

Theory of International Relations

The International Relations Science is defined by various ways to include the diplomatic- strategic relations, trans-borders dealings, global community, globalization, and all of the three interpretations have a relation with the international rivers management. The first two interpretations have a direct importance for the planners who focus on the rivers basins while the third interpretation has a relation with those who have wider point of view about the water in forms such as the export crops (hypothetical water), and of course the readers of this book.

Al Fabin Group, which was established in Britain in 1884, advocated the policy of the cautious and graduate political change, and the liberal state which was supported by Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States of America in the period 1913-1921. The policy, which is called now “Al Tobaweyah”, had come out after the World War II in an attempt to explain and avoid more of such crises, and such policy had been promoted for the thoughts of the political democratic regimes, determination of the national destiny, and the international institutional structures. The fundamental presumption was the existence of a harmony between the real interests. Whereas the

harmony was not perceived sometimes as in the initial popularity of the World War I in 1914-1918, as there was a necessity for some cautious explanation. The Fabians attributed the initial popularity of the War to the public ignorance of the peoples with their best interests and rational acts. By the end of the War, after the massacres which have no meaning in (Ypres), (Somme), (Passchendaele) battles, and poems of (Wilfred Owen) and (Siegrried Sasson), the popularity evaporated and the honesty of the Fabians logic was evident.

These ideas had been developed for a period of one decade after the World War I until the rising of strong dictators in Europe (Mussolini in 1992, Stalin in 1928, Hitler in 1933, Franco in 1936) has destroyed such thoughts and such matter led to the World War II. The realistic Tobaweyah thoughts were completed by the school led by Carr (1939), Morgentau (1948), which suggests that the countries seek the interests as the power language determines. The realism emphasizes that the countries are the main executing parties in a group which includes all of the international corporations and nongovernmental organizations. The contained thing in this thought is summarized in that the countries have national specific interests distinguished from the interests of those who hold the authority at any certain time, and that such interests dominate the behavior of the country.

This analysis, which was supporting the power policy, required some modification in the sixties and seventies of the twentieth century following the learnt lessons from the cold war, in particular the Cuban crisis, which took the world to the edge of the nuclear war. In analyses after the crisis, the countries had decided that nothing can justify the war.

Vietnam War has showed that both the neither economic power nor military power was sufficient to guarantee the victory in the conflict, and this opinion is supported by the continued fighting in Iraq. The analysts of the international relations have developed the multiplicity theory which has declared that the other organizations – the international companies, United Nations Agencies, regional communities such as European community and North Atlantic Treaty Organization joined the national- countries in the form of executors while the business transactions and commercial transactions joined the diplomatic- strategic relations in the text of the international relations opera. Keohane and Nye (1997) have distinguished between this multiplicity and the realistic theory on three bases. First: Channels of the multi access have allowed the substitute dialoguers to interact in the various forums. Second: The power will have less importance.

Third: There is no hierarchy for the issues. The second point admits the mechanisms of power such as the economic blockades, commercial sanctions. The last point cancels the emphasis on the security as the most important issue among the countries, and declares that other issues will dominate periodically the relations for a period of time. The realism, which was redefined and was called as the new realism (Waltz, 1979), refused the multiplicity on the basis that it is superficial, and emphasized on the necessity of declaring that the fundamental system is chaotic instead of being pyramidal.. Waltz was often interested in the polar dual relations between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and he drove on a pretext that the balance of power is the important thing inside the chaotic regime. The classic economic was used to confirm that the countries should adopt the behavior of the buyers and sellers in the free market, or should get out of the commercial businesses circuit. The countries create the structure of the international relations from their cooperation.

The liberal reaction is represented in adapting the multiplicity very closely with the model of the new realism so that the distinguishing between the two has become hardly possible (Ashley, 1984). Despite that, Grieco (1988) distinguished between the new liberal belief that

the countries evaluate their gains of the cooperation in appropriation with the other countries. He confirmed that the public opinion surveys support the new liberal attitude. But those who see in the growth of the international corporations a desire for more cooperation refuse to analyze the same.

Since the early debate about the multi opinion, the regime theory has come out (Krasner, 1983), which is defined on the basis that it is a group of the implied or express principles, criteria, laws and procedures of decision making on which the expectations of the executors meet in a certain field of the international relations. And it has led to adopt the game theory as means to explain the reason that rational selfish people may cooperate within a chaotic regime. But it has welcomed implicitly the Tobaeyah thoughts by explaining the importance of the dominating (ruling) power to establish a practical frame (stability of domination) of the game.¹ And without the compulsory power of the dominant, the interesting and desire of the entities in the cooperation as deemed by Hobbes (1588-1679) is an impossible thing, or as deemed by Locke (1632-1702), are achieved only at the semi optimal levels² and Brown discusses the role of the dominant, and he concludes that it is unnecessary for a country to be

strong in particular until it accomplishes the role despite that some power is required until the other countries accept its leadership.

What is called the English School is based on the concept of the international society (Dunne, 1995), and it adopts the real focus on the countries as sole executing parties. The countries form a society in which the criteria of the international law and diplomacy govern their reactions, and (usually) they put restrictions on their businesses. And this matter was suiting the world comfortably as it was before the World War I, and which ruled to a considerable extent by the Europeans with their joint cultural values. But it entails a problem in the modern world which is more diversified culturally. Brown suggests that the European concept of the national country was rooted throughout the world. Then he reduced the problem to the minimum extent. But the observers of China and Russia in the present times may reject such simple explanation. Nardin suggests that the miscellaneous countries constitute voluntarily a practical league which sole purpose is procedural so that they allow the countries to live peacefully and with justice to the extent of eliminating the specified purposes (Nardin, 1983). The fact that criteria are derived from a world of which center is Europe, with my respect to Brown, have nothing to do with the matter because the countries do not give a privilege on any

one concept “for welfare. And such declaration would not be issued except from a European: in the light of the reactions in the past few years on the religious principles and the right of the executor for the nuclear power we can confirm that the Western concepts of “welfare” have in virtue of the real matter a privilege on the other concepts. The Italian philosopher Gramsci (1891-1937) confirmed similarly that the cultural control, i.e. the workers adoption of the perspective of the ruling class, explains the absence of the wide –ranging Marxian revolution.

Application

Many authors use the international relations theory to analyze the management process of water in the international rivers, and the water rocky layers. And mostly they use the term of “Water Policy”. Waterbury (1979 and 2002) wrote extensively about Nile. Chapman and Thompson (1995) wrote about the Gang, and Ohlsson (1955) about each of the two rivers, and Turton (1997) about Zambezi, and Allan (2001) about Middle East and North Africa Region, and among these writers, Allan check only the problem of predicting the behavior of the countries rather than explaining it retroactively.

As the international relations theory deals with the South where Nile and Gang- Brahmaputra – Magna are located, the two rivers which this study covers. It focuses often on the structural relations between the North and South.⁴ The analysis of the center-edge (Biswas) and similar critical methods of these relations largely on the economic reliability. The review of the papers submitted in meetings between the riparian states on these two rivers suggest that south – south relations are discussed according to the international relations theories which have been reviewed above rather than doing such matter in the context of a model related to the South. Allan (2001) indicates that the differences between the internal and external construction types which are parallel in the Middle East and North Africa Region, but such matter is attributed to the differences in the speed of adopting the “new thinking” of management of the water resources (the strangers are more familiar with such matter) rather than a separate opinion from the world. And even in the Middle East and North Africa Region, it seems that Sharia which is enriched with the indications of using water plays a small role in the relations about the international water resources.⁵

Waterbury (2002) analyzed in details and very clearly “the limitations of the team work” for Nile starting with a series of questions about the

nature of the problem and the method by which the various countries perceive. He starts with the logical introduction which is summarized in that the cooperation in using the trans-border resources is a desirable thing, and will tend to enhance the recreation of the larger number of those who own the outlet to the resource or live on it". Crow and Singh (2000) analyzes also the Indian relations with Nepal and Bangladesh on the basis of the logical introduction which is summarized in that there are earnings which can be gained from the multi parties cooperation in the water issues. None of these writers feel the need for explaining that these presumed earnings already exist. Waterbury continued saying that the main issue in the Nile basin is not summarized in that some of the riparian states of common coasts can utilize the public interest for cooperation, but it is summarized considerably in that a number of the riparian states see a little of the value in the public interest itself. In the following analysis, Waterbury explains that these riparian states have good bases to believe that there is a little value in the cooperation, and thereby the echo of Roger's conclusion before thirty years comes back in relation to the Indian- Bangladeshi cooperation in Gang – Brahmaputra- Magna (Chaturvedi and Rogers, 1975) ⁶.

If these riparian states are right – and the evidence contained in chapter three suggests that there is a good belief that they are so- one of the fundamental logic introductions of the integral management of water resources shall be pulled down, as well as supposing that the countries will adopt A Tobaweyah relation with the partner riparian states.

Explanation Of The Historical Behavior Of The Country

Allen (2001) tried to specify which of these main intellectual schools provides the greatest explanatory power for the behavior of the water policy which was observed, and extended its work below.

As long as there are no examples for the behavior which Al Tobaweyah explains, as defined originally, it seems that the acceptance of the conclusions of the international relations theory which are summarized in that the countries do not act in this way is a safe thing. Anyone also can get rid of the explanations taken from the English School at least in relation to the water management whereas the sharing of the countries in both of the two rivers stated in this study is a purposeful thing – control of the water resources and utilization thereof by construction of the structures.⁷

The regime theory is used by both of Ergil (1991) and Kibaroglu (1998) in their analysis to include the Kurdish issues in the Syrian – Turkish water policy. Chaturved and Rogers use the game theory, which is of the characteristics of the regime theory, in their analysis of the deals in the near Gang, and such theory is used by Waterbury and Whittington (1998) in their analysis of the deals between the construction of small dams by Ethiopia in the heights and Toshka development project in Egypt. Kru's analysis of India's behavior in the United Nations at the time of Bangladesh's appeal about the water becomes harmonious with the regime theory.⁸

Waterbury (1979), Lowi (1990-1993) and Kru (1995) use the realistic theory and confirm that the countries create the facts on the ground by construction of big structures for storage and transfer such as Ataturk Dam, Faraka Dam, High Dam in Aswan and Toshka project. The agreements of the type which Britain signed in relation to Nile are facts on the ground by the power itself as evident later in the analysis of the international law. Inside India, it seems that the relations among the states about water are explained by the realistic theory, and there is a little of the evidences for the existence of Al Tobawi cooperation in

the rivers such as Gang – Brahmaputra- Ganges in which several Indian states share.

The process of what is called “Route 2” (series of the meetings of nongovernmental organizations from the riparian states) in Gang (Adhikari et al, 2000), and the inclusion of the civil construction forum in the initiative of Nile basin are two examples for the construction in multi channels, which is one of the characteristics of the regime theory, and the new liberalism as well.

Thus, we find that both of these two theories about the international relations (realism and regime theory) can be applied to Nile and Gang – Brahmaputra- Ganges. This situation becomes harmonious with Allen’s analysis of the international relations in the Middle East and North Africa Region. Despite that, the results which he concluded are considered as a warning to every person looking for explanations as he shows that although the security policy (realism) can be used in the retroactive explanation for three routes for using the water resources in Israel throughout the period 1947-1999, however it cannot predict what will happen in future. Other persons (Waterbury, 1979, Shapland, 1997) reached a similar conclusion.