

Why are We Studying IR Theories?

Drawn from: Nossal's International Relations, Goldstein, Pevehouse & Whitworth's International Relations, Sens & Stoett's Global Politics, and Peterson & Runyan's Global Gender Issues, *in addition to* our class text

Lecture Plan:

What is theory ?

The four debates in IR? Cox's 'classification' of theory?

What is a Theory?

theoria= 'view'; figures out the 'mind of god'

Set of assumption that leads us to another big idea

Organize facts, ideas, events, and explanations (allows for structure)

Created from experience, formulas, or imagination (e.g. Who is hobbies mentioning as savages in his work)

' a belief policy or procedure proposed or followed **as the basis of action** <her method is based on the theory that all children want to learn

Lenses on global events, policies, decisions etc.

- o Some things come **into view** ...
- o ... Other things become '**invisible**'
- o Get **clarity** about what you see (want to see?) (clarity about certain events and why they occurred/ended the way they did..... e.g. turkish coo)

Theories suggest:

- o What is **most important** to understand and study?
- o **How** should we analyze our world?
- o What is **knowledge**? (is it driven by materiality and difficulty with less factual subjects)
- o What is **reality**? (every approach tells you what is real and what matters)
- o What **should we** (as global actors) **do**? (what do we condone and not condone)

Acknowledge

- o *Some limitations* ...
- o **Debatable** = presentation & points (all theories can be debated because its interpretations)
- o **Contextual** = IR (limiting theories to there approach to IR
- o **Focus** = limits, simplify to make useful (gives limits to uses of theories)
- o *Please be **engaged with & critical** of what is presented throughout the course*
- o

Four Debates in IR

1. **Idealism vs. Realism** – 1900s – 1940s

- o Idealists: 'ought to be' world = better it (i.e. Woodrow Wilson wanting to end war)
- o Realists: 'way it is' world = deal with it (i.e. Ed Hallet Carr)

2. **Historicism vs. Behaviouralism** – 1940s – 1970s

- o Historicism: patterns in history—guide for action [realism] (find pattern in history and let us guide/compare our actions)
- o Behaviouralism: observe, collect & measure data——‘laws’/axioms of international relations [neorealism, neoliberals] (almost mathematic principle and can be predictive)

3. Interparadigm debate – 1980’s – 1990’s

- o **Incommensurability**: cannot agree on ... (different theory cannot be synthesized in on) (different theories must stand out)
- o **Ontology** = who or what to study?
- o **Epistemology** = what counts as knowledge? (is it only material etc.)
- o **Methodology** = how do we do analyze/study it?

4. Disciplinary diversity – 1990s - onwards

- o Lots of **different theories** – and **differences within** those theories (differences in feminism itself)
- o Differ on ontology, epistemology, methodology
- o **Purpose**: State policy-relevant? Social progress? (what is its basic purpose, who it effects?)
- o Objectivity & unbiased vs. Specificity & biased?
- o **Normative** concerns? (right, correct, moral, etc.) (is being moral as important as just understanding)

• Explaining Approach:

- o Scientific approach
- o Analysis: data, measure, systems, etc.

• Understanding Approach:

- o Interpretivist approach (as good or bad)
- o Analysis: meanings, beliefs, reasons, language, etc.

- o Positivism vs. Post-positivism ☺ Both are **empiricist** = knowledge based on data gathered by human senses

• Positivism:

- o Focus = observable realities
- o Systematic & repeated observation
- o Observers—observed (only the observer participates)
- o Objectively assess — regularities and laws

• Post-positivism

- o Non-observable = important
- o Meaning, interpretation, traditional knowledges
- o Observer—Observed (arrow goes both ways)
- o Biases in assessments—limited, contextual claims

• Rational choice (positivist):

- o **Actors** = utility-maximizers
- o Simplify reality = analyze it = policy
- o Provide predictions

• Reflectivist (post-positivist):

- o **Reflexivity**: self-critical of bias & assumptions
- o Complexify reality = analyze it = understanding
- o Contextualized claims (the goal is not policy)

o

Note: All theories do fall broadly into these difference

What is the purpose of theory?

Theories are always . . .

- o For someone (audience) [Cox]
- o For some purpose (goal, message for audience, action) [Cox]
- o *By someone (Nig)*

Two general types of IR theory: Problem Solving and Critical Theory

- Robert Cox:
 - o **Problem-solving theory** = manage
 - o **Critical theory** = change
 - o Way it is vs. ought to be
- Nig Narain:
 - o Dominant (problem solving theory)
 - o Challengers (critical theory)

Dominant	Challenger
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Objectivity<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Theorist & observed = separate• Knowledge = unbiased• Judgment = analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Perspectives<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Theorist & observed = connected• Knowledge = ideological, biases• Judgment = values, norms & context
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Manage world:<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 'As it is' = framework for action• Conservative• Policy-relevant analysis = some actor can use it to act	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Change world:<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 'Ought to be' = deep change/ overthrow of existing order• Radical• Emancipation: increase freedom, & better = state & non-state actors can use to improve
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Normative concerns less important	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Normative issues equally or more important (values, freedoms etc.)
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Dominant theories: realism, neo-realism, neo-liberalism, constructivism (whether it solves or causes problems)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Challenger theories: Marxism, feminism, post-modernism, post-structuralism, post-colonialism (the why behind the problems and challenges the way to go)

The powerful *use* theories (politicians and rich)

The disempowered *use* theories (not always the powerful, can be weaker)

Theories may *empower* or *disempower*

Theories have *power*

All IR is written from some theoretical approach or lens!

REALISM & NEO-REALISM

Realism and Neorealism lie between the domestic and interstate charts

Ancient Thinkers

- *Note: these thinkers, according to Realists, are the first realists, but there is considerable disagreement about this*
- Claim to Tradition (why ancient thinkers)
 - o Linkage/lineage with past thinkers (there is a **claim to tradition**)
 - o Gives the **approach continuity, salience, depth**, etc.

According to Realists, the following are some of the first realists

- Who are they?
- What idea/ideas from them do Realists lay claim to? (focus in on this because other people will argue they are not actually realist)
- Common (Commonalities among ancient thinkers)
 - Power- is relative and comparative
 - Political unit – kingdoms city-states and empires
 - Territory – single ruler controlling territory and creating border is new
 - Mirror- **writing to leader**--- learn from my teaching---become a great leader--- and eventually build a great kingdom (state).....(idea that they are writing to the leader to look in the mirror and follow my advice)
 -
 - Ancient Thinkers
- **Sun-Tzu**
 - Modern China
 - 2500 years ago
 - **Strong warrior leaders** (a kingdom that is strong and will survive, it must have these strong warrior leaders)
 - Key idea is that leaders need to build and consolidate empires = war
 - But war then is not just brute force
 - Winning wars (Sun Tzu Theory on War)
 - 1. Not fighting: diplomacy
 - 2. Pre-fighting: psychological element, give them the terms of surrender
 - 3. Fighting: if you go to fight, only fight when you know **victory is assured** (definitive victory)
 - **Only Win war only by strategy**
- **Thucydides** (modern Greece)
- 2400 years ago
- Wrote on Peloponnesian war: Athens v. Sparta

The realist key focus is on the security dilemma

- “Security dilemma” develops
 - State A= increases power (Athens)
 - State B = increases relative power (Sparta)
 - Arm race= the result is an arms race
 - If A or B, can’t match the other
 1. The result is that the lesser feels insecure
 2. The result is often war
 3. The security dilemma is can we match are opponents fire power and if not do we strike first

Relational analysis: We need to look at the distribution of power between actors within a System (see neo-realism)

- **Kautilya**
 - Modern India
 - 2300 years ago

- “Mandala” or circle of kings
 - Idea that my neighbor is my enemy
 - My enemy’s neighbor is my friend--- and my future ally
 - **Gives notion of alliances**
 - Note: The mandala theory in a way applied to the World War 1 military alliances
- **Machiavelli** (modern Italy)
- Modern Italy, 700 years ago
 - State-building and maintenance
 - **Leaders must pursue the states interest**
 - And always do what is in the best interest of the state
 - To do otherwise (when leaders make moral consideration over state interest consideration) is immoral
 - How leaders should act?
 - Create ‘ought to be world’ would = disaster
 - Deal with ‘as is world’ would = a success

e.g. Hitler decided to make the ought to be world which was wrong

- **Thomas Hobbes** (modern England)
 - State of war
 - State of nature = ‘war of all against all’
 - Get out of this = state (domestic, inside)
 - Permanent situation = IR (foreign, outside) and inter state relations (the state of war is permanent in inter state relation)
 - Anarchy
 - **Not chaos** but a Framework: for self help and survival
 - Absence of government and enforcement power at the level of international relations
 - Self-preservation = power (it is relation as to preserve yourself you gain power and power preserves you)

Realism (also classical and Historical Realism)

- **Evolution:**
 - 1930s-1960s in USA and England
 - Reaction to leaders actions World War and World War II , failures to prevent major war
 - Counter to the idealism of Woodrow Wilson (and some socialists)
 - Begins: 1940’s
- **Names**
 - E.H. Carr: British, launched the modern traditions
 - Hans Morgenthau: American, launched the American tradition
 - Martin Wight, Hedley Bull: British tradition of realism
- **Method**
 - History= important (we have to go back and consider/draw from history)
 - Longer is better (how old the theory has been around for) – bring validity (having a longer historical record)
 - “Thick Description” is better - depth
 - Patterns----Key pattern is that war = cyclical
 - Great Leaders
 - Their ideas, etc.

- Question: What is a good leader reasonably expected to do to protect the national interest (reading what people in the past did to make their countries great and was it in the state interest)
 - You = leader's shoes
- **Statism**
 - State
 - 'Legitimate representative of the collective will of the people'
 - Main actors in international relations
 - State-centric approach (focus on state as the key actor and focus on every other actor as less relevant)
 - High politics: security (division of politics that is security should be the focus of the state)
 - Low politics: economy resources etc. ---these are the **secondary concerns to realist**
 - Sovereignty
 - Highest authority= no authority above the state
 - Legitimate use of force by the state
 - Internal = can use it to enforce authority and control population
 - External= borders and territory
 - No state will ever give this sovereignty up
 - Will take back when sovereignty or national interest threatened
 - Immoral to do so (Machiavelli) (never right for the state leader to hand over the sovereign control of the state to someone else)
 - State = rational and self-interest actor
 - Raison d'état/reason of the state
 - National interest = should guide all policies
 - Key aspect of this is survival
 - Not morally based (only done when national interest aligns with morals)
 - Act similarly: there are differences between states but they do not crucially matter
 - Political authority: military subordinate to government
 - Government leads: public opinion, etc., subordinate to the domestic policies (decision should not be made by anyone else other than the government) (politics trump whatever even the public wants)
- **Power**
 - Morgenthau
 - Principle of Dominance= perpetual struggle for power (because we seek to dominate in IR and assure protection etc.)
 - Realpolitik/power politics= exercise of power by states toward each other (all states want to exercise power and keep others at bay)
 - Military power= most important power--- gives you most amount of leverage
 - Power as Capability --- Power as an influence +
 - Ability of A to make B do something B would not do otherwise (said by Dahl)
 - Relative gains
 - Relational = comparison to others
 - Zero-sum
 - Materialist claim (about territory or control over resources)

- The idea of One winner and one loser
 - Finite and limited, including resources, economy etc. (only so much of a certain resource to conquer) (kind of a limit to are power)
- “Power over”
- Military
- High politics
- Low politics
-
- **International Level**
 - IR = area of activity
 - Policy-relevant analysis (certain domestic concerns about aboriginals are related to debating whether to conquer land)
 - Features:
 - Anarchy
 - Self-help
 - Survival
 - Pursuit of power
 - War = always present
 - Permanent & recurring feature/problem of International Relations
 - Morality
 - not relevant and not apart of the international system
 - only relevant when necessary for survival/national interest
 - If doing warfare: have to have an ‘exit plan’ and ‘retreat option’ (only start war when you can win but if you don’t, you must have an exit plan)
 - Peace = is just the absence of war (not an actual thing)
 - Temporary situation
 - Awaiting--- all sides are just awaiting advantages for a power grab
 - Always want to be war-ready and not caught off guard
 - Don’t rely on:
 - Reason and diplomacy
 - Morality
 - International community or international organizations (cannot rely on IGO’s)
 - States= **only rely on military power**--- because that is the only thing that allows you to enforce your power (war is that way to use power as a capability)
 - Alliances & IOs
 - States can coordinate actions to accomplish some end= common threat and international
 - Formalized in written treaties (NATO)
 - Enduring
 - If short-term = then it is only coalition

Alliances are useful if

- Useful
 - Pool resources
 - Cohesive
 - Engage in diplomacy if possible
 - Avoid war (if it avoids war with other actors all together)
 - Only engage in war with alliance if = Gain win @ a low cost to you
- Problem:
 - Temporary (actors will go in/out of alliances all the time)

- Cheaters = actors will often choose self-interest over the group
- Free-riders= in alliances there are a whole bunch of countries who do not contribute
- *****Don't let weak states dictate your actions (pull you into a war) (the big issue with alliances) (kind of like all the major powers getting dragged into world war 1 by the Serbia-austria issues)

Neo-Realism (Structural/ Systemic Realism)

- Begins in 1950s: Kenneth Waltz, John Mearsheimer
- Using economics and mathematical models
 - Past influences: Behaviouralism & Peace Studies
 - Current influences: Game theory
- **Systemic analysis**
 - Structure of international systems because that what determines state agency (doing) (where countries stand in the system)
 - Status Quo states: like system = benefit most (USA) from current system
 - Revisionist states: change system = benefit least (Iran) from current system
 - Distribution of power
 - Currency of power depends on the system
 - 1800s: naval power
 - 1945- : nukes
 - **Hierarchy of States**
 - Martin Wight
 - Hegemons = Superpowers
 - Dominant powers = Regional, but wider influence
 - Middle powers = not Super or Regional, but wide-ranging role & often connected to Dominant or Hegemon
 - Regional powers = power in a region alone
 - Small powers
 - Micro powers = island states
 - Some of this idea is gone now in current system
 - Distribution of power
 - Polarity: distribution of the concentration of power in an international system
 - Unipolar: 1 --- USA
 - Bipolar 2 ----- USSR v. USA
 - Multipolar 2 +
 1. Tripolar ----- China USSR, USA
 2. Quadripolar --- China, Russia, USA , India

****For realist the multi polar system is the best**

- Balance of power
 - Ratio of relatively equal power capabilities between states or alliances in a international system
 - Coalition of states to counter-balance power of one state (or states) to prevent domination or take over
- Analyze/explain 'what more important to explain' (this is the care of neo realists)
 - 1. War (Especially, if its leading to a change within the system)

- 2. Systemic change
 - System
 - 1800s: naval power
 - 1945- : nukes--- states with nukes have most power and most important (they have the power to bring their issues to the table)
 - State = black boxes (inside the system)
 - The leaders of the country are less important
 - System rewards/punishes the behavior of actors by the system
 - Billiard ball analogy – states bouncing against each other (they are still bounded by the system/box)
- Bipolarity
 - BEST FOR 'PEACE'
 - 2 main camps
 - Reduce uncertainty and miscommunications
 - Deterrence: other side threatened retaliation or annihilation if attacked
 - Current system: Nukes matter the most = proved balance/order
 - Spheres of influence
 - Keep your bloc's members in line
 - Maintain order
 - Cold War = time with equilibrium = no major powers war

Offensive vs Defensive Realist

John Mearshimer – Ask the question how much power should states seek? (and how will that effect the structure) (Intro of Offensive and Defensive)

- Defensive realists:
 - Seek power
 - 1. Not upset the system's balance (like Germany did in World War)
 - 2. Avoid triggering balancing by other states
 - Satisfy the security dilemma= ensure there is **balance**
 - Defender states= upper hand--- because they only have a specific state to defend
 - Avoid: over extension rebellion,

Italy, Germany, Japan= tried to take colonies in WW1--- defeated by the other states in the system (created too great an imbalance and the defender states won) (we see historically that the defender states win)

Imperial states= will all crumble (England, France etc.)

John Mearshimer actually agrees with the offensive side

- Offensive realists:
 - Seek out and seize opportunities to get more power (always take that chance)
 - Power: as much as possible (in zero sum game, you must go out and get that power)
 - Goal: overwhelming, unchallenged power
 - Buck-passing = saying someone else will deal with it, and the problem with this is it prevents a balancing alliance
 - War-initiators: Wins > losses

India and Israel: 1970's (both have been very successful in their wars)

USA: 2000's (Iraq)

Russia: 2010's (Ukraine)

They are saying that the strength her

Key Idea for Realist: Is very much a Material Approach

Neoliberalism (Sept.28, 2016)

What's the core distinction?

- Cooperation in global politics
 - Cooperation is a collective action problem; how do we get individual states to do different things
- Temporary vs. permanent?
- Survival vs higher ideas?
- Incidental or significant?

How do they *differ* about Realist assumptions?

- 1. Anarchy
 - Realist: the whole system is anarchical all the time
 - Neoliberal: partial; laws, cooperation, reciprocity. Can set up international organizations like the UN and can be co-dependent
- 2. States
 - Realist: most important, unitary/black box, and has a monopoly on mass violence and legitimacy
 - Neoliberal: most important but not always because there are multiple actors: interest shaping policies, etc.
 - Some non-state actors can be more powerful, e.g. TNCs or terrorists (Cali Cartel, MS-13)
 - Mass violence: State not always legitimate (ICC)
 - Non-state actors can be legitimate (former Yugoslavia)
- 3. Rationality
 - Realist is short-term and is about individual benefits
 - Get what you can now because eventually it will be gone (zero sum. "everyone dies")
 - Neoliberal is long-term and can be sustained from states focusing on collective benefits
- 4. Power
 - Realist: power is getting others to do what you want them to do
 - Neoliberal: power is the ability to accomplish desirable ends
- 5. Non-military
 - Realist say military power is most important
 - Neoliberals say non-military leverage is increasingly effective today and less costly (sometime more important)
 - A military invasion of Iran would be expensive and deadly
- 6. Human History
 - Realists: all about the pursuit of self-interest
 - War is cyclical but regular and inevitable
 - Neoliberals: all about self-interest and the greater good

- Human history is progressive and linear (not-cyclical) and is bettering over time
 - Proof: Rule of law, modernized economy, and engage in less wars
- 7. Individual State
 - Realists: Need constraints (balance of power)
 - Forced to act a certain way (war)
 - Neoliberals: less constraints to unleash potential
 - Without war and balancing of power allows people to reach a higher potential to move towards a progressive path
 - International laws and organizations, not arbitrary state force
 - Agree to abide by international laws to avoid arbitrary use of force and war

Are States Rational?

- Rationality = universal
- Checks power
- Consensus is possible as states can come to agreement on conflict resolutions
- States are rational
 - 1. Discuss problems
 - 2. Develop solutions
 - 3. Create laws
 - 4. Self-regulate
 - can be disagreement but there is always a compromise

What is Power?

- Keohane: power must include legitimate social purpose
 - Otherwise people will not support it
- Absolute gains
 - Not relative gains
- Self-interest
 - Rationally pursued (absolute gains doesn't mean everyone gets everything but everyone gets enough)
 - Harmony of interest are material (land, peace, etc.)
 - Not moral or the right thing to do but rather because it effects you and could potentially because you harm down the road (we treat you right, you treat us right)
 - Not altruism as its pursued in the one's self interest still
- Centralization of power is bad (no balance of power or putting power in the hands of few)
- Diffuse: give many states power so everyone has enough to check the actions of others
- Cobweb model: all the power of all states are linked but the power is checked by other actors
 - Linked power
 - Checked by other actors
 - Nodes of power: actors, constraints, etc. (no one spider will eat all the flies)

But there is no World Government?

- Need governance= structure of rules
- Need global institutions = agent to regulate
- Powers like national governments (some)
- Democratic

- Limited, accountable and transparent
 - Check governing power
- Why Democracy?
- Peace = state type
 - Liberal democracy
 - Capitalism
 - Kant: “perpetual peace”: democracies offset wars
 - ‘democratic peace’
 - Death and destruction disrupt voters
 - Trade disruption hurts business (apple phone encryption)
- Two-level games
 - Realists wrong to think that domestic and foreign policy are not linked
 - Domestic constituencies (people inside the state that challenge the state and force change)
 - Rule of law = legal obstructions
 - Democracy = electoral sanctions
 - Free speech = media
 - For non-democratic states it may not necessarily work and there will not be as strong of a connection from international policy to domestic policy

How does Reciprocity help?

- ‘Give-and-take’ (you give something as a state in order to gain access to new opportunities)
- Do not need a central authority because everyone holds each other accountable
 - Response is an in-kind (tit for tat)
- Long-term is to institutionalize the reciprocity agreement
 - Mutual gain → mutual rules and reasonable expectations on how a state will deal with a conflict (NATO)
 - Overcomes free-riders, cheats, etc.

How does Interdependence get us to cooperate?

- Interconnection through reliance and dependence on each other for certain goods and services
 - Economic globalization (we rely on others for technology and resources)
 - Security (UN- we rely on other states to help us intervene in other conflicts)
- Why?
 - Adam Smiths’ invisible hand argument that states that what we do creates other benefits for others
 - Individual self interests, so we work with others to help protect ourselves
 - Collective benefit= the good or service they sell/provide
 - Trade trumps war = rational
 - State= war is costly (resources, legitimacy)
 - Business classes= no gain (taxes, limits)
 - Workers, etc. = losses (drafted, inflation)
 - War has overall negative economic impact and therefore people will choose a well functioning economy over a war
- Comparative Advantage
 - Produces what they do best
 - Import what they do poorly

- Other states are better equipped to produce specific goods and have access to more resources
- Depends on: cost (key), quality, quantity, national priorities, etc.
- Need cooperation = tariffs, taxes, regulations, etc.

What is Functionalism?

- Inter-state cooperation that spillover into other areas
- Benefits of cooperation are the formation of permanent organizations
 - The formation of the European Union in terms of economic issues, immigration, and now legal issues

What is an International Regime?

- 'Set of rules, norms, and procedures around which expectations of actors converge on a certain issue'
- Group of states
 - Shared problem and shared interests
 - Agree on norms and rules
 - Particular issue or delimited area
 - Goal is for it to become a habit

Why do we need IGOs to get cooperation?

- Key Problem: Transaction costs- the cost/loss of engaging in a particular activity
 - For states these costs are huge (military costs)
- Issue is how to overcome the transaction costs
 - IGOs are used to bridge the gap and overcome the costs
- Negotiation and discussion (IGOs provide a forum)
- Coordinate actions (IGOs organize who does what)
- Monitoring and enforcement (IGO criteria creation)
- Mechanisms for catching cheaters (IGOs collect info and are an objective source)
- Sanction state response (IGOs add legitimacy to the actions of individual states)
- Escape clauses and renege (IGO engagement is not mandatory so easy for states to disobey and leave the international organizations)

So IGOs benefit all states?

- Principal-Agent Framework
 - Who gets favorable policies?
 - IGO creators get the benefits as they mold the organizations for themselves or the powerful states
- Powerful states
 - Guide policy direction
 - Create impotence
 - Sway, bully, bribe weaker states
 - (UN Security council with USA and UK protects Israel and denies sanctions)
 - IGOs develops 'technocratic interests' and engage in policies and goals that benefit the institution
- Economic governance post WW2 = IGOs
 - Develop and manage the global liberal capitalist order
 - Establish IMF, World Bank, etc., WTO

- Today?
 - IGOs are still mostly run for the US and the 'west'
- **What of Security Issues?**
 - Alliances are the best way to go
 - Diplomacy over military capability
 - Collective security refers to the idea that states are responsible for the security of other states (NATO- an attack on one is as attack on all)
 - UN= globally otherwise through alliance
 - International Law= overcome power politics
 - Intervention to protect the individual (from state)
 - R2P: responsibility to protect
 - Humanitarian intervention to protect innocent civilians when the state is not doing so (Syria)
 - Human security: individuals matter the most
 - States should intervene when they are being denied of this right
 - Multilateralism = best (UN)
 - Must be done as a group
 - Many states act together, alliances, interdependence
 - Bilateralism = okay
 - Two states or organization act jointly to protect a common goal
 - Unilateralism = necessary (sometimes)
 - One state act
 - Prefer not pursuing this
- **What is Gilpin's Hegemonic Stability Theory?**
 - Hegemon is a preponderant state (the US, most powerful state)
 - Interest in Global stability to avoid costs
 - US interest in the middle east
 - Has Competition/challengers but promotes own interests
 - Costs are less than the benefits from free trade and security, etc.
 - Establishes regimes, IGOs, etc. making the hegemon able to enforce (or avoid)
 - Not Unilateral (do whatever)
 - The Hegemon can't do whatever they want
 - US can't just nuke ISIS because they understand the constraints and implications of actions like this
 - Multilateralist Hegemony
 - One state
 - Bears most of the responsibility
 - For a group of states
 - Do what is necessary for security, economy, environment, etc.

ENGLISH SCHOOL

Approach to IR

- Settle security issues (war, arms, etc.) ☹pursue 'ideals' (justice, inequality)
- Normative questions and values matter
 - What's right?

- What ought to be done?
 - What do we want the world to look like?
- Policy-relevance ≠ only role of IR
- Note: these thinkers, according to Realists, are the first realists, but there is considerable disagreement about this

What is their disagreement with American Realists?

- Social system of states
 - International society of states (develop network around these states)
 - Diplomats & state leaders = “Privileged Community” (trained elite)
 - ‘World view’
 - Cooperation
- 3 progressive social systems
 - **Progressive** = each one builds to the next, better one: Inter-state > International Society > World government (not here yet)

1. Inter-state System (kind of one that the realist talk about)

- Basic system of IR
- States follow ‘constraints’
- Actions: legitimate but *may* face moral constraints
- No shared rules or institutions (get away with what you can) (No UN or international law)

2. International Society

- States create by:
 - 1. Sovereignty ☞ mutually recognized (shared principle amongst all states)
 - 2. Shared purposes (free trade)
 - 3. Rely on common institutions (UN)
 - 4. Minimize violence & chaos (humanitarian intervention, NPT)
 - Congeal into ‘European International Society’
- 1. Pluralist international society (just want people to stop fighting and obey basic rules)
 - Liberty = state sovereignty
 - Order = balance of power, self-help, limited war
 - 1600s-1900s
- 2. Solidarist international society (we as community need to actually obey certain rules/ more than balance of power)
 - Common institutions (UN)
 - Enforcement of/seek:
 - International rules (war crimes)
 - Justice, ethics & human rights
 - Intervention (Rwanda)

3. World Society

- Goal to achieve for all states
- Shared interests, values, and institutions (human rights, free trade, etc.)
- European International Society ☞ develop & incorporate moral claims outside of standard European international society
- Realistic about not reaching one world government

Constructivism

@Nigmendra Narain

How we use social means to control behavior and actions

- 1990s: Nicholas Onuf / Alexander Wendt / Follow the English School but scientific positivist approach
- 2 Types of Constructivism
 - 1. Agent centered constructivism
 - (States with) Autonomous identities and interests
 - 2. Social constructivism
 - Collective identity and interest formation
 - Purposive interaction= shared identities and interests
 - (suggest identity and interest are structured socially and collectively)
- Why do states behave as they do?
 - IR: social relationship between states
 - How do states decide policy?
 - How do other states see them? (reflection)
 - How do other states react? (feedback)
 - Analyze interactions between states as a form of **learning**
 - Agents influence each other (e.g. nuke NPT)
 - Agents (states) ----- Structures (international system) – shared relationship
 - Affected by it
 - Affect it (Duterte recent statement)
- What causes change?
 - Change = ideas and interactions
 - Not only material conditions
 - But also ideational conditions (perceptions, norms relations)
 - China = capitalism with a socialist heart (direct it for benefit of the people)
 - Use of more soft power in china
 - Africa engagement
- Why do states cooperate?

Focus on Wendt's Take

- Neorealists wrong
 - Cooperation is not only temporary
 - Hobbesian anarchy = all are enemies
- Neoliberals wrong
 - Domestic sphere is not interest
 - Cooperation is not trade only other basis cooperation (besides security)
 - Lockien anarchy = look at all as rivals
- Constructivists
 - Action and interests = anarchic inter-state system
 - i. Wendt: 'anarchy is what states make of it'
 - Cooperation: learned interaction between states
 - i. Intersubjective understanding (shared...) (e.g. we get nukes and war crimes are important part of system)
 - ii. Interest satisfied – interact as friend--- 'friendly structure'----- change interest and actions accordingly

Kantian Anarchy= all can be friends

- Neoliberals
 - Domestic
 - Trade
- Constructivists
 - Within
 - Learned
 - Intersubjective
 - Influence
 - Learn
 - Redefine
 - Interact
 - 'friendly'
- What is Securitization?
 - Copenhagen School (Ole weaver, etc.)
 - Makes something the object of a security framework--- subsequent response to it
 - Relies shared meanings, etc. --- security issues (how we securitize people even etc.)
 - States pursue the purposely through language and actions – 'war on....' (used to be drugs, now desecuritized and now on terror)
 - Security Communities
 - Sense of community
 - Stable peace (idea of shared understanding weapons borders etc.)
 - Security framework pre-determined (Europeans and refugees) (NATO- as bulwark to keep Russia at bay)
 - Speech act and its relation to securitization
 - Language/words = action (intersubjective)
 - Intention of action (speech) + actual action
 - 'regime change in Iraq (also term axis of evil) (we now know regime change now means invading another and force change in politics)

-Can you think of current speech acts (Obama on warfare, immigration)

- Why analyze norms?
- - Not just shared interests (neoliberals)
 - Implicit limits on actions and behaviors
 - Habit: follow them, even unconsciously
 - Constrain
 - Conformity
 - Legitimate
 - Impact states decisions → State actions (or not)
 - **Neorealist and Neoliberals**--*Logic of Consequences*---'what will happen to me if I behave in a certain way' --- cost? ---- decision
 - **Constructivist**--- *Logic of Appropriateness*----- 'how should behave in this situation'--- legitimate option---- decision
 - 'Normative entrapment' model

- we can get states to fall in line with norms if we get them into the right normative trap
- spiral model: oppose --- participate – follow
- agreement = interest on some action/simulation
- takes root = creates change—legitimized
- norm = part of regular interactions
- diplomatic immunity

e.g. climate change becoming a norm- and someone not worrying about the environment is a consideration

MARXISM

©Nigmendra Narain

What do Marxists think is important?

- Analysis
 - Social relationships between humans
 - Holistic (international, personal etc) = interwoven
 - Politics, economics, society, culture, technology, ...
 - Interconnected: whole(!) \leftrightarrow parts (how everything interconnects is the big picture)
 - Bird's-eye view: 'totality of social world' (very broad view of international relations)
- Human nature
 - \neq fixed (different then realist who say people are bad, Marxists think its decided by social relations)
 - = produced through social relations
- Focus: economy = Capitalism
- **Base level:**
 - Forces of production (things brought together)
 - Means of production = factories, land, etc.
 - Labour power = people
 - Mode of production
 - Mode of production: (how are the good brought together)
 - Economic production system
 - How society produces & distributes goods/services to satisfy needs & wants
 - History: Hunting/gathering > feudal agriculture > capitalism
 - Capitalism is the current *mode of production*
 - Relations of production: (how the different classes in the system interact)
 - Capitalist class
 - own the means of production
 - Higher profits = cost of production less than sale
 - Exploiting working class (they do not do the actual work,
 - 'Accumulation of wealth' (this is the end goal)
 - versus
 - Workers
 - Sell their labour power to live (most people are wage slaves as marx says)
 - Seek emancipation from capitalists' oppression (which is basically what retirement is)
 - 'Accumulation of misery' (get alienated from work and just get misery)
- Capitalism
 - **Power System** in addition to an economic system
 - 1. Economic = trumps all (wealth)

- 2. Private = freedom, no social limits (get out of things other people cannot)
 - Class conflict
 - Identifiable groups + Concrete interests
 - Workers overthrow the Capitalists (these are the two groups and the workers will want to beat the capitalist) (but capitalism unites workers that may lead to overthrow)
 - power
- Superstructure (supra=above)
 - Created by capitalists
 - To 'normalize' exploitation and control rebellion
 - Institutions: government, law, education, entertainment (way to tell people you're not exploited but just part of world system) (creates this narrative that says its not exploitation)
 - Agents: state, police/army, schools
 - Ideas (illusions) that the system promotes: 'American dream', 'hard work', meritocracy (women are in reality heavily underrepresented)

How does Marxism analyze IR?

- IR 'knowledge' = all of it is ideological
 - Realism, Neoliberalism, etc. = capitalist management (problem solving theories)
 - Marx (1848): Expose 'mysteries of international politics'
 - → act to free from global capitalism
- Global capitalism = international system
 - Capitalist (& workers) = key agents
 - ≠ states
 - Predatory: (looks to put all people in global capitalist market)
 - Absorbs & subordinate into markets
 - Buy & sell everything (humans, too)
 - Expand markets (create market for everything)
 - All value = market value (\$)
 - Inequality & exploitation = systematic analysis
- States
 - Limited to no autonomy
 - Dependent on capitalists ----economy (because without it you cant survive)
 - Subordinate to capitalists ---- override national interest (realist claim that, but business lobby is above it)
 - Use 'legitimate force' against those who want to change or overthrow capitalism
 - Rescue capitalism from cyclical economic crises [chile etc, 1970's]
 - Enforce costs of economic crises [not on capitalists] [SAPs]
 - Functional role: what is their use?
 - US & West = hegemon, free trade, global economic order
 - China = cheap labour for goods, electronics production
 - India = cheap labour for services, law support or call centers
 - African states = cheap resources, safari/tourism, 'slavery'(exploitive black African workers still available)
- States & Anarchy (Justin Rosenberg)
 - Anarchy = Capitalist Competition (but not all out anarchy like realist say because they work together to maintain system)
 - Insatiable accumulation and profit
 - Explains inter-state violence (occurs when they cannot agree on economic decisions)

What is the Dependency approach?

- Names: Raul Prebisch, Andre Gunder Frank, Henrique Cardoso (Eduardo Galeano)
- 1950s-1970s
- Question: why couldn't South America catch up to North America & Western Europe? (how did these successful economies fall behind)
- Attacked American modernization theory
 - Ristow's stages of growth
 - Traditional
 - Agricultural mechanized + outside funding (free people up to other things like manufacturing)
 - Manufacturing + Poli Institutions developed
 - Maturity: Industry, Tech, Education and other industries
 - Middle class (that will bring you to highest stage of human existence)
 - NO = Ristow's 'stages of growth'
 - Remain largely traditional/agricultural societies
 - Limited: upper-end manufacturing and tech
 - Lack of access to goods/services---- because of growing income inequality
 - Middle class growth is limited to none in some places
 - No/prevented: true democracy/democratic expansion (has been prevented or not happened) (chile cannot establish good democracies etc.)
- Problem: Not allowed to develop to same level
 - Trade rules favour core capitalist states (TPP still favors US)
 - Attempts to break cycle = punished by capitalist states
 - Post-colonial imperialism by America and Europe
- Imperialist= prevent revolution
 - Northern states:
 - Capitalists: reward coopted states
 - Workers: benefits from imperialist exploitation = no revolt
 - Southern States
 - Progressively impoverished =exploit suffering
 - Local Elites
 1. Exploit/dominate on behalf of the north
 2. Reward/protected by North

That's how the system is maintained

What is the World Systems approach?

- Immanuel Wallerstein / Giovanni Arrighi / Samir Amin
- World System (groups states into general categories): Core > Semi-Periphery > Periphery (it's a pcking order)
 - Core
 - Main capitalist's states:
 - Democratic
 - Technology: control, advances, prioritization of their needs
 - Favourable international division of labour: high wages, service and tech jobs
 - Receive: raw materials, luxury goods
 - Send: technology and finished good
 - States? (USA, Canada, Western European state)
 - Semi Periphery
 - Intermediate Capitalist State
 - Subordinate to core

- Better off than periphery
- States? (South Korea, Indonesia etc.)
- Periphery
 - Provide cheap resource and labour and goods
 - Kept in state of dependency (people have to work in these lower job)

Not really a lot of room from progression for workers in the periphery

- Cooperation
- What's Changed?
 - Old: world-empire = empires (conquest and subordination)
 - New: world-economy= [since 1500's] linking economies, esp. globalization (linking world through capitalism) (the McDonalds empire= 31,000 locations in 91 states)
 - Managed by IMF, etc.)

Currently: the systems end phase

- Traditional Marxism = mode or production
- World Systems
- What is the Mode?
 - Traditional Marxism = mode of production (old thinking)
 - World Systems = mode of exchange (the way we must think and what some Marxist miss out on)
 - World Empire
 - World Economy
 - Currently:

What is Critical Theory?

- Names: Theodore Adorno, Max Horkheimer, Jurgen Habermas, Andrew Linklater
- Superstructure (matters more than base)
 - Institutions: university, media, state, IMF, UN etc. (institution make at seem as though rebellion is not way to go)
- States (what do critical theorist focus on?)
 - Autonomous= democratically reform
 - Citizens= change agents
- Social forces: class + race, gender, etc. (more than just the class that matters) (don't just have two classes of people)
- Question: why no revolt against global capitalism?
 - Global consumerism= get stuff (and more access to it)
 - Global socialization= between mass education and media (we can get stuff)
 - "The Citizen"
 - Good = global economic citizen: consumers, investors, businesses [resources]
 - Bad = state level citizens: students, homeless, workers, poor [resource-less and just drain resources]
 - How do we counter global capitalism?
 - Politically
 - Democratize global institutions (change rules to take account for ethics)
 - Political community =cosmopolitan= global obligations (humans, nature, etc.)

What is Gramscian IR?

- Names: Antonio Gramsci / Robert Cox / Stephen Gill / Craig Murphy
- Culture and Ideology?
- Braudel: 'Limits of the possible' (suggest are way not having resources but culture and ideology can also limit the options)
- Gramsci's "common sense"
 - Legitimate & natural? (globalization excuses certain behaviors that we hold to be natural)
 - Who decides? (government or are they influenced by other global institutions)
 - How enforced/coerced compliance?
- Hegemony
 - Dissemination of ideas and values =accepted by vast numbers
 - Avoid coercion (population enforces these thing among themselves)
 - Get consent = consensus
 - Dominated people get benefits (which is why they agree to domination)
 - Agree to their domination (and obviously because they choose this they will not engage in rebellion)
 - Consensus
 - Dominant class
 - Stephen Gill
- Historic Bloc = hegemony
 - Cohesive group--- solve global problems (includes states, institutions, powerful elites etc.)
 - Create the economic system and social reality
 - Create dominant ideas--- capability to act
 - State =managerial-technocratic (not political debate)
 - Market civilization = everything through market
 - Hegemonic: transnational capitalist-managerial class (US , West, MNCs, IMF, etc.)
 - Counter-hegemonic: indigenous peoples, international trade unions, NGOs, women groups (these are beyond the normal class, these include the social forces new marxist discussed)

Feminism (Oct. 11th, 2016)

Who?

- Cynthia Enloe (First feminist IR Scholar analyzing the role women play in foreign relations)
- Spike Peterson
- Anne Runyan
- Christine Sylvester
- Chandra Mohanty

What does Feminist IR analyze?

- Textbook states that there isn't a feminist IR, we disagree with them
 - Not all feminist IR scholars are women
- Gender analysis
 - Not about Sex = biology (Male vs Female)
 - About Gender = socio-structure

- Analytic category: masculine and feminine
- Organizes relations between sexes and distribution of power between the genders
- + other identities (which ones are more important, gender relations within society, who gets what and why)
 - currently over 32 different gender identities

- Power

- Based on gender and gender relations
 - Power emanates primarily based on what gender you are and how you play out the power you are given based on that gender
- Enforcement of gender roles, etc.
 - Men = typically the workers in society and had the power to dictate the nature of society
 - Women =
- Empowerment: control over own lives (how women can take control over their own lives)
 - No: men, husbands, parents, states, society
 - Yes: education, economic independence, family
 - Even within the male dominated system, they can have forms of empowerment through education and lifestyle choices (prostitutes)
 - Men can still control which women get educated, can keep them economically dependent, and can withhold their power

- Patriarchy

- Social structure underpinning everything (politics, economy, education)
- Normalizes & enforces = makes gender oppression invisible (men making more money, glass ceiling)
- Males/ masculine:
 - Considered superior and better
 - Legitimizes rule/power
 - Rewards those who display these characteristics

- Many people still don't think women can be legitimate leaders because of menstrual cycles
 - Most women leaders have masculine characteristics (Margaret Thatcher, Angela Merkel)
- Malestream IR
 - Masculine values = universal and matter
 - IR privilege: don't bother to consider or deride/denigrate (is a women fit to tackle the major issues in IR?)
- The priorities in IR fall into the main stream of Male Traits
 - *Competition* > anarchy, capitalism
 - *Fighting, Protection* > War, markets
 - *Control* > states and classes
 - *Rational* > national interest and freedoms
 - *Autonomy* > sovereignty
 - *Non-family labour* > statecraft, industrial production
- Women/feminine = invisible or irrelevant
 - State: secretaries, cleaners, administrators
 - Home: sex, children, household maintenance
 - Employment: domestics, textile worker, secretarial staff, teachers, etc.
 - Informal economy
 - Expected to do for husband, family, state, society (women are expected to have children and grow the population)
- Where should knowledge be drawn from?
 - Realists = states
 - Marxists = workers
 - Feminists = iterative margin
 - Gendered experience = gendered knowledges
 - Experiences of marginalization = women
 - Method: who is the most marginalized in IR?

- Emancipation and social progress
- 'Invisibility' of women and gender in global politics
- Men/masculine values
- Few women in gov't, IGOs, etc.

What are some Feminist approaches?

- Liberal feminists:
 - Participation in international policies & decision-making → political institutions, economic activities, society-building
 - Representation in IGOs, like UN, etc.
 - Removal of legal barriers & passing of international laws, e.g. CEDAW or rape as war crime
 - **Goal: equality of rights & opportunities** (ask how are women not being given these equal opportunities and how to mitigate that)
- Difference feminism
 - Valorizes the feminine = role as nurturers/ peacemakers ← Intl Sys based on this
 - Real difference between genders biologically or culturally determined
 - Goes against the Assumption of Masculinity in IR
 - Gender gap in politics, economics, etc. (certain jobs are only available for men, computer science)
 - The idea that if women ran the world they would be nicer and kinder and do a better job
- Critical theory feminists:
 - Marxist feminists: global capitalism needs exploitation of women, so seeks gender-stratified societies
 - Radical feminists: patriarchy is global, structuring relations between states (males fighting) and inside states (males control)
 - Focus on gender identities & power
 - Determines legitimate ideas (Gramsci)
 - International Planned Parenthood and International Labor (put out model and women's work)
 - Determines material manifestations: state leaders, UN priorities, market products

- Key priority of the UN is to stop men from fighting with each other
- People that pay the price for the fighting are mostly women and children
- Constructivist feminists:
 - Influence gender \leftrightarrow global politics (the influence goes both ways)
 - Gender ideas impact global institutions, home-work regulation: home-work \rightarrow global work regulation
 - Global institution impact gender relations: UN maternal health program \rightarrow family size & reproduction
- Post-structural feminists:
 - IR events = Meaning \leftarrow Language \leftarrow Power & Knowledge \leftarrow Men
 - Men dominate the majority of fields and IR chooses male dominated events over female events
 - Male experience \rightarrow IR = war, revolution, empires, etc.
 - Female experience = male constructed: 'for her', protected
 - Impact on men/masculine = limits men, too (if Trump wasn't an aggressive male, would he have gotten this far?) Men have to look tough to be leaders
- Post-colonial feminists:
 - *Multiple* women's experience
 - Impact of imperialism, colonialism, independence struggles
 - Western women: oppression of non-Western women
 - Oppressions = contextual \rightarrow particularities of women in the South, Third World, etc.
- What does the approach suggest for?
 - Practical gender interests: vs gender situation/context
 - Strategic gender interest: v. gender system

What is the State's role?

- State is a Gendered institution that can change
- Patriarchal state
 - State leaders with favored masculine traits:

- Institutionalized in state bureaucracies, army, etc.
- Limits role inside and outside state for women
 - IGOs, global NGOs, MNCs, etc. leaders? Participate?
 - Women have a discounted role: 'who is the man in charge?'
 - Often times business deals are done in informal ways that favor men (meetings at strip clubs/sporting events etc.)
- Gender order (Raewyn Connell)
 - Social order
 - Created/enforced → between sexes and genders (and sexualities)
 - Social order created by state (patriarchy allows men to have many wives, and have access to more power than subordinate women)
 - Stabilizes → exploit (politics, economic, etc.)
 - Hierarchy of roles
 - Men = warriors and defend the state (Men are stronger and are the breadwinners)
 - Women = child care and populate state
 - State can consciously control the social order and gender roles (WW2 getting women to join the army and labour force when men went off to fight, state run daycares)
 - Hegemonic masculinity/ dominant masculinity
 - All other genders: dominated and subordinate
- 'State Sovereignty'
 - Replicates public/private divide
 - Public man = limits ← IR = politics
 - Private man = absolute family power ← IR = domestic politics
 - Internally the man has absolute power
 - 'Personal is the political' (Carol Hanisch) → Personal is the global (individual and global effect each other)

What is Security?

- What type?

- Insufficient
 - Women's security is often decreased when national security is increased
 - National security over Women's security
 - Military spending over Social spending
 - War is expensive so dealing with IR problems means neglected domestic issues
 - Gender enforcement over Freedom (women have to satisfy their man or else he can leave them)
 - Enforcement of a gender order restricts the freedom of the women if they do are not aligned
- Better: human security
 - Gender and other considerations
 - Economic & social insecurities
 - Jobs, work, food, clothing shelter
 - Protections against violence, esp. sexualize

How is War problematized?

- Militarized Masculinity
 - Enloe
 - Lopez: "it is a combination of traits and attitudes that are hyper masculine, hegemonic, and are associated primarily with military soldiers"
 - Men that have protective experience are the most important in society but they all have hyper masculine qualities and are the 'alpha males' in their lives
 - Best men are the military men
 - They make the best political leaders too → they are fighters, rational, willing to kill, and protect
 - Training = attack on people viewed as feminine and nurturing other qualities (also racialized, homophobic, etc.)
 - Peace itself is feminized and unprotected
 - Realist's 'prepare for war to have peace'
- Gendered protection myth
 - Men protect women

- But women become head of the household when men are off to war
- Men fight and women nurse
 - But women keep the state going when men are absent (make economic and political decisions)
- Men POWs and women refugees
 - But women are left without protection and are required to protect and provide for an entire family
- Violences against women are often not recognized
 - Death: “collateral damage” civilians and refugee camps
 - Women are less protected during war and have typically died at a larger extent to men during conflicts
 - Home: domestic violence and constant moving
 - Militaries:
 - Sexual harassment and assaults (2014: 20000+ reports in US)
 - Sexual access: women for ‘sexual release’, ‘boys will be boys’, ‘sex-for-protect’
 - Limited military advancement and no combat roles
 - Post-war: focus is on soldiers with PTSD, they rely mostly on their moms and wives to take care of them, this is a risk to personal safety
- Language & Sexuality (Carol Cohn)
 - Phallocentrism: worship of male genitalia and sexuality
 - Male heteronormativity: misogynist, homophobia, racist, etc.
 - War = sexual and sexualized language/ideas
 - Freud: death and sex instinct
 - Release and exhilaration of warfare (having more missiles means having a bigger penis)
 - 9/11 was an attack on American phallocentrism
 - Misogyny, ex. US Army’s Tailhook Scandal

Is Globalization Gendered?

- States & markets
 - Structure choices for women

- Exploit gender differentials
- Push out specific people from jobs
- Labour?
 - Mostly agriculture and informal sector (women)
 - Mostly industrialized (men)
- Need male breadwinner (owns property, can do banking, etc.)
- Gendered division of labour
 - Men's vs. Women's Jobs (natural)
 - Women/feminine:
 - Expected behaviours: docile/passive, nimble bodies (sexually available)
 - Jobs: low-paying, temporary, non-progressive for women, non-unionized
 - Controlled employment: bussed, enclosed, no resource to abuse, money given to male family head
 - Double burden day:
 - Work @ paid job
 - Home @ unpaid job (take care of the kids, work is often an escape)
 - Pay differential and glass ceiling
 - Men = higher pay = extra case
 - Women = lower pay
 - Glass ceiling: no more promotion or raise
- Feminization of labour
 - Push men out and get women in
 - Feminize the work: pay less, flexible hours, and no protections (the type of work most women have found themselves in)
 - Hire: girls (not women) to do "pink collar jobs"
 - More exploitable: from minorities and marginalized groups (set up factories in the developing world and lower costs)
 - Why? Control and exploitation = power
- Women's free labour

- Diane Elson, Isabelle Bakker, Marilyn Waring
- Sex & reproduction (the cost of bearing children is very high)
- Domestic duties: cooking, cleaning, psychological/counselling services, teaching, healthcare

Post-structuralism

©Nigmendra Narain

Who?

The key thinkers in this regard

- 1970s
- Michel Foucault & Jacques Derrida
- James Der Derian, RBJ Walker, Cynthia Weber, David Campbell

What does Post-structural IR analyze?

- Challenges Western Enlightenment ...- the idea that we have foundational knowledge and we can improve people through reason etc.
- Logocentrism = systematic study to find truth
 - Science (sense & study) does not explain all reality
 - IR analysis = chosen IR theory's focus (not objectively determined what we want to focus on)
 - *No one theory is possible*

They all build on each other so you cannot bring them together coherently

- Discourse = language and ideas in material reality
 - Shapes (limits) what and how we can discuss
 - Balance of power (idea): used to be army then having navy and now the focus is on nuclear weapons (again clearly related to language and idea)
 - Computers (material reality)- cyber warfare (has material reality at level of personal and global), satellites, drones
 - Response to failures of Western leftist failures & Socialist failures under USSR
 -
- Deconstruction = language is used to constructed signs (represents)
 - Signs = signified & signifier e.g. pic of horse = horse

- ≠ the *thing or fact*, e.g. “*Nigmedra*” (his name is only a sign as many people would mistake it for a girl’s name, you ID is caught up in the signification) (nukes can be thought of a radiation but in IR we think of it as balance of power)
- Dichotomies: constructions of superior/inferior
- (left is good/ right is worse)
 - Science/religion
 - USA/Canada
 - War/peace
 - Allies/Axis
 - West/Rest
 -
- Euro-centrism = West’s is Best
 - Knowledge, ideas, etc. first, superior, progressive
 - Dismiss or Belittle others
 - Whose ‘development’? *Not Indigenous Communities* (our economic development of pipeline in US hurts first nation economy, one development over another)
 - Whose “World” Wars? *Not non-Europeans* (nobody discusses the India and Malaysian involvement) (we call it the world war because Europe/heart of the west was involved in it)
 -
- Genealogy:
 - 1. What political practices created present?
 - 2. What events/people were marginalized or suppressed? (why?)
 - Meta-narratives (prior to telling you a story, you need to have an understanding of what is universal etc.): universal, trans historical ‘stories’ = problematic: capitalism, the state, individual, etc.

Look at Structuralism vs. Post Structuralism on OWL

What was the Nazi’s Final Solution?

- Final Solution- the extermination of lesser people
- Enlightenment’s ‘dark side’- post structuralism say it’s the dark side of enlightenment project

- ‘Rational consequences’ of modernity (not deviation from it)- using all the logo centric thing to make society better
- National interest: Third Reich and Self Preservation
- Eurocentrism: anti-Semitism= truth of euro and North America= the Jews are not euro’s or Christians
- Cataloguing & Numbering (rationalist state among is to catalogue and number)
- Representation of turning meta narrative about non Christians and make them familiar to other
 - Challenged person = waste = Jews
 - Banker = oppressor = Jews
 - Ghetto dweller = drain = Jews
 - Mode of representation
 -
- Scientific detachment from the suffering of inferiors, like pigs, dogs, Jews, gays, etc. = rational = catalogue, measure, categorize ---- Mengle (idea here was that its rational to use inferiors to ensure our lives our better)
- ‘Means-end’ instrumentality of humans: what particular purposes do a people serve? = science of progress of *real humanity is more important (use of jews was way to further humanity) (if they don’t have purpose give them one of serving you)*
- Efficient industrialization:
 - Concentration camps = death factories
 - Technological solutions = atom bomb (the initial problem and also the solution)
- Argument overall is recognizing duality of problem and no overall truth here

What is Power?

- Productive: creates ‘subjects’
 - Empowers some = police, lawyers, officials, MNC’s
 - Disempowers others = protestors, rebels, TOCs (transnational organized crime)
 - → naturalized (we see in IR that we say that states are the most important but are they really?), hierarchal
- Created & legitimated by discourses and genealogies
- Intertextualities
 - Interconnection between past present texts, events and speeches

- Involves a Construction of meaning – connect to past?
- Putin in Crimea?
 - West narrative: Hitler and Czechoslovakia and WW2
 - Russians: Alexendar Nevsky (protector), Peter the great and protecting Russians
- Establish a *mode of representation*
 - Discourses representing identities and ideas
 - Past assumptions → connects to present issues.... Connects to surveillance and control
 - Connecting identities/ideas to familiar, accepted and ‘stabilized’ ideas (the impact Pierre Trudeau popularity had on people thought on Justin)
 -
- David Campbell → modes of representation are important in IR and how they are conducted as well
 - Post WWII: American leaders: How do we get American to fear the Soviets
 - How to get Americans to understand?
 - Communists = non-Christians + communal property ownership
 - ← same as Natives Americans =contain or kill them to defend good American (we have the idea that communist deserve the same fate)
 - Soviet Union = equality, no class distinction, government intervention for jobs food etc.
 - ← same as Blacks on welfare and civil rights = threat to America if not contained and controlled
 - Currently? *Axis Powers* of WWII = Axis of Evil (Iran, Iraq leader, Venezuela)

What’s wrong with the State?

- Discourses after Westphalia (after construction of state)
 - → Productive power
 - → State
 - → Dichotomies
 - → Conflict, cooperation etc.

This is where the discourses lead us look at the dichotomies that the states create

- Anarchy:
 - Anarchy problematique (Ashley):

- Anarchy ≠ peace possible (if anarchy peace is not possible)
 - ← discourses & assumptions prevents solution peace (if anarchy is central idea that we cannot change it, legitimates immoral action etc.)
- Realists' anarchy *legitimates* amorality, injustice etc.
- Why can't states be moral just agents in global politics?
-
- Inside vs. Outside (Rob Walker) (dichotomized problem of order inside state vs anarchy outside)
 - Constructed dichotomy for global relations
 - Domestic = orderly/law v. international= anarchy/self help
 - Why cannot states have 'inside' principles in 'outside' relations?
 -
- Problem = European Westphalia State
 - Only legitimate political organization now (is the state)
 - Other political forms = dismissed/ destroyed
 - All groups have to secure a state
 - *to be* (East Timorese, Palestinians – need a state that will legitimize them and the defense of them)
 - *to be considered legitimate (Kurds, Indigenous People)*
 -
- Cynthia Weber: Sovereignty = “performance” (not principles but involve performance of state)
 - Keep: perform aggressively/defend = war
 - Vietnam vs. USA
 - Lose: can't perform = invasion = lose sovereignty
 - Iraq vs. USA (Iraq loss sovereignty in the same way as other countries, US has serious influence) (don't just get those rights because you are a static
 - ≠ Principle, and not static
 - = Performative and = dynamic (can change sovereignty and anarchy)
 - → war it or lose it

- → how can we have peace?

What is 'foreign policy'?

- Relations with other states = Self/them
- Campbell: Capital F vs lower case f
 - 1. Foreign Policy = state's policies
 - 2. foreign policy = state's discursive practices creating self vs. other
 - = our identity (peacekeeping) (identity is formed by our foreign policy, Canada as peacekeeper)
 - Foreign policy says something about us

Why have Passports?

- Salter:
- No? = can't travel, etc. (FP) → don't really exist if you don't have passport (fp)
- 'Bare life' (Agamben) = state's mercy coz in a 'state of anarchy' (border, customs)
- Identity: creates you ---- 'official identity' (your name matters more than who you really are as if your name sounds like terrorist may be on no fly list no matter who you are)

Why have Borders?

- Not separating territory *only*
- Ontopology
 - Geography + Identity
 - Who we are is linked to the geography
 - Intertextual: past events, writing etc.
 - → Yugoslavia: 1989 (identity marker above geography)
- State borders = who are we?
 - No internal dissent = 'with us or with the enemy' (border define what you should believe etc.)
 - Create, exclude, police, punish 'the Other'
 - Foreigners = no rights, just force applied to you (you are no longer under the protection of the only legitimate things in IR, the state)

Post-colonialism

Dichotomized= represent as divided or opposed

©Nigmendra Narain

Who?

- South Asian, African, & South American scholars –Franz Fanon, Edward Said, Homi Bhabha, Gayathri Spivak

What does Post-colonial IR analyze?

- **Race:**
 - **Constructed differentiation → political order** (in every society certain races/often skin color determines where they stand)
 - **Racism orders global politics**
- **Colonialism**
 - Euro-centrism → (y)our way are better: (ghandi is ok because he aligned with much of what they believed)
 - Why? How? When? (all with regard to euro centrism)
 - Impact on colonized – and the colonizers (both change as people)
 - Need perspectives of the colonized (only have perspective of colonizers so far in IR)
 - Structures current global politics (the entire structure was created by the colonizers and Westphalia)
 -
- Alternative sources: novels, plays, testimony, oral history
- Categories: race, gender, class etc. --- hybridity (multiple identities within country and a person) (remove the idea of single category)
-
- Agents:
 - Subaltern: subordinated in own society (those who are predominantly colonized)
 - World-traveller: emphatically listen to subaltern and learn from experiences

Why does Identity matter?

- **Ali Mazrui: ‘who has the power to represent us?’ --- culture**
 - To others AND ourselves
 - European imperialists = created South American, African and Asian States

- Do Africans refer to each other as 'blacks?' (one self gets to tell the other who they are by another who is giving them that name)
- 'African-Americans' = African, Caribbean, south American, middle east (not all of these people are actually African)
- Movies, books, music, names, etc.
-
- *Orientalism*: West invents the East (dichotomized because it is something were not)
 - Different → dichotomized
 - Despotic, autocratic, non-state
 - 'Odd' cultural practices and rituals of those places (also dichotomized)
 - Exotic, sensuous, gentle, feminine
 -
 - West invents the 'East' as ...
 - Self-referential
 - ≠ writers from there & their writings, poetry, analysis, etc. (dont look at them, we read our own sources on them)
 - = our views of them
 - Currently? Middle East: through who writings do we understand?

How does Racism figure into IR?

Errol Henderson

- Race and racism = organizing principles
 - Bases of scientific international relations
 - Spencer → off darwins work
 - 'favored races' = civilization and state = euros (there ideas won out)
 - 'inferior races' = chaos and tribal systems = non-euros
 - Method: observe → theory than....put it into practice
 - Imperialism & colonization (this is the step of putting it into practice of fixing the backwards people)
 - Proxy wars: use colonized for war (using Kurds to help us with war)

-
- Henderson: Racism & IR Conceptualization
 - Hobbes on Anarchy
 - Europeans = orderly society always emerges
 - Non-Europeans = anarchic and violent
 - Clear argument that we don't want to end up like these inferior (first nations and tribal even though some of these issues caused by colonizers)
 - Colonization justified = Non-Christian = 'state of anarchy'
 - Not protected/favored by god
 - 'might makes right' against inferior people
 -
 - Locke on Property & Land
 - Non-Europeans, 'idle Indian's & 'non-human blacks': lazy, naked, nomadic—somewhat barbaric people
 - ≠ rights, property-deserving, political say etc.
 - 'idle Indians' & 'non-human blacks'
 - Just wars against non-Europeans = civilizing, Christianizing etc. (doing stuff to bring them into civilize discourse)
 - African slavery = okay”
 - Lose: agency--- become property (when they are slaves their better then they were before)
 - Gain greater stuff: Europeans provide personal care, religious enlightenment, purpose to their life and even a name (*become moral agents because they gain Christian name*)
 -
 - Kant on Democratic thesis
 - 'Negroes' ≠ 'higher rational and moral achievement' (can't achieve this)
 - Talent = do repetitive, low/no intelligence tasks
 - Beat with a cane = suffer pain → learn moral agency (helps teach lesson against how they can be better)

- Slavery justified = Europeans must be able to provide politics economy sociology and its ok to impose
- Political development & Democratic thesis ≠ apply
 - Non-European systems ≠ co-exist
 - Non-European democracies ≠ legitimate
 - Iroquois Confederacy's *Great Laws of Peace* in 1400s → American Constitution

Why does Imperialism matter?

- W.E.B. DuBois: (first African American PHD to grad from Harvard)
 - Imperialism = *bourgeoisie* + *proletariat* (not about this)
 - 1915:--- Before Lenin's 1917 class-based imperialism book
 - Queries: 'why lower class don't rebel?'
 - Explains: racism against anyone must be fought (imperialism is actually a racial system/ exploitation is different when its of a different/lower race)
 - Racial alignment (important in how politics play out) = segregation in USA (allowed for this to occur politically)
 - Racial superiority = domination of Africa (allowed and privileged)
 - Poor non-black Ams/Europeans = are still better off than inferior races elsewhere. (African counterparts)
 - Imposed *alien* Western state structure
 - Morgenthau: prevent 'anarchy' in 'politically empty spaces of Africa and Asia'
 - If like Europe = can join 'society of states' (like how they totally arbitrarily cut up ethnic group into state)
 - BUT: Divide-and-Conquer
 - Produce dictatorships = benefit former colonies
 - Minority groups = give power and dependent (to make them dependent and stay aligned with former colonizer)
 - Border = separate and pit against
 - Where?
 - France > Rwanda: Tutsi minority vs. Hutu Minority (tutsi power)

- Britain > Syria: Allouite minority vs. Sunni majority (allouite power)
- USA > Iraq: Sunni minority vs. Shia majority (sunni power)

West > Egypt: military and urban minority (army) vs. muslim, rural majority (muslim brotherhood) (able to help the army come to power)

- Various revisions of racialised discourse
 - Samuel Huntington's 'Clash of Civilizations'
 - Max Singer and Aaron Wildavsky's 'Zones of Peace' versus 'Zones of Turmoil' (middle east, Africa, latin America)
 - African states = zones of anarchy (Kaplan) ← give political order, 'right path', etc. (back to H,L,K)

Past is Future: started with race & civilization divisions/superiority in IR now going to back it as ordering international relations?