**The United States and International Institutions**

•

What are the differences between international institutions (rules, marriage, constitution) and international organizations (enforce rules, congress)?

•

How do international institutions/organizations shape international politics?

•

Is it all about enforcement? The U.S. and the U.N.

•

The U.S. and N.A.T.O

•

N.A.T.O expansion after the Cold War

**What are institutions?**

I.

What are Political Institutions?

“Institutions are the rules of the game in a society or, more formally, are the humanly devised constraints that shape human interaction. In consequence they structure incentives in human exchange, whether political, social, or economic.”

II. Institutions vs. organizations

-- How the United Nations or Congress is and is not an institution

-- Examples of institutions: electoral rules, legislative rules, federalism

**How do international institutions structure global politics?**

•

Institutions as rules that guide interactions among states

•

Examples

–

Sovereignty as legal recognition (by other states) of a government’s right to regulate people (set laws for

them) living within set territorial boundaries

•

Create expectations about appropriate behavior i.e. should not violate territory of another state without authorization

–

Trade liberalization: grant access of foreign companies access to domestic market

**How do international organizations structure global politics (I)?**

•

Enforcement of rules, sometimes...

–

World Trade Organization (WTO) as dispute resolution mechanism that can impose penalties on states that violate their commitments

•

Problem: If IO does not possess means to enforce (think UN) and has to delegate authority to enforce to states, what happens to IO if states refuse to enforce?

–

Can mean effective end of IO e.g. League of Nations

–

Note Stewart video on UN shortly

**How do international organizations structure global politics (II)?**

•

Provide information about state interests and trustworthiness

–

Decision itself to join often domestically costly because requires concessions

–

Demonstrates commitment to pursue line of policies

•

Examples

–

Chinese entry into WTO, not costless (cut tariff barriers for China)

–

Weapons inspectors: check for compliance

**How do international organizations structure global politics(III)?**

•

Allocate power and influence among states

–

Independently powerful

•

Create new international law

–

Judicial activism at WTO

•

Set agenda in favor of some

–

Veto power of UN Security Council (US) helps to keep recognition of Palestine off agenda, but...

–

Lock-in existing power arrangements

•

P5 on UN Security Council (United States, Russia, China, United Kingdom, and France) function of post-WWII settlement; no Germany, Brazil, Japan, India

**How do international organizations structure global politics(III, ctd)?**

•

Allocate power and influence among states

–

Ikenberry: US entry into international organizations helps to solve fundamental problem of politics at

international level

•

**Need coercive power and authority; but once exists, how limit?**

–

And preserve US power/hegemony

–

Examples: NATO, Bretton Woods organizations (IMF and WTO), participation in UN

**RECAP: How do international institutions/organizations structure international politics?**

•

Even if possess limited capacity enforce rules on states, they still matter in IR

–

Shape expectations

–

Provide information about state interests and incentives to comply

–

Allocate and generate power for states

•

Video clip: Jon Stewart is funny, but wrong... (politically legitimate)

**The United States and the UN (difficult because nearly universal)**

•

US key player because of seat on Security Council

•

Can ignore, but...why participate regularly (e.g. seek approval for 2003 Iraq War, political capital)?

•

Source of legitimacy abroad and at home

–

UN reflect global public opinion, easier to gain allies if support

–

Domestic public more likely to support policies that have secured UN approval (Chapman—UT)

**The US and International Organizations**

•

Real tension: might need to gain legitimacy for policy, secure additional support to implement

policies, but...

•

Can require some surrender of sovereignty or authority of elected officials in US set policy of

the United States

**U.S. and NATO: Cold War Origins**

A.

U.S. and NATO: Cold War Origins – deter soviets, 3 goals (zone of peace, binding mechanism, peace between democracies, protection from soviets)

1.

General Lord Ismay, NATO first secretary general, on goal of NATO: “to keep the Russians out, the Americans in, and the Germans down”

2.

NATO and protection of Europe from the Soviet threat

3.

NATO as a binding mechanism for American military power

4.

NATO and peace between democratic powers in Europe

B.

Dilemmas of NATO

5.

European shirking not paying their self defense

6.

U.S. as reluctant hegemon:

President Eisenhower on European shirking in NATO: “They won’t make the sacrifices to provide the soldiers for their own defense.”

**U.S., NATO, and the End of Cold War**

A.

Dilemmas for NATO at the end of the Cold War

1.

Loss of mission – Shouldn’t end of Warsaw Pact mean the end of NATO

a.

Finding new missions: Out-of-region interventions.

2.

Pressure from Eastern Europe to enter NATO

b.

EE countries determined not be left vulnerable to Russian hegemony again

3.

What to do about Russia? How should NATO approach the “new Russia”?

c.

Should NATO preemptively contain Russia even though it was no longer communist?

d.

Could Russia be a part of NATO?

**U.S., NATO, and Post-Cold War World: The case for NATO expansion**

A.

The case for NATO expansion

1.

The original goal remains relevant (keep Russia out, U.S. in, and Germany down)

a.

Neo-containment of an inevitably anti-Western Russia

b.

Keeps American power bound by allies

c.

NATO could expand the zone of peace in Europe

2.

NATO as a more effective “mini-United Nations”

d.

Out-of-region interventions allow U.S. and its allies opportunities to use multi-lateralism to enforce liberal internationalism. But, this may expand rather than bind U.S. power.

**U.S., NATO, and Post-Cold War World: The case against NATO expansion**

A.

The case against NATO expansion

1.

Loss of mission – NATO is no longer relevant

a.

Security in Europe does not need NATO

2.

Threatened and antagonized Russia

b.

Treating Russia like an enemy made Russia an enemy