus he reasoned that international problems were the direct result of men trying to usurp God's divine authority. He coined this as the "will to power" that mankind desired power for the sake of having power. He believes that as an individual's greed for power increases his aspiration to become Christ-like diminishes. Thus, the trend toward immorality compounds itself due to increases in the numbers of individuals. Because of this "universal immorality", Neibuhr held that a balance of power must be struck to achieve some fashion of order and justice. However it should be pointed out that he did not entirely approve of certain immoral methods used by statesmen.

Hans Morgenthau defines his arguments in a more structured and prescriptive manner than does Reinhold
Niebuhr. Morgenthau believes that morality gives man his humanness and separates him from animals and argues that there should be morality in domestic politics. Moreover, he asserts that morality in domestic polity is of value and "is not a utilitarian instrument aiming at the protection of society, even though its observance has this effect, but its commands are absolute and must be obeyed for their own sake." Finally, Morgenthau looks at the level in which the interplay occurs. He argues that at the domestic level there are fewer numbers of men with differing ideas as to what is moral. Since morals are instituted by men they will differ from culture to culture and from man to man. Therefore, Morgenthau deduced that when the:

responsibility for government is widely distributed among a great number of individuals with different conceptions as to what is morally required in international affairs, or with no such conceptions at all, international morality as an effective system of restraints upon international policy becomes impossible."

Morgenthau's views conflict when domestic polity and international relations merge. If, as he states, domestic morality is to be prized, what happens when popular support wanes with respect to official international policy? Rather than acquiesce to Populist pressure, Morgenthau states:

Whenever these two sets of conditions diverge, those responsible for the conduct of foreign policy
are confronted with a tragic choice. Either they must sacrifice what they consider good policy on the altar of public opinion, or they must by devious means, gain popular support for policies whose true nature is concealed from the public.  

George Kennan supports Morgenthau's views of morality. He too believes that moral principles have a place in shaping individual conduct both as a citizen and as a government official. However he believes that when individual moral philosophy merges with millions of other individual philosophies it is transformed and the original precepts are no longer valid. Thus governments are not the creator of morals but only an agent for the collective morality; "and no more than any other agent may it attempt to be the conscience of its principle."
CHAPTER FOUR

TRANSNATIONALISM: AN ALTERNATIVE
Increasingly the world's maps are showing antiquated borders. People, ideas, commodities and social mores flow across state lines. Interstate problems that were once solved by the diplomat and the soldier are now finding other actors such as individuals, multinational corporations, non-governmental organizations and even intergovernmental organizations imposing their demands on the international system. Thus, both problems and solutions are moving beyond the purview of the state. Transnationalism is challenging the long established, Realist inspired, State Centric model which contends that the state is a hardshelled unit with international relations occurring outside of the unit. Because Transnationalism has more elements than Realism, this chapter will provide more additional information in greater depth than the previous chapter for two reasons. First, Transnationalism seeking to displace the existing model; and second, the theory is broader in scope and more complex. This section is divided into several subsections. The first seeks to define transnationalism as variations of a theme and offers various definitions which seek to clarify and resolve the ambiguities associated with the new paradigm. The second section examines the growing interdependence of politics and economics. In the third section inquiry will focus on the impact of technology in international relations through a discussion of the product cycle and the
appropriations theory. Fourth, an analysis of the emergence of the Multinational Corporation as an international actor will be presented. The fifth section illuminates the growth of international organizations and their impact on international relations, finally, this section will provide a synopsis of the major debates between the scholars so that the reader can more easily discern the entire paradigm.

Defining Transnationalism

According to Seymond Brown "the alignments and antagonisms of the recent past are shifting ground and structures premised on their stability appear to be crumbing."

The realignment reflects a dissolution of the cold war balance of power and a renewed focus toward other structures such as "ethnicity, religion, social class, economic function, and generation with each vying for a large piece of pie." This movement away from the state having sole control over international relations was first identified as Political Linkage and then due to misusage of the term, has become known as Transnationalism (see figure 4.1).

Unlike the State Centric theorists, Transnationalism demands that theorists separate themselves from their respective national interests and social mores that could color their perception of international relations. As a
Obstacles to theory building require a radical revision of the standard conception of (state) politics that posits a world of national and international actors whose interrelationships look like this.

(Transnational Theory) requires supplementing the conventional conception with one that looks like (the following incorporating multiple linkages between states and non state actors).

or even this:

result Transnationalists see national borders as too limited a criterion for illuminating all of the activities that occur in the international arena. The perception that government's role has diminished as the primary actor varies from scholar to scholar. But in general theorists agree that Transnationalism is "the processes whereby international relations conducted by governments have been supplemented by relations among private individuals, groups, and societies that can and do have important consequences for the course of events" These Transnational interactions are not new and do not supersede interstate politics "but they affect interstate politics by altering the choices open to statesmen and the costs that must be borne for adopting various courses of action." (see figure 4.2).

Transnational interactions can be further refined by process. In concert with the basic premises of this study is the notion that output takes precedence over input, all of which James Rosenau identifies as recurring sequences of behavior. That is, that linkage as a basic unit of analysis, can be operationalized through the application of "initial" and "terminal" stages which, Rosenau no doubt drawing on the work of David Easton, labels respectively as outputs and inputs. These stages are in turn classified as taking place within a polity or its external environment. Citing Harold and Margaret Sprout (1965) Rosenau is quick to point out that:
Figure 4.2

Nye and Keohane's Interaction Patterns

A STATE-CENTRIC INTERACTION PATTERN

Interstate politics

Domestic politics

G = Government
S = Society
IGO = Intergovernmental organization

TRANSNATIONAL INTERACTIONS AND INTERSTATE POLITICS

Classic interstate politics

Domestic politics

Transnational interactions

G = Government
S = Society
IGO = Intergovernmental interactions and interstate politics

International Organization, Vol 25 Number 3 Summer 1971
Although the term 'environment' has special meanings for students of international politics, in this discussion it is employed in the more general, systems theory sense with which students of comparative politics are familiar. It is conceived as an analytic entity consisting of all the human and nonhuman phenomena that exist external to a polity, irrespective of whether their existence is perceived by the actors of the polity.

Accordingly "environmental inputs" are those social expressions that occur in the external environment that gave rise to the policy outputs. Concomitantly, "environmental outputs" are those behaviors that begin in the external environments of a polity and are either supported or terminated within a polity. Finally, "polity inputs" are those social expressions occurring within a polity that are the result of environmental outputs. This input-output method of conflict resolution was the first model used by Transnationalists to describe the emergence of the theory from a closed hard shelled system. The political theory has changed to the point that the first portion of his pseudo-Eastonian model is not as valid as the second portion of Rosenau's discussion. Aside from his Eastonian premise Rosenau claims there are three types of interactions or linkage process. First, "the penetrative process occurs when members of one polity serve as participants in the political process of another." Such participants include, for example, armies, corporations, terrorists, international organizations,
foreign aid missions, like the Peace Corps or Cuban teachers, and transnational political parties such as the Christian Social Democrats. Rosenau saw these links as direct. In contrast, the "reactive process...is brought into being by recurrent and similar boundary- crossing reactions rather than by the sharing of authority." In the reactive process the actor's initial output is in response to some form of direct or indirect stimuli from another entity. Rosenau is led to conclude that this process is the most common form of international linkage. Finally, the emulative process "is established when the input is not only a response to the output but takes essentially the same form as the output." Modernization is an example of this emulative process and while it can be closely tied to the penetrative process it has a spillover effect and is not the result of direct actions or policies imposed upon another state.

Nye and Keohane offer a much simpler explanation of transnational interaction. They see transnational interactions as "...the movement of tangible or intangible items across state boundaries when at least one actor is not an agent of a government or an international organization." Thus, they contend there are four types of global interactions: (1) communication which is occurring at increased rates and provides for rapid dispersal of "beliefs, ideas and doctrines"; (2) increased modes of
transportation which allow for "the movement of physical objects, including war materiel and personal property as well as merchandise"; (3) international finance; and (4) travel.\textsuperscript{12}

According to Nye and Keohane, transnational interactions have, and continue to, produce at least five results: (1) attitude changes, (2) international pluralism, (3) increased constraints on states through dependence and interdependence, (4) increases in the ability of certain governments to influence others, and (5) the emergence of autonomous actors with private foreign policies that may deliberately oppose or impinge on state polices."\textsuperscript{13}

Walter Jones offers yet another perspective of Transnationalism by postulating that:

\begin{quote}
(The) contact between two or more nongovernmental actors, or between one official actor and one or more private actors. The nongovernmental participants may be corporations interest groups, political parties, elite structures or formally instituted organizations designed to facilitate private relations. An agreement between an oil company and a foreign government falls in this category, as does contact between the International Red Cross and the government of Cuba. An International Youth Conference involving no governments, is also transnational.\textsuperscript{14}
\end{quote}

Jones' definition is one of the most comprehensive yet it too contains an oversight. It does not fully encompass all relevant actors who have influence apart from their institutional positions as non-governmental actors for
example, Albert Schweitzer, Mother Theresa and Andrei Sakharov. However, even with its faults it is the most comprehensive explanation.

The Growing Interdependence of Economics and Politics

The key issue and pivotal to the theory of transnationalism, is the rate at which international interdependence takes place. According to Transnationalists increases in the level of interdependence buttress the validity of the theory. However one of the problems facing theorists is defining just exactly what interdependence is. Richard Rosecrance and Arthur Stein in their article, "Interdependence: Myth and Reality" attempt to define the term and show a high degree of interdependence between states exists. They believe that interdependence can be defined as: (1) relationships between states that are linked so that if one nation's interests change others will be affected; (2) interdependence can be a function of economics sensitizing states to changes within that sphere; and/or (3), using Kenneth Waltz's definition, it would be a "relationship that would be costly to break." Rosecrance and Stein believe that Waltz's definition deviates significantly from the other two in that there is the presumption of a positive relationship between states.

David Singer also identifies several subsystems that
promote interdependence. He claims there are several "Intra-National Entities" like families, tribes and employers that act to either defuse or legitimate ideas and promote social norms. Equally as important in the political socialization process are governments and non-governmental entities such as "trade unions, industrial-commercial associations, banking and investment institutions, professional societies, vocational groups, ethnic, ideological, and religious organizations, separatist movements, and finally, political parties." Second, Singer believes that foreign policy is effected by "Extra-National Entities". These entities cross over national borders either physically or ideologically. A result of this cross linkage is that many groups fuse with their counter parts in other countries and ask them to exert some form of pressure on their respective governments. Third, Singer sees "National States" acting as mediators between those individuals working at home and those citizens traveling abroad. Fourth, he assumes that historically most "Inter-Nation Coalitions" are historically recognized as military alliances but more recently other inter-governmental organizations (IGO's) such as the Arab League, NATO, OAS, Comintern, and The Organization of African Unity, have begun to grow in strength and place new and often greater demands on the international community than previous military alliances. Finally, Singer believes that there are "National
Environments", or geopolitical conditions, which act to link nations together. These environments include not only contiguous borders but also regional and shared geographic attributes like oceanic frontage, deserts or forests.\textsuperscript{17}

While David Singer correctly identifies many of the elements that impact the international system he does not address the linkages fostered by technology.

Technology

Technology has moved the global community toward a greater interdependence and has been the underlying cause of many of the recent revolutions particularly in Iran, but also perhaps in Eastern Europe and China.

Robert Gilpin claims that the effect of modern technology on the international relations scene has marked one of the major schisms between the Transnationalists and the Realists. On one hand the Transnationalists believe that advancements in weaponry have changed the consequences and as such, the nature of warfare. This shift, they contend, is evident in the doctrine of mutual assured destruction (MAD) that opts for suicide over victory. Therefore military power has become of little use and is no longer a rational option to conflict resolution. Thus, strategies of power have been forced to change. Even Hans Morgenthau concedes: "I think a revolution has occurred
...through the introduction of nuclear weapons into the arsenal of warfare." 18

On the other hand, the realists contend that their theory, which hinges on the distribution of power, has not been damaged because, although incidents of war have declined, the threat to wage war has increased and enhanced the position of the main actors.

Aside from the debate over technology and warfare, Transnationalists believe that no nation can maintain a monopoly in the area of research and development, particularly as it is applied to the Multi-National Corporation (MNC). Raymond Vernon agrees and argues for this assumption in his theory of the Product Cycle.

Economic theorists, Raymond Vernon, William Gruber and Dileep Mehta, have concluded a study in which they contend, U.S. technology and related products pass through four phases in what they deem to be a product cycle. 19 These theorists claim the cycle begins when managers respond to a deficiency in the domestic market which they then attempt to fill with a suitable product. Thus, MNC's begin product development with the anticipation of selling at home rather than abroad. During this initial phase firms produce and innovate products at home for several reasons: (1) the company has a ready supply of engineers, scientists and technicians available to develop the product; (2) these technocrats can interact with prospective buyers to work
out any of the early bugs in the product; and (3) firms like economic and social stability when they are introducing or creating new products. This penchant for socioeconomic stability is related to the firm's desire to be able to anticipate swings in the domestic market and to be free from excessive political interference, allowing them to produce without the fear of being banned or nationalized. So, in phase one, product development becomes linked to stable externalities and a compatible geographic proximity for both the client and the manufacturer to perfect the product.

The second phase is characterized by the standardization of the product which leads to easier production and utilization of previously existing parts. According to Vernon, standardization causes the product to be produced more efficiently and, as a result, prices fall as the firm seeks a larger market. Due to the decline in price the company monopoly becomes opened up to increased threats by rival producers pursuing similar products while using cheaper foreign labor.

In the third phase, the firm anticipating the loss of its monopoly begins to shift its production from the high-paid labor (and resources) found at home to cheaper sources found abroad. However, firms still tend to act on the threat more slowly than rivals appropriate their technology. Vernon assumes, that even though firms know
rivals are intent on taking a portion of the existing foreign market, firms act slowly because they often do not perceive the threat until after the rival has already begun to produce. In addition, the innovator finally gets the impetus to move only after it has suffered a reduction in its foreign market. Thus, in an attempt to hold on to, or regain its original monopolistic advantage, the firm sets up foreign production. As an indirect result, the change in location of production effectively carries the transfer of technology from the more developed nations to the lesser developed countries (LDC's). This transfer is completed by either the establishment of foreign subsidiaries or by licensing a foreign-held company to produce in return for royalties.

Finally, foreign production outstrips indigenous production leaving the developed nation a net importer of its own technology. Therefore, according to Vernon, the only way we, as a developed nation, can maintain our comparative advantage is not in the production of the product but in the continuing innovation of new technology.

Steven Margee builds upon Vernon's product cycle by focusing on the length of the innovative and maturation phases. In concert with Vernon, and key to Magee's appropriations theory, is his belief that as long as innovating firms continue to maintain their technological
lead over appropriators (copiers or thieves) they will remain youthful and economically viable. But as firms expand their operations, "emulators in the United States and abroad reduce the profitability of innovations so that the industry's product line shifts to older, more standardized products". \(^{22}\) Sadly, any turn toward standardization is not conducive to the long term well-being of the U.S. economy since the labor market dictates high wages. Thus, standardized American industries tend to become moribund and ask for government protection from foreign competition. \(^{23}\)

In contrast to Vernon's product cycle, Magee contends that the flow of technology is best examined within the context of the industry technology cycle. He believes that the primary problem facing MNC's is the rivalry between appropriators and innovators. This rivalry is spurred on by the high cost of technology and the appropriators' desire to steal technology, or at minimum, copy the product to cut those costs. As a result, MNC's jealously guard their trade secrets shifting their scientific knowledge in-house between subsidiaries rather than produce the product, via contract, on the open market.

Magee states that, some innovations are so widely used they become publicly owned (i.e., the zipper) and the return to the innovator falls. He calls this the "appropriations problem." In an attempt to hedge against
appropriations MNC's produce more complex technologies because "sophisticated ideas are hard to copy." Thus, the "problem" requires firms to continue to pursue additional research and development to stay alive.

Multi-National Corporate Growth

Even the most conservative of contemporary scholars should recognize that multinational corporations are key players in every nation and in one way or another affect every person on the planet.

Raymond Vernon defines the multinational corporation as "a cluster of corporations of different nationalities that are joined together by a parent company through bonds of common ownership, that respond to a common strategy, and that draw on a common pool of finances and human resources." He claims that the boundaries between states are being lessened due to the influx of goods manufactured abroad. No longer is it unusual to have goods that are manufactured in different nations that are internationally standardized.

Harry Magdoff contends, that business itself is pursuing global cohesion as a method of increasing profits and claims that "the advanced thinkers and publicists of the business community have sounded the tocsin: the old fashioned nationstate is standing in the way of progress."
However, he hastens to point out, that while multinational corporations may represent integrated global production they should not be thought of as efficient producers except in the realm of exploitation of world resources. As resources dwindle in one nation they began to shift to cheap resources in found in another state. Accordingly we must see MNCs as self serving and not as some benevolent entity. A prime example of Magdoff's warning can be seen in food production.

According to Francis Moore Lappé, increases in food production have outstripped the increases in population growth rate in every area of world except the African Sahel since 1950. She claims that, "abundance, not scarcity, best describes the supply of food in the world today." 27 The question then arises as to why there are starving people in under developed countries. The answer is that, the foodstuffs that are grown in those regions are either exported by agribusiness to the developed world or are disposed of in an inefficient manner, such as food for livestock. As a result, many states are faced with importing finished products, mono crop agriculture and a populace that does not have the economic wherewithal to place food on their tables.

Agribusiness is defined as anything used to produce food from the seed to the refrigerator into which the customer sticks their hand to pull out a product. In many
respects agribusiness shares common business traits: (1) It is market-oriented; (2) The demand is stable and inelastic; (3) Profit margins are low; (4) Income and profit are slow but constant; and (5) Cash flows are large.\textsuperscript{28} But agribusiness also has the uncommon trait of being oligopic. That is, several large firms control most of the output. They are characterized by their mutually interdependent behavior, each considering their actions on the others prior to changing policy.

Agribusiness is often asked to come into a developing nation and advise its government on the best way to produce a product. The reason UDC's ask agribusiness or MNC's to come into their economies is, in part, because of their need for foreign exchange. In turn, MNC's are attracted to developing countries because of high profit rates, which result from some combination of cheap labor, tax benefits, new markets, and relaxed economic and environmental regulations. In addition, MNC's benefit from other developmental factors, such as access to foreign investment capital; most importantly, they control most of the research and development that is being applied to the UDC's new agricultural product. Lastly, MNC's decide the marketing strategies for the products. The advantage to agribusiness firms is that controlling these developmental factors are that as the they grow more powerful, they remove the decision making processes away from the source of the
products to their home base in a developed nation. The centralizing of power occurs because UDC's cannot produce technocrats which are needed for efficient indigenous corporate operation, but more often because corporations seek to increase profits and hide taxes due the state. Finally, Third World elites conspire with the MNC management because of a lack of loyalty to the state and people for which they have a responsibility.

Growth of International Organizations

Transnationalists believe that world politics is becoming increasingly more integrated. Scholars such as Keohane, Nye and Rosenau claim, that separate national entities which have political and/or economic power are merging into supranational authorities. Although this process is slow, multi layered, and tends to grow in spurts, most scholars contend that the merging of economies is usually the first step toward greater interdependence. This is now transpiring in Europe under the European Community.

Most theorists believe that increases in integration are based on previously successful ventures. Therefore, integration or progress on one front becomes linked to progress in other sectors. However, not "even compatible societies cannot integrate all public functions
simultaneously." Thus, federation can only take place when several sectors become linked so that they produce carry over effects. Walter Jones identifies the economic sector as the primary sector, exemplified by various groups like the European Economic Community (EEC) and the Latin American Free Trade Association (LAFTA), organizations which act to tie the economies of sovereign states together. The second area that states integrate is the social structure. This is much more difficult to achieve than meshing economies since it involves changing individual loyalties from village devotion to regional and then support to nationalism and ultimately to a larger and more removed political entity. The third area Jones addresses is political. This area is even more difficult to promote assimilation than the other two sectors because it demands that nations yield a portion of their sovereignty to either a regional system such as the European Community or an international system, which to date is the U.N. The final sector of integration is collective security. According to Jones integrations of this type are rare and involves more than building alliances, in which the dominate power makes the decisions for the weaker nations. It implies that politics and militaries of states become linked through some time of crises. However it remains to be seen whether integration carries with it equality of decision making. Questioning Jones, it seems that nations are more eager
to join military forces in an effort to provide collective security than for any other single reason of integration.

International Organization and Functionalism

Keohane and Nye point out that Transnational organizations impact interstate politics by effectively producing:

(1) attitude changes, (2) international pluralism, (3) increased in constraints on states through dependence and interdependence, (4) increases in the ability of certain governments to influence others, and (5) the emergence of autonomous actors with private foreign policies that may deliberately oppose or impinge on states policies.

Transnational organizations play a major role in promoting world pluralism by linking national groups with their counterparts in other nations. These transnational organizations take two forms, international intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) and non governmental international organizations (NGOs), both of which emanate from a parent organization or state which allocates resources. There has been a noticeable increase in the chartering of IGO's as well as vast growth in NGO's in recent years and particularly since the 1940's (see figure 4.3). As a result of this growth, exchanges within the international system have established new avenues by which
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governments and organizations are able to exert influence over outside governments.

According to Wallace and Singer the criteria for an IGO is (1) the organization must have at least two qualified members; (2) there must be a permanent secretariat and a permanent headquarters; and (3) date that mark the birth or death of each organization. The growth in IGO's is due to many factors; one of them is that nations on low budgets are increasingly drawn to use international organizations as their chief method of diplomacy. Another factor is that additional exchanges between states create avenues by which governments are able to exert influence over other governments. Still another factor is the professional cohesion which bonds bureaucratic members of one state to another through international organizations.

The Economic and Social Council of the United Nations defines a NonGovernmental Organization as "any international organization which is not established by intergovernmental agreement..." NGO's vary greatly from charities to political organizations but all share a common thread—they are able to exert influence on the state. This element of power draws additional members to the organizations. Thus, non government actors control more resources than in previous years and "exist by integrating the governments of nation-states or citizens of many states.
into a common organization." Concomitantly, within the borders of states NGO's also influence the growth of autonomous actors that form policies that are in opposition to the official policy. Examples include the spread of communism in the 1920s and 1960s, fascism and Nazism during the 1930s and 40s, and the more recent spread of the Islamic revolution.

The study of international intergovernmental integration has fallen to a subfield of Transnationalism known as functionalism or neofunctionalism (see figure 4.4). By definition, "functionalism is a theory which describes a gradual progression from confrontational forms of international cooperation to supranationalism." This is done by fostering a process which reduces the differences in political systems and by gradually increasing mutually shared interests. Functionalists argue both that international cohesion will continue to increase as economies become further integrated and that cooperation in economic integration produces working relationships between states which effectively bypass politics. However, David Mitrany, "father" of functionalism, cautions that economic parliaments that have been tried in the past failed miserably and given today's climate it is even more difficult to separate economies from social issues and politics. Moreover, there is a penchant to expand governmental institutions beyond their functional design.
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and as such, policies and information becomes too mixed to have validity. Paramount among his concerns is that all of the past economic parliaments were dominated by special interests. Instead of this political milieu, Mitrany contends that international economics should fall under the direction of nongovernmental organizations. But clearly, functionalists contend, working relationships aid in the transference of loyalty from individual states to a supranational organization which ultimately form into a global community.

Neofunctionalists differ from functionalists in that, while they agree economics has a major role to play, they do not believe that social transformation will automatically follow economics. Instead they contend that politics tends to twist or push the integration process through "cultivated spillover." In this process energy from previous successful ventures carries or spills over into another sector and furthers integration between nation states.

Schisms Between The Theorists

There are two areas in which Transnational Theorists are divided (see figure 4.5). The first debate centers on benefits produced from international integration. Surprisingly there are those within the field that believe that international integration may produce more ills than
Pessimist and Optimist arguments cross over the schism between opposing schools of thought. Optimism is higher on the World Orderist side due to their commitment of fostering world government. Pessimism is higher among the Globalists because they believe there is an increased chance of anarchy due to changes within international relations.

Diagrammed by Dr. Maghroori during an interview on June 24, 1989.
it will cure. This debate was termed by Ray Maghroori as
the optimist and pessimist conflict. The second debate
is on whether or not Transnationalists should take an active
role leading mankind toward increased integration with
the ultimate aim being world government or, as others in
the field contend, merely report on the phenomena as
scientists. These two groups are respectively known as
World Orderists and the Transnationalist Globalists. Each
of these debates will be discussed below.

Optimists and Pessimists

The optimistic Transnationalists see the inter-twining
of political and socio-economic systems as a ray of bright
hope. They contend that integration of systems will
ultimately produce a world community and a world culture,
which in turn will give rise to a world state or
government.

On the other hand, pessimistic Karl Kaiser claims,
"transnational relations and other multinational process
seriously threaten democratic control of foreign policy,
particularly in advanced industrial societies." Kaiser
contends that, due to transnationalism, domestic issues
have become embroiled with decisions that have been made
from outside the state and result in a loss of democratic
participation by those who reside within that state. He
believes that the primary legitimacy for foreign policy rests with those consenting to be governed. However, increased intergovernmental participation might sway constituents toward democratic solutions that may not be in their best interest. He further claims, that the influence of integration on the democratic process has reduced the power of the Executive branch to enforce regulations. This weakens the state's negotiating advantage and moves any settlement into the sphere of competing national interests. Thus, he concludes, increased integration threatens the democratic process.

Transnationalist Globalists and World Orderists

Here again the field is split between two camps; the system maintenance proponents who claim that gradualism is the best path to take as political scientists because it will not upset stability, and the System-Transformers who are seeking to push the system into reform before civilization collapses.46 These two schools have become known as the Transnationalist Globalist and the World Orderists.

The Globalists unlike the Orderists "do not presume to have discovered the dynamics of the underlying order, in as much as uniform as those set by national interests or the requirements of capitalism."47 They believe that
slow integration of the functional elements between polities will actually provide a more stable and less conflicting world community than a pro-active approach that tends to increase the probability of an anarchical world.

Whereas the Globalists see the withering of the nation-state as a matter of fact, the World Orderists assert the "state system inclines the world toward destruction."

They believe the state system must either be destroyed as quickly as possible and some other form of utopian system be instituted in its place. They see themselves in a pro-active role believing that it is their mission to show the paths whereby the global village can achieve transition to a higher human plain.

According to Richard Falk, the academic field of World Order is primarily a North American invention. In the early stages the field was criticized as plagued with advocacy rather than analysis. This reasoning was countered by proponents who argued that the purpose of a higher education included the placement of values. Falk argues that, "They concluded that anyone who insisted that objectivity excluded normative considerations endorsed, wittingly, or not, the status quo. In other words, an academic inquiry could never be a neutral one".

The second criticism about Orderists is their preoccupation with establishing a world government as a means toward greater international co-operation and hence
international security. Critics claim that the unattainability of this goal makes the studies of this field a waste of time.

The third criticism facing Orderists is their penchant for cultural integration. Opponents argue that because mores differ between cultures the promotion of Orderists' ideology is a waste of time and that they should concentrate on a more important factor— that human nature has common traits that motivate human behavior. Falk believes that there has been no accounting of human nature. Accordingly, this has led to unsuccessful attempts by the Transnationalists in general and the Orderists in particular "to proceed from here to there, or to employ more recent terminology, in its attempt to solve the 'transition problem'."52

Many different variables impact on the process of transnational integration. Often there are quite a few obstacles in the way for integration to occur and at other times integration transpires with no problems at all. Therefore when considering the variables before enacting a policy or when studying the results of a policy we must take into account the environment in which the integration or proposed integration occurred.

Rosenau recognizes many different categories within this environment. These include: (1) "The Contiguous
Environment" such as "boundary disputes, historic rivalries, traditional friendships and the many other distinctive features of relations among immediate neighbors.\(^5\); (2) "the Regional Environment," such as Central America, South America and North America as opposed to Europe; (3) "the Cold War Environment"; (4) "the Racial Environment" which manifests itself in the strife between ethnic groups; (5) "the Resource Environment," defined as "the activities through which goods and services in the external world of any polity are created, processed, and utilized," rather than the existence of the resources themselves \(^5\); and (6) "the Organizational Environment," such as the growth of the United Nations and the International Court of Justice.

The main challenges to Rosenau's theory of environments can be traced to the works of Lucien Pye (1965) and Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba (1963). The central thrust of their thesis is that, every political system has a psychological orientation toward a "political system and its various parts, and attitudes toward the role of the self in the system".\(^5\) According to Almond and Verba these psychological orientations can be effectively translated into three types of political orientations:

1. "cognitive orientation," that is, knowledge of a political system, its roles and the incumbents of these roles, its inputs, and its outputs;
"affective orientation," or feelings about the political system, its roles, personnel, and performance, and

(3) "evaluational orientation," the judgments and opinions about political objects that typically involve the combination of value standards and criteria with information and feeling.

Thus, the political culture of a particular society can be defined as the "particular distribution of patterns of cognitive, affective, and evaluational orientations among the population toward political objects". The frequency in which these elements are combined results in three political cultures: the parochial, the subject and the participant. The first culture lacks specialized political roles and as a result individuals feel that the political system will not respond to their needs. In the second culture, individuals recognize that they are affected by the output of the system but are removed from the input process. Third, the participant political culture is one in which individuals enjoy all of the aspects of the political system even though they may be disillusioned from time to time.

Almond and Verba further assert that political cultures become diffused and that they simply do not replace one another, but become combined with "earlier"orientations. Therefore, "every political culture is a 'mix,' and the classification of parochial, subject, and participant cultures does not suggest homogeneity or uniformity, but
the statistical frequency of particular orientations. As such participant cultures include some parochials and subjects. This mix often impedes the development of the state and ultimately lends to state instability.

However a fundamental weakness in Almond and Verba's approach is that it appears to be insensitive to cultural variations between and within states. Nor does political culture "resolve the fundamental problem of relationship between the political culture and the political system." While political culture may explain incremental change within the state it lacks an explanation for revolutionary change. Moreover as James Bill and Robert Hardgrave suggest, "its focus is almost wholly on the 'input' side of the political system-- on the determinants of political behavior rather than on political behavior as such."60

CONCLUSION

This paper has traced the origins of colonialism and demonstrated its legacy which continues to impact current state relationships. As mentioned, the author finds no significant differences between the terms colonialism and imperialism. Colonialism implies the domination of one society over another for the purposes of territorial and economic gain. As a corollary, imperialism can be described as the tools used by colonialists to implement their
objectives. Although, some scholars may wish to argue that neo-imperialism is separate and distinct from colonialism, I contend, that for the most part, the precepts of colonialism still continue to operate within this system.

The ideological expressions of colonialism were rationalized and operationalized in Realism. Realists concern themselves with the distribution of power. They argue that national interest is national power and conversely, national power is buttressed by acquisition of interests. Accordingly, Realists argue that men are motivated by self interests which continually change and are reflected in state foreign policy. Concomitantly, politics is divided into domestic and international spheres each separate and distinct from the other, both in terms of morals and economics. Thus, realists hold any affirmation of universal morality and its relationship to international relations as spurious. In fact, the only "good" policy is one which insures the survivability of the state.

I have offered an alternative view to Realist paradigm. Transnationalism is not a radical departure, but rather, a continuation of theory based on world interdependence. As discussed, Transnationalism contends, that the world is more complex than states being driven by the need for national security. Besides the military, diplomats and official policy makers, other non-state actors also influence the international polity. Transnationalists argue
that international relations are becoming increasingly more integrated and that political and economic powers are merging into supranational entities. Although this process is slow, multilayered, and grows by spurts it is continual.

Finally, Transnationalism is a viable alternative because it is flexible, culture sensitive, combines politics and economics, and accurately depicts the contemporary political setting.
ENDNOTES
Endnotes for Chapter One


2 Chilcote, p. 59.


4 Chilcote, p. 59.


7 See for example, the Kellogg-Brand Treaty of 1928 which outlawed war. For more on Toynbee refer to his "Encounters Between Civilizations" in Harpers CXCIV (April 1947), p. 289-298. For Norman Angell, see Theories of International Relations (New York: Appleton, 1936). Angell's book contends that war can be eliminated by educating people is The Great Illusion: A study of the Relation of Military Power to National Advantage (New York: Putnam's 1910).

8 Evans and Newnham, p. 165.


Evans and Newnham, p. 236.

See for example, Niccolo Machiavelli's The Prince and Thomas Hobbs' The Great Leviathan.


Endnotes for Chapter Two

1 For the purpose of this study the terms Third World and underdeveloped countries (UDCs) are synonymous with each other. Any interchange is met to quell redundancy in language.


3 Braveboy, p. 87.

4 Braveboy, p. 87.

5 Braveboy, p. 87.


9 For more information see Dependency theorists, Andre' Gunder Frank, Fernando Henrique Cardoso and Claire Savit Bacha.

10 Braveboy, p. 20.

11 Ritter, p. 224.

13 Hobson quoted in Ritter, p. 224.


16 Maunier, p. 166.

17 Maunier, p. 168.

18 Shater quoted in Braveboy, p. 40.

19 Maunier, p. 193.

20 Maunier, p. 194.

21 Maunier, p. 223.

22 Maunier, p. 177.

23 Maunier, p. 178.


28 Snyder, p. 57.

29 Vincent, p. 664.


31 Gladwin, p. 19.

32 Gladwin, p. 20.


35 Isaacs in Shepherd, p. 27.


39 Armenian terrorist activity began as early as 1921 when a group by the name of Nemesis shot and killed Ottoman government officials in Western Europe. Terrorist groups now include the Armenian-Marxist organization (ASALA) and the right-wing Justice Commandos of the Armenian Genocide (JCAG). A re-emergence of terrorism began in 1975.

40 Erickson quoted in Duchacek, p. 6.

41 Snyder, p. 27.

108
42 Vincent, p. 666.

43 Tinker quoted in Vincent, p.

44 Snyder, p. 3.

45 Snyder, p. 39.

46 Isaacs in Shepard, p. 100.

47 Duchacek, p. 23.

48 Snyder, p. 27.

49 Deutch quoted in Braveboy, p. 166.


51 Taylor, pp. 13-14.


56 Langsam in Snyder, p. 55.

57 Chinweizw quoted in Gladwin, pp. 79-85.
Endnotes for Chapter 3


4 Dougherty, p. 85.


6 Dougherty, pp.103-4


8 Morgenthau, p. 4.

9 Morgenthau, pp. 4-5.

10 Morgenthau, p. 5.

11 Morgenthau, p. 5.

12 Morgenthau, p. 5.

13 Morgenthau, p. 6.

14 Morgenthau, p. 11.
15 Morgenthau, p. 12.

16 Morgenthau, p. 12.


19 Morgenthau, p. 15.


21 Bull, p. 17.

22 Bull, p. 19.

23 Bull, p. 19.

24 Bull, p. 19.

25 Morgenthau, p. 7.

26 Morgenthau, p. 11.

27 Spykman in Dougherty, p. 87.

28 Knorr in Dougherty, p. 88.

29 Holsti in Dougherty, p. 89.


32 Waltz in Maghoori, p. 85.

33 Waltz in Maghoori, pp. 85-6.

34 Waltz in Maghoori, p. 91.

35 Waltz in Maghoori, p. 91.


37 Morse, p. 313.


39 Knorr, p. 212.

40 Knorr, p. 237.

41 Knorr, p. 237.


43 Morgenthau in Macridis, p. 354.

45 Morgenthau, p. 266

46 Morgenthau in Macridis, p. 404.
Kennan in Dougherty, p. 105.
Endnotes for Chapter Four


2 Brown, p. 3.


7 Rosenau 1969, pp. 44-5.

8 Rosenau 1969, p. 46.

9 Rosenau 1969, p. 46.

10 Rosenau 1969, p. 46.

11 Keohane and Nye, p. 332.

12 Keohane and Nye, p. 332.

13 Keohane and Nye, p. 337.

114


17 Singer, pp. 21-30.


19 Vernon's articles are entitled "International Investment and International Trade". Also see "The Product Cycle Hypothesis in a New International Environment."


22 Steven Margee in John Adams, p. 437.

23 Gray, pp. 138-140.

24 Margee in quoted in Adams, p. 437.


29 Jones and Rosen, p. 520.

30 Jones and Rosen, p. 526.

31 Keohane and Nye, p. 337.

32 Keohane and Nye, pp. 328-41.


36 Puchala, p. 251.

38 Keohane and Nye, pp. 328-41.


41 Taylor, p. 34.

42 Taylor, p. 34.

43 Maghoori and Ramberg, p. 17-20.

44 Young, p. 728.


47 Rosenau in Maghoori, p. 6.

48 Falk, p. 155.

49 Falk, p. 146.

50 Falk, p. 147.

51 Falk, p. 147.

52 Falk, p. 148.

54 Rosenau 1969, p. 62.


56 Bill and Hardgrave, p. 87.

57 Bill and Hardgrave, p. 87.

58 Bill and Hardgrave, p. 88.

59 Bill and Hardgrave, p. 114.

60 Bill and Hardgrave, p. 114.
BIBLIOGRAPHY
BIBLIOGRAPHY


Morse, Edward L. "The Politics of Interdependence." International Organization 23 (1972), 311-


