Introduction to Global Politics

Section 1: Basic Concepts and History

1.1 Introduction to Global Politics

Global Trends
- Declining incidence of wars and terrorist attacks
- Continuing global poverty
- Growing number of democracies since 1945

Traditional International Relations
- Traditional view of international relations was that states were the only actors that mattered
- Non-state actors played only a peripheral role
- States hold a monopoly on the legitimate use of force, and are the highest authority in the world political system – no world government
- States had monopoly over the control of a given territorial area
- Focus was on wars, diplomacy, and political economy
- New agenda issues like gender discrimination, the environment and human rights peripheral

Global Politics Today
- Since the end of the Cold War the focus of international relations has shifted towards non-state actors and ‘new agenda’ issues
- Questions of justice and ethics have become much more important – just as important as security and stability in many cases
- Borders are becoming more porous, though arguably not for refugees

Immediate Challenges
- The global war on terror – hard to deter terrorists, can only keep one step ahead or remove source of discontent
- Wars in Iraq and Afghanistan – fed war on terror
- WMD proliferation – hypocrisy of NNPT
- Humanitarian crises and intervention, perceived abuses of human rights by US (hypocrisy)
- International financial instability – death of the Washington Consensus?

Longer-Term Challenges
- Managing American primacy – US economic dominance challenged by China,
- Managing the rise of new Great Powers, especially China
- Governing globalization/managing capitalism – inequality and trade liberalization, managing world financial system and perceived need for capitalism to reform
- Weak and failed states
- Relationship between the state and globalization
- The global ecological crisis, especially the challenge of climate change (and the predicted end of the petroleum age)

Theories of World Politics
- Theories of world politics are abstractions used to help understand the world
• Social scientific *explanatory* theories, which seek to observe, explain and predict from a detached standpoint
• Normative or prescriptive *ethical* theories, which seek to tell us what our attitude ought to be on particular issues
• No theory is politically innocent, even when it claims to be ‘scientific’; all theories presuppose a particular standpoint and a particular set of assumptions and values about the world
• For example, realists tried to describe the world the way it was, but in doing so they implicitly helped to perpetuate the status quo – ‘thats just the way it is’

**Contrasting Views of Global Politics**
• Pessimists – The anarchic structure of global politics and the existence of structural inequalities deeply embedded within global economic and political structures preclude all possibilities of fundamental progress in world politics.
• Optimists – The declining incidence and lethality of war, the spread of institutionalized international cooperation, growing global economic integration and the diffusion of democracy and human rights norms constitute permanent structural changes in the global polity
• Realism – GP as the struggle for power and survival between states dwelling in anarchy
• Liberalism – GP as the struggle for consensus between states and individuals seeking to realise common interests
• Marxism – GP as the struggle for power between contending social forces in the context of a hierarchically organized global capitalist system
• Should we call the 21st century: ‘the unipolar century’, ‘the anti-American century’, ‘the age of globalization’, the post-petroleum age’, ‘the age of environmental insecurity’?

**1.2 Globalisation**

**Defining Globalisation**
• Globalisation: ‘a *stretching* of social, political and economic activities across frontiers such that events, decisions and activities in one region of the world can come to have significance for individuals and communities in distant regions of the globe’

**Bin Laden and Globalisation**
• Osama bin Laden – got angry at the USA when they increased their military presence in the Saudi Arabia around the time of the Gulf War
• Osama bin Laden picture mixes the pre-modern (cave background, headgear) and the modern (AK-47, US watch, global communications network)

**Aspects of Connectedness**
• Market connections and exposure to financial collapses
• Communications and transport
• Culture
• The diffusion of new technologies (the ipod)
• The movement of peoples (e.g., migrants, refugees, sex slaves)
• Crime/terrorism
• Transboundary ecological problems; movement of plants and animal species across borders
• Health risks and pandemics (AIDS, SARS, malaria etc)
• Global military capability and bases
Concerns about Globalisation
- Growing inequalities (within and between states), which breeds resentment and hostility and the possibility of ‘political blowback’
- Increasing insecurities and threats (nuclear proliferation, terrorism, global warming, resource scarcity, ecosystem degradation, AIDS);
- Growing concern that the processes of globalization are out of control, or that no-one is really in full control

Decline of the Nation-State?
- A state rules over a particular nation, whose people have some unique identity, same language and a feeling of mutual solidarity
- Legitimacy of the state to rule comes from the people of the nation
- Is the state in decline? What is its future? Three views: hyperglobalists, skeptics, transformationalists
- Hyperglobalists – yes; the state is being superseded by global capitalism, corporations and international organizations like the IMF and World Bank
- Skeptics – the above it highly exaggerated, we have had globalization for a long time, much of what is called globalization is actually regionalisation (e.g. EU)
- Transformationalists – yes and no; global interconnections have increased, but they have not eroded the power of the states but merely changed it, in fact globalization was orchestrated by states (at least the most powerful states)
- One the one hand, most nations are becoming more multi-cultural and ethnically diverse
- On the other hand, the cultural interconnection brought by globalisation results in a homogenisation of global culture
- Also, the increase in economic inequality has reduced feelings of solidarity amongst a nation; thus declining voter turnout
- Sovereignty is a binary state – it means the recognition of legal and juridical supremacy over a certain territory
- What is being undermined by globalization is not sovereignty but autonomy – notably the ability of countries to control their own economies in the face of IMF and WB structural adjustment programs, etc
- Also difficult for states to impose environmental regulations, owing to the risk of ‘carbon flight’

Implications for Democracy
- Nations are becoming less cohesive at the same time as state political autonomy is being eroded
- This is not so good for democracy
- Even more limited prospects for democracy at supra-national level

Nationalism and Religious Fundamentalism
- Nationalism was once a force of unification and integration, a movement to unite previously disparate communities and tribes under a single flag, 6
- Now that nationalism has triumphed, however, it has become a force for disunity, as many smaller groups and cultures desire their own nations, and thus nationalism works to undermine the very nations it once help to cement together, 6
- The same can be said about the revival of religious fundamentalism – rather than universal in focus, it has become highly ethnocentric and parochial, 7
The sense of community solidarity and local identity promoted by the ‘Jihadists’ nevertheless only functions in opposition to ‘outsiders’ and in obedience to local ‘big-wig’s, and in subordination of self to the group. None of these are good for democracy, 8

The Ethical Debate

- Cosmopolitanism: all individuals regardless of nation, culture, religion, sexuality, etc, are important, and we must be concerned about what happens to them regardless of borders
- Humans can and should form a universal (that is global) moral/political community
- Communitarianism: humans are inherently tribal and will band together with families, tribes, nations, etc. Cosmopolitanism is thus not possible
- Particularistic communities (whether states or other kinds of community) should be allowed to define for themselves rightful conduct, free from any higher authority.
- Moral values are seen to grow out of particular communities and should not be imposed from ‘outside’; morality is relative to different states or communities
- Cosmopolitans say that communitarians don’t care about the suffering of others, and could act as apologists of Fascism, racism, slavery, etc
- Both cosmopolitans and communitarians can be left or right wing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Left</th>
<th>Right</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cosmopolitan</td>
<td>- INGOs (e.g., Amnesty, Greenpeace and Oxfam)</td>
<td>- Neoliberal economists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Kofi Anan</td>
<td>- IMF, WB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Nike Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communitarian</td>
<td>- Indigenous communities</td>
<td>- Nationalists and neo-Fascists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Some trade unions</td>
<td>- Agricultural protectionists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Traditional democrats</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3 The Cold War Period

Core Features of the Cold War

- Was a very stable and peaceful period in Europe
- A broadly bipolar global system typified by bloc-building and proxy wars
- Mutual mistrust and rivalry between the superpowers
- Military competition, and the menacing nuclear threat
- Deep and irreconcilable ideological differences
- Lack of free trade between economic blocks

The Beginning of the Cold War

- Soviet fears of a resurgent Germany – massive losses in WWII
- Disagreements over how to manage Germany and Berlin
- Western allies concerned about the installation of Soviet puppet states in eastern Europe
- American policy towards the USSR became more confrontative when the USSr reneged on its promise to hold free elections in eastern Europe, continued to press territorial demands on Turkey, and refused to withdraw its troops from ran, 12
• In February 1946, US diplomat George Kennan published the Long Telegram, which argued for a policy of containing the USSR within its existing territories, while allowing the natural inferiority of the Soviet system to gradually undermine itself, 12
• Marshal plan part of the doctrine of containment - rebuild western economies
• Tensions of the Berlin blockade of 1948-1949 led to the formation of NATO – collective defensive alliance against the Soviets

Opinions on the Onset of the Cold War
• Orthodox view: it was Soviet’s fault, they established puppet governments and made aggressive demands; the US was only acting defensively
• This was seemingly confirmed by Stalin’s occupation of Eastern Europe, Eastern Germany, and Northern Iran, and the North Korean invasion of the south in 1950
• Revisionist view: Soviet Union was only interested in protecting itself from renewed Germany; it was the US who had the bomb, not the USSR
• The USSR was the victim of US economic aggression, which first occurred in the form of reuniting the western zones of Germany in a political and currency union, which the USSR saw as uniting Germany against them
• The USSR saw the later Marshall plan as a US attempt to spread their economic influence and free-market system throughout Europe, including the Soviet buffer zone in Eastern Europe. This was interpreted as a direct security threat to the USSR
• According to this argument, Russia was provoked into blockading Berlin by the currency union of the western occupation zones of Germany, and consequent threats over its control over its Eastern European buffer zone
• Post-revisionist: both of the above are partly right

Realist and Liberal Views
• Realists argue that the Cold War was the inevitable result of the power vacuum in Europe created by the end of the war, and later the opportunities posed by decolonisation
• According to this view, the Cold War was a result of the inexorable workings of the international system, where states felt compelled to either expand their influence and power or fall prey to their rivals. Thus the route of the conflict was the distribution of power across states
• Neither side really acted as an aggressor, nor was an aggressor necessary for the Cold War to being
• According to this argument, Germany was such an important part of Europe (economically and territorially) that neither side could afford to let it fall entirely to the other
• Thus, each side sought merely to protect its own security by seeking the best outcome for itself – the result was essentially a split of the ‘prize’, which did not greatly alter the balance of power
• Liberal Institutionalists argue that the Cold War was not inevitable, but was the result of ineffective policies, misunderstandings, and miscommunication which could have been avoided
• Rivalry was not inevitable, but was the product of mutual feelings of insecurity that could have been resolved

The Consolidation of the Cold War
• The Warsaw Pact 1955
• The Brezhnev doctrine; intervene in Eastern Europe to crush any reformist tendencies in eastern Europe, enacted in 1956 against Hungary
• Exodus of East Germans to the west and consequent threat of war ended by the construction of the Berlin Wall in 1961
• Bay of pigs invasion; US assumed that the Cuban people would rise up against Castro
• In response, the Cubans decided to allow the Soviets to install nuclear missiles to help defend them
• When US spy planes discovered the missiles, they went into a frenzy, and established a blockade around Cuba; eventually Khrushchev backed down and removed the missiles

Détente and US Weakness
• Beginning around 1969, the US took advantage of the growing Soviet-China split to attempt to improve relations with both states, and hence allow itself to withdraw from Vietnam and to organise arms control agreements with the Soviets, 16
• Key achievements of Detente included the US recognition of China in 1972, the signing of SALT I, and the Helsinki Accord of 1975, 16
• By the second half of the second, however, the USSR was increasingly perceived as having taken advantage of Detente to step up support for revolutionary movements around the world, 16
• This generated a sense of weakness in American foreign policy, which was compounded by the poorly functioning US economy in the 1970s, 17

The Second Cold War
• It was on the back of these concerns that Ronald Reagan came to office in 1980
• He increased US military spending, intervened in conflicts in Central America, and stepped up anti-Soviet rhetoric
• In Europe the threat of nuclear war seemed to be higher than for decades
• Ronald Reagan’s Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI or “Star Wars”) announced
• Soviet Union denounced as ‘evil empire’
• Deployed new missiles in Europe
• Rise of peace movements in Europe

The End of the Cold War
• Young reformist Mikhail Gorbachev unexpectedly came to power in 1985
• Gorbachev wanted to revitalise the Soviet economy and society through wide-ranging reforms, but believed that he could only do this in a peaceful international environment
• Glasnost (openness) - greater freedom of speech and religion
• Perestroika (restructuring) – semi-capitalist economic reforms
• Introduction of the Sinatra doctrine to overthrow the Brezhnev doctrine
• Beginning with the Summit meeting in Geneva in 1985, where both sides showed receptiveness to arms control talks, the Soviets reformed their foreign policy to now encompass military disarmament and the adoption of a liberal posture towards the international system, focusing on human rights, rule of law and institutions
• Withdrew support from Cuba, Third World communist insurgencies and Soviet troops from Afghanistan
• Renewed arms control talks, and engaged in unilateral force reductions
• Gorbachev’s reforms and ‘hands off’ approach to Eastern Europe ultimately unleashed nationalist and anti-Soviet sentiments which tore apart the Soviet Bloc, and then the USSR itself
Explaining the End of the Cold War

- Realist explanation: the Cold War was all about the rise and fall of the Soviet union as a great power, and hence the end of the Cold War was caused by the increasing weakness of the Soviets.
- Realists now debate about how stable the current unipolar world is: some say that it is less stable because there is no counterbalancing power, some say that there is now a hierarchy of nations, in which the US is so far ahead that no one bothers to challenge them.
- Others point to the changing preferences and views in the Soviet population; increasing western cultural and economic influence.
- Some point to Gorbachev as being pre-eminent in ending the Cold War, some point to Reagan.
- Contingent factors (Chernobyl nuclear accident, communications revolution, rising peace and green movements).

The Realist Perspective

- The realist perspective of deterrence was that each side needed to possess the capability of projecting force at each level of escalation of a crisis, as nuclear weapons alone were not a credible deterrence for many lesser threats, 30-31.
- The idea here was that one side could achieve victory over the other by demonstrating its willingness to continue escalating the crises to levels higher than the other side was willing to – this was called escalation dominance, 30.
- Liberals argued that only a small second-strike counter-value nuclear deterrent force was needed, and that diplomacy should play a greater role in ending crises, 31.
- America’s European allies simultaneously feared that the alliance would be too loose, and that they would be ‘abandoned’, and also that it would be too tight, and they would be dragged into undesirable peripheral wars like Vietnam, 34.
- Some realists argued that struggles, wars and crises over peripheral areas should be avoided, and that the US should focus on its primary interests in central Europe, 34.
- Perimeter deterrence, however, opposed such strongpoint deterrence by arguing that confronting the USSR in peripheral areas was essential to prevent them from escalating the stakes in Central Europe, 34-35.
- Gorbachev’s primary concern upon coming to power was to avoid a new arms race with the United States, which he knew that the ailing Soviet economy could not afford, 36.
- Thus, from a realist perspective, it was not ideological change that prompted the end of the Cold War, but rather a material deficit on the Soviet side which any leader, old or new, would have had to have recognised, 36.
- Nevertheless, the USSR still continued the arms race and stayed in Afghanistan until 1988, thus indicating that the supposed ‘new thinking’ had less impact than expected, 36.
- John Gladdis concludes that internal changes in the USSR were more important in ending the Cold War than any external factors, 37.
- However, he also asserts that Reagan’s new aggressive stance towards the USSR, his willingness to challenge rather than merely accept their dominance, and his willingness to accept that Detente perpetuated rather than shortened the Cold War, were ideas very different form his predecessors, and certainly contributed to the end of the Cold War, 37.

Identity Explanations

- Identity explanations of the Cold War place much bigger weight upon the differing ideologies of the two opposing blocs, 38.
• On the one hand, identity accounts consider that the Soviets really did believe in their Marxist doctrines, and really did believe that history was on their side, 38
• Thus, the USSR was less likely to back down in a crisis, and more willing to promote communist insurgencies around the globe, 38
• This theory explains the foundation of Cominform in 1947, and the establishment of Communist economic systems in Eastern Europe after WWII, 38
• Communist ideology really did inspire the USSR to develop a worldwide conspiracy to overthrow capitalism, 39
• At the other end of the spectrum, the USA truly believed in its doctrines of freedom and democracy, and wanted to spread these across the world, 39
• The fundamental incompatibility of these two ideologies helps to explain why the USSR and USA became enemies which threatened each other’s very existence, rather than merely rivals competing to advance their own interest, 40
• It also helps to explain why Western Europe sided with the USA, when a pure power-based argument might have indicated that they would side with the USSR against the more powerful USA, 40
• It also explains why Stalin could not accept a Soviet-aligned but internally autonomous eastern Europe, on the model of Finland, as to do so would undermine his Communist ideology back in the USSR, 40
• According to the identity account of the Cold War, the war ended when Gorbachev’s restructuring programs and the ideological changes they represented undermined the core ideology that made the USA and USSR enemies, and instead made them rivals again, 41-42
• The renewed willingness to negotiate effectively brought about an end to most of the Cold War tensions, including a divided Germany, the arms race, Afghanistan, etc, 42

Liberal Interpretations
• Liberal interpretations of the Cold War emphasise the importance of institutions, diplomacy and interactions between leaders in facilitating the breakdown in relations, 43
• Roosevelt was crucial in helping to establish the UN, and truly believed that he would be able to maintain a cooperative relationship with the USSR to make collective security work, 44
• Harry Truman, however, was more confrontational, berating Molotov for the Soviet failure to hold elections in Poland at their very first meeting, 44
• American and Soviet meeting over Germany, Berlin, Poland, Iran and other issues dragged on without resolution until they broke down in 1947, 45
• Thus, the liberals say that the Cold War was caused neither by a power vacuum nor ideology, but by a failure of diplomacy and a breakdown in negotiations, 45
• Liberals also emphasise the importance of European integration and economic cooperation institutions, including the ECSC, OEEC and later the EEC, 45-47
• Liberals point to these as examples of institutions which can reorient state preoccupations from power struggles and zero-sum relative security concerns to mutually beneficial economic and political cooperation, 46-47
• Liberals also point out that NATO and the other institutions were more than an anti-Soviet alliance, as they continued until after the Cold War, and hence power concerns alone cannot explain the post-war division of Europe, 46
Liberals argue that it was the ability and willingness of Kennedy and Khrushchev to negotiate and give something up, rather than the skilful management of the threat of escalation, which enabled the Cuban Crisis to end peacefully, 47

Liberals also strongly approved dente in the 1970s, arguing that it forged important contacts and meeting which continued even in the renewed Cold War years, as well as many non-government organisations promoting arms control, human rights watch, peaceful research, etc, 48-49

Liberals argue that without these institutions, the ‘new thinking’ that emerged the USSR, and the willingness to work with this in the west, would not have developed, 49

1.4 After the Cold War

Political Changes after the Cold War
- Twenty new sovereign states came into being
- The Warsaw Pact disbanded, and NATO began to question its relevance
- Accelerated economic and political integration of Western Europe expansion of the EU
- Fewer communist states (China, North Korea, Vietnam and Cuba)
- End of the proxy-wars in the Third World, and hence decreased ability of Third World states to get aid and development assistance
- Change from a bipolar to unipolar world
- The UN security council had been ineffective at organising military interventions during the Cold War, owing to the clash between the USA and USSR; both sides frequently vetoed proposals of the other
- Now the scope for cooperation was increased, as China and particularly Russia were more friendly – for example, UN intervention in Gulf War 1991

A New World Order
- Speech by George Bush Snr in March 1991
  - “The principles of justice and fair play ... protect the weak against the strong ...”
  - “A world where the United Nations, freed from cold war stalemate, is poised to fulfill the historic vision of its founders.”
  - “A world in which freedom and respect for human rights find a home among all nations...”

Four Post-War Pronouncements
- The triumph of capitalism and/or liberalism and ‘the end of history’
- The spread of ‘democratic peace’
- The ‘clash of civilizations’ as the new fault line
- The triumph of America?

The End of History
- Argument put forward by Francis Fukuyama; he was a neo-Hegelian, and essentially argued that the dialectic is over; no new ideals could possibly challenge capitalism/democracy
- We have reached the end of any serious ideological battle over the viability of the liberal democratic/capitalist model vs. communism
- End of the long process of emancipation and spread of franchise; non-propertied men, free slaves, women, etc
- The major battle is over; all we face are minor mopping-up operations
- No new great struggles between workers and capitalists, etc
- Liberalism has outlived Fascism, Communism and Authoritarianism
Many criticised this view as triumphalist and naive; new battles developing as ‘Clash of civilisation’ or Environmentalist vs. Developists

The Democratic Peace
- Basic observation: liberal democratic states do not go to war with each other
- Thus, if we can expand the zone of democratic peace, we can achieve world peace
- However, Liberal democracy is still only secure in a minority of states
- Although many new democracies had arisen since the 1970s, liberal democracy is not secure in many cases
- The transition to democracy is slow, painful and by no means guaranteed
- The move to capitalism does not inevitably entail liberal democracy (e.g., China, Vietnam)

The ‘Clash of Civilizations’
- First made by Samuel Huntington in 1993
- Identifies four major phases of history:
  - The clash of princes (pre-modern era to Napoleonic Wars)
  - The clash of nations (Up to end of WWI)
  - The clash of ideologies (End of WWI to end of Cold War)
  - And now the clash of civilizations
- Identities two ‘transition wars’: The Soviet-Afghan war of 1979-1989 and the Gulf War in 1991 began with one country invading another but transformed into civilisation wars.
- Huntington argues that the Gulf War began as an intervention against a ‘rogue state’, but increasingly the other Muslim states began to turn against the American intervention
- Also argued that the US wanted to safeguard oil supplies
- Huntington identifies 7, maybe 8 civilizations: Western, Slavic-orthodox, Islamic, Confucian, Japanese, Hindu, Latin America and possibly African
- Note that has categories are a hodge-podge of two continents, four religions, one nation and one broader cultural grouping
- The most significant clash is between ‘the west and the rest’, especially ‘the west versus Islam’

Criticisms of Huntington
- Gulf War was not a ‘civilizational war’; it was a war to punish Iraq for breaching international law, and to secure oil supplies
- Huntington underestimates the influence of states – we do not see civilisaitonal groupings at the UN, Olympics or Eurovision Song Contest
- Also argued that Huntington has greatly exaggerated the opposition of many people to certain aspects of American foreign policy to a massive ‘clash of civilisations’
- Focuses too much on fundamentalism and too little on the power of secular modernity
- International terrorist groups use modern western technology, and reinterpret history and religion to suit modern objectives – not real religious fundamentalism
- Also ignores the fact that fundamentalists and terrorists form a tiny minority of Muslims
- The rise of religious fundamentalism has less to do with civilisational fault lines and more to do with the foreign policies of states and the internal politics within particular states
- E.g. Osama bin Laden was mostly annoyed at the US for stationing troops in Saudi Arabia
- Heaps of people other than Islamic Fundamentalists use terrorism – e.g. IRA, states themselves, the idea that Islamic territories is a new Post-Cold War phenomenon is not true
- Treats the Muslim world as monolithic and grossly oversimplifies its internal cohesion
Contrary to Huntington’s claims, there is plenty of trade between countries who lack a common civilizational base.

He pays no attention to the role of Christian fundamentalism and (neo)conservatism in the US

Interestingly the September 11 and Bali bombings etc led to increasing cooperation between Western and Muslim states against the threat of terrorism

The Triumph of America

- Structural realists argue that a unipolar world is an unstable world
- It is just a matter of time before a new balance of power consolidates
- Classical realists argue that the unipolar world of American hegemony will bring relative stability; there will be a clear hierarchy of prestige and power

New Ideological Conflicts

- Pro-globalisation vs. anti-globalisation
- North vs. South, underdevelopment in the Third World
- The west (or just America?) vs. the rest (or just Islam?)
- States versus non-state terrorist networks
- Humanity vs. Nature: the ecological crisis

Section 2: Theories of World Politics

2.1 Realism

Historical Background

- Realism was once the only international relations theory that was taught, notably during the Cold War in the USA
- Realists believed they were developing a more realistic representation of the world, in response to the unrealistic hopes of the inter-war liberals (notably Woodrow Wilson, League of Nations)
- They believed that Chamberlain’s appeasement of Hitler and the consequent World War was vindication of their ideas – this was a very silly way to conduct politics

Objectives and Basic Outlook

- It seeks to explain international relations ‘as it really is’, without any wishful projections or utopian hopes
- Realists believe that relations between states are full of mistrust and the risk of violence
- It provides a hard-headed, pessimistic view of international politics; it is concerned with stability and order, not justice
- They do not believe states should do things based on misguided moral principles which may harm their national interest
- Presents itself as an objective social scientific theory of international relations; it does not seek to change the world, merely to understand it and learn how to act prudently

Beliefs about International Relations

- Realists see the world as anarchical, with no overarching government. States are the highest authority, and hold monopoly over jurisdiction and the legitimate use of force within their lands
- Security and survival are the overarching preoccupation of states, because of this anarchic structure; this is very different to domestic political structures, which can be democratic, etc
- States are considered to be the preeminent global actors
- Relative gains more important than absolute gains
- For this reason, realists do not believe international organisations or laws will be very effective even if they make all states absolutely better off – it will always be in the interest of some state to defect, unless there is a hegemon who can coerce other states

**Classical Realism**
- Realists origins with Greek historian Thucydides, he wrote that: “the strong do what they have the power to do and the weak accept what they have to accept”
- Machiavelli argued that rulers should do whatever they need to retain power, including break their promises and abuse their enemies
- The League of Nations was seen during the interwar years as replacing interstate wars and alliances with collective security; conflict with cooperation
- E. H. Carr argued that such naive liberalism led to the appeasement of Hitler and hence WWII
- He argued that the post-WW I system was created by the victors to serve their own interests
- The only way to minimize violent clashes between states was to ensure a balance of power or sometimes bandwagoning – collective security does not work
- The pursuit of national power understood to be a natural drive which foreign policy advisers neglect at their peril.
- Morgenthau’s *Politics Among Nations (1948)*, provided the first systematic realist textbook
- He rejected the idea of universal progress, and instead saw the political man as selfish and power-hungry

**Core claims of Morgenthau**
- Politics is governed by objective laws, which can be understood by social scientists, and used to predict what states will do
- The key to understanding world politics is national interest, defined as power, or the enhancement of strategic and economic capability.
- The pursuit of national interest remains constant through time; the acts of states do not differ between historical periods, geography or cultures
- Morality is not important in international relations; any moral claim are used to dress up naked self interest; there is no possibility of universal ethical standards; prudence, not morality, is the basis of statecraft
- The international sphere is analytically distinct from other spheres of life – political man is constrained by domestic laws and structures, but this does not occur internationally

**Structural Realism**
- Structural realism builds its claim upon the structure of the international system, and then proceeds to understand the actions of states based upon their relation to this system
- In contrast, classical realism built its theory from the basic units (states) upwards
- In other words, the anarchical character of the international system holds the key to determining how states act within it
- Given these conditions of international anarchy states have only one interest, namely, self-preservation through the build-up of military capability
- States must always prepare for the worst; no state can be sure of another state’s intentions, and thus war is always likely and must be prepared for
The fundamental keys to understanding international relations are the structure of the system, the units in the system (states), and the distribution of power between states.

All states are ‘unit like’ and behave in the same ways despite domestic differences; Realists are not interested in internatal state politics, and don’t think they matter.

Alliances are formed between states according to the balance of power principle and the structure of the system; alliances help to keep the world stable and secure.

**Defensive Realists**

- It is unwise for states to always seek to maximize their power, as this will prompt other states to form a balancing coalition that may seek to defeat the aspiring hegemon (e.g. Nazi Germany).
- Maximizing power through conquest is too costly; occupied populations will rise up against the occupier; military spending could undermine economy.
- States should strive for ‘an appropriate amount’ of power to achieve an ‘offence-defence balance’.

** Offensive Realists**

- It makes strategic sense for states to gain as much power as possible to pursue hegemony.
- This is the best way for a state to ensure its own survival; gaining more power works often enough to be the best policy to pursue.
- Most realists opposed the War in Iraq as being against America’s national interest.

**Neoclassical Realism**

- Anarchy and distribution of power are still the starting point of international relations.
- However, they argue that we cannot just say that all states will act the same in response to this system – they think domestic politics are important.
- It is not the objective distribution of material capability but leader’s perceptions of that capability (including norms and ideas shaped by domestic structures) that matters.
- The relationship between states can depend upon their historical relationship – they can be friends, enemies or rivals.
- Occupies a middle ground between structural realists and constructivists.

**Challenges to Realism**

- The peaceful collapse of Cold War was not predicted nor adequately explained by realism.
- Cannot explain the expanding zone of democratic peace.
- Economic globalization demonstrates that the trading state is becoming more important than the military state.
- Too state-centric; non-state actors (e.g. terrorist networks) now a major source of insecurity and their motivations are different to those of other states.
- Neorealism is too rigid and does not allow for changes in the international structure.
- The interests and identities of states are treated as fixed and trans-historical, as if national interests do not change and indeed are completely known by state leaders.
- Cannot explain why most states observe most treaties most of the time; Kyoto Protocol.
- Cannot explain why human rights and morality are becoming increasingly important in international relations; NATO intervention in Kosovo.
- Ignores the fact that states may adhere to laws and international institutions because it is in their self interest; self-interest is not always synonymous with power pursuits.
- Politically conservative/legitimizes the status quo – apologists for amoral politics.
• Most neorealists would reply that they do not seek to explain everything, only the most salient features of world politics

**Realist Rebuttals**

• The core realist concepts of anarchy, self-help, power balancing and the security dilemma remain central to the state system; democracy and other factors are irrelevant
• Powerful states do not have to go to war precisely because they are powerful, not because they are democratic
• Liberal interventionism can quickly turn into war mongering moral crusading. Iraq 2003 was a strategic disaster, weakening the US’s ability to contain a rising China
• A balance of power will one day be restored because a unipolar world is unpredictable and unstable; someone will challenge the USA

**2.2 Liberalism**

**Basic Concepts of Liberalism**

• The term 'liberalism' has many different meanings in different contexts – in Australia it means a conservative supporter of the Liberal party, whereas in the US it is often used as a derogatory term to refer to progressives
• All strands of liberalism share a ‘family resemblance’, but have many distinguishing characteristics – think of the different varieties of distinct branches of one family tree
• Liberals share a broad support for individual liberty; specifically focused on *individuals*
• Adhere to the idea of the equal moral worth of each individual; people should not be treated differently based on religion, race, class, etc
• Government should be limited in scope, and based on the consent of the people
• Government power should not act arbitrarily according to the whims of rulers, but should enact clear, established laws which apply equally to all; the rule of law
• Adhere to a tolerance of diversity and pluralism, so long as they do not undermine the liberty of others, etc
• The rights and duties of individuals are universal, and should be separated from religion, superstition, tradition, culture, etc
• A belief in human progress, and the ability of innovation and technology to make life better
• Liberals also believe in the sanctity of private property; some consider it a natural right
• Economic Liberals emphasise virtues of competition, private initiative, freedom of contract, and the sanctity of private property
• Political Liberals emphasise the inherent dignity of the individual, human rights, constitutional democracy and the rule of law

**Liberal Internationalism: The Enlightenment**

• Liberal theories of international politics are normative theories
• They saw the enormous wars of the 18th century, and rejected the traditional ideas of colonisation, spying, empire building and military balancing as irrational and destructive
• Emphasised the pacifying effects of education, trade and democracy
• Immanuel Kant was the most prominent proponent of liberal internationalism
• He believed that humanity could create a perpetual peace via a federation of liberal republics
• He also argues that peace could be attained though interstate treaties, trade, and other intuitions, without requiring an overarching world government
Liberal Idealism: Inter-War Period

- Like internationalists, they also wanted to apply liberal principles to international relations
- However unlike the internationalists, they argued that world peace had to be created by an overarching world government; it would not arise naturally out of trade, communications, peace agreements, etc
- These ideals were codified in the establishment of the League of Nations
- Based on the principle of self-determination, and the idea that rational international debate and agreement could replace wars and secret agreements as the means of settling disputes
- Also based on the idea of collective security based on ‘one for all and all for one’
- After WWII, realists argued that the league failed because it privileged abstract liberal ethics and neglected real power considerations
- Thus the UN was established on the basis of a combination of Liberal and Realist ideals – it had a security council with the great powers having a veto power

Neoliberal Institutionalism: Post-Cold War Revival

- Realism was the dominant theory during the Cold War, but declined in importance afterwards
- After the Cold War, there was a resurgence in liberalist principles, including a wave of democratisation across Africa and the former Communist Bloc, the growth in the importance of trade liberalism, and the IMF and World Bank, a growing trend towards humanitarian intervention, and a growing concern for human rights
- Neoliberal institutionalism is the new orthodoxy in the international relations discipline in the US; its name comes from its adoption of a number of neo-realist ideas, not economic neo-liberalism
- Neo-liberals share many of the precepts of realism, including the anarchic nature of the international system, self-interested states, need for positive rather than normative approach
- Neo-liberals argue that institutions matter, and can effect international outcome
- They also argue that states are rational egoists and will cooperate for absolute gains in situations of interdependence
- Realists argue that states only care about relative gains
- Liberals argue that international relations is not just about state survival (as realists argue), but also interest maximisation; cooperation and institutions can allow this, and so states cooperate
- Neo-liberals are criticised for upholding the status quo: the state system and capitalism are taken for granted, and thus implicitly supported and perpetuated
- Constructivists criticise liberals for assuming that the interests and identities of states are fixed, rather than shaped to some extent by multilateral negotiation

The Democratic Peace Thesis

- Core claim: spread of liberal democracy will enlarge the separate zone of peace and prosperity among liberal democratic states
- In a 1983 article, Boyle argued that since 1816, no state which he defined as liberal had ever gone to war with another; though they had frequently gone to war with non-liberal states
- This has been taken up by many democratic states as a guiding idea behind foreign policy
- One proposed explanation is that in a democracy citizens will need to consent to go to war
- Because the costs of war seldom exceed the benefits, citizens in democratic states do not often agree to go to war
- Another argument is that trade and economic interdependence between democratic states means that peace it too profitable to go to war
A third explanation is that democracies are more likely to treat each other as friends, and hence are much more likely to sort out their disagreements via negotiation, etc.

**Criticisms of the Thesis**
- Liberal democratic peace is not statistically significant: democratic states have historically been a minority and interstate wars are uncommon.
- Correlation does not imply causation: absence of war may be explained by other factors.
- For example, nuclear weapons prevent Pakistan and India from going to war, not democracy.
- Long periods of peace have been observed in non-democratic regions, like South America.
- It is sometimes argued that the spread of global capitalism enhances rather than mitigates economic inequalities and hence causes international stability.
- Another argument is that transitions to democracy and ‘democracy promotion’ are often associated with violence and war.

**Liberal Cosmopolitanism**
- Critical of injustices created by economic globalisation.
- Concerned about the future of human rights and democracy in a context of eroding state autonomy and increasing power of corporations and neoliberal global institutions.
- Held: ‘a global and divided authority system’ founded on ‘cosmopolitan democratic law’ – top down approach like the EU.
- Falk: democratise globalisation from below.

**Criticisms of Liberalism**
- Failing ‘democracy promotion’.
- Accusations of imperialism.
- Persistent economic inequalities.
- Hypocritical practices of liberal states.

**2.3 Marxism and its Offshoots**

**Key Features of Critical Theories**
- Critical theories challenge the mainstream theories of realism and liberalism.
- Critical theories like Marxism and its offshoots want to change the world.
- They seek not only to explain the world, but to do so in a way that helps us to change the world, and hence improve the status of oppressed peoples, etc.

**Introduction to Marxism**
- Marx disputed Adam Smith’s view that human beings are naturally self-interested and hence inclined to exchange and make deals, 65.
- Instead, Marx argued that human actions were shaped by and hence can only be understood in light of, their position in and relationship with the natural world, social institutions, and other human beings, 65.
- Thus, if we consciously act to change human relations and social institutions, we will be able to overcome the tendency toward self-interested individualism, 65.
- Social structures and institutions influence the way humans act and think about the world, but they are not deterministic: people can choose to follow another path, 66.
- His main focus was the means and methods of material production, not international relations.
• Marx: ‘Philosophers have only interpreted the world in various ways; the point, however, is to change it’
• Human history has been a long struggle to satisfy basic human material needs; this needs to be done before we can do anything else
• All other aspects of society are build upon this economic base; politics depends on economics
• The position of the bourgeois class will always be dominant, as they own all the knowledge and means of production, while the proletariat own only their labour
• Marx believed in the enlightenment ideal of promoting human freedom and development through technological change; changes in material conditions lead to changes in political system
• Primitive communism → Feudalism → Capitalism → Socialism → Communism
• Communism: No private property, no states, no wars, no classes
• Thus, Marxism was fundamentally a universal theory of history (the first of its kind); history was about class struggle and materialism rather than states and wars

Marx on Capitalism
• Marx differentiated capitalism from merely the market and exchange (which he said far predated capitalism), by the fact that capitalism alone involves the commoditization of labour, and the concept of capital, 67
• Also, unlike feudalism and slavery, under capitalism the workers are not bound to their masters, but are nominally free
• However, according to Marx, they are compelled to sell their labour in order to obtain access to the fruits of capital, and hence the means of material survival, 67
• Although Marx argues that capitalism develops the productive power of human far beyond any other systems, it does so in a way which is disabling, undemocratic and exploitative, 67
• Capitalism is disabling because it encourages individuals to see themselves as isolated, independent decision makers acting upon preferences and goals which are held to be ‘hard-wired’ for that individual, independent of social context, 68
• Further, we are encouraged to see social life and norms as things that happen to us and constrain us, rather than as relations in which we participate and collectively form, 68
• According to Marxists, capitalism removes the social powers of investors and employers from the public sphere and places them in the private sphere, where they are ‘exempt’ from democratic control and scrutiny, 69
• In addition, states are said to be held ‘captive’ by business interests, for fear that making laws which go against the interests of business will encourage them to move elsewhere, hence precipitating an economic crisis, 69

Criticisms of Marxism
• The endurance of the capitalist mode of production – Marx argued capitalism would be a temporary phase, but there is no evidence of widespread revolution
• Marx overestimates the role of economics, and underestimates the importance of nationalism and religion – these can trump class identities
• Marx also ignores other methods of exclusion; e.g. race, gender, ethnicity
• Economic determinism: the idea that economic structure determines politics leaves little room for human choice or action

Marxist International Theory
• Economic relationships form the key dynamic of international politics
• Relations between states are secondary to the global capitalist division of labour
• The capitalist division of labour makes poor countries dependent on rich countries
• Classes and the conflicts between them are more important than states
• The state is believed to be merely a tool of the bourgeois; they have to fight not only the domestic proletariat, but also the capitalists from other states, who want to expand their power
• International justice and equality is the most important normative concern
• Mostly concerned with transforming international relations and pursuing social justice

Imperialist and Dependency Theories
• Lenin’s Imperialist theory: large corporations become fused with the state and shape its interests
• War is caused by the need for capitalists to expand their markets by capturing new territories
• Thus the only way to end war is to end capitalism
• Dependency theory: underdevelopment of poor countries due to their subordinate position in world economy; it is a permanent condition
• World politics reflects the structural domination of a ‘periphery’ of weak states exploited by a ‘core’ of rich industrial states
• Poor states are locked into providing raw materials for the rich states, and hence are stuck in unequal exchange and can never develop
• Criticise those who are optimistic about the benefits of economic globalisation; the global economy is based on exploitation and hence globalisation will not help the poor

World Systems Theory
• Principal Theorist: Immanuel Wallerstein
• ‘Modern world system’ is an evolving and interlocking world capitalist economy which emerged in Europe in the 16th century
• System based on a transfer of resources from the poor periphery to the rich core states
• Critics say that world systems theory cannot explain the industrialisation of East Asia
• Thus they conceded that development was possible in the ‘semi-periphery’

Gramscian Critical Theory
• Gramsci tried to explain why western societies did not revolt against capitalism
• Ideas explained in the *Prison Notebooks* (1929-35), written in a Fascist jail
• He developed the concept of hegemony: the consensual aspect of power
• This means that most people conform most of the time; pure dominance and oppression is only used in a few exceptional cases
• Thus he argued that the bourgeoisie had achieved hegemonic leadership over Western societies
• The bourgeoisie had made enough concessions to the working classes to make them accept capitalism; for example welfare benefits and excessive taxation
• In addition, civil society had developed such that arts, media, newspapers, education and political parties all supported the existing social system, thus leading the proletariat to consent

Neo-Gramscian Political Economy
• There is no such thing as value-free, non-normative social science: ‘Theory is always for someone and some purpose.’
• Knowledge is not and cannot be neutral; it always reflects the social characteristics, values, interests and attitudes of the individual
• Thus, mainstream theories of global politics are problem-solving theories (they accept the world order and seek only to smooth over the ‘bumps’), while the critical theories seeks to drastically change the world order
• The world order is shaped by hegemony and acceptance of the world by the majority
• World politics should be viewed in terms of social forces on a global scale
• Interested in the potential of transformations to prevailing hegemonic structures in global politics (e.g. anti-globalisation)
• Frankfurt School Critical Theory

Contributions of Marxism
• The critical theories of Marxism and its offshoots have helped to expose systems of domination and exploitation in world politics
• Critical theory has provided an essential counterweight to realist theories that emphasise the unchanging character of world politics
• Realist theories emphasise the continuity of politics; critical theories emphasise that human societies have in the past changed themselves for the better
• Critical theorists have challenged the objective, scientific approach of mainstream neo-realism and –liberalism; they claim that these approaches hides important issues, like inequality and environment
• There is no such thing as objective social science theories, and so mainstream theories such ‘come clean’ about their ethical ideals

2.4 Constructivism and Feminism

Basic Constructivist Tenants
• Feminism and constructivism share a similar approach of examining global politics from a sociological and ideological approach
• Both have been developed in response to the rationalist approaches of neo-realism and neo-liberalism
• Constructivism is seen as a broad structure for understanding world politics rather than a specific explanation like realism
• Normative or ideational structures are just as important as material structures
• Emphasise the importance of social interactions and ideas in global politics
• This contrasts with the materialist focus of realism and even Marxism
• Material forces only obtain meaning in the presence of shared ideas or world outlook
• For example, a simple balance of power explanation cannot explain why Canada is a close ally with the US while Cuba is an enemy; different ideals can only explain this
• Socially constructed identities shape interests and action
• This contrasts to realists, who treat states as if they have pre-determined and fixed interests
• Identities and objectives are determined by social structures, not given by nature
• Social structures exist only because of the practices of agents; thus norms about human rights continue to exist only because of the actions of liberal democratic states
• Constructivists argue that beliefs and ideologies are the heart of international diplomacy, and that groups become powerful if they can persuade others to adopt their views, 60
• Constructivists argue that international change occurs when ‘intellectual entrepreneurs’ convince others of new ideas, and ‘name and shame’ actors whose behaviours deviates from these new accepted ideals, 60
• Examples of this include the religious ideals of Protestantism and the rise of the secular state, and contemporary human rights and Islamic fundamentalist groups, 60-61

The Rationalist-Constructivist Debate
• Rationalist: World politics consists of autonomous actors whose interests and identities are fixed
• Rationalist: World politics is a strategic realm for satisfying material interests
• Constructivist: World politics consists of social actors whose identities and interests are shaped by social interaction, by the social environment in which they interact
• Constructivist: World politics is a social realm with normative and ideational structures

Constructivist IR Theory
• Constructivist IR theorists want to push explanations of IR beyond rationalist approaches and incorporate social, historical and cultural factors
• For example, Alexander Wendt argues that ‘Anarchy is what states make of it’
• Anarchy does not necessarily imply any particular outcome; states could consider themselves as ‘rivals’, ‘enemies’ or ‘friends’, depending upon the social environment and ideologies

Reasons for the Rise of Feminism
• Mainstream (aka male-stream) theory ignores the perspectives of women, the actual roles of women, and the forms of constraint on women
• Reasons for the development of feminist theory include:
  • The impact of feminist political movements in the western world
  • The rise of critical theory in the discipline of IR (e.g. Gramscian) encouraged more people to ask ‘what does mainstream theory ignore’ – feminists answered ‘women’
  • The growing recognition of the marginalisation of women in global politics (e.g. fewer rights)

Feminism and IR Theory
• There is a difference between ‘sex’ and ‘gender’: sex relates to biological differences between men and women, gender relates to socially constructed differences in roles of men and women
• World politics is a socially constructed realm that entails gendered assumptions and expectations
• The gendered nature of world politics leads to forms of constraints and harm to many women
• These include economic inequality, sexual violence, etc
• They argue that these forms of harm are caused and sustained by ‘gendered power relations’
• Female concerns and concepts are ignored in International Relations scholarship
• Encourages and promotes the liberation of women from the constraints and harms they face

Women in Global Politics
• Women are still systematically underrepresented in the political sphere
• Only 7 states have a female head of state; another 12 as head of government
• The significance of unpaid women’s work in the home
• Women form about 70% of the world’s poor
• Welfare reform effects women disproportionately (notably because of child rearing)
• ‘Sex tourism’ and people trafficking
• UNIFEM (1976)
• Convention of the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (1979)
• Declaration on the Elimination of Violence Against Women (1993)
Conclusions

- Gender is but one form of marginalization – indigenous people, refugees, race etc. are other categories neglected by mainstream IR.
- The international women’s movement has grown and diversified, representing many different perspectives.
- Feminism helps us to rethink security and power in world politics; for example, have emphasised the personal security is more important than national security.
- Feminism will not fix all the world’s problems, but Feminists do think it would be a better place.

Section 3: Inter-state Rivalry and Conflict

3.1 Sovereignty and the Nation State

Defining Sovereignty

- Supreme authority within a territory.
- Authority refers to the right to command and hence the right to be obeyed.
- The idea of authority involves at least some basic amount of legitimacy.
- Supreme refers to the highest level of power; there is no level of authority above them.
- One must be sovereign over a particular unit of territory.

Debating the Extent of Sovereignty

- Sovereignty can be held collectively by a group of people or singularly by an individual.
- Non-absolute sovereignty is possible, for example the EU nations are sovereign in many areas, but not in monetary matters.
- Are states the only legitimate actors in international politics?
- Which collective group can legitimately become a state? A nation? A colony?
- To what extent should states be totally internally sovereign? Is genocide permissible?

History of Sovereignty

- Established the principle that each ruler could chose the religion of their territory.
- However, Westphalia should be called an important development in a long process, rather than an end or final realisation.
- National self-determination arose with the French Revolution, and gradually gained prominence during the 19th century, notably with the break-up of the Austrian and Ottoman Empires.
- Self-determination only became a principle of international law during the period of decolonisation in the 1950s and 1960s.

Challenges to Sovereignty

- Human Rights agreements and genocide.
- The rise of the European union – non-state actor now has some sovereignty.
- The EU is sovereign in a number of areas over its member states (trade, movement of peoples, monetary policy, environment).

Historical Myths about Sovereignty

- Sovereignty was never as absolute as many people suggest, and many states had their internal and external affairs interfered with by outside states, notably China in the late 19th century.
- Jean Bodin and Thomas first developed the notion of sovereignty in the 16th and 17th centuries.
For them it referred to the establishment of a single, absolutist ruler whose word was law, and hence who could bring order to his subjects.

In practise, power in nation states was increasingly shared, notably in 17th century Britain and 18th century France and America.

The Peace of Westphalia was primarily a new constitution for the Holy Roman Empire.

It does not represent the birth of autonomous nation states – in fact it reaffirmed the election of the Emperor by four princes (who thus were not fully sovereign themselves), and further undermined the sovereignty of the dukes by introducing strict rules regarding religious toleration within all German territories.

**The Decline of Sovereignty?**

- Recent Human Rights accords and agreements are not more a threat to sovereignty than the protections of minority ethnic groups forced by the powerful states upon many new states that were born following the collapse of the Ottoman and Austrian Empires, 22.
- Indeed, similar ideas can be traced back to the calls for religious toleration in the 16th and 17th centuries; the weak have always ascended to the values of the strong, 22.

- Globalisation and the news media is not undermining state control any more than did the Protestant reformation, or the introduction of the printing press, 24.
- In many ways, states now have more control over the flow of capital and goods than they used to, as demonstrated by the much lower political significance of tariffs compared to the 19th century, and also the lack of world financial crises of Great Depression magnitude, 24.

- State authority has declined in some areas, notably in monetary affairs (note independent central banks and the Euro), citizenship and claims upon loyalty (note the rise of dual citizenship, guest worker programs, refugees and permanent residents who have many of the rights of citizens), and often control over religion (states have found since the 16th century that this undermines their power rather than enhances it), 24-25.

- In general, however, we see an expansion in the role of the state (at least in the west) over the past 100 years, 26.

- TNOs have been around for a while (note the East India Company), and played a role in things like abolishing slavery and women’s rights movements, 26.

- It is true, however, that improvements in communications have increased both the number and influence of NGOs, from 200 in 1909 to 17,000 today, 26.

- The EU was born in a very unique climate of post-WWII desires to avoid another war, and fear of communist expansion. It is unlikely that great powers in other regions will be similarly interested in forgoing some of their national autonomy for such a project, 28-29.

### 3.2 The United Nations

**Purposes of the UN**

- The UN’s most important purpose was to maintain international peace and security after two devastating World Wars.

- Another purpose is to develop friendly relations among nations according to the principles of self-determination and national sovereignty.

- To cooperate in solving international economic, cultural and political problems, and promote respect for human rights.

- To be a centre for harmonising the actions of nations towards these ends.
• It is based on the sovereign equality of all members – all member states have supreme control over their territory

**Major Principles of Operation**
• All states are granted equal states, regardless of wealth, power or population
• All Members are to fulfil in good faith their Charter obligations (not deceptive or disruptive)
• Members are to settle international disputes by peaceful means
• Members are to refrain from the threat or use of force against another state
• Members are to give the UN every assistance in Charter obligations, not obstruct it in any way
• *Nothing in the Charter is to authorise the UN to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state* (principle of non-intervention)
• These principles allow smaller states to have protection against weaker states

**Six Principle Organs**
• Security Council
• General Assembly
• Economic and Social Council – coordinates other UN organisations, and serves as a forum for discussing economic and social problems
• International Court of Justice – settles matters between states; participation and decisions are voluntary
• Secretariat – headed by secretary general, and carries out day-to-day work of UN
• Trusteeship Council – created to supervise territories progressing from colonial status to independence; became obsolete in 1994

**Specialised Agencies**
• World Bank Group
• International Monetary Fund (IMF)
• World Health Organisation (WHO) – elimination of smallpox, monitoring sars
• UN Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) – world heritage
• International Labor Organisation (ILO)
• International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) – checking for WMDs in Iraq
• World Trade Organisation (WTO) – multi-lateral trade agreements

**Security Council**
• Primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security
• Five permanent members with veto powers (USA, France, UK, Russia, China)
• Ten non-permanent members elected by General Assembly for 2 year terms
• The idea was that the P5 would be providing the majority of the troops and force for resolving security crises
• The security council was supposed to be more nimble in responding to crises than the General Assembly; this was supposed to make it more effective than the UN
• The P5 can also veto any resolution to recognise new members – thus China can prevent Taiwan from joining
Idealistic and Actual Purposes of the SC

- The illusion of the immediate post-cold War period was that the UN security council, freed from superpower struggles, would finally become effective, 91
- In actuality, these were merely superseded by other international power struggles, as seen in the disagreement about the War in Iraq between France and the USA, 91
- Although it might not be that effective in its initial aims the security council still performs a number of important functions for states, and particularly the P5, 91
- These including acting as a scapegoat for the failures of statesmen, serving as a legitimator of unilateral action, and acting as a means for states to trade favours and do deals, 91-92
- The Security Council is still seen by the P5 states as a useful forum for addressing (if not actually resolving) security issues, 92
- The fact that states (even the US) explain how their actions are in concord with UN principles, and try to get UN support for their actions whenever possible, is further indication of the enormous respect and legitimacy held by the UN, 92-93

Attitudes of the P5

- The UK and France are particularly eager to retain the Security Council, as it gives them powers disproportionate to their current military or political influence, 93-95
- Like Britain and France, Russia feels that its permanent seat is a useful tool to help preserve its former Great Power status, 95
- For this reason, it has repeatedly campaigned for UN intervention and involvement in many areas, notably in the War in Iraq, 95
- China has much less need for play its permanent membership forcefully, as it has much greater claim to great power status, 95
- Instead, it uses its membership primarily to defend the principle of non-intervention in internal affairs of states, and also to oppose any claim’s for Taiwanese independence, 95-96

The Security Council and the USA

- The Security Council and UN in general is much less important for the US, though it does still find it useful to gain the extra legitimacy that the UN can confer on its actions, 96
- The US also finds the UN a useful means to deal with or at least to subdue issues for which its military power is not very useful, 96
- One reason for expecting continued and indeed increasing US engagement with the UN is the strength of public and elite opinion in the US, both of which are generally supportive of the UN and its purposes (though not the current administration), 103
- The UN many also help the US to regain some of the legitimacy it has recently lost in unilateral actions in Iraq, and perhaps to gain legitimacy for its future endeavours, 104
- The UN, through its international programs and intervention in many countries, also possesses great expertise, personal and resources in managing war reconstruction, peacekeeping, de-arming militias and so on, which the US may find it beneficial to draw upon in Iraq and other areas, 105-107

UN General Assembly

- The main deliberative organ in which all member states represented
- Each member state has one vote
- Two-thirds majority is required on important issues (e.g. peace and security, budgets)
- Simple majority on other questions
The UN General Assembly resolutions have the status of only recommendations; they are not legally binding like the security council resolutions.

Poorer and smaller states can use the General Assembly to make their voices heard.

**The UN and Human Rights**

- Growing tension between state sovereignty and concepts of human rights and justice.
- Human rights transcend state borders; if states are required to uphold human rights, they are no longer wholly sovereign.
- To the extent that a human rights regime is actually enforced, states can no longer have full internal sovereignty.
- This conflicts the UN’s principle of non-intervention.
- The problem of humanitarian intervention and the ‘responsibility to protect’.
- There is a growing international norm that it is appropriate to intervene when there are gross violations of human rights.
- Humanitarian intervention has been used as an exclusive for invasions which arguably had alternative justifications – notably the War in Iraq, and Russia’s invasion of Georgia in 2008.
- The UN has no standing military to enforce its human rights resolutions – there was an intent to create such a force when the UN was originally established.
- There is also a tendency for states to act unilaterally without permission, e.g. Iraq war.
- Nevertheless, the fact that the coalition tried so hard to get US approval demonstrates the legitimacy the UN carries.

**Funding and Reform**

- Many UN programs rely on voluntary contributions from states.
- The peace keeping budget is only $5 billion per year, which is less than the budget for the New York police department.
- Any reform to the UN would require a change to the UN constitution, which would have to get passed the security council.
- As most proposals would remove veto rights, the P5 are unlikely to allow these to pass.

**Benefits of the UN**

- Since 19445, the UN has created over 500 multilateral agreements about all sorts of issues.
- It has also provided 60 peacekeeping and fact-finding missions.
- Provides essential assistance to the poor, sick, and displaced, and funding for development, human rights, the environment etc.
- The UN is still the most prominent, important and recognized global institutions.
- Failures of the UN reflect the failures of states (states are divided, won’t provide the funds).
- Supporters ask: What would the world be like without the UN?

**Criticisms of the UN**

- Argue that the security council is ineffective in ensuring international peace and security; important decisions about war and peace are made elsewhere.
- The General Assembly is merely a place of ‘bloc politics’ and not a forum for debate deliberation.
- Many Americans argue that the GA is a forum for undemocratic states to advance anti-Israeli and anti-American views.
- Failures of the UN in arms control and promoting Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).
• Radicals argue that the UN does too little to help the poor, and has been captured by neo-liberal economic ideals
• Most critics accept the UN has a role to play in world affairs, but disagree about what these roles should be

3.3 Iraq War – Rationale and Justification

Historical Background
• 1968 17 July Baathist led-coup
• 1972 Iraq nationalises the Iraq Petroleum Company (IPC)
• 1974 Iraq grants limited autonomy to Kurds but KDP rejects it
• 1979 16 July President Al-Bakr resigns and is succeeded by Vice-President Saddam Hussein
• 1980 4 Sept Iran shells Iraqi border towns, beginning Iran-Iraq War
• 1981 7 June Israel attacks Iraqi nuclear research centre
• 1988 16 March Iraq is said to use chemical weapons against Kurdish town of Halabjah
• 1988 20 August A ceasefire comes into effect to be monitored by UN
• 1990 2 August Iraq invades Kuwait - is condemned by UN Security Council (UNSC) Res 660 which calls for full withdrawal
• 1990 6 August UNSC Res 661 imposes economic sanctions on Iraq
• 1990 8 August Iraq announces merger of Iraq and Kuwait
• 1990 29 Nov UNSC Res 678 authorizes the states cooperating with Kuwait to use "all necessary means" to uphold UNSC Res 660
• 1991 16 -17 Jan Operation Desert Storm
• 1991 24 Feb Start of ground operation which results in liberation of Kuwait on 27 February
• 1991 3 March Iraq accepts the terms of ceasefire
• 1991 March Iraqi forces suppress rebellions in the south and the north of the country
• 1991 8 April Establishment of UN safe-haven in northern Iraq to protect Kurds
• 1992 26 August No-fly zone is set up, which Iraqi planes are not allowed to enter
• 1993 27 June US forces launch a cruise missile attack on Baghdad
• 1995 14 April UNSC Res 986 allows partial resumption of Iraq's oil exports to buy food and medicine
• 1998 31 October Iraq ends cooperation with UN Special Commission to Oversee Destruction of Iraq's Weapons of Mass Destruction (UNSCOM)
• 1998 16-19 Dec US and UK launch a bombing campaign, "Operation Desert Fox", to destroy Iraq's WMD programmes
• 1999 17 Dec UNSC Res 1284 creates UN Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission (UNMOVIC) to replace UNSCOM
• 2001 Feb Britain, US carry out bombing raids against Iraq's air defence network - have little international support
• 2002 Sept President G W Bush tells sceptical world to confront "grave and gathering danger" of Iraq - or stand aside
• 2002 Nov UN weapons inspectors return to Iraq backed by UN Sec Res 1441 which threatens serious consequences if Iraq is in "material breach" of its terms
• 2003 Feb US President George W Bush: In Iraq a dictator is building and hiding weapons that could enable him to dominate the Middle East and intimidate the civilised world - and we will not allow it
• 2003 March    Chief weapons inspector Hans Blix reports that Iraq has accelerated its cooperation but says inspectors need more time to verify Iraq's compliance.

Just War Doctrine
• Makes the face that the use of force by one state against another may be justified in some circumstances, though certain very specific circumstances must be met.
• Such principles are codified in the UN charter, and the Geneva and Hague Conventions.
• The three key elements of the doctrine are ‘jus ad bellum’ (justice concerning the cause of the war), ‘jus in bello’ (justice concerning the conduct of the war), and justice concerning the termination of the war (peace treaties etc).
• All three elements must be just if the war itself is just.

Jus ad bellum
• All the following must be met:
  • Just cause (self-defence from external attack; resistance of aggression).
  • Right intention (force only for the sake of its just cause – no ulterior motives e.g. a land grab, revenge or ethnic hatred).
  • Proper authority and public declaration.
  • Last Resort (a state may resort to war only if it has exhausted all plausible, peaceful alternatives to resolving the conflict).
  • Probability of success (a state may not resort to war if doing so is likely to make things no better or worse).
  • Proportionality.

Jus in bello
• Obey all international laws on weapons prohibition.
• Discrimination and Non-Combatant Immunity (weapons to target those who are, in Walzer’s words, ‘engaged in harm’).
• Proportionality (force proportional to the end).
• Benevolent quarantine for prisoners of war (POWs) – they cannot be targeted with death, starvation, rape, torture, medical experimentation, or other inhumane treatment.
• No Means Mala in Se (soldiers may not use weapons or methods which are ‘evil in themselves’: mass rape, genocide, use of poison or treachery).
• No reprisals.

The Case for War in Iraq
• The US put substantial resources and diplomatic pressure into persuading the UN to back its intervention in Iraq.
• It was opposed by the ‘quartet’ of Russia, China, France and Germany – these states met in a summit three times.
• The three main arguments for war were weapons of mass destruction, terrorism and the removal of a tyrannical regime.
• These three arguments were emphasized roughly in this order, as the first two arguments successfully came into difficulties.

Preventative War Justification
• The Bush Administration argued that the uniquely enormous threat posed by the combination of WMDs and terrorism provided justification for preventative war against Iraq, 39-40.
Micheal Walzer has argued that preventive wars are justified if there is ‘a manifest threat to injure, a degree of active preparation that makes the intent a positive danger, and a general situation in which waiting, or doing anything other than fighting, greatly magnifies the risk.

This seems reasonable as a doctrine, but raises the question as to whether the situation in Iraq before the war met these criteria.

It is very hard to argue that Iraq itself posed any credible threat against the US, and although terrorists with WMDs may, the evidence for Saddam’s connections with terrorists were always very weak.

A military response as also only justified it if is the only realistic way to deal with the problem, which given the success of the weapons inspectors is by no means certain.

Any military reaction must also be proportionate to the threat; thus while limited air strikes may have been permissible, a fully-fledged invasion certainly was not.

**Humanitarian Intervention Justification**

- There is a clear difference between intervening to stop a sudden, devastating collapse of order or outbreak of violence which immediately and massively effects whole populations – for example genocide or such things.
- And on the other hand intervention to stop longstanding, steady oppression by an authoritarian ruler.
- This is analogous to the obligation one has to save a drowning child, while one does not have an obligation to raise and educate a destitute child.
- Also, the sheer case of the US operation (invasion and wholesale destruction of the regime) was far out of proportion either to any past humanitarian intervention, or to any danger Saddam posed to the Iraqi population.
- There is also the issue that humanitarian grounds were clearly an ex post justification for invasion, and thereby lend it no moral credibility.

**Pre-Existing UN Permission?**

- Supporters of the invasion argue that it did have UN backing, as Resolution 678 passed in November 1990 granted authority to use force against Iraq, and the subsequent ceasefire was conditional upon Saddam’s compliance with UN agreements that he abandon WMDs.
- Thus, his apparent non-compliance re-activated the mandate of resolution 678.
- The trouble with this is that resolution 678 clearly provided the authority only to use force to evict Saddam from Kuwait, and only to conduct limited military operations in the event of UN non-compliance (e.g. air strikes).
- There was clearly no mandate for wholesale invasion or regime change.

**Validity of UN Final Say**

- Hardcore supporters of the UN argue that the invasion was immoral simply because it was not Un sanctioned, as defying the Un is immoral in and of itself.
- However, the decisions of the UN are merely the aggregate of a variety of self-interested and whimsical decisions of its member states – hardly a solid basis for morality.
- Another argument is that defying the UN increases the likelihood that other aggressor states will be willing to defy it in the future.
- However, this does not provide conclusively that these potential risks always outweigh the benefits of non-approved intervention.
• The third argument is that if the UN does not accept your reasons for going to war, than this should give one pause as to the validity of one’s reasons, 38
• However, the UN opposed the 1999 intervention in Serbia because Russia vetoed it – hardly a moralistic reason, 38-39

The Case Against War
• Put forth to the UN by the French foreign minister
• War can only be the last resort
• Any decision must be based upon the rule of law based on collective international responsibility
• Argued that UN weapons inspections had already produced tangible results
• Thus there was good chances for a peaceful disarmament of Iraq
• Put forth two opposing choices; either we can use military prevention as a ‘quick fix’, or we could use a slower approach, utilizing negotiation and taking into account culture and religion
• He also predicted that any invasion would exacerbate the unstable situation in Iraq and worsen internal divisions
• Following this speech, it became clear that the US did not have the numbers to pass its resolution, and hence withdrew it from the Security Council

The US goes before the UN
• Made by Colin Powell to the UN in Feb 2003
• Accusations of Iraqi scientists and officials deceiving UN inspectors
• Satellite images of ‘active chemical munitions bunkers’
• Intelligence of ‘mobile biological weapons labs’
• Nerve gas supposedly unaccounted for
• Continuing efforts to develop nuclear weapons
• Supposed Iraqi government links to terrorism
• Was designed to back up a resolution put forth by the US in the UN Security Council to support America’s invasion in Iraq
• The US expected to get enough votes to pass it, and also expected to avoid any vetoes, as no one had every vetoed any Security Council resolution behind which the US had placed all its support since the end of the Cold War

UN Charter
• Article 2 clause 4 is widely regarded as the most important clause of the whole charter
• War of aggression is against international law
• States cannot violate international frontiers by force
• States must refrain from acts of reprisal using force
• States must not use force to deny self-determination
• States must not use terrorism against other states
• Article 2 clause 5: the UN Security Council has primary responsibility for international security
• Article 25: the Security Council can only act on behalf of the entire UN
• Article 39: it is up to the Security Council to determine whether aggression has occurred
• Article 42: The Security may in certain circumstances use force to punish aggressors
• Article 48: UN members are under obligation to carry out Security Council decisions
• In September 2004, Kofi Annan finally took a position on the legality of the US invasion; he declared it was not in conformity with the US charter and hence was illegal
The Real Reason: Strategic Intervention

- Probably the real reason for the Iraq War was that a prominent group of policy makers in the future Bush administration came in the 1990s to the view that the US should be more aggressive in using its military power to shape the world in ways that suited American interests, 44
- September 11 provided a great opportunity for them to implement their desire to overthrow Saddam, 45
- Clearly, however, the idea that every nation has the right to use force to promote their interests has been soundly defeated by liberal thought, and would if implemented lead to a world of violence and anarchy, 46
- One reason put forward for US ‘exceptionalism’ is that the US is morally superior to other nations
- The trouble with this argument is that it is clear that American people are no better than other peoples, it is merely the superiority of American institutions that generally sees bad ideas thrown out, 46-47
- Thus, it is the Iraq War that is an example of ‘exceptionalism’ (i.e. the unusual failure of American political institutions to reject stupid ideas), rather than the US itself, 47
- The second argument put forth for American exceptionalism, that the US is uniquely and massively threatened by terrorism, it simply not factually true, 47-48

3.4 American Power

Three Conceptions of Power

- Hard power: the ability to exert one’s will unilaterally using the tools of ‘compellence’, coercion, bribery, and/or exit’
- Soft power (co-optive): the ability to shape what others want, by making one’s culture and ideology attractive to others (mainly by inducement).
- Legitimate/social power (free consent): based on persuasion and/or emulation following leadership by example
- Perhaps power is best understood not as a thing to possess (like bombs), but rather as a relationship between parties
- America nevertheless does provide many benefits (including economic institutions, humanitarian intervention, military protection, culture and technology)
- Perhaps it is more useful to ask how a responsible hegemon should behave

Military Power

- Only power with true global reach
- Accounts for about half of world military expenditure
- America has military bases in over 50 countries
- The US has military command structures in all world regions but Africa

Economic Power

- Largest economy in the world
- Prominence of the US dollar and Wall street in global financial transactions
- Wall Street trades around two thirds of the world’s stock market transactions
- US Treasury dominates the IMF and World Bank
- Significant lead in high-tech areas like computers
Cultural Power

- Ivy League (Harvard, Yale, Princeton etc.) education
- Hollywood, music, arts, literature, fashion (blue jeans, baseball caps); fast food; lifestyle
- The ‘golden arch peace thesis’
- Philanthropic foundations, especially the Big Three (Ford, Rockefeller and Carnegie Foundations – all of which promote liberalism or soft versions of neoliberalism at home and abroad), through aid, medical assistance, education, etc.

Moral/Ideological Power

- The pre-eminent liberal state, seeking to defend the liberal republican ideals of:
  - Freedom and human rights
  - Democracy
  - Peace
  - Tainted somewhat by recent redefinitions of torture, etc.

Is the US an Empire?

- Empire: a powerful state that has direct political control and economic exploitation of the territory of some peripheral state
- This undermines the ideal of sovereignty, and is mainly coercive in nature
- A hegemon is a supreme power which uses both coercion and persuasion to provide public goods and shape the rules of the game; secondary states fall into line
- A hegemon needs more than just hard power; it must also have some degree of recognition and respect, such that other states will follow its lead
- A Great Power is simply a state that possesses superior military and economic capability and the ability to exert influence on a global scale
- Neocons say it is an Empire but downplay the word, radical left says it is and this is something to be bemoaned

Rebuttals of Empire Argument

- US political culture stresses democracy and the rule of law
- US voters and taxpayers don’t want to bear the costs of empire
- While US military capacity may be unrivalled, it is still unable to control the whole world
- Nationalist ideologies now much stronger than in the age of empire
- Imperialism is now thoroughly delegitimization
- Growing economic interdependence demands a multilateral framework of coordination
- It is rational for a major power to accept some limitation on their power in return for the order and certainty provided by multilateralism and respect

The Changing Use of US Power

- After World War Two, America was generally highly popular amongst Europeans
- It set up NATO and the marshal plan, protected them from the Soviets
- Established and promoted important global institutions like Bretton Woods, GATT, UN
- Sometimes the US did not follow its own rules of these institutions (as they did not always serve its short-term interests), but not so much that it undermined the institutions themselves (which served America’s long-term interests)
- The US has moved away from multilateralism and towards unilateralism in many areas since the end of the Cold War
• Notably with the Iraq war, but also with its refusal to cooperate in the international court of justice, Kyoto Protocol, and other such things
• US power is the provider, protector, arbiter and final word in international order

**Neo-Conservatism**

• In the 1990s, a group of scholars new referred to as ‘Neo-Conservatives’, argued that American military, technological and economic dominance in the world was unprecedented, 424
• They argued for a Reagan-style administration that would keep a strong military, a bold foreign policy, and purposefully use American power to promote American principles abroad, 424
• Although the September 11 attacks galvanised the new Bush administration into action, the policies of many of these individuals bore great resemblance to the Bush Doctrine, 424
• These people also believe that American values of freedom, democracy and free enterprise have universal application to all peoples around the world, 424
• In addition, it is believed that American culture has universal world appeal, and also that the United States has the power and the right to use its power unilaterally, outside of multilateral institutional frameworks, 425

**Problems with Neo-Conservatism**

• One problem with all these views is that they presuppose a clear link between power and influence, when in reality it is clear that in many key areas (Kyoto Protocol, International Criminal Court, War in Iraq), the US has failed to get its way, 425-426
• Another problem is that the US administration has a misunderstanding of legitimacy, believing that US actions are legitimated by the universality of American values, when in fact legitimacy only comes when voluntarily given by other parties, 426
• The universality of American values is also not as beneficial to America as one might think, as by their very nature such values as freedom and democracy mean very different things to different people, and hence a world fully adopting such values would still be very diverse, and maybe hostile to the US, 426
• Furthermore, it is similarly possible to be enamoured with American culture but hostile to their foreign policy, 426-427
• Though the current US administration draws analogies between the US position now and its hegemonic position after WWII, when it effectively had to rebuild the world order by itself, this analogy does not really hold, 427
• Though American military dominance may be similar, the rest of the world is no longer economically or military dependent on the US as it was then, nor does the US operate in an institutionally poor environment, but in the mix of many global network, 427

**Why has America Failed?**

• Why, despite the US’s remarkable military and economic preponderance, has it failed to achieve its strategic and ideological objectives in many areas of foreign policy?
• Too much reliance on hard power, which becomes expensive and hence cannot be sustained in the long-run
• This also does not win ‘hearts and minds’, but breed resentment and revenge
• Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo have tainted the soul of the liberal republic
• Robert Kagan has struck back against European critics of the US
• He argues that Europeans are weak; they free ride on the ‘heavy lifting’ (military expenditure, etc) provided by America; Americans are the only ones prepared to use power
• As a realist, he rejects the use of soft power as naive
• Joseph Nye has argued that the US should use more soft power, which entails ‘shaping what others want, by making one’s culture and ideology attractive to them’
• Successful states should be both feared and loved; US needs to be loved again

Backlash against America
• America is criticized either for what it has done, or what it has failed to do
• American foreign policy
• Capitalism
• The Bush administration
• US hypocrisy
• American exceptionalism (‘America’s cause is the cause of all mankind’: B. Franklin); think they are the most important, chosen by God, etc
• American ignorance of the rest of the world
• Anti-Americanism as a movement must be distinguished from opposition to specific US foreign policies and actions

Other Potential Powers
• Europe shares many similar values to the US
• Europe prefers to negotiate and trade; little desire for global power
• Russia has a decent military and huge energy resources
• Nevertheless, it has a backward economy, an authoritarian government, poverty, low birth rate
• China has a history as a great power, and growing military and economic strength
• Increasing role on international stage
• Questions about China’s human rights record, authoritarian rules, and Taiwan

3.5 Weapons of Mass Destruction

Defining WMDs
• The first use of the term Weapons of Mass Destruction occurred in the print media in 1937 following the bombing of Guernica in the Spanish Civil War
• During WWII the term referred to the mass killing of civilians using modern weapons, including bombing and chemicals
• After 1945 WMDs came to include nuclear and biological weapons
• The FBI defines WMDs as any weapon whose consequences overwhelm local responders
• CBRN – chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear capabilities: some say that defining a weapon as belonging to one of these categories, rather than as merely a ‘WMD’
• Vertical proliferation refers to the increase of the CBRN arsenal held by any one state
• Horizontal proliferation refers to the spread of CBRN capabilities to new states

Nuclear and Biological Weapons
• The USSR built the Tsar Bomba in 1961, which had a maximum yield of 100 MT
• However, the bomb weighted 27 tons, and could only be carried for four hours of flight, and thus could not reach the US – thus its purpose was entirely propaganda
• Biological weapons are based on naturally occurring viruses, bacteria and other microorganisms
• Biological weapons are odourless, tasteless and invisible, making them perfect for undercover operations
Chemical weapons
- Chemical weapons are lethal, made-made substances which can be deployed as liquids, solids or gases
- Mustard gas used on WWI is one of the most famous examples of chemical weapons
- The last major use of chemical weapons occurred in the Iran-Iraq War in 1988
- This included the widespread use of mustard gas against Kurdish civilians by Iraq

Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty
- The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty was introduced in the UN in 1965, and entered into force in 1970
- It divided the world into two groups of states – the nuclear powers (the five veto powers) and those without them
- All countries agree not to export nuclear equipment or material to non-nuclear weapon states except under IAEA safeguards
- All countries agree to facilitate the fullest possible exchange of peaceful nuclear technology
- All countries agree to pursue negotiations in good faith to end the nuclear arms race
- The non-nuclear states pledged not to produce or receive nuclear weapons
- Non-nuclear states also agree to accept IAEA safeguards for all nuclear activities

The Biological Weapon Convention
- Opened 1972, into force, 1975
- Prohibits the development, production, stockpiling, acquisition and transfers of biological agents
- It has been ratified by 155 states, but not the US
- Lacks verification and enforcement measures

The Chemical Weapon Convention
- Entered into force in 1997
- Prohibits the development, production, acquisition, stockpiling, retention or use of chemical weapons
- Prohibits the transfer, directly or indirectly, of chemical weapons to anyone
- Requires signatories to destroy all CW stockpiles and production facilities

Issues and Controversies
- Something like 100 warheads from the old Soviet stockpile are unaccounted for
- Another problem is that many weapons that had been deactivated in the US and Russia have not actually been destroyed – merely disassembled and placed in storage
- There is also the issue of how to get India, Pakistan and Israel to join the NPT – should they be allowed in as nuclear states, or should they be required to disarm?
- Also problematic is the lack of enforcement of the NPT

Section 4: New Agenda Security Issues

4.1 Terrorism

Defining Terrorism
- Terrorism is neither a new nor Islamic phenomenon (e.g. SS, IRA, Tamil Tigers, states)
- But, the September 11 attacks demonstrate the emergence of new forms of ‘global terrorism’
The definition of terrorism is very important, as it allows some groups to be labeled terrorists and other not to be. Even the UN cannot agree on a definition of terrorism – some want to label Hamas as terrorists, while others want to label Israel as terrorists. UNSC definition (Resolution 1566): ‘criminal acts, including against civilians, committed with the intent to cause death or serious bodily injury, or taking of hostages, with the purpose to provoke a state of terror in the general public or in a group of persons or particular persons, intimidate a population or compel a government or an international organization to do or to abstain from doing any act.’

Note that this does not rule out state action. CIA definition: ‘terrorism means premeditated, politically motivated violence perpetrated against non-combatant targets by subnational groups or clandestine agents.’ According to this definition, states cannot commit terrorist acts. ‘One person’s terrorist is another person’s freedom fighter.’ However, such definitional debates confuse the issue, and mix debates about means with debates about ends and goals. The act itself should define whether it is terrorism, not based on who does it or the purpose for which it is done. Thus, terrorism could be defined as violent acts committed against some persons to try to frighten others into changing their behavior.

**Fundamental Features of Terrorism**
- Terrorism is a political phenomenon – aims to achieve political goal (e.g. liberate homeland, drive out US forces, overthrow disliked government)
- Terrorism involves the direct targeting of non-combatants; unlike traditional warfare it deliberately targets non-combatants
- Terrorism involves indiscriminate and unpredictable attacks; they do not discriminate between intended targets and innocent bystanders
- Terrorism is a type of psychological warfare that usually involves non-state actors
- Terrorism is primarily a form of communication: unlike other forms of violence like guerrilla warfare or assassinations, it involves three actors (perpetrators, victims and audience)

**Types of Terrorism**
- Repressive Terrorism: Perpetrated by a government agency to frighten dissidents into refraining from subversive activities – e.g. SS, KGB, Stasi, public executions, imprisonment without trial
- The key purpose of these states activities is to instil a general fear in the population, and hence to prevent people from opposing the government: The Lives of Others
- Revolutionary Terrorism: Attacks on government officials and infrastructure to destabilise the political order and advance revolution – Red Army Faction, Red Brigades
- National Liberation: Terrorist tactics are often used in the cause of liberating a national community - Bombings and highjackings by IRA, PLO, ETA, Tamil Tigers
- International Terrorism: Terrorism that crosses national borders and is aimed at changing a state’s foreign policy – Hezbollah suicide bombings, Al Qaeda train bombing in Spain
- Note that this was worked a number of times in history, including attacks against French and US troops in Lebanon in 1982, and the 2004 train bombings in Spain
- Religious Terrorism: Motivated by interpretations of religious scriptures and theology, religion used to explain or justify violent acts or gain recruits
Examples include Al Qaeda attacks on Western civilians, anti-abortion violence of the Army of God, Sarin gas attacks of Aum Shinrikyo.

**New Global Terrorism**
- New global terrorist networks and activities make it difficult to individual states to tackle terrorism, and mean that borders are no longer an effective barrier to terrorism.
- Technological advances associated with globalisation have provided increased opportunities for terrorists to plan and conduct operations.
- Indeed, we have recently seen the rise of ‘freelance’ terrorists, who are committed to the same ideological goals, but have no connection at all with each other.
- Globalisation can also mean that funds can come from a variety of sources and nations, including states, private donors and drug sales.
- Increased lethality and destructiveness: aim to kill as many people as possible.
- This marks a distinct change from the 1970s and 1980s, when many attacks focused on kidnapping or aircraft hijackings, and hence often ended without violence.
- Increased emphasis on non-conventional weapons or WMDs like anthrax, nuclear bombs etc, as part of the increased importance of maximising casualties.
- Prominence of religious motivations and suicide tactics has increased recently.

**Al Qaeda**
- Al Qaeda: part of broader Islamist movement of global Salafi jihad.
- ‘Al Qaeda’ simply means ‘the base’ – it was originally a name given to Muhujaddin training camps in the fight against the Russians in Afghanistan, and it stuck.
- It is comprised of individuals who have sworn an oath to Bin Ladan and trained in camps in Afghanistan and the Sudan.
- It is very hard to define the size or extent of Al Qaeda, as it has links with many other terrorist groups, and many isolated individuals or splinter groups have adopted the ‘Al Qaeda brand name’ without any actual formal training or recruitment into Al Qaeda.
- Want to return to a purer and more fundamentalist implementation of the Quran, modelled on the community of the Prophet and his companions (Salaf).

**Global Salafi Jihad**
- Salafists believe that Islam was originally perfect, but has been corrupted over the centuries by foreign influences and innovations.
- Jihad originally simply meant a struggle to overcome personal weaknesses and spread Islam, etc.
- The radical salafists have adopted a violent and revolutionary interpretation of jihad, which justifies overthrow of pro-western governments and attacks on westerners.
- The biggest difference between the national movements committed to overthrowing various ‘corrupt’ Arabic government and the new global jihad movement, is that the latter believes that the ‘near enemy’ cannot be defeated until after the defeat of the ‘far enemy’ (i.e. the west).
- Terrorists justify targeting of western civilians on the grounds that they support the perceived unjust actions of their democratic governments.
- Many such terrorists are recruited from Diaspora communities.
- Terrorists have made extensive use of modern media and communications to spread fear.


4.2 Security – Old and New Challenges

What is Security?

- During the Cold War, security was equated to national security and strategic studies, and was the primary focus of IR
- Since the end of the Cold War, security studies have adopted a broader approach, and there are now contested definitions of the term
- Many IR scholars have argued that security and military matters cannot be studied without examining relevant historical, political, social and economic factors
- Population growth and how that effects economic security
- Concerns over the transmission of disease, e.g. AIDS, SARS etc
- Issues of economic and societal security are often linked to environmental scarcity, e.g. Gulf area and Israel/Palestine area

Strategic Societies

- Strategic studies is generally consistent with realism – focus on states as primary actors
- States are primarily concerned with security, and power as the means to achieve security
- Sovereign states will inevitably develop offensive military capabilities
- Uncertainty, leading to a lack of trust, is inherent in the international system
- States will want to maintain their independence and sovereignty
- Survival becomes the most basic driving interest of states
- Cooperation limited; states interested in relative gains
- Strategic Studies argues that threats are derived, as a result of the international anarchy, from the military capabilities of other states

The Post-Cold War Change

- Military Power has declined in importance. Move away from traditional, ‘great power’ conflict.
- Re-examine the way we think about security studies and security.
- Expand what we mean by security.
- New forms of insecurity caused by ethnic rivalries, environment, poverty, development.

Criticisms of Strategic Studies

- Many democratic wealthy states have moved away from the traditional model of the militant, security-maximising actors – move away from the traditional Great Power conflict
- Strategic Studies has been criticised as simplistic and not looking at the deeper causes of things
- Realism and Strategic Studies have been criticised as a ‘problem solving’ theory – it took important facts as given and worked from them (e.g. the USSR is aggressive), but did not ‘dig down’ to examine the reasons for and explanations of these things
- Security studies is a counter to the existing orthodoxy of strategic studies
- It argues that security is not always the primary concern of states
- Actors other than the state are also considered
- Critical Security Studies argues that the anarchic structure is socially constructed and as such a critical approach questions how the threats are constructed and mobilised against

Securitisation

- One categorisation of the different realms of security: Military (threats from other states), political (internal or external threats to the sovereignty of the state), economic (threats to
access to trade, resources and finance), cultural (threats to cultural, linguistic and ethnic groups), environmental (threats to the environment)

- Key question: what makes something a security threat/question – who decides?
- ‘In naming a certain development a security problem, the ‘state’ can claim a special right, one that will, in the first instance, always be defined by the state and its elites...By definition, something is a security problem when the elites declare it to be so.’
- The first is that in naming a certain development a security problem, the ‘state’ can claim a special right.
- The second implication concerns the nature of security study to which it gives rise. If ‘security’ is whatever the state says it is, how can we engage in its study?

4.3 Nationalism and Ethnic Conflict

Nation and State

- State - a political community which can change shape & size because borders are artificial & rarely immutable
- Nation - a group of proximate people with common cultural, historical and political ties
- When the political boundaries of the state and the cultural boundaries of the nation do not coincide, tension develops between the principles of territorial integrity and national self-determination
- “A state can be created, mutilated or destroyed overnight by a document drawn up in due form prescribed by international law. A nation grows or decays by a process which is independent of any single conscious act of the human will.”
- Not all nations have their own states, e.g. Kurds, Palestinians, Basque, Quebecois, Tamils, Acehnese, Kooris, Welsh
- States may encompass many nations, e.g. Yugoslavia, India, Nigeria, Indonesia, Israel, US, Russia

Ethnic Conflict

- In the inter-war period, ethnic and national minorities were given a key place of importance in International Relations, notably with the creation of many new European states and the requirement that ethnic minorities were protected, 133
- The ideological conflict of the Cold War tended to mute interest in ethnic conflicts, but this has changed since the 1990s, 133-134
- The collapse of the USSR and Yugoslavia in particular increases awareness of and interest in ethnic conflicts, 134
- An ethnic group develops from a feeling of shared culture, common descent, a sense of solidarity, shared history, and association with a particular territory, 134
- Ethnic conflict has not been very prevalent in the west since 1945, probably due to such factors as wealth, stable governments, democratic values, and a stable and peaceful regional environment, 135
- International involvement in ethnic conflicts has increased over the years, and now includes NATO/UN peacekeeping operations in Macedonia, Cyprus, East Timor, Bosnia, Kosovo, 136
- The international community has a strong bias against secessionist movements, which means that few of them succeed, 138
- Conversely, there are many areas of the world where irredentist claims play a strong role, particularly in Hungary, Russia, Serbia and Macedonia, 138-139
• Internal ethnic conflicts increasingly spread to other states, either by directly spreading violence across borders, or by drawing in foreign intervention, 139
• Ethnic groups are not states, and therefore do not have access to international bodies like the UN – this can make it difficult to generate support and awareness of their cause, 139-140

**Ethnic Conflict After the Cold War**
• The end of the Cold War has made the international community realise that many conflicts it saw as ideologically-based proxy wars between the superpowers, were in fact ethnic conflicts dressed up as ideological conflicts to gain superpower support, 141
• The end of the Cold War and hence funding for many groups has allowed some conflicts to be resolved, while the collapse of the Soviet Bloc has allowed long suppressed rivalries to re-emerge (e.g. Armenia and Azerbaijan), 141
• It is now less likely that a given ethnic conflict will escalate into global war, 142
• In the 1990s the UN tried to act more as the ‘global policeman’ that it was designed as, though in Bosnia, Rwanda and Somalia it largely failed, 142

**Getting the World’s Attention**
• Ways in which ethnic conflicts are brought to world attention include if there is an effective link between the group and another state, like Cyprus, Turkey and Greece, the Tamils in India and the Tamils in Sri-Lanka, and even Diaspora communities like Jewish-Americans influencing US policy over Israel, 140
• Geo-strategic interests of powerful states play an important role – for example, western states did not punish Indonesia for invading East Timor in 1975 because it was an important Cold War ally, 140
• Conflicts that occur closer to the west or in other important regions (e.g. Yugoslav wars) are more likely to be noticed than those in backward areas (e.g. South Sudan), 140
• NGOs like church groups, human rights agencies and aid groups can also bring conflicts to the attention of the world, 140-141

**Possible Solutions to Ethnic Conflict**
• A greater emphasis on internal autonomy rather than full independence may help to make it easier to resolve ethnic conflicts, 145
• However, many states reject this because they do not want to encourage other areas to seek autonomy, while some ethnic groups will accept nothing short of full independence, 145
• Ethnic conflicts are also difficult to solve because of the inequalities of state and non-state actors, and the non-negotiable nature of identity and security concerns, 145
• Informal diplomacy and outside mediation, through organisations like the Carter Centre, has played a role in achieving settlements in a number of conflicts, 145-146
• One argument is that focusing on zero-sum issue like sovereignty makes it difficult to achieve resolutions to conflicts, while switching the emphasis to ensuring that all human needs are cared for (not zero sum) would make resolution easier, 146

**Ethnic Conflict and Globalisation**
• It is unlikely that ethnic conflicts will spell the end of the dominance of the state itself, however, owing to the importance of states in demonstrating pride, self-worth, and protecting the nation’s interests and culture, 148
• At the same time, the state system is not conducive to solving ethnic crises, as the anarchic nature of the international system generates mistrust and fear of ethnic minorities, while state
policies towards minorities are dominated by selfish national interests (e.g. Turkey supports Turkish Cypriots by not Kurdish autonomy), 148

- It is sometimes said that globalisation acts to undermine the importance of ethnic identity, but in fact globalisation is in large part the spread of western culture and values, by which ethnic groups in many countries may feel their culture and values are threatened, 149
- There is also the case of separatist movements in Europe both moving towards autonomy or independence while remaining in the EU – note Belgium, 149-150

**Nationalism**

- Nationalism is a much more modern concept than ethnicity, and involves the centrality of the nation in world affairs, and as the source of social power and loyalty
- Nations must be free and secure, and loyalty to one’s nation must take precedence over other identities
- Nationalism is a belief system that the world is divided up into separate, competing nations
- An expression of political identity
- A nation is formed of a cultural group bound by: linguistic association, common territory, history and experience, political culture
- Formed from an imagined community – no person can never personally be acquainted with everyone else in their nation
- Nationalism is both a binding and dividing force – it binds nations together internally, but sets them up as rivals against each other
- A group which wants to be ‘governed in common’

**Secession**

- Requirements for a secessionist movement include:
- A sizable human grouping (distinct community or society)
- A territorial base for this grouping
- Negative relationship with the central government (based on discontent), perceived as real by the community
- Strong leadership of this minority group
- A normative claim to justify their attempt (often self-determination of the peoples)

**Causes of Separatism**

- Internal Colony: Separatism is aroused by relative deprivation. Social discrimination between core and periphery fuels secessionism.
- Ethnicity or Primordialism: Ethnic identity leads to political awareness and separatism regardless of the existence of inequalities
- Communalism: traces separatism to elite disputes related to scarcity of resources, privileges etc.

**Justifications of Secessionism**

- Liberal Nationalism: individual freedom is tied in a crucial way to membership in one’s national culture; nations constitute special groups of social and political organisation
- Just Cause Theory: dismisses the significance of the nation; secession is solely associated to group remedial rights, and hence to justify it there must be a grave injustice which can only be remedied when the territorial group no longer belongs to the state
- Choice Theories: the consent of the individual is the basis of political obligation, which in turn confers legitimacy on the state. Individuals within the state should be able to define and redefine the boundaries of the political community
4.4 The Global Ecological Crisis

Environmental Problems
- Since the end of WWII, we have seen the rapid rise of world prosperity, and at the same time a rise on ecological problems
- 10–30% of mammal, bird, and amphibian species are currently threatened with extinction *(medium to high certainty)*
- Pollution of land, air, waterways and oceans and the accumulation of toxic and nuclear waste
- Other problems include Habitat destruction, Species extinction (including overfishing), Deforestation, Desertification, Land degradation, Resource scarcity (especially potable water, arable land, and timber)

Alleged Ethical Dilemmas
- Rise of the concept of the ‘ecological footprint’, and comparison of regional disparities
- Striking disparity in the size of the ecological footprints of citizens in the developed and developing worlds
- The idea that the west is ‘importing’ ecological capacity from the south
- There is also an ethical dilemma, namely that most of existing damage and emissions has been caused by the west, but most future damage will be caused by the developing world

Political Responses
- Since the late 1960s there has been a significant rise in:
  - global environmental movements and organizations
  - new environmental laws and treaties
  - a global environmental consciousness
- New environmental values and ideologies (questioning technological determinism, indiscriminate economic growth and the human domination of nature)
- New environmental movements and political parties (and counter-movements to environmentalism)
- New ‘meta-discourses’: the idea of social and ecological *limits* to growth vs. sustainable development/ecological modernisation
- An increasing focus on environmental justice based on the disparity in consumption between North and South
- New state preoccupations, such as ‘ecological security’
- The US was the pioneer of environmental laws in the early 1970s with the foundation of the EPA
- Many western countries then established their own environmental ministries, and emulated US laws

The Limits to Growth Debate
- The idea of mankind sharing a common ecological space, and ‘spaceship earth’ was prominent in the late 1960s and early 1970s, owing to the first color photos of Earth taken by NASA
- Promoted by various environmental reports
- Focused on exponential trends of resource use, population growth, and environmental damage
- Focussed on the concept of limited ecological ‘carrying capacity’
- Argued that if growth is degrading the environment, then we ought to stop or slow it
- This was a profound challenge to the status quo; it was highly controversial, and many politicians ignored it
There were some potentially disturbing implications for distributive justice and population policy – some even argued that authoritarian governments alone could solve the problem.


This challenged the limits to growth theory, and introduced the idea of ‘sustainable development’

That is, meeting the needs of the present in a way that does not compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.

This was popular with governments, but not all environmental groups.

The 1992 UN Conference on Environment and Development at Rio de Janeiro signed a variety of declarations, treaties and so forth on a variety of environmental issues.

### Rise of Environmental Multilateralism

- Spectacular rise in the number of environmental treaties.
- Increasing use of Framework Convention/Protocol approach – where individual countries negotiate specific actions and targets on the basis of a broader, framework treaty.
- The tragedy of the commons is said to be a failure of assurance – people will restrain their own actions if they know others will do the same, but not if they do not have this assurance.
- Thus the need for treaties and agreements.

### Realist, Liberal and Critical Analyses

- **Realists**: environmental problems will remain on the periphery of international relations (in theory and practice).
- Realists also predict that states will only be interested in environmental issues if they are also security issues (e.g., Pacific island states).
- **Neoliberal institutionalists**: continued work on improving the effectiveness of environmental regimes.
- Neoliberals believe that states pursue their self-interest in environmental issues; thus more vulnerable states will tend to pursue pro-environmental policies.
- **Critical Theorists**: research should extend beyond environmental regimes to economic regimes (WTO, WB, IMF) and the sustainability of global capitalism.
- Critical theorists also tend to emphasise norms and values as drivers of states signing treaties, not merely self-interest.

### The Ecological Security Debate

- Growing potential for natural resource conflicts.
- Growing range of direct threats to environmental health and safety, such as spread of disease.
- Instabilities arising from the mass migration of ecological refugees.
- Increasing risk of sporadic acts of eco-sabotage or environmental terrorism.
- The ecologically destructive power of the military (agent orange, nuclear weapons).
- There is a debate about whether or not environmental problems should be classed as ‘security problems’ and placed in the same category as security studies.

### 4.5 Global Politics of Climate Change

#### Carbon Levels and Global Warming

- Eleven of the last 12 years (1995-2006) rank among the twelve warmest years in the instrumental record of global surface temperature (since 1850).
- Global warming of more than 2 degree above pre-industrial levels significantly increases the chance of ‘dangerous’ climate change
- To keep temp below 2 to 2.4 degrees we need to stabilize at between 350-400 ppm CO2 (or 445-490 CO2 equivalent concentration); yet even at these concentrations there is still 25-80% chance that warming will exceed 2 degrees
- We are already at 385ppm and rising at 2ppm per year
- To reduce the risk of more than 2 degree warming, global emissions would need to peak before 2015, with 50% to 85% reductions on 2000 levels by 2050 (IPCC 4AR, p.20)
- These means that rich countries would need to cut by around 90% to allow room for developing countries to grow

**Consequences of not Cutting Emissions**
- More frequent and more severe droughts, floods, hurricanes and other ‘extreme weather’
- Sea level rise – land losses projected to range from 1% in Egypt, 6% in the Netherlands, 17.5% in Bangladesh and 80% in the Marshall Islands
- Decreasing water availability and increasing drought in mid-latitude and semi-arid and low latitude regions
- Overall loss of agricultural productivity, and a shift in location of production
- Species extinction
- Coral bleaching
- Increased damage to coasts and coastal infrastructure
- Increasing morbidity and mortality from heatwaves, floods and droughts
- Change in disease vectors
- The Gaurum and Stern reports both agree that the long-run costs of inaction exceed the costs of action
- For example, the costs of Australia playing its proportionate part in an effective global effort, while considerable, are manageable (around 0.1 to 0.2% p.a. of economic growth to 2020).
- ‘On a balance of probabilities, the failure of our generation on climate change mitigation would lead to consequences that would haunt humanity until the end of time’ – Ross Garnaut

**UN Convention on Climate Change 1992**
- Objectives: ...to achieve “stabilization of greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system”
- To do this within a time-frame sufficient to protect ecosystems, food production and economic development
- The Parties should protect the climate system for the benefit of present and future generations of humankind, on the basis of equity and in accordance with their common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities.
- Accordingly, the developed country Parties should take the lead in combating climate change and the adverse effects thereof. (Article 3(1));
- However, there were no binding targets or timetables
- In 1995, the Berlin Mandate met to work out binding target cuts, in order to actually achieve something – these were finally decided upon in 1997 at Kyoto

**The Kyoto Protocol 1997**
- Developed countries (‘annex 1 nations’) agreed to reduce their aggregate levels of greenhouse gas emissions below 1990 levels by an average of 5.2% by the commitment period 2008-2012
• The individual commitments of particular states varied from an 8% cut to a 10% increase
• Kyoto was flexible in many areas: it permitted emissions trading between countries, joint projects between nations, and green investment in Third World nations credited to first world
• Australia is among the top 20 greenhouse gas emitters in the world, and about the 2nd or 3rd highest per capita
• The Kyoto protocol came into force after Russia ratified it in 2005, at which point the 55% total global emissions requirement had been reached
• As of August 2008, 181 states have ratified

Political Responses
• Bush and Howard both argued against the Kyoto Protocol using three main reasons:
  o Uncertain science (now mostly dropped)
  o KP would be ineffective without developing country participation
  o Would harm the economy
• However, the Rudd government:
  o Ratified the Kyoto Protocol
  o Supports a national targets and a cap-and-trade system
  o Commissioned the Garnaut report on the economic costs of climate change
  o Supported a Mandatory Renewable Energy Target of 20% by 2020
  o Has supported a long-term target of 60% reduction below 2000 levels by 2050 (2020 interim target not yet announced)

Analyzing the Kyoto Protocol
• Skeptics argue that:
  o The Kyoto Protocol is a failure because the world’s two biggest aggregate emitters – the US and China - are not parties
  o Kyoto targets are negligible (c. 5%)
  o Not all Kyoto parties are on track to meet their targets
  o There is too much flexibility – merely offsetting or investing in China, not actually changing or cutting emissions at source, opposition to carbon trading
• Optimists argue that:
  o The first commitment period (2008-2012) is really only a test drive; the next period (2013-2020) is the ‘main game’
  o KP result of 10 years of painstaking negotiations that have est. an architecture for future cooperation;
  o Ratified by 181 states, based on widely accepted (except for US) environmental justice norms of common but differentiated responsibility

The Bali Compromise
• Parties agreed to reach a decision on a long-term global goal for emissions reductions by COP15 at Copenhagen (Dec 2009)
• Recent science estimates 25-40% cuts needed by 2020 to avoid 2% warming
• Developed countries agreed to negotiate ‘measurable, reportable and verifiable’ mitigation measures, including emission reductions targets
• Developing countries also agreed to pursue ‘measurable, reportable and verifiable’ mitigation measures, but without mandatory targets
Differential treatment between developed and undeveloped world, but developing world agreed to non-binding measures and programs, which they did not do at Kyoto

There was agreement on action to reduce emissions from deforestation (responsible for around 20% of GHGs)

**Australia’s Progress**

- According to the AGO, Australia’s GHG emissions are now projected to be around 109% by 2008-12, and thus we are basically on track to meet Kyoto
- However, this is only because we managed to get land clearance emissions included, and land clearance had dropped off significantly since 1990 – with this clause out emissions are +125%
- Australia does not have a 2020 target yet

**Progress in Other Countries**

- Germany – minus 40% by 2020 (and minus 21% by 2012)
- UK – aiming for minus 26-32% by 2020
- EU as a whole, though more for north and less for south – minus 20% by 2020 (will increase to minus 30% if other industrialised countries make comparable reductions
- Both US president candidates essentially support only stabilization of US emissions by 2020
- US’s Kyoto target is a 7% cut by 2012 – now beyond the reach of the US!
- All depends on what targets are set for 2020 at next international conferences

**Section 5: Human Rights and Poverty**

**5.1 Humanitarian Intervention**

**Defining Humanitarian Intervention**

- Humanitarian intervention is the use or threat of force by a state, to prevent or end widespread and grave violations of the fundamental human rights of individuals other than its own citizens, without the permission of the state within whose territory force is applied
- Two types of humanitarian emergencies:
  - Orchestrated by the state – ethnic cleansing, genocide, etc
  - Structural crises – ongoing human suffering in form of famine, malnutrition, etc.

**Defining UN Peacekeeping**

- This is different from UN peacekeeping missions, which enter with the consent of the state, and have only a very limited mandate to use force (self defence only)
- Their purpose is to keep the peace between warring sides, not to get involved
- Since 1948, UN has been involved in 63 peacekeeping operations around the world
- Currently 18 peacekeeping operations, involving around 100,000 military, police civilian personnel
- Biggest current challenge is the crisis in Darfur region of Sudan

**Intervention during the Cold War**

- Nonintervention was the guiding rule during the Cold War period (1948-1989)
- This is enshrined numerous times in the UN charter
- General ban on the use of force except for self-defence (Article 2(4))
- UN prohibited from intervening in the domestic affairs of states, except under chapter VII 2(7)
• Chapter VII confers power on the UNSC to authorise military interventions to restore international peace and security
• UNSC given wide discretion to interpret the meaning of ‘threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression’ Article 39, and what ‘measures’ to take (Art. 41-42)
• Notable Cold War interventions included India into East Pakistan (1971), Tanzania into Uganda (1978) to stop Amin, and Vietnam into Cambodia (1979) to stop the Kymer Rouge
• In none of these cases, however, was the invasion justified as humanitarian intervention, but rather were argued as self-defence

Interventions in the 1990s
• 1. Operation ‘Provide Comfort’ in Iraq in 1991 to protect the Shia and the Kurds – not particularly controversial
• 2. In Somalia the clash between War Lords (after the overthrow of President Siad Barre in 1991) leads to famine
• UNSC passed res. 794 to authorise a US-led military intervention to secure humanitarian relief
• The long-term objectives were unclear, however, and the US withdrew after death of 18 US soldiers – thus the mission failed
• 3. Bosnia-Herzegovina 1992-1995 began as peacekeeping operation authorised by UNSC but with limited mandate; res. 836 in 1993 which authorised forces to ‘deter attacks’ failed to prevent massacre of thousands of Muslims by Serbs – Peacekeeping mandate too limited
• Violence escalated to a stage where UNSC authorised NATO bombing campaign in 1995
• This bombing campaign was seen as ‘too little, too late’, and thus it gave rise to a debate about the need for more decisive action in humanitarian cases
• 4. A big turning point was the failure of the UN peacekeeping force to prevent genocide of 800,000 Tutsis in Rwanda
• 5. Russia and China opposed any UN sanctioned offensive in Kosovo to stop the persecution and murder of ethnic Albanians by the Serbian leader Slobodan Milosovich
• NATO then decided to conduct an aerial bombing campaign, followed by sending in ground troops – though technically illegal, many felt it was justified
• 6. East Timor 1999 (reluctant consent?)

The Darfur Situation
• In 2004 UNSC condemned the human rights abuses of the government-sponsored Janjaweed, and gave them 30 days to disarm; the Sudanese government ignored this
• A ceasefire was agreed and the African Union sent in 7,000 poorly equipped peacekeeping troops, with very limited mandate; they were too poorly equipped to be effective
• On 31 March 2005, the UNSC referred the situation to the Prosecutor of the International Criminal Court. In July 2008, charges of war crimes, genocide, crimes against humanity and murder were filed against Sudan’s President Omar al-Bashir
• In August 2006, the UNSC passed resolution 1706 calling for a new 17,000 peacekeeping force to supplement the 7,000 African Union forces to protect the non-Baggara people in the Darfur region from raids from the Janjaweed militia group recruited from the Baggara tribes. Russia and China abstained. The Resolution ‘invites the consent of the Sudanese government’
• On 31 July 2007 Security Council unanimously adopted resolution 1769, authorizing the deployment of a 26,000-strong hybrid UN-African Union force to Sudan’s western Darfur region (UNAMID) – with Khartoum’s consent but also ongoing obstruction
UNAMID is authorized for an initial period of 12 months, pending extension at a later date; still lacks appropriate equipment and personnel

The Legal Debate
- The Restrictionists argue that the UN Charter prohibits the use of force and enshrines principle of non-intervention; the UN is supposed to keep international law and order, not intervene in internal affairs
- The Counter-restrictionists point to conflicting character of UNC, in that it promotes both non-intervention and human rights
- They also claim UNSC has broad discretion to interpret what amounts to a breach of the peace
- They also point to growing precedents for humanitarian intervention, e.g. the Genocide Convention 1948

The Moral Debate
- Pluralists (communitarian): need to preserve order over justice in international politics; sovereignty must be respected in order to prevent large states from abusing HI to advance vested interests; intervention risks amplifying the risks of international war by diluting ‘good neighbor’ policies of non-intervention.
- Solidarists (cosmopolitan): international community is/ought to be bound together by subscription to common humanitarian principles
- They argue that sovereignty is a privilege rather than a right, and is conditional upon states ‘advancement of citizens’ welfare; it can be suspended when states, through acts of omission or commission, threaten the welfare of the populations in whose name they rule
- The International Commission on Interventions and State Sovereignty in 2001 argued that sovereignty carries with it the responsibility to protect their citizens
- If states unable or unwilling to prevent gross HR abuses, ‘the principle of non-intervention yields to the international responsibility to protect’
- The principle of ‘right to protect’ was unanimously endorsed by the UN member states as part of the World Summit Outcome document in 2005
- They did not, however, adopt the more specific criteria for determining exactly when intervention is justified
- One particular idea that was definitely not adopted was the argument for ‘constructive abstention’ by P5 members in using their veto unless vital national interest at stake

Current Prospects for Intervention
- Scepticism towards military intervention of any kind is running high in the shadow of the Anglo-American intervention in Iraq
- The norm of non-intervention has become more, rather than less important, over time with the proliferation of non-European states, which regard non-intervention as an important principle of justice in an unequal world (legacy of colonialism, etc)
- Smaller states worry that powerful states may take on role of global action heroes in furtherance of their own values and priorities that may not be widely shared
- Indeed, it is necessary that powerful states can and must play the predominant role in such intervention activities, while poor and small nations have little say in the matter
- US currently ‘over-stretched’ and widely disliked, and hence may become more reluctant to act as ‘action hero’
5.2 Human Rights

Natural vs. Positivist Conceptions
- Positivist view of Human Rights states that they are entitlements which are backed by the force of law, and supported by the state; usually specified in black on white on some paper
- The natural rights view argues that rights do not derive from law at all (Though it may be involved), but derive from the nature of human beings themselves
- Human beings, by their nature of being human, can never be means to an end, and must always be ends unto themselves

History of Human Rights
- The natural rights idea of human rights developed in Europe during the Enlightenment
- These ideas were enshrined in the American and French constitutions, which proved to be immensely important for later legal and political thought
- The 19th century saw the expansion of the concept and implementation of human rights across the world – after all, why should some people have rights protection while others do not, simply because of the luck of place of birth
- This included the banning of the slave trade, various treaties made to protect minorities in Eastern Europe, and the Geneva conventions on the laws of war

The UN and Human Rights
- The UN Charter in its preamble declares as a primary purpose of the UN: “promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion.”
- The International Bill of Rights incorporates the ‘roof’ of the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), and the ‘pillars’ of The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (CCPR) and The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (CESCR) of 1966
- Universal Declaration of Human Rights was adopted by the UN General Assembly as a "common standard of achievement"
- UDHR is not a treaty, however, its provisions have become part of international customary law
- The key purpose of the UNDHR is to outline human rights, emphasizing that these rights apply to everyone – even Hitler
- However, the declaration only outlines what human rights are, but does not do anything about implementing and enforcing them

The Two Rights Covenants
- The UDHR was codified with the adoption of two Covenants in 1966: the CCPR, and the CESCR
- The two covenants are different in nature because of different type of rights that each addresses
- The idea of the two covenants was that any country who signed them would be legally required to enforce these rights in domestic law
- It took almost two decades to negotiate these, and another full decade for them to be ratified
- These covenants explain the rights in more detail, and then outline the obligations of those states who sign the treaty
- The idea of these covenants is that all these rights are universal, inalienable, and indivisible (must accept all the rights, not just some)
• The Covenant contains a provision for suspending or qualifying these rights in times of emergency, though some (the right to life, freedom of thought and religion, protection from slavery and torture, etc.) cannot ever be derogated.
• In addition, there are many conditions that must be met for these rights to be suspended:
  • For instance, it must be temporary, it must be universal, it must be announced, etc.

Other Major Rights Treaties
• The Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (CERD), 1965
• The Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, 1979
• The Convention against Torture (CAT), 1984
• The Convention on the Rights of the Child, 1989
• The Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and its Protocol, 1951 and 1967
• These and other treaties have made much progress in setting out what human rights are, now we need to work on the enforcement and observational mechanisms.
• The other big question is how universal rights fit in with cultural and religious differences.

5.3 Trade Liberalization and WTO

Critiques of Comparative Advantage
• The mercantilists believed that a nation increased its wealth by expanding exports and restricting imports, thus building up ‘treasure’.
• The realist critique: a purely market-driven global division of labour between states might compromise the security of those states that forego development of a home-grown military-industrial capacity.
• Developmentalist critique: Excessive specialization by poor developing countries in commodity trade may ‘lock’ them at the bottom of the value chain.
• Selective protection of ‘infant industries’ would enable developing states to develop capacities in higher-value industries that will increase their wealth more rapidly.

Historical Background
• The victors of WWII wanted to undo the high-tariff, autarkical world economic system which was considered to have contributed to the outbreak of WWII.
• At the Bretton Woods negotiations in 1944, a number of institutions were established, including:
  • The International Monetary Fund
  • The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD); later World Bank
  • The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) was signed in 1947 (this agreement was incorporated into the WTO, created in 1995)
• At a series of meeting and conferences over the coming decades, tariffs were progressively reduced between western nations.
• During the post-war period up to the late 1970s, the dominant political economy ideology was ‘Embedded liberalism’, which included a general acceptance of government intervention to ensure macro-economic stability and equitable income distribution (Keynesianism and government ownership).
• This consensus broke down in the late 1970s, and gave way to Neo-liberalism, which incorporated a more robust commitment to the operation of market forces unfettered by government intervention or regulation, notably deregulation, privatization, and trade liberalisation (facilitated by the GATT and now the WTO).
This shift in policy increased the debate about and importance of trade liberalization in the 1980s and 1990s.

**The World Trade Organization**
- At the conclusion of the Uruguay Round in 1994, the GATT was amended and folded into the newly established WTO, which commenced operation in January 1995.
- The WTO has 153 members, accounting for over 97% of world trade; developing countries now constitute around 75% of the WTO membership.
- The WTO operates through:
  - A standing General Council, which superintends the Dispute Settlement Body and the numerous specialised councils and committees.
- Disputes are heard by dispute panels (panels of experts in a particular trade area); appeals are taken to an Appellate Body made up of judges.
- Decisions in the WTO are made by the entire membership (trade rounds are agreed as a ‘single undertaking’, typically by consensus) – this is why agreements take so long to make.
- WTO members have to change a variety of domestic laws to make them consistent with WTO principles.
- In addition, if countries refuse the decisions of WTO dispute councils, the other nation is entitled to put up retaliatory trade barriers – decisions are binding on the parties.

**Principles of the Trading System**
1. Nondiscrimination between countries or between domestic and foreign firms.
2. Reciprocity – mutual reduction in tariffs.
3. Transparency.
4. Periodic negotiations between the contracting parties to promote further liberalisation.

**Rounds of Trade Negotiations**
- Earlier rounds of trade negotiations under the GATT (from the late 1940s to the late 1980s) had focused mainly on bringing down tariffs on manufactured goods.
- The ‘Uruguay round’ (1986-1994) was the most ambitious and complex so far; included agreements on services (banking, insurance, tourism, telecommunications), trade in intellectual property rights, trade-related investment measures and agricultural goods.
- These included General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS), Trade Related Investment Measures (TRIMs), and Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPs).
- The WTO’s Agriculture Agreement was negotiated in the 1986–94 Uruguay Round; designed to improve market access and reduce trade-distorting subsidies in agriculture.
- Further negotiations on Agriculture began in 2000 on to improve market access, reduce exports subsidies and reduce other domestic support.
- The failure of these negotiations is a major reason for the suspension of the Doha Development round; major cleavage between EU and US, and the ‘Cairns group’/developing countries.
- The Doha round has been increasingly preoccupied with concerns to developing countries, particularly European and US farm subsidies (Australia has teamed up with developing countries on this issue).
Free Trade Controversies

- Free trade position: trade liberalization promises to maximize global economic growth and facilitate convergence of incomes in the long-term (rising tide lifts all boats)
- Current inequalities and global poverty due to failure of developed states to liberalize in sectors, e.g. labor-intensive manufactures and agriculture) in which poor countries have a competitive advantage.
- One counter-argument is that even full trade liberalization would result in uneven global economic development and a widening of the income gap between rich and poor countries
- Commitment to free trade encourages a ‘race to the bottom’ in terms of welfare standards, as well as impacting detrimentally on workers and communities working in ‘uncompetitive’ sectors of the economy
- Free trade enables developing countries to utilise their comparative advantage in cheap labour
- Counter-argument: WTO has no rules to prevent the growth of ‘sweatshops’ or poor labour conditions in developing countries; fair labour standards are a human right and should be respected globally (International Labour Organisation)
- The free trade position – ‘cultural’ industries (e.g. film, radio, TV) are no different from other industries, and should be subject to the laws of the global free market in order to maximize competition and consumer choice
- The cultural protectionist argument – governments should subsidies local ‘cultural’ industries (e.g. through provision of local content rules, provision of subsidies to local performers) in order to cultivate and sustain a distinct sense of national identity in the face of globalizing cultural
- Free Trade Argument – Intellectual Property Rights must be globally respected and recognized to maintain incentives to invest and innovate in the development of new technologies and medicines/vaccines needed for the alleviation of public health problems (e.g. the AIDS pandemic) in the developed and developing worlds
- Counter-argument – Trade-Related Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) unfairly restrict the access of the poor to vital anti-HIV/AIDS drugs; they are simply too expensive

The Environment

- Trade liberalization encourages a more environmentally efficient use of resources and leads to technological innovation and capacity building that enhances the ability of states to protect the environment
- The environmental exceptions in the WTO rules are adequate to ensure that states can protect their environment while ensuring environmental regulations do not constitute ‘disguised protectionism’
- Counter-Arguments: Trade liberalization encourages increasing world output, including increasing use of energy and natural resources and the increasing production of waste and greenhouse gases, all of which increase global environmental degradation
- The environmental exceptions are negative and inadequate, and there is no positive requirement that trade should be ecologically sustainable
- The WTO regime undermines the effectiveness of many environmental regimes because of its powerful dispute settlement mechanism – far more powerful than environmentalists

Democracy

- Free-traders argue that membership of the WTO is voluntary, and that the rules are decided by the representatives of member states
Critiques argue that this is a very indirect form of democracy; not enough role for NGOs or debate in national parliaments.

Free traders: National leaders require insulation from protectionists’ lobbying in order to advance free trade agenda that is ultimately in material interests of all consumers.

Critiques: insulation of trade delegates from popular scrutiny and accountability at WTO meetings detracts from the democratic legitimacy of the proceedings, and enables WTO to formulate and impose policies that lack popular support.

WTO rules increasingly encroaching on areas of decision-making that were formerly the exclusive preserve of national governments, raising serious concerns about the impact of trade liberalization on national sovereignty and democracy.

Since the ‘battle in Seattle’ in 1999s, the WTO has increased its efforts to pro-actively engage with NGOs and members of global civil society – increase its transparency.

What should be the boundaries of the WTO?

5.4 Global Inequality

Conceptions of Poverty

- The Orthodox view: Poverty seen as the lack of income to fulfil basic needs
- Need to reduce unemployment and introduce a commercial economy in traditional areas
- Need economic reform, open economies, integration into the global market, less state intervention, free trade, market oriented societies
- Critical Alternatives: primitive/communal societies are not necessarily poor, and can provide basic needs for all members of the community – money and employment not everything
- Western approaches to economics are not applicable to everyone
- The market economy destroys community ties and values and destroys the human spirit

Millennium Development Goals

- Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger
- Achieve universal primary education
- Promote gender equality and empower women
- Reduce child mortality
- Improve maternal health
- Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases
- Ensure environmental sustainability
- Develop a global partnership for development

Conceptions of Hunger

- The UN estimates that current food production provides enough calories to provide every person with something like 150% of the needed calorific intake
- Despite this, there are about 800 million malnourished people in the world
- The mainstream view focuses on excessive population levels, and the need to control fertility
- They also focus on increasing food production through genetically modified crops, economic modernisation and liberalisation, etc
- The alternative view holds that it is not production but distribution that is the problem
- Need global social, political and economic reforms needed to achieve parity
- Most at risk are landless rural labourers in Latin America and South-East Asia, and nomadic pastoralists in Africa
Defining Economic Globalisation

- In economic terms, globalisation involves the spatial reorganisation of production and spread of markets and corporations across national frontiers, privatisation and deregulation of industry, removal of tariffs and growth in world trade, increased mobility of capital and spread of financial markets, and increase in identical consumer products sold all over the world, and an intensification of economic interdependence, 567
- Technological advancements in communications and information technology have increased the flow of information, peoples, ideas and culture around the world, contributing to the growth of a new world culture, and a harmonisation of tastes and standards, 567
- Globalisation includes quantitative shifts (more of the same), and qualitative shifts (the development of new global networks and interconnectedness), 568
- Liberals argue that globalisation is the inevitable result of technological progress, and that it will help promote democracy and economic development through free trade, 568
- Critics argue that the growing role of market forces and the diminishing role of the state has created a ‘democratic deficit’, 568

Criticisms of Economic Globalisation

- Critics argue that globalisation causes and deepens poverty and increases inequality, 572
- First, they argue that without capital, the poor cannot benefit from globalisation, 572
- They also argue that globalisation creates opportunities which inevitably some nations are better at taking advantage of than others, thus widening inequalities, 572
- Dependency theorists argue that the affluence of the rich countries and their exploitation of the poor ‘periphery’ is the cause of their poverty, 572
- Another argument is that globalisation and free trade has turned the third world into an ‘open reserve’ of cheap labour and natural resources, while structural adjustment programs and so on, have undermined the ability of poor nations to build their economies, 572

The Orthodox View of Development

- The orthodox liberal view: development means economic growth
- The aim is the transformation of traditional “backward” economies into “modern” industrial economies – end of self-sufficiency through the production of surpluses
- Individuals sell labour for money rather than produce family needs at home
- Economic growth will produce a trickle down of wealth to the poor
- Measured as economic growth and GDP per capita
- Reliance on “expert knowledge”, capital investment in large projects
- Poverty is a condition suffered by people who do not earn enough money to satisfy their basic material requirement in the market place
- Development as economic growth through the free market has been successful and must be applied worldwide

The Alternative View of Development

- Creation of human well-being through sustainable societies (political, economic, social)
- Self-sufficiency and self-reliance
- Local priorities with “community controlled” commons
- Value of nature and cultural diversity
- Measured as a fulfilment of basic material and non-material human needs for everyone
- Political empowerment of marginalised people
• Reliance on appropriate local knowledge and technology
• Small investment in small scale projects
• Protection of the commons
• Poverty is lack of access to community-regulated common resources, the erosion of community ties and spiritual values
• Development as creation of human well-being through sustainable societies

5.5 The Refugee Crisis

Refugee Controversies
• There are a growing number of ‘boat people’ trying to escape from African nations like Somalia, as well as Mexican immigrants to the US
• To what extent should countries be free to prevent asylum seekers, Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) or economic/climate refugees from entering their territory?
• To what extent should the international community penalise refusal, given the difficulties of enforcing hospitality on the part of unwilling states?
• Communitarians say that state sovereignty means that states can control their borders and who crosses them
• Cosmopolitans say that everyone has certain basic rights, and hence every country has a duty to provide for those in need

Historical Context
• 1870-1914: large scale population movements, minimally regulated; mostly Chinese and Indians moving abroad, and Europeans migrating to America
• 1914-1945: contraction of international migration, as caused by war and depression (need to prevent overburdening of welfare state)
• 1945-1970s: birth and development of international refugee regime
• 1970s onwards: growth of international refugee population, especially since 1980s/1990s (refugees from collapse of USSR, Vietnamese boat people, Iraq, Africa and Afghanistan)
• Future challenge: fear of growing number of ‘environmental refugees’
• In 1951 was signed the Geneva Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees – initially limited to protecting mainly European refugees, particularly those victims of Nazi persecution, including Jews, homosexuals, Poles, etc
• In a 1967 Protocol it was expanded to rest of world
• The number of refugees has declined from 1992 peak (17.8m) to 9.7m in 2003, although number of IDPs has increased (25m in 2005, up from 3m in 1982)
• The vast majority of the world’s refugees can be found in neighbouring developing states rather than in the wealthy states of the developed North

Defining Refugees
• A refugee is: ‘A person who is outside his/her country of nationality or habitual residence; has a well-founded fear of persecution because of his/her race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group or political opinion; and is unable or unwilling to avail himself/herself of the protection of that country, or to return there, for fear of persecution’ (Article 1, 1951 Geneva Convention)
Note that this strict definition only includes those peoples specifically singled out for persecution, and precludes those fleeing general warfare, poverty and people fleeing autocratic governments.

This definition excludes:
- Migrants, or persons suffering economic hardship
- Internally displaced persons (IDPs) who have crossed an international border into a second country seeking sanctuary
- Soldiers, although former soldiers may qualify
- Environmental refugees

**Asylum Seekers**

- An asylum seeker is a person requesting refugee status under the Geneva Convention
- The 1951 Refugee Convention does not actually guarantee anyone the right to asylum, *only the right to seek it*
- States still have the right to decide who should be allowed entry, and to determine the mechanisms/procedures for determining how to decide who gets asylum
- Unlike the HR regime, there is no supranational authority to receive individual or interstate petitions, complaints or appeals – also no enforcement
- However, the principle of *non-refoulement* states that states must not return a refugee to a country where his or her life or freedom would be threatened (Article 33)
- *Non-refoulement* is also a principle of customary international law, and so is binding on all states, even if they are not a party to the 1951 Convention

**UN High Commission for Refugees**

- Limited mandate: the UNHCR is not empowered to take preventive action, only to provide assistance to refugees in times of crisis
- It was set up to play a non-political and strictly humanitarian role
- However, the UNHCR is limited in its independence and operations by its reliance on voluntary funding from donor states – harder to criticize their practices regarding refugees
- The UNHCR assists with the integration of refugees into the destination country, voluntary return to homeland *once danger has abated*, and resettlement in ‘third’ countries

**Limitations of the UNHCR**

- Some argue that the scope of ‘refugee’ is too narrow, given its post-WWII origins
- There is no obligation on source states to prevent persecution, which seems rather contradictory given the elaborate mechanism for dealing with refugees
- In addition, despite various rights of refugees, they do not have the ‘right of assistance’ from wealthy states
- Seekers of asylum often compelled to rely on ‘people smugglers’
- The vast majority of the world’s refugees can be found in neighbouring developing states rather than in the wealthy states of the developed North

**For and Against Border Protection**

- Quarantine and preventing the spread of communicable diseases
- Interception of terrorists and criminals, suppression of people smuggling and trafficking
- Prevention of widespread social and political dislocation from large scale unregulated population movements (especially for fragile and weak states)
• Communitarian argument regarding the imperative of maintaining and preserving a distinctive collective ‘self’ or cohesive national identity as the foundation of a functioning political community – states have the right to do this

• Cosmopolitans would want to expand the right to seek asylum to the right to enjoy it, would want to build in appeals, etc, and would want to expand the definition of refugee to poor, etc

• They argue that the principle of granting refugees the right to seek asylum is enshrined in the Refugees Convention and Article 14 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights

• This embodies a widely held international norm relating to a collective international responsibility to protect the vulnerable who are fleeing persecution

Australia and Refugees
• Australia has historically been a strong supporter of the international refugee regime, having resettled 645,000 refugees or displaced persons since 1945

• Played a major role in receiving refugees from Indochina in the 1970s – Fraser argued on the basis of fulfilling our international obligations and being hospitable

• Australia is one of only a handful of countries to accept quotas of refugees on an annual basis through participation in UNHCR’s resettlement program

• However, Australia’s border protection regime became much more ‘hard line’ from 2001 under the Howard government

Border Protection under Howard
• Mandatory detention of unauthorised entrants and pro-active deterrence of asylum seekers

• Excision of outlying islands from ‘Australian migration zone’ (withdrew an attempt to excise entire mainland in a 2006 bill) – this means that people landing in these islands do not have to have their claims processed

• Enhanced anti-people smuggling initiative

• Policy of mandatory detention of asylum seekers is arguably inconsistent with both the spirit of the Refugee Convention as well as a range of other international human rights regimes to which Australia is signatory

• Interception of MV Tampa and excision of outlying islands from ‘Australian migration zone’ also outside the spirit of international law

Labour Party Reforms
• Detention in immigration detention centres will no longer be used as a deterrent, only as a last resort for risk management purposes and for the shortest practicable time

• Children will not be detained

• A person who poses no danger to the community will be able to remain in the community while their visa status is resolved

• The detention centre on Nauru has been closed

• Yet many small islands in Australia’s territory remain excised from the immigration zone, including Christmas island

• Temporary protection visas still in place