

DOWNLOAD PDF A CULTURAL THEORY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Chapter 1 : Why cultural values cannot be ignored in international relations | East Asia Forum

"A Cultural Theory is the capstone of Lebow's unceasing commitment to restoring a dynamic and historical dimension of international relations and to reinstating values and motives to their proper place at the center of enquiry.

Why cultural values cannot be ignored in international relations 20 September Author: Kadira Pethiyagoda, Canberra One hundred years ago began the war that was supposed to end all wars. This inauspicious centenary has allowed the foreign affairs commentariat to indulge in one of the things it is best at – drawing historical analogies. It is true that aspects of the global landscape look similar to a century ago. States push the boundaries of international law and act unilaterally, returning to old-school territoriality. A major redistribution of strategic and economic weight is also afoot. New superpowers emerge and agitate for a place at the high table of international affairs. This time the shift is seismic, moving across entire continents. Alongside the growing multipolarity, many have pointed to the increasing great-power rivalry and divergence over major issues like Ukraine and the South and East China Seas. Culture is making a comeback as a factor in international relations. The influence of culture in the future will be felt a few layers deeper. It will make an impact through values. The behaviour of states was simply individual self-interest writ large. Cultural values impact what people, and therefore states, want and think in world affairs, often subconsciously. It affects what tools of statecraft are used, what national image is sought and how concepts of peace, freedom and development are valued. India has long presented itself as adhering to its ancient ideal of non-violence. By contrast, in the Middle East various militarily weak actors, for reasons of honour, adopt the mantle of dominant aggressor – making attacks by adversaries seem more justifiable and damaging strategic interests. This is underpinned by the value of hierarchy, as seen domestically in the caste system. When combined with the value of non-violence, nuclear weapons become symbolically important but militarily unusable. To date most non-Western countries have operated to a significant extent using European-sourced institutions of statecraft, making their foreign policies at least somewhat predictable to Western policymakers. Non-European cultures may exert differing views on international organisation to the current European-rooted configuration of nation-states. While Western culture sees society as individuals relating to others through rules and contracts, Chinese scholars highlight a more interconnected, holistic worldview. This may equate to a comparatively greater focus on the global social environment than on individual state actors. Ensuring the peaceful rise of new great powers requires more in-depth and organised effort among Western governments to understand the cultures of Asia and elsewhere. Western diplomatic services are starting to recognise the need for more country specialists and interaction with academia. However, much of the mainstream media still lags behind. The return of culture is not just an academic debate.

DOWNLOAD PDF A CULTURAL THEORY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Chapter 2 : A cultural theory of international relations (Book,) [calendrierdelascience.com]

Over a distinguished career, Lebow has consistently challenged conventional categories of thinking about international relations. In this magisterial new volume, he lays out his own sweeping theory of society, history, and international order. Whereas realists start their analysis with states.

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 A CULTURAL THEORY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Chapter 3 : A Cultural Theory of International Relations by Richard Ned Lebow

This (lowercase (translateProductType calendrierdelascience.comtType)) has been cited by the following publications. This list is generated based on data provided by CrossRef. Pashakhanlou, Arash Heydarian The ethics of Carr and Wendt: Fairness and peace. Journal of International Political Theory, p.

Feminism international relations Feminist IR considers the ways that international politics affects and is affected by both men and women and also at how the core concepts that are employed within the discipline of IR e. Feminist IR has not only concerned itself with the traditional focus of IR on states, wars, diplomacy and security, but feminist IR scholars have also emphasized the importance of looking at how gender shapes the current global political economy. From its inception, feminist IR has also theorized extensively about men and, in particular, masculinities. Many IR feminists argue that the discipline is inherently masculine in nature. For example, in her article "Sex and Death in the Rational World of Defense Intellectuals" *Signs*, Carol Cohn claimed that a highly masculinized culture within the defence establishment contributed to the divorcing of war from human emotion. Feminist IR emerged largely from the late s onwards. The end of the Cold War and the re-evaluation of traditional IR theory during the s opened up a space for gendering International Relations. However, the growing influence of feminist and women-centric approaches within the international policy communities for example at the World Bank and the United Nations is more reflective of the liberal feminist emphasis on equality of opportunity for women. It makes the assumption that the economy trumps other concerns; allowing for the elevation of class as the focus of study. Marxists view the international system as an integrated capitalist system in pursuit of capital accumulation. Thus, colonialism brought in sources for raw materials and captive markets for exports, while decolonialization brought new opportunities in the form of dependence. A prominent derivative of Marxian thought is critical international relations theory which is the application of "critical theory" to international relations. Their emphasis on the "critical" component of theory was derived significantly from their attempt to overcome the limits of positivism. Modern-day proponents such as Andrew Linklater, Robert W. Cox and Ken Booth focus on the need for human emancipation from the nation-state. Hence, it is "critical" of mainstream IR theories that tend to be both positivist and state-centric. Further linked in with Marxist theories is dependency theory and the core-periphery model, which argue that developed countries, in their pursuit of power, appropriate developing states through international banking, security and trade agreements and unions on a formal level, and do so through the interaction of political and financial advisors, missionaries, relief aid workers, and MNCs on the informal level, in order to integrate them into the capitalist system, strategically appropriating undervalued natural resources and labor hours and fostering economic and political dependence. Marxist theories receive little attention in the United States. It is more common in parts of Europe and is one of the more important theoretic contributions of Latin American academia to the study of global networks. Examples of interest groups include political lobbyists, the military, and the corporate sector. Group theory argues that although these interest groups are constitutive of the state, they are also causal forces in the exercise of state power. Strategic perspective[edit] Strategic perspective is a theoretical[citation needed] approach that views individuals as choosing their actions by taking into account the anticipated actions and responses of others with the intention of maximizing their own welfare. Inherent bad faith model[edit] Further information: They are dismissed as propaganda ploys or signs of weakness. Post-structuralism explores the deconstruction of concepts traditionally not problematic in IR such as "power" and "agency" and examines how the construction of these concepts shapes international relations. The examination of "narratives" plays an important part in poststructuralist analysis; for example, feminist poststructuralist work has examined the role that "women" play in global society and how they are constructed in war as "innocent" and "civilians". See also feminism in international relations. Post-structuralism has garnered both significant praise and criticism, with its critics arguing that post-structuralist research often fails to address the real-world problems that international

DOWNLOAD PDF A CULTURAL THEORY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

relations studies is supposed to contribute to solving. Levels of analysis[edit] Systemic level concepts[edit] International relations are often viewed in terms of levels of analysis. The systemic level concepts are those broad concepts that define and shape an international milieu, characterized by anarchy. Focusing on the systemic level of international relations is often, but not always, the preferred method for neo-realists and other structuralist IR analysts. Westphalian sovereignty Preceding the concepts of interdependence and dependence, international relations relies on the idea of sovereignty. While throughout world history there have been instances of groups lacking or losing sovereignty, such as African nations prior to Decolonization or the occupation of Iraq during the Iraq War , there is still a need for sovereignty in terms of assessing international relations. Power international relations The concept of Power in international relations can be described as the degree of resources, capabilities, and influence in international affairs. It is often divided up into the concepts of hard power and soft power , hard power relating primarily to coercive power, such as the use of force, and soft power commonly covering economics , diplomacy and cultural influence. However, there is no clear dividing line between the two forms of power. Core or vital interests constitute the things which a country is willing to defend or expand with conflict such as territory, ideology religious, political, economic , or its citizens. Peripheral or non-vital are interests which a state is willing to compromise. For example, in the German annexation of the Sudetenland in a part of Czechoslovakia under the Munich Agreement , Czechoslovakia was willing to relinquish territory which was considered ethnically German in order to preserve its own integrity and sovereignty. Rather, it is the presence of non-state actors, who autonomously act to implement unpredictable behaviour to the international system. Whether it is transnational corporations , liberation movements , non-governmental agencies , or international organizations , these entities have the potential to significantly influence the outcome of any international transaction. Additionally, this also includes the individual person as while the individual is what constitutes the states collective entity, the individual does have the potential to also create unpredicted behaviours. Al-Qaeda , as an example of a non-state actor, has significantly influenced the way states and non-state actors conduct international affairs. During the Cold War , the alignment of several nations to one side or another based on ideological differences or national interests has become an endemic feature of international relations. Unlike prior, shorter-term blocs, the Western and Soviet blocs sought to spread their national ideological differences to other nations. Truman under the Truman Doctrine believed it was necessary to spread democracy whereas the Warsaw Pact under Soviet policy sought to spread communism. After the Cold War, and the dissolution of the ideologically homogeneous Eastern bloc still gave rise to others such as the South-South Cooperation movement. Polarity international relations Polarity in international relations refers to the arrangement of power within the international system. The concept arose from bipolarity during the Cold War , with the international system dominated by the conflict between two superpowers , and has been applied retrospectively by theorists. However, the term bipolar was notably used by Stalin who said he saw the international system as a bipolar one with two opposing powerbases and ideologies. Consequently, the international system prior to can be described as multipolar, with power being shared among Great powers. Empires of the world in The collapse of the Soviet Union in had led to unipolarity, with the United States as a sole superpower, although many refuse to acknowledge the fact. Several theories of international relations draw upon the idea of polarity. The balance of power was a concept prevalent in Europe prior to the First World War , the thought being that by balancing power blocs it would create stability and prevent war. Here, the concepts of balancing rising in power to counter another and bandwagoning siding with another are developed. Hegemony is the preponderance of power at one pole in the international system, and the theory argues this is a stable configuration because of mutual gains by both the dominant power and others in the international system. This is contrary to many neorealist arguments, particularly made by Kenneth Waltz , stating that the end of the Cold War and the state of unipolarity is an unstable configuration that will inevitably change. It suggests that while hegemony can control the occurrence of wars, it also results in the creation of one. Its main proponent, A. Organski , argued this based on the occurrence of previous wars during

DOWNLOAD PDF A CULTURAL THEORY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

British, Portuguese, and Dutch hegemony. Interdependence[edit] Many advocate that the current international system is characterized by growing interdependence; the mutual responsibility and dependency on others. Advocates of this point to growing globalization , particularly with international economic interaction. The role of international institutions, and widespread acceptance of a number of operating principles in the international system, reinforces ideas that relations are characterized by interdependence. NATO International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan Dependency theory is a theory most commonly associated with Marxism , stating that a set of core states exploit a set of weaker periphery states for their prosperity. Various versions of the theory suggest that this is either an inevitability standard dependency theory , or use the theory to highlight the necessity for change Neo-Marxist. Systemic tools of international relations[edit] Diplomacy is the practice of communication and negotiation between representatives of states. To some extent, all other tools of international relations can be considered the failure of diplomacy. Keeping in mind, the use of other tools are part of the communication and negotiation inherent within diplomacy. Sanctions, force, and adjusting trade regulations, while not typically considered part of diplomacy, are actually valuable tools in the interest of leverage and placement in negotiations. Sanctions are usually a first resort after the failure of diplomacy, and are one of the main tools used to enforce treaties. They can take the form of diplomatic or economic sanctions and involve the cutting of ties and imposition of barriers to communication or trade. War , the use of force, is often thought of as the ultimate tool of international relations. A popular definition is that given by Clausewitz , with war being "the continuation of politics by other means". There is a growing study into "new wars" involving actors other than states. The study of war in international relations is covered by the disciplines of " war studies " and " strategic studies ". The mobilization of international shame can also be thought of as a tool of international relations.

DOWNLOAD PDF A CULTURAL THEORY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Chapter 4 : Globalization - International Relations - Oxford Bibliographies

In this volume, Richard Ned Lebow introduces his own constructivist theory of political order and international relations based on theories of motives and identity formation drawn from the ancient Greeks.

The process is subject to a wide-ranging number of definitions, but most scholars and observers agree that it represents a global process of increasing economic, cultural, and political interdependence and integration, with deep historical roots. It is a process fostered by liberalized international trade and innovations in information technology and communication, which has been promoted and managed to a greater or lesser degree by international institutions, multinational corporations, national governments especially the United States, international nongovernmental organizations, and even individuals with access to the Internet. The field is particularly subject to the vagaries of events, and as such it is a dynamic literature that is constantly in flux. Nevertheless, the basic outlines of the field are clear. Economic interdependence remains the most obvious and significant manifestation of globalization. It remains a controversial process that has engendered both withering critiques and staunch defenses, while other scholars debate whether the process is irresistible, irrevocable, reversible, or even whether it represents the global reality at all. General Overviews

Scholars of globalization are well served by a number of excellent general introductory texts. These overviews provide an indispensable entry point for new students, yet they are rigorous enough to provide new insights, approaches, and methodologies for graduate students and experienced scholars. Ritzer offers an excellent orientation for those seeking a textbook-style introduction to the theory, debates, critiques, and scope of modern globalization. Similarly, Steger provides a concise but effective introduction to the myriad issues inherent in the subject. Scholte also provides an accessible overview of the major debates and themes, while stressing the overarching concept of superterritoriality. For those ready to delve into the often eclectic issues and implications raised by globalization in the modern age, Lechner and Boli presents a diverse assortment of essays and articles that run the gamut of opinion and methodology. Held and McGrew is an older but nevertheless excellent introduction to the major themes and debates facing globalization scholars. Once oriented in the theory and issues, new researchers will find Friedman and Greider excellent introductions to the often vigorous debates regarding the inevitability, impact, and sustainability of political, economic, and cultural globalization. The Lexus and the Olive Tree. Farrar, Straus and Giroux, Sees the process of globalization as inexorable and irrevocable; posits tension between consumer desires and traditional attachment to community. Insightful anecdotes illuminate the argument, but are increasingly outdated. Often betrays bias toward US-led free-market solutions, and its contrived jargon may grate. Lively introduction, best read in conjunction with Greider

One World, Ready or Not: The Manic Logic of Global Capitalism. Sees globalization as a recipe for exploitation and severe economic inequity. Advocates global labor reforms, corrective tariffs, and capital reform. Unashamedly biased toward the left; best read in conjunction with Friedman

Held, David, and Anthony McGrew. Politics, Economics, and Culture. Stanford University Press, Includes well-researched and historically grounded sections on historical precedents, violence, trade, finance, corporations, migration, culture, and environmentalism. Highly recommended to beginning undergraduates and graduate students, who should nevertheless bear in mind its age. Impressive roster of contributors, ranging from esteemed academics to distinguished practitioners, along with statements from international nongovernmental organizations. Offers something for every researcher, from novice undergraduates to experienced scholars. Highly recommended, albeit eclectic, introductory text. Translated by Dona Geyer. Princeton University Press, Brief introductory chapter on theory and concepts, but major focus on historical trends including imperialism, industrialization, emergence of global economy, and modern challenges to globalization. Especially suited to undergraduates and beginning graduate students. Thorough, extensive, and coherent introductory textbook. Particularly appropriate for undergraduates and new researchers. Effectively outlines contemporary theories, debates, criticisms, and issues. Includes chapters on historical antecedents,

DOWNLOAD PDF A CULTURAL THEORY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

economics, culture, technology, the environment, migration, crime, and inequality. Clearly presented and well-organized overview of major debates and concepts. Adopts superterritoriality as its organizing theme. Excellent bibliography provides readers of all levels with directions for future research. Suitable for use in the classroom, while experienced researchers will also benefit. A Very Short Introduction. Oxford University Press, Wide ranging and instructive despite its brevity. Thematic chapters on historical antecedents, economics, politics, culture, ecology, and ideology. Nevertheless, an illuminating brief introductory text. Users without a subscription are not able to see the full content on this page. Please subscribe or login. How to Subscribe Oxford Bibliographies Online is available by subscription and perpetual access to institutions. For more information or to contact an Oxford Sales Representative [click here](#).

DOWNLOAD PDF A CULTURAL THEORY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Chapter 5 : Download [PDF] A Cultural Theory Of International Relations – Fodreport eBook

A Cultural Theory of International Relations is not so much a general "theory" of international relations as a series of generalisations about human nature and the way this nature expresses itself in thought and action in different times, places and cultures. Lebow welds these generalisations into a compelling grand history of international.

Table of Contents Theories of International Relations A theory of international relations is a set of ideas that explains how the international system works. Unlike an ideology, a theory of international relations is at least in principle backed up with concrete evidence. The two major theories of international relations are realism and liberalism. National Interest Most theories of international relations are based on the idea that states always act in accordance with their national interest, or the interests of that particular state. State interests often include self-preservation, military security, economic prosperity, and influence over other states. Sometimes two or more states have the same national interest. For example, two states might both want to foster peace and economic trade. And states with diametrically opposing national interests might try to resolve their differences through negotiation or even war. Realism According to realism, states work only to increase their own power relative to that of other states. Realism also claims the following: The world is a harsh and dangerous place. The only certainty in the world is power. A powerful state will always be able to outdo—and outlast—weaker competitors. The most important and reliable form of power is military power. Therefore, the state must seek power and must always protect itself There is no overarching power that can enforce global rules or punish bad behavior. The international system itself drives states to use military force and to war. Leaders may be moral, but they must not let moral concerns guide foreign policy. International organizations and law have no power or force; they exist only as long as states accept them. Politicians have practiced realism as long as states have existed. Most scholars and politicians during the Cold War viewed international relations through a realist lens. Neither the United States nor the Soviet Union trusted the other, and each sought allies to protect itself and increase its political and military influence abroad. Realism has also featured prominently in the administration of George W. Machiavelli One of the best-known realist thinkers is the notorious Niccolò Machiavelli. In his book *The Prince*, he advised rulers to use deceit and violence as tools against other states. Moral goals are so dangerous, he wrote, that to act morally will bring about disaster. Liberalism Liberalism emphasizes that the broad ties among states have both made it difficult to define national interest and decreased the usefulness of military power. Liberalism developed in the s as some scholars began arguing that realism was outdated. Increasing globalization, the rapid rise in communications technology, and the increase in international trade meant that states could no longer rely on simple power politics to decide matters. Liberal approaches to international relations are also called theories of complex interdependence. Liberalism claims the following: The world is a harsh and dangerous place, but the consequences of using military power often outweigh the benefits. International cooperation is therefore in the interest of every state. Military power is not the only form of power. Economic and social power matter a great deal too. Exercising economic power has proven more effective than exercising military power. Different states often have different primary interests. International rules and organizations can help foster cooperation, trust, and prosperity. Relations among the major Western powers fit a model of complex interdependence very well. The United States has significant disagreements with its European and Asian allies over trade and policy, but it is hard to imagine a circumstance in which the United States would use military power against any of these allies. Instead, the United States relies on economic pressure and incentives to achieve its policy aims. Idealism Idealism is a specific school of liberalism that stresses the need for states to pursue moral goals and to act ethically in the international arena. Idealists believe that behavior considered immoral on an interpersonal level is also immoral in foreign policy. Therefore, idealists argue that dishonesty, trickery, and violence should be shunned. As he negotiated the treaty to end World War I in , Woodrow Wilson worked to promote democracy and national self-determination. Scholars use the term Wilsonian to describe a person or

DOWNLOAD PDF A CULTURAL THEORY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

group who advocates promoting democracy overseas in the name of idealism.

DOWNLOAD PDF A CULTURAL THEORY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Chapter 6 : Roundtable on A Cultural Theory of International Relations | H-Diplo | ISSFH-Diplo | ISSF

A Cultural Theory of International Relations. [Richard Ned Lebow] -- In this volume, Richard Ned Lebow introduces his own constructivist theory of political order and international relations based on theories of motives and identity formation drawn from the ancient.

A Theory of International Relations appeared in Kenneth Waltz presented his unmodified Theory of International Politics in It would be twenty years before Alexander Wendt countered with another article-less book title: Social Theory of International Politics. The reviewers praise the historic breadth of the book and welcome its focus on honor and social standing as explanatory factors. They differ on the value of grand theory. Patrick Finney is sympathetic to its culturalist core but more skeptical about the novelty and explanatory power of some of its claims. Geoffrey Roberts commends it as a grand historical narrative, but has doubts about the enterprise of grand theorizing in general. Most historians and a fair number of political scientists are skeptical of grand theories. Too much analytical parsimony yields too much synthetical imprecision. Too much analytical complexity yields too much synthetical confusion. In his review, Roberts argues that A Cultural Theory is too precise and insufficiently deterministic to serve as a grand theory in the international relations IR discipline. This is a compliment rather than a criticism as far as historians are concerned. Roberts argues that IR theorists will require greater abstraction and inter-theoretical discussion than A Cultural Theory provides in order for it to serve as a competing theoretical paradigm. What makes the book interesting to historians necessarily dooms it as paradigm-buster among IR theorists. Lebow disagrees, which is not surprising given his career-long efforts to integrate political science and history. According to Mansbach, honor-seeking motives often provide better explanations for aggressive or stubborn actions than do power-seeking or security-seeking motives. Like Roberts, Finney is skeptical of grand theory but his criticism differs from that of Roberts. Finney argues that A Cultural Theory sacrifices the specific for the general because of its grand-theory ambitions. Finney argues that rather than synthesizing existing, detailed cultural histories, A Cultural Theory often ignores them to focus on spirit as a universal motive. For example, cultural historians have explained how German military culture before World War I produced belligerent policies; however, to cultural historians, these are complex and contingent effects, not the result of primary drives to seek honor and standing. Lebow rejects this criticism, claiming that his case-studies examine the contingent and contending factors. Mansbach defends Lebow on his point. Mansbach hails A Cultural Theory for recognizing that the social meaning of honor and the conduct that will increase standing vary in time and place. Competing IR theories rely on trans-historical factors and regard culture as an epiphenomenon, Mansbach argues. Finney acknowledges that A Cultural Theory avoids the pitfalls of parsimony that bedevil IR theories, but since his standard is existing historiography, not IR theorizing, he is more critical of the specific cases than are Mansbach or Roberts. Finney and Roberts agree on one point: A Cultural Theory downplays the role of ideology. In response Lebow does not deny the role of ideology, but maintains that it is subordinate to the drives that he prioritizes. There is a consensus among the reviewers that A Cultural Theory focuses on change over continuity and human agency over material structure. For Finney and Roberts, these are elements of the historic narrative; for Mansbach, they are the central features of the grand theory. There is no stable order, but a continuous process of non-teleological change. While some orders are more robust than others, they are in flux. Lebow also emphasizes an equal role for human agency with social structures, particularly hierarchies of standing and understandings of honor. These emerge from continuous human interactions, and are transformed by them. One does not expect immediate policy relevance from a theoretical work, but A Cultural Theory provides several insights into contemporary affairs. Similarly, a myopic focus on the security aspects of territorial disputes in the South China Sea would miss the competition over rank that such disputes might represent. Despite all its achievements, A Cultural Theory is not a capstone book. Lebow plans to construct of a theory of order for a subsequent volume that will further develop the theory of

DOWNLOAD PDF A CULTURAL THEORY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

international relations he has already presented. Of books that are to be chewed and digested rather than tasted, *A Cultural Theory* is a banquet, and still only a first course. Richard Ned Lebow is the James O. In Search of Ourselves Cambridge. He has published widely on twentieth century international history and history and theory. He is the author, with Yale H. Ferguson of *Remapping Global Politics: Essays on Global Politics* Routledge, , and *Globalization: The Return of Borders to a Borderless World?* On the one hand, it is a very substantial piece of scholarship, almost pages thick with a page bibliography testifying to prodigious reading across the diverse disciplines of political science, International Relations IR , history, and psychology. On the other hand, its explanatory goals are hugely ambitious, for Lebow is proposing nothing less than a new grand theory for IR, if not for the social sciences as a whole. Lebow reaches back to the ancient Greeks – principally, Homer, Thucydides, Plato and Aristotle – for his theoretical framework, rooted in the premise that there are four basic drives of the human psyche: In practice, real worlds evince mixed motives and behavior, and the relationship between the motives helps to explain historical change. For example, spirit- and appetite-based societies are inherently competitive and delicately-balanced and unless the dominant motive is held in check by reason, fear will rise and order unravel as violence and warfare break out. Thus human history is a saga of the consolidation and decline of order, as social formations predominantly rooted in one drive give way to alternative ones. Across two millennia Lebow plots how these different motives have manifested themselves, given rise to conflicts and determined the character of warfare, thus claiming to offer a novel explanation for the whole course of international relations. Amongst the various motives in play, Lebow is primarily interested in the role of the spirit which he contends is neglected by dominant theories. Only certain strands of critical constructivism understand that culture and ideology are more than smokescreens obfuscating political, economic and military realities. In particular, he speculates about how the contemporary international system might evolve in ways that enhance stability and justice, pointing to transformations that are perhaps already underway as dominant understandings of honor and esteem are reconfigured. Yet the totalizing and generalizing schema of the book is not entirely to my taste. International historians are bound to ask what fresh insight Lebow can bring to our thinking about the origins and nature of the major wars that he considers in his case studies. Against appetite- and fear-oriented explanations, he again invokes the role of the spirit, in the form of the search to attain or enhance national recognition and standing, and through that personal honor and self-esteem. Lebow demonstrates with choice quotations how the thinking of leading political and military decision-makers was saturated with the language of honor in the years before the war and as they made their fateful choices in the summer of 1941. Desire for standing and recognition – coupled with economic motives – drove the Japanese into a war with China in the 1930s and the inability to bring this to a successful conclusion led to the decision to confront the European colonial powers and the United States. Once it was fully underway, however, spirit becomes much more significant. On both sides superpower competition was animated by concern for prestige and reputation, which were viewed as absolute and not merely instrumental goals. Personal emotions were also heavily implicated: American commentators have pervasively failed to give Gorbachev proper credit for his initiative, and have instead insisted that the Soviets were forced into retreat by American pressure: Material motives and objective security considerations cannot make this disastrous war explicable: Yet the overall impression conveyed by the text is that Lebow believes he is offering more than just another positioned, contestable reading. Moreover, in discussing alternative explanations offered by historians and IR scholars Lebow is pretty forthright about their inadequacies, so it seems legitimate to approach his text in the same spirit. To an extent, his approach simply entails reformulating elements from elsewhere in the existing historiography. The key difference is that such work explains this pathology as a product of the contingencies of national military culture or the specific values of a particular social group or ruling caste, while Lebow seeks constantly to operate on a more abstract level of explanation by invoking universal human psychic drives. It is this construal of these dispositions as products of spirit rather than of a narrower culture which primarily lends his analysis its distinctiveness. I will recur later to some of the other the implications of this move. The second ground on which Lebow lays claim to

DOWNLOAD PDF A CULTURAL THEORY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

innovation concerns the relative importance of the spirit compared to other operative factors. Anyone familiar with the primary documentary material on the Cuban Missile Crisis would not find it difficult to accept the claim that personal emotional responses were implicated in the making of American policy; equally, the notion that the wider Cold War evolved into a counter-productive, illogically competitive confrontation is not a particularly hard sell. The same goes for the idea that the invasion of Iraq was a product of outraged pride and score-settling rather than sober strategic calculation. Yet there is a significant difference between asserting that conceptions of honor, prestige, credibility and identity were involved in the conflict, and asserting that they were what it was primarily about. The interpretive tension with which Lebow must tussle here is very similar to that faced by culturalist international historians seeking to probe the significance of culturally constructed notions of race, class, gender or religion in policy-making. On the one hand, if he presents the spirit as just one hitherto unrecognized determinant or variable amongst many then his claims become much less novel and interesting, and proponents of established realist or liberal interpretations can more easily dismiss this ideational dimension as mere garnish. On the other hand, the more he asserts the central and supreme importance of the spirit, the more his interpretation will appear strained in relation to competing explanations and the greater the risk that he will be accused of peddling monocausal idealism. Lebow seems to wrestle with this dilemma, employing various finessing formulations, but ultimately to embrace the latter hazard, presumably judging that it is essential in order to sustain his overall theoretical edifice. Thus in his First World War case study he insists that the spirit must figure as the prime explanation for the phenomena he is describing: However, the two moves that he makes in order to do this are very precisely ones likely to arouse skepticism amongst historians, since they seem to embody a predilection for the classic IR virtues or vices of generalization and parsimony. Granted, we must be careful not to over-simplify or pigeonhole here, since historians of culturalist leanings are more likely to be sympathetic to his effort to stress the ideational than historians invested in the realist and liberalist approaches he is primarily critiquing. The accounts of policy-making in the three Axis powers are very brief and at times verge on the trite. The discussion of Japan is the most substantial: Moreover, these sections are marred by stylistic infelicities, which compound the impression that Lebow lacks a sure touch here. In the discussion of Fascist Italy, he has some difficulty in handling competing historiographical perspectives. Apart from the headline invocation of the spirit, Lebow identifies four key operative factors in these Second World War case studies: The case of Imperial Japan works reasonably well against this template, since the role of persisting semi-feudal structures in spawning militarism and imperialism has long figured in the historiography. Indeed, if pushed too far the argument that Japanese policy was a response to western discrimination flirts with endorsing dubious nationalist rationalizations of expansion as a defensive riposte to encirclement, even as a genuine campaign to liberate Asia from western colonialism. It is in the Nazi German case that Lebow departs most extensively and problematically from established historiographical orthodoxy. Moreover, in that literature it figures as part of more complex explanations and is not asked to bear the explanatory weight that Lebow seeks to ascribe to it here. Even glossed through the four-part model mentioned in the previous paragraph, his spirit-based account marginalizes many other factors. The presence of economic and strategic motives in Nazi policy is acknowledged, but in a very perfunctory and elliptical fashion. What this analysis most dramatically downplays, however, is the role of Nazi ideology, and the twin fixations of race and space. Moreover, there is something very jarring and distasteful, even ethically problematic, about reducing the Holocaust briefly mentioned in a section on the changing character of warfare to a by-product of a German search for self-esteem. True, he tends to push his argument too far, and it is questionable whether his whole complex theoretical structure is really required to facilitate his readings, since some of them have been made in slightly different terms by others. But the aspiration to move beyond the frames of realism and objective material interests in explaining foreign policy-making is one that is entirely laudable, and speaks intriguingly to the thrust of recent culturalist work in international history.

DOWNLOAD PDF A CULTURAL THEORY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Chapter 7 : SparkNotes: International Politics: Theories of International Relations

A theory of international relations is a set of ideas that explains how the international system works. Unlike an ideology, a theory of international relations is (at least in principle) backed up with concrete evidence. The two major theories of international relations are realism and liberalism.

Popular culture is interesting for IR theorists for a variety of reasons, however, and there exist a diversity of approaches to its study. For some, movies, TV shows, and the like, are interesting in a pedagogical sense, insofar as they can distill for us more simply some or other highly complex facet of our world. Others prefer to look at how these artifacts function to normalize or reify the social order, modeling for consumers the expectations of social behavior upon which the dominant ideologies of foreign policy and political economy, for example, are founded. In this sense, if normalization is construed as a precondition for any social action, artifacts of popular culture can be said to have a degree of constitutive agency. There is some divergence, however, on the status of the artifact in this framing. Following the pioneering efforts of Michael Shapiro see Methodology over the last thirty years, much of this work within IR is premised on the idea that cultural artifacts are immanent to a general social grammar. For Shapiro, seeing as the artifact is an effect of the social, it is a worthy object of study in and of itself. Here then, the study of a popular cultural artifact is understood already as the study of a facet of the reality of our own world. There is no need to separate the world presented within the artifact from the world in which we live, for they are both part of the same general text. This latter group includes a diversity of scholars, from Marxist, feminist, and other critical persuasions, who insist that while the myths and unconscious ideologies of fictional universes often serve as silent, sub-textual pillars of the real, gestures of naturalization can also be accompanied by gestures of disruption see Crawford , cited under Bodies, Genders, and Posthumans. Scholars of the latter group are also especially interested in assessing whether and how cultural artifacts and social life are linked, arguing that empirical work is needed to demonstrate that such linkages actually exist, and that the social habits and passionate subjective investments that make them possible in the first place need to be proven. General Overviews For some, like Dyson , the purpose of turning to pop culture to explain International Relations IR is primarily pedagogical. Others prefer a more constitutive approach, however, focusing on issues like nationalism and the formation of identity through official discourse. Indeed, cultural practices have been a focus of IR theory since the earliest published poststructural work in IR see Shapiro , cited under Methodology. Importantly, however, as Neumann and Nexon argues, such research has recently become more focused on quotidian or day-to-day sites of popular cultural production. Topics addressed include possible frameworks for a research agenda in the field, how pop culture shapes political identities, and how it can also be used to disrupt familiar ways of thinking and acting in world politics. Its publications focus on issues pertaining to the human experience of time, space, scale, identity, and mobilization while also questioning the limits of what we imagine politics to be. Theories of International Politics and Zombies. Princeton University Press, Johns Hopkins University Press, Covers realism, liberalism, and constructivism, but also extends into complexities of cultural difference in globalization, managing global crises, and the ethics of robotics and bioengineering. Covers a range of topics, including the political economy of the music industry and the significance of music as an emotional force. Harry Potter and the Study of World Politics. In Harry Potter and International Relations. Nexon and Iver B. London and New York: Features chapters on all the major IR theories, each featuring a close reading of a relevant movie. Users without a subscription are not able to see the full content on this page. Please subscribe or login. How to Subscribe Oxford Bibliographies Online is available by subscription and perpetual access to institutions. For more information or to contact an Oxford Sales Representative click here.

Chapter 8 : A Cultural Theory of International Relations: calendrierdelascience.com: Richard Ned Lebow: E

DOWNLOAD PDF A CULTURAL THEORY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

International Relations Theory: A Critical Introduction. 4th ed. London and New York: Routledge, E-mail Citation» A wonderful textbook for teaching IR in its own right, the author sets out in simple but provocative terms the rationale for a poststructuralist approach to the analysis of pop cultural artifacts.

Chapter 9 : International relations - Wikipedia

international relations and the host culture. Highly developed countries such as the United States of America, United Kingdom, Canada, and France, just to name a few.