



Intro to IR

Dr. Willardson



Nurbolat Gabbassov
Aizhan Omirzak

The Present and Future of Diplomacy and Diplomatic Studies

Author(s): Stuart Murray, Paul Sharp, Geoffrey Wiseman, David Criekemans and Jan Melissen

5 essays: The authors take diverse approaches but on one thing they are in agreement. That is the need for a strong and active Diplomatic Studies Section in ISA serving as a two-way conduit between practitioners and scholars.

- Who is the audience for this work?
 - Other academics
 - IR scholars
 - Diplomacy scholars

- What is the purpose of the article?
 - To outline the academic study of diplomacy and discuss an agenda for further study
 - Community of scholarship
 - Knowledge creation and scientific processes/community

Diplomacy, Diplomatic Studies, and the ISA (Paul Sharp)

ISA - is a professional association for scholars, practitioners and graduate students in the field of international studies.

Definition of *diplomacy*: “The institutions and processes by which states and others represent themselves and their interests to one another- plays an important part in shaping what happens in international relations” (709)

Bringing Diplomacy Back In: Time for Theory to catch up with Practice (Wiseman)

- Diplomacy (as practice) attacked with four critiques (traditionally):
 - *Wilsonian liberal democratic critique*, that secret diplomacy leads to war;
 - *Revolutionary critique*, associated with communists from Trotsky on, that diplomacy would fade with the capitalist state's demise;
 - *Postcolonial critique*, that diplomacy was merely a polite form of neo-colonialism whereby the West co-opted the newly independent states of Africa and Asia;
 - *American neo-conservative critique*, nowadays associated with George W. Bush's administration, which built on an American tradition of diplomatically isolating adversarial states while claiming that diplomacy is harmful because it constrains the United States from dealing preemptively and decisively with such states.

- Different assumptions (American vs. non-American) about diplomacy

4 assumptions held by American IR scholars:

- 1 - during the Cold War, it was widely assumed that US leadership had to be heavily based on realist hard power assets of force, coercion, and intelligence, and far less on soft power assets of diplomatic skill and persuasion.
- 2 - that Cold War bipolarity and deterrence required skills and approaches different from those of traditional diplomacy. It was strategists and game theorists who helped the country (and the West) survive the Nuclear Cold War.
- 3 - it has been assumed that scholars from universities and think tanks seeking government positions in a new presidential administration would find them in Washington, DC, where many foreign- policy-related jobs open up in a variety of departments and agencies, rather than at embassies abroad, where the ambassadorial-level openings are few. This state of affairs reinforced the notion of decision making and negotiation at home.
- 4 - much of IR scholarship assumed the importance of macro decisions, befitting a superpower having to deal with crisis diplomacy from Berlin to Cuba

Non-American IR assumptions about Diplomacy

- Non-Americans tend to value the theory and practice of diplomacy more than Americans do.
 - For example, English School theory - with epistemic and intellectual connections to the study of diplomacy - long promoted diplomacy as both an order-creating institution of international society and a process involving rules and practice.
 - The English School theory of the 1990s, is arguably the only IR subfield that does not take diplomacy for granted.
 - There is widespread agreement that even if the sovereign state remains the key actor, nonstate actors will complicate and diversify diplomacy.
-
- Different types of diplomacy (bilateral, unilateral, polylateral (state-nonstate))
 - Role of non-state actors in diplomacy

Exploring the Relationship between Geopolitics, Foreign Policy, and Diplomacy

(Criekemans)

- Study of diplomacy is marginalized because of lack of theorizing about how diplomacy fits into geopolitics/other IR theories of overall state relations.

Today, diplomacy constitutes an integral part of the geopolitical and geo-economical shifts taking place both at a regional and global level and thus demands academic attention.

- Role of BRIC (Brazil, Russia, India, and China)
- Shifting resources to reflect changing international order (embassies, etc.)
- Role of resources on diplomacy (The demand for natural resources will increase, making some countries or regions relatively more important than others)
- Role of non-state actors

Diplomatic studies live separately from Foreign Policy Analysis

Diplomacy can be considered as “an activity, a mechanism of representation, communication and negotiation through which states and other international actors do business with one another” (Melissen 1999:xvi-xvii).

Foreign policy, can be defined as "the sum total of decisions made on behalf of a given political unit (usually a state) entailing the implementation of goals with direct reference to its external environment. Foreign policy inputs are those many factors that influence foreign policy decision making, while the observable outputs of foreign policy are a feature of state (and nonstate) behavior within the international system" (Smith, Hadfield, and Dunne 2008:392

- Contributions to other scholarship on IR (Foreign Policy, esp.)
 - “Mental maps” of diplomatic players can impact upon the final outcome of a foreign policy question

Diplomats, Diplomacy, Diplomatic Studies, and the Future of International Relations and International Studies (Sharp)

Good time to study diplomacy

- Reasons for revival
 - Shifting distribution of wealth and power
 - A shift in the way we represent ourselves to one another (social media, etc.)
- Questions to ask (p. 719) to further study of diplomacy

Diplomatic Theory and the Evolving Canon of Diplomatic Studies (Murray)

- Diplomatic theory sought to describe the “elite practice” of official state-qua-state diplomacy
- Critiques of diplomatic studies
 - One grand theory cannot account for the reality of modern, plural diplomacy
 - A focus on practice ignores the philosophical, sociological, and psychological study of diplomacy
 - Diplomatic studies is far too close to its boring subject which makes it difficult to maintain intellectual integrity

Diplomatic Studies in the Right Season (Melissen)

- The troubled relationship between other IR scholarship and diplomatic studies
 - “No love lost between the two”
 - Due to emphasis on practice in diplomatic studies
- Need to encourage other perspectives (esp. Asian) to enlarge diplomatic studies reach

Levels of Analysis

- Levels of analysis help us to focus on different aspects of issues in international relations
- The primary levels of analysis are: *individual, state, systemic or international*
- The international or systemic level of analysis argues that all foreign policy can be understood without even looking at the internal characteristics of nations or individuals. Rather, characteristics of the international system lead nations to behave in particular ways based upon how much power they hold. The most easily understood example of international level analysis is the Cold War, when there was a bipolar system where two nations -- the United States and the USSR -- both held substantial power.
- Supporters of state level analysis argue that the international system level tells only part of the story of international relations, but looking at the backgrounds of states -- type of government, economic performance, geography, history and cultural values -- can offer a more complete explanation (Cold War: capitalist vs communist).
- the individual level emphasizes the "great man in history" concept. In this view, the very personalities of leaders shape foreign policy. Leaders are not simply mechanically responding to international or state systems, but taking an active role in determine international relations.
- In Foreign Policy all levels of analysis converge

International Relations Theory

Theories are tool to simplify the complex things

Traditional theories: *Liberalism* and *Realism* are the two “big theories” which both focus on the states. History of competition between the two. Remain central to discipline - even when challenged by other theories . Pessimism vs. Optimism

Realism: academic theory developed during and right after WWII ○ Hobbes, Thucydides, Machiavelli are often cited as early proponents of realist ideas ● Key concept for realists is the anarchical nature of the international system ● Realists don't believe that humans are inherently good ● it can be thought of as unified by the belief that world politics ultimately is always and necessarily a field of conflict among actors pursuing power. Crudely, realists are of three kinds: *Classical realists* believe that it follows from human nature, *neorealists* focus upon the structure of the anarchic state system, and *neoclassical realists* believe that it is a result of a combination of the two and certain domestic variables. Realists also disagree about what kind of action states ought to take to navigate world politics, dividing between *defensive realism* and *offensive realism*.

Liberalism is a school of thought which revolves around three interrelated principles: 1. rejection of power politics as the only possible outcome of international relations; it questions security/warfare principles of realism. 2. it accentuates mutual benefits and international cooperation. 3. it implements **international organizations** and **nongovernmental actors** for shaping state preferences and policy choice. So, it view human beings as innately good ○ Peace and harmony between nations is desirable and attainable ○ Idea that permanent cessation of war is attainable (Wilsonian liberalism) ● History of the league of nation

Middle Ground Theories

- **English school**, or *state society theory* maintains that there is a 'society of states' at the international level, despite the condition of "anarchy", i.e., the lack of a ruler or world state. In short, it claims that world is anarchical, but ideas, norms, and shared behaviors exist giving order to the anarchy. Despite being called the English School many of the academics from this school were neither English nor from the United Kingdom.
- **Constructivism** is the claim that significant aspects of international relations are historically and socially constructed, rather than inevitable consequences of human nature or other essential characteristics of world politics. Highlights the importance of values and shared interests between individuals. Essence of constructivism is the interaction of people (or states) ○ Constructivists assert that ideas and “norms” have power. Wendt (1992) and anarchy: he attempted to show that even such a core realist concept as "power politics" is socially constructed—that is, not given by nature and hence, capable of being transformed by human practice.

Critical Theories

Wide spectrum of theories - all rely on opposition to, or criticism of traditional theories. They reject positivism (sensory experience, reason and logic)

○ **Marxism** ○ **Postcolonialism** ○ **Feminism** ○ **Poststructuralism**

■ Deconstructing language

● If you can shake the foundations of a structure, be that a word or an idea, you can move beyond it in your thinking and become free of the power it has over you.

Realism

Realism is not one consistent theory, it is a consistent set of assumptions.

4 central proposition:

Groupism: politics takes place within and between groups • Egoism: groups and individuals are driven by narrow self-interest • Anarchy: the absence of government at the international level shapes the nature of international politics. • Power Politics: Groupism and egoism interact with the anarchical environment and make international relations largely about the politics of power and security.

Neorealism

- Unitary states whose behavior is influenced by their environment (anarchic international system)
- Behavior characterized by mistrust, security-seeking (self-help), concern for relative gains, dearth of cooperation.
- Key implications: balance of power (alliance patterns, arms race, security dilemma)
- The system influences the type of behavior; the concern for the security, mistrust, and etc.
- Says *power* is the most important factor in international relations.
- Kenneth Waltz (1979) used economic theory to simplify the assumptions of the international system and constrained itself to studying one level of analysis (the system). The theory was meant to answer a few, but very important questions, in international relations.
- Realists rely on rationalist assumptions, they have set of goals, and the chief goal is *survival*

Liberalism

“The universal condition of world politics is globalization.” States are, and always have been embedded in a domestic and transnational society that creates incentives for its members to engage in economic, social, and cultural interactions that transcend borders.”(Moravcsik 2008, 234)

Core assumptions of Liberal Theory:

- The Nature of Societal actors
 - Belief in a bottom-up or pluralistic view of politics
 - Individuals are risk averse
 - Liberal theory rests on a contrary premise
 - Societal demands are variable, and the contest over resources leads to winners and losers
- The Nature of the State
 - States represent a subset of individuals and groups whose preferences aggregate to “state preferences.”
- The Nature of the International System
 - The pattern of interdependence among state preferences shapes state behavior.

Types of Liberalism

Moravcsic (2008, 240) generates theoretical variants of liberalism by examining sources of state preference:

- Set of core domestic and social identities
- Commercial liberalism - economic assets and cross-border transactions
- Republican liberalism - representation and rent-seeking

Broader Implications of Liberalism

- Distinctive predictions of liberal theory - accounts for variation in the substantive content of foreign policy across issues, regions, or hegemonic orders.
- Liberalism as a systemic theory - what states want determines what they do.
- Liberalism and multicausal synthesis ○ State behavior should be modeled multicausally - that is as a multi-stage process of constrained social choice in which variation in state preferences comes first (Moravcsic 2008, 250).
- The domestic origins of state preferences:
 - State preferences are endogenous and not fixed
 - States are agents of societal actors
 - Societal actors' preferences as influential in informing states official policy position
- States bargain based on the intensity of these domestically defined preferences with other states

The New Liberalism (Andrew Moravcsik)

Three core assumptions of Liberal Theory:

Assumption 1: The Nature of Societal Actors

- Globalization generates differentiated demands from societal individuals and groups with regard to international affairs.

Assumption 2: The Nature of the State

- States represent the demands of a subset of domestic individuals and social groups, on the basis of whose interests they define “state preferences” and act instrumentally to manage globalization.

Assumption 3: The Nature of the International System

- The pattern of interdependence among state preferences shapes state behavior

Constructivism

“500 British nuclear weapons are less threatening to the United States than 5 North Korean Nuclear weapons”
(Alexander Wendt).

- In this observation there are traces of the features of constructivism:

- Critique of materialism
- Emphasis on social construction
- Relationship between structures and agents
- Multiple logics of anarchy

- An alternative to materialism:

- People act toward other objects, including other actors, on the basis of meanings that the objects have for them. Constructivism suggests that material forces must be understood through the social concepts that define their meaning for human life.
- Beliefs, expectations, and interpretations are crucial when thinking about international affairs.

- Construction of State Interests:

- Focus on the social content involved in the production of international relations
- There is a focus on the social aspects of interest formation

Constructivism

Mutual Constitution of Structures and Agents

- Structures are the institutions and shared meanings that make up the context of international action and agents are any entities that operate as an actor within that context.
- The actions of states contribute to making the institutions and norms of international life, and these institutions contribute to defining, socializing, and influencing states.
- Multiple Logics of Anarchy ○ Example of rivalry ○ An anarchy of friends differs from one of enemies.

IAN HURD (Constructivism)

1. **The distinguishing features of constructivism**

1.1 *An alternative to materialism*

Constructivism suggests that material forces must be understood through social concepts that define their meaning for human life.

1.2 *The construction of state interests*

Constructivists often find it useful to examine the historical construction of “national interests”.

Many constructivists are interested in how states come to hold the interests that structure their decision-making.

1.3 *Mutual constitution of structure and agents*

International norms are simultaneously the products of state actions and influences upon state action. Thus, the idea that states and the international environment are mutually constituted is inherent in the constructivist approach.

1.4 *Multiple agents of anarchy*

“An anarchy of friends differs from one of enemies”

2. **Controversies within constructivism**

2.1 *State-centrism*

Actors and structures at all levels of analyses are socially constructed.

2.2 *Science and positivism*

Positivist epistemology maintains that the socially constructed international system contains patterns that are amenable to generalization and to falsifiable hypotheses.

A competing view represented by postpositivists, is that in social life are not fully objectifiable, observers cannot be fully autonomous of the subject under study, and social relationships can be separated into discrete “causes” and “effects”.

IAN HURD (Constructivism)

2.3 *Anarchy or Authority?*

Most constructivists operated within what Ashley (1988) called the “anarchy problematique”. This view acknowledges the existence of a formal condition of anarchy among states and makes anarchy a crucial element of the international structure. It sees hierarchy as the alternative to anarchy, where hierarchy refers to a system, in which the units “stand vis-à-vis each other in relations of super- and subordination” (Waltz 1979, 81).

3. **Continuing challenges in international relations theory**

3.1 *Strategic behavior and norms*

It is a mistake to separate the study of the logic of consequences from the logic of appropriateness.

Constructivism adds two things: an interest in explaining how state needs and interests come to be, and the possibility that different constructions of states could lead to radically different types of states and patterns of state behavior.

3.2 *Constructivism and rationalism*

Strategic behavior and international norms are often presented as competitors to each other.

2 versions:

One suggests that rationalism and constructivism predict different behavior from states and these differences should be measurable and testable.

Second version of the competitive relation argues that rationalism and constructivism based on ontological commitments that are irreconcilable.

International Organizations

- UN & EU
- I-NGOs and global civil society
- Global civil society - The space outside of government, family, and market.

International Political Economy

- Dominant approach - Economic Liberalism. Father of economic liberalism - Adam Smith and David Ricardo.
- Adam Smith - Free Trade
- David Ricardo - Theory of Competitive Advantage

International Political Economy

- A global supply chain - what is it?
- MNC - derives 25% or more of its revenue from out-of-home-country operations.
- Criticism: lacking ethical standards, tax avoidance through multinational tax haven
- Race to the bottom

International Political Economy

- How do states govern their economic activities?
 - Regional agreements
 - Multilateralism. Bretton Woods institutions:
 - WTO
 - IMF
 - World Bank

Stewart Patrick, "Failed" States and Global Security: Empirical Questions and Policy Dilemmas

- Conventional wisdom: Spillover effect of weak and failing states. Poor governed states cause threat to international security
- Research Question: What is the connection between state failure, on the one hand, and transnational threats, on the other?
- A new measure of state weakness - Index of state weakness in the developing world. Four critical government functions: security, political, economic, social welfare. Score from 0 to 10.
- Transnational threats: terrorism; weapons proliferation; international crime; infectious disease, energy insecurity.
- Conclusion: the overlap between state weakness and today's most pressing transnational threats is hardly clear-cut, much less universal. State weakness is only imperfectly correlated with them.

Rafael Reuveny, Climate change-induced migration and violent conflict

- Research Question: What are implications of degrading environment to human migration and violent conflict? Climate change -> migration -> conflict
- Thesis: Facing severe environmental problems, people in LDCs may have to leave affected areas, which, in turn, may cause conflict in receiving areas due to several reasons.
- LDCs will experience more climate change-induced migration and conflict than DCs.
- Migration & violent conflict. Four channels: competition; ethnic tension; distrust; fault lines.
- Conclusion: Environmental migration crosses international borders at times, and plays a role in conflict. Environmental migration does not always lead to conflict, but when it does, the conflict intensity can be very high, including interstate and intrastate wars.

Owen Temby, What are levels of analysis and what do they contribute to international relations theory?

- Level of analysis are methodological tools
- Level of analysis are relational: one is defined in terms of its associated unit of analysis
- The macro-international level is often referred to as the systemic level, and the micro-international level as the interaction level.
- What the state is need not determine our decision regarding whether or not to examine domestic actors for their effect on state action or any other unit of analysis.

Ross, Michael, Does oil hinder democracy?

- Thesis: oil impedes democracy.
- Three causal mechanisms:
 - 1) The Rentier Effect - governments use their oil revenues to relieve social pressures that might otherwise lead to demands for greater accountability. "Taxation effect". "Spending effect". Collectively, the taxation, spending and group formation effects constitute the rentier effect. State's fiscal policies influence its regime type: governments that fund themselves through oil revenues and have larger budgets are more likely to be authoritarian; governments that fund themselves through taxes and are relatively small are more likely to be democratic.
 - 2) The Repression Effect - resource wealth may allow the governments to spend more on internal security and so block the population's democratic aspirations. Resource wealth leads to larger military forces.
 - 3) Modernization effect: wealth does not lead to democracy per se. If resource-led growth does not lead to higher education levels and greater occupational specialization, it should also fail to bring democracy.
- Conclusion: 1) oil does hurt democracy; 2) the harmful effect of oil is not limited to Middle East. 3) Nonfuel wealth also impedes democracy. 4) Support for three causal mechanisms that link oil and authoritarianism.

Simmons, Beth and Lisa L. Martin, International Institutions: Organizations, International Regimes

- Distinction between International Organizations and International Regimes
- What do IO's do? They have agency, agenda-setting influence and potentially important socializing influences.
- International regimes - rules, norms, principles and procedures that focus expectations regarding international behavior. Regime - focal points around which actors' expectations converge.
- International institutions - set of rules meant to govern international behavior.
- **Realist:** power exerts true influence behind the facade of international institutional structures. Use international law to promote their national interest.
- **Rational functionalism:** international institutions provide a way for states to overcome problems of collective action, high transactions costs and information deficits.
- **Social constructivism:** social context of state behavior. Subjective interpretation of social arrangements.

Vayrynen, Raimo: Regionalism: Old and New

- Differentiation between physical (geographical and strategic) regions and functional (economic, environmental, and cultural) regions
- Traditional views concerning the state-centric regional system are being challenged by the concentration of political and military power at the top as well as by transnational networks built around economic ties and cultural identities.
- Regions appear to arise either through the dissemination of various transactions and externalities or as protection against the hegemony of capitalist globalization and great-power politics.
- 1) With the shrinking of the state, the national level has lost some of its influence. Organizing power of the state is diminishing and that of the global market and local initiatives is growing.
- 2) Horizontal reorganization taking place in international relations as various subnational and regional units develop networks that cross territorial boundaries. ; regionness is strengthened by the inside-out effects of political, economic, environmental, and cultural processes that move boundaries of regions through spillovers and emulation.
- 3) Concept of hegemony and empire have returned to describe the emerging world order (as opposed to regional concert)