

DOWNLOAD PDF VALUE PLURALISM, NORMATIVE THEORY, AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Chapter 1 : Pluralism (political theory) - Wikipedia

"The existence of diverse ultimate values and value systems, or value pluralism, is an undeniable reality in the international sphere today. For example, the current debates between Western advocates of human rights and their primarily non-Western critics illustrate this phenomenon.

With the end of the Cold War, the political map of the world has changed dramatically; new normative issues have emerged; the old ones have come to the fore in world politics. While discussing why Normative Theory has had a marginal position in the discipline of IR, the article also examines its content. With his approach, Frost attempts to reconcile the two settled norms of international relations, namely rights and sovereignty. Moreover, Frost emphasises that the IR theorists and academicians have to take normative positions and make them explicit since the original commitment of the discipline is normative itself. Theory, normative theory, constitutive theory, international norms, international relations. In the last two decades we have been witnessing the resurgence of normative theory in IR coinciding with the rise of post-positivist and reflectivist theoretical approaches to the discipline. Normative theorists attempt to clarify basic moral issues and dilemmas of international relations. Nevertheless, the centrality of normative issues has been now more widely acknowledged in world politics. In doing so, Frost attempts to reconcile state sovereignty with the individual rights. Firstly, I will briefly look at what normative theory attempts to do and which issues it takes as its subject of inquiry. Secondly, I will outline the arguments against normative theory, which all had been obstacles for the development of normative theorising in IR. In other words, normative theory addresses the ethical nature of the relations within the state-centric global practice in a wide context of liberty, distributive justice, sovereignty, violence, just war, human rights and so on. Hence, the main question of normative theory is how to link the ethical values of individuals to social institutions in which they live within, such as family, civil society, religious formations, the state, and the system of sovereign states. Moreover, normative theory has a central concern with how to relate the core normative concepts such as freedom, equality, justice, democracy, state autonomy, the meaning of war, etc. Normative theory always presupposes that actors in the practice of international relations do have alternatives and real choices, and can change their conduct. The debates on ethical issues in IR have been brought under two main approaches in order to provide background foundations for normative theories. According to the communitarian approach, the autonomy of states is derived from the nature of individuals as being a member of a community. That is to say, individuals gain their status as a result of their membership of a particular community. The communitarians assert that the state, the only legal representative of a community, has an absolute right to autonomy. Thus, the individuals must accept and live according to the limitations that are determined by this highest authority, namely, the state. Nevertheless, the cosmopolitan approach rejects such an understanding and puts forward a universalist notion. They suggest that the autonomy of states is derived from the nature of individuals as a member of humankind. According to the cosmopolitans, all individuals are a part of the humanity and they are born with certain natural rights, which are applied to any human beings on an equal basis. As a result, the universal rights possessed by the individual override the state autonomy. In other words, the autonomy of a state can be limited by the universal rights. On human rights issues, for communitarians, individuals do not exist as autonomous entities but they receive their identities as a result of being a member of community. Therefore, each community has a right to develop its own social, political, or economic system, and individuals can not make claims beyond the limits of these systems. Cosmopolitans take an universalist position advocating that human rights are possessed by individuals as autonomous moral agents, rather than as members of a community. For them, rights are gained by an individual because of his own status, and therefore they are independent from any particular system of community. Whereas communitarians adopt the norm of non-intervention underpinning order in international society, cosmopolitans accept intervention only if it is justified under specific conditions such as in the preservation of human rights and social justice. On the other

DOWNLOAD PDF VALUE PLURALISM, NORMATIVE THEORY, AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

hand, communitarians do not accept such a global approach to the environmental issues: Therefore, environmental issues are to be considered one of the aspects of state interests. In sum, normative theory faces with a wide range of ethical questions to deal with such as: Do human rights override state autonomy? What is our responsibility for preserving human rights and justice? What kinds of wars are just? What are the justifications for intervention? To what extent is environmental issues a global concern? We can add many more to these. Walzer, Michael, *Just and Unjust Wars: The Ethics of Globalization*, New Haven: Examining the second alternative, which takes international ethics as a fad, Brown discusses two possible theses on how ethics has shifted from the margins of the field to a closer place of the centre: Is the revival of normative theory a response to the decline of American hegemony, or is it a result of post-Cold War politics? According to Brown, the latter is more plausible. He claims that international ethics has not fulfilled the requirements of being a field yet, and it is not possible to be sure about its future. In this positivist formulation of theorising, normative theory has been neglected in IR for a number of different reasons, which involve the predominance of positivism in social sciences, the dominance of realism in the discipline of IR, and the blocking effects of the Cold War politics. The predominance of the positivist approach to the study of IR has invalidated the recognition of the ethical grounds of several issues. *A Pragmatic Approach*, Cambridge: Primarily, researchers using a positivist approach within the study of IR have to choose a research field as well as a theory in order to examine the topic they have chosen. Moreover, the theory which social scientists use to explain their research topic is already embedded in certain normative preferences. So the chosen theory determines the facts, which will be taken into account according to its mainstream assumptions. In the next stage, in order to explain the issue faced with, it is required to make an interpretation viewing from the each side of the problem. In order to do this, the observer or the investigator must engage in normative theory. Another reason, which contributed to keep normative theory in the margins of the discipline, has been the dominance of realist theory in the field of IR. In , Peter Winch combined the insights of these earlier theorists and published his conclusions in his work called *The Idea of a Social Science*. The rational-actor model, which is central to realist thinking, is not value-free itself. Firstly, determining the national objectives requires value choices; and secondly, the means, which will be used to achieve these goals, has to be chosen according to the decision on which one is the best or more efficient. This type of decision-making underlines a value choice. Additionally, Frost claims that the primary actor-state, in its origin, has built into certain normative implications. Frost draws attention to the deep value commitments such as sovereignty and the right to self-determination that have been claimed by states: Participating in a social practice be it a game or a political arrangement like the state or the system of states requires that the participants recognise themselves as bound by a set of rules; that is as bound by certain norms. Thus where a state exists there must be a group of people who see themselves as constituting a state through their mutual recognition of a specified set of rules. According to Frost and Brown, another reason that has invalidated normative theory is the Cold War system itself. In the Cold War period, it was meaningless to make ethical claims within a bipolar system of power and nuclear deterrence. Therefore, the end of the Cold War, the emergence of new states bringing new ethical problems, and the rise of ethical concerns in world politics paved the way for normative theory to flourish in the last two decades. This entails, according to Frost, the construction of a background theory for the institution within which the hard case in question arises. In his construction of a normative theory of international relations, Frost identifies the following steps: First, we must list all those norms in international relations that are considered settled in terms of the modern state domain of discourse. Second, we must attempt to construct the best possible background justification for this settled body of norms. Third, following through on step two, we must apply the procedure of reflective equilibrium. Therefore, Frost offers a list of the settled norms in IR. However, that does not mean that he proposes that most people or states do in fact obey the norm. But rather it means that the states attempt to provide special justifications for their non-compliance with the norm. The settled body of norms in international relations within the modern state domain of discourse is introduced by Frost under four main headings: The list of these settled norms within the modern state domain of discourse, as identified by Frost, is

DOWNLOAD PDF VALUE PLURALISM, NORMATIVE THEORY, AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

as follows: It is settled that the following are goods: The preservation of the society of states. The balance of power. Economic sanctions under specified circumstances. Democratic institutions within states. Human rights Frost, a: In order to elucidate his point, he offers a neo- Hegelian account of how not only individuals within societies, but also individual states within the society of states play mutually constitutive roles, establishing, Frost believes, a meaningful link between constituted individuality and the society of states. Although all social theorists as well as IR scholars have to take normative positions, Frost believes that these are always kept implicit because of the shadow of positivism. This is due to the very fact that every person, every citizen, every family and every state make ethical claims and they take certain ethical stances when they face with normative questions in everyday life. Like them, IR theorists as being human-beings, citizens of a state, members of the global civil society and actors in world politics via their theorising, also find themselves to hold ethical beliefs about typical kinds of issues such as terrorism, war, human rights, environmental problems, migrants, economic and social distributions of food, water, housing education, health care, etc. So far, normative theory has been ignored in the field of IR until the recent changes, which occurred both in the order of political system i. These developments both in theory and practice have given way to the revival of normative theory gaining a place much closer to the centre than a decade ago. In the highlighting of these changes, Neufeld suggests that IR theory must move in a non-positivist direction, and should commit itself to human emancipation. Neufeld takes recent developments such as postmodernist, feminist and normative approaches as evidence of such a current shift in the discipline. In this respect, normative theory provides a crucial account of how we should understand world politics and how the distinct claims in terms of main themes of international relations sovereignty, freedom, human rights, humanitarian intervention, justice, etc. Although it seems hard not to agree with the suggestion that normative theory is not still central to the discipline, and it does not form a unified field of opinions on academic studies; it does not require to ignore the fact that it is necessary to the study of world politics. Since several normative issues and ethical considerations have emerged in the post-Cold War politics, normative theory has an inevitable task to provide theoretical grounds to the practice of world politics. Thus, by setting forth a fundamental attempt to reconcile the morality of individuals and the morality of political communities, Mervyn Frost takes his place amongst the most influential normative theorists. A Handbook of Current Theory London: Fad, Fantasy or Field? New Normative Approaches London: A Pragmatic Approach Cambridge: The Eighty Years Crisis University of Kent at Canterbury.

DOWNLOAD PDF VALUE PLURALISM, NORMATIVE THEORY, AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Chapter 2 : International relations theory - Wikipedia

*Value Pluralism, Normative Theory and International Relations (Millennium) [Maria Lensu, Jan-Stefan Fritz] on www.nxgvision.com *FREE* shipping on qualifying offers. The existence of diverse values and value systems is a reality in the international sphere today.*

Yet, a persistent conventional wisdom suggests ethics are marginal to international relations. This conventional wisdom has two sources. After World War II, as the discipline of international relations was taking shape in the United Kingdom and the United States, a number of prominent scholars holding a realist view on questions of ethics came to dominate the field. Figures such as Hans J. Morgenthau, Reinhold Niebuhr, and E. Carr criticized what they saw as the misplaced moralism of earlier scholars who put their faith in the power of law and institutions to reform international relations. Not long after this move toward a realist paradigm that was skeptical of ethics, the discipline also began to focus on developing a value-free social scientific approach that rejected ethical questions as part of the study of international relations, especially in the United States. Yet, these two early shifts in the discipline obscure the fact that questions of ethics have always been part of the study of international relations. International relations, however, is concerned with political events and social forces that impact the lives of individuals, communities, and the human species as a whole, making ethical considerations inescapable. There is a long tradition of ethical reflection on international relations, stretching as far back as human beings have been concerned with intercommunal relations, but these reflections have been a secondary focus to the consideration of ethics and politics within communities. In part, this is why ethical questions about international relations come to the fore during periods of imperial expansion. Just War theory has its roots in St. International law developed as a way of justly dividing the world between sovereign states and savage peoples in need of civilization during the era of European colonialism, and human rights have taken center stage since the end of the Cold War, as the global influence of the United States reached its peak. Today, ethics are increasingly seen as a central part of the study of international relations. This shift has come about partly through the work of critical scholars working in a variety of traditions, who have rejected the long dominance of realism and the aspiration to a value-free social science. These critical voices include liberal political theorists, feminists, critical theorists, postmodernists, and postcolonialists. Along with this shift within the academic study of international relations, important changes have also taken place in the interactions between states. Without suggesting we have gone through an epochal change to a supposedly unprecedented era of globalization, it is clear that the traditional Westphalian state system has changed dramatically. There are more sovereign states than before with a greater equality of political and economic power between regions, while at the same time international institutions and global civil society have expanded, and individuals have more contact with each other outside of their national communities than was previously possible. Together with shifts in how we think about international relations, these social changes have put ethics back onto the agenda. As the current state of the field is defined by a diversity of perspectives and problems, this article is plural in the views represented and as wide ranging in its coverage as space will allow—although students should be aware that much more information is available. Hopefully, other scholars will appreciate that boundaries have to be drawn, and exclusions must be made.

General Overviews Within the field of international relations, ethics took on a more prominent role starting in the s with the rise of feminist approaches, illustrated in edited collections by Narayan and Harding and Whisnant and DesAutels ; the emergence of critical theory, notably in Linklater ; and increasing interest in postmodernist ethics, discussed in the edited volume by Campbell and Shapiro , and traced with great clarity in Hutchings Further, a number of international relations scholars began reexamining the place of normative questions within the tradition of Western thought that forms the core of the discipline. Boucher traced the historical relationship between ethics and international politics, and Brown did similar work but focused on the re-emergence of ethical questions within the discipline of international relations. Keene provided a more

DOWNLOAD PDF VALUE PLURALISM, NORMATIVE THEORY, AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

focused intellectual history of international political thinking. *Political Theories of International Relations: From Thucydides to the Present*. Oxford University Press, Columbia University Press, The core distinction between cosmopolitan and communitarian theories put forward in the book has been influential. Campbell, David, and Michael J. *Rethinking Ethics and World Politics*. University of Minnesota Press, This edited collection draws together a number of postmodern thinkers from both international relations and political theory. It provides a good overview of approaches and issues in world politics covered by this tradition. *Rethinking Ethics in a Global Era*. A very clear account of the development of international political theory as a form of normative international theory or global ethics, which also highlights the contributions made by critical theorists, feminists, and poststructuralists. This text provides a history of political thought on international relations that focuses on conceptual changes in how relations between communities are conducted. It self-consciously avoids summarizing canonical thinkers and looks beyond the modern European state system. *The Transformation of Political Community: Ethical Foundations of the Post-Westphalian Era*. Narayan, Uma, and Sandra Harding, eds. *Philosophy for a Multicultural, Postcolonial, and Feminist World*. Indiana University Press, Whisnant, Rebecca, and Peggy DesAutels, eds. *Feminist Ethics and Social Theory*. Rowman and Littlefield,

DOWNLOAD PDF VALUE PLURALISM, NORMATIVE THEORY, AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Chapter 3 : NORMATIVE THEORY IN IR: FROST'S CONSTITUTIVE APPROACH | Zerrin Ayar

Value Pluralism, Normative Theory and International Relations by Maria Lensu The existence of diverse values and value systems is a reality in the international sphere today. The fundamental question facing normative theory in International Relations is how to reconcile this value pluralism with an ethical orientation.

Pluralists also stress the differences between potential and actual power as it stands. Actual power means the ability to compel someone to do something and is the view of power as a causation. Potential power refers to the possibility of turning resources into actual power. Cash, one of many resources, is only a stack of bills until it is put to work. Malcolm X, for example, was certainly not a rich person growing up, but received money from many groups after his prison term and used other resources such as his forceful personality and organizational skills. He had a greater impact on American politics than most wealthy people. A particular resource like money cannot automatically be equated with power because the resource can be used skillfully or clumsily, fully or partially, or not at all. The pluralist approach to the study of power, states that nothing categorical about power can be assumed in any community. The question then is not who runs a community, but if any group in fact does. To determine this, pluralists study specific outcomes. The reason for this is that they believe human behavior is governed in large part by inertia. That said, actual involvement in overt activity is a more valid marker of leadership than simply a reputation. Pluralists also believe that there is no one particular issue or point in time at which any group must assert itself to stay true to its own expressed values, but rather that there are a variety of issues and points at which this is possible. While a structuralist may argue that power distributions have a rather permanent nature, this rationale says that power may in fact be tied to issues, which vary widely in duration. Also, instead of focusing on actors within a system, the emphasis is on the leadership roles itself. By studying these, it can be determined to what extent there is a power structure present in a society. Three of the major tenets of the pluralist school are 1 resources and hence potential power are widely scattered throughout society; 2 at least some resources are available to nearly everyone; and 3 at any time the amount of potential power exceeds the amount of actual power. Finally, and perhaps most important, no one is all-powerful unless proven so through empirical observation. An individual or group that is influential in one realm may be weak in another. Large military contractors certainly throw their weight around on defense matters, but how much sway do they have on agricultural or health policies? A measure of power, therefore, is its scope, or the range of areas where it is successfully applied as observed by a researcher. Pluralists believe that with few exceptions power holders usually have a relatively limited scope of influence. Pluralism does leave room for an elitist situation- Should a group A continuously exert power over multiple groups. For a pluralist to accept this notion, it must be empirically observed and not assumed so by definition. For all these reasons power cannot be taken for granted. One has to observe it empirically in order to know who really governs. The best way to do this, pluralists believe, is to examine a wide range of specific decisions, noting who took which side and who ultimately won and lost. Only by keeping score on a variety of controversies can one begin to identify actual power holders. Pluralism was associated with behavioralism. Although certain groups may share power, people within those groups set agendas, decide issues, and take on leadership roles through their own qualities. Some theorists argue that these qualities cannot be transferred, thus creating a system where elitism still exists. What this theory fails to take into account is the prospect of overcoming these qualities by garnering support from other groups. By aggregating power with other organizations, interest groups can over-power these non-transferable qualities. In this sense, political pluralism still applies to these aspects. Elite pluralism[edit] Elite pluralists agree with classical pluralists that there is "plurality" of power; however, this plurality is not "pure" as some people and groups have more power than others. For example, some people have more money than others, so they can pay to have their opinion put across better. This inequality is because society has "elites"; people who have more power, perhaps through money, inheritance or social tradition than others. The idea behind reads as follow:

DOWNLOAD PDF VALUE PLURALISM, NORMATIVE THEORY, AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Glasberg and Deric Shannon highlights, "political elites are not a monolithic, unified interest group representing their own narrow group of interests but rather are diverse, competitive elites representing a wide range of interests". Moreover, the stability in the system is achieved through this competition among the elites, as they have to negotiate in order to pass a bill. And, sometimes, they have to change their positions and points of view in order to reach a common point. Elites respect and follow the policy-making procedures because they are accountable of their acts and they can be replaced through legal procedures of through new elections. Views differed about the division of power in democratic society. Although neo-pluralism sees multiple pressure groups competing over political influence, the political agenda is biased towards corporate power. Neo-pluralism no longer sees the state as an umpire mediating and adjudicating between the demands of different interest groups, but as a relatively autonomous actor with different departments that forges and looks after its own sectional interests. Constitutional rules, which in pluralism are embedded in a supportive political culture, should be seen in the context of a diverse, and not necessarily supportive, political culture and a system of radically uneven economic sources. This diverse culture exists because of an uneven distribution of socioeconomic power. In the international realm, order is distorted by powerful multinational interests and dominant states, while in classical pluralism emphasis is put on stability by a framework of pluralist rules and free market society. There are two significant theoretical critiques on pluralism: Charles Lindblom[edit] Charles E. Lindblom , who is seen as positing a strong neo-pluralist argument, still attributed primacy to the competition between interest groups in the policy process but recognized the disproportionate influence business interests have in the policy process. Corporatism[edit] Classical pluralism was criticized as it did not seem to apply to Westminster-style democracies or the European context. This led to the development of corporatist theories. For example, trade unions and major sectoral business associations are often consulted about if not the drivers of specific policies. These policies often concern tripartite relations between workers, employers and the state, with a coordinating role for the latter. The state constructs a framework in which it can address the political and economic issues with these organized and centralized groups. In this view, parliament and party politics lose influence in the policy forming process. In international security, during the policy making process, different parties may have a chance to take part in decision making. The one who has more power, the more opportunity that it gains and the higher possibility to get what it wants. Frances , "decision making appears to be a maze of influence and power.

DOWNLOAD PDF VALUE PLURALISM, NORMATIVE THEORY, AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Chapter 4 : Value pluralism, normative theory, and international relations - JH Libraries

I want to do this by asking three questions about the manner in which "pluralism" is, in fact, constitutive of IR (as well as perhaps international relations)³ and offer some thoughts about both strengths and weaknesses in each case. I will then end by offering one, I hope provocative, thought by way of conclusion.

Entries are supplemented using sources from the Credo Reference and Gale Virtual Reference Library databases, with additional references to selected books and journal articles. To search for studies that utilize these theories and apply them within the context of IR research and practice, go here. Offensive Realism

Offensive realism is a covering term for several theories of international politics and foreign policy that give analytical primacy to the hostile and unforgiving nature of the international system as the cause of conflict. Offensive realism holds that anarchy the absence of a worldwide government or universal sovereign provides strong incentives for expansion. All states strive to maximize their relative power because only the strongest states can guarantee their survival. They pursue expansionist policies when and where the benefits of doing so outweigh the costs. States face the ever-present threat that other states will use force to harm or conquer them. This compels them to improve their relative power positions through arms build-ups, unilateral diplomacy, mercantile or even autarkic foreign economic policies, and opportunistic expansion. Ultimately every state in the international system strives to become a regional hegemon - a state that enjoys a preponderance of military, economic, and potential power in its part of the globe. Offensive realists however, disagree over the historical prevalence of hegemonic regional systems and the likely responses of weaker states to would-be regional hegemons e. In particular, there is a sharp disagreement between proponents of the balance-of-power tradition. Taliaferro, "Security-Seeking Under Anarchy: Tragedy of Great Power Politics. Parallelism Theory Based on a fusion of Weberian and Freudian concepts, Parallelism argues that, at the macro level, states fall into two general categories, paternal and fraternal, and that the struggle between the two types characterizes international relations. In the ancient world, paternal systems were predominant because they were militarily superior, but since the rise of the nation-state, fraternal states have become predominant. The engine of historical change is the revolution-hegemonic war cycle, which brings paternal and fraternal systems into conflict with one another. There are at least four examples of this type of hegemonic conflict occurring in documented history: There are other types of hegemonic conflicts e. Victory in revolutionary and hegemonic conflict has determined the direction of the world system, towards paternalism or fraternalism. For more information, refer to the Center for the Study of Political Parallelism. Peripheral Realism A foreign policy theory arising from the special perspective of Latin American peripheral states and represented by the work of Carlos Escude, for example. This view of international relations regards the international system as having an incipient hierarchical structure based on perceived differences between states: The peripheral approach introduces a different way of understanding the international system: Thus, the foreign policies of peripheral states are typically framed and implemented in such a way that the national interest is defined in terms of development, confrontation with great powers is avoided, and autonomy is not understood as freedom of action but rather in terms of the costs of using that freedom. IR Paradigms, Approaches and Theories. Last up-dated on 14 March

Pluralism A tradition in international relations that argued that politics, and hence policy, was the product of a myriad of competing interests, hence depriving the state of any independent status. Pluralists make four key assumptions about international relations. Primarily, non-state actors are important entities in world politics. Thirdly, pluralists challenge the realist assumption of the state as a rational actor, and this derives from the second assumption where the clash of competing interests may not always provide for a rational decision making process. Finally, the fourth assumption revolves around the nature of the international agenda, where it is deemed extensive by the pluralists and includes issues of national security as well as economic, social and environmental issues. They also contend with the predominance of a physical conception of power inherent in realism. Yale Journal of International Law 32 Pluralism in International

DOWNLOAD PDF VALUE PLURALISM, NORMATIVE THEORY, AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Political Theory. Policy-Relevant Theory Policy-relevant theories may have explicit purposes that stem from the value preferences of the theorist, such as reducing the likelihood of war or curbing the arms race. Acting on such theories, of course, is the domain of the policy maker, a task separate from that of the empirical theorist. Theorists who become policy makers may well make choices informed by what theories say will be the likely outcomes of implementing one or another alternative. Their choices may be informed by empirical theory or understanding of world events, but the decisions they make are still based on value preferences.

Political Psychology and the Work of Alexander L. George] 15 March Macmillan Publishing Company, Poliheuristic Theory of Foreign Policy Decision Making Poliheuristic theory suggests that leaders simplify their choice problems according to a two-stage decision process. In setting out a pivotal preliminary stage to expected utility decision making, the poliheuristic theory bridges the gap between research in cognitive psychology Taber and Steenbergen and the considerable insights provided by rational analyses of decision making e. Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce and David Lalman. Domestic and International Imperatives. Yale University Press, ; Mintz, A. Palgrave Macmillan, ; Taber, Charles S. Milton Lodge and Kathleen M. University of Michigan Press, , pp. It asserts that science can only deal with entities that can be directly experienced. Positivists have generally taken natural sciences as their model. Positivists seek to stress the quantitative aspects of political and social life, and behavioralism is attracted to a positivist view of science. Imagine a discussion about democracy that does not indicate normative preferences. The attempt to separate facts from values denies that facts are relational, and it is out of the relationships that facts presuppose, that values emerge. Moreover, it is a myth that the natural sciences are value free. In Dictionary of World Philosophy. Gale Virtual Reference Library. Post-behavioralism A position which tried to make American political science relevant to social problems: The Need for Self-Reflection. Post-internationalism Unlike many other theories, postinternational theory is organized around the premise that our time is marked by profound and continuous transformations and turbulence. It seeks to account for the dynamics of change and anticipate where they might be leading the world. Its prime focus is on the transformation of three basic parameters: The central concept at the micro level involves a skill revolution, whereas at the micro-macro level it involves the pervasiveness of authority crises experienced by all kinds of collectivities; and at the macro level it posits a bifurcation of global structures into the state-centric world of sovereignty-bound actors and the multi-centric world of sovereignty-free actors. This formulation is theoretical in the sense that it anticipates the conditions under which continual turbulence and transformation are likely to sustain world affairs. Turbulence in World Politics: A Theory of Change and Continuity. A Paradigm for the Twenty-First Century? State University of New York Press, Post-modernism A more extreme branch of Critical Social Theory see above that can be identified in terms of its critical stance toward western modernity and the unambiguous narratives of reason, truth and progress. Whereas the dominant narrative of modernity upholds reason as the foundation of objective truth and the source of progress, postmodernism emphasises the interplay of a plurality of discursive practices, ways of knowing, social identities and possible worlds. International Relations and the "Third Debate": Postmodernism and its Critics. International Relations and the Challenge of Postmodernism: University of South Carolina Press, Post-positivism In the philosophy of science, the term post-positivist has been used in two ways: This use of the term would include among others phenomenology, Marxism, critical theory, poststructuralism, and postmodernism see Postpositivism and 2 To refer to a reformed version of positivism that addresses criticisms made by the schools of thought listed under the first definition, but preserves the basic assumptions of positivism, i. Post-positivism of this type is common in the social sciences for both practical and conceptual reasons. Practically, it is often impossible or unethical to use the kind of carefully controlled laboratory studies characteristic of physics or chemistry for social phenomena. Conceptually, it is often noted that unlike the subjects of natural science, people are reflexive, that is, they may alter their behavior based on the presence or findings of the researcher. Critics of this type of post-positivism charge that it has not gone far enough from the basic assumptions of positivism. Poststructuralist theories of IR developed in the s from postmodernist studies in political science. Academic Dictionaries and Encyclopedias ;

DOWNLOAD PDF VALUE PLURALISM, NORMATIVE THEORY, AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Wikipedia. Post-structuralism The movement of ideas, centered on the French left and in particular on the journal *Tel Quel* edited by Philippe Sollers , which followed the brief ascendancy of structuralism in literary and political circles in Paris during the early s. Not a school, but a loose assembly of thinkers who flirted with structuralism and then rejected it, looking elsewhere for cultural and political foundations. Foucault is usually described as a post-structuralist, as is Derrida; deconstruction is also said to be a form of post-structuralism. In general, post-structuralism emphasizes the importance of language in structuring our experience of the world - meanings are not inherent in the thing or action itself but are created by words and their relationship to other words. At the heart of the post-structuralist perspective lies the principle that language produces social reality, which varies across cultures and time. Macmillan Reference USA, Power Transition Theory Created by A. Organski and originally published in his textbook, *World Politics* , power transition theory today describes international politics as a hierarchy with 1 a "dominant" state, the one with the largest proportion of power resources population, productivity, and political capacity meaning coherence and stability ; 2 "great powers," a collection of potential rivals to the dominant state and who share in the tasks of maintaining the system and controlling the allocation of power resources; 3 "middle powers" of regional significance similar to the dominant state, but unable to challenge the dominant state or the system structure, and 4 "small powers," the rest. The principle predictive power of the theory is in the likelihood of war and the stability of alliances. War is most likely, of longest duration, and greatest magnitude, when a challenger to the dominant power enters into approximate parity with the dominant state and is dissatisfied with the existing system. Similarly, alliances are most stable when the parties to the alliance are satisfied with the system structure. There are further nuances to the theory: Routledge, ; Tammen, Ronald L. *Strategies for the 21st Century*. Chatham House Publishers, Today, Pragmatic Idealism can be said to characterize any foreign policy - including the international role of the European Union - that embraces the aforementioned principles and values. The two players in the game can choose between two moves, either "cooperate" or "defect".

DOWNLOAD PDF VALUE PLURALISM, NORMATIVE THEORY, AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Chapter 5 : The IR Theory Knowledge Base

Normative Theory in International Relations seek to interrogate and complicate the value conferred position and the debate in normative IR theory as a.

Producing y units of value On this account, painting produces beauty, and beauty which is not a value but the intermediate source of value produces value. Similarly, reading a book produces knowledge, and gaining knowledge produces value. Now it should be clear how the monist can make sense of phenomena like higher and lower pleasures. The non-evaluative options e. On top of that, the intermediate effect, or non-basic value, e. Varying diminishing marginal value in these cases is easily explained psychologically. It is just the way we are—we get less and less enjoyment from donuts as we eat more and more at least in one sitting. However, we may well get the same amount of enjoyment from the tenth Johnny Cash song that we did from the first. In order to deal with the higher and lower pleasures case the monist will have to argue that pleasures themselves can have diminishing marginal utility—the monist can argue that gustatory pleasure gets boring after a while, and hence contributes less and less to the super value—well being, or whatever it is. Notice that the monist theories being imagined here are foundationally monist, because they claim that there is fundamentally one value, such as pleasure, and they are pluralist at the level of ordinary choice because they claim that there are intermediate values, such as knowledge and beauty, which are valuable because of the amount of pleasure they produce or realize, or contain—the exact relationship will vary from theory to theory. We experience values as plural, and pluralism tells us that values are indeed plural. The monist can respond, as we have seen, that there are ways to explain the apparent plurality of values without positing fundamentally plural values. Another, complementary strategy that the monist can pursue is to argue that monism has theoretical virtues that pluralism lacks. In general, it seems that theories should be as simple and coherent as possible, and that other things being equal, we should prefer a more coherent theory to a less coherent one. Thus so long as monism can make sense of enough of our intuitive judgments about the nature of value, then it is to be preferred to pluralism because it does better on the theoretical virtue of coherence. Another way to put this point is in terms of explanation. The monist can point out that the pluralist picture lacks explanatory depth. It seems that a list of values needs some further explanation: See Bradley, , p. The monist picture is superior, because the monist can provide an explanation for the value of the non-foundational plurality of values: See also the discussion of this in the entry on value theory. Patricia Marino argues against this strategy. Marino points out that explanation in terms of fewer fundamental principles is not necessarily better explanation. If there are plural values, then the explanation that appeals to plural values is a better one, in the sense that it is the true one: Even if we could give a monist explanation without having to trade off against our pluralist intuitions, Marino argues, we have no particular reason to think that explanations appealing to fewer principles are superior. On this view, knowledge and pleasure and so on are valuable when they are desired, and if they are not desired anymore they are not valuable anymore. There is no need to appeal to complicated accounts of diminishing marginal utility: Thus complexities in choices are explained by complexities in our desires, and it is uncontroversial that our desires are complex. Imagine a one person preference satisfaction account of value that says simply that what is valuable is what P desires. Apparently this view is foundationally monist: Let us say that P desires hot baths, donuts and knowledge. The ranking is not explained by the value of the objects, rather, her desire explains the ranking and determines the value of the objects. So it might be that P sometimes desires a hot bath and a donut equally, and cannot choose between them; it might be that sometimes she would choose knowledge over a hot bath and a donut, but sometimes she would choose a hot bath over knowledge. I may want it even though the second thing does not, with addition, lose its value; it may be that I think that no increase in that kind of value, even if constant and positive, can overtake a certain amount of this kind of value. First, this view can account for deep complexities in choice. The plural goods that P is choosing between do not seem merely instrumental. Donuts are not good because they contribute to

DOWNLOAD PDF VALUE PLURALISM, NORMATIVE THEORY, AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

another value, and P does not desire donuts for any reason other than their donuty nature. On this view, if it is hard to choose between donuts and hot baths it is because of the intrinsic nature of the objects. The key here is that value is conferred by desire, not by contribution to another value. Second, this view can accommodate incomparabilities: Unconstrained desire accounts of value seem implausible because our desires can be for all sorts of things—we may desire things that are bad for us, or we may desire things because of some mistake we have made. A desire satisfaction view that restricts the qualifying desires must give an account of what restricts them, and obviously, the account may commit the view to foundational pluralism. Griffin addresses this question at the very beginning of his book on well being Griffin, , ch. We had to qualify desire with informed, and that gave prominence to the features or qualities of the objects of desire, and not to the mere existence of desire. Griffin argues that it is a mistake to see desire as a blind motivational force—we desire things that we perceive in a favorable light- we take them to have a desirability feature. When we try to explain what involved in seeing things in a favorable light, we cannot, according to Griffin, separate understanding from desire: Desire is not blind. Understanding is not bloodless. Neither is the slave of the other. There is no priority. I shall not pursue further the question whether or not Griffin is a foundational pluralist, my aim in this section is to show first, that monist preference satisfaction accounts of value may have more compelling ways of explaining complexities in value comparison than monist goods approaches, but second, to point out that any constrained desire account may well actually be foundationally pluralist. As soon as something is introduced to constrain the desires that qualify as value conferring, it looks as though another value is operating. Pluralism and Rational Choice The big question facing pluralism is whether rational choices can be made between irreducibly plural values. Irreducible plurality appears to imply incommensurability—that is to say, that there is no common measure which can be used to compare two different values. See the entry on incommensurable values. Value incommensurability seems worrying: Neither of these are very appealing options. However, pluralists reject this dilemma. Bernard Williams argues that it is a mistake to think that pluralism implies that comparisons are impossible. There is one motive for reductivism that does not operate simply on the ethical, or on the non-ethical, but tends to reduce every consideration to one basic kind. This rests on an assumption about rationality, to the effect that two considerations cannot be rationally weighed against each other unless there is a common consideration in terms of which they can be compared. This assumption is at once very powerful and utterly baseless. Quite apart from the ethical, aesthetic considerations can be weighed against economic ones for instance without being an application of them, and without their both being an example of a third kind of consideration. She provides clear definitions of each: Chang points out that incommensurability is often thought to entail incomparability, but it does not. Defenders of pluralism have used various strategies to show that it is possible to make rational choices between plural values. Practical wisdom is not just a question of being able to see and collate the facts, it goes beyond that in some way—the wise person will see things that only a wise person could see. This strategy is used explicitly or implicitly by McDowell , Nagel , Larmore , Skorupski , Anderson and Wiggins and , Chappell , Swanton Provided one has taken the process of practical justification as far as it will go in the course of arriving at the conflict, one may be able to proceed without further justification, but without irrationality either. What makes this possible is judgment—essentially the faculty Aristotle described as practical wisdom, which reveals itself over time in individual decisions rather than in the enunciation of general principles. It is not easy to understand what sort of thing the faculty of judgment might be, or how it might work. Obviously pluralists who appeal to this strategy do not want to end up saying that the wise judge can see which of the options has more goodness, as that would constitute collapsing back into monism. So the pluralist has to maintain that the wise judge makes a judgment about what the right thing to do is without making any quantitative judgment. The danger is that the faculty seems entirely mysterious: As a solution to the comparison problem, the appeal to practical wisdom looks rather like way of shifting the problem to another level. Thus the appeal to practical wisdom cannot be left at that. The pluralist owes more explanation of what is involved in practical wisdom. This scale is not rationalized by something that the values have in

DOWNLOAD PDF VALUE PLURALISM, NORMATIVE THEORY, AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

common that would be monism, but by something over and above the values, which is not itself a super-value. Williams sometimes writes as if this is his intention, as do Griffin and , Stocker , Chang and , Taylor and James Griffin develops this suggestion in his discussion of plural prudential values. According to Griffin, we do not need to have a super-value to have super-scale. It enters through ranking; quantitative differences are defined on qualitative ones. All that we need for the all-encompassing-scale is the possibility of ranking items on the basis of their nature. And we can, in fact, rank them in that way. We can work out trade-offs between different dimensions of pleasure or happiness. And when we do, we rank in a strong sense: That is the ultimate scale here: On one interpretation, Griffin is in fact espousing a sophisticated monism. On this interpretation, it is hard to see what worth to life is, if not a supervalue. Perhaps it is only a value that we should resort to when faced with incomparabilities. However, this interpretation invites the criticism that Griffin is introducing a non-moral value, perhaps prudential value, to arbitrate when moral values are incommensurable. In other words, we cannot decide between incommensurable values on moral grounds, so we should decide on prudential grounds. This seems reasonable when applied to incommensurabilities in aesthetic values. In the case of moral choices this is a less convincing strategy: According to Stocker these comparisons are not quantitative, they are evaluative: Suppose we are trying to choose between lying on a beach and discussing philosophy—or more particularly, between the pleasure of the former and the gain in understanding from the latter. To compare them we may invoke what might be called a higher-level synthesizing category. So, we may ask which will conduce to a more pleasing day, or to a day that is better spent. Once we have fixed upon the higher synthesizing category, we can often easily ask which option is better in regard to that category and judge which to choose on the basis of that.

DOWNLOAD PDF VALUE PLURALISM, NORMATIVE THEORY, AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Chapter 6 : Value Pluralism (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)

Abstract. The thesis argues for the centrality of normative theory in the study of international relations because of its unique capacity to address values comprehensively, in contrast to the dominant traditions of political realism which marginalises their theoretical significance.

Postcolonialism and international relations theory Postcolonial International relations scholarship posits a critical theory approach to International relations IR , and is a non-mainstream area of international relations scholarship. Post-colonialism focuses on the persistence of colonial forms of power and the continuing existence of racism in world politics. However, a variety of evolved psychological mechanisms, in particular those for dealing with inter group interactions, are argued to influence current international relations. These include evolved mechanisms for social exchange, cheating and detecting cheating, status conflicts, leadership, ingroup and outgroup distinction and biases, coalitions, and violence. Evolutionary concepts such as inclusive fitness may help explain seeming limitations of a concept such as egotism which is of fundamental importance to realist and rational choice international relations theories. Nayef Al-Rodhan from Oxford University has argued that neuroscience [47] can significantly advance the IR debate as it brings forward new insights about human nature, which is at the centre of political theory. New tools to scan the human brain, and studies in neurochemistry allow us to grasp what drives divisiveness, [48] conflict, and human nature in general. The theory of human nature in Classical Realism, developed long before the advent of neuroscience, stressed that egoism and competition were central to human behaviour, to politics and social relations. Evidence from neuroscience, however, provides a more nuanced understanding of human nature, which Prof. Al-Rodhan describes as emotional amoral egoistic. These three features can be summarized as follows: This neurophilosophy of human nature can also be applied to states [49] - similarly to the Realist analogy between the character and flaws of man and the state in international politics. Prof Al-Rodhan argues there are significant examples in history and contemporary politics that demonstrate states behave less rationally than IR dogma would have us believe: Queer and transgender perspectives[edit] Queer international relations scholarship aims to broaden the scope and method of traditional international relations theory to include sexed and gendered approaches that are often excluded in the discipline at large. While affiliated with feminist theory and gender studies , as well as post-structuralism , queer IR theory is not reducible to any other field of international relations scholarship. Queer international relations theory works to expose the many ways in which sexualities and gender affect international politics. Queer IR theory takes sites of traditional international relations scholarship war and peace, international political economy , and state and nation building as its subjects of study. It also expands its scope and methods beyond those traditionally utilized in Realist IR scholarship. Ontologically , queer IR utilizes a different scope from traditional IR, as it aims to non-monolithically address the needs of various queer groups, including trans -, inter-, cross-, and pan-gendered, sexed, and sexualized bodies. Epistemologically , queer IR explores alternative methodologies to those traditionally used in IR, as it emphasizes the sexual dimension of knowledge within international relations. While queer IR incorporates transgender individuals in its expanded scope, some argue its emphasis on sexuality fails to adequately capture transgender experiences. This leads Stryker to advocate that transgender studies follows its own trajectory. She suggests some possible improvements that trans-theorizing may offer for feminist IR theory, which include a more nuanced understanding of gender hierarchy through a pluralist approach to sex, a holistic view of gender that resists viewing gender entirely either as a social construction or as biologically essential , and an increased awareness of gender as involving power relations among different sexes and genders. As such, Sjoberg advocates for the inclusion of trans-theorizing in feminist IR theory in the interests of improving explanations and understandings of global politics.

DOWNLOAD PDF VALUE PLURALISM, NORMATIVE THEORY, AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Chapter 7 : SAGE Reference - Normative Theory Versus Positive Theory

Abstract. The existence of diverse values and value systems is a reality in the international sphere today. The fundamental question facing normative theory in International Relations is how to reconcile this value pluralism with an ethical orientation.

We seek your assistance in helping to create a descriptive list see below of existing IR paradigms, approaches and theories. If you know of a particular IR theory, for example, that is not listed and described below, please e-mail the name of the theory and a brief description of it to Mark Beavis at irtheory@hotmail.com. Even if you only know the name, send it: The list will be maintained as an on-going project and knowledge resource which will be developed and enhanced over time. So, if you think that a particular description is inadequate, please send in a better one. IR Paradigms, Approaches and Theories: For this reason, the balancing process helps to maintain the stability of relations between states. A balance of power system functions most effectively when alliances are fluid, when they are easily formed or broken on the basis of expediency, regardless of values, religion, history, or form of government. Occasionally a single state plays a balancer role, shifting its support to oppose whatever state or alliance is strongest. A weakness of the balance of power concept is the difficulty of measuring power. Balance of Terror Theory Suggested text for this entry welcome. Balance of Threat Theory Suggested text for this entry welcome. Behavioralism An approach to the study of politics or other social phenomena that focuses on the actions and interactions among units by using scientific methods of observation to include quantification of variables whenever possible. A practitioner of behavioralism is often referred to as a behavioralist. Behaviorism refers to the ideas held by those behavioral scientists who consider only observed behavior as relevant to the scientific enterprise and who reject what they consider to be metaphysical notions of "mind" or "consciousness" Viotti, P. Macmillan Publishing Company, New York. Chaos Theory In mathematics and physics, chaos theory describes the behavior of certain nonlinear dynamical systems that may exhibit dynamics that are highly sensitive to initial conditions popularly referred to as the butterfly effect. As a result of this sensitivity, which manifests itself as an exponential growth of perturbations in the initial conditions, the behavior of chaotic systems appears to be random. This happens even though these systems are deterministic, meaning that their future dynamics are fully defined by their initial conditions, with no random elements involved. This behavior is known as deterministic chaos, or simply chaos. Since the International System can be considered a nonlinear dynamic system, it is reasonable to take this theory into account for the study of the International Order. From this, it is theorized that perfected collective security would discourage potential aggressors from angering a collectivity of states. Like balance-of-power, collective security works on the assumption that any potential aggressor would be deterred by the prospect of joint retaliation, but it goes beyond the military realm to include a wider array of security problems. It assumes that states will relinquish sovereignty and freedom of action or inaction to increasing interdependence and the premise of the indivisibility of peace. The security that can be derived from this is part of the foundation of the neoliberal institutionalist argument. Communitarianism Suggested text for this entry welcome. Interdependence theorists noted that such relations, particularly economic ones, were increasing; while the use of military force and power balancing were decreasing but remained important. Reflecting on these developments, they argued that the decline of military force as a policy tool and the increase in economic and other forms of interdependence should increase the probability of cooperation among states. The complex interdependence framework can be seen as an attempt to synthesise elements of realist and liberal thought. Here, we can see an obvious connection to neo-liberal institutionalism. World Politics in Transition. Complexity Theory Complexity theory offers a rich array of concepts that can help us ask deeper questions. Taken together, these concepts argue for viewing world politics increasingly as a group of tightly bound actors evolving together, characterized more by context than their innate nature, vulnerable to surprise from new groups whose members decide independently to organize themselves in new ways and for new purposes.

DOWNLOAD PDF VALUE PLURALISM, NORMATIVE THEORY, AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

These concepts argue further for assuming that substantive consequences can arise, sometimes rapidly, from initially minor conditions and that organizations and countries will have a dangerous tendency to push themselves to limits beyond which catastrophe is almost unavoidable. The resultant picture of the 21st century world of high technology, instant communication, tight international connectivity at all levels of society, and universal education is one of a political world not only constantly evolving but evolving more rapidly, where actors can change course abruptly, policies that worked can suddenly fail, and success will go to the nimble. Mills, Analyzing the Future Web site.

Chapter 8 : Moral Pluralism - Bibliography - PhilPapers

He claimed that constitutive theory, a position within normative IR theory on which I have been working for some years now, failed to take account of the tragic dimensions of international relations and that this was a weakness of the theory.

Chapter 9 : Search results for `Normative Pluralism` - PhilPapers

apply the theory of Gustav Radbruch, as a specific theory of the internal value pluralism of law, to global legal pluralism. In section 5 I explain his ideas of value relativism and the relationship between.