
A REVIEW OF THE IDEALIST, REALIST AND FUNCTIONALIST PERSPECTIVES ON MAINTAINING INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY

By

Ahayere Christian
MSc Graduating Student
Department of International Relations and Strategic Studies
Igbinedion University Okada

&

Madu Magnus Emeka
Department of History and International Studies
Nigeria Police Academy, Wudil, Kano State

Abstract

This paper reviews three key theories—Idealism, Realism, and Functionalism—in explaining efforts to achieve international peace and security. It highlights their core assumptions, strengths, and limitations, especially in addressing modern global conflicts. The study concludes by emphasizing the need for a new, morally grounded approach to global peace.

Keywords: *International Peace and Security, International Relations, Diplomacy, Alliance Formations*

Historical Background

From the early history of man, it has been obvious that due to personal, group, national and regional struggles for various interests, the society has remained chaotic, and volatile due to the conflicts that result from struggles over power, influence and scarce resources contended by man. In the chronological development of human civilization, by the time the society became politically organized, the interaction within the human society became politically conditioned, giving rise to the struggle for power between groups and individuals to determine in the words of Laswell, "who gets what, when and how" (Watson 1992). Thus, the focus of human interaction revolves around the nature of law governing individuals, groups and states over the distribution of resources between and among them. What therefore has been prevailing in both the ancient and modern society has been survival of the fittest. Henceforth, group interaction became characterized with rivalry, disputes, threats, intimidation, intervention, invasion, conquest and other hostile and warlike relations. Naturally, since the society, inhabited by man cannot exist without crisis and conflicts, the concern has remained how to manage those conflicts and crises to ensure the maintenance of peace and security within, between and among nations.

On that note, many people have shared views on how to promote international peace and security by explaining what should constitute international peace and security, and the threats to international peace and security with possible proposals. For instance, in the view of Halliday (1994) world peace and security will be promoted through the treatment of all people with kindness, regardless of race, gender orientation, sexual orientation and religion. Other conditions include the creation of a peaceful affirmation/mantra, avoidance of engagement in violence of any kind and banning of the purchase of weapons of mass destruction (WMD). He went further to mention the causes of the loss of World Peace such as: religion, governance and politics. These issues and their allied topics of human rights, justice and so forth have historically caused many of the world's most significant conflicts and continue to do so as often these issues are the most fundamental in the structure of a society.

Howard (1976), equally identified the factors that destroy peace to include; conflict, injustice, inequality, discrimination, and lack of understanding or empathy. To him, these factors can lead to tension, violence, and unrest, ultimately undermining peaceful coexistence. To him world peace can also be achieved through upholding democracy. Jackson and Sorenensen (1999) highlighted the five principles of peaceful co-existence that can make international peace and security to be achieved such as: mutual respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity, mutual non-aggression, non-interference in each other's internal affairs, equality and mutual benefit, and peaceful coexistence. In the process, idealist thinkers suggested that world peace can be achieved through having international bodies that will ensure that every nation upholds world peace. Such a body is United Nations and other world organizations that ensure that every country has responsibility of promoting peace.

The Concepts, International Peace and Security:

Peace and security have been defined and explained from various viewpoints depending on the angle the opinion comes from. In this paper, the focus will be on international peace and global security. There are two common ways of thinking about peace: negative and positive peace (Kant 1992). Negative Peace is defined as the absence of visible violence, such as war, which might be achieved by dialogue or mediation rather than physical force. Negative peace refers to the absence of direct violence. Positive peace refers to the absence of indirect and structural violence, and is the concept that most peace and conflict researchers adopt. The basic distinction between positive and negative peace is that societal peace can be seen at least in two forms: A simple silence of arms or absence of war. Absence of war accompanied by particular requirements for the mutual settlement of relations, which are characterized by justice, mutual respect, respect for law, and good will. https: Peace is a stress-free state of security and calmness that comes when there's no fighting or war, everything coexisting in perfect harmony and freedom.

Peace is specifically the absence of war and violence, and can be celebrated by a temporary ceasefire in a combat zone (Wikipedia.orghttp).

World peace is an idea of a world without violence, where nations try to work with each other. World peace could mean equal human rights, technology, free education for everyone, engineering, availability of medicine, diplomats and/or an end to all forms of fighting.

According to the UN Charter the United Nations have the primary responsibilities '[t]o maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace (Agba, A. E 2020)

International Security

The concept of security encompasses every aspect of life but the focus here is on international security which denotes the action taken to prevent and deal with conflicts, and protect people and their way of life. This may involve military action, peacekeeping, capacity building and diplomatic agreements such as treaties and conventions (Halliday 1994). International security is a term which refers to the measures taken by states and international organizations, such as the United Nations, European Union, and others, to ensure mutual survival and safety. It focuses on issues of power politics and international order, peace and war, strategy and diplomacy. Its main focus is on the phenomenon of, and theoretical reflection on, 'violence' in its broader context. It requires a deep understanding of those complex issues that militate against security and contribute to finding effective solutions (Jackson and Sorensen 1999). International security studies provide people with the tools to analyze and address security challenges both traditional and emerging, in a rapidly changing world. In a world of proliferating conflicts, sustaining peace has become a complex task which demands for a comprehensive approach including political process; safety and security; rule of law and human rights; social services; core government functions and economic revitalization and livelihoods.

Conflicts and War as a Generic Phenomena

From the ancient and medieval era until the peace of Westphalia that laid the foundation of the modern nation states, the world has been characterized with the rising and falling of kingdoms, empires and chiefdoms occasioned by conflicts and wars of invasion, annexation, conquests and dominations. The more people expect possible normalization of international relations, the more conflicts generating issues around the world crops up (Cooper 1996). However, the end of World War II marked a decisive shift in the global system. After the war, only two great world powers remained: the United States and the Soviet Union. Although some other important states existed, almost all states were understood within the context of their relations with the two superpowers.

This global system was called **Bipolar** because the system centered on two great powers. Since the end of the Cold War and the fall of the Soviet Union, the nature of the world has changed again. Only one superpower remains, leading some scholars to label the new international system **Unipolar**. Others point to the increasing economic power of some European and Asian states and label the new system Multi-polar. To some extent, both terms are accurate. The United States has the world's most powerful military, which supports the uni-polar view, but the U.S. economy is not as powerful, relative to the rest of the world, lending credence to the multi-polar view.

Political Miscalculation by Francis Fukuyama

After the collapse of Soviet Union, Francis Fukuyama, a Japanese published a book he captioned "The End of History and The Last Man. In the Book he envisioned that the collapse of Soviet Union will surely result to a peaceful world as the main opposing power of Western values, capitalism and democracy has given way ...Contrary to his view, another political postulator, Samuel Huntington, an Englishman, in opposition to the views of Fukuyame published his own work, titled "The Clash of Civilizations. In his own view, the collapse of Soviet Union will not guarantee world peace; instead, it will eventually be overtaken by another intractable cultural conflict that might be unprecedented in human history (Cooper, 1996). In the justification of Samuel Huntington's postulations, the collapsed of the Soviet Union was followed by the September 11 terrorist attacks in United States of America, the protests and political crises in the Middle East and African countries, which started in 2010 and called the Arab Spring, the acquisition and tests of nuclear weapons by India, Pakistan, North Korea and Iran as well as the unrestrained spread of weapons of mass destruction across nations dramatically, affected the international politics differently than in the Cold War period. Additionally, terrorism's spreading global threat shook the international system in which IR discipline faced a new era.

Alliance and Counter-Alliance as New Dimensions of Threat to Peace and Security:

From the medieval era alliance and counter alliance formations has remained a major approach by nations to oppose others and it has been responsible for the cause of major wars. In the proxy war between US and its NATO allies that are countering the Russian invasion of Ukraine, alliances have already been going on. While US and NATO members are on the same page in support of Ukraine, Russia has on its own formed allies to counter US and NATO member countries. For instance, while US and NATO are on one side (FOXNEWS, April 14, 2024) below are the countries supporting Russia in its invasion of Ukraine:

- Belarus: Moscow's loyal ally.
- Iran: replenishing Russian arms stockpile.
- North Korea: Russia's newfound ally.

- Syria: Moscow's Middle Eastern stronghold.
- China: Kremlin's Biggest Global Partner.
- India: historical ties to Russia

To some observers of the Sino-Russian relationship, Beijing has given more support to Moscow than expected since the outbreak of war, a conflict that has disrupted global trade, energy and food security. Russia has been widely described as an energy superpower; as it has the world's largest natural gas reserves, 2nd-largest coal reserves, 8th-largest oil reserves, and the largest oil reserves in Europe.

Russia has deep cultural, economic, and political bonds with Ukraine, and in many ways Ukraine is central to Russia's identity and vision in the world including family ties. Generally, Russia and Ukraine have strong family bonds that go back centuries. Despite the closeness with Russia, Ukraine believes that “it is only through NATO membership that it can experience true security in the face of repeated Russian aggression,” the Ukrainian senators said in a statement. “Their fight has been a stand against corrupt crony authoritarianism and they have earned a secure and lasting peace within NATO.” When Russian troops invaded Crimean peninsula, Putin said that the Crimean people were aimed “to ensure proper conditions for the people of Crimea to be able to freely express their will,” whilst Ukraine and other nations argue that such intervention is a violation of Ukraine's sovereignty. However, he invaded Ukraine because he believed that NATO was weak, that his efforts to regain control of Ukraine by other means had failed, and that installing a pro-Russian government. Despite the strength of Russia, The collective military capabilities of the 30 countries that make up NATO outnumber Russia in terms of aircraft, at 20,633 to 4,182, and in naval power, with 2,151 military ships, to 598. Russia's ground combat vehicle capacity is more competitive, however, with 12,566 main battle tanks, to 12,408 (Newspoting, April 4, 2014)

The Failure of International organizations in Ensuring Peace and Security

The inability of international organizations to play an effective role in these crises and the increasing number of human rights violations both at regional and global basis led to questioning the effectiveness of the rules of managing international relations. The lack of feasible solutions to regional and global crises have also displayed weaknesses in the theories of managing International Relations (IR) and diplomacy, leading to the need for the exploration of innovative approaches of managing international relations and diplomacy. The above mentioned recent events and the newly emerging threats, risks, and uncertainties need to be responded to with possible innovative postulations as the weaknesses in the current major views have not led the world to the desired destination.

Theories of Maintaining International Peace and Security

Considering the character of the international system, political thinkers and peace lovers have at different times, initiated ideas and practices geared toward securing cooperation and accommodation that is a consideration for peace and security in the contemporary system.

But such ideas of those intellectual fathers of the contemporary international system vary because they were influenced by varying social, economic, political and ideological conditions. Thus, since the thinking and behavior of men are products of their psycho-social milieu, it becomes imperative for the thinking and orientations of the forebears of the contemporary international system to diverge. For instance, their point of departure is on the frameworks for peace and security. Yet, there is overwhelming reasons to conclude that the ancestors are in the common graveyard of consensus on acknowledging the seeming malignancy of conflict and war and the need to have peace and security in the international system. For ease of understanding, their divergent views are organized into three philosophical orientations as follows: The Idealist/Utopian view, the realist/pragmatic view and the functionalist/political economy view.

The Idealist Doctrine

This is a classical view about the international system which deplores conflict and war as evil, destructive and wasteful. It proposes peace in the international system through cooperation and accommodation in a one world international system or world federalism under world government. Idealism often derogatorily called utopianism is premised on legal approach to peace. Essentially, as a doctrine of peace through law, it “seeks to limit or prevent war by international treaty, negotiation procedures and the growth of international organizations” (Jackson et al 1999, p. 10). The decisive push for this idea was the harrowing experience of the First World War (1914-1918), which recorded millions of casualties. According to Jackson et al's (1999) account:

It was driven by a widely felt determination never to allow human suffering on such a scale to happen again. That desire not to repeat the same catastrophic mistake required coming to grips with the problem of total warfare between the mechanized armies of modern industrial states which were capable of inflicting mass destruction. The war was a devastating experience for millions of people, and particularly for young soldiers who were conscripted into the armies and were slaughtered by the million, especially in the trench warfare on the Western Front.

Some battles resulted in tens of thousands, and sometimes 100,000 casualties' or even more.

The thinking by the proponents of this idea is that the First World War was in no small measure attributable to the egoistic and short-sighted calculations and miscalculations of autocratic leaders in the heavily militarized countries involved, especially Germany and Austria. In this regard, the autocratic leaders were inclined to take the fatal decisions that led their countries into war because of their apparent irrationality and power drunkenness. The antidote therefore, is to reform both the international system that is without a central ruler and the domestic structures of autocratic countries. The argument is that the lack of sovereign authority is the greatest source of violence in the international system.

Schumann (1954, p.485) amplifies this by positing that “men who live without government live inescapably by the ways of violence”. This implies that the international system without a central authority is like a 'jungle', so to speak, where dangerous beasts roam and the strong and cunning rule. But in the idealist view, a reformed international system with a supranational authority in the form of international organization backed by international law is the appropriate place where the beasts are put into cages (i.e. into a kind of 'zoo') that could guarantee permanent peace. Therefore, the form of the international system through the establishment of a kind of a world government is according to the idealist doctrine, the only path to avoid major disasters occasioned by great wars.

The summary of the idealist doctrine is that through a rational and intelligently designed international organization, it should be possible to put an end to war and to achieve more or less permanent peace. This is driven by the assumption that it may be possible to do away with states and states-people, foreign ministries, armed forces, and other agents and instruments of international conflict by taming states and states-people and subjecting them to the appropriate international organizations, institutions, and laws. In the alternative, the idealist thinking is that state system could be overthrown or reformed in several conceivable ways. What is contemplated is a single state in the international system in the appearance of a world empire which could acquire ever-increasing power and come to dominate the whole. A world empire would then be established. By so doing, states will gradually lose their power to international organizations which will perform more and more of the tasks of states as the world become increasingly interdependent. States may volunteer to give up their sovereignty and to establish a world government because they feel that existing 'international anarchy' makes war too probably and costly. Proponents of this view are Hugo de Groot, Professor Woodrow Wilson, Immanuel Kant, Karl Marx, Kenneth Clinton Wheare, and many other renowned thinkers.

The shortcomings of the Idealist view

These proponents of idealist theory came up with innocent and progressive mind in search of how to ensure world peace and security after the devastating and catastrophic effects of the first and Second World War. Their postulations could have been a perfect one but there are some inherent contradictions in the process of actualizing their view, such as: religion, ethno/racial historical affiliations, and preferential treatment of members. For instance, within the international/world organization, there is always a sentimental treatment among the members of the same religious faith, while antagonizing others. On that note, religious discrimination and supports impacts on the world organization policies as evidenced in the present crisis in the middle East.

Another factor that creates division in the international system is ethno/racial inclinations. Representatives of the same ethnic or racial cleavage naturally support the interest and views of their members. For instance, European countries always support their member on issues likewise other groups.

Also, language is another factor that integrates people while discriminating others. For instance, in ECOWAS meetings in Abuja, in any vote, the francophone West African countries always carry the day while putting the Anglophone countries in a disadvantage. The argument here is that even if there is a strong world body, there will be internal conflicts that will create disunity and insecurity.

The Realist Doctrine

The realist thinking is a reaction against what is generally regarded by its fore-fathers and their progenies as the “foolish expectations” of abolishing or minimizing conflict and war in the international system through the establishment of a supranational authority. It starts from the position that states in the international system assume the character of human nature which they conceive as dangerous and untrustworthy. The realist thinkers are unanimous in emphasizing the dark side of human behavior. Thus, just like human beings, there is little expectation that interests of one state and others will be complementary. Ultimately, the realist view is that the world is made of clashing interests and the belief that a global harmony of interest exists is rejected. The realist argument runs basically to the effect that, unless a state is secure, it cannot be sure that it will survive and, if it does not survive, it will not be able to fulfill any other goals favoring its citizens' welfare. Schuman (1969: 279) reinforces this view in his assertion that “since survival is the first law of life, the first duty of diplomats is the promotion of national security”. The summary of the realist proposition is as follows.

Power maximization, the most central of the realist argument is that states have no choice but to maximize their power because of the anarchic character of the international political system in which they have to operate.

The justification is because the international political system has no central authority to resolve disputes and to allocate scarce resource. Therefore, it then behooves each state actor in the international system to rely on itself for protection against external threat and to obtain what it can for itself. As such, all states must seek power because only with it will they be able to protect themselves and advance the well-being of their citizens. This makes power to become an inevitable feature of the international system without a central authority. In this connection, the high point of the realist perspective 'power is the ability of state to maintain its own existence (Crabb, 1968:12).

Military strength The belief that military strength is the most important aspect of power is also implicit or explicitly stated in the works of the realist ancestors who strongly argued that the power capability of states are essentially geared to their ability to wage war or effectively to threaten it. Belief in the importance of military strength is derived from the expectation that a state whose armies have conquered the enemy's forces and have occupied its territory can then impose its will on the defeated people. The conqueror is seen to have what Russell called “naked power”, which according to him refers to “such... power of the butcher over the sheep, of a victorious army over a vanquished nation and of the police over detected conspirators”. The use of force is viewed as the ultimate and the most serious type of state action.

Inevitability of conflicts: The realist thinking starts from the position that at root one's fellow man is a dangerous and untrustworthy creature. Moreover, there is little expectation that his interests and others will be complementary. The realist view is that the world is made of clashing interests and the belief that a global harmony of interest exists is rejected. Internationally, the realist expects the wishes and interests of a state to be opposed by others. The things that men and states want such as wealth, prestige and, of course power do not and cannot exist in sufficient quantities for all to be satisfied and conflict is the inevitable result. Thus, Hobbes had observed that: Moreover, considering that men's appetites carry them to one and the same end; which end sometimes can neither be enjoyed in common, nor divided, it followed, that the stronger must enjoy it alone, and that it must be decided by battle that is the stronger. For the realist therefore, conflict is natural. This perhaps explains the deluge of theoretical propositions in this regard. For instance, Dutt (1956:26) described relations between states as “ceaseless conflict, sometimes breaking out into open war”. The reason for this aspect of the realist contribution is that states in the international system lack harmonious interest and this makes the international system to be basically conflict-ridden. States are always on the alert for threat or potential threats. In other words, they guard against the capabilities of others rather than the intentions.

Invariably, the realist doctrine acknowledges conflict and war as evil but disagrees on its abolition. According to this view, war is necessary evil that will ironically bring about peace through balance of terror and mutual deterrence otherwise the international system will be plunged into mutually assured destruction. Dr. Kwame Nkrumah believed that war is an instrument of peace. Hence he posited that if you want peace you prepare for war because without revolution there will be no resolution. Realists believe that war has a positive attribute and this is why they are opposed to its abolition. In the realist thinking, no state would go to war if it knows it would lose more than it would gain and that all wars could be avoided if their outcome could be discovered in advance—the loser—to-be would give in without suffering the expense of fighting. This apparently, implies that the most peaceful situation should be one where one side is clearly superior in terms of military capability. Therefore, an ability to retaliate against an enemy who has struck first to the extent that he will suffer 'unacceptable damage,' is a way out of the debate about superiority and equality as sources of peace in the international system. They based their argument on the inherent selfish and dark side of human nature which is prone to violence. Therefore, the solution is violence qua violence after which, the survivor would have learnt the bitter lesson of not challenging the stronger.

A related theme in much realist writing is that the over-throw or reform of the state system as canvassed by the idealists is a utopia. Wars, it is stressed usually occur because of conflict of interests between groups. While such conflicts exist, global peace is unlikely because some groups will be willing to use violence to try to get their way. Thus, the establishment of a world government might mean a simple replacement of international war with 'civil' war.

According to the realists, even “general and complete disarmament” would not substantially affect this situation because man, if he wishes, can fight with sticks and stones or even his bare hands.

Fundamentally, states accustomed to struggling for power cannot be expected to give up voluntarily as they would fear the vulnerability which would follow. They will neither trust other states also to give up their power nor allow other bodies (such as international organizations) to look after the interests of their citizens on a permanent and irrevocable basis. The proponents therefore encourage arms buildup and arms race as a desideratum to peace and security in the international system. Major ancestors of this philosophical orientation include Thucydides, Hobbes, Niccolo Machiavelli, St. Augustine, Hans Morgenthau, E.H. Carr, etc.

The Functionalist alternative

The realist pessimistic view of the anarchical international system appeared to have shaped the trends of world politics between 1930s and 1950s far better than the idealist optimistic conception of the international system.

Thus realism became the dominant way of thinking about the international system until in the post-second world War era when a new thinking emerged emphasizing cooperation and international institutions instead of the realist glorification of struggle for power and survival between the United States and the Soviet Union and their political and military alliances (Jackson et al 1999). So, although realism seemingly won the contention about the nature of the international system, there are still competing perspectives that refused to accept permanent defeat. This new way of thinking became known as functionalism and is also labeled as neoliberalism. The promoters of the alternative thinking were the remnants of the earlier idealism that repudiated its utopian excesses but believed in the ideas about the possibility of progress and change in the international system through trade and investment, travel and communication. Thus, functionalism advocates building on existing foundations, extending the network of international agencies and increasing their powers

Arguably, the practice of this idea originated in the nineteenth century as a result of the rapid technological progress and the exploitation of new sources of energy. According to Mangrove (1954), the development led to the widening of the range of international relations as nations found more and more common interests which led to the creation of numerous international organizations, both private and governmental. From the functionalist's point of view, the most significant of these institutions were the "Public Unions" or "Administrative Unions." These generally started as treaties signed by states to protect specific interests. The treaties led to the establishment of international bureaus or secretariats which coordinated the activities of the members and handled administrative matters.

Periodic meetings were held at which representatives of the member states set broad policies, generally making decisions by unanimous vote only. These organizations that fostered cooperation among newly industrialized nations of the world emerged primarily in the field of communication, transport, and commerce, and to a lesser extent in the areas of health and social welfare. Thus they represented primarily the economic and social interests of nations and were comparatively untouched by issues of war and peace despite the outbreak of both the First World War (1914-1918) and the Second World War (1939-1945). As Walters (1952) had demonstrated elsewhere, several of these public unions survived both world wars and are still functioning today as specialized agencies of the United Nations while others have however assumed independent status. That is why it is easy to understand the insistence of the functionalists on separating economic from political issues and on increasing the number of such organizations that will deepen economic cooperation and integration across territorial borders.

In fact, it may be ideal to stress that many of these organizations are on the spiral and have continued to function with considerable success within their limited spheres of competence. Examples include the International Labour Organization (ILO), the World Health Organization (WHO), World Trade Organization, to mention but a few. It is doubtful who the proponent of functionalism is but activities of some individuals who occupied important positions in world affairs created the congenial atmosphere for the flowering of functionalism. Prominent among these functionalists by defaults through expressed views are Albert Thomas of the ILO, Lord Boyd Orr of the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), Brook Chisolm of the World Health Organization (WHO), and Asko Ording of the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF) (Schumann 1962). Moreover, functionalist ideal influenced considerable number of international civil servants and even some national leaders, both before and after World War II. But it should be noted that the functional phenomenon was directly propagated through the works of David Mitrany, Ernest Haas, Gunnar Myrdal, James Avery Joyce, and others. The thrust of the functionalist thinking is that certain functional activities across borders (trade, investment etc) offered mutually advantageous long term cooperation. The argument is that intensive form of cooperation in trade and investment, for instance, will eventually result in integration. In other words, cooperation in one transactional area paved the way for cooperation in other areas (Haas 1958; Keohane and Nye 1975). The view therefore, espouses a higher level of trade communication, cultural exchange and other relations and transactions across borders.

General Analysis

First of all, to think of how to ensure world peace and security is like someone thinking of how to bring order, peace, justice and security in the animal kingdom or animal planet. That is because; the international or world community is an ungoverned territory like animal planet where there is no law. The idealist thinkers believe, like plato that when you apply law to man, he will be the best of all animals but when you remove law from man, he is the worst of all animals. The idealist thinkers hoped that if the representatives of nations are brought together in one forum, it will enable them to find common positions and be able to determine the good and bad of issues or behaviour and use the law to regulate the behaviour and practices of nations. However;

1. The conflicting interests among nations, example, Ukraine and Russia over Ukrainian membership of NATO and the security danger it pose to Russia. Another example of conflicting interest is the Israeli struggle for survival in the middle East and the Iranian expressed statement that it will wipe out Israel from the face of the earth.

2. Discrimination in ethno-racial, religious and linguistic inclinations that makes people to deviate. Example is the support and opposition in the national assembly meetings.
3. Disobedient to the law, this is more rampant among the more powerful nations.
4. No central authority that enforces the resolutions as everything is based on agreements due to the doctrine of sovereignty in the international system that is why the doctrine of necessity is introduced.

The realist thinking is a reaction against what it regarded as foolish expectation of abolishing or minimizing conflict and war in the international system through the establishment of a supranational authority. It stands with the position that states in the international system assuring the character of human nature as such humans are dangerous and untrustworthy. This, the realist thinkers are more interested in laying emphasis on the dark side of human beings. For instance, like human beings you cannot expect the interest of one state to be complementary to the other. Instead the realist view is that states have clashing interests and a global harmony of interests does not exist. For example Israel who is aware that it is a targeted state and Iran whose interest is to wipe Israel out from the face of the earth, as well as UK and Russia with clashing interests of each other's existence. The realists believe that unless a state is secured, it cannot survive, and if it does not survive, it will not be able to fulfill any other goal favoring the citizen's welfare.

Therefore, for the realists, since survival is the first in life, the first duty of the diplomat is the promotion of national security.

1. Power Maximization. Due to the anarchic nature of the international system, where there is no law and where no other one will protect you, then try to acquire power to defend yourself to stay alive first as the international political system has no central authority to resolve disputes and allocate scarce resources. This each state orator relies on itself for protection and interests attainment therefore states must seek for power. It is only of its citizens that it can enjoy peace and security. This makes power an inevitable feature of the international system as it has no central authority. This power here means the ability of a state to maintain its own existence.
2. Military Strength. To maintain power, states must have military strength which it can use to defeat their enemies, annex their territory and impose their will on them or the defeated people. As such the state will exercise a "naked" power over the defeated people which are like the power of the butcher over the sheep or the victorious army over a vanquished nation or the power of the police over a dictated conspirator. This use of force is an essential aspect of state action.
3. Inevitability of Conflicts. It starts from the notion that man's fellow man is a dangerous and untrustworthy creature and that there is no way their interest can be complementary.

Thus, the international states have clashing interests. Example, Russia and Ukraine where the interest of a state is opposed by the other. In another level states or man's interests are insatiable or unsatisfactory. Therefore conflict is inevitable. Thomas Hobbes observed that sometimes, men or states pursue the same interest that cannot be divided. It is either you get it or you lose it. Just like in a football match. Therefore it becomes the survival of the fittest, the stronger takes, after it is decided by battle. This, war or conflict is inevitable. On that note, almost all states are potential rivals or enemies.

Generally, the realists while condemning war and conflicts as evil, they disagree that conflicts and war can be avoided. This is because they see war as a necessary evil that will bring about peace and security through the balance of terror and mutual deterrence, otherwise the international community will be plunged into mutual assured destruction. (MAD). Kwarne Nkurumah believe that if you want peace, you prepare for war because without revolution, there will be no resolution. Furthermore, in the realist thinking, no state will go to war if it knows that it will be defeated instead it will take the world how it sees it. By so doing, it will bring about Peace and Security. Thus, knowing one's superior is vital to peace. In the view of the realist thinkers, the overthrowing of the state and its replacement with an international world system will not even guarantee peace and security because we are going to have civil wars in the system as states determine to fight for their interests.

The Functionalist Alternative, the realist view of the international system from anarchical point has shaped the trend of world policies from 1930s-1950 than the ideological view point. Thus, it was the dominant way of thinking about the international system until after the second world war was emphasizing cooperation and socio-economic integration for other benefits. The new alternative thinker that refused to accept the permanent defect of realism is functionalist group.

The functionalists are of the view that despite all arguments, there are still the possibility of progress and change in the international system through trade, investment and communication. Thus functionalism advocates building on existing foundations of agencies of international organizations (eg) UNO and its agencies, IMF, WTO, world bank, etc to foster stronger social, economic organization to advance other benefits.

These may be “public” or administrative unions which started as treaties signed by countries both on social economic development and human rights protections and humanitarian considerations. Periodic meetings are held where representatives of member states set broad policies and making decisions by unanimous votes only.

Those organization that fosters cooperation among newly industrialized nations of the world emerged from the areas of communication, transport trade or commerce, health and social welfare (eg) WHO, UNICEF telecommunication e.t.c.

This main idea that leads to integration on issues of common interests makes war difficult as emphasis is not politics or other contests.

The third consideration for functionalist argument is that high degree of interdependence will make nations to set up international institutions to deal with common problems.

The fourth consideration is democratic peace. In such international institutions issues are determined by democratic process

One of the strands of this thinking is that the impact of these expanding cross border activities such as interconnecting activities will help to create common value and identities among people from different states and paved the way for peaceful, cooperative relations by making war increasingly costly and thus more unlikely. Another strand of the neoliberal thinking is that the cooperative relations among states will lead into complex interdependence. This means that there will be many forms of connections between societies in addition to the political relations of governments, including transnational links between business corporations.

The interdependence will also mean an 'absence of hierarchy among issues': i.e. military security does not dominate the agenda any more. Military force is no longer used as an instrument of foreign policy (Keohane and Nye 1977:25). In this circumstance, complex interdependence portrays a situation that is radically different from the realist picture of international relations. Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye are among the main contributors to this line of thinking.

A third strand of the functionalist argument is that the high degree of interdependence will prompt states to set up international institutions to deal with common problems. Institutions promote cooperation across international boundaries by providing information and by reducing costs. Institutions can be formal international organizations, such as the World Trade Organization (WTO) or European Union EU or Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) or Economic Community of West Africa (ECOWAS), or they can be less formal sets of agreements (often called regimes) which deal with common activities or issues, such as agreements about shipping, aviation, communication, or the environment. Keohane (1989) and Oran Young (1986) are among the main contributors to his line of thinking.

The fourth and final strand of the functionalist idea is democratic peace. By this is meant that since democracies do not go to war against each other, complex interdependence will enhance and strongly influence the rapid spread of democratization in the world. Jackson et al (1999) identified three pillars of democratic peace as follows: "the first is peaceful conflict resolution between democratic states; the second is common values among democratic states – a common moral foundation; the final pillar is economic cooperation among democracies". By so doing, the functionalists are generally optimistic that there will be a steadily expanding 'Zone of Peace' among liberal democracies even though there may also be occasional setbacks.

In a nutshell, the different strands of functionalism are mutually supportive in providing an overall consistent argument for more peaceful and cooperative international system. Consequently, the emergent worldview of the contemporary international system stands as a counter attack by the reformed idealist thinkers against the turbulent realist assumption of the international system.

Summary, conclusion and the way forward

The topic explored the dominant doctrines of the international system. These include idealism which espouses a kind of a world government as a panacea for international conflict. The realist doctrine is pessimistic about the international system because of the inherent clash of interest. It therefore, canvasses conflict as a roadmap for peace. A new thinking known as functionalism however, while not reinforcing the idealist option for peace via world government did not agree with the realist pessimism about the international system. Instead, it chose eclectic position of charting the course of peace through transnational cooperation in social and economic, including technical matters. These interdependent relations will eventually lead to political and economic integration as exemplified in the European Union.

5.1 Conclusion

Considering the current developments at the international and global levels where the conventional theories of resolving conflict issues are displaying doubts of effectiveness, coupled with the increasing issues of human rights violations both at regional and global levels which are invitations for greater threats to world peace and security, thus, there is need for a new thinking on how to effectively ensure stable world peace and security.

5.2 One of the re-occurring decimal in the international relations literature is the lack of morality. That is the missing concept that must be brought in to balance the imbalance. Now, the question is how do we incorporate morality in international interaction.

References

1. Adeniran, T. (1980). *An Introduction to International Relations*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books Ltd.
- 2, Agba, A. E and Alufunmilade, F. (2020). *An Introduction of Conflict and Peace Studies*. Abuja: Cephas Printing Press. ISSN: 978-978-947-060-2
3. Barber, F. (1979). *Diplomacy: The World of the Honest Spy*. London:.
4. Bull, H. (1977). *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*. London: Macmillan,
5. Cooper. (1996). *The Post – modern state and the world order*. Demos.
6. Echezona, N. (1993). *Hegemonism or A New World Order?* Awka: Melinks
7. E. Greenste and N. Polsby (eds.), *Handbook of Political Science*, viii: International Politics.

8. Haas, E. B. (1958). *The Uniting of Europe: Political, Social and Economic Forces, 1950–1957*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
9. Halliday, F. (1994). *Rethinking International Relations*. London: Macmillan.
10. Hobbes, T. (1946). *Leviathan*. Oxford: Blackwell.
11. Howard, M. (1976). *War in European History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
12. Jackson, R. and Sorensen, G. (1999). *Introduction to International Relations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
13. Kant, I. (1795). *Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch*. repr. in H. Reiss (1992) (ed.), *Kant's Political Writings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (93-131).
14. Keohane, R. O. (1989). *International and State Institutions: Essays in International Relations Theory*. Boulder: Westview Press.
15. Keohane, R. O. and Nye, J. S. (eds.) (1975). 'International Interdependence and Integration' in Leeds, C. A. (1981). *Political Studies*. Great Britain: Macdonald and Evans.
16. Nasubaum, A. (1962). *A Concise History of the Law of Nations*. New York.
17. Reading, Mass: Addison– Wesley, 363– 414. (1977). *Power and Interdependence: World Politics in Transition*. Boston: Little Brown.
18. Shaw, M. N. (1997). *International Law*. 4th edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
19. Watson, A. (1992). *The Evolution of International Society*. London: Routledge.
20. Wight, M. (1977). *Systems of States*. Leicester: Leicester University Press