Critical Reflections on the Relevance of Theories and the Concepts of International Relations

Mujitaba Liman Arabu

Abstract

No single theory reliably explains the wide range of international interactions, even though theoretical framework has traditionally held a central position in the study of international relations. Hence it becomes necessary to have such a framework for; otherwise, one may easily loose direction and once the ideas and the facts cannot be presented mutually the whole work loses meaning. Theories are therefore, necessary in intellectual and academic pursuits. It is because of this that scholars belonging to different camps write on the same thing differently. This is also why there are many models, methods and circles of thought as there are as much conflicting interests. Theories are developed in order to understand the causes of events that occur in international relations. Although theory depends on a logical deduction of hypotheses from assumptions and a testing of the hypotheses, as more and more data are collected in the empirical world, theories have to be improved and regulated by the analyst. This is for the avoidance of ambiguity which will probably create wary situation. Instrumentalist theorists believe that "theories are useful tools for making predictions but cannot be literally true or false". This paper has identified a number of concepts that are considered important in any meaningful study of international relations. It is pertinent therefore to highlight their theoretical meanings as this would enable us to appreciate their practical applications in everyday use in the relations between States over a long period of time. These concepts include: a variety of theories in international relation studies; the state; national interest; foreign policy; diplomacy; the international system; balance of power and so forth.

Introduction

In the real sense, international relations emerged to provide the mechanism for collective action and to serve as a useful link between nations, between peoples and between civilizations. Morgenthau observed that, "international relations deals with the economic, political, ideological, legal, diplomatic and military ties and inter-relationships between states; between peoples; between systems of states; and between the basic socio-economic and political forces and organizations acting in the world arena.[i] The subject matter of international relations is, therefore, as old as political history itself. International relation as a subject of study is a 20th century product.[ii] Until the Second World War, except for a few writers who contributed to the study of geopolitics, international relations did not exist as a discipline.[iii] It was however, the events that led to and those that followed the Second World War in the period 1939-1945 which provided the first serious impetus to the emergence of International Relations as a subject of study, when scholars began to ask questions about the future of World peace.[iv] In the other words, Alkali perceived that "international relations pre-date the modern state".[v]

Theoretical Framework

The dominant theories of international relations are those of the Realists, Liberals and Marxists, in the sense that whatever comes later is simply built on them.[vi] Realism as one of the dominant theories since the conception of the discipline is a school of thought that explains international relations in terms of power. The exercise of power by states towards each other is sometimes called *realpolitik*, or power politics.[vii] This thought developed in reaction to a liberal tradition that realists called idealism.[viii] The realist theory claims to rely upon an ancient tradition of thought which includes writers such as Thucydides[ix], Machiavelli[x], Hobbes[xi], Morgenthau[xii] and Rousseau.[xiii] Realists see interstates relation as anarchical in nature due to lack of authority capable of regulating interactions between states as no single authoritative world government exist. They also assumed that sovereign states rather than Intergovernmental Organizations (IGOs) or Multinational Corporations (MNCs) are the primary actors in international affairs. Thus, states must always compete with one another in a struggle to pursuit their self-interest with the primary goal to maintain and ensure their security and thus their sovereignty and survival.[xiv] Realism holds that in pursuit of their interest, states always attempt to exploit resources, and therefore, relations between them are determined by the state's military and economic capabilities. According to this perception, power is thus a central concept in international relations and is said to be the ability to get another actor to do what it would not have otherwise done. This means that power is a political phenomenon that if pursued by a nation, is done in order to gain leverage over other actors. Moreover, as observed by Morgenthau "power is the acquisition and control of those things that could help in establishing hegemony over others".[xv]

The struggle between the United States of America and the former Soviet Union to dominate world politics and interstate relations up to the last decade of the twentieth century led to what was later termed as hegemonies in the form of bipolar politics after the Second World War.[xvi] Between these two giants stood a large number of independent states, the "Second World" and the "Third World" countries with different degrees of attachment to these two, in a complex network of alliances, regional groupings, and academic cartels.[xvii]

Liberalism holds that state preferences rather than state capabilities, are the primary determinant of states interrelation. Unlike realism, where the state is seen as a unitary actor, liberalism allows for plurality in state actions. Thus, preferences vary from state to state, depending on factors such as culture, economic system or government type. They also hold that interaction between states is not limited to the political security but also economic and cultural whether through commercial firms, organizations or individuals. Thus instead of an anarchic international system,[xviii] there are plenty of opportunities for cooperation and broader notions of power. This thought still maintains that economic interdependence is one possible explanation for international cooperation, but only one among many factors.

Marxists reject both realists' and liberals' view of state conflicts or cooperation: instead, they focused on the economic and material aspects. Marxists theorists argue that economic concerns are more than any other reason for international interaction primarily class struggle, between the ruling and the working classes. Marxists viewed the international system as an integrated capitalist system in pursuit of capital accumulation.[xix] To Marxists, imperialism produces the hierarchical international system, in which there were opportunities for some states, organizations and individuals, and significant constraints on behaviour for others. Powerful countries can expand at the expense of the weak ones, enabling them to sell goods and export surplus wealth that they cannot use at home. Simultaneously, the less developed or weak ones are increasingly constrained and dependent on the actions of the more powerful ones.[xx]

In sum, the contending theoretical perspectives discussed above see the interstate relations quite differently. What theorists and policymakers choose to see, what they each seek to explain, and what implications they draw, all these elements of analysis can vary, even though the facts of the event may be the same. In fact, politico-economic and cultural foothold is the bases upon which nations interact and thus theoretically, this indicates that, one may likely take advantage of the other. In fact, some scholars argued that it is hardly going to be a symmetrical relation between the rich and the poor countries and that is whether between the North and South[xxi] or the South-South[xxii] themselves.

Key Concepts Worthy of Study in International Relations:

The State

The major theories concerning the origin of the state include: the divine right theory, the social contract theory, the force theory, Marxist theory and the evolutionary theory.[xxiii] The theory of divine right posits that, the state has been created by God and that the rulers are divinely appointed; as such they are accountable to no one else, or to any other authority except that of God. Most established religions including Islam and Christianity shared this view.[xxiv] This theory also states three simple propositions: the state has been established by an ordinance of God; its rulers are divinely appointed; they are accountable to no authority but God. In fact, the importance of the theory is primarily historical; it helped to support the claims of certain rulers, like James I of England, to govern absolutely and without being accountable to their people. James I further explained that:

> "A king can never be monstrously vicious. Even if a king is wicked, it means God has sent him as a punishment for peoples' sins and it is unlawful to shake off the burden which God has laid upon them. Patience, earnest prayer and amendment of their lives are the only lawful means to move God to relieve them of that heavy curse".[xxv]

The Social Contract Theory advanced that the state is the result of an agreement entered into by men who originally had no governmental organization.[xxvi] According to this theory, the history of the world is thus isolatable into two clear periods: the period before the state was instituted and the period after. In the first period, there was no government, and there was no law which could be enforced by a coercive authority. Men lived; it was said, in a state of nature, in which they were subject only to such regulations as nature was supposed to prescribe. But there was no human authority to formulate these rules precisely or to enforce them. After some time, they decided to set up a Government. Thereby, they parted with their natural liberty and agreed to obey the laws prescribed by the government.[xxvii]

The theory of force postulates that "the state is the result of the subjugation of the weaker by the stronger. According to David, "it is probable that the first ascendance of one man over multitudes began during the state of war, where the superiority of courage and of genius discovers itself most visibly, where anonymity and concert are requisites; and where the malicious effects of disorders are most sensibly felt. The long continuation of that state, an incident common among savage tribes, toughened the people to deference".[xxviii]

Jenks also observed that, historically speaking, there is not the slightest difficulty in proving that all political communities of the modern type own their existence to successful warfare". He also noted: "with the expansion and growth of populations and the subsequent pressure on subsistence, the art of warfare was improved, thus fighting became the work of specialists".[xxix] The state thus emerged when a leader with his range of warriors established paramount control over a definite territory.

Marxists in this theory of the state hypothesized that, the state emerged from, and was the outcome of changes and transformation of modes of production from primitive communalism to slavery, then to feudalism and finally to capitalism.[xxx] With increased production, and division of labour, specialization was accompanied by social differentiation, which in turn led to the emergence of classes and class antipathy.[xxxi] According to the theory, in each epoch, new forms of classes revitalized, conforming to the particular mode of production, which, in effect, defined the nature, and character of the forces of production and production relations.[xxxii] Thus, the state emerged to reconcile the class conflict, though frequently too, in favour of the dominant ruling class.[xxxiii] Karl Marx, Engels and Lenin are among the advocates of this theory.

The most accepted theory is known as the historical or evolutionary theory. It theorized that: "the state is neither a divine institution nor a deliberate human apparatus; it sees the State coming into existence as the result of natural evolution".[xxxiv] According to Burgess, "the proposition that the State is a product of history means that it is a gradual and continuous development of human society out of a grossly imperfect beginning through crude but improving forms of manifestation towards a perfect and universal organization of mankind"[xxxv].

According to this theory, the beginning of government cannot be traced to a particular time or cause; it is the result of various factors, working through ages. These influences are kinship, religion, war and political consciousness. This theory agreed that, whether or not the patriarchal family was the first form of the family, it must have provided the first adequate form of government.

In précis, several opinions had been developed regarding the origin of the state. However, there is no doubt about the fact that the state is central in international relations. Yet, both realism and liberalism acknowledged the primacy of the state. But for an entity to be considered a state, four fundamental conditions must be met. First, a state must have a territorial base, a geographically defined boundary. Second, within its borders, a stable population must reside. Third, there should be a government to which this population owes allegiance. Finally, a state has to be recognized diplomatically by other states.

Another important segment in international relations is the function of the non-state actors. There is no doubt, that National governments are the most important actors in international relations, but they are strongly influenced by a variety of non-state actors. These actors are also called transnational actors when they operate across international borders.[xxxvi] First, states often take actions through, within or in the context of intergovernmental organizations (IGOs), organizations whose members are national governments. IGOs fulfil a variety of functions and vary in size from just a few states to virtually the whole UN membership. The Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC), the World Trade Organization (WTO), military alliances such as North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), and political groupings such as the African Union (AU) are all IGOs.[xxxvii]

Another type of transnational actor, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), are private organizations, some of considerable size and resources. Increasingly NGOs are being recognized, in the UN and other forums, as legitimate actors along with states, though not equal to them. Some of these groups have a political purpose, some a humanitarian one, some an economic or technical one. Sometimes NGOs combine efforts through transnational advocacy networks.[xxxviii] Together, IGOs and NGOs are referred to as international organizations (IOs). There are more than 25,000 NGOs and 5,000 IGOs.[xxxix] Others are the Multinational Corporations i.e. Companies that span borders individuals, Cities, or Constituencies, etc.[xl] Example is ExxonMobil, Patterson Zochonis, Lever Brothers and others.

The National Interest

According to Mbachu, "the ambiguity of the concept of national interest rests not on its definition but its practical relevance".[xli] Generally, national interest is interpreted as if it is synonymous with state's interest or elite interests, or interest of decision makers. In reality, policies reflect at times national interest and occasionally, personality or regime interests or at any rate elite interests.[xlii] The crucial problem lies in the frequent justification or rationalization of elite or personality interests as national interests.

In order to determine what actually national interest is, consideration must be given towards explanation on the indicators of national interest, who determines national interest and how truly is national interest a public serving? Mbachu opined that, theoretically, "national interest derives much from rational-decision making model which cautiously considers alternative course of actions in order to choose those capable of promoting ends purposefully".[xliii] According to him, "every nation state has decision makers who ought to employ their skill to formulate and implement decisions or policies capable of providing or maintaining domestic stability as well as safeguarding citizens and investments abroad".[xliv]

Broadly speaking, national interest expresses core socio-economic and political ideals, values and aspirations which are well defended at home, and pursued or promoted or defended beyond national boundaries. Operationally (in practice), national interest expresses manifesting public serving policies which make for, or promote core values held high and proud by the people. The impression therefore is that national interest is not defined by what happens at the domestic setting only but the sum total of interests pursued or projected, or defended in the international setting.

The major classifications of national interests distinguished between the primary, secondary and general interests.[xlv] The primary interest of any nation concerns the expression of those policies which promote the defence of a given country. This includes rights to territorial sovereignty and independence. Most importantly, primary interest is aimed at ensuring the self-preservation of a nation, basically national defence and security. The whole idea is to show that the first task of any state is to preserve the safety of life and property of its citizens.

The political realist's proposition of international politics theorized that national interest is best guaranteed by the struggle for and use of power. Kissinger favouring this political theory opined that "a statesman who does not believe in the balance of power (military options) is like a scientist who does not believe in law of gravity".[xlvi] Hence in both domestic and international setting, every state is committed to every 'good' and 'evil' means in order to ensure national security. Thus, States readily go to war, violate other states territorial sovereignty in order to defend or promote what they considered to be their national interest.

Secondary interest of a nation is more concerned with the management, promotion and defence of nationals in the diaspora and investments abroad. This is because of the interdependence nature of states in international system. It is not unusual when citizens of other nations reside outside theirs either for scholarship, commerce, tourism, or on diplomatic services. The foreign investment of a particular nation in other nations of the world needs also to be advanced and protected. This is because, no nation would ignore its citizens and investments abroad since their activities have implications for domestic stability. This is in fact, why military option, economic sanction or diplomatic means are applied depending on images of risk involved. In effect, this is why Western nations have interest in the security related issues in the host states of their multinationals.

The general interest of the states expresses policies which seek among others to promote world peace and security. It could be achieved in form of representing international law, conventions, treaties, etc. Non-violation of territorial integrity of other states and independence cum supporting efforts towards disarmament and arms control were placed prominence under general interest. It equally recognized policies to promote regional, continental or ideological interests in the field of economics, politics, science, strategic studies, and foreign policy.

In a nutshell, national interest in whatever form, is the interests of the state, most basically the protection of territory and sovereignty; in realist thinking, the interest is a unitary one defined in terms of the pursuit of power; in liberal thinking, there are many national interests; in Marxist thinking, it is the interest of a ruling elite. The pursuit of permanent interest had severally led United States of America (U.S.A) in particular to violate other states territorial integrity as in Vietnam, North Korea, Chile, Nicaragua, Afghanistan, Libya, etc. This is consistent with cardinal principle of international relations which states: "there is no permanent enemy or friend but permanent interest".[xlvii]

The Foreign Policy

States establish various organizational structures and functional relationships to create and carry out foreign policies. Officials and agencies collect information about a situation through various channels. They write memoranda outlining possible options for action, they hold meetings to discuss the matter, some of them meet privately outside these meetings to decide how to steer the meetings. In effect, foreign policy now and then is too closed to national interest.

It is not easy to define foreign policy to a universal accepted standard. However, several scholars see it as having to do with what is to be done about external matters and diplomacy and how to do it. Northedge has it that, "the foreign policy of any country is the product of both internal and external environmental factors surrounding the country**".**[xlviii] Yet, according to him, "it is a product of interaction between internal and external forces".[xlix] This means the formulation of desired outcomes which are intended or expected to be consequent upon decisions taken by those in authority or who have the ability to commit the state and to commit a significant fraction of the state towards that end.

Frankel went little further to say that the environment of foreign policy decisions is limitless theoretically, though in practice, the environment circumscribed by the range of interests and the limitations of the power of every single state.[l] Francis defines foreign policy as "the projection abroad of a country's values and aspirations".[li] Legg and James also opined that foreign policy "is a set of objectives with regard to the world beyond the borders of a given social unit and a set of strategies and tactics designed to achieve these objectives".[lii] On the other hand, Frankel again

believes that foreign policy consists "a decisions and actions which involve, to some appreciable extent, relations between one state and others".[liii]

To pursue these, states in the international system whether small or big, rich or poor, strong or weak, democracies or totalitarian systems, within or outside established alliances, use various methods and instruments of foreign policy to influence, sometimes even dictate, the role orientations, objectives and actions of other states. In inter-state relations, therefore, various instruments of foreign policy are often used with varying results. Thus diplomatic manoeuvres, bargaining, negotiations, persuasions, propaganda, economic blockade, moral warfare, blackmail, military coercion and even war are used to achieve foreign policy aims.[liv]

Mbachu defined foreign policy as a set of goals and course of actions a nation wishes to pursue or pursues in respect to the demands or interactions of the internal and external settings as perceived by the decision makers. It is a goal of a state being pursued in her interest in international interactions. It is by nature the international objectives of states. They are export oriented policies which goes through formulation, evaluation and execution. It is both an act performed as well as a process. Thus this made it a link between one state and another.[lv]

According to Alkali, in order to achieve a declared national foreign policy objective, and for a nation to choose one form of foreign policy strategy or the other, serious considerations must be given to the sum total of the tangible and intangible instruments of power available at the disposal of the nation in relation to other nations in the international system.[lvi]

The tangible bases of state power include the size of the population, its demographic configuration, natural resources and their distribution, levels of development, military capability, technology, education and the location of a state within the regional and continental actors. The non-tangible bases that are equally important include among others, the levels of national consciousness, national cohesion and the extent of identification of the people towards the state values, interests, ideals and institutions which are often reflected in the morale and will of the people to commit themselves wholly to a national cause.[lvii] Alkali however, identified countries like Cuba, Libya, Iraq, Iran and the Soviet Union before its collapse, as having shown evidence of people's commitment towards the defence of their national values and sovereignty.[lviii]

Diplomacy

Diplomacy is concerned with the states trying to influence the behaviour of others by peaceful negotiating, and it usually begins with bargaining,[lix] through direct or indirect communication, in an attempt to reach agreement on an issue. This bargaining may not be stated openly among the parties, each of whom recognizes that a move in one direction leads to a response by the other. The bargaining may also be conducted openly in a situation of formal negotiations, where one side offers a formal proposal and the other responds in kind; this is repeated many times over until a compromise has been reached. In either case, reciprocity usually occurs, wherein each side responds to the other's moves in kind.[lx]

Diplomacy holds a paramount importance as an element of national power towards the maintenance of international peace. Thus the significance of diplomacy for the preservation of international peace cannot be overstated. Yet, the issue of power played its usual role during negotiations as states make efforts to benefit more than the others in the bargaining. This is why the states seldom enter diplomatic bargaining or negotiations as power equals. Each would try to have knowledge of its opponent's power potential, as well as information about its own goals.

This is why some states feared the outcome of the bargaining because it is not necessarily going to be mutual. It is not likely to please each of the parties equally.[lxi]

The above statement had therefore suggested that diplomacy is an instrument of foreign policy which relates to organized relations among governments and other non-state actors in the international system and it provides the framework for articulating and securing a nation's foreign policy objectives. Diplomacy is also the application of intelligence and tact in the conduct of inter-state relations. This is achieved through negotiations, arbitration, reconciliation and pacific settlements of disputes between actors.

The International System

This refers to states' interaction within a set of long-established "rules of the game" governing what is considered a state and how states treat each other in the international system.[lxii] International system can also be seen as the set of relationships among the worlds' states, structured according to certain rules and patterns of interaction. Some such rules are explicit, some implicit. They include who is considered a member of the system, what rights and responsibilities the members have, and what kinds of actions and responses normally occur between states.[lxiii]

Realists believe that the international system exists in a state of anarchy (a term that implies not complete chaos or absence of structure and rules, but rather the lack of a central government that can enforce rules.[lxiv] In domestic society within states, governments can enforce contracts, deter citizens from breaking rules, and use their monopoly on legally sanctioned violence to enforce a system of law. Realists contend that no central authority exists to enforce rules and ensure compliance with norms of conduct. This is why some people think that only a world government can solve this problem. Others think that adequate order can be provided by international organizations and agreements, short of world government. But most realists think that international relations cannot escape from a state of anarchy and will continue to be dangerous as a result.[lxv]

The great majority of state interactions closely adhere to norms of behaviour, shared expectations about what behaviour is considered proper. This is why despite its anarchy; the international system is far from chaotic. Norms change over time, slowly, but the most basic norms of the international system have changed little in recent centuries. Two terms are important here: Sovereignty is the most important norm in the international system and balance of power is the most enduring feature of international system.[lxvi]

Sovereignty as the most important norm means, a government has the right, in principle, to do whatever it wants in its own territory. States are separate and autonomous and answer to no higher authority. In principle, all states are equal in status, if not in power.[lxvii] It also means that states are not supposed to interfere in the internal affairs of other states. Although states do try to influence each other (exert power) on matters of trade, alliances, war and so on. They are not supposed to meddle in the internal politics and decision processes of other states. For example, it would be inappropriate for Nigeria to endorse a candidate for Niger's president. However, this rule is often bent in practice. This cannot be unconnected to the lack of a "world police" to punish states if they break an agreement and hence makes enforcement of international agreement difficult.

Balance of power refers to the general concept of one or more states' power being used to balance that of another state or group of states. Balance of power can refer also to any ratio of power capabilities between states or alliances, or it can mean only a relatively equal ratio.[lxviii] Edward described balance of power as a process by which counterbalancing coalitions have repeatedly formed in history to prevent one state from conquering an entire region.[lxix] However, the theory of balance of power argues that such counterbalancing occurs regularly and maintains the stability of the international system.[lxx] The system is stable in that its rules and principles sty the same: state sovereignty does not collapse into a universal empire. This stability does not, however, imply peace; it is rather a stability maintained by means of recurring wars that adjust power relations.[lxxi] Alliances thus play a key role in the balance of power. Building up one's own capabilities against a rival is a form of power balancing, but forming an alliance against a threatening state is often quicker, cheaper and more effective.[lxxii]

Conclusion

When talking international relations, understanding international system and other aforementioned issues discussed is ideal. Being the set of relationships among the world's states, international system is structured by certain rules and patterns of interaction. The modern international system has existed for less than 400 years.[lxxiii] Before then, people were organized into more mixed and overlapping political units such as city-states, empires and feudal fiefs. In the past 200 years the idea has spread that nations (group of people who share a sense of national identity), usually including a language and culture[lxxiv] should have their own states. Most large states today are such nation-states. But since World War II, the decolonization process in much of Asia and Africa has added many new states,[lxxv] the youngest being the Africa's South Sudan.

States therefore are the main units in the interactions occurring in the international system, although static, occupying immovable geographical regions, the safety of the state depends on the behaviour of its people, particularly those holding political office as well as those involved in major international transactions such as international trade.[lxxvi] This is especially important because as already noted, the international system lacks institutions that can give some order to the interactions that occur within it. At times these interactions have resulted in costly conflicts. Thus writings on international relations have been the result of human desire to structure and explain the political interactions of nations in the hope of developing a device for imposing order and meaning on the complexities of international affairs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alkali, R.A. *Issues in International Relations and Nigeria's Foreign Policy*, Kaduna, Northpoint Publishers Ltd., 2003.

Appadorai, A. *The Substance of Politics*, Oxford India Paperbacks, 2004.

Asobie, H.A. 'Decision-Making Models Revisited: An Analysis of the Application of Theories and Models of Foreign Policy Decision-Making to the Study of Nigeria's Foreign Policy', in G.O. Olusanya and R.A. Akindele (eds.), *The Structure and Processes of Foreign Policy Making and Implementation in Nigeria, 1960-1990*, Lagos, National Institute of International Affairs, (NIIA), 1990.

Carr, E.H. *The Twenty Years Crisis, 1919-1939: An Introduction to the Study of International Relations*, New York: Harper Torch books, 1980.

Deutsch, K.W. *The Analysis of International Relations*, New Delhi: Prentice Hall, 1989.

Donelan, M. (ed.), *The Reason of States: A Study in International Political Theory*, London: George Allen and Unwin Publishers, 1978.

George, C.T. & Amawi, A.M. (eds.), *The Theoretical Evolution of International Political Economy*: A Reader, 2nd Ed., London, Oxford University Press, 1997.

Goldstein, J.S. & Pevehouse, J.C. *International Relations, Eighth Edition*, New York, Pearson International, 2009.

Hobbes, T. *Leviathan*, ed. C.B. Macpherson, Harmondsworth, Eng.: Penguin, 1968.

Hoffman, A. 'Nigeria: The Foreign Policy Conundrum', Foreign Policy, 1998.

Jenks, E. *A History of Politics*, Sussex, East Anglia, 1985.

Kant, E. *Idea for a Universal History from a Cosmopolitan Point of View*, Penguin, Reprinted in Kant Selections, Lewis White Beck (ed.), New York, Macmillan, 1988.

Kennedy, P. *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers: Economic Change and Military Conflict from 1500-2000,* Random House, 1987.

Lenin, V.I. *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism,* New York: International Publishers, 1939.

Macridis, R.C. (ed.), *Foreign Policy in World Politics*, U.S.A.: Prentice-Hall International, Eighth ed., 1976.

Machiavelli, N. *The Prince and the Discourse*, New York, Random House, 1940.

Margarate, K.E. *Activist Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*, Cornell. 1998.

Mbachu, O. *Foreign Policy Analysis: The Nigerian Perspective*, Lagos, Medusa Academic Publishers, 2011.

Mingst, K.A. *Essential of International Relations*, London, Norton & Company Inc., 1999.

Morgenthau, H.J. *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, Sixth, edition, New Delhi, Kalyani Publishers, 2012.

Morgenthau, H.J 'The Intellectual and Political Functions of Theory (1970), in J.D. Derian (ed.), *International Theory: Critical Investigations*, London, Macmillan Press Ltd, 1995.

Ofoegbu, R. *Foundation Course in International Relations for African Universities*, London: George Allen and Unwin, 1980.

Robert, S. & George, S. *Introduction to International Relations: Theories and Approaches*, Oxford, OUP, 3rd edition, 2006.

Rosenau, J.N. *Turbulence in World Politics: A Theory of Change and Continuity*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1990.

Rousseau, J.J. *Discourse on the Origin and Foundations of Inequality among Men*, Donald A. Crees, ed. "Political Writings of J.J. Rousseau", Indiana Polis, Hackett Publishing, 1987.

Thucydides, *History of the Peloponnesian War*, rev. ed. Trans. Rex Warner, Harmonsworth, Eng.: Penguin, 1972.

Waltz, K.N. "Realist Thought and Neorealist Theory", in C.W. Kegley, Jr. (ed.), *Controversies in International Relations Theory: Realism and the Neoliberal Challenge,* New York: St. Martins, 1995.

Yandaki, A.I. *The State in Africa: A Critical Study in Historiography and Political Philosophy*, Zaria, Gaskiya Corporation Ltd. 2015.

[i] H.J. Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, Sixth, edition, New Delhi, Kalyani Publishers, 2012, p. 61.

[ii] R.A. Alkali, *Issues in International Relations and Nigeria's Foreign Policy*, Kaduna, Northpoint Publishers Ltd., 2003, p. 14.

[iii] ibid

[iv] J.N. Rosenau, *Turbulence in World Politics: A Theory of Change and Continuity*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1990, p. 117.

[v] R.A. Alkali, *Issues in International Relations and Nigeria's Foreign Policy* op cit, p. 13.

[vi] S. Robert & S. George, *Introduction to International Relations: Theories and Approaches*, Oxford, OUP, 3rd edition, 2006, p. 216.

[vii] K.N. Waltz, "Realist Thought and Neorealist Theory", in C.W. Kegley, Jr. (ed.), *Controversies in International Relations Theory: Realism and the Neoliberal Challenge,* New York: St. Martins, 1995, p. 67-82.

[viii] Of course, idealists or liberalists themselves do not consider their approach unrealistic.

[ix] Thucydides, *History of the Peloponnesian War*, rev. ed. Trans. Rex Warner, Harmonsworth, Eng.: Penguin, 1972.

[x] Niccolo Machiavelli, *The Prince and the Discourse*, New York, Random House, 1940.

[xi] Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, ed. C.B. Macpherson, Harmondsworth, Eng.: Penguin, 1968.

[xii] H.J. Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations…*, op cit.

[xiii] J.J. Rousseau, *Discourse on the Origin and Foundations of Inequality among Men*, Donald A. Crees   ed. "Political Writings of J.J. Rousseau", Indiana Polis, Hackett Publishing, 1987.

[xiv] J. Frankel, Quoted in R.A. Alkali, *Issues in International Relations…*, op cit, p. 15.

[xv] H.J. Morgenthau, op cit.

[xvi] E. Kant, *Idea for a Universal History from a Cosmopolitan Point of View*, Penguin, Reprinted in Kant Selections, Lewis White Beck (ed.), New York, Macmillan, 1988, p. 247.

[xvii] J.S. Goldstein & J.C. Pevehouse, *International Relations, Eighth Edition*, New York, Pearson International, 2009, p. 49.

[xviii] An approach that generally shares the assumption of anarchy (the lack of world government) but does not see this condition as precluding extensive cooperation to realize common gains from economic exchanges. It emphasizes absolute over relative gains and, in practice, a commitment to free trade, free capital flows, and an "open" world economy.

[xix] K.A. Mingst, Essential of International Relations…, op cit. p. 79.

[xx] Ibid p. 81.

[xxi] This refers to the gap between the relatively rich industrialized countries of the North and the relatively poor countries of the South as the most important geographical element at the global level of analysis. The North includes both the West (the rich countries of North America, Western Europe and Japan) and the old East (the former Soviet Union and its bloc of allies). The South includes Latin America, Africa, the Middle East, and much of Asia.

[xxii] The South is often called the *third world,* a term that is still widely used in international relations. These countries are also called "developing" countries or "less-developed" countries (LDCs), in contrast to the developed countries of the North. In international relations, there is a system called South-South Aid through which the inferior ones among them benefited with technical assistance, relief assistance and grants from the superiors. Nigeria is a classical example of the donor state (a hegemon in the ECOWAS region) while countries like Niger, Liberia, Sierra Leone, etc are good example of the receiving states.

[xxiii] A. Appadorai, *The Substance of Politics*, Oxford India Paperbacks, 2004, p. 19.

[xxiv] Ibid p. 21.

[xxv] Ibid p. 31

[xxvi] E.H. Carr, *The Twenty Years Crisis, 1919-1939: An Introduction to the Study of International Relations*, New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1980, p. 224.

[xxvii] ibid

[xxviii] H. David, Quoted in R.A. Alkali, *Issues in International Relations…*, p. 49.

[xxix] E. Jenks, *A History of Politics*, Sussex, East Anglia, 1985, p. 71.

[xxx] J.S. Goldstein & J.C. Pevehouse, *International Relations…*, op. cit. p. 516.

[xxxi] Quoted in P. Kennedy, *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers: Economic Change and Military Conflict from 1500-2000,* Random House, 1987, p. 58.

[xxxii] Ibid

[xxxiii] Ibid p. 59.

[xxxiv] A. Appadorai, *The Substance of Politics…*, op. cit. p. 36.

[xxxv] Ibid p. 37

[xxxvi] J.S. Goldstein & J.C. Pevehouse, *International Relations…,* op. cit. p.15

[xxxvii] ibid

[xxxviii] K.E. Margarate, *Activist Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*, Cornell. 1998, P. 105.

[xxxix] J.S. Goldstein & J.C. Pevehouse op cit., *International Relations*, p.51.

[xl] ibid

[xli] O. Mbachu, *Foreign Policy Analysis: The Nigerian Perspective*, Lagos, Medusa Academic Publishers, 2011, p. 29.

[xlii] A. Hoffman, 'Nigeria: The Foreign Policy Conundrum', Foreign Policy, 1998, p. 147.

[xliii] H.A. Asobie, 'Decision-Making Models Revisited: An Analysis of the Application of Theories and Models of Foreign Policy Decision-Making to the Study of Nigeria's Foreign Policy', in G.O. Olusanya and R.A. Akindele (eds.), *The Structure and Processes of Foreign Policy Making and Implementation in Nigeria, 1960-1990*, Lagos, National Institute of International Affairs, (NIIA), 1990, p. 112.

[xliv] Ibid p. 32

[xlv] O. Mbachu, *Foreign Policy Analysis…*, op. cit. pp. 31-33.

[xlvi] H. Kissinger, Quoted in O. Mbachu, ibid p. 31.

[xlvii] K.W. Deutsch, *The Analysis of International Relations*, New Delhi: Prentice Hall, 1989, p. 87.

[xlviii] M. Donelan (ed.), *The Reason of States: A Study in International Political Theory*, London: George Allen and Unwin Publishers, 1978, p. 117.

[xlix] ibid

[l] R.C. Macridis (ed.), *Foreign Policy in World Politics*, U.S.A.: Prentice-Hall International, Eighth ed., 1976, p. 1.

[li] Ibid p. 3.

[lii] Quoted in R.A. Alkali, Issues in International Relations…, op. cit, p.29.

[liii] R.C. Macridis (ed.), *Foreign Policy in World Politics…*, op. cit.

[liv] P.A. Reynolds, *An Introduction to International Relations for African Universities*, London: George Allen and Unwin, 1980, p. 1.

[lv] O. Mbachu, *Foreign Policy Analysis…*, op. cit, p. 2.

[lvi] R.A. Alkali, *Issues in International Relations*, op. cit, p. 30.

[lvii] R.C. Macridis (ed.), *Foreign Policy in World Politics…*, op. cit, p. 3.

[lviii] R.A. Alkali, op. cit.

[lix] This implies the ability of a state to achieve a desired end in a negotiation, as determined by her relative strengths or weaknesses.

[lx] R. Ofoegbu, *Foundation Course in International Relations for African Universities*, London: George Allen and Unwin, 1980, p. 235.

[lxi] C.T. George & A.M. Amawi (eds.), *The Theoretical Evolution of International Political Economy*: A Reader, 2nd Ed., London, Oxford University Press, 1997, p. 278.

[lxii] J.S. Goldstein & J.C. Pevehouse, *International Relations…*, op. cit. p.49.

[lxiii] Ibid, 13

[lxiv] B. Hedley, *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*, Columbia: Vintage Books, 2002, p. 202.

[lxv] P. Burke, *History and Social Theory*, Oxford: Polity Press, 1995, p. 31.

[lxvi] Ibid p. 33

[lxvii] K. Mingst, *Essentials of International Relations…*, op. cit. p. 81.

[lxviii] C.O. Peter & G.F. Rose, *The Balance of Power: Stability and Instability in International Systems*, Cambridge, 1989, p. 152.

[lxix] ibid

[lxx] K. Waltz, 'International Structure, National Force, and the Balance of World Power', *Journal of International Affairs*: NIIA, Vol. 21, No. 2, 1967, p. 229.

[lxxi] O.K. Robert & J.S. Nye, *Power and Interdependence: World Politics in Transition*, Boston: Little Brown, 1977, p. 107.

[lxxii] H. John, *Idealist Internationalism and the Security Dilemma*, Princeton: 1950, p. 157.

[lxxiii] Ibid p. 113

lxxiv C. Brown, "International Affairs" in R.E. Goodin and Philip Pettit (eds.), A Companion to Contemporary Political Philosophy, Oxford: Blackwell, 1996, pp. 515-526.

lxxv ibid

lxxvi ibid