

# BASUDEV GODABARI DEGREE COLLEGE , KESAIBAHAL

Department of Political Science

"SELF STUDY MODULE"



## Module Details :

- Class - 3 rd Semester
- Subject Name : Political Science
- Paper Name : PERSPECTIVES ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

VII

## UNIT - 2 : STRUCTURE

- (i) Classical Realism & Neo-Realism, Liberalism & Neo-liberalism
- (ii) Marxist Approaches, Feminist Perspectives, Euro- centricism & Perspective from the Global South

You Can use the Following Learning Video link related to above topic :

<https://youtu.be/lwD6MPRzPFE>

<https://youtu.be/D16E1j5qRMs>

<https://youtu.be/D6DI-9pSW-4>

You Can also use the following Books :

S.NO	Book Title	Author
1	'International Politics: Concepts, Theories and Issues',	Basu, Rumki (2012)•
2.	'The Globalization of World PoliticsForbes, Geraldine (1998)	Baylis & S. Smith (2002) (eds.),

And also you can download any book in free by using the following website.

- <https://www.pdfdrive.com/>

Principal  
30/06/2021  
Basudev Godabari Degree College  
KESAIBAHAL, SAMBALPUR, ODISHA, INDIA

## Introduction

The debate between neorealism and neoliberal institutionalism has dominated International Relations (IR) theory, particularly in the United States. The 'neo-neo' debate has brought much contention between the scholars of IR, equally the two schools of thought have been considered by many to be remarkably similar. In the first part of this essay I will outline the framework of the 'neo-neo' debate, discussing the fundamental points of contention between neorealism and neoliberal institutionalism. Two prominent Institutionalists, Robert Keohane and Lisa Martin (1995), have suggested that "for better or for worse institutional theory is a half-sibling of neorealism" (Keohane & Martin, 1995, cited in Lamy, 2005, p.215). The study of IR has experienced dramatic change as the foundational epistemology has been criticized by post-modern theorists who attack the underlying assumptions of positivism. As post-positivists are simply united through their opposition to the positivist movement, it is not a clean two-sided debate.

In the second part of this essay I will highlight the fundamental similarities that bring neorealism and neoliberal institutionalism under the theoretical umbrella of rationalism, whilst comparing the rationalist position to the recently surfaced reflectivism. As the debate has evolved the common assumptions of neorealism and neoliberal institutionalism have become increasingly obvious. In the final part of the essay I will analyse the similar assumptions of the international system held by rationalist theories, with particularly close attention paid to 'anarchy', 'self-help', and 'collective security'. To some extent the 'Great Debate' was an artificially constructed 'debate', invented for "specific presentational purposes, teaching and self-reflection of the discipline" (Waever, 1996, p.161). Moreover, the debate has highlighted the comparable paradigm positions of neorealism and neoliberal institutionalism, giving rise to a 'neo-neo synthesis' (Waever, 1996, p. 163), further consolidating the idea that the two approaches are simply manifestation of the same approach.

The debate between neorealism and neoliberal institutionalism has dominated IR debate for decades. The two schools of thought have jostled over views of the international system in an attempt to define the world of international politics. These two paradigms have been important to defining policymaking and the research within international relations (Lamy, 2005, p.207). The debate is characterized by their disagreement over specific issues such as: the nature and consequences of anarchy, international cooperation, relative versus absolute gains, intentions versus capabilities, institutions and regimes, and priority of state goals.

Kenneth Waltz is one of many scholars responsible for expanding the ideas of traditional realists such as Hans Morganthau, who looked at the actions and interactions between states in the system, in an attempt to explain international politics (Lamy, 2005, p.208). Neorealism looks to separate the internal factors of the international political systems from the external. This separation isolates one realm from another, allowing theorists to deal with each at an intellectual level. Neorealists focus on the structure of the system, analysing the variations, how they affect the interacting units, and the outcomes they produce (Waltz, 1990, p.29).

Waltz (1986) claims that the anarchic international system was a force that fashioned the states which constitute the system. The structure of the anarchic system compelled states to worry about security and take adequate measures achieve it. The preferences of states could not explain international outcomes, rather, Waltz argued that "state behaviour varies more with differences of power than with difference in ideology, in internal structure of property relations or in governmental form" (Waltz, 1986, cited in Walt, 2002, p.202-203).

Where neorealists were seen to focus on security measures, neoliberal institutionalists are believed to have placed greater emphasis upon environmental and economic issues, with a specific focus on the latter. Keohane and Nye (2001) argue that interdependence, particularly economic interdependence, is now an important feature of world politics. Furthermore, Keohane and Nye argue that states are dominant actors in international relations; equally there is an assumption that hierarchy exists within international politics and force can be used as an effective instrument of policy. Globalization represents an increase in interconnectedness and linkages; this

mutual interdependence between states positively affects behavioural patterns and changes the way states cooperate (Keohane and Nye, 2001).

The realist view on international cooperation is rather more pessimistic. As man by nature has a restless desire for power and self-interest (Keohane, 1986, p.211-212), cooperation becomes difficult to achieve as this strive for power is likely to upset the status-quo. According to Mearsheimer (1995), the two main obstructions to international cooperation are relative gains considerations and cheating, both of which stem from the logic of anarchy (Mearsheimer, 1995, p.12). Grieco (1988) argues that realists find that states are positional, not atomistic, in character; therefore as well as being anxious about cheating, states are primarily concerned with how their partners might benefit from any cooperative arrangements (Grieco, 1988, p.487). Since international relations are a zero-sum game, states compete with each other to ensure their own benefits outweigh that of others.

For realists, survival within the anarchic international system is paramount. The intentions of states are unknown and subsequently state actors are cautious about the gains of others when cooperating; a friend may gain from cooperation one day and use it as a threat the next. Waltz (1979) argues, under global anarchy, "when faced with the possibility of cooperating for mutual gains, states that feel insecure must ask how the gain will be divided. They are compelled to ask not 'Will both of us gain?' but 'Who will gain more?'" (Waltz, 1979, cited in Kegley, 2008, p.30). For neorealist's, balance of power is essential to understanding world politics; when states have such concerns about the balance of power cooperation is much more difficult to achieve.

Neoliberals show more concern as to how a state benefits overall, as opposed to how a state will benefit in comparison to others; it is suggested that policy makers will consider absolute gains to be made from an agreement, including potential longer-term gains. Neoliberals argue that to focus on relative gains is misguided as economic interdependence ensures that neither side can effectively exploit the economic relationship and take advantage of the other politically. Mastanduno (1991) suggests that relative gains can be destructive as they are conducive to the twin evils of protectionism and nationalism (Mastanduno, 1991, p. 76). To focus on distribution of benefit could affect the total benefit overall.

Neoliberal institutionalists agree that states act in their own interests, yet hold a much more optimistic view on cooperation. Keohane (1984) recognized that cooperation is not an easy feat and can lead to tension, but states could potentially benefit from cooperative strategies (Keohane, 1984). Duncan Snidal (1991) believes that if absolute gains from cooperation are considerable then relative gains are likely to have minimal effect on cooperation (Snidal, 1991, cited in Keohane & Martin, 1995, p.44). Like realists, institutionalists are concerned about cheating, but unlike neorealists, they place great faith in institutions themselves. Institutions provide a coordinating mechanism to help states capture potential gains from cooperation; this "constructed focal point" increases the opportunity of cooperative outcomes (Keohane & Martin, 1995, p.45). Furthermore, institutions provide an arbitrary body that is able to provide states with information preventing states from cheating. As explained in the game theory, more specifically Prisoners dilemma, states seek to maximize individual pay-offs, and so institutions offer a platform through which greater coordination and cooperation can be executed, subsequently benefitting both parties.

In Mearsheimer's article *The False Promise of International Institutions*, he purports that institutions reflect the distribution of power in the world; moreover, institutions have little influence on state behavior and offer diminutive opportunity for holding stability in a post Cold War period. Where neoliberals believe there to be strong correlation between institutions, economic cooperation and peace, neorealists doubt the link made between cooperation and stability as neoliberal theorists avoid military issues (Mearsheimer, 1995).

Mearsheimer (1995) argues that absolute gains logic can only apply to the economic realm, whereas relative gains apply to the security realm. Neoliberal institutionalists attempt to divide a line between the economic and security realm, yet there is correlation between economic might and military might. If neoliberals accept this realist claim that states act in accordance to self interest in an anarchic system where military powers matter, then according to Mearsheimer they must deal with the issue of relative gains (Mearsheimer, 1995, p.20). Keohane and Martin (1995) recognize that there is not a clear analytical line between security and economic

issues, but institutionalist theory has placed an importance on the role of institutions providing information removing the problem of uncertainty (Keohane & Martin, 1995, p.43).

Driven by survival, neorealists are sensitive to any erosion of their relative capabilities as these factors are the basis for security and independence (Grieco, 1988, p.498). Similarly, Krasner (1991) criticizes the neoliberal school of thought for placing too much emphasis upon intentions, interests, and information, paying little attention to the distribution of capabilities (Krasner, 1991, cited in Baldwin, 1993, p.7). Again institutionalists envisage the issue of capabilities being amended through security institutions signaling governments' intentions by providing others with adequate information. Institutions reflect advancing principles and norms of community standards lowering the costs of multilateral enforcement strategies (Kay, 2011, p.60).

The 'inter-paradigm' debate between neorealists and neoliberal institutionalists lasted for decades as scholars continued to pick flaws in position of the opposing approach, in an attempt highlight problems with the causal logic. It was not until the emergence of alternative approaches to international theory did the axis of the debate change.

A good place to situate the start of theoretical debates about women, class and work is in the intersection with Marxism and feminism. Such debates were shaped not only by academic inquiries but as questions about the relation between women's oppression and liberation and the class politics of the left, trade union and feminist movements in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, particularly in the U.S., Britain and Europe. It will also be necessary to consider various philosophical approaches to the concept of work, the way that women's work and household activities are subsumed or not under this category, how the specific features of this work may or may not connect to different "ways of knowing" and different approaches to ethics, and the debate between essentialist and social constructionist approaches to differences between the sexes as a base for the sexual division of labor in most known human societies.

The relation of women as a social group to the analysis of economic class has spurred political debates within both Marxist and feminist circles as to whether women's movements challenging male domination can assume a common set of women's interests across race, ethnicity, and class. If there are no such interests, on what can a viable women's movement be based, and how can it evade promoting primarily the interests of white middle class and wealthy women? To the extent to which women do organize themselves as a political group cutting across traditional class lines, under what conditions are they a conservative influence as opposed to a progressive force for social change? If poor and working class women's issues are different than middle and upper class women's issues, how can middle class women's movements be trusted to address them? In addition to these questions, there is a set of issues related to cross-cultural comparative studies of women, work and relative power in different societies, as well as analyses of how women's work is connected to processes of globalization.

Considerable research in the past 30 years has been devoted to women and work in the context of shifting divisions of labor globally (Ehrenreich and Hochschild 2004). Some of this feminist work proceeds from the development perspectives promoted by the UN and other policy making institutions (Chen *et al.* 2005), while other research takes a more critical view (Beneria 2003; Pyle and Ward 2007). Many studies address changes in the gender division of labor within specific national economies (Freeman 1999; George 2005; Rofel; Sangster 1995) while others consider the impact of transnational migration on women's class position (Pratt 2004; Romero 1992; Stephen 2007; Keogh 2015) and women's opportunities for cross-class solidarity and grassroots-based organizing (Mohanty 2003). More recent feminist research has addressed the restructuring of work and its impact on women and gender culture as an effect of neo-liberal economic adjustments (Adkins 2002; Enloe 2004; Federici 2008; McRobbie 2002; Skeggs 2003).

---

## 1. Marxism, Work, and Human Nature

Marxism as a philosophy of human nature stresses the centrality of work in the creation of human nature itself and human self-understanding (see the entry on Marxism). Both the changing historical relations between human work and nature, and the relations of humans to each other in the production and distribution of goods to meet material needs construct human nature differently in different historical periods: nomadic humans are different

than agrarian or industrial humans. Marxism as a philosophy of history and social change highlights the social relations of work in different economic modes of production in its analysis of social inequalities and exploitation, including relations of domination such as racism and sexism. (Marx 1844, 1950, 1906–9; Marx and Engels 1848, 1850; Engels 1942). Within capitalism, the system they most analyzed, the logic of profit drives the bourgeois class into developing the productive forces of land, labor and capital by expanding markets, turning land into a commodity and forcing the working classes from feudal and independent agrarian production into wage labor. Marx and Engels argue that turning all labor into a commodity to be bought and sold not only alienates workers by taking the power of production away from them, it also collectivizes workers into factories and mass assembly lines. This provides the opportunity for workers to unite against the capitalists and to demand the collectivization of property, i.e., socialism, or communism.

According to Engels's famous analysis of women's situation in the history of different economic modes of production in *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State* (1942), women are originally equal to, if not more powerful than, men in communal forms of production with matrilineal family organizations. Women lose power when private property comes into existence as a mode of production. Men's control of private property, and the ability thereby to generate a surplus, changes the family form to a patriarchal one where women, and often slaves,<sup>[1]</sup> become the property of the father and husband.

The rise of capitalism, in separating the family household from commodity production, further solidifies this control of men over women in the family when the latter become economic dependents of the former in the male breadwinner-female housewife nuclear family form. Importantly, capitalism also creates the possibility of women's liberation from family-based patriarchy by creating possibilities for women to work in wage labor and become economically independent of husbands and fathers. Engels stresses, however, that because of the problem of unpaid housework, a private task allocated to women in the sexual division of labor of capitalism, full women's liberation can only be achieved with the development of socialism and the socialization of housework and childrearing in social services provided by the state. For this reason, most contemporary Marxists have argued that women's liberation requires feminists to join the working class struggle against capitalism (Cliff 1984).

## 2. Marxist-Feminist Analyses

Many Marxist-feminist thinkers, prominent among them sociologists and anthropologists, have done cross-cultural and historical studies of earlier forms of kinship and economy and the role of the sexual or gender division of labor in supporting or undermining women's social power (cf. Reed 1973, Leacock 1972, Rosaldo and Lamphere 1974). They have also attempted to assess the world economic development of capitalism as a contradictory force for the liberation of women (Federici 2004; Mies 1986; Saffioti 1978) and to argue that universal women's liberation requires attention to the worse off: poor women workers in poor post-colonial countries (Sen & Grown 1987). Other feminist anthropologists have argued that other variables in addition to women's role in production are key to understanding women's social status and power (Sanday 1981; Leghorn and Parker 1981). Yet other feminist economic historians have done historical studies of the ways that race, class and ethnicity have situated women differently in relation to production, for example in the history of the United States (Davis 1983; Amott and Matthaei 1991). Finally some Marxist-feminists have argued that women's work in biological and social reproduction is a necessary element of all modes of production and one often ignored by Marxist economists (Benston 1969; Hennessy 2003; Vogel 1995).

## 3. First Wave Feminist Analyses of Women and Work

Those feminist analyses which have highlighted the role of women's work in the social construction of gender and the perpetuation of male dominance have been termed liberal, radical, Marxist, and socialist feminism by such influential categorizers as Jaggar and Rothenberg [Struhl] (1978), Tong (2000), Barrett (1980), Jaggar (1983) and Walby (1990)<sup>[2]</sup>. However, the pigeonhole categories of liberal, radical, Marxist, or socialist categories apply poorly to both to first wave women's movement feminist predecessors and contemporary deconstructionist, post-structuralist and post-colonialist perspectives.

A number of first wave feminists write about work and class as key issues for women's liberation, such as socialist-feminist Charlotte Perkins Gilman, heavily influenced by Darwinism and 19<sup>th</sup> century utopian modernism (Gilman 1898, 1910, 1979), anarchist Emma Goldman (1969), and existentialist, radical feminist and Marxist of sorts Simone de Beauvoir (1952). This is because the debates that arose around the place of the women's

movement in class politics were different in the early and mid-twentieth century than they were in the 1960s when many feminist theorists were trying to define themselves independently of the left anti-Vietnam war and civil rights movements of the time.

The debate about the economic and social function of housework and its relation to women's oppression is an old one that has been a feature of both the first and second wave women's movements in the US, Britain and Europe. In both eras, the underlying issue is how to handle the public/private split of capitalist societies in which women's reproductive functions have either limited their work to the home or created a "second shift" problem of unpaid housework and childcare as well as waged work. In the first wave, located as it was in the Victorian period where the dominant ideology for middle and upper class women was purity, piety and domesticity (also called the "cult of true womanhood"), the debate centered on whether to keep housework in the private sphere yet make it more scientific and efficient (Beecher 1841; Richards 1915), or whether to "socialize" it by bringing it into the public sphere, as socialist Charlotte Perkins Gilman advocated (1898).

In the US, the "public housekeeping" aspect of the Progressive movement of the 1890s through early 1900s advocated that women bring the positive values associated with motherhood into the public sphere — by obtaining the vote, cleaning out corruption in politics, creating settlement houses to educate and support immigrants, and forming the women's peace movement, etc. (cf. Jane Addams 1914). Disagreements about whether to downplay or valorize the distinctive function and skills in motherhood as work for which women are naturally superior, or to see motherhood as restricting women's chances for economic independence and equality with men in the public sphere, were also evident in debates between Ellen Keys (1909, 1914) and Gilman. Keys represented the difference side, that women are superior humans because of mothering; while Gilman and Goldman took the equality side of the debate, that is, that, women are restricted, and made socially unequal to men, by unpaid housework and mothering<sup>[3]</sup>.