An Introduction to International Politics

Module - POL10601

Lecture Notes
Lecture 1 - The **Idealist** Approach to International Politics

1. The Core Themes

- Early IR scholarship was predominantly Liberal in approach. Tended to advocate the ‘domestication’ of international politics. Reflected a belief that the progress of humankind since the ‘Enlightenment’ (17th-18thC) needed to extend into international politics.
- Emphasis on domestic change to prevent ‘sinister interests’ from dominating foreign policy: open up foreign policy to public scrutiny, making foreign policy a bit more like other areas of public policy. Growing influence of ‘world public opinion’.
- Recognition of the need to develop mediation and organisation at the international level that would facilitate good communication and negotiation of disputes. This established a key theme in Liberal International Relations thinking: international institutions. Hence the establishment of the League of Nations.
- The need to introduce an element of coercion to back up international law. This rapidly filtered into the leading texts on international law during and immediately after WW1.

2. Kant’s ‘Inside Out’ International Reformism

Kant’s pamphlet *Perpetual Peace* (1795) seen as a key source of ‘idealist’ thinking. Kant argued that ‘Republics’ (nowadays we would say ‘democracies’) were less likely to go to war. Why?

- People are less bellicose than their rulers because it is they who will wear the costs of waging war. In a ‘republic’ the populace is more likely to constrain the aggressive tendencies of their leaders.
- The republic (today we would say a democracy) was the only form of state that could ensure the development of a good moral culture in which individuals learn to heed the voice of reason and also learn from experience that war can lead only to suffering. Individual moral development leads us to see ourselves as part of a global community of humankind.
- The more democracy spreads, the better relations between states would be and we might eventually eliminate the need for standing armies.
- The ‘democracies don’t go to war with each other’ argument is still very influential today (although some contest its accuracy) and lies behind the contemporary Liberal emphasis on the virtues of ‘democratisation’. Think of the contemporary arguments for invading Iraq and attempting to stabilise and pacify Afghanistan.

His legacy within Idealist International Relations thought is highly significant.
- There is a ‘harmony of interests’ binding all people. Reason compels us to seek perpetual peace no matter how improbable it might appear.
- The hopes of world peace lie first in the establishment of republican and responsible governments in all states.
- The rule of law can and should prevail globally.
- Free trade provides the best foundation for peaceful relations between states.
- There should be an international ‘federation’ of states.
- The influence of Kant very evident in the efforts of the US President Woodrow Wilson to promote the reform of international relations and the establishment of the League of Nations after WW1.
- The Kantian legacy then consists in:
  - A belief in human rational self-interest which underpins a belief in the possibility of progress.
  - A belief in the capacity of humans, in spite of self-interest, to cooperate which is extended to a belief in the capacities of states to cooperate.
  - Democratic governments, economic interdependence and international law and organizations can combine to overcome the barriers to international peace.

Lecture 2 - The Realist Approach to International Politics

Became the dominant perspective after 1945 and highly influential in foreign policy. At it’s heart lies a preoccupation with power; hence the common synonym for Realism – Power Politics.

Recognises the central role of power in politics of all kinds, but also it’s limitations of power and the ways in which it can readily be made self-defeating. Stresses sensitivity to ethical dilemmas and the practical implications and the need to base influence, wherever possible, on shared interests and persuasion.

1. Principal Proponents

- Thucydides
- Machiavelli
- Von Clausewitz
- Morgenthau
- Carr

Have holistic understanding of politics that stress the similarities between domestic and international politics, and the roles of ethics and community when promoting stability. Recognise that communal bonds are fragile and easily undermined by the unrestrained pursuit of unilateral advantage by individuals, factions and states. Regards history as cyclical, in the sense that efforts to build
order and escape from fear-driven worlds, while they may succeed for a considerable period of time, ultimately succumbs to the destabilising effects of actors who believe they are too powerful to be constrained by law and custom.

Although emerging after 1945, Classical Realism claims a long heritage; some Realists trace the theory back through history to suggest it is premised upon a ‘timeless’ understanding of relations between, rather than within, bounded communities.

2. Origins of Realism

Thucydide’s account of the Peloponnesian Wars (431 – 404 BC) between Athens and other city-states. ‘The strong do what they have the power to do and the weak accept what they have to accept’.

Machiavelli’s advice to Lorenzo de Medici – hence, the ‘Machiavellian’ phrase to describe those who see politics as the art of amoral manipulation and use of power.

Hobbes account, in the Leviathan, of the ‘state of nature’ is seen by Realists to capture the essence of the international anarchical system.

3. The Classical Realists

E.H Carr – ‘The Twenty Years Crisis’

Carr saw the roots of Liberal utopian optimism stemming from the belief in laissez-faire economics. Above all, Liberalism rested on the assumption of a ‘harmony of interests’ between people’s and states.

According to Carr, ‘Realism is the study of what is rather than what it should be’.

Carr emphasises the centrality of power in International relations. He accuses interwar Liberal idealism of shoring up the international status quo and was very critical of the League of Nations. Carr motivated by historical circumstances – the Versailles Peace Treaty, his personal experiences as a diplomat, a growing disenchantment with Liberalism, and impending war with Nazi Germany. Carr’s writing suggests he was not only a critic of ‘Idealism’ but also a critic of ‘Realism’ and not a proper Realist (clear sign of Marxism in his work). He advocated a synthesis of Idealism and Realism.

Carr was a supporter of appeasement and argued that Nazi Germany needed it’s own ‘sphere of influence’ and some room to expand. Carr’s understanding of International politics was centred around a deputation of conflict between ‘have’ and ‘have not’ states; a view with influence of Marxism.
Hans Morgenthau – ‘Politics among Nations’

A Jewish refugee from Nazi Germany who fled to the United States in 1937.

He argued that Liberalism took a naïve and benign view of International politics. He saw it as too legalistic and placing too much faith in international institutions as the cornerstones of a more peaceful, liberal world order. He believed politics was an incessant struggle for power.

- Pessimistic view of human nature
- Six principles of political realism

The six principles:

1) Politics is governed by objective laws which have their root in human nature
2) The key to understanding international politics is the concept of interest in terms of power
3) State power will vary according to time and place, but the concept of interest is universally valid
4) Universal moral principles do not guide state behaviour; states are not moral agents
5) There is no universally agreed set of moral principles
6) Intellectually, the political sphere needs to be understood as autonomous from other spheres of human activity

All varieties/strands of Realism have a set of core concerns:

- Statism
- Self-help
- Survival
- Skeptical about the role of morality
- Focus strongly on the role of power
- Emphasise the centrality of the national interest for all states

The core assumptions of classical Realism:

- State centrisim; the main actors in the International system are sovereign states and have been since its emergence
- The International system is anarchic. It is a self-help system which generates a security dilemma for states
- The principle concern of states is the acquisition of power and survival – the preservation of their security – ‘raison d'état (Reason of State)
- The primary influence on a state's foreign policy is the national interest
- What order arises from largely from the balance of power, but the possibility of war is ever-present
- The possibility of reform of the international system is very limited/non-existent. The international system is characterised by ‘recurrence and reputation’
- International Relations requires its own unique theoretical tools

4. Theories within Realism

Theory on Community

Believe that the tensions between individual and communities could be reconciled in part at a deeper level of understanding. This is because a well functioning community is essential to the intelligent formation and pursuit of individual interests. Principles of justice on which all viable communities are based also allow the efficient translation of power into interests. Membership in a community imposes limits on the ends and means of power. Failure to subordinate goals to the requirements of justice leads to self-defeating policies of over expansion. Understand that great powers are often their own worst enemies because success and the hubris it engenders encourage actors to see themselves outside of and above their community, and this in turn blinds them to the need for self-restraint.

Theory on Change, Transformation and Modernisation

Think of political systems in terms of their principles of order, and the ways in which they help to shape the identities of actors and the discourses are often the result of modernisation, and hegemonic war is more often a consequence than a cause of such a transformation. Different understandings of cause and effect have important implications for the sorts of strategies classical realists envisage on efficacious in maintaining or restoring order. They put more weight on values and ideas than they do on power.

Different systems on the basis of their polarity. System change occurs when the number of poles changes. Often the result of hegemonic wars, brought on in turn by shifts in the balance of material capabilities. Rising powers may go to war to remake the system in their interests, and status quo powers to forestall such change. The cycle is timeless and independent. Transformation is a broader concept, and one they associate with processes that we have come to describe as modernisation. It brings about shifts in identities and discourses, and, with them, changing conceptions of security. Leads to a misplaced faith in reason and undermined the values and norms that had restrained individual and state behaviour. The self definition of human beings, widespread belief in the power of reason and the triumph of secular over religious values had far reaching political implications.

Theory on Nature/Purpose of Theory
Theoretical knowledge is not an end in itself, but a starting point for actors to work their way through contemporary problems and, in the process, come to deeper forms of understanding.

**Theory on Order and Stability**

Governments that defend border, enforce laws and protect citizens make domestic politics more peaceful and qualitatively different from international politics. All politics is an expression of the same human drives and subject to the same pathologies. They see more variations in order and stability within domestic and international systems that they do between them, and explain it within reference to the cohesiveness of society, domestic or international, and the channels into which it directs human drives. All politics is a struggle for power. Communities and the identities and norms they help to create and sustain are the most critical determinants of order, at home and abroad.

**Theory on the Balance of Power**

Consider military capability and alliances the very foundation of security. However, see them also as likely to provoke as to prevent conflict. Individuals, groups and states inevitably combined to protect themselves from predators. At an international level, the balance of power had contradictory implications for peace. It may prevent war if status quo powers outgunned imperialist challengers and demonstrated their resolve to go to war in defence of the status quo. But balancing could also intensify tensions and make war more likely because of the impossibility of assessing with any certainty the motives, capability, and resolve of other states.

“The balance of power works best when needed least”

**Theory on Interest and Justice**

Define interests in terms of power. Many Realists also believe in the primary of self-interest over moral principle, and regard considerations of justice as inappropriate, if not dangerous foundations on which to base foreign policies. See capabilities as only one source of power and do not equate power with influence. Influence is a psychological relationship, based on ties that transcend momentary interests. Justice is the foundation for relationships and of the sense of community on which influence and security ultimately depend.

**Lecture 3 + 4 – The Neo-Realist and Neo-Liberal Approach to International Politics; The ‘Neo-Neo’ Debate**

1. **The Neo-Neo Debate**
1970's; Emergence of Liberal ideas of interdependence. Key theorists include Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye

1979; The arrival of Neo-Realism. Key theorist – Kenneth Waltz

1980; The Neo-Liberal retort. Key theorist – Robert Keohane

2. The Revival of Liberalism

During the 1970’s, a number of US scholars began to challenge Realism’s “Billiard Ball” model of international politics by introducing the concept of “interdependence”. They began presenting a different image of international politics as more like a network of relations between states.

For example, the integration of Europe was highly influential; with emphasis on institutions and cooperation.

Also influenced by the impact of the trebling of oil prices by OPEC after the Yom Kippur War of 1973 between Israel and its Arab neighbours. A cartel of oil producing states were able to decisively influence international politics and states varied significantly in their sensitivity and vulnerability to the oil price shock.

Liberals took the view that if you actually looked at what concerned most states, it was not the ‘high’ politics of security and survival, but the ‘low’ politics of trade and economic interaction. States were increasingly finding themselves in a condition of “complex interdependence”.

3. Keohane and Nye; Power and Interdependence (1977)

This was a key challenge to Realist dominance in international relations. It emphasised that to varying degrees, states exhibited sensitivity or vulnerability. A degree of Realism is still evident; strong states tend to be sensitive, and weaker states were more vulnerable.

A ‘complex interdependence’ consists of multiple channels, informal and formal, connecting societies: interstate, trans-governmental and trans-national relations. Interstate relationships consist of multiple issues that are not arranged in a clear of consistent hierarchy. Issues arise from both domestic and international policy arenas, generate different coalitions both within governments and between them, and involve different degrees of conflict. Military force is not used by Government’s towards other Governments within the region or on the issues when complex interdependence prevails.
The Liberal Challenge to Realist dominance
Gathered speed during the period of “Détente” between the superpowers when attention was shifting away from the Cold War and the European integration product was gathering speed.

The importance of trans-national regimes (precursor to contemporary ideas of global governance). Division between domestic and international politics, and therefore policy making, is breaking down. State is not a single actor but an amalgam of actual and potential international politics.

In summary, “Cooperation under anarchy”

4. Kenneth Waltz and Neo-Realism

The Theory of International Politics (1979)
Waltz argues his revised Realism is a systematic theory and not a reductionist one. The explanation for international politics lies at the level of the international system. In Neo-Realism, structure (of the international system) takes precedence over agency (the nature of states, or human nature).

Waltz argues we need parsimonious theories – simple explanations that only focus on what is necessary to explain the phenomenon under investigation (in this case, why the anarchical international system preserves).

There are three elements to Waltz’s theory;
- Ordering principle of the system
- Nature of the units within the system
- The distribution of capabilities

Because the ordering principle of the international system is anarchic, its units – States – are functionally similar. States are distinguished by their capabilities. The capacity of each state to pursue and achieve their objectives varies on where they are placed in the international system; their relative power.

Thus, States should always be mindful of the prevailing distribution of capabilities and their positions within it. Distribution of capabilities within the system might relate to a unipolar, a bipolar or a multipolar system. Waltz argues that unless the ordering principle changes (from anarchy to hierarchy), the system will tend to reproduce itself, ie, the prospects for change or progress is poor.

5. Debates within Neo-Realism

Bipolar or Unipolar?
Waltz argues that a bipolar system is the most stable (not all Realists agree).
- 2 superpowers bring stability; weaker states tend to align or bandwagon with one of the two dominant powers.
- Waltz argues that an unbalanced single power is dangerous (even if it is the US) as it can encourage recklessness.

However, many argue we have unipolar system. This has generated a debate about the role of a hegemonic power - can a responsible hegemon provide stability by being the ultimate provider of military, economic and political security? This is an idea developed within Hegemonic Stability Theory (Kindleberger).

**Defensive v Offensive Realism?**

Defensive Realism (Waltz) - It is foolish for states to maximise power or over-expansion. This will lead to dangerous and destabilising balancing by other states and the costs can outweigh the benefits. States should pursue appropriate levels of power to ensure order and avoid war.

Offensive Realism (Mearsheimer) - Offence can pay, and hegemony is both achievable and preferable. States want to be ‘the biggest, best “dude” on the block’. But, no state can be a truly ‘global hegemon’. The US is certainly the hegemon in the Western hemisphere and tolerates no rivals, but it cannot enforce its dominance in all other regions due to competitor hegemons and the risk of major conflict.

6. **Neo-Liberal Institutionalism**

Keohane and others responded to Waltz’s Neo-Realism.

**Key thesis**

State actions depend to a considerable degree of prevailing institutional arrangements. Institutions are persistent and connected by a set of rules (formal and informal) that prescribe behavioural roles, constrain activity, and shape expectations. They can be formal creations by Governments, international regimes, or informal conventions that affect:

- The flow of information and opportunities to negotiate
- The ability of Governments to monitor others compliance and to implement their own commitments
- Expectations about the solidity of international agreements
- They influence the incentives facing states and the understanding that state leaders have about their role and the motives and interests of other states

For example, for Institutionalism to work, States must have some mutual interest - ie; they must all potentially gain from cooperation. The central banks of the US, UK, the EU, Sweden, Canada and Switzerland all cut interest rates in coordinated action to help reduce the risk of a global recession.
7. **Neo-Liberals and Neo-Realists**

Both agree that...

- The international system is anarchic
- States matter
- We should try and develop a rigorous and parsimonious theory of international politics

They disagree on...

- The significance of non-state actors
- The significance of regimes, institutions and conventions
- The degree and significance of “cooperation under anarchy”
- The importance of “relative” versus “absolute” gains through cooperation - Neo-Liberals stress about absolute gains (How do I benefit, regardless?), whereas Neo-Realists stress “relative” gains (How do I benefit compared to them?)
- The role of an hegemonic power - both acknowledge the key role of hegemon in maintaining international order, but Neo-Liberals see hegemons as potentially more ‘other regarding’ than Neo-Realists and stable post-hegemonic orders or multipolar systems are seen as possible and viable

8. **The Neo-Neo Debate**

- There has been a clear movement towards a middle neo-neo position
- This remains dominant in US International Relations scholarship, but much less outside the United States
- The two perspectives are very similar and share methodology, focus on similar questions and agree on a number of key assumptions about the international system
- Key differences centre on the significance of international institutions, the role of non-state actors and the benefits of cooperation
- Critics tend to focus on what the neo-neo debate leaves out, such as moral and ethical issues, the possibly declining significance of the state in a globalizing world (as argued by many Liberals), issues of political culture, identity and the complex impact of domestic politics on foreign policy and international relations
- The narrowness of the neo-neo debate has generated a lot of critical responses and encouraged the rapid growth of non-mainstream approaches, especially outside the U.S. in response to the overly narrow focus of the mainstream American International Relations

**Lecture 5 - Critical Approaches to International Relations**
To be critical in the everyday sense means to disagree with/or criticise a point of view. In social sciences, critical theory has a more formal meaning.

Critical theories take a different view of the nature and purpose of theory. One of the most famous early expressions of this is found by the work of Karl Marx; ‘Philosopher’s have only interpreted the world, in various ways. The point, however, is to change it’ (Theses on Feuerbach 1845). What is at stake is the purpose of theory and the role of the theorist. Some newer theories confine themselves to criticising the mainstream for not looking at certain things (some types of Feminism and Marxism for example). Others are more challenging to grasp because they raise questions about theory itself. These see theory as not just explaining the world but as constitutive of the world, helping to make and sustain a specific world (Constructivists, some Marxists, some Feminists). Some go further and question whether there are any secure foundations at all from which we can judge a social or political theory to be true or false (Poststructuralism, Postmodernism, some Feminism).

1. **Horkheimer: Distinction between ‘Traditional’ and ‘Critical’ Theories**

   Traditional theories; “Make a distinction between subject and object...postulate that the subject (the theorist) can stand independently outside the object which they are trying to theorise. There is, and can be, a distinction between fact and value and theory must be value free” (This kind of theory often referred to as empiricist and positivist).

   Critical theories; “Deny the possibility of a separation between subject and object. The social scientist (subject) is worthily embedded and situated in social and political life. As such, theories are irreducibly related to social life. They are not, and cannot be, simple objective descriptions of what there is. Critical theory is concerned with the purposes and functions of social theories. Underlying the purpose is the improvement of the human condition through elimination of injustice”.

2. **Critical Theories of International Relations**

   Critical theories started to appear from 1981 onwards in response to Waltz’s Neo-Realism.

   They reject positivism (the belief in the possibility of scientific knowledge of social and political phenomena). They argue that all knowledge reflects the interests of the researcher. International Relations scholars cannot be detached from the subject matter we are studying – we are part of the human world that we study and our theorising is also part of that world. Critical theories reject the distinction between facts and judgements.

   As stated by Robert Cox, “Theory is always for someone and for some purpose”.

---
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Cox, Robert (1981), "Social Forces, States and World Orders; Beyond International Relations Theory"

'Problem Solving' Theory
Takes the world as it finds it, with the prevailing social and power relationships and the institutions, which they are organised, as the given framework for action. The general aim of the 'problem solving' theory is to make these relationships and institutions work smoothly by dealing with sources of trouble.

Critical Theory
Does not take institutions and social and power relations for granted but calls them into question concerning itself with their origins and how and whether they might be in the process of changing. It is directed towards an appraisal of the very framework for action, or problematic, which problem solving theory accepts as it’s parameters.

4. So what is International Relations?

Traditional/Mainstream theories of International Relations concern themselves with relations between states, conflict and cooperation. Critical theories are far less attached to this agenda. They take their inspiration from many sources.

Critical theories ask different questions, for example:

Neo-Realism and Neo-Liberalism are traditional theories. They accept the anarchy problem and try to find ways to live in it or mitigate it.

Critical theories conduct a meta-theoretical critique – in other words, they don’t join in with the theoretical debate, they ask questions about the debate itself.

Critical theories respond to Traditional theories in two ways:

1. Critical theories explore the way in which a theory serves particular kinds of interests, asking questions such as ‘Who benefits?’ or ‘Who doesn’t benefit?’
   - Neo-Realism paints a certain picture of the world. Who does well in this picture and who doesn’t?

2. Critical theories explore which arguments are closed down or shut out of a particular theoretical debate (What questions are being asked? What is missing?)
   - Neo-Realism; ‘Anarchy leads to conflict so it’s every state for themselves’
   - Neo-Liberal; ‘No, no. Anarchy leads to conflict so states will cooperate to avoid it and institutions will help them do this’
• Critical; ‘Isn’t there a different conversation we could be having? Like, why is the world divided into states in the first place? Why does politics become violent? Why are some people better off than others?’

Sources of Inspiration for Critical Theories
- Marx deeply influenced the thought of the Frankfurter School
- Feminist writers
- Italian philosopher Gramsci (Very influential in Critical IPE)
- German philosopher Habermas
- French philosopher Foucault and Derrida

Critical thinkers do not all have a lot in common; but they do all agree that theory should challenge and unsettle established categories and disconnect the reader.

5. Feminism(s)

There is not one Feminism, but many Feminisms – different theoretical approaches to understanding the role of gender in power relations. Feminism is not necessarily just about women; it is about progressive social change. Without the appreciation of gender in the hierarchical structure of all social and political relationships, we only have a partial view. There are many varieties of Feminism, which emerged in International Relations in the 1980s. They all share a concern with the place of gender in international politics and the subordination of women globally.

Feminism in International Relations
Most Feminists define gender as different from sex. They see gender as referring to socially and culturally constructed characteristics that vary according to the time and place. Gender is a system of social hierarchy where masculinity is valued over femininity.

Male ➔ Rational, Competitive, Aggressive

Female ➔ Emotional, Consensus orientated, Submissive

Many Feminists see women as rendered invisible in most international politics scholarship or reduced to very limited roles; home-makers, mothers, in need of protection, victims. As such, they are often depicted as (or simply assumed to be) unsuited to a world marked by conflict and war. Many Feminists see the global economy as highly gendered. 3/5 of the world’s poor are women and girls; on average, women earn 2/3 of a man’s earnings; globally, women are disproportionately represented in low paid jobs, subsistence agriculture, and unpaid labour in the ‘private’ sphere. But, not that many Feminists resist the notion that women are just victims and some also argue that men are also victims of gender stereotypes and roles.
There are many types/varieties of Feminism.

Feminisms of **EQUALITY**:

**Liberal Feminism**
“Add women and stir” – The most mainstream variety. Emphasises discrimination and the absence of women in politics. Would having more women in the upper echelons of politics and international politics make a difference? Think of the Scandinavian states, which are all famously “women friendly”. They are high numbers of women in Parliament, Government and public administration.

**Standpoint Feminism**
Goes beyond the empirical circumstances of Feminism to suggest that women offer a different way of seeing things – a viewpoint from those excluded from power. Questions the category of power itself. A number of varieties including Socialist Feminism and Radical Feminism. The latter particularly noted for its emphasis on ‘Patriarchy’ - the role of the male.

Feminism of **DIFFERENCE**;

**Poststructural Feminism**
Shares the critique of patriarchy but challenges earlier Feminism’s tendency to articulate a singular feminine identity favouring the articulation of a municipality of identities both male and female, which are constantly being made and remade through language and text. Asks how international politics produces and reproduces particular accounts of ‘gender subjectivity’.

6. **Post-Modernism**

The most controversial of newer, critical theories and ‘the fastest growing’. It is highly sceptical of any theory that asserts it has clear foundations - an epistemology - for verifying the truth of knowledge claims. This scepticism comes from;

- The relationship between power and knowledge. It follows Foucault in arguing that knowledge is not immune from power, and that power produces knowledge. There is no truth outside of power. Their key question then is how some forms of knowledge become dominant.
- ‘There is nothing but the text’ (Derrida). Post-Modernists argue, not that there is no ‘reality’ (as many critics suggest), but that reality can only be known through its representation in language and text. To represent reality is to immediately act upon that reality. A key aspect of this approach is to show how any text has always more than one reading and how seemingly stable and ‘natural’ concepts and relations are in fact artificial constructs. Adds up to a questioning of how the world is represented in mainstream theories and how dominant representations limit of possible knowledge.
**Baudrilliard**

Wrote three essays published in Liberation (France) and The Guardian (UK) in 1991 entitled:

- “The Gulf War will not take place”
- “The Gulf War is not really taking place”
- “The Gulf War did not take place”

What Baudrilliard says is that the United States fought much of the war virtually, using hi-technology, avoiding contact with Iraqi troops (which meant a lot more Iraqi’s dead), and we saw most of the war through carefully filtered reports. For Baudrilliard, the issue is one of interpretation; were the events that took place on the ground comparable to how they were presented, and could these events be called a war as we have traditionally understood the term?

**Examples:**

Difference between the Mercator (1569) and Peter’s (1970s) Projection. The representations between both stagger incredibly. The Mercator Projection puts 2/3’s of the world’s landmass north of the equator, whereas the Peter’s Projection provides a more accurate “equal-area” map, which gives greater prominence to the global South.

**Lecture 6 - 1945; Post War Global Landscape and the First Cold War**

Academic writing on the Cold War was often described as ‘expansionist’ in the West but the US rarely was. There is frequent reference to Soviet behaviour versus US policy. The Soviet literature was also politically coloured.

Although the relationship between the superpowers is central to any understanding of the post 1945 international system, there were other processes which both fed into and mitigated the Cold War. These include:

- The rapid acceleration of the struggle against Colonialism and the emergence of the Third World and the concept of non-alignment
- The development of the UN system and International organisation more generally
- The emergence (and re-emergence) of other powerful states such as China, Japan and West Germany
- Europe was no longer the centre of international politics; but it was still crucial (the project of European integration)
- The development of weapons of mass-destruction
The term ‘Cold War’ was coined by US journalist H.B Swope and popularised by Walter Lippman.

- Used to describe the state of tension, hostility and rivalry that had developed between the Western (Capitalist) and Eastern (Communist) blocs after 1945
- A condition of neither peace nor war, which displays the structural features of great power rivalry but stops short of actual armed engagement

But, it did not preclude:

- Conflict between one of the superpowers and states aligned with another superpower
- Conflict between proxies of either superpower
- Armed intervention; covert or overt; by one of the superpowers within their sphere of influence. For instance; Korean War (1950 - 1953), Vietnam War (1959 - 1975), US intervention in Latin America and Soviet interventions in Hungary (1956), Czechoslovakia (1968) and Afghanistan (1978 - 1989)

1. The Situation in 1945: Signs of Mutual commitment to Cooperation?

The spheres of influence deal between Churchill and Stalin in 1944 that carved up Europe, Korea etc was to reflect where each of the superpowers were dominant. Four key conferences of the ‘Grand Alliance’ between Britain, The US and The USSR:

- Cairo Conference (November 1943)
- Tehran Conference (December 1943)
- Yalta Conference (February 1945)
- Potsdam Conference (July 1945)

Also, an agreement was reached on the UN charter at San Francisco (June 1945). Recognition, notably on the part of the US, that a new world order was emerging and it required some governing principles and institutions. But real tensions within each of the key players perspectives and the role of individual personalities cannot be directed.

2. 1946: Growing Confrontation

From 1946 onwards sees a rapid decline in the spirit of cooperation. Key tension was between the development of a new international framework and the pursuit of ‘vital interests’ by the key players.
- Growing perception by US and UK that Stalin was not sticking to the Yalta agreement
- Rapid rise in a general anti-Communist sentiment in the West not only because of greater knowledge of Stalin’s Russia but also because of events in China
- Consolidation on the Anglo-American alliance
- Stalin’s speech (February 9th 1946) to the Supreme Soviet claiming that Capitalist economic competition made war ‘inevitable’. These were followed by; Churchill’s Iron Curtain speech (March 5th 1946) and the enunciation of the Truman Doctrine (March 11th 1947)

3. The Emergence of Uneven Bipolarity?

The Truman Doctrine should be read against the backdrop of an emerging bipolar Cold War system within which, however, the economic and military dominance of the US is increasingly apparent - the first signs of American hegemony and ‘Pax Americana’. By 1947, the US had embarked upon the building of a global, institutionalised liberal, capitalist world order.

There were, however, challenges confronting the US. These included:

- Ensuring the future of the Capitalist world economy
- Reconstruction of war-torn Europe and Japan
- Economic weakness of the US’ key allies
- Future of Germany
- Relationship with an economically weak and increasingly hostile Soviet Union

The resultant Cold War was arguably a new form of ‘total war’.

4. Origins of the Cold War

The Orthodox view
Soviet expansion created US insecurity. Tends to depict an aggressive and expansionist USSR as dictating justifiable US reactions in defence of core liberal values. Found also in more Realist versions, which depict the USSR as a threat to national security.

The Revisionist view
US commitment to expansion of Capitalism created Soviet insecurity. Emerging in the 1960’s, the revisionists linked US strategy and policy with the requirements of an US dominated international capitalist system. The Soviet’s are depicted as largely reacting defensively to an aggressive US commitment policy.
The Postrevisionist view

Rejects the simplistic ascription of responsibility to one side or the other. Often adapts a realist/neo-realist slant in seeing the Cold War as a product of security oriented power politics, suggesting the Cold War was inevitable. Others focus on the problems of misperception, the manipulation of ideology by elites on both sides, and the impact of domestic politics.

Even today, the origins of the Cold War create a heated debate. The notion that the Cold War was a key stage in the emergence of US global dominance is becoming more prominent but ultimately blaming Stalin is still fashionable.

5. The Consolidation of the Blocs - The West

The Marshall Plan (1947 - 1951)
Based on conviction that European recovery was vital both to long term interests of the US and the containment of Soviet communism. An integrated European market would benefit European recovery, US exporters, and the consolidation of a multi-lateral leading system. USSR invited but soon walked out. During 1948 - 1953, the US pumped $13 billion of economic aid into 14 Western European countries, including controversially, West Germany.

The reconstruction of Japan

The formation of NATO (1949)
Intended to address political as well as military issues;
- Embedded a re-militarised Germany in an alliance
- Responding to Soviet military superiority in Europe and the future development of Soviet nuclear capability
- Preparing for 'hot' war
- Cementing the Western anti-Communist alliance

National Security Council 68 (NSC68) (1950)
Blueprint for US Cold War policy for the next 20 years. Made the case for a US military build up to confront an enemy, which was 'animated by a new fanatical faith, antithetical to our own': idea of containment shifted to that of an offensive Cold War while avoiding hot war coupled with US rearmament.

6. The Consolidation of the Blocs - The East

A matter of debate whether Stalin had a master plan for extending Soviet control over Eastern Europe after 1945 or whether Soviet policy was largely reactive. Also debated are Stalin's motivations; traditional imperialism, Marxism-Leninism, or Soviet national interests?
It is clear that Stalin saw the consolidation of Soviet control over Eastern Europe as a key response to the American plan for the political and economic subjugation of Europe. Germany was a key point of contention, especially US plans to establish a West German state.

Prior to 1947, Soviet political interference in Eastern Europe was uneven but after 1948 all opposition parties were suppressed and all of the Eastern European states (with the exception of Tito’s Yugoslavia) effectively became Soviet satellites.

- Creation of COMINFORM (1947)
- Creation of COMECON (1949)
- The Berlin Crisis (1948 - 1949)
- Creation of the Warsaw Pact (1955)

7. The Cycles of Stability and Crisis in the First Cold War

The first Cold War is marked throughout by cycles of tension and relaxation. Conflict flashpoints are interpreted by the evolution of a more systematic and institutionalised relationship between the superpowers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1948 - 1949</td>
<td>The Berlin Blockade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950 - 1953</td>
<td>The Korean War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Stalin dies and Eisenhower elected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Dulles makes ‘Massive Retaliation’ speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Soviet’s propose ‘peaceful coexistence’ and first summit takes place between US, UK, France and USSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Germany join NATO and Warsaw Pact formed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Khrushchev assumes control of USSR - COMINFORM dissolved and the Hungarian Uprising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Khrushchev visits US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Castro takes over in Cuba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>US ‘U2’ spy plane shot down over USSR - Kennedy elected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Bay of Pigs incident and Berlin Wall elected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Cuban Missile Crisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>The ‘Hot-Line’ between Washington and Moscow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Summarising the Cold War in the 1960’s

Clear signs of stabilisation in superpower relationship (after the Cuban Missile Crisis, 1963 Test ban treaty and the Hot-Line agreement). But, the Cold War also
becomes increasingly global with 'hot' wars breaking out in the post colonial world (Vietnam, 1967 Six-Day war in the Middle East).

And these are tensions within the blocs (1966 - France quits NATO military structure, increase in Sino-Soviet tensions, 1968 - signs of liberalisation in Czechoslovakia subsequently crushed by the Warsaw Pact, Romania declares independence within the Eastern bloc, the student uprisings and opposition to US foreign policy in the West). Growing signs of multi-polarity (Germany adopts Ostpolitik, China emerging as an independent power, ‘Group of 77’ Third World states become active in the UN and the ‘North-South’ relationship rises up the agenda).

First signs of progress on Arms Control (1968 Non-Proliferation Treaty) and in January 1969, Nixon becomes US president and in his inaugurations speech calls for 'an era of negotiations between the superpowers'. Is this the beginning of the détente period?

Lecture 7 - 1968: Discontent, Détente and the Second Cold War

The mid-to-late 1960’s saw the emergence of a political and cultural crisis in the West. Symbolised by opposition to the Vietnam War which spawned heightened student activism throughout the West - most famously in Paris in 1968. A generalised reaction, mostly by middle-class youth, to the constraints and dominant values of bourgeois modernity. It saw the rise of early Green, Feminist and anti-Consumerist social movements.

1. Détente

A relaxation in the Cold War between the superpowers ad the replacement of confrontation with a more trusting relationship. Détente is usually dated between 1972 and 1979, but started earlier in Europe, with the highpoint between 1971 and 1973.

2. Motives driving the Superpowers to greater cooperation

The United States:
Typically described as the US pursuing old goals in new circumstances

- Key figures were Nixon and Henry Kissinger (NSA 1969 - 1975 and SOS 1973 - 1977)
- Declining US influence in a changing world leads to a shift from confrontation to modifying Soviet behaviour through cooperation and the ‘carrot’ of greater East-West trade and technology transfer
- Enlisting USSR and China in co-management of international system that still favoured the US and its interests.
- Nixon and Kissinger saw the need for a change in largely Realist terms, but aware of the value of appearing to pursue a stable and more peaceful world.
- Much controversy surrounding their handling of the Vietnam War – combined peace talks with intensified secret bombing of the Ho Chi Minh trail in Cambodia and Laos to cut off supplies to the Viet Cong.

The USSR:

- Political stability at home under Brezhnev (General Secretary of Communist Party 1964 – 1982) and increasing military strength – especially in terms of nuclear capability due to higher military expenditure led to new confidence in dealing with the United States.
- This produces a shift to a policy of continuing the ideological conflict with the West whilst also looking for mutual benefit through cooperation.
- A key goal was recognition of USSR as the equal of the US especially in military terms. The USSR also looking through Realist ‘lenses’.
- Evidence of disagreement within the Kremlin between an ideological and a more Realist outlook, especially regarding anti-Russian sentiment in the Eastern European Communist states.

3. The 1970’s; Growing ‘perceptions’ of a changing world?

In international relations scholarship:

- Emergence of ideas of ‘complex interdependence’ (the fore-runner of neo-Liberalism) and greater emphasis on the growing importance of ‘low politics’ (Trade, Economic development) over ‘high politics’ (Security).
- Increasing questioning of bipolarity in favour of emerging multi-polarity.
- Emergence of International Political Economy (IPE) as a key sub-discipline in reflection of emerging problems in the post-war Capitalist economic system.
- Greater emphasis on North South relations, at expense of East-West, as ‘Third World’ bloc (Group 77) in UN becomes increasingly vocal.
- ‘Dependency Theory’ emerges, focussing on exploiting of ‘under developed’ global South by the ‘developed’ North.
- Arms control rises up the academic agenda and relatively new sub-disciplines such as ‘Conflict Analysis’ and ‘Peace Research’ at their peaks. These ideas seem to influence US foreign policy under Carter (after 1976).
- Human Rights begin to emerge as a key area of scholarly debate and research.

4. The 1970’s; Growing ‘signs’ of a changing world?

- Liberal IR theory increasingly influential, but Nixon and Kissinger bring Realism into the White House.
- Opening up of the US-China relationship ‘Triangular Diplomacy’.
- China joins UN as a member of the P5 replacing Taiwan.
- Fall of South Vietnam and Cambodia.
- An era of diplomacy (‘Shuttle Diplomacy’).
- Real progress in arms control (1972 - SALT I Agreements - ABM Treaty and ceilings on Offensive Missile Numbers agreed. SALT2 started).
- European East-West relations improve.
- Middle East crisis (1973; Yom Kippur War and OPEC Oil price hike).
- UN General Assembly debates; Middle East, Human Rights, and a new international economic order (NIEO).
- Crisis in the Bretton Woods economic system and currency stability - stagflation.
- Japan experiences substantial economic growth.
- First expansion of the EEC (1973 - UK, Ireland and Denmark join).

5. Changes in the White House:

From different sides of the political fence, but united by strong anti-Communism. Kissinger is a former professor of International Relations who shifts Nixon towards Realism. Architects of détente as a strategy always intended to realise US interests. Goals were to get out of Vietnam ‘with honour’, open up China (and triangulate the relationship with the USSR), and do deals with the USSR. Not afraid to meddle in the Third World.

Presided over crisis in US-Soviet relations induced by growing US domestic criticism of USSR’s human rights record (especially regarding Jewish dissidents) but regarded as a decent, honest man.

Carter (1977 - 1980):
A Liberal, evangelical Christian, Democrat who endeavoured to shift US foreign policy in a more ‘idealistic’ direction. Placed greater emphasis on human rights, North-South issues and a foreign policy pursuing ‘more just and decent relations between people’. But, in part at least, a victim of events; inflation, the Vietnam syndrome, an energy crisis and growing criticism from right of left of détente. Policy inconsistency and internal divisions marked his administration. Championing a post-Cold War world before the Cold War was over?

6. The Second Cold War

Carter had some successes (eg; Egypt Israeli peace agreement) but confronted a growing anti-détente mood in the US. Since 1976, the Committee for the present danger was portraying the USSR as abusing détente and becoming a growing threat to US interests that required a return to confrontation;

The decline of détente:
- Stalling and suspension of SALT II talks.
- Soviet interference in the Horn of Africa.
- Soviet intervention in Afghanistan 1979, which led to the enunciation of the Carter Doctrine.
- Iranian hostage crisis.

By the end of his administration, Carter had returned to a confrontational stance with the USSR, exemplified by his enunciation in January 1980 of the Carter Doctrine;

“Any attempt by an outside force to gain control...will be repelled by an means necessary, including military force”.

7. Ronald Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev

Ronald Reagan:
Former Governor of California, openly Conservative, resolutely anti-Communist since his Hollywood days and hostile to both Nixon’s amoral Realism and Carter’s Liberal idealism. Benefited from the support of right wing Republicans, the Christian Right and disillusioned Democrats (many of whom we now know as Neo-Conservatives).

Dismissed détente as ‘a one-way street that the Soviet Union has used to pursue it’s aims’. Restored confrontation with Communism to the centre of US foreign policy (in 1983, called the USSR an “evil empire”). Saw Latin America as a key focus of the confrontation with Communism (invades Grenada in 1983, covertly supports ‘Contras’ in Nicaragua). Massively increased arms spending (first trillion dollar defence budget). Introduces the Strategic Defence Initiative, signalling shift away from MAD theory. Under the Reagan Doctrine, overtly supports ‘freedom fighters’ in Afghanistan, Angola and Latin America.
Mikhail Gorbachev:
- November 1982: Brezhnev
- November 1982: Andropov succeeds
- 1984: Chernenko succeeds
- 1985: Gorbachev succeeds
- 1985: Reopens arms talks with US, suspends new deployments of nuclear missiles and urges NATO to do the same, places a moratorium on Soviet Nuclear tests, meets Reagan in Geneva.
- 1986: Agrees with Reagan’s “Zero-Option” to destroy all intermediate nuclear forces (INF), holds summit with Reagan in Reykjavik (but it breaks down over SDI).
- 1988: Announces Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan, holds another summit with Reagan, makes speech in UN, denying the abandonment of Communist philosophy but also calls for the ‘de-ideologisation’ of international relations, respect for human rights, and announcing large cuts in Soviet conventional forces.
- 1989: His press aside, announces replacement of the Brezhnev Doctrine (that was used to justify invasion of Czechoslovakia by Warsaw Pact in 1968) with the ‘Sinatra Doctrine’, he condemns the 1968 invasion and declares the Cold War dead.
- Gorbachev introduces policies of ‘Perestroika’ (restructuring) and Glasnost’ (openness).

Lecture 8 – 1989; The fall of the Berlin Wall and after

1. Gorbachev’s Reform: ‘Glasnost’ and ‘Perestroika’

Mikhail Gorbachev was famous for his ‘new thinking’ - two key polices that underpinned his efforts to reform (but not eliminate) Soviet Communism.

‘Glasnost’:
Gorbachev promoted genuine openness in public discussion, including stringent criticism of both the Stalin and Brezhnev eras. This extended to much greater candidness about the USSR in official dealing with the outside world. Russian journalists and official spokespersons appeared more frequently in Western media and spoke more frankly and in decreasingly ideological terms.

‘Perestroika’:
Gorbachev’s policy to transform the stagnant, inefficient command economy of the USSR into a decentralized market-orientated economy. Industrial managers, local government and party officials were granted greater autonomy, and open elections were introduced in an attempt to democratise the Communist party organisation.
2. From Renewed Confrontation to Co-Operation

The Second Cold War was much shorter than the first. It started with the election of Reagan in 1980, but with Reagan’s re-election in 1984 and the arrival of Gorbachev in 1985, it soon became apparent that real change in superpower relations was in the air.

By 1987, Gorbachev had become a popular figure in the West, far more so, in fact, than at home. Initially, the US was suspicious of Gorbachev’s reformism but he initiated an ‘interim’ summit in Reykjavik in September 1986. Intended to be a brief meeting, this rapidly turned into a major summit on arms control. Reykjavik ended in disagreement - principally over Reagan’s “Star-Wars” missile defence proposal - it eventually led to a very extensive Intermediate Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, signed in 1987. The Soviet’s cut 1750 medium range nuclear arsenals and the US cut 850, the first real cut in nuclear arsenals (by about 7%).

By 1988, relations were remarkably warm. When Reagan was asked during his visit to Moscow about his earlier description of the USSR as an ‘evil empire’, he replied, ‘I was talking about another time, another era...’

3. The Collapse of Soviet Communism

November 1988 - George Bush Senior elected US President and initially expressed scepticism about Gorbachev’s promises.

December 1988 - Gorbachev tells the UN General Assembly that Marxism-Leninism was not absolute truth and there are ‘different roads to the future’.

January 1989 - Hungary promises multi-party elections and legalises non-Communist political organisations.

May 1989 - Hungary opens it’s borders allowing more than 10,000 East German ‘tourists’ to enter.

June 1989 - In Poland, the non-Communist party ‘Solidarity’ make big gains in the elections. In September of 1989, the Warsaw’s Pact first non-Communist PM was appointed.

August 1989 - Demonstrations in Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia in favour of independence from the USSR.

October 1989 - East German Premier resigns.


November 9th 1989 – Berlin Wall is breached on both sides.
November 24th 1989 - Czech Government resigns, with a non-Communist coalition taking over.

December 25th 1989 - Romanian leader Ceausescu and his wife are executed.

March 1990 - Hungarian Communist Party changes its name and Hungary is no longer a "people's republic".

December 1990 - Lech Walsia, Solidarity leader in Poland, freely elected President.

4. Why did the Cold War end?

As with the beginning of the Cold War, there is considerable debate about its end, particularly regarding why it was not predicted and who could take the credit.

Reagan's victory?

Usually depicted between two distinct versions

- The Cold War ended because of Reagan’s initial tough stance and US policies which put such a strain on the USSR. Gorbachev only adopted his ‘new thinking’ because he had to.
- Reagan underwent a crucial change in thinking, principally over his fear of nuclear war, and relished the role of peacemaker.

A direct consequence of Gorbachev's actions?

Gorbachev was the first Soviet leader to see ‘the writing on the wall’ and the impending economic collapse of the USSR. He was a genuinely innovative leader, who though a lifelong Communist, wanted to preside over a radically reformed USSR that still offered an alternative West.

No clear answer?

Both Reagan and Gorbachev can take some credit, but the end of the Cold War was also a consequence of inherent weaknesses in the Soviet system and a doomed attempt by the USSR to match US military power. Gorbachev’s policies of ‘Glasnost’ and ‘perestroika’ unleashed forces beyond his control both in the USSR and the wider Communist world.

5. A New World Order?


February 1990 - Nelson Mandela freed from prison.

July 1990 - NATO meets to redefine their role.

August 1990 - Iraq invades Kuwait.
October 1990 – Germany reunified.


June 1991 – Yugoslav army attacks Slovenia and Croatia when they declare their independence; Boris Yeltsin elected President of the Russian Federation (largest Republic in the USSR) and leaves the Communist Party.


August 1991 – Coup against Gorbachev in Moscow collapses.

December 1991 – Gorbachev resigns and the USSR breaks up into 15 republics (and various wars of secession break-out); Czechoslovakia breaks up.

1992 – War in Bosnia; UN imposes sanctions on Serbia; US troops land in Somalia.

1994 – Clinton becomes US President; ‘Black Hawk Down’ incident in Somalia leads to withdrawal of US troops; Ukraine agrees to destroy its nuclear arsenal (3rd largest in the world); NATO enters war in Bosnia.


6. The ‘End of History’?

In the 1990’s, two competing visions of the post-Cold War world emerged.

Francis Fukuyama – ‘The End of History’;

In a 1989 article called ‘The End of History’ and a 1992 book, ‘The End of History and the Last Man’, Fukuyama argued that the triumph of liberal democracy over Communism might signal the end of human kind’s ideological evolution and the emergence of the final form of Government. If history is driven by ideological struggle, does this mean the ‘end of history’ in some sense? Empirically, he argued, democracy had advanced significantly and this would mean less likelihood of war (the Democratic Peace thesis). Philosophically, Fukuyama claimed that democracy was the only universal system that offered every individual ‘Recognition’. All other systems that existed were either authoritarian and/or of limited appeal (such as Islamic Fundamentalism). Fukuyama saw the
end of history as completed only at the level of ideas, but more practically, the final triumph of liberal democracy was some way off and may face setbacks but it ultimately occur. By the mid-1990’s, however, much of the original euphoria about the triumphs of liberalism was fading and an alternative vision emerged.

Samuel Huntington - ‘The Clash of Civilisations’;
In a 1993 article, Samuel Huntington wrote a response to Fukuyama’s book and in a 1996 book, ‘The Clash of Civilisations and the Remaking of World Order’, Samuel Huntington argued that although the age of ideology had ended, the world was reverting to a mode of conflict between cultures.

‘The great divisions among humankind and the domination source of conflict will be cultural...’

Huntington depicted the West’s belief in the universality of its values and political system as naïve. Although the West may have built the international system, power was shifting away from the West in favour of what he called the ‘challenge civilisations’ - for example, Islam. In particular, Western Islamic conflicts would be the bloodiest of the 21st century.

Both theories certainly helped to set the terms of a still ongoing debate about where we are heading.

7. Key Issues in the post-Cold War World;
By mid-to-late 1990’s, post-Cold War enthusiasm had dimmed considerably and talk of ‘a new world disorder’ emerged. A number of key issues feature in contemporary debate and in various ways they illustrate the continuing saliency of elements of both Fukuyama’s and Huntington’s theses;

- ‘New Wars’ (Bosnia, Somalia, Kosovo, Rwanda, Congo, Sierra Leone, Afghanistan, Chechnya).
- Identification (by US) of ‘Rogue States’ (Iran, Syria, North Korea).
- The future role of the UN (and membership of the SC).
- Globalisation - an inescapable ‘fact’ or a product of the policies of liberal capitalist states?
- Continuing global inequality and poverty.
- The need to strengthen the international legal and economic order.
- The deterioration of the global eco-system.
- Growing signs of militant Islamic fundamentalism centred on Al Qai’dah.

At the centre of all of these is the issue of US power and responsibility - in the 1990’s, there was increasing reference to a US empire. On 09/11/2001, US power and vulnerability moved to centre stage.
Lecture 9 – 9/11/2001: The war on Terror in a Globalizing World

A series of coordinated attacks on the United States on September 11th 2001.

- Two hijacked planes flown into the Twin Towers, NYC.
- One hijacked plane crashed into The Pentagon.
- One hijacked plane crashed into a field in Pennsylvania.
- 2,976 people plus 19 hijackers killed in total (2,605 in NYC).

Resulted in, invocation of Article 5 of NATO charter, launch of invasion of Afghanistan, and declaration by US of a ‘War on Terror’, followed by enunciation of the ‘Bush Doctrine’ and the identification of an ‘axis of evil’.


First Presidential campaign depicted him as a ‘compassionate conservative’ with a low key approach to foreign policy in which there would be a reduction in US involvement in ‘nation-building’ overseas, less military engagement, and development of a national missile defence programme. Appointed Condoleezza Rice as National Security Advisor (and from 2005 as Secretary as State). Formerly an academic specialist on the USSR. After 9/11, a clear shift in Bush’s foreign policy emerges, reflecting growing influence of the neo-conservatives. During Bush’s administration, the nature of US power became a key concern in IR academic debates - hegemony or empire?

2. The Neo-Conservatives:

The label ‘Neo-Conservative’ became widespread from 2001 on, although it’s precise meaning and who it refers to remain disputed. Although debateable whether Bush was himself a true ‘Neo-Con’, he appointed a number of neo-conservatives to his administration. Key among them was his speechwriter, David Frum, who coined the phrase ‘axis of evil’.

Many commonly identified Neo-Cons in the Bush administration were lifelong Conservative Republicans who clearly emphasised with the Neo-Con viewpoint even if not closely associated with its core advocates, for example, Donald Rumsfeld and Dick Cheney. Neo-Conservative has an intellectual history that stretches back to the Reagan era when conservatives were looking for an alternative to Nixon’s Realism and Carter’s Liberalism. They were keen to recover US standing in the world and promote US power and values globally. Saw Reagan as the ideal representation of an assertive, powerful America.
3. **What is Neo-Conservatism?**

An American political perspective closely connected with domestic US political debates. Became very visible during the campaign to elect Ronald Reagan as President in 1979. Conservative intellectuals such as Leo Strauss and Irving Kristol influenced the campaign. Complex relationship with Liberalism - sympathetic to Liberalism's emphasis on progress towards human 'liberty' but sees modern pluralistic and hedonistic Liberalism as becoming a barrier to this. Brings together Liberalism emphasis on individual interests with a strong commitment to communal values, the recovery of civic or republican virtue in politics, and the value of political order and the public interest. Critical of both 'amoral' and 'inambitious' Realism and pluralist Liberalism in US foreign policy. Pursues a neo-Reaganite US foreign policy; the ‘national interest’ must embody Republican virtue.

4. **Neo Conservatism; Liberalism and Realism**

Agrees with Realism on:
- The significance of military power
- The centrality of the national interest
- The limits to cooperation and multilateralism

Disagrees with (most) Realists on:
- The virtues of Realism in foreign policy
- The place of morality in foreign policy

Agrees with broad-Liberalism philosophy on:
- The pursuit of ‘freedom’
- Individuals pursuing their interests (but constrained by civic duty)
- The virtues of spreading democracy
- Foreign policy as a motor of change

Disagrees with Liberalism and Neo-Liberalism:
- The virtues of pluralism and unbridled individualism
- The significance of international institutions
- The importance of international legitimacy
- Multilateralism

5. **The Bush Doctrine**

The Bush Doctrine is the label applied to cover the dominant theme of US foreign policy after 9/11. A key factor was the elevation of US national security to the top of the agenda and the equation of US security with global security. The clearest statement came in 2002 National Security Strategy.
6. The Bush Doctrine Applied:

Afghanistan:
Invasion of Afghanistan, backed by NATO and the UN, quickly removed the Taliban government but failed to find Osama Bin Laden.

Iraq:
In 2002, US attention turned to the ‘axis of evil’; states seen to be actual or potential supporters of Terrorism. US singled out Iraq and accused Saddam Hussein of possessing WMD. Neo-Cons advocated deposing Saddam Hussein because:

- It might initiate further democratisation in the Middle East.
- A stable Iraq would reduce need for US troops in Saudi Arabia, which inflamed support for Islamic militants.
- It would address domestic demands for clear action in support of national security.

US sought international support and a UN mandate but signalled intention to go ahead regardless. Failed to get explicit UN mandate but claimed existing UN resolutions were sufficient. Growing international scepticism about US claims concerning Iraq WMD and support for Al Qai’da. Generated widespread debate on the legality and morality of invasion.

7. Questioning US power in the 21st Century:

Bush was initially a popular President and there was undoubted widespread international sympathy for the US after 9/11 (along with significant pockets of celebration; especially in the Middle East). At his departure, his popularity had plummeted and international hostility to the US and its foreign policy had grown to unprecedented levels.

Why?
- Widespread scepticism about the war in Iraq, and to a lesser extent, the war in Afghanistan.
- Terrorist attacks in Bali (October 2002), Madrid (March 2004) and London (July 2005), led to many to argue US foreign policy was inflaming rather than defeating Terrorism.
- The widespread perception that US foreign policy was not just hegemonic but imperial - significant academic debate about the nature of US power emerged.
- The ‘War on Terror’ was perhaps the hallmark of US foreign policy but other aspects also contributed to criticism of the US:
  1. US opposition to the 1997 Kyoto Protocol on climate change and the International Criminal Court.
8. Consequences:

- Bush era ended with US at an historic low point in world public opinion.
- The ‘War on Terror’ unique perhaps in its impact on everyone’s daily lives
- The US’s key ally – Britain under Blair – also damaged by the close relationship with the US. Blair accused of being a ‘poodle’ and UK relations with other EU states, more critical of the US, clearly affected.
- Emergence of Islamophobia; rise of populist right-wing parties in EU states, for example, Denmark and Netherlands.
- Increased influence of radical Islamic movements in both Western and non-Western States.
- Residual problems of long-term solutions in Iraq and Afghanistan.
- Signs of emerging coalitions of states seeking to counter US global dominance – the ‘Beijing Consensus’.
- The ‘War on Terror’ and related interventions has revivified widespread perceptions of Western imperialism.
- Final months of Bush administration showed signs of back-pedalling; key Neo-Cons pushed out and Condoleezza Rice’s Realism more dominant.
- 2008 Presidential campaign saw emergence of distinct alternative in Barrack Obama and Hillary Clinton.

Lecture 10 – Security Studies; An Introduction

Security has always been central to the study of International politics – it was the horrors of the First World War that inspired the academic discipline of International Relations. Security studies is a sub-discipline of International Relations. During the Cold War, Security studies concerned itself with how to keep the state secure from external military threats – particularly the threat of Nuclear weapons. With the end of the Cold War, some scholars argue that the nature of security threats has changed. Security studies as a discipline had undergone much change.

The questions that are the centre of contemporary Security studies are:

1. What is a Security matter and why does it matter?
Tsunami (December 26th 2004)
- 283,000 dead (1/3 children)
- 14,000 missing
- 1,000,000 refugees

East Asian Economic Crisis (1997)
Resulted in bankruptcies, protests, rioting, mass unemployment and the fall of governments in South Korea, Thailand and Indonesia.

Death of Jean Charles de Menezes
Shot on the London Underground on the 22nd July 2005 by British Police. Unarmed and innocent of any crime, Jean was shot 7 times in the head at point blank range.

Proposed EDVIGE database in France
The system would hold information on people active in political and civic life, including religious and political representatives and trade union activists. It could also include personal details such as psychical appearance, nationality, ethnicity, travel history, address, health issues and sexual orientation.

2. What is Security and how is it achieved?
Security is a contested subject – there is no definitive definition.

Traditional Security Studies
- State centric
- Military Power; focus on inter-state war, territorial disputes, security dilemmas, arms races etc.

Traditional Security Practices
- Deterrence
- Compliance
- Alliance systems
- Arms control

New thinking about Security developed in the 1980’s but significantly at the end of the Cold War. What is now known as ‘Critical Security Studies’ is a broad church including many different theoretical perspectives; all of which are human centred.

3. Security for whom?
Realist thinkers dominate traditional Security studies. As such:
Gives that the states exist in an anarchical realm. Threats to state security come from external threats.

- Realism is a theory about power – power is defined in material (military) terms.
- If a state feels threatened from outside, it will increase its power.
- Security dilemmas.

4. National Security and is the concept still valid?

The creation of the modern state system introduced the notion of National Security. The state is threatened externally and makes itself secure through protecting its territory and its vital interests from attack. This is done by accumulating military power (weapons). Security in this interpretation is the ability to coerce.

Is the concept still valid?
- Can we protect the state from external threats?
- Are some threats beyond the scope of the state – do they require global cooperation?
- Are threats against the state the only threats to the lives of individuals?
- Aren’t National Security practices endangering the lives of individuals?
  - Human Rights violations
  - Civilian casualties
  - Terrorism
  - Civil liberties
  - War
- Can’t the state be secured by non-military means?

5. New Security Thinking

The end of the Cold War challenged Realist thinking about Security. The Soviet Union collapsed due to internal structures, global capitalist institutions and democratic ideology. It could not be explained or predicted by Realism’s focus on military power. Post-Cold War Security as a concept has broadened – should the state remain the referent object of Security? Rather than provide Security for many people around the world, the state is the cause of insecurity.

Levels of Analysis
- Security of the individual/human security
- Security of the community
- Security of the nation
- Security of the regime
- Security of the state
- Security of the region
- Global security
The Copenhagen School: Five categories of Security

It is argued that ‘Security’ is a speech act with distinct consequences in the context over international politics. By talking Security an actor tries to move a topic away from politics and into an area of security concerns thereby legitimating extraordinary means against the socially constructed threat. The process of securitization is intersubjective meaning that it is neither a question of an objective threat or a subjective perception of a threat. Instead securitization of a subject depends on an audience accepting the securitization speech act.

- Military
- Political
- Economic
- Societal
- Environmental

6. What does it mean to be secure?

In terms of national Security, integrity of the borders and independent control of territory, economic wealth and military power and the preservation of vital interests.

In 1994, the UNDP produced a Human Security Report suggesting seven threats to human security:

- Personal
- Economic
- Health
- Political
- Food
- Community
- Environmental

Lecture 11 – Weapons of Mass Distraction? Nuclear Weapons and Small Arms

- To explore the problem of weapons proliferation
- Critically assess the threat posed by nuclear weapons and small arms
- Think through the notion of security as discussed in the last lecture

1. Nuclear Weapons and their States

There are twelve nuclear weapons states in the world;
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year Acquired Nuclear Weapons</th>
<th>Number of Warheads Owned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soviet Union</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>1960 - 1963</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>1966 - 1970</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Korea</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Less than 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Post Cold War Challenge from Nuclear Weapons**

- Challenges from within the non-proliferation regime
- Challenges from states outside the non-proliferation regime
- Challenge from non state actors

**Rogue State #1 – Iran**

In late September 2009, Iran revealed that it had covertly built a second uranium enrichment plant. Since then, the U.S., Iran, the UK and other countries have met in Geneva to try to come to an agreement around Iran’s nuclear programme. Hillary Clinton stated “it is not in Iran’s interest to have a nuclear arms race in the Gulf”.

**Rogue State #2 – North Korea**

2002; Nuclear tensions mount. In October, the US says North Korea has admitted to having a secret weapons programme. The US decides to halt oil shipments to Pyongyang. In December, North Korea begins to reactivate it’s Yongbyon reactor. International inspectors are thrown out of North Korea.

2003; North Korea withdraws from the NPT, a key international agreement aimed at preventing the spread of atomic weapons.

2006; North Korea became the world’s eighth atomic power, conducting an underground nuclear weapons test. Although the country’s nuclear programme and its development of long range rocket systems has outraged world opinion,
it is still unclear whether the country has mastered the ability to deliver a working nuclear weapon.

2009; North Korea announced that it had successfully conducted its second nuclear test, again defying international warnings.

The reclusive dictatorship’s dream of a nuclear arsenal dates back half a century, to the years just after the Korean War. Kim Il Sung, founder of North Korea, was actually aware that General Douglas MacArthur had requested nuclear weapons to use against his country during the conflict, and declassified documents show that he pressed his Cold War allies - the USSR and China - for nuclear technology. But it took decades to put together the equipment, and it appears that only relatively recently did the North make a political decision to speed forward.

3. **Horizontal and Vertical Proliferation**

**Horizontal Proliferation** - The spread of nuclear weapons to states not yet possessing them.

**Vertical Proliferation** - Increase in numbers or dispersion of nuclear weapons by nuclear weapons states.

Much attention is paid to the nuclear ambitions of states such as Iran and North Korea, less to the challenges posed by the huge combined arsenals of five nuclear weapons states within the NPT.

97% of nuclear weapons are stockpiled in the US and Russian Federation. Several thousand remain on alert.

Permanent 5 NWS have made cuts to their nuclear arsenal but a lack of transparency makes it difficult to assess whether reductions are complete, verifiable and irreversible.


4. **A Change in Mood?**

April 2009; Obama calls for a world without nuclear weapons

September 2009; UN Security Council calls for an end to proliferation of nuclear weapons

September 2009; Gordon Brown offers to withdraw fourth Trident nuclear-armed submarine. Symbolism rather than a change of strategy?
It does appear to be a change of mood prompted in large by a change in the perceived nature of the threat. Nuclear weapons much less relevant and strategically useful. For example; Pakistan is a failed state with nuclear weapons and Iran as a future nuclear power would limit US power projection in the Middle East and the Gulf.

A nuclear free world would be one in which the US as the world’s most powerful conventional army would politically as well as militarily call the shots. However, there is not a uniform belief tat nuclear weapons are obsolete. Middle powers such as Britain and France believe they must maintain a nuclear arsenal so as to maintain their position.

5. **The challenge from States outside the non-Proliferation regime**

Non Proliferation Treaty deal between those states that had tested nuclear weapons by 1970 and those that had not.

India, Pakistan and Israel refused to sign the NPT (North Korea withdrew in 2005). These States argued that the NPT enshrines a system o “global nuclear apartheid”. Why should some state shave nuclear weapons and others not?

In Western discourse, ‘their’ nuclear weapons are a problem but ‘ours’ are not. Discourse suggests that these states (often third world states) cannot afford nuclear weapons and cannot be trusted with them.

Why would a state want a Nuclear Weapon?
- To enhance national security?
- Because of regional security fears?
- Satisfy pressures of domestic politics?
- Gain prestige and honour?
- Desire to play a role in global politics?

6. **The challenge from non-state actors**

In the second nuclear age (post Cold War), the biggest threat cited comes from terrorists and other non-state actors. This has increased since 9/11.

Is it likely that a terrorist organisation would use a Nuclear Weapon?
- Motives
- Methods
- Access to materials
- Resources to buy materials
- Expertise to manufacture
Taking these factors into account, the threat that al Qa’ida would use a nuclear weapon is very low. There is a greater possibility they would use a “dirty bomb”.

7. **Weapons of Mass Distraction?**

Deaths by Nuclear Weapons (1945 – onwards)
- Hiroshima; 140,000
- Nagasaki; 80,000

- 3,800,000
- 45,000 deaths a month (January 2008) from post conflict effects

8. **The Global Arms Trade**

- Worth $1060 billion in 2007
- 15 times more than all international aid expenditure
- 1998 – 2001; The US, UK and France earned more income from arms sales to developing countries than they gave in aid
- The developing world spends around $25 billion (only a fraction of the total). However, it is enough to put every child in school and reduce child mortality by 2/3’s
- The US dominates the arms market (half of all exports), with the UK the second largest supplier
- 58% of all US arms deals are with developing countries
- US supply arms or military technology to 92% of all conflicts (1992).

It was largely ignored until the 1990’s and still an issue dominated by NGO’s, not governments. This trade has the least regulation, however, it is responsible for the vast majority of combat deaths.

9. **Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW)**

- One person dies every minute – more than 500,000 a year as a result of armed violence
- There are 689 million small arms in the world today; enough for one in ten people on the entire planet to own one
- Nearly 8 million new firearms are produced every year
- More than 1,100 companies manufacture small arms in over 98 countries
- 60% are owned by civilians
- In 2001, 16 billion rounds of military ammunition was produced; enough to shoot everyone in the world twice

The majority of wars are within states, and not between them. The reason why SALW’s are the weapons of choice are as followed:
- Durability and reliability
- Little training and lightweight
- Low cost and availability
- Lethality
- Portability and easily concealed
- Notoriously hard to track

The diffusion of SALW’s is primarily through governments, via several methods;

- Military aid
- Government sanctioned commercial sales
- Grey-market operations
- Capture theft and corruption

For example, in the 1980’s, the US gave $2 billion in arms to Afghan rebels, which were soon redistributed throughout South Asia to countries such as Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos and Thailand.

There is also little regulation for SALW’s. In 1991, the UN set up the ‘Register of Conventional Weapons’. Surprisingly, SALW’s were **not** included. There is no global reporting system for small arms. Gun owner’s organisations protested against UN attempts to include firearms in anti-proliferation measures. The US Government vetoed attempts by the UN to limit international trade in civilian firearms. SALW regulation has now become an NGO campaign, through organisations such as Red Cross, Oxfam and Amnesty International. In 2001, a UN conference on curbing illicit trafficking of SALW’s initiated a program of action calling on UN members to undertake voluntary efforts to ensure better internal controls of exports and to mark and trade weapons.

**Lecture 12 – Humanitarian Intervention**

- An introduction to the topic of humanitarian intervention
- Why is it controversial?
- What is security, and how is it achieved?

1. **Definitions**


“Intervention” – An activity which interferes in the domestic affairs of a sovereign state without the consent of its government. This may well involve the use, or threat, of force.
John Vincent defined ‘Humanitarian Intervention’ as, ‘An activity undertaken by a state, a group within a state, a group of states or an international organisation which interferes coercively in the domestic affairs of another state. It is a discrete event having a beginning and an end, and it is aimed at the authority structure of the target state. It is not necessarily lawful or unlawful, but it does break a conventional pattern of international relations’.

2. **Why is Humanitarian Intervention controversial?**

   - The use of armed force is always controversial
   - There is a tension between intervention and the traditions of sovereignty, non-intervention and the non-use of force, which have so far governed international society.
   - Its legality is disputed; Articles 2(4) and 2(7) of the UN charter appear to prohibit humanitarian intervention:
     1. Article 2(4); ‘Shall refrain…the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state’.
     2. Article 2(7); ‘Shall authorize the UN to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state’.

   However...

   - Growth of human rights culture
   - Globalisation and Security
   - Weak/failed state concept
   - Chapter 7 of the United Nations Charter states it shall fight for the ‘Maintenance of international peace and security’.

3. **Advantages and Disadvantages of Humanitarian Intervention**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Humanitarian Intervention does have a legal basis;
- Declaration of Human Rights
- UN Charter Chapter 7
- Customary international law

Preventing human rights abuses is normally important
It is in a state’s “national interest”

States don’t intervene for primarily humanitarian reasons
Don’t have the right to risk soldiers’ lives in the name of ‘common humanity’

Problem of abuse of the principle of Humanitarian Intervention
Selectivity of response reveals the presence of national self-interests
Lack of consensus of Humanitarian Intervention
Don’t produce morally unequivocal outcomes
No basis in law
Reflects cultural preferences of powerful states

4. Humanitarian Intervention during the Cold War

There were interventions; Vietnam in Cambodia and Tanzania in Uganda. Both incidences happened in 1978, but in both cases, humanitarian justification was not claimed. Both interventions were justified as acts of self-defence even though massive human rights violations were stopped as a consequence. Overriding influence of Cold War politics; Vietnam was widely condemned for invading Pol Pot’s Cambodia, but Tanzania were not criticised for invading Idi Amin’s Uganda.

There was a reluctance to establish a principle of Humanitarian Intervention because:

- It’s implications for sovereignty and lack of agreement
- Fear that Humanitarian Intervention risked counter interventions by rival superpowers
- Countries that didn’t satisfy vital security needs or serve some economic or ideological end considered to be of little importance
- Superpower veto in the UN Security Council effectively ruled out such operations
5. ‘The New World Order': Putting the debate in context

- End of the Cold War
  An end to superpower confrontation allowed a new focus → A new way of thinking about what security is and how it is achieved. State security → Human security.

- Empowerment of the United Nations
  Less use of the permanent member veto; allows change in UN outlook 1992 Agenda for Peace.

- Success of the Gulf War 1991
  The utility of force and a return to collective security.

- Emerging role of the Media
  Allowed Westerners to see the human consequences of Civil War, Genocide and Human Rights abuses.

- High Profile Conflicts in the 1990's
  Somalia, Kosovo, Rwanda and Bosnia-Herzegovina.

6. Examples of high-profile Conflicts

- Worst violence in Europe since World War II
- Evidence of massacres, systematic rape, civilian displacements, torture and concentration camps
- Western Governments decided not to intervene for three and a half years
- 1995; NATO air-strikes begin named ‘Operation Deliberate Force’
- Reluctance to send in ground troops

Kosovo
- Caused the most controversy about the notion of Humanitarian Intervention because the UN did not sanction NATO’s actions
- Genuine Humanitarian Intervention or Criminal actions?

Rwanda
- Organised genocide of Tutsis' and moderate Hutu people carried out over 100 days in 1994 during Rwandan Civil War
- Nearly 1 million people were killed
- States refused to intervene
- Described as an “Incomprehensible scandal”

7. ‘War on Terror’ = Humanitarian Intervention?
The issue of Humanitarian Intervention intersects with the ongoing ‘War on Terror’. This has put the Humanitarian Intervention debate in a difficult position.

Humanitarianism = Legitimacy?

Lecture 13 – Terrorism

Terrorism is a contested term, with some 270 recorded definitions. The Oxford English Dictionary, “The use of violence and intimidation in the pursuit of political aims”.

1. Other Definitions

“The illegitimate use of force to achieve a political objective when innocent people are targeted” (Walter Laqueur)

“A strategy of violence designed to promote desired outcomes by instilling fear in the public at large” (Walter Reich)

“Politically motivated violence perpetuated against non-combatant targets by sub-national group or clandestine agents” (US State Department)

“Acts intended to cause death or serious bodily harm to civilians or non-combatants, when the purpose of such an act, by its nature or context, is to intimidate a population, or to compel a government or an international organisation to do or obtain from doing an act” (United Nations, 2004)

2. Dropping of Atomic Bomb on Japan = Act of Terrorism?

In the committee established to find the most effective use of the atomic bomb, every target recommended and every target approved by Truman was a city (Bundy 1988).

According to Secretary of War Stimson, “While we could not concentrate on a civilian area, we should seek to make a profound psychological impression on as many of the inhabitant’s as possible” (Bundy 1988).

“The political targets of the bomb were not the dead of Hiroshima or the factories they worked in but the survivors in Tokyo” (Schelling 1966).

3. Death rates by Terrorism

Every year in the UK, more people die in road accidents than have been killed by Terrorists in all of recorded history.
Death Rates in the United Kingdom in 1999

- Terrorism = 16
- Murders = 679
- DIY = 70
- Electric Blankets = 20
- Garden Implements = 46

4. Terrorism: How much of a threat?

Between 1968 and 1997, Terrorists killed 800 Americans. There were 25,000 murders per year.

Between 1989 and 1992, Terrorism did not cause a single fatality in the United States. During the same time, some 1322 new books on ‘Terrorism’ were catalogued in American libraries.

In the 1980’s, there was not one single Terrorist event in the US, yet 80% of Americans in a national survey said Terrorism was their #1 concern.

In May 2002, Foreign Ministers of the eight leading industrial nations met in Paris to affirm that Terrorism remained ‘a pervasive and global threat’. Just three days earlier, the State Department had announced that ‘Terrorism was at its lowest level in 33 years’.

The US State Department said to Congress that the 199-recorded Terrorist incidents in 2002 represented a 44% drop from the previous year, and was the lowest total since 1969.

In 2003, thousands of New Yorkers, acting on Federal Government advice, built themselves tape sealed rooms stocked with provisions, water and gas for a prolonged siege by Terrorists.

Terrorist Incidents in 2002
The number of incidents in countries/nations/regions around the world.

- United States = 0
- Asia = 99
- Latin America = 50 (41 of those were bombings of a US owned oil pipe line in Columbia)
- Middle East = 29

Nearly all the incidents identified by the US Government as acts of ‘Global Terrorism’ occurred in four places; Columbia, Afghanistan, Palestine and Chechnya.
5. **Old v New Terrorism**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Old Terrorism’</th>
<th>‘New Terrorism’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secular and Rational</td>
<td>Inspired and justified by Religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted and Proportional</td>
<td>Indiscriminate targeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolise targeting</td>
<td>Tendency for mass casualties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional weapons</td>
<td>Increase in suicide bombings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State sponsored</td>
<td>Not state sponsored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchically structured organisations</td>
<td>Loose networks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **How new is ‘New Terrorism’?**

Religiously inspired acts of terror have been carried out for thousands of years from the 1st century Zealots to the 13th century Assassins.

Much violence is labelled as ‘Religious’, when in fact it has a political agenda.

*Pape;* 1980 – 2003; Nearly all suicide bombers had a desire to compel foreign forces from the place the bomber considered his or her homeland. Between 1980 – 2000, Tamil Tigers carried out 168 out of 270 suicide bombings – more than all other groups put together.

Statistics show that there has not been a significant increase in casualties. Casualties rose in the 1970’s but have stayed stable since then. In 1968, 60 Terrorist incidences involved plans or attempts to use WMD. However, the threat of Terrorists using WMD is massively inflated.

**Lecture 14 – What is International Political Economy?**

“We have a framework to deal with poverty reduction and global environmental challenges”

The growth of IPE since the 1970’s concerns international relations scholars, as well as some from other disciplines, coming to terms with profound changes in world order. The growth of IPE since the 1970’s represents the recovery of an old intellectual tradition (i.e.; political economy) in a new or changed context.

1. **Account #1 – International Relations goes ‘Global’**

This account is demonstrated by academics such as Keohane, Nye and Cox.

- Interdependence (Keohane and Nye)
- Internationalisation, Transnationalisation and Globalisation (Cox)
- New actors and institutions
- The rise of market power - at the expense of the power of the state
- Nation states/National economies no longer isolated/protected
- Much at stake; Globalisation represents threat and/or opportunity

2. **Account #2 - Reviving an academic tradition**

- Classical political economy (Adam Smith, Karl Marx)
- Growth of distinct disciplines from the late 19th century (Political Science, International Relations, Economics, Sociology etc...)
- Assertion of boundaries between disciplines
- The revival in the 1970’s
- IPE as space for ‘Heterodoxy’ and critical thought

3. **Context - The turbulent 1970’s onwards**

- The limits of the post-war boom
- The 1973 Oil crisis and the recycling of ‘Petro-Dollars’
- The abandonment of the Bretton Woods system of monetary regulation
- Economic crises (UK, US and Mexico)
- Thatcherism, Reaganomics and the Washington Consensus.
- Financialisation; Transnationalisation of Production
- The end of the ‘Cold War’; the “triumph” of Liberal Democracy and market-led development

In summary, other disciplines ill-equipped to explain these events/processes. International Political Economy ideally situated to provide explanations.

4. **What is IPE and what can IPE scholars agree on?**

- State versus Market?
- Power and Wealth
- A consciously methodologically diverse discipline
- A field in which debates of fundamental importance to the future of global society take place

International Political Economy scholars agree on the following:

1. That the political and economic domains cannot be separated in any real sense, and even doing so for analytical purposes has its perils
2. Political interaction is one of the principal means through which the economic structures of the market are established and in turn transformed
3. That there is an intimate connection between the domestic and international levels of analysis, and that the two cannot be meaningfully separated off from one another (Underhill, 2000)
5. **What do IPE scholars study?**

“It is often heard said that the study of globalisation and the study of IPE are, to all intents and purposes, one and the same thing” (Phillips, 2005)

- Components of “Globalisation” studies
  - Growth in global financial markets and their failures.
  - Transnational Corporations
  - Internationalisation of products and labour markets
  - Opening up of new parts of the world to trade and institutionalisation of international trade
  - The ‘Triadisation’ of the global economy and the emergence of new regions and sub-regions
  - The rapid diffusion of technology, knowledge and culture
  - Urbanisation and the rise of global cities
  - The politics of development and ‘poverty reduction’
  - Global governance
  - Anti-globalisation and the politics of resistance

6. **Theories in International Political Economy**

**Realism**
Maintain focus on states (and their relative power) as main agents in constructing and maintaining the global economy. Particular attention to the question of hegemonic states and processes of their rise and decline - global economy reflects these processes.

**Liberalism**
Principally concerned with the conditions for co-operation. Nineteenth century analyses of comparative advantage in international trade. International economy as a market-concerned with efficiency, institutional arrangements to provide optimal working of it (Neo-Liberalism).

**Historical Materialism (Marxism/Neo-Gramscian)**
Key to understanding IPE is the process of capital accumulation; inherently dynamic and changeable. ‘Growth addiction’ explains technological innovation but also tendency towards inequality and propensity for periodic crises. Global economy constituted by antagonistic class relations, or ‘social forces’ vying for control of state power.

**Post-Structuralism**
Against any analytical attachment to ‘hierarchy’ (eg; Class). Rather, power is ‘de-centred’ and is “down here, now” rather than “up, or out, there”. And therefore, we needn’t wait for a mass, organised counter hegemonic movement to resist globalisation.
Lecture 15 - The Politics of Globalisation

1. Quick Recap

- Key actors have recognised the limits to state-centric world-view (Brown, Wolfensohn and Bourguigon)
- IPE has the conceptual and methodological apparatus to analysis this emergent ‘global security’
- Both accounts of the growth of IPE need to be contextualised (the turbulent 1970’s onwards)
- IPE/Globalisation studies concerned with a range of subject matter, for example, new actors and their role within the state

2. Globalisation: An inescapable reality

“Not only is it impossible to turn back the tide of globalisation, but efforts to do so can make us worse off” (Obama, 2008)

Held et al (1999) defined Globalisation as “a process (or set of processes), which embodies a transformation in the spatial organisation of social relations and transactions - assessed in terms of their extensity, velocity and impact - generating transcontinental or interregional flows and networks of activity, interaction and the exercise of power”.

3. What is changing?

- Increased interconnections across and beyond national borders
  - Quantitative proliferation (New actors)
  - Cultural awareness (‘Global Village’)
  - Events impact multiple locations

- Increased speed and intensity of these connections
  - New technologies key (‘Information Society’)
  - ‘Space time compression’ (Harvey)

- Increased global awareness
  - Globalism
  - Global media
  - Rise of global issues, for example, Global Warming
  - Cultural diversity

In spite of these observations, many have questioned the validity of the concept ‘Globalisation’.

- Is globalisation new?
- Are these processes of global change really significant?
- Is the ‘local’ really no longer important?

4. Theories of Globalisation

There are three main positions (following Held et al) in the globalisation debate;
- The Hyperglobalisers
- The Sceptics
- The Transformationalists

It is possible to identify Marxism as a fourth, however, it doesn’t contribute to the debate, merely questions the terms of the debate.

The Hyperglobalisers
- Quantitative evidence of unprecedented and inexorable global change
- Less plausible to think in terms of the nation state (‘a borderless world’)
- From autonomous national economies (‘billiard ball model’), to a unified global economy (new actors important).
- Eroded capacities of states to regulate the economy, compelled states to dismantle social democratic systems of social provision (eg: Welfare States) through Neo-Liberal reform.

There are two kinds of Hyperglobalisers; Neo-Liberal and Radical.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neo-Liberal Hyperglobalisers</th>
<th>Radical Hyperglobalisers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Globalisation to be welcomed</td>
<td>- Globalisation represents fundamental change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- State intervention has for too long impinged upon personal liberty</td>
<td>- Critical of globalisation in its current form; exacerbates social and political injustice on a global scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- An unhindered global market best means of guaranteeing;</td>
<td>- William Robinson ‘A Theory of Global Capitalism’; emblematic of the Neo-Gramscian approach to IPE;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Efficiency</td>
<td>• Emergence of Transnational Capitalist Class (TCC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Material well-being</td>
<td>• Transcendence of old, Imperialist rivalries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Technological innovation</td>
<td>• Emergence of a Transnational state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Advocates of regimes of global governance to establish and enforce minimal rules of the game at the global level (See Wolfensohn and Bourguigon)</td>
<td>• Enforces Neo-Liberalism on a global scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Basis for Transnational</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
solidarity and the emergence of Transnational (or global) civil society to counter the TCC

The Sceptics
- Get your facts right! (Hirst and Thompson)
- Nothing new about Globalisation
- Capital less mobile than portrayed
- Myth of unified global economy; inequality ripe, major economic activity focused in the ‘triad’
- Labour especially immobile
- Regionalisation rather than Globalisation
- Nation state still the principal organisational unit upon which the ‘global’ economy is founded
- Nation states remarkably adaptable (Weiss)
- Again, Sceptics come from both Conservative (Realist) and Progressive (Radical) camps

The Transformationalists
- Globalisation is a reality but others misplace emphasis; key is qualitative change (Held et al)
- New in so far as the extension and intensification of global interactions has never before been witnessed
- Societies are being transformed in ways not witnessed before
- Globalisation contingent and open-minded; not an inevitable trajectory
- Globalisation is hierarchically and unevenly structured
- Nation states remain important; powers being transformed rather than eroded (‘Competition States’ – Cerny)

5. A Flawed Debate?
- See, for example, Radice (1999)
- Globalisation = Capitalism
- Wrong to ‘reify’ Globalisation; not ‘out there’ but engineered by states
- Symptomatic of the tendency to counter-pose ‘state’ and ‘market’ - need a theoretical appreciation of how both are inextricably inter-related (i.e., an analysis of class society)
- Capitalism has always been both a national and international affair (see Marx and Engels ‘The Communist Manifesto 1848’)
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- Forms of state have always been different and have always changed
- The key to understanding ‘Globalisation’ is to see it as a major global offensive to complete the ‘historical mission’ of capital;
  - Turn every human being of working age into a capable and willing wage labourer (Expansion of Capitalist social relations)
  - To ensure maximal competitiveness between workers as well as individual capitals (Intensification of Capitalist social relations)

6. In Summary

- Globalisation remains a contested concept
- How we think about Globalisation often reflects our own political assumptions and carries with it political implications
- Depends upon whether you view yourselves as victims or authors of globalisation

Lecture 16 – Non-state actors and Multinational Corporations

1. Quick Recap

- The word ‘Globalisation’ is widely used, but what does it mean?
- IPE scholars can agree on certain ‘objective’ characteristics of global change since the 1970’s
- But there are clear differences when it comes to;
  - Explaining processes of global change
  - Arguing whether or not such changes are new, inevitable, or to be welcomed
  - Some, for example, Classical Marxists, question the very terms of the debate; Globalisation = Capitalism
- Necessary to interrogate the theoretical positions taken by scholars in the ‘Globalisation’ debate

2. Aims

- To focus on a couple of specific issue areas or sub-topics within IPE and ‘Globalisation’ studies
- To illustrate how IPE scholars have analysed and explained certain issues
- To illustrate how such issues are intrinsically political

3. New Actors in International Politics

These include;
- International institutions of global governance (IMF, World Bank, WTO)
- Over 77,000 Transnational corporations (TNCs) and Multinational corporations (MNCs)
- Over 10,000 single country non-governmental organisations (NGOs)
- Around 7,300 international NGOs
- Organised crime and terrorist networks
- Emergent anti-Globalisation movement
- Operate outside, within and across states
- Blur the distinction between the domestic and the international

4. Challenging Traditional Assumptions

- Especially problematic for Realism
- Challenges state-centrism
- Challenges sovereignty
- Challenges organising rationale for the study of ‘International’ as opposed to ‘The Global’
- Challenges privileging of ‘High’ over ‘Low’ politics

Example #1: Global Governance
- Wolfensohn and Bourguigon: a ‘world executive committee?’
- 1980’s and early 1990’s, World Bank and the IMF debt restructuring and aid granted to developing countries provided structural adjustment policies implemented (Conditionally)
- Late 1990’s; Recognised limits of structural adjustments;
  - Comprehensive Development Framework (1998); structural adjustment with a human face and good governance
  - Business plans to be drawn up and implemented by means of ‘country-led dialogue’, albeit in consultation with civil society groups (eg, NGOs) and under the expert guidance of the WB-IMF
    1) Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers
    2) Country Assistance Strategies/Country Partnership Strategies
- Critics suggest this challenges notions of sovereignty and the autonomy over policy reform by states; reveals power of new actors both at the global level and the role played by actors within and across nation states (NGOs)

Example #2: ‘Non-Legitimate’ Actors
- Examples: Terrorist networks, trafficking of drugs and arms, trade in women and children for sexual exploitation, new forms of counterfeit goods
- Involve huge flows of money outside of political control
- States uncertain of whether their territory is being used
- Police action merely displaces the activity in question
- Problem of extraterritorial jurisdiction being reconciled with sovereignty (e.g. money laundering)
- Again, it challenges the world view that see national states and diplomatic relations between sovereign states as the primary units of analysis

**Example #3: Transnational Corporations**

- Generally regarded as an enterprise comprising entities in more than one country
- Share knowledge, resources and responsibilities with others

**5. Transnational Corporations as ‘New Actors’**

- In a sense, nothing new; Dutch/British East India Companies
- Dramatic increase in number and the significance of TNCs since the 1960’s (around 10,000 in 1980 to over 77,000 by 2006)
- 2004: 14% world sales, 12% global assets, 13% employment worldwide
- For example, Nike employed 20,000 direct employees, products made by 500,000 workers worldwide in over 700 factories in 51 countries
- For example, Gap bought 1 billion units of clothing from 700 suppliers in 2004, who in turn, operate 3,000 factories in 50 countries (Note: Gap does not have a single factory outside the United States)
- Noteworthy that 14 of the top 100 TNCs have HQs based in developing countries, although total assets of all these are less than the total assets owned by General Electric

**The Politics of TNCs and Global Production**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positives (✓)</th>
<th>Negatives (x)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Inflows of capital and investment</td>
<td>- Profit over development; threat of withdrawal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Job creation and employment</td>
<td>- ‘Indigenous’ businesses crowded out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Technology transfer</td>
<td>- Little technology transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Transfer of expertise and knowledge</td>
<td>- Repatriation of profits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Tax revenue</td>
<td>- Pressure to decrease tax burden as an incentive to encourage business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Facilitate integration into the global economy</td>
<td>- Investment based upon labour and environmental costs;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Leads to decline in labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Non sustainable in environmental terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Responsible for a ‘!race to the bottom’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. **The new global division of labour and labour standards**

- Not just a developing world problem!
- Symptomatic of increasingly complex supply chains
- Flexibilisation and casualisation
- Downward pressure of wages
- Use of migrant labour (often ‘illegal aliens’)
- Export processing zones; ‘Sweatshops?’
  1. Largely feminised
  2. Unionisation prohibited
  3. Much evidence of systematic abuse
- Child labour (estimated 100,000 children working in Delhi, India)
- The ILO estimates that 12.3 million people around the world are trapped in forced labour

7. **In Summary**

- TNCs challenge state centrisim
  1. Financial flows and intra-firm trade
  2. Easily avoid sanctions
  3. Difficult to maintain high standards
  4. Extraterritoriality and sovereignty conflicts
- TNCs present a normative challenge
  1. National Regulation
  2. Global Regulations
- TNCs example forces us to reconsider the broader globalisation debate
  1. What is behind Globalisation?
  2. Is Globalisation inevitable or desirable?
  3. What is the role/responsibility for states in guaranteeing labour standards?

**Lecture 17 – Globalisation for the many or the few?**

1. **Recap**

- The ‘politics’ of Globalisation demonstrated in the Global Trends 2005 document
- Issue of ‘New Actors’ a special concern
- Such new actors problematise state centrist approach to international politics
- Evident when one examines the role of TNCs in the global political economy
- The ‘politics’ of global production play out in the example of the labour standards debate

2. **Aims**
- To introduce another area of study within international politics and global political economy
  - Development too important to be left to economists
- To suggest, again, that the ways in which scholars interpret and explain Globalisation are contestable and therefore reflect a politics of Globalisation and development

3. Poverty and Global Inequality

- Of the 6.7 billion people on the planet, over 85% live in developing countries, with over half in conditions that meet widely accepted definitions of poverty
- One child dies every 6 seconds from hunger and related causes; one in 4 children are underweight
- Over the next 20 years, 1.5 billion people will be born in developing countries compared with only 50 million in developed countries
- As of 2010, approximately 213 million adults are unemployed; of which 81 million are young people (15 - 24)
- 184 million children (5 - 17) are in the labour market
- In developing countries, women earn on average 73% of what men earn
- The richest 50 individuals in the world have a combined income greater than that of the poorest 416 million
- 2.5 billion people living on less than $2 a day
- The bottom half of the world’s population owned barely 1% of global wealth

4. Does Poverty and Global Inequality just involve ‘poor countries’?

- Again, beware of state centrism
- Inequality within countries is a global problem
- In the United States, the average income of the richest 10% is around $93,000; the highest level in any OECD
- However, the poorest 10% of US citizens have an income of $5,800; about 20% lower than the average for OECD countries

5. Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)

- 2000; 191 UN Member state signatories
- Full support of major international organisations
- By 2015, the goals wanted to be achieved are:
  1. Eradication of extreme poverty and hunger
  2. Universal primary education
  3. Gender equality and empower women
  4. Reduce child mortality
  5. Improve maternal health
6. Combat HIV/AIDS, Malaria and other diseases
7. Ensure environmental stability

6. Recap; The 1970's onwards
- The limits of post-war boom
  - Poor economic performance by developed states
- 1973 Oil crisis and the recycling of ‘Petro-dollars’
  - Latin America countries heaviest borrowers
- Abandonment of Bretton Woods
  - IMF and World Bank set new guidelines
- Economic crises in UK, US and Mexico
- The solution? Thatcherism, Reagonomics and The Washington Consensus (‘Neo-Liberalism’)
- The end of the Cold War; the ‘triumph’ of Liberal Democracy and market-led development
  - Shock therapy for former centrally planned economies

7. The Orthodoxy; Neo-Liberalism
- Neo-Liberal the orthodoxy in development policy circles
- Globalisation to be welcomed
- State intervention impinged upon personal liberty
- An unhindered global market best means of guaranteeing
  - Efficiency
  - Material well-being
  - Technological innovation
- Advocates a regime of global governance to establish and enforce minimal rules of the game at the global level (eg; WTO)

8. The Washington Consensus and Afterwards

The Washington Consensus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secure Property Rights</th>
<th>Privatisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Discipline</td>
<td>Deregulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Reform</td>
<td>Financial Liberalisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Budget Priorities</td>
<td>Trade Liberalisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Direct Investment</td>
<td>Single Competitive Exchange Rate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And Afterwards...
- Recognises failures of “Market-Fundamentalism” (Stiglitz)
  - Dramatic increase in the number of poor people
  - Increase in inequality
- Rapid deregulation makes economies vulnerable; multiple crises in 1990s/early 2000s
- Environmental cost
- Shift away from conditionality to “country ownership”
- The ‘Good Governance’ agenda
  - (Legitimate) New Actors involved
  - Better understanding of society

9. **The Politics of Development**

- Country ownership ineffective; same interests represented, with a top-down development. “Business as usual”
- Supposedly sovereign national states still subjected to considerable international influence
- Advanced countries still dominate international organisations (‘Politics’ of the WTO)
- Return to comparative advantage = A return to dependency
- Does development = economic growth?

10. **Summary**

- Poverty and inequality remain key features of global political economy
- 27 years on from the debt crisis; what has changed?
- There are politics ‘in’ development
  - Good governance; Transformation of societies and institutions
- There is politics ‘of’ development
  - TINA; question of Orthodoxy?
  - Venezuela only country set to met MDGs