

APPROACHES TO . . .

GLOBALIZATION

Realist view

Realists have typically adopted a sceptical stance towards globalization, seeing it more in terms of intensifying economic interdependence (that is, 'more of the same') rather than the creation of an interlocking global economy. Most importantly, the state continues to be the dominant unit in world politics. Instead of being threatened by globalization, the state's capacity for regulation and surveillance may have increased rather than decreased. However, realists are not simply globalization deniers. In assessing the nature and significance of globalization, they emphasize that globalization and the international system are not separate, still less rival, structures. Rather, the former should be seen as a manifestation of the latter. Globalization has been made *by* states, *for* states, particularly dominant states. Developments such as an open trading system, global financial markets and the advent of transnational production were all put in place to advance the interests of western states in general and the USA in particular. Furthermore, realists question the notion that globalization is associated with a shift towards peace and cooperation. Instead, heightened economic interdependence is as likely to breed 'mutual vulnerability', leading to conflict rather than cooperation.

Liberal view

Liberals adopt a consistently positive attitude towards globalization. For economic liberals, globalization reflects the victory of the market over 'irrational' national allegiances and 'arbitrary' state borders. The miracle of the market is that it draws resources towards their most profitable use, thus bringing prosperity to individuals, families, companies and societies. The attraction of economic globalization is therefore that it allows markets to operate on a global scale, replacing the 'shallow' integration of free trade and intensified interdependence with the 'deep' integration of a single global economy. The increased productivity and intensified competition that this produces benefits all the societies that participate within it, demonstrating that economic globalization is a positive-sum game, a game of winners and winners. Liberals also believe that globalization brings social and political benefits. The freer flow of information and ideas around the world both widens opportunities for personal self-development and creates more dynamic and vigorous societies. Moreover, from a liberal standpoint, the spread of market capital-

ism is invariably associated with the advance of liberal democracy, economic freedom breeding a demand for political freedom. For liberals, globalization marks a watershed in world history, in that it ends the period during which the nation-state was the dominant global actor, world order being determined by an (inherently unstable) balance of power. The global era, by contrast, is characterized by a tendency towards peace and international cooperation as well as by the dispersal of global power, in particular through the emergence of global civil society (see p. 152) and the growing importance of international organizations.

Critical views

Critical theorists have adopted a negative or oppositional stance towards globalization. Often drawing on an established socialist or specifically Marxist critique of capitalism, this portrays the essence of globalization as the establishment of a global capitalist order. (Indeed, Marx (see p. 69) can be said to have prefigured much 'hyperglobalist' literature, in having highlighted the intrinsically transnational character of the capitalist mode of production.) Like liberals, critical theorists usually accept that globalization marks a historically significant shift, not least in the relationship between states and markets. States have lost power over the economy, being reduced to little more than instruments for the restructuring of national economies in the interests of global capitalism. Globalization is thus viewed as an uneven, hierarchical process, characterized both by the growing polarization between the rich and the poor, explained by world-systems theorists in terms of a structural imbalance between 'core' and 'peripheral' areas in the global economy, and by a weakening of democratic accountability and popular responsiveness due to burgeoning corporate power. Feminist analysts have sometimes linked globalization to growing gender inequalities, associated, for example, with the disruption of small-scale farming in the developing world, largely carried out by women, and growing pressure on them to support their families by seeking work abroad, leading to the 'feminization of migration'. Postcolonial theorists, for their part, have taken particular exception to cultural globalization, interpreted as a form of western imperialism which subverts indigenous cultures and ways of life and leads to the spread of soulless consumerism.

APPROACHES TO . . .

HISTORY

Realist view

Realists believe that history tends to have an enduring character. From their perspective, similarities between historical eras are always more substantial than the differences. In particular, power politics, conflict and the likelihood of war (though, by no means, endless war) are inescapable facts of history. History, if you like, does not ‘move forward’; rather, it repeats itself, endlessly. This happens for at least three reasons. First, human nature does not change: humans are self-interested and power-seeking creatures, given to lusts and impulses that cannot be restrained by reason or moral considerations. Changes in terms of cultural, technological and economic progress do not change these ‘facts of life’. Second, history is shaped by self-interested political units of one kind or another. These political units may take different forms in different historical periods – tribes, empires, city-states, nation-states and so on – but their basic behaviour in terms of rivalry (potentially or actually) with other political units never changes. Third, anarchy is an enduring fact of history, an assumption sometimes referred to as ‘anarcho-centrism’. Despite long periods of domination by various civilizations, empires, great powers or superpowers, none has managed to establish global supremacy. The absence of world government (see p. 457) ensures that every historical period is characterized by fear, suspicion and rivalry, as all political units are forced, ultimately, to rely on violent self-help.

Liberal view

The liberal view of history is characterized by a belief in progress: history marches forwards as human society achieves higher and higher levels of advancement. The assumption that history moves from the ‘dark’ to the ‘light’ is based, above all, on a faith in reason. Reason emancipates humankind from the grip of the past and the weight of custom and tradition. Each generation is able to advance beyond the last as the stock of human knowledge and understanding progressively increases. In international affairs, progress involves a transition from power-seeking behaviour, in which aggression and violence are routinely used as tools of state policy, to a condition characterized by cooperation and peaceful co-existence, brought about by economic interdependence, the emergence of an international rule of law and the advance of democracy. Such thinking has a

utopian dimension, in that it emphasizes the possibility of ‘perpetual peace’ (Kant) and suggests, following Fukuyama (see p.513) that the worldwide victory of liberal democracy would amount to the ‘end of history’. However, the scope and degree of liberal optimism about the future has fluctuated over time. Whilst liberalism flourished both in the period after WWI and following the collapse of communism in the early 1990s, it was distinctly muted in the post-1945 period and also became so in the aftermath of September 11.

Critical views

The most influential critical approaches to history have developed out of Marxism. The Marxist theory of history – often portrayed as ‘historical materialism’ – emphasizes that the primary driving forces in history are material or economic factors. In Marx’s view, history moves forwards from one ‘mode of production’ to the next, working its way through primitive communism, slavery, feudalism and capitalism and eventually leading to the establishment of a fully communist society, history’s determinant end point. Each of these historical stages would collapse under the weight of their internal contradictions, manifest in the form of class conflict. However, communism would mark the end of history because, being based on common ownership of wealth, it is classless. Although orthodox Marxists sometimes interpreted this as a form of economic determinism. Frankfurt School critical theorists, such as Robert Cox (see p. 120), have rejected determinism in allowing that, in addition to the material forces of production, states and relations among states can also influence the course of history. Nevertheless, such essentially class-based theories have been rejected by poststructuralists, social constructivists and feminists. Poststructuralists have often followed Foucault (see p. 17) in employing a style of historical thought called ‘genealogy’, attempting to expose hidden meanings and representations in history that serve the interests of domination and exclude marginalized groups and peoples. Social constructivists criticise materialism in emphasizing the power of ideas, norms and values to shape world history. Feminists, for their part, have sometimes highlighted continuity, by portraying patriarchy (see p. 417) as a historical constant, found in all historical and contemporary societies.

APPROACHES TO . . .

HUMAN NATURE

Realist view

Human nature is the starting point for much realist analysis, so much so that classical realism has sometimes been portrayed as 'biological realism'. Influenced by thinkers such as Hobbes and Machiavelli, realists have embraced a theory of human nature that has three main features. First, the essential core of human nature is fixed and given, fashioned by 'nature' (biological or genetic factors) rather than by 'nurture' (the influence of education or social factors generally). Second, instinct ultimately prevails over intellect. Human beings are driven by non-rational appetites: aversions, fears, hopes and desires, the strongest of which is the desire to exercise power over others. Intellect and reason may guide us in pursuing these appetites, but they do not define them in the first place. Third, as human beings are essentially self-seeking and egoistical, conflict between and amongst them is an unavoidable fact of life. For classical realists, this human egoism determines state egoism, and creates an international system that is inevitably characterized by rivalry and the pursuit of the national interest. Hopes for international cooperation and even 'perpetual peace' are therefore a utopian delusion. However, assumptions about human nature are peripheral within neorealism, in which rivalry and conflict is explained in terms of the structure of the international system rather than the make-up of individuals and therefore of states.

Liberal view

Liberals have a broadly optimistic view of human nature. Humans are self-seeking and largely self-reliant creatures; but they are also governed by reason and are capable of personal self-development. This implies, on the one hand, that there is an underlying and unavoidable tendency towards rivalry and competition among individuals, groups and, in the international arena, states. However, on the other hand, this tendency towards rivalry is contained by an underlying faith in a harmony of interests (conflicts can and should be resolved) and by a preference for resolving conflict through discussion, debate and negotiation. Liberals therefore typically deplore the use of force and aggression; war, for example, is invariably seen as an option of the very last resort. In this view, the use of force may

be justified, either on the grounds of self-defence or as a means of countering oppression, but always and only after reason and argument have failed. By contrast with the realist image of humans as ruthless power-maximizers, liberals emphasize that there is a moral dimension to human nature, most commonly reflected in the doctrine of human rights. This moral dimension is grounded in a strong faith in reason and progress. Reason dictates that human beings treat each other with respect, guided by rationally-based rules and principles. It also emphasizes the scope within human beings for personal development – as individuals expand their understanding and refine their sensibilities – and thus for social progress.

Critical views

While both realists and liberals tend to believe that core aspects of human nature are unchanging and fixed at birth, critical theorists generally view human nature as 'plastic', moulded by the experiences and circumstances of social life. In the nurture–nature debate, they therefore tend to favour nurture. This has two key implications. First, it suggests a unifying vision of humans as social creatures, animated by a common humanity and, therefore, cosmopolitan moral sensibilities. Critical theorists, for example, are often willing to go further than liberal internationalists in endorsing a 'one world' vision, grounded in the ideas of global justice. The second implication of 'plasticity' is that it highlights the extent to which economic, political or cultural structures shape human identities, wants and perceptions. As Marxists have put it, social being determines consciousness. For social constructivists and poststructuralists, this may suggest that there is no such thing as 'human nature', in the sense of a set of abiding tendencies or dispositions that apply in all circumstances and all societies. Feminists usually embrace an androgynous model of human nature, implying that women and men share a common human nature and that gender differences are socially and culturally imposed. Difference feminists nevertheless hold that there are deep-rooted, and perhaps even essential, differences between women and men, such that men are disposed to competition and domination while women are naturally sympathetic and peaceful.

APPROACHES TO . . .

GLOBAL POLITICAL ECONOMY

Realist view

Realist economic theory is firmly rooted in, and sometimes seen as being synonymous with 'economic nationalism' or 'mercantilism'. Mercantilism takes the state to be the most significant economic actor, highlighting the extent to which economic relations are determined by political power. In this view, markets are not 'natural' but exist within a social context largely shaped by the exercise of state power. As the state system is anarchical, the global economy tends to be characterized by conflict as states compete with each other for power and wealth in a zero-sum game. The classic mercantilist strategy is to build up a state's wealth, power and prestige by developing a favourable trading balance through producing goods for export while keeping imports low. The chief device for achieving this is protectionism. *Defensive* mercantilism is designed to protect 'infant' industries and weaker economies from 'unfair' competition from stronger economies, while *aggressive* mercantilism aims to strengthen the national economy in order to provide a basis for expansionism and war. The global economy has thus been fashioned by the interests of the most powerful states, sometimes through neo-colonialism but also through free trade arrangements that force weaker states to open up their markets. For some realists, a stable world economy requires the existence of a single dominant power, as implied by hegemonic stability theory (see p. 229).

Liberal view

Liberal economic theory is based on the belief that individuals, as rationally self-interested creatures, or 'utility maximizers', are the key economic actors (utility maximizers act to achieve the greatest pleasure over pain, calculated in terms of material consumption). In this light, businesses are an important means of organizing production and thus of generating wealth. In line with the deeper liberal belief in balance or harmony amongst competing forces, the key idea of economic liberalism is that an unregulated market economy tends towards long-run equilibrium (the price mechanism, the 'invisible hand' of the market, brings 'supply' and 'demand' into line with one another). From the perspective of classical liberal political economy, this implies a policy of *laissez-faire* (see p. 103), in which

the state leaves the economy alone, and the market is left to manage itself. Economic exchange via the market is therefore a positive-sum game, in that greater efficiency produces economic growth and benefits everyone. The global economy is thus characterized by co-operation as trading and other economic relationships promise to bring mutual benefit and general prosperity. This further implies a positive view of economic globalization, which is seen as the triumph of the market over 'irrational' impediments such as national borders. Such thinking has been taken furthest by neoliberalism (see p. 90). Since Keynes (see p. 105), however, an alternative tradition of liberal political economy has recognized that markets can fail or are imperfect, in which case they need to be managed or regulated on a national and global level.

Critical views

Critical approaches to the economy have been dominated by Marxism, which portrays capitalism as a system of class exploitation and treats social classes as the key economic actors. As class allegiances are taken to be more powerful than national loyalties, political economy always has an international dimension, in the Marxist view. In modern economic circumstances, the interests of the capitalist class, or bourgeoisie, are increasingly identified with those of transnational corporations (see p. 99), which are widely seen as more powerful than national governments, economics having primacy over politics. Capitalism therefore has inherently globalizing tendencies, an unceasing desire to expand regardless of national borders. The global economy is nevertheless characterized by conflict, stemming from the oppressive nature of the capitalist system itself. For some Marxists this is expressed through imperialism (see p. 28) and the desire to secure raw materials and cheap labour. However, some neo-Marxists, following Wallerstein (see p. 100), have interpreted global capitalism as a world-system, which is structured by an exploitative relationship between so-called 'core' areas and 'peripheral' ones, and specifically between transnational corporations and the developing world. Others have adopted a neo-Gramscism approach that stresses the role of hegemony (see p. 221), highlighting the extent to which economic power and political power operate in tandem.

APPROACHES TO . . .

THE STATE

Realist view

Realists tend to view states from the outside; that is, from the perspective of the international system. Above all, they take states to be unitary and coherent actors; indeed, they are commonly portrayed as the basic 'units' of the international system. Their unitary and cohesive character derives from the fact that, regardless of their domestic make-up, state leaders speak and act on behalf of their respective states and can deploy their populations and resources as they wish or choose. State behaviour is determined by a single, overriding motive – 'the wish to survive' (Waltz 2002) – although realists disagree about whether this implies merely a defensive desire to avoid invasion and attack or an aggressive wish to maximize power and achieve domination (see *Offensive or defensive realism?* p. 234). The social, constitutional, political and social composition of the state is therefore irrelevant to its external behaviour. In this sense, the state is a 'black box'. Neorealists in particular insist that states differ only in terms of their 'capabilities', or power resources (there are great powers (see p. 7), minor powers and so on). All realists nevertheless agree that the state is the dominant global actor; hence they adopt a state-centric view of global politics. For example, from a realist perspective, globalization and the state are not separate or, still less, opposing forces: rather, globalization has been created by states and thus exists to serve their interests. Other actors thus only exert influence to the extent that the state allows.

Liberal view

Liberals believe that the state arises out of the needs of society and reflects the interests of individual citizens. So-called social contract theory suggests that the state was established through an agreement amongst citizens to create a sovereign power in order to escape from the chaos and brutality of the 'state of nature' (a stateless, or pre-political, society). The core role of the state is thus to ensure order by arbitrating between the competing individuals and groups in society. The state thus acts as a referee or umpire. This implies that changes in the structure of society can and will alter the role and power of the state. Liberals, as a result,

have been less willing than realists to view the state as the dominant global actor, usually adopting instead a mixed-actor model of world politics. Indeed, liberals have generally accepted that globalization has been marked by the decline of the state (and perhaps the transition from nation-states to 'postmodern' or 'market' states), as power has shifted away from the state and towards, in particular, global markets and transnational corporations (TNCs) (see p. 99), but also to individuals. Furthermore, liberals insist that the constitutional and political make-up of the state has a crucial impact on its external behaviour. In particular, republican liberals argue that democratic states are inherently more peaceable than non-democratic states (Doyle 1986).

Critical views

Critical theorists reject both realist state-centrism and liberal assertions about the retreat of the state, but they do so in different ways. Neo-Marxists and post-Marxist theorists may have abandoned the orthodox Marxist belief that the (capitalist) state is merely a reflection of the class system, but they continue to argue that state structures and, for that matter, world orders are grounded in social relations. The mutual dependence between markets and states has in fact intensified as a result of globalization, leading to what Cox (1993) called the 'internationalization of the state'. Social constructivists deny that the state has a fixed and objective character; rather, the identity of the state is shaped by a variety of historical and sociological factors, and these, in turn, inform the interests of the state and its actions. Wendt (1999), for example, distinguished between the social identity of the state (shaped by the status, role or personality that international society ascribes to a state) and its corporate identity (shaped by internal material, ideological and cultural factors). Feminist theorists have been ambivalent about the state. While liberal feminists have believed that it is possible to reform the state from within, by increasing female representation at all levels, radical feminists have highlighted structural links between the state and the system of male power, believing that the state has an intrinsically patriarchal character.

APPROACHES TO . . .

SOCIETY

Realist view

Realist theorists have given very little attention to society, in any sense of the term. This reflects the fact that the focus of their attention falls on the state, which they view as a 'black box', in that internal social, political, constitutional and, for that matter, cultural arrangements are irrelevant to its behaviour in the global system. As realists view states as robust, autonomous units that are capable of extracting resources from society and imposing their will on society, foreign policy is determined first and foremost by considerations of power and security. Moreover, relations between and amongst states are essentially 'strategic' rather than 'social': the international system is characterized by competition and struggle, not by regular patterns of social interaction that develop through the emergence of norms, shared values and a willingness to cooperate.

Liberal view

The liberal view of society is based on individualism (see p. 150). Liberals thus regard society not as an entity in its own right but as a collection of individuals. To the extent that society exists, it is fashioned out of voluntary and contractual agreements made by self-interested human beings. Pluralists, nevertheless, have drawn attention to the role of groups in articulating the diverse interests within society. However, whether society is understood simply as a collection of self-interested individuals or as a collection of competing groups, liberals hold that there is a general balance of interests in society that tends to promote harmony and equilibrium. This harmony is largely brought about through the state, which acts as a neutral arbiter amongst the competing interests and groups in society, so guaranteeing social order. This task also has implications for foreign policy, which may therefore be shaped by the different groups in society and the political influence they can exert. In this way, liberals accept that foreign policy decision-making may be society-centred, by contrast with the realist model of state-centrism. Liberals have typically welcomed the emergence of global civil society, seeing this as a way of pluralizing power and making intergovernmental decision-making more considered and popularly accountable. They also tend to assume that interactions among states have a significant social component, favouring the notion of

'international society' and believing that interactions among states and non-state actors tend to be structured by principles, procedures, norms or rules, often leading to the formation of international regimes (see p. 67).

Critical views

Critical approaches to society have been significantly influenced by social constructivism. Constructivists have placed sociological enquiry at the centre of global politics by emphasizing that identities and interests in world affairs are socially constructed. Social, cultural and historical factors are therefore of primary interest in affecting the behaviour of states and other actors. Whereas mainstream theorists view society as a 'strategic' realm, in which actors rationally pursue their various interests, constructivists view society as a 'constitutive' realm, the realm that makes actors who or what they are, shaping their identities and interests. However, constructivism is more an analytical tool that emphasizes the sociological dimension of academic enquiry than a substantive social theory, as advanced, for instance, by neo-Marxists and feminists.

Whereas orthodox Marxists explained society in terms of the class system, viewing the proletariat as an emancipatory force, neo-Marxists such as Frankfurt critical theorists have tended to place their faith in 'counter-cultural' social movements, such as the women's movement (see p. 415), the green movement and the peace movement. In this view, global civil society in general, or the 'anti-capitalist' movement (see p. 70) in particular, has sometimes been seen as a counter-hegemonic force. Feminists, for their part, have analyzed society primarily in terms of gender inequality, seeing all contemporary and historical societies as being characterized by patriarchy (see p. 417) and female subordination. However, there is significant disagreement within feminism about matters such as whether patriarchal society is shaped by biological or cultural factors, and the extent to which gender and class hierarchies are linked. From the perspective of green politics, society is either understood in mechanical terms, reflecting the disjuncture in conventional society between humankind and nature, or it is understood in terms of 'social ecology', reflecting natural harmony both amongst human beings and between humans and nature.

APPROACHES TO . . .

NATIONALISM

Realist view

Realists do not generally place an emphasis on nationalism as such. In their view, the crucial stage in the development of the modern international system was the emergence of sovereign states in the 1500–1750 period (particularly through the 1648 Peace of Westphalia), rather than the transformation of these states, from the early nineteenth century onwards, into nation-states through the advent of nationalism. The international system is thus, more accurately, viewed as an inter-state system. Despite this, realists have tended to view nationalism in broadly positive terms. From the realist perspective, nationalism is a key auxiliary component of state power, a source of internal cohesion that consolidates the external effectiveness of a nation-state. By interpreting state interests (generally) as ‘national interests’, realists recognize nationalism as a force that sustains international anarchy, limits the scope for cooperation between and among states, and implies that universal values, such as human rights (see p. 304), are defective.

Liberal view

Liberals have long endorsed nationalism. Indeed, in nineteenth-century Europe in particular, to be a liberal meant to be a nationalist. Liberal nationalism is a principled form of nationalism, based above all on the notion of national self-determination, which portrays the nation as a sovereign entity and implies both national independence and democratic rule. Although liberal nationalists, like all nationalists, view the nation as a ‘natural’ community, they regard nations as essentially civic entities, based on the existence of common values and political loyalties. This makes their form of nationalism tolerant and inclusive. From the liberal perspective, the nation-state (see p. 164) is a political ideal, representing the goal of freedom and the right of each nation to fashion its own destiny. Self-determination, moreover, is a universal right, reflecting the equality of nations (at least in a moral sense) and implying that liberals aim not merely to achieve sovereign statehood for their particular nation but to construct a world of independent nation-states. Liberals argue that such a world would be characterized by peace and harmony, both because nation-states are likely to respect each other’s rights and freedoms, and because no nation-state would wish to endanger its own civic

and cultural unity. Liberals nevertheless view nationalism and internationalism (see p. 64) as complementary, not conflicting, principles. The most prominent forms of liberal internationalism are support for free trade to promote economic interdependence, making war so costly it becomes almost unthinkable, and the construction of intergovernmental or supranational bodies to ensure an international rule of law.

Critical views

Critical views of nationalism have been developed within the Marxist, social constructivist, poststructuralist and feminist traditions. For Marxists, nationality is an example of ‘false consciousness’, an illusion that serves to mystify and confuse the working classes, preventing them from recognizing their genuine interests. In particular, in emphasizing the bonds of nationhood over those of social class, nationalism serves to distort, and conceal, the realities of unequal class power and prevent social revolution. Social constructivists have been particularly critical of the primordialist image of ‘fixed’ ethnic and national identities, emphasizing instead that the sense of national belonging is ‘constructed’ through social, political and other processes. They therefore tend to argue that nations are fashioned by nationalism itself, sympathizing with Eric Hobsbawm’s (1983) image of nations as ‘invented traditions’.

Poststructuralist and postmodernist approaches to nationalism tend to suggest that at the heart of the nationalist project is a narrative, or collection of narratives. The story of the nation is told by history books, works of fiction, symbols, myths and so on, with particular importance being given to a foundational myth that locates the origins of the nation in a time long ago and imbues the nation with special qualities. Feminist theories of nationalism build to these ideas by emphasizing the gender dimension of national identity. The nation is often depicted as female – as the ‘motherland’ rather than the ‘fatherland’ – a tendency that draws from an emphasis on women as the (biological) reproducers of the nation and as symbols of the nation’s values and culture (usually emphasizing the home, purity and selflessness). On the other hand, when the nation is constructed as masculine, this often links national identity to heroism, self-assertion and aggression, tending to conflate nationalism with militarism.

APPROACHES TO . . .

IDENTITY

Realist view

Realists have given relatively little attention to the issue of identity. Their primary focus is on the interests and behaviour of the state, seen as the dominant global actor, rather than on the make-up of its constituent population. Nevertheless, since states are viewed as unified and cohesive entities, this reflects assumptions about political allegiance and social belonging. Notably, as most states are nation-states (see p. 164), realists tend to assume that identity is forged through the overlapping ties of nationality and citizenship. National identity, indeed, may be 'natural', in that it reflects an irresistible psychological disposition for people to identify with others who are similar to themselves.

Liberal view

Liberals generally understand identity in strictly personal terms. Human beings are first and foremost individuals, possessed of a unique identity. However, emphasizing the importance of the individual has two contrasting implications. Individuals are defined by 'inner' qualities and attributes that are specific to themselves, but such thinking is also universalist, in that it implies that, as individuals, all human beings share the same status and so are entitled to the same rights and opportunities. This is reflected in liberal support for the doctrine of human rights (see p. 304). For liberals, then, identity is both unique and universal. The liberal commitment to individualism has important implications for any theory of social or collective identity. In particular, it suggests that factors such as race, religion, culture, gender and social class are at best of secondary importance: they are not 'core' to human identity. Nevertheless, liberals have adopted a wide range of views on such issues, and have also recognized the social dimension of personal identity. This is evident in the ideas of liberal communitarianism (Taylor 1994) and liberal nationalism (Miller 2007).

Critical views

A variety of critical approaches to identity have been developed. Theorists in the Marxist tradition have conventionally understood identity in terms of social class. They believe that people tend to identify with those who have the same economic position, and

therefore class interests, as themselves, other forms of identity (linked to nationality, religion, ethnicity (see p. 175) and so on) being written off simply as 'false consciousness' (deluded and manipulated thinking). Class identities, nevertheless, were provisional, not fundamental. They were essentially a manifestation of the inequalities of the capitalist system, and would be swept away once a classless, communist society had been established. Social constructivists, for their part, have emphasized the extent to which the interests and actions of global actors, be they states or individuals, are fashioned by their sense of identity, which is in turn conditioned by non-material factors. As Wendt (see p. 74) put it, 'identities are the basis of interests'. Such a position rejects any fixed or unchanging notion of identity, as it does the idea that actors encounter each other with pre-determined sets of preferences. Individuals can thus adopt different identities in different cultural and ideational circumstances, including, potentially, cosmopolitan identities.

Since the 1970s, however, critical theorists from various traditions have increasingly understood identity in terms of 'difference'. This reflects both the decline of the politics of social class and a growing awareness of other sources of social injustice, linked, for example, to gender (see p. 416), race, ethnicity and sexual orientation. Conventional models of identity came to be seen as forms of cultural control and subordination, in that they are constructed on the basis of the norms and characteristics of dominant groups. The emphasis on difference, by contrast, allowed marginalized and subordinated groups to embrace, even celebrate, their distinctive, and therefore more 'authentic', identity. Identity formation thus became a vehicle for political self-assertion, as in the ideas of 'black liberation', 'women's liberation', 'gay liberation' and so on. Such thinking has been particularly embraced by feminist theorists, for whom identity is linked to gender. However, while egalitarian feminists have been concerned to reduce or remove gender differences (on the grounds that gender serves to divide otherwise identical human beings), so-called difference feminists have argued that gender is the very root of identity. The theory of gender identity suggests that women should be 'woman-identified', thinking of themselves in terms of the distinctive capacities, needs and interests of women.

APPROACHES TO . . .

THE END OF THE COLD WAR

Realist view

The end of the Cold War came as a shock to the overwhelming majority of realist theorists, creating something of a crisis within realist theory. The problem was that the events of 1989–91 simply do not fit in to realist assumptions about how states behave. States are meant to pursue their national interests, particularly though the maintenance of military and territorial security. However, under Gorbachev, the Soviet Union was prepared to relinquish its military and political domination over Eastern Europe and accepted the break-away of its non-Russian republics. This was, moreover, accomplished without the Soviet Union being subject to irresistible strategic pressure from outside. Nevertheless, realism may shed some light on these developments. From a realist perspective, the Cold War could only end either in the military defeat of one superpower by another, or through the decline in the relative power of one or both of the superpowers, either bringing about the collapse of bipolarity. The contours of the bipolar system were certainly affected in the 1970s and 1980s by the relative decline of the Soviet Union. However, it is difficult to argue that bipolarity had disappeared altogether, certainly as far as military matters were concerned.

Liberal view

Although the end of the Cold War led to a burst of optimism amongst liberal theorists who anticipated that morality, rather than power politics, could be placed at the heart of international diplomacy, liberals fared little better than realists in predicting the end of the Cold War. Nevertheless, since the 1970s, liberals had been highlighting a general trend in favour of cooperation and away from the use of military power. This was based on the tendency of economic modernization to create patterns of 'complex interdependence' that both favoured integration and encouraged states to compete through trade rather than war. Cold War-style antagonism and military confrontation in the form of the nuclear arms race were therefore seen to be increasingly outmoded, as the tendency towards *détente* demonstrated. In this view, the Soviet Union's reluctance to use military force to maintain its control over Eastern Europe as well as its own territorial integrity

stemmed, in part, from the recognition that ending East–West rivalry would be likely to bring economic benefits.

Critical views

The end of the Cold War struck many critical theorists with disquiet. While disillusionment with the Soviet Union had steadily grown in critical and radical circles, many theorists, especially those linked to the Marxist tradition, continued to regard the actually existing socialism of the Eastern bloc as a viable, if imperfect, alternative to western capitalism. Communist regimes were therefore usually viewed as stable and cohesive, especially in view of their ability to deliver economic and social security. The levels of public disaffection with the communist system that were demonstrated across Eastern Europe in 1989 therefore caught most critical theorists by surprise, particularly as these revolutions sought to reverse history, by ditching socialism in favour of capitalism. The one way in which critical thinkers can claim to help to explain the end of the Cold War is through the extent to which the Gorbachev reform process was inspired by a model of 'market socialism', which some had seen as the best hope for a non-authoritarian or 'reform' communism. However, the failure of the Gorbachev reforms merely demonstrated the limitations of market socialism.

The end of the Cold War nevertheless gave significant impetus to social constructivism. The failure of conventional theories adequately to explain why the Cold War ended highlighted, in a sense, a missing dimension: the role played by ideas and perceptions. What was changing during the 1990s was the identity of the Soviet Union, which informed its interests and, in turn, its actions. The social identity of the Soviet Union was reshaped by the 'new thinking' that Gorbachev and a younger generation of Soviet leaders brought to the conduct of domestic and foreign policy. Believing that Soviet interests would best be served by international engagement across the capitalist–communist divide and no longer perceiving the USA and the capitalist West as a security threat, they calculated that political and military domination over Eastern Europe had ceased to be a key strategic interest for the Soviet Union, and may indeed have become an impediment.

APPROACHES TO . . .

WAR AND PEACE

Realist view

For realists, war is an enduring feature of international relations and world affairs. The possibility of war stems from the inescapable dynamics of power politics: as states pursue the national interest (see p. 130) they will inevitably come into conflict with one another, and this conflict will sometimes (but not always) be played out in military terms. Realists explain violent power politics in two ways. First, classical realists emphasize state egoism, arguing that rivalry between and among political communities reflects inherent tendencies within human nature towards self-seeking, competition and aggression. Second, neorealists argue that, as the international system is anarchic, states are forced to rely on self-help in order to achieve survival and security, and this can only be ensured through the acquisition of military power. For offensive realists in particular, this leads to a strong likelihood of war (see *Offensive or defensive realism?* p. 234). All realists, however, agree that the principal factor distinguishing between war and peace is the balance of power (see p. 256). States will avoid war if they calculate that their chances of victory are slim. Decisions about war and peace are therefore made through a kind of cost–benefit analysis, in which rational self-interest may dictate either the use of war or its avoidance. States that wish to preserve peace must therefore prepare for war, hoping to deter potential aggressors and to prevent any other state or coalition of states from achieving a position of predominance.

Liberal view

Liberals believe that peace is a natural, but by no means an inevitable, condition for international relations. From the liberal perspective, war arises from three sets of circumstances, each of which is avoidable. First, echoing realist analysis, liberals accept that state egoism in a context of anarchy may lead to conflict and a possibility of war. However, liberals believe that an international anarchy can and should be replaced by an international rule of law, achieved through the construction of supranational bodies. Second, liberals argue that war is often linked to economic nationalism and autarky, the quest for economic self-sufficiency tending to bring states into violent conflict with one another. Peace can nevertheless be achieved through

free trade and other forms of economic interdependence, especially as these may make war so economically costly that it becomes unthinkable. Third, the disposition of a state towards war or peace is crucially determined by its constitutional character. Authoritarian states tend to be militaristic and expansionist, accustomed to the use of force to achieve both domestic and foreign goals, while democratic states are more peaceful, at least in their relations with other democratic states (for a discussion of the ‘democratic peace’ thesis, see p. 66).

Critical views

Critical theorists in the Marxist tradition have tended to explain war primarily in economic terms. WWI, for instance, was an imperialist war fought in pursuit of colonial gains in Africa and elsewhere (Lenin 1970). The origins of war can thus be traced back to the capitalist economic system, war, in effect, being the pursuit of economic advantage by other means. Such an analysis implies that socialism is the best guarantee of peace, socialist movements often having a marked anti-war or even pacifist orientation, shaped by a commitment to internationalism (see p. 64). Critical theorists in the anarchist tradition, such as Chomsky (see p. 228), have shown a particular interest in the phenomenon of hegemonic war, believing that the world’s most powerful states use war, directly or indirectly, to defend or expand their global economic and political interests. War is therefore closely associated with hegemony (see p. 221), while peace can be built only through a radical redistribution of global power. Feminists, for their part, have adopted a gender perspective on war and peace. Not only are wars fought essentially between males, but the realist image of international politics as conflict-ridden and prone to violence reflects ‘masculinist’ assumptions about self-interest, competition and the quest for domination. For difference feminists in particular, the origins of war stem either from the warlike nature of the male sex or from the institution of patriarchy (see p. 417). By contrast, feminists draw attention to what they see as the close association between women and peace, based either on the ‘natural’ peacefulness of women or on the fact that women’s experience of the world encourages an emphasis on human connectedness and cooperation.

APPROACHES TO . . .

THE BALANCE OF POWER

Realist view

The idea of the balance of power has played a central role in realist theory. Waltz (1979), for example, portrayed the balance of power as *the* theory of international politics. This reflects core assumptions about the importance of power in shaping state behaviour and of the role of power relations in structuring international politics. Realists view the balance of power, understood as a rough equilibrium between two or more power blocs, in strongly positive terms. As only power can be a check on power, the balance of power tends to lead to peace and stability. However, realism embraces two quite different conceptions of the balance of power. For classical realists, the balance of power is essentially a policy, a product of political intervention and statesmanship. This example of *voluntarism* (implying faith in free will and personal commitment) assumes that key decision-makers in foreign policy enjoy great (though not unlimited) freedom of manoeuvre. For neorealists, on the other hand, the balance of power is treated more as a system, as a set of arrangements that tend to arise automatically, rather than through the self-willed actions of decision-makers. This example of *determinism* (implying that human actions are entirely conditioned by external factors) suggests that the balance of power is essentially 'imposed by events' on statesman who are constrained by the dynamics of the international system. This happens because states in a self-help system are likely to act to prevent the emergence of hegemonic domination by a single state. A balance of power, nevertheless, is more likely to develop in a bipolar system than it is in either a multipolar or unipolar system (see Neorealist stability theory, p. 63).

Liberal view

Liberals have generally been critical of the idea of balance of power. In their view, the balance of power legitimizes and entrenches power politics and international rivalry, creating inherent instability and deepening distrust. This is because the basic premise of the balance of power is that other states, or coalitions of states, pose a threat to security, and this can only be contained through a rival build-up of power or the formation of a rival alliance. A balance-of-power

mindset is therefore more likely to cause war than prevent it. Much of liberal thinking about international politics has therefore focused on finding alternative and more effective mechanisms for ensuring peace and security. The principal liberal solution is the construction of international organizations such as the League of Nations or the United Nations, which are capable of turning the jungle of international politics into a zoo. This happens, in part, because whereas the balance of power fosters private agreements amongst states, international organizations foster public agreements that cover most if not all states, so making possible a system of collective security (see p. 440).

Critical views

A variety of critical approaches to the balance of power have emerged. Social constructivists, for instance, have emphasized the extent to which any assessment of the balance of power is dependent on perception, ideas and beliefs. Any assessment of the balance of power is therefore shaped by the identities that states have of themselves and of other states. In short, paraphrasing Wendt's (1999) oft-quoted assertion about anarchy, the balance of power is what states make of it. International society theorists have, similarly, argued that the balance of power is an artefact: it emerges out of the existence of common norms and values and a mutual desire of states to avoid war. The balance of power, then, works because states *want* it to work (Bull [1977] 2002). Feminist theorists have shared with liberals the belief that balance-of-power thinking tends to intensify international conflict and make war more likely, not less likely. For feminists, this reflects a gendered conception of the balance of power, in which power is almost always conceived as 'power over', the ability to control or dominate others. The balance of power therefore invariably becomes a struggle for power. Finally, postcolonial theorists have viewed the balance of power as an essentially European, or western, game, which excludes consideration of the rest of the world. The European balance-of-power system in the late nineteenth century thus coincided with the 'scramble for Africa', and a deepening of global inequalities and imbalances.

APPROACHES TO . . .

TERRORISM

Realist view

Realist thinking about terrorism tends to place a strong emphasis on the state/non-state dichotomy. Terrorism is usually viewed as a violent challenge to the established order by a non-state group or movement, often as part of a bid for power. The realist emphasis on politics as a realm of power seeking and competition can thus be seen to apply to the behaviour of non-state actors as well as to that of states. From this perspective, the motivations behind terrorism are largely strategic in character. Groups use clandestine violence and focus on civilian targets mainly because they are too weak to challenge the state openly through conventional armed conflict. They attempt to exhaust or weaken the resolve of a government or regime that they cannot destroy. The crucial feature of the realist approach to terrorism is nevertheless that, being an attempt to subvert civil order and overthrow the political system, the state's response to terrorism should be uncompromising. In a political tradition that can be traced back to Machiavelli (see p. 55), this reflects the belief that political leaders should be prepared to contravene conventional morality in order to protect a political community that is under threat. This is often called the problem of 'dirty hands' – because they have wider public responsibilities, political leaders should be prepared to get their hands dirty, and set aside private scruples. Realists therefore tend to be relatively unconcerned about whether counter-terrorist strategies infringe civil liberties; the important matter is whether counter-terrorism works.

Liberal view

Liberals, like realists, tend to view terrorism as an activity primarily engaged in by non-state actors. Insofar as they have different views about the motivations behind terrorism, liberals are more inclined to emphasize the role of ideology rather than simple power seeking. A key factor in explaining terrorism is therefore the influence of a political or religious ideology that creates an exaggerated sense of injustice and hostility, and so blinds the perpetrators of violence to the moral and human costs of their actions. However, liberal thinking about terrorism has tended to be dominated by the ethical dilemmas that are posed by the task of counter-terrorism. On the

one hand, liberals typically view terrorism as an attack on the very principles of a liberal-democratic society – openness, choice, debate, toleration and so on. On the other hand, liberals have been anxious to ensure that attempts to counter terrorism are consistent with these same values, and, in particular, that they should not infringe human rights and civil liberties. (For an account of the relationship between counter-terrorism and individual rights and freedoms, see p. 299).

Critical views

There are two main critical perspectives on terrorism. The first reflects the views of radical theorists such as Chomsky (see p. 228) and Falk (1991). In their view, terrorism amounts to the killing of unarmed civilians, and it is something that is engaged in by both states and non-state actors. State terrorism ('wholesale terrorism'), indeed, is much more significant than non-state terrorism ('retail terrorism'), because states have a far greater coercive capacity than any non-state actors. Terrorism is thus largely a mechanism through which states use violence against civilians either to maintain themselves in power or to extend political or economic influence over other states. In this respect, particular attention has focused on its role in promoting US hegemony, the USA being viewed as the world's 'leading terrorist state' (Chomsky 2003).

The alternative critical perspective on terrorism is shaped by constructivist and poststructuralist thinking. It is characterized by the belief that much, and possibly all, commonly accepted knowledge about terrorism amounts to stereotypes and misconceptions. In this view, terrorism is a social or political construct. It is typically used to define certain groups and political causes as non-legitimate, by associating them with the image of immorality and wanton violence. This, in turn, tends to imply that the institutions and political structures against which terrorism is used are rightful and legitimate. Such thinking has been applied in particular to the discourses that have emerged in connection with the 'war on terror' (see p. 223), in which the term 'terrorism' is allegedly used to de-legitimize the enemies of the dominant actors in the modern global system (Dedeoglu 2003).

APPROACHES TO . . .

HUMAN RIGHTS

Realist view

Realists have tended to view a concern with human rights as, at best, a 'soft' issue in international affairs, by contrast with 'hard', or 'core', concerns such as the pursuit of security and prosperity. Other realists go further and believe that human rights thinking in relation to international and global issues is entirely wrong-headed. This is because realists hold that it is impossible, and undesirable, to view international politics in moral terms. Morality and the national interest are two distinct things, and states fail adequately to serve their own citizens (and often those of other states) when they allow ethical considerations – particularly ones as inherently vague and confused as human rights – to affect their behaviour. Realist objections to the culture of human rights have at least three bases. In the first place, they take issue with the essentially optimistic model of human nature that underpins human rights, which emphasizes dignity, respect and rationality. Second, realists are primarily concerned about collective behaviour, and especially the capacity of the state to ensure order and stability for their citizens. The national interest should therefore take precedence over any individually-based conception of morality. Third, being based on positivism, realism is keen to uphold its scientific credentials. This implies a concern with what *is*, rather than with what *should be*.

Liberal view

The modern doctrine of human rights is very largely a product of liberal political philosophy. Indeed, so entangled with liberal assumptions are they that some doubt whether human rights can ever properly be described as 'above' ideological differences, bearing the cultural imprint of western liberalism. At a philosophical level, the image of humans as 'rights bearers' derives from liberal individualism. On a political level, liberals have long used the notion of natural or human rights to establish the basis of legitimacy. Social contract theorists thus argued that the central purpose of government is to protect a set of inalienable rights, variously described as 'life, liberty and property' (Locke), or as 'life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness' (Jefferson). If governments become tyrannical, by abusing or failing to protect such rights, they break an

implicit contract between the people and government, entitling citizens to rebel. The English, American and French revolutions were all justified using such ideas. During the twentieth century, liberals increasingly used such thinking to outline the basis for international legitimacy, arguing that states should be bound, preferably legally, to uphold human rights in their dealings with their domestic population as well as with other states. The 1948 UN Declaration therefore has, for liberals, a near-religious significance. Nevertheless, liberals tend to regard only civil and political rights as fundamental rights, and sometimes view economic rights and any conception of group rights with grave suspicion.

Critical views

Critical approaches to human rights have either tended to revise or recast the traditional, liberal view of human rights, or they have been openly hostile to the idea itself. The global justice movement has used economic and social rights as the basis of calls for a radical redistribution of power and resources, both within countries and between them (Shue 1996; Pogge 2008). Human rights have thus been turned into a doctrine of global social justice, grounded in moral cosmopolitanism. Feminists, for their part, have demonstrated a growing interest in the cause of human rights. In particular, they have sought to transform the concept and practice of human rights to take better account of women's lives, highlighting the issues of 'women's human rights' (Friedman 1995). This marks a recognition by feminist activists of the power of the international human rights framework, and especially its capacity to place women's issues on mainstream agendas. Human rights have thus been redefined to include the degradation and violation of women. At the same time, however, feminists have taken a critical view of rights that men have designed to protect their entitlement to private commerce, free speech and cultural integrity, which have been used to legitimize practices such as child marriages, the trafficking of women and child pornography (see Cultural rights or women's rights? p. 196). The postcolonial critique of human rights is examined in the main body of the text, see pp. 316–18.

APPROACHES TO . . .

INTERNATIONAL LAW

Realist view

Realists are generally sceptical about international law and its value, usually drawing a sharp distinction between domestic law and international law. While domestic law derives from the existence of a sovereign authority responsible for enacting and enforcing law, the absence of a central political authority in the international realm means that what is called ‘international law’ is perhaps nothing more than a collection of moral principles and ideals. As Thomas Hobbes (see p. 14), put it, ‘where there is no common power, there is no law’. For Morgenthau (see p. 58), international law amounted to a form of ‘primitive law’, similar to the behavioural codes established in pre-modern societies. However, only ultra-realists go as far as dismissing international law altogether. Most realists accept that international law plays a key role in the international system, albeit one that is, and should be, limited. International law is limited by the fact that states, and particularly powerful states, are the primary actors on the world stage, meaning that international law largely reflects, and is circumscribed by, state interests. Realists also believe that the proper, and perhaps only legitimate, purpose of international law is to uphold the principle of state sovereignty. This makes them deeply suspicious of the trend towards ‘supranational’ or ‘world’ law, in which international law becomes entangled with the idea of global justice and is used to protect individual rights rather than states’ rights.

Liberal view

Liberals have a clearly positive assessment of the role and importance of international law. This stems from the belief that human beings are imbued with rights and guided by reason. As the international sphere is a moral sphere, core ethical principles should be codified within a framework of international law. For idealists, such thinking implied that in international politics, as in domestic politics, the only solution to the disorder and chaos of anarchy is the establishment of a supreme legal authority, creating an international rule of law. This doctrine of ‘peace through law’ was expressed, for example, in the establishment of the League of Nations and in the 1928 Kellogg-Briand Pact, which in effect banned war. Although modern liberals and particularly neoliberals have long since abandoned such idealism, they nevertheless continue to believe that international

law plays an important and constructive role in world affairs. For them, regimes of international law reflect the common interests and common rationality that bind statesmen together. By translating agreements among states into authoritative principles and by strengthening levels of trust and mutual confidence, international law deepens interdependence (see p. 8) and promotes cooperation. The idea that there is a tendency for interdependence to be consolidated through formal rules of international behaviour is reflected in the functionalist theory of integration, as discussed in Chapter 20.

Critical views

The three main critical perspectives on international law have emerged from social constructivism, critical legal studies and postcolonialism. Although there is no developed or coherent constructivist account of the nature of international law, the assertion that political practice is crucially shaped by norms and perceptions emphasizes the extent to which norms embodied in international law structure the identities of states as well as the interests they pursue. This helps to explain why and how state behaviour changes over time, as, for instance, once accepted practices such as slavery, the use of foreign mercenaries and the ill-treatment of prisoners of war become less common. Influenced by poststructuralist analysis, critical legal studies highlights the inherently indeterminate nature of international law, based on the fact that legal language is capable of multiple and competing meanings. Such insights have, for instance, been used by feminists to suggest that international law embodies patriarchal biases, either because the legal ‘person’ (whether the individual or the state) is constructed on the basis of masculine norms, or because international law perpetuates the image of women as victims. Postcolonialists, for their part, have viewed international law as an expression, in various ways, of western global dominance (Grovoqui 1996; Antony 2005). From this perspective, international law developed out of Christian and Eurocentric thinking about the nature of legal and political order, is tainted by the inheritance of colonialism and possibly racism, and operates through institutions, such as the International Court of Justice, that are wedded to the interests of the industrialized West.

APPROACHES TO . . .

DEVELOPMENT

Realist view

There is no realist theory of development as such. Nevertheless, in explaining the phenomenon of economic development, realists have generally drawn heavily on the ideas of mercantilism. Mercantilism stresses the interplay between economics and politics, particularly through the extent to which healthy and stable domestic economies rely on a strong dose of state intervention, especially in order to manage external trade relations (implying protectionism). Such a view is highly sceptical of liberal claims about the natural tendency of market economies towards equilibrium and growth, believing, always, that markets need to be managed.

Liberal view

The liberal approach to development is firmly rooted in the ideas of economic liberalism. Classical liberal economics draws heavily on individualist and rationalist assumptions about human nature, placing a strong emphasis on the idea that human beings are primarily motivated by the desire for material consumption. Liberalism therefore provides the basis for the orthodox notion of 'development as growth'. From the liberal perspective, the central mechanism for generating wealth is the market, which operates according to the wishes and decisions of free individuals. The attraction of the market is that it is a self-regulating mechanism, which tends naturally to promote economic prosperity and well-being. However, individual acquisitiveness and market forces are not always in themselves powerful enough to deliver economic development. For liberals, 'development failures' stem from factors that are internal to the society itself. These include cultural or religious norms that inhibit individual self-seeking, rigid and authoritarian state institutions, chronic corruption, and ethnic and tribal rivalries that subvert civil order. The best way to overcome these obstacles is through market reform (privatization, financial deregulation, labour flexibility, tax cuts and so on) and the integration of the national economy into the global capitalist economy (free trade and an open economy).

Critical views

Critical approaches to development have been dominated by neo-Marxists theories. These shift attention away from internal obstacles to development, to external ones, particularly those that stem from the structural dynamics of the global capitalist system.

Neo-Marxist thinking about development has been shaped by two main theoretical sub-traditions. Dependency theory highlights the extent to which, in the post-1945 period, traditional imperialism gave way to neo-colonialism, sometimes viewed as 'economic imperialism' or, more specifically, 'dollar imperialism'. Despite enjoying formal independence and sovereignty (see p. 3), developing world states continued to be subject to economic dependency through, for instance, unequal trade relations, the impact of TNCs and biases within bodies such as the IMF and the World Bank that favour the interests of industrially advanced states. The other key neo-Marxist sub-tradition is world-system theory (see p. 367), which portrays the world economy as an interlocking whole, composed of core, peripheral and semi-peripheral areas. In this, economically advanced and politically stable core areas dominate and exploit peripheral areas that are characterized by low wages, rudimentary technology and a dependence on agriculture or primary production.

Amongst other critical approaches to development, green politics has challenged the conventional emphasis on economic growth by championing the notion of 'development as sustainability', usually linked to the concept of sustainable development (see p.390). In this view, economic growth must be balanced against its ecological costs, a healthy environment being vital for meaningful development. For cosmopolitan theorists, development should be understood in terms of the larger project of advancing global justice. Feminism has been associated with various views about development. Some feminists argue that overturning gender inequality must be seen as a key component of development, thereby highlighting the need to change social structures, institutions and cultural practices in the developing world. However, other feminists stress the extent to which 'development as growth' is constructed on the basis of masculinist assumptions, or the degree to which women already play an important, if usually ignored, role in bringing about development. Post-colonialists, for their part, have sometimes challenged the very idea of development, advancing instead the notion of 'post-development'. While conventional models of development involve the imposition of western institutions and values on non-western societies, 'post-development' allows each society to embrace its own model of economic and social progress, based on aspirations and a cultural heritage that are authentic to the society itself.

APPROACHES TO . . .

NATURE

Realist view

Realism has traditionally paid little attention to environmental thinking and it would be highly questionable to suggest that realism can be associated with a particular conception of nature. Realism is certainly more concerned with survival than with sustainability. Nevertheless, it has addressed the issue of the relationship between humankind and the natural world in at least two senses. First, classical realists have often explained human behaviour and propensities in terms of those found in other animals and, indeed, in nature itself. Selfishness, greed and aggression have commonly been viewed as innate features of human nature, reflecting tendencies that are found in all species (Lorenz 1966). On a larger scale, the struggle and conflict that realists believe is an ineradicable feature of human existence has sometimes been traced back to the fact that nature itself is 'red in tooth and claw'. Conflict and war have thus been seen as a manifestation of 'the survival of the fittest', a kind of social Darwinism. Second, realists have acknowledged the importance of nature, in recognizing the role that scarcity, and therefore conflict over resources, often plays in generating international tensions. Such thinking has been particularly evident in the ideas of geopolitics (see p. 407), which is itself a form of environmentalism. It is also reflected in the idea that many, and perhaps most, wars are 'resource wars'.

Liberal view

In the liberal view, nature is viewed as a resource to satisfy human needs. This explains why liberals have rarely questioned human dominion over nature. Lacking value in itself, nature is invested with value only when it is transformed by human labour, or when it is harnessed to human ends. This is reflected in Locke's theory that property rights derived from the fact that nature has, in effect, been mixed with labour. Nature is thus 'commodified', assigned an economic value, and it is drawn into the processes of the market economy. Indeed, in emphasizing the virtues of free-market capitalism, classical liberals have endorsed self-interested materialism and economic growth, a position that many ecologists have linked to the rapacious exploitation of nature. The anti-nature or anti-ecological biases of liberalism can be seen to stem

from two main sources. First, liberalism is strongly anthropocentric, by virtue of its belief in individualism (see p. 150). Second, liberals have a strong faith in scientific rationality and technology, encouraging them to adopt a problem-solving approach to nature and to place a heavy reliance on human ingenuity. Nevertheless, alternative traditions within liberalism reflect a more positive approach to nature. These include a modern liberal stress on human flourishing, which may be facilitated through the contemplation of nature, and a utilitarian emphasis on maximizing happiness and minimizing suffering, a stance that may be applied to other species or to future generations of humans (Singer 1993).

Critical views

The two critical theories that address the issue of nature most explicitly are feminism and green politics. Feminists generally hold nature to be creative and benign. This is a view that is most closely associated with ecofeminism. For most ecofeminists, there is an essential or natural bond between women and nature. The fact that women bear children and suckle babies means that they cannot live separated from natural rhythms and processes and this, in turn, means that traditional 'female' values (reciprocity, cooperation, nurturing and so on) have a 'soft' or ecological character. While women are creatures of nature, men are creatures of culture: their world is synthetic or man-made, a product of human ingenuity rather than natural creativity. Environmental degradation is therefore an inevitable consequence of patriarchal power. From the perspective of green politics, nature is an interconnected whole which embraces humans and non-humans as well as the inanimate world. Nature thus embodies the principles of harmony and wholeness, implying that human fulfilment comes from a closeness to nature, not from attempts to dominate it. This holistic view is embraced most radically by deep ecologists, for whom nature is the source or all value. Nature is thus an ethical community, meaning that human beings are nothing more than 'plain citizens' who have no more rights and are no more deserving of respect than any other member of the community (Leopold 1968).

APPROACHES TO . . .

GENDER RELATIONS

Realist view

There is no realist theory of gender as such. Realists, indeed, would usually view gender relations as irrelevant to international and global affairs. This is because the principal actors on the world stage are states, whose behaviour is shaped by an overriding concern about the national interest (see p. 130) and the fact that, within an anarchic international system, they are forced to prioritize security (especially military security) over other considerations. States are therefore 'black boxes': their internal political and constitutional structures and their social make-up, in terms of gender, class, ethnic, racial or other divisions, have no bearing on their external behaviour. However, in arguing that state egoism derives from human egoism, classical realists such as Morgenthau have suggested that the tendency to dominate is an element in all human associations including the family. The patriarchal family and the sexual division of labour between 'public' men and 'private' women (Elshtain 1981) therefore tend to be thought of as natural and unchangeable.

Liberal view

Liberals have long been concerned about the issue of gender equality, so much so that liberal feminism was the earliest, and in countries such as the USA continues to be the most influential, school of feminist thought. The philosophical basis of liberal feminism lies in the principle of individualism (see p. 150). Individuals are entitled to equal treatment, regardless of their gender, race, colour, creed or religion. If individuals are to be judged, it should be on rational grounds, on the content of their character, their talents, or their personal worth. Any form of sexual discrimination should clearly be prohibited. Liberal feminists therefore aim to break down the remaining legal and social pressures that restrict women from pursuing careers and being politically active, and, in particular, to increase the representation of women in senior positions in public and political life. They believe that this would both serve the interests of justice (in promoting equal opportunities for women and men) and, probably, make a difference to how politics is conducted. This is because liberals have usually assumed that women and men have different natures and inclinations, women's leaning towards family and domestic life being shaped,

at least in part, by a natural impulse towards caring and nurturing. Feminist thinking has had a significant impact on liberal international relations scholars such as Keohane (1989, 1998), who accepted that standpoint feminism in particular had given ideas such as complex interdependence and institutional change a richer and more gender-conscious formulation. As a liberal rationalist, however, he criticized the attachment of some feminist scholars to postmodern or poststructural methodologies, insisting that knowledge can only be advanced by developing testable hypotheses.

Critical views

Critical theories of global politics have engaged with feminist thinking and gender perspectives in a number of different ways. Social constructivism had a significant impact on early radical feminist conceptions of gender, which placed a particular emphasis on the process of socialization that takes place within the family as boys and girls are encouraged to conform to contrasting masculine and feminine stereotypes. Gender is therefore a social construct, quite distinct from the notion of biological sex. Frankfurt critical theory, as with any tradition that derives from Marxism, has tended to ignore or marginalize gender, preferring instead to concentrate on social class. However, a form of feminist critical theory has emerged that tends to fuse elements of standpoint feminism with a broadly Marxist emphasis on the links between capitalism and patriarchy, seen as interlocking hegemonic structures. In this view, women's groups have considerable emancipatory potential, operating as a force of resistance against the advance of global capitalism and TNCs (see p. 99). Postmodern or poststructuralist feminists have taken issue in particular with forms of feminism that proclaim that there are essential differences between women and men. Finally, postcolonial feminists have been critical of Eurocentric, universalist models of female emancipation that fail to recognize that gender identities are enmeshed with considerations of race, ethnicity and culture. For instance, forms of Islamic feminism have developed in which the return to traditional moral and religious principles has been seen to enhance the status of women (see Cultural rights or women's rights, p. 196).

APPROACHES TO . . .

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

Realist view

Realists are deeply sceptical about international organizations. They view such bodies as largely ineffective, and also question their authority. The weakness of international organizations derives from the fact that international politics continues to be characterized by a quest for power amongst all states, reflected in the pursuit of relative gains. If world politics is shaped by a struggle for power rather than a harmony of interests, there is little scope for the levels of cooperation and trust that would allow international organizations to develop into meaningful and significant bodies. In addition, the growth of international organizations is usually deemed to be undesirable because of its implications for sovereignty. Any form of international organization therefore tends to erode the authority of the nation-state. However, realists do not completely discount the role of international organizations. Neorealists, for example, have drawn attention to the relationship between international organization and hegemony (see p. 221). As hegemonic states possess such superior power, they are the only states that can tolerate the relative gains of other states so long as they are making absolute gains themselves. The effectiveness of international organizations is therefore closely linked to the emergence of a global hegemon – the UK in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and the USA since 1945 and, more particularly, since 1990. Nevertheless, the disproportionate burden that such powers shoulder may contribute to their long-term decline.

Liberal view

Liberals have been amongst the most committed supporters of international organizations. This is reflected in the ideas of liberal institutionalism. From the institutionalist perspective, states cooperate because it is in their interest to do so. This does not imply that state interests are always harmoniously in agreement, but only that there are important, and growing, areas of mutual interest where cooperation amongst states is rational and sensible. International organizations are therefore a reflection of the extent of interdependence in the global system, an acknowledgement by states that they can often achieve more by working together than by working separately. In areas of mutual interest, states' desire to make absolute gains usually wins out over concerns about relative gains. Neoliberal institu-

tionalists, nevertheless, acknowledge that the existence of complex interdependence among states does not automatically result in the creation of international organizations. Cooperation may be hard to achieve when, despite the existence of common interests, states feel they have an incentive to defect from an agreement or fear that other states may defect. One of the purposes of international organizations is therefore to reduce the likelihood of this happening, by both building trust between and amongst states and accustoming them to rule-governed behaviour. As such considerations apply to all states, regardless of where they stand within a hierarchy of power, liberals question the realist belief that successful international institutions require the participation of a hegemonic state.

Critical views

Social constructivists challenge both neorealist and neoliberal accounts of international organization on the grounds that, despite their differences, they assume that states are rational actors guided by objective interests. This discounts the role of ideas and perceptions. The state-system is an arena of inter-subjective interaction. Levels of cooperation within the international system therefore depend on how states construe their own identities and interests as well as the identities and interests of other states. These, moreover, change due to membership of, and interactions that take place within, international organizations, meaning that international organizations themselves are essentially ideational constructs. Other critical theories advance critiques of international organization that stress the degree to which international structures reflect, and, to some extent, exist to consolidate, the wider inequalities and imbalances of the global system. Frankfurt critical theorists, for example, emphasize that bodies such as the World Bank (see p. 373) and the IMF (see p. 469) have internalized a neoliberal agenda, and so act in the interests of global capitalism. Feminists, for their part, highlight the gendered construction of international organizations, reflecting both the traditional domination of elite men and the internalization of masculinist ideas and policy approaches. In this respect, green politics is often an exception. Many greens looked to international organization, and even some form of world government, to provide a solution to the 'tragedy of the commons' (see p. 388).

APPROACHES TO . . .

GLOBAL ECONOMIC GOVERNANCE

Realist view

The realist stance on global economic governance is shaped by mercantilism and the belief that the world economy is essentially an arena of competition amongst states, each seeking to maximize its wealth and relative power. Economics is therefore largely explained in political terms. For realists, the combination of state egoism and international anarchy ensure that, in most circumstances, the scope for cooperation amongst states in economic affairs is very limited. This only alters, however, with the emergence of a hegemonic power, a state whose dominant military and economic position means that its interests are inextricably linked to those of the liberal world economy itself. As explained by hegemonic stability theory (see p. 229), a hegemon is necessary for the creation and full development of a liberal world economy because it is the only power that is willing and able to establish and enforce its basic rules. The Great Depression of the 1930s thus persisted as long as it did largely because the UK, as a fading hegemon, was no longer willing or able to re-establish economic stability (Kindleberger 1973). By the same token, the establishment of the Bretton Woods system marked the emergence of the USA as a hegemonic power. From the realist perspective, the breakdown of the system in the early 1970s reflected either the decline of US hegemony, or the emergence of the USA as a 'predatory hegemon'.

Liberal view

The liberal position on global economic governance is based on faith in the market and in untrammelled competition. As the workings of impersonal market forces draw resources towards their most profitable use and establish conditions of long-run equilibrium, it follows that any obstacle to the unfettered operation of markets should be ruled out. Such a stance could imply hostility towards any form of economic governance, whether operating on a national or global level. Nevertheless, most liberals accept the need for economic governance so long as it promotes, rather than restricts, openness and free competition. The emergence of a framework of global economic governance therefore reflected a recognition that, in conditions of economic interdependence, states have a mutual interest in upholding agreed norms and rules. The nature of these norms and rules is crucial,

however. From the perspective of economic liberalism, the Bretton Woods system was defective from the outset, because it set out to regulate a liberal economic order, not least though fixed exchange rates, that works best when it is free and unregulated. The breakdown of the Bretton Woods system thus reflected not the decline in US hegemony but fundamental flaws in the architecture of the Bretton Woods system itself. By comparison, the shift towards neoliberalism brought about by the emergence of the Washington consensus from the 1980s onwards marked the triumph of liberalism over the quasi-mercantilism of Bretton Woods.

Critical views

The two main critical approaches to global economic governance have been advanced from the perspectives, respectively, of social constructivism and neo-Marxist or post-Marxist theory. Social constructivists, such as Ruggie (1998, 2008), have emphasized the extent to which policies and institutional frameworks designed to regulate the world economy have been shaped by historical and sociological factors. The Bretton Woods system, thus, did not merely reflect a reconfiguration of state power and interests, but also a changing pattern of social expectations, norms and economic ideas in the form of 'embedded liberalism', which had come to be widely shared amongst industrialized states. Similarly, the later adoption of the Washington consensus owed a great deal to the growing hegemonic influence of neoliberal ideology, which helped to embed a belief in global markets. Neo-Marxists, such as world-systems theorists, and post-Marxist critical theorists have, for their part, challenged the liberal assumption that the institutions of global economic governance are neutral in the sense that they reflect the interests of all groups and all states (Soederberg 2006). Instead, they are constructed in line with the dominant interests in the global capitalist system: the USA as the leading capitalist state, transnational corporations (TNCs) (see p. 99) and banking conglomerates, and so on. For world-system theorists, the institutions of global economic governance have presided over a significant transfer of wealth and resources from 'peripheral' areas of the world economy to 'core' areas (Wallerstein 1984).