

Chap 5

What are the BRICS? Do they represent a cohesive economic unit and power bloc?

- The 'BRICS' began as an acronym that referred to four emerging economies: Brazil, China, India and Russia.
- By 2025, the BRICs would account for over half of the size of the G7 in terms of GDP.
- In less than 40 years, the BRICs economies together could be larger than the G7
- China and India as the suppliers of manufactured goods and services, while Brazil and Russia would become similarly dominant as suppliers of raw materials.
- An enormous potential consumer market, complemented by access to regional markets, and an abundant workforce.
- Fragility and vulnerability.
- World trade has slowed.
- A diplomatic grouping.
- A bargaining coalition or even a proto-alliance designed to balance the power of the United States.

Are they strong enough to affect international order?

Yes

- Most change in world politics is incremental and gradual
- Rising powers' diplomatic achievements have been considerable and have persisted despite a more adverse international environment
- The capacity of the United States to unilaterally reassert its hegemony and to use its coercive military and other power to achieve its goals is, and will remain, limited.
- Today's emerging powers are far more centrally a part of the global economy and international system, despite the economic slowdown.
- The power of today's rising powers is not just their economic resource.
- It derives from the role that they are playing with functional institutions created to deal with ever more pressing sets of challenges (such as the management of the global economy, climate change, and nuclear proliferation). And it derives from their equality necessary role in the creation of legitimate institutions and representative structures of global governance.

No

- Realists are right that military power remains the most important source of power in international relations. There is no challenger to the United States, and its dominance of the new military technologies means that this supremacy is set to continue well into the future.
- The US continues to have unparalleled influence over international institutions and global governance. It can use its agenda-setting power to shape new norms and to decide what gets decided. Faced with the deadlock of existing institutions or criticism of its policies, It has a unique capacity to create alternative options. For example, it has brought together groups of like-minded states to negotiate so-called mega-regional trade blocs across the Atlantic and Pacific. The marginal role of emerging world in these negotiations is a clear sign of their weakness in global order.

- BRICS and similar groupings face deep divisions that have prevented them from achieving cohesion and influence. For all the talk of new coalitional politics, China, India and Russia are competitor for power and their economic preferences and interests are strongly divergent. They have very little in common.

Chap 14

National-international.

Two types of war.

- Civil war within a state
- International war between two or more sovereign states.

What does it mean that war has both national-international and global dimensions?

- Many contemporary wars are 'civil' wars in that they are fought on the territory of a sovereign state, and ultimately concern how and by whom that territory is to be governed. But these civil wars involve international actors like the UN, NATO and NGOs, foreign fighters like jihadis. And the covert or overt involvement of foreign states.
- Religions and politics bond together actors across borders.
- These international dimensions of 'civil' war show how the political groups and forces that wage war are in tension with, and spread across, the sovereign territories of the national-international world.

Does democracy create peace among states?

For

- Immanuel Kant though representative government could bring an end to war. In *Perpetual Peace*, written in 1795, Kant argued that Europe would always be at peace if it were composed only of republic which obeyed the rule of law; guaranteed freedom of travel; and were members of an international federation (Kant 1991: 93-130)
- Statistical tests suggest Kant might have been right. Depending on the exact definitions and data sets used, the finding is that no or very few democratic states have waged war against one another since 1816
- Democratic institutions make it harder for a state to go to war. Separation of powers in government, the rule of law, and a free media and public opinion all constrain the ability of leaders to go to war.
- Democrats do not like to go to war against other democrats. Liberal opinion in one democracy will argue against going to war against another democracy. According to John Owen (1998), this is why Britain and the US did not go to war against one another after the War of 1812 despite serious crises in the nineteenth century.

Against

- Statistical studies linking democracy with peace are problematic. Prior to 1939, there were very few democracies, especially if one considers are democratic only a state with universal adult suffrage. After 1947, liberal democracies were allied with one another against the Soviet bloc and had no reason to go to war with each other.

- Democratic states have fought against democratic movements. Western states have wages war against popular insurgencies, such as anti-colonial movements or revolts against authoritarian governments allied with the West.
- Democracies fight covert wars that do not appear in statistical tests. The US overthrew a number of elected regimes if feared were susceptible to communism during the cold war, but used the CIA and foreign proxies to do so
- Explanations for peace are to be found at the level of the international system, not regime type. Factors such as the balance of power, the relationship between the global North and South, or the advent of nuclear weapons better explain when wars occur and what kinds of wars are fought.

Chap 15.

Realist's view

- Realism/Neorealism's key assumptions of anarchy in the international system and state sovereignty
- Push for military power by states for self-protection (self-help system)
- Uncertain international climate means that self-help and survival become paramount
- Cooperation is limited by fear of cheating on agreements, lack of enforcement power, and concern for relative gain over absolute gain
- War is always a possibility

Liberal Institutionalism

- Peace (or at least cooperation) through institutions
- Collective security
- Arms control and disarmament
- International institutions and both state and non-state actors
- Example of European-North American relations
- Role of institutions? Provide information, reduce transaction costs, make commitments more credible, establish focal points for coordination and facilitate the operation of reciprocity
- Democratic Peace Thesis

Old vs. New Geopolitics – Richard Falk

- Old geopolitics (dominated by the US, administered from Washington, Western-centric) has not accounted for the collapse of colonialism and the relative weakening of US primacy
- New geopolitics is emerging fueled by globalization based less on hard military power and more on soft power
- For example, rise of BRIC countries and growth in importance of numerous non-state actors
- The US' wineless withdrawals from Afghanistan and Iraq show that superior military might does not guarantee successfully achieving political goals in violent conflicts
- Yet, adherents to the OG cannot seem to learn from failure, which continues the cycle of war.

Chap 16. GPE

What is GPE

- A search for explanation of the events in the global economy
- Mutual interplay of politics and economics
- Focusing both on structure & agency, understanding that not only do political outcomes have impacts on economic spheres, but also that the economic can constrain and shape the political sphere
- Key focus on power (recognizing the influence of power relations on the economic)
- The relationship between power and wealth
- 'States and markets'
- Interplay of public and private power in the allocation of scarce resources'

Areas of Studying in GPE

- Trade
- Finance
- Production

Increasingly also:

- Development
- Inequality
- Environment
- Migration
- Regionalism
- IOs and global governance

Chap 17

Is war inherently masculine

For

- Historically, virtually all soldiers have been male. It has been very rare indeed for women to contribute to combat forces in significant numbers. This is true over great periods of time and across many societies that differ in other respects, strongly suggesting that there is something that closely bond men, masculinity, and war, for good or ill.
- Male physiology is well suited to war. Average physically stronger than women.
- The military is a special kind of institution. Even if historical and biological considerations can be overcome, and armed forces serve a distinctive social function. The task of the military is not to represent a population fairly, but to protect it effectively. Militaries work best when they are made up of units of men prepared to make great sacrifices for each other. Regardless of whether women have the ability to serve on equal terms, preserving military cohesion must be the pre-eminent consideration, even if that means indulging the prejudices of male soldiers.

Against

- The historical record is neither neutral nor exhaustive. Where women have been formally forbidden from joining armies, their absence from battle does not prove that they cannot be effective soldiers. They have simply not been given the chance.

- Assumptions about the violent nature or physical superiority of male bodies are deeply flawed. Testosterone does not play an uncomplicated or unmediated role in enabling violence. Women are only now being allowed into the most grueling training courses; it is misleading to extrapolate from the failing of a few innovators to a judgement of women's physical capabilities in general. Male bodies fail too, and female soldiers have already completed many advanced military training programmes.
- Militaries are complex institutions undertaking complex missions. Many military tasks are better suited to intelligence and situational awareness than to raw physical strength. Professional militaries have integrated women on a greater scale in recent decades precisely because women offer skills that their male colleagues may lack. Studies have shown the hyper-masculine culture distinctive of modern militaries may in fact hamper cohesion and reduce mission effectiveness. Diverse militaries are strong militaries.

Chap 18 – Race in World Politics

Chap 19 – International Law

Does international law have any real effect on the nature and conduct of international relations?

For

- International law creates states as primary actors in world politics. Sovereign states don't just exist as self-created entities; they are creations of international society. To have sovereignty is to have certain rights as a legitimate actor, and these rights (as well as responsibilities) are embedded in international norms and practices, and recognized by other sovereign states. International law is the principal site in which the rights that come with sovereignty are codified.
- Legitimacy is crucially important to states, and international law is one of its principal sources. If states can present themselves as legitimate actors, with legitimate interests, acting in legitimate ways, then others will step out of their way, or even cooperate with them. States are thus always seeking to bolster their legitimacy, and casting their goals and actions as consistent with international law is a common and robust means of doing this.
- Levels of compliance with international law are high, even by the domestic standard. This is not entirely because states often negotiate international laws that suit their interests. Some of the most important international laws involve states limiting their power to further order or justice. For example, the United Nations Charter places legal restraints on the use of force that can be against the immediate interests of particular states but serve the wider interests of international society.
- When states break international law, they almost always reference it, thus reinforcing its status as a legitimate standard of international conduct. Few law-breaking states claim that international law is irrelevant or invalid. Instead, they deny that they broke

the law, they insist that what they did wasn't covered by any law, or they claim that their actions were a defense of law.

Against

- International law is not real law, and cannot therefore have the same regulatory effects. Real law is created by a central authority – most commonly, a state – and it is enforced by centralized agencies, backed ultimately by the legitimate exercise of force. International law has none of these properties: it is negotiated by sovereign states and enforcement mechanisms are weak or non-existent.
- International law exists only because it serves the interests of the powerful. The existence of extensive and complex bodies of international law is not evidence of law's has none of these properties: it is negotiated by sovereign states and enforcement mechanisms are weak or non-existent.
- The complexity of international law means that almost any actions can be justified. International law is complex and fragmented: multiple, overlapping legal regimes have emerged, often in the same issue-area, and states often encounter conflicting, or at least confusing, global and regional legal norms. This complexity means that states can choose from a menu of international legal norms so varied as to justify almost any conduct.
- International law cannot keep pace with rapid changes in world politics. For example, the laws of war are designed to regulate a particular kind of warfare: between sovereign states, where combatants and non-combatants can be distinguished, and using a particular range of military technologies. Today's wars challenge each of these aspects and profoundly undermine international law's regulatory power.