

Liberalism

Liberalism versions	Ideational/Utopian (humans/states guided by ethics, moral compass) institutional (regulate through institutions), commercial/economic (war restrains progress + globalisation so not efficient way to produce/spend capital) – so these two would be functionalist-institutional, neo-liberal institutional (paradigmatic hybrid).
Assumption of humans	Morally neutral, rational, absolute gain seekers & malleable
Assumption of the world	Optimistic; Elastic – can reach a point of harmony; effects of anarchy can be controlled / eliminated / anarchy no inevitable / causation is not embedded + non zero sum game
Forces moving forward	Individual consciousness, interests norms, rules and laws
Actor	Pluralist approach: actors pursue own and ‘common’ interest → state reflects the sum of interest from ‘below’. Deregulate power from actors alone
Motivator of actor	Combination of expedient and moral; affluence, improvement, efficiency, more ethical life, justice → Absolute gain (timeline of success over time instead of in comparison to others)
Order of objectives	Can be acquired i.e. prosperity
Problems of the world	War & collective violence, lack of ethics, freedom and law, despotic regimes, realism
Tools / solutions	International institutions, foreign policy transparency, interdependence, collective security, democratization, education, regime change & trade / other exchanges
Ambitions	Regulation of the world, progress & transform + improvement
General / Perpetual Peace prospects	Positive
Favourable processes	Integration, conversion & global interdependence
Theorists	Kant, Doyle etc. and decision makers like Jimmy Carter

Security Dilemma: dilemma of the constant unit of concern that states can not afford to do anything other than to constantly develop their security measures. If you do not play the game, then you may become the victim of aggression from other states.

Great Power: someone with more of everything or the capability to create a world order where they are at the hop of the hierarchy. Dominance in areas of intrinsic value i.e. middle east currently or regions of extrinsic importance i.e. India for the UK previously.

Grand Strategy: chain of goals-means based on identification and definition of threats to national security, and the construction of political, economic, military, and other answers to these threats. It allocates resources and proposes methods to use means in order to achieve the supreme goal.

- Test of failure/success = achieving the ultimate goals not the operational goals.
 - o Occurs when there is a misconception of the situation or not assessing things correctly
- Matching goals with means and how to craft a plan to use/acquire available resources
- Hierarchy of strategy = grand → regional → bilateral → operational → tactical

Strategy: plan or action program that specifies how to use resources (available and acquired) in order to achieve the high end goals.

- factors affecting the formation of strategy
 - o geography: structure and constraint of your threats/opportunities
 - UK using strategic alliances to overcome isolation
 - Israel and the role of absorbing the west bank
 - o economic, patterns of production and industrial capacity
 - economy creates the means; provides army and trade relationships to take advantage of when designing strategy
 - Germany increasing world trade post industrial revolution → rising power
 - o Technology: Transportation technology + stronger arms systems through military technology
 - Weapon systems – air carriers, nuclear weapons, submarines → remotely operated systems that are unmanned so new generation of military achievements
 - o History, ideology and culture
 - i.e. Soviet buffer zone & threat of NATO expansions impact
 - o organisational: ie. executive agencies (military or intelligence agencies) to expand capabilities
- Military strategy: use of battle to achieve the ends of the campaign (below grand strategy)
 - o Logistical: restoring and transportation of resources / co-ordination for example
 - o Operational: flexibility and ingenuity of the plans i.e. strategic surprise or aircraft dominance
 - o Social: need the support of the nation i.e. national pride / larger army / nationalist attitude
 - o Technological: developing more advance technology / capabilities i.e. autonomous weapons
- Tactics (military): use of force to achieve the objectives of the battle
- i.e. Japanese operational success – wanted control over the area/natural resources

Reading List Summary

Tse-min Fu, Gill, Hundman, Liff, & Ikenberry (2015), "Looking for Asia's Security Dilemma" *International Security* 40:2, pp. 181-204.

- Overview: balance of power is changing as China shows more assertive postures + economically and militarily they are developing / becoming a threat
- Critique: theoretical & empirical inconsistency / case selection → lacks transparency
 - Empirical date was in isolation + dealt with different periods/scopes
 - US as security guarantor → why lack of military development by other states or that they did not fear for their survival
 - Ambiguous evidence
 - Lack of definition clarity i.e. security dilemma & military competition
 - Assumptions about security dilemma / historical records links
 - Under emphasis role of misinterpretation, interests and motives
- Rebuttal: state that none of the measures proposed should be taken in isolation + offered a conceptualisation of the security dilemma that we considered empirically operationisable.

Doyle (1986), "Liberalism and World Politics" *American Political Science Review* 80:4, pp. 1151- 1169.

- Argument: differences among liberal pacifism, liberal imperialism, and Kant's internationalism are not arbitrary. They are rooted in differing conceptions of the citizen and the state.
- Overview: rest of different views of the nature of human beings, the state & international relations
 - Schumpeter: democratic capitalist – liberal pacifism
 - 'war machine' + only war profiteers and military aristocrats gain from war
 - Machiavelli: classical republican – imperialism
 - Calls for 'necessity' in political survival and expansion
 - Kant: liberal republican – internationalism
 - Perpetual peace + collectively institutions can cause liberal peace amongst common states

Craig, Friedman, Rittenhouse, Green & Logan, Brooks, Ikenberry & Wohlforth (2013), "Debating American Engagement: The Future of U.S. Grand Strategy" *International Security* 38:2, pp. 181-199.

- Overview: working against the theory that deep engagement reduces the chance of a major Eurasian war; a new strategy of retrenchment would increase them.
- Basically poses other opinions to the previous reading on the key arguments + introduces new considerations relating to – revisionist states, costs of primacy; entrapment and temptation, non security consequences, budgetary costs
- Plus, features rebuttal from Brooks, Ikenberry & Wohlforth