

Chapter 1 : Theoretical Perspectives: Liberalism & Realism

Liberalism is a school of thought within international relations theory which can be thought to revolve around three interrelated principles. Rejection of power politics as the only possible outcome of international relations; it questions security/warfare principles of realism.

Bea Kylene Jumarang , Jul 2 , views This content was written by a student and assessed as part of a university degree. Any student of international relations can be counted on to study the basic foundations of IR, which are the theories behind the study of IR itself. Among the most prevalent of these theories are realism and liberalism. Until the present, professors still speak of the motto from the work of Thomas Hobbes, entitled Leviathan, that speaks of the state of nature being prone to what Hobbes calls bellum omnium contra omnes or the war of all against all Hobbes: De Cive, and Leviathan, , as well as Francis Fukuyama naming Western liberal democracy as the final form of human government Fukuyama: The End of History and the Last Man, Realism is, therefore, primarily concerned with states and their actions in the international system, as driven by competitive self-interest. Thus, realism holds that international organizations and other trans-state or sub-state actors hold little real influence, in the face of states as unitary actors looking after themselves. It is then reasonable to contend that realism places man as a creature whose greatest instinct is self-preservation. Insofar as self-preservation and the gain of resources and prestige remain aims of the human creature, then maybe, taken collectively, these aims can and are being projected across state borders. One will remember, I hope, that states act in their own interest, a concept not too far from human choices in the name of self-advancement and the accrual of resources, first for survival, and eventually as whims of luxury, paralleled by the section in Thomas Hobbes work, which says the first [competition] maketh man invade for gain, the second [diffidence] for safety and the third [glory] for reputation Hobbes: Additionally, as long as armed conflict, ideological rifts and possibilities of aggression remain, then realism will continue as a valid means of interpreting international politics, since yet another of its core assumptions lie in the measurement of power in terms of military capability, within an anarchic global system, where natural antagonism presents little possibility for peace and cooperation. All that said, however accurately realism can account for aggression, conflict and militaristic-expansionist policies, its assumptions prevent it from possessing effective explanatory capacity when it comes to the concept of transnational cooperation, free trade, the relative peacefulness of the international system, the prevalence of democratic governance and the growing emphasis on economic linkage and globalization. Among the main faults ascribed to realism are its disability to predict and account for the collapse of the Soviet Union and the pervasive peace between liberal nations McMurtrie: Thus, we now have the opposite of realism itself, the liberal school of thought. Liberalism, in stark contrast to realism, believes in the measurement of power through state economies, the possibility of peace and cooperation, as well as the concepts of political freedoms, rights and the like. Francis Fukuyama, quite notably, believed that progress in human history can be measured by the elimination of global conflict and the adoption of principles of legitimacy and observed the extent to which liberal democracies have transcended their violent instincts Burchill: That having been established as core assumptions of liberal international theory, can it be supposed, that since there are observable limits to human nature and altruistic action, as in the realist school of thought, liberalism is therefore overly idealistic in its belief in human capacity and the eventual obsolescence of war as the measure of state power in the international system? As I believe, liberalism offers the possibility of peace even as states amass power, on the basis that power has now taken a less destructive form, from guns to bank notes and exports. In my opinion, there need not be an overarching stress on the frailties of humanity even if world peace seems too lofty of an ideal. This shift creates the need for greater linkage therefore, the new emphasis on globalization as well as increased cooperation. For this reason, states still amass power even under the liberal system, the main difference being the fact that power is now better accrued if more cooperation is realized within the framework of international politics. As it stands, in my opinion, liberalism operates under real-world conditions, reflecting state interest and aggrandizement, if only that such advancement results in peace instead of the expected dose of conflict. Still, the debate continues as to which

school remains the most relevant and timely, with regards to the interpretation of the international system. Some will always say realism is politics as it is while liberalism is an example of politics idealized. Whichever way we choose to justify or to answer those questions, despite their polar difference, realism and liberalism are both reflections of various aspects of the international system, which we seek to understand. The significance of both lies in their capacity to explain opposite phenomena, and though both are clearly antithetical, perhaps the answer to the question of how the world operates will lie not in the thesis and antithesis, but in the synthesis of both. In my opinion, for all the disagreement that has been in existence with both schools of thought, perhaps the true path lies in combination. A state of anarchy as a condition but peace as a result, and a world that knows the obstacles confronting all of its inhabitants, but knows as well that humanity has always been great at overcoming what seems insurmountable. Sources Used Burchill, S. Bea Kylene Jumarang
Written at:

Chapter 2 : Liberalism (international relations) | Revolv

Liberalism, pluralism, or Liberal Institutionalism is set on the idea that actors in the international system could reach a "peaceful world order" (Burchill,), and not one of violence and insecurity that the realists argue.

Liberalism international relations rests on a number of assumptions. In this article, we shall discuss liberalism in international relations. Liberalism is important to understand, since the theory is the foundation of belief for those who favor international organizations such as the United Nations in the global system. Thus, humans are not naturally violent-prone with one another, that instead, peace is actually quite possible. Fortunately, for those who espoused liberalism in international relations, particularly early in the 1900s, were saying humans can get to the point where war could be eliminated. Democratic processes and institutions would break the power of the ruling elites and curb their propensity for violence. In addition, there is a place for the rule of law. One might argue that international human rights law, as well as international courts such as the International Criminal Court are non-military ways of working towards global justice and cooperation. There are a number of differences between these two schools of thought. While the state does indeed matter in the international system, individual actors are key in international relations. Related to this, unlike realists, liberals believe that domestic politics should not be ignored. Thus, they place a primary emphasis on the actions and interests of individuals and groups, and namely these interests within a state. And, unlike realism, which emphasizes individual loyalty to the overall state, liberalism argues otherwise, saying instead that individuals have their own interests, which often can differ from that of government leaders. This is a point that counters realist claims about the state being a unified actor. However, this is not to suggest that these individual interests are always harmonious; some within liberalism recognize the conflict associated with the political interests of varying actors. Yet, despite these issues, liberalism argues that despite these tensions, it is the possibility that, through political institutions, that individuals will be able to cooperate with one another to reach common objectives and goals Moravcsik. While liberalists and realists do agree that the state is an anarchical system, unlike realists, liberalists believe that there is not a competition for power and resources. Instead, in the anarchical state, states are best off not by competing, but rather by cooperating. Thus, there is a strong focus on regional and international organizations. Such organizations can help the international community reach continual peaceful outcomes, which are possible to liberals. Furthermore, with liberalism, there is a belief that states can indeed cooperate by themselves; there is no need for a sole superpower to organize or force such behavior. Regimes constrain state behaviour by formalizing the expectations of each party to an agreement where there is a shared interest. Institutions then assume the role of encouraging cooperative habits, monitoring compliance and sanctioning defectors. Now, the makeup of these political institutions can vary. In some instances, such institutions may be more focused on the individual human being, whereas in others, it may be the formation of an international institution such as an international organization, which is composed of state actors. But regardless, through institutions that establish and protect norms such as individual rights, as well as an open economic market, states can cooperate with one another to not only improve their economic wealth, but also that they can, through institutions and cooperation, be more secure as a state Moravcsik. Liberals also disagree with realists about ideas of relative power and absolute power. For liberals, absolute power is much more important than relative power. Thus, if two states both benefit from an agreement, than this would be a policy option worth considering, regardless of how well off the deal makes the other state. If we recall, realism and realists have often discouraged alliances and trade agreements when it made one state much stronger than the other, despite the fact that both would benefit from the said agreement. Artificial barriers to commerce distorted perceptions and relations between individuals, thereby causing international tension. Thus, herein lies the notion that interdependence leads states to avoid war so as to continue to benefit from trade ties with other states, and thus, would help states move away from aggressive behavior towards one another Burchill, Benefits and Criticism of Liberalism International Relations Scholars, such as Robert Keohane have argued that liberalism has indeed led to a shift in international relations. Specifically, he notes three particular advancements in recent decades, saying that: Keohane argues that the fast rise in human rights

documents in recent decades is evidence of the increased emphasis on moralism by states in the international system. Furthermore, states have continued to emphasize democratic governance. Moreover, international intervention has gained popularity in international institutions; ideas such as the Responsibility to Protect R2P which are centered in moralism have taken center stage for state behavior. However, he also speaks to the point that moralism can be an issue if it jeopardizes security, or if it is negatively impacted by power. *Twenty Years of Institutional Liberalism. Liberalism and International Relations Theory. Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy. The Philosophical Ideal of World Citizenship.*

Chapter 3 : Liberalism and international relations theory - Andrew Moravcsik - Google Books

The "English School" of international relations theory, also known as International Society, Liberal Realism, Rationalism or the British institutionalists, maintains that there is a 'society of states' at the international level, despite the condition of "anarchy", i.e., the lack of a ruler or world state. Despite being called the English.

Liberalism international relations Save Liberalism is a school of thought within international relations theory which can be thought to revolve around three interrelated principles: States interact in various ways, through economic, financial, and cultural means; security tends to not be the primary goal in state-to-state interactions; and military forces are not typically used. Liberalism comes from the Latin liber meaning "free", referred originally to the philosophy of freedom. The central issues that it seeks to address are the problems of achieving lasting peace and cooperation in international relations, and the various methods that could contribute to their achievement. Supporters of liberalism often believe in the spreading of democracy through cooperation. Areas of study Broad areas of study within liberal international relations theory include: The democratic peace theory , and, more broadly, the effect of domestic political regime types and domestic politics on international relations;[7][8] The commercial peace theory , arguing that free trade has pacifying effects on international relations. Current explorations of globalization and interdependence are a broader continuation of this line of inquiry; Institutional peace theory , which attempts to demonstrate how cooperation can be sustained in anarchy , how long-term interests can be pursued over short-term interests, and how actors may realize absolute gains instead of seeking relative gains ; Related, the effect of international organizations on international politics, both in their role as forums for states to pursue their interests, and in their role as actors in their own right; The role of international law in moderating or constraining state behavior; The effects of liberal norms on international politics, especially relations between liberal states; The role of various types of unions in international politics relations , such as highly institutionalized alliances e. NATO , confederations , leagues, federations , and evolving entities like the European Union ; and, The role, or potential role, of cosmopolitanism in transcending the state and affecting international relations. History Early beginnings Liberalism originally arose from both deep scholarly and philosophical roots. It was later in the 17th and 18th centuries in which political liberalism began to take form that challenged nobility and inherited equality. Thinkers, like Locke and Kant, wrote about what they saw in the world around them. John Locke discusses many ideas that are now attributed to Liberalism in Two Treatises of Government,[11] published in In his second treatise, Locke comments on society and outlines the importance of natural rights and laws. Locke believes that people are born as blank slates without any preordained ideas or notions. This state is known as the State of Nature because it shows people in their most barbaric form. As people grow, their experiences begin to shape their thoughts and actions. They are naturally in the State of Nature until they choose not to be, until something changes their barbaric nature. Locke says that, civil government can remedy this anarchy. Locke argues that civil government can help people gain the basic human rights of health, liberty and possession. This program would require cooperation between states as well as the mutual pursuit of secure freedom and shared benefits. Because war was naturally unpopular, Kant thought that leaders would avoid burdening voters with its costs. After seeing success in intertwining states through economic coalition, liberal supporters began to believe that warfare was not always an inevitable part of IR. Keohane and Joseph S. These theorists have seen that democracies do in fact fight wars. However, democracies do not fight wars with other democracies because of capitalist ties. Democracies are economically dependent and therefore are more likely to resolve issues diplomatically. Furthermore, citizens in democracies are less likely to think of citizens in other democracies as enemies because of shared morals.

Chapter 4 : SparkNotes: International Politics: Theories of International Relations

A theory of international relations is a set of ideas that explains how the international system works. Unlike an ideology, a theory of international relations is (at least in principle) backed up with concrete evidence. The two major theories of international relations are realism and liberalism.

Areas of study[edit] Broad areas of study within liberal international relations theory include: The democratic peace theory , and, more broadly, the effect of domestic political regime types and domestic politics on international relations; [7] [8] The commercial peace theory , arguing that free trade has pacifying effects on international relations. Current explorations of globalization and interdependence are a broader continuation of this line of inquiry; Institutional peace theory , which attempts to demonstrate how cooperation can be sustained in anarchy , how long-term interests can be pursued over short-term interests, and how actors may realize absolute gains instead of seeking relative gains ; Related, the effect of international organizations on international politics, both in their role as forums for states to pursue their interests, and in their role as actors in their own right; The role of international law in moderating or constraining state behavior; The effects of liberal norms on international politics, especially relations between liberal states; The role of various types of unions in international politics relations , such as highly institutionalized alliances e. NATO , confederations , leagues, federations , and evolving entities like the European Union ; and, The role, or potential role, of cosmopolitanism in transcending the state and affecting international relations. Early beginnings[edit] Liberalism originally arose from both deep scholarly and philosophical roots. It was later in the 17th and 18th centuries in which political liberalism began to take form that challenged nobility and inherited equality. Thinkers, like Locke and Kant, wrote about what they saw in the world around them. John Locke discusses many ideas that are now attributed to Liberalism in Two Treatises of Government, [11] published in In his second treatise, Locke comments on society and outlines the importance of natural rights and laws. Locke believes that people are born as blank slates without any preordained ideas or notions. This state is known as the State of Nature because it shows people in their most barbaric form. As people grow, their experiences begin to shape their thoughts and actions. They are naturally in the State of Nature until they choose not to be, until something changes their barbaric nature. Locke says that, civil government can remedy this anarchy. Locke argues that civil government can help people gain the basic human rights of health, liberty and possession. This program would require cooperation between states as well as the mutual pursuit of secure freedom and shared benefits. Because war was naturally unpopular, Kant thought that leaders would avoid burdening voters with its costs. After seeing success in intertwining states through economic coalition, liberal supporters began to believe that warfare was not always an inevitable part of IR. Keohane and Joseph S. These theorists have seen that democracies do in fact fight wars. However, democracies do not fight wars with other democracies because of capitalist ties. Democracies are economically dependent and therefore are more likely to resolve issues diplomatically. Furthermore, citizens in democracies are less likely to think of citizens in other democracies as enemies because of shared morals.

Chapter 5 : Principles of Liberalism in International Relations | Katehon think tank. Geopolitics & Tradition

Introduction. Liberal international relations (IR) theory is related to, but distinct from, the utopianism of the interwar period. The utopians believed that war could be eliminated either by perfecting man or by perfecting government.

Toynbee , Lester Pearson and David Davies. Idealism is centered on the notion that states are rational actors capable of ensuring lasting peace and security rather than resorting to war. Idealism is also marked by the prominent role played by international law and international organizations in its conception of policy formation. One of the most well-known tenets of modern idealist thinking is democratic peace theory , which holds that states with similar modes of democratic governance do not fight one another. Idealism transcends the left - right political spectrum. Idealists can include both human rights campaigners traditionally, but not always, associated with the left and American neoconservatism which is usually associated with the right. Moral principle, constitutionalism, and faith in God were among the prerequisites for alleviating human strife. While he interpreted international law within such a brittle, moral cast, Wilson remained remarkably insensitive to new and changing social forces and conditions of the 20th century. He expected too much justice in a morally brutal world which disregarded the self-righteous resolutions of parliaments and statesmen like himself. Diplomatic historian Walter Russell Mead has explained: He called for a world made safe democracy, this was organized around political, economic and social standards. These principles were stated in his point peace program. Wilson thought of this program as an American commitment to show man kind the way of liberty. The idea was that if democracy could be widespread peace and prosperity would prevail. Wilson may not have gotten everything he wanted at Versailles , and his treaty was never ratified by the Senate, but his vision and his diplomacy, for better or worse, set the tone for the twentieth century. France , Germany , Italy , and Britain may have sneered at Wilson, but every one of these powers today conducts its European policy along Wilsonian lines. What was once dismissed as visionary is now accepted as fundamental. This was no mean achievement, and no European statesman of the twentieth century has had as lasting, as benign, or as widespread an influence. American foreign relations since have rested on Wilsonian idealism, says historian David Kennedy, even if adjusted somewhat by the "realism" represented by Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Henry Kissinger. Kennedy argues that every president since Wilson has "embraced the core precepts of Wilsonianism. However, subsequent theories of international relations would draw elements from Wilsonian Idealism when constructing their world views. Cognizant of the failures of Idealism to prevent renewed isolationism following World War II, and its inability to manage the balance of power in Europe to prevent the outbreak of a new war, liberal thinkers devised a set of international institutions based on rule of law and regularized interaction. These international organizations, such as the United Nations and the NATO , or even international regimes such as the Bretton Woods system , and General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade GATT , were calculated both to maintain a balance of power as well as regularize cooperation between nations. However, it differs in that it is less wedded to the importance of preserving international institutions and treaties while pursuing assertive or aggressive stances which it deems morally worthy, and is willing to use force or the threat of force, unilaterally if necessary, to push for its goals.

Chapter 6 : International Relations Theory - International Relations - Oxford Bibliographies

Main Principles of IR theory of Liberalism - The IR school of liberalism opposes the main thesis of the IR school of realism. For the liberals: national states are important, but they are not the only, and in some cases not the main, actors in International Relations;

International Relations Theory A. One word often used to describe theory is "paradigm". According to Ray and Kaarbo, a paradigm is simply a way of thinking about and approaching an area of scientific or scholarly inquiry that is widely accepted within a particular discipline. In other words, a paradigm provides a simplified map of reality; it takes the complexity of the real world and reduces it to a core set of assumptions that make global events that seem so isolated, unrelated and complicated more comprehensible. So that's what theory and paradigms are all about: William of Ockham said [a long time ago! Ray and Kaarbo p4 make the point that studying theories "allows students of international relations to analyze global politics in the future, long after they finish reading this book or taking courses on the subject. When students learn only history or contemporary issues In this lecture we will be examining two dominant paradigms in world politics: Realism and Liberalism along with sub-theories within the same larger paradigm A. To this war of every man against every man, this also is consequent: The notion of right and wrong, justice and injustice, have there no place. Where there is no common power, there is no law; where no law, no injustice. Force and fraud are in war the two cardinal virtues. You should note from the above that realism embraces a more pessimistic view of world politics, state relations, and the possibility of "perpetual peace" Definitions and Description of Realist Theory. Ray and Kaarbo p4 write that realism is "a theoretical perspective for understanding intl. The founding father of this theory is the Greek historian Thucydides , who wrote the seminal account of the war between Athens and Sparta. His writings greatly influenced theorists and statemen alike through the next two thousand years, including the modern proponents Morgenthau, Kissinger, Waltz, James et al of classical and neo-realism In short and in sum, realists see international relations as driven by the unrelenting and competitive pursuit of power by states in the effort to secure state interests. At the core of this theory is that world politics takes place within a context of anarchy ie the absence of world govt. In this state of nature, Hobbes argues that because there are no rules, no laws, no enforcement mechanisms etc, that conflict turns into war he calls it a perpetual "war of all against all" which is why INSIDE countries, people consent ie the so-called social charter to live under a government that makes and enforces laws, order, security, etc. Therefore, the violence, chaos, death and destruction that often accompany world politics reflect the "war of all against all" that intl. Realists also assume that states, or countries, are the "key actors and determine what happens in the world" Ray and Kaarbo: Ray and Kaarbo p. State interests, rather than human rights or ideological preferences, are the reason behind every state action. Thus, everything a state does can be explained by its desire to maintain, safeguard, or increase its power in relation to other states. In the world of anarchy and state sovereignty, there is no higher authority to impose order, and there is no intl. States must therefore provide for their own defense and protection. Realists refer to this effort by states to defend their own interests as SELF-HELP usually though the acquisition of military capacity or joining alliances In short and in sum, without an "intl. To realists, this is the only rational way to behave in an anarchic intl. The implications of all of the above for realists is somewhat obvious: Realists conclude a few other things--the possibility of cooperation and change is limited, that world politics is not primarily about good and evil, that power trumps justice, and that the road to order lies through the balance of power The core of classical realist theory is best summarized in the form of 10 assumptions: The Liberal Worldview A. As in classical realist theory, I will start the discussion of liberalism with a quote from one of the founders of this paradigm, Immanuel Kant For these reasons there must be a league of a particular kind, which can be called a league of peace foedus pacificum , and which would be distinguished from a treaty of peace pactum pacis by the fact that the latter terminates only one war, while the former seeks to make an end of all wars forever. You should note from the above that liberalism, or idealist theory, embraces a more optimistic view of world politics, state relations, and the possibility of "perpetual peace" Definitions and Description of Liberal Theory 1. Idealists questioned many of the basic tenets of

realism and suggested that it would be possible to transform the world of power seeking and war into one in which peace and cooperation among states might prevail. Idealism, in contrast to realism, suggests a well-intentioned but utopian perspective that realists believe was out of touch with how the real world actually works. Unlike realists, liberals believe that significant global cooperation is possible and that we can move beyond the power politics at the heart of the realist paradigm. For liberals, the key assumption is that peace and cooperation among states can produce absolute gains for all. As long as your state is better off as a result of cooperating with others, the gains of others should not matter. BTW, whilst Kant argued that the natural state of humankind is one of war and conflict he also importantly suggested a state of peace can be established. He argues that this "perpetual peace" can be established, esp. Complex interdependence means that there are multiple channels among a variety of actors in intl. Where realists see states as the only important actors, liberals see a world where there are a variety of non-state actors such as multi-national corporations, intergovernmental organizations, and governmental organizations, share the world stage with countries. They also argue that multiple issues, not just military security, are vital to the global agenda. Modern Liberalism based on the following set of assumptions: The Post-WWI Liberal Reform Agenda 1st group advocated creating intl institutions which would replace the anarchic, war-prone balance-of-power system 2nd group emphasized the use of legal processes such as mediation and arbitration to settle disputes and avoid interstate wars 3rd group followed the biblical injunction that states should beat their swords into plowshares and disarm.

Chapter 7 : Realism and Liberalism in International Relations

The course aims to introduce the key assumptions of the international relations theory as a part of social science and as an analytic tool, focusing on the problems of war and peace, foreign policy decision-making, etc.

The unsentimental power politics emphasis of Realism in the present era has its antecedents in the writings of Thucydides and Sun Tzu, as well as later thinkers such as Niccolo Machiavelli of the 16th century. However, the obvious failure of such efforts to prevent the Second World War helped bring Realism into the prominence it held throughout the Cold War. Deeper theoretical explorations and the emergence of new empirical challenges, particularly after the end of the Cold War, have brought changes in IR theory. Among the new factors are: The summary comments below present only a brief and inevitably simplistic sampling of a rich and growing intellectual field. Suggested readings at the end of each segment guide the interested student toward major contemporary works dealing with specific theories. Realism Realism is characterized by a concern with material coercive power. It treats states as the primary unit of analysis. Power is primarily viewed in military terms, and the military power of other states presents the greatest potential danger to an individual state. Economic leverage is also considered an important element of national strength, and Realist analyses of international economics assume that hegemonic actors define not just political but economic structures. Realists have also long rejected notions such as that free trade or scientific progress might lead to long-term peace, viewing such ideas as dangerous chimera. Neorealism, a structuralist variant of Realism, focuses on ways that the global distribution of power relationships shapes the actions of states. An Introduction to the Study of International Relations. Palgrave, [] Mearsheimer, John J. The Tragedy of Great Power Politics. The University of Chicago Press, History of the Peloponnesian War. Man, the State, and War: Liberal theorists reject the Realist presumption that international relations are a zero-sum game, but instead view them as a system of interactions holding the potential for mutual gain. Cooperative and peaceful international behaviors are therefore both possible and desirable. Contemporary Liberal scholars of international relations typically pursue research on economic and political interdependence and non military sources of power e. Although Liberalism has long argued that economic and political integration produce peace, some scholars have called for offensive military actions against illiberal regimes. Samuel Huntington sees Liberalism as a uniquely European phenomenon and predicts conflict with other civilizations, while Francis Fukuyama has argued that Liberalism represents the final stage in human political evolution. Humphrey, Hpc Philosophical Classics Series. Harper Collins Publishers, A Liberal Theory of International Politics. Through a Constructivist lens ideas e. This proposition directly contrasts with the Realist or Liberal view that ideas are of little real consequence to the most fundamental measures of influence â€” i. Realist Constructivists read social and political realities as not structurally determined, but rather as accomplishments of people e. They focus on the role of power conceptualized as inhering in social practices, especially the practice of interpretation through which, for example, a bombing becomes defined as an act of terrorism. The Realist Constructivist investigates how power relations operate within particular situations by analyzing recurrent combinations of practices aimed at achieving specific results. In doing so, they pay particular attention to the cultures and identities of the actors on the international stage. While Liberal Constructivists accept that material factors, including the distribution of power, are important, they see the overarching structure of norms as even more important. Moreover, such ideas and norms cannot be reduced to material power and material constraints do not determine the formation of particular ideas. Research focuses on cross-cultural communication and such issues as explaining the creation of norms such as the human rights norm , their dissemination among individuals and political actors, and their effects on the behavior of those actors. Security as Practice, New York: Michigan University Press, Uses of the Other, Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, International Studies Review 6, no. Cornell University Press, The Culture of National Security: Columbia University Press, There are three main strands of IPE: Economic Liberalism, Mercantilism and Marxism. Economic Liberalism, following in the tradition of Adam Smith and David Ricardo, stresses the value of a capitalist market economy that operates according to its own laws and, when

freely allowed to do so, maximizes benefits for individuals, companies and nations. Mercantilism holds that the economy should be used to enhance state power, and thus be subordinate to politics. Protectionist and other policies that minimize dependence on other states are promoted, as are policies of state-led development. Marxism sees the economy as a crucible of exploitation and inequality between classes, one in which the dominant economic class also dominates politically. It holds that capitalist development contains contradictions that will eventually produce crisis conditions affecting both social classes and nation states. In doing so, these theorists promote greater recognition of how underdeveloped countries are exploited by those with capital. *Production, Power and World Order: Social Forces in the Making of History*. Understanding the International Economic Order. Princeton University Press, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, ed. Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell-Smith. Lawrence and Wishart, Feminism seeks not only to explain historical and present-day phenomena, but to foster changes in politics, economics and social interactions. While all Feminists agree that women should be brought into positions of power "in all civilian and military institutions" - they differ in assessing the consequences of such a major change, should it occur. *A Glossary of Feminist Theory*. *Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. *Bananas, Beaches and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics*.

Chapter 8 : Liberalism - International Relations - Oxford Bibliographies

LIBERAL INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS THEORY AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC LAW Anne-Marie Slaughter"
Political scientists rediscovered international law in the s, under.

Postcolonialism and international relations theory Postcolonial International relations scholarship posits a critical theory approach to International relations IR , and is a non-mainstream area of international relations scholarship. Post-colonialism focuses on the persistence of colonial forms of power and the continuing existence of racism in world politics. However, a variety of evolved psychological mechanisms, in particular those for dealing with inter group interactions, are argued to influence current international relations. These include evolved mechanisms for social exchange, cheating and detecting cheating, status conflicts, leadership, ingroup and outgroup distinction and biases, coalitions, and violence. Evolutionary concepts such as inclusive fitness may help explain seeming limitations of a concept such as egotism which is of fundamental importance to realist and rational choice international relations theories. Nayef Al-Rodhan from Oxford University has argued that neuroscience [47] can significantly advance the IR debate as it brings forward new insights about human nature, which is at the centre of political theory. New tools to scan the human brain, and studies in neurochemistry allow us to grasp what drives divisiveness, [48] conflict, and human nature in general. The theory of human nature in Classical Realism, developed long before the advent of neuroscience, stressed that egoism and competition were central to human behaviour, to politics and social relations. Evidence from neuroscience, however, provides a more nuanced understanding of human nature, which Prof. Al-Rodhan describes as emotional amoral egoistic. These three features can be summarized as follows: This neurophilosophy of human nature can also be applied to states [49] - similarly to the Realist analogy between the character and flaws of man and the state in international politics. Prof Al-Rodhan argues there are significant examples in history and contemporary politics that demonstrate states behave less rationally than IR dogma would have us believe: Queer and transgender perspectives[edit] Queer international relations scholarship aims to broaden the scope and method of traditional international relations theory to include sexed and gendered approaches that are often excluded in the discipline at large. While affiliated with feminist theory and gender studies , as well as post-structuralism , queer IR theory is not reducible to any other field of international relations scholarship. Queer international relations theory works to expose the many ways in which sexualities and gender affect international politics. Queer IR theory takes sites of traditional international relations scholarship war and peace, international political economy , and state and nation building as its subjects of study. It also expands its scope and methods beyond those traditionally utilized in Realist IR scholarship. Ontologically , queer IR utilizes a different scope from traditional IR, as it aims to non-monolithically address the needs of various queer groups, including trans -, inter-, cross-, and pan-gendered, sexed, and sexualized bodies. Epistemologically , queer IR explores alternative methodologies to those traditionally used in IR, as it emphasizes the sexual dimension of knowledge within international relations. While queer IR incorporates transgender individuals in its expanded scope, some argue its emphasis on sexuality fails to adequately capture transgender experiences. This leads Stryker to advocate that transgender studies follows its own trajectory. She suggests some possible improvements that trans-theorizing may offer for feminist IR theory, which include a more nuanced understanding of gender hierarchy through a pluralist approach to sex, a holistic view of gender that resists viewing gender entirely either as a social construction or as biologically essential , and an increased awareness of gender as involving power relations among different sexes and genders. As such, Sjoberg advocates for the inclusion of trans-theorizing in feminist IR theory in the interests of improving explanations and understandings of global politics.

Chapter 9 : Liberalism (international relations) - Wikipedia

The debate continues as to which school of International Relations remains the most relevant and timely with regards to the interpretation of the international system. Some will always say realism is politics as it is while liberalism is an example of politics idealized.

Table of Contents Theories of International Relations A theory of international relations is a set of ideas that explains how the international system works. Unlike an ideology, a theory of international relations is at least in principle backed up with concrete evidence. The two major theories of international relations are realism and liberalism. National Interest Most theories of international relations are based on the idea that states always act in accordance with their national interest, or the interests of that particular state. State interests often include self-preservation, military security, economic prosperity, and influence over other states. Sometimes two or more states have the same national interest. For example, two states might both want to foster peace and economic trade. And states with diametrically opposing national interests might try to resolve their differences through negotiation or even war. Realism According to realism, states work only to increase their own power relative to that of other states. Realism also claims the following: The world is a harsh and dangerous place. The only certainty in the world is power. A powerful state will always be able to outdo and outlast weaker competitors. The most important and reliable form of power is military power. Therefore, the state must seek power and must always protect itself There is no overarching power that can enforce global rules or punish bad behavior. The international system itself drives states to use military force and to war. Leaders may be moral, but they must not let moral concerns guide foreign policy. International organizations and law have no power or force; they exist only as long as states accept them. Politicians have practiced realism as long as states have existed. Most scholars and politicians during the Cold War viewed international relations through a realist lens. Neither the United States nor the Soviet Union trusted the other, and each sought allies to protect itself and increase its political and military influence abroad. Realism has also featured prominently in the administration of George W. Machiavelli One of the best-known realist thinkers is the notorious Niccolo Machiavelli. In his book *The Prince*, he advised rulers to use deceit and violence as tools against other states. Moral goals are so dangerous, he wrote, that to act morally will bring about disaster. Liberalism Liberalism emphasizes that the broad ties among states have both made it difficult to define national interest and decreased the usefulness of military power. Liberalism developed in the s as some scholars began arguing that realism was outdated. Increasing globalization, the rapid rise in communications technology, and the increase in international trade meant that states could no longer rely on simple power politics to decide matters. Liberal approaches to international relations are also called theories of complex interdependence. Liberalism claims the following: The world is a harsh and dangerous place, but the consequences of using military power often outweigh the benefits. International cooperation is therefore in the interest of every state. Military power is not the only form of power. Economic and social power matter a great deal too. Exercising economic power has proven more effective than exercising military power. Different states often have different primary interests. International rules and organizations can help foster cooperation, trust, and prosperity. Relations among the major Western powers fit a model of complex interdependence very well. The United States has significant disagreements with its European and Asian allies over trade and policy, but it is hard to imagine a circumstance in which the United States would use military power against any of these allies. Instead, the United States relies on economic pressure and incentives to achieve its policy aims. Idealism Idealism is a specific school of liberalism that stresses the need for states to pursue moral goals and to act ethically in the international arena. Idealists believe that behavior considered immoral on an interpersonal level is also immoral in foreign policy. Therefore, idealists argue that dishonesty, trickery, and violence should be shunned. As he negotiated the treaty to end World War I in , Woodrow Wilson worked to promote democracy and national self-determination. Scholars use the term Wilsonian to describe a person or group who advocates promoting democracy overseas in the name of idealism.