



6

Theory and World Politics: Realism

I. Ön Hazırlık

Uluslararası ilişkiler teorileri uluslararası politikayı sistematik bir yöntemle anlama ve açıklama amacıyla geliştirilmiş teorilerdir. Uluslararası ilişkiler teorisyenlerinin güncel ve tarihsel olayları farklı yorumlamaları birbirinden bağımsız teorilerin ortaya çıkmasına neden olmuştur. Bu bölümde uluslararası ilişkiler teorileri içerisinde yaygın olarak kullanılan teorilerden bir tanesi olan Realizm ele alınacaktır. Realist teorisyenler genel olarak devletler arasındaki güç ve çıkar mücadeleleri üzerinden uluslararası politikayı açıklamaya çalışmaktadırlar. Her ne kadar uluslararası ilişkilerin karmaşık yapısını yüzeysel bir yaklaşımla açıklamaya çalıştığı yönünde eleştirilere uğrasa da Realizm uluslararası ilişkiler teorileri içerisindeki önemini korumaya devam etmektedir.

Bu bölümün ele aldığı konuyu anlayabilmek için aşağıdaki kavramları araştırın ve bu konuda Türkçe ve İngilizce kaynaklardan yararlanarak bir ön hazırlık yapın.

Klasik realizm, neorealizm, güç, güç dengesi, ulusal çıkar, güvenlik ikilemi,

II. Çeviri Çalışması: Aşağıdaki metinleri tercüme ediniz.

1. Realism is the name given to a particular theoretical approach to the study of international relations. According to its proponents, realism has been around for a very long time. Some scholars trace its intellectual origins all the way back to Thucydides, the chronicler of the Peloponnesian wars. Thucydides argued that the cause of the war between the Athenians and the Spartans (around 420 BC) was an increase in Athenian military power and the insecurity that it created among the Spartans. In making this and other observations about state behaviour, Thucydides is said to have begun one of the main traditions of thinking about international relations. Niccolo Machiavelli, Thomas Hobbes, and Max Weber are also regarded as seminal thinkers in this intellectual tradition, although it is quite possible to find statements by a large number of past philosophers, theologians, historians, and political commentators that might be called realist. It is important to recognise, however, that none of these early writers actually thought of himself as a realist. Thus while the origins of realism may lie in the writings of these early thinkers, its formulation as a theoretical approach to the study of international relations is a relatively recent development beginning in the late 1930s and early 1940s.

Martin Griffiths, Terry O'Callaghan, Steven C. Roach, International Relations Key Concepts, Routledge, Londra, 2008, sf.267

Vocabulary

Proponent

Regard

Observation

Theologian

Behaviour

Thinker

Translation

2. Basic realist ideas and assumptions are: (1) a pessimistic view of human nature; (2) a conviction that international relations are necessarily conflictual and that international conflicts are ultimately resolved by war; (3) a high regard for the values of national security and state survival; (4) a basic scepticism that there can be progress in international politics which is comparable to that in domestic political life. These pervasive ideas and assumptions steer the thought of most leading realist IR theorists, both past and present. In realist thought humans are characterized as being preoccupied with their own well-being in their competitive relations with each other. They desire to be in the driver's seat. They do not wish to be taken advantage of. They consequently strive to have the 'edge' in relations with other people—including international relations with other countries. In that regard at least, human beings are considered to be basically the same everywhere. Thus, the desire to enjoy an advantage over others and to avoid domination by others is universal. This pessimistic view of human nature is strongly evident in the IR theory of Hans Morgenthau (1965, 1985), who was the leading classical realist thinker of the twentieth century. He sees men and women as having a 'will to power'. That is particularly evident in politics and especially international politics: 'Politics is a struggle for power over men, and whatever its ultimate aim may be, power is its immediate goal and the modes of acquiring, maintaining, and demonstrating it determine the technique of political action' (Morgenthau 1965: 195).

Robert Jackson, Georg Sorensen, Introduction to International Relations: Theories and Approaches, Oxford University Press, Birleşik Krallık, 2010, sf.66

Vocabulary

Pessimistic

Resolve

Preoccupy

Strive to

Conflictual

Steer

Well-being

will

Translation

3. The leading neorealist thinker is undoubtedly Kenneth Waltz. Waltz's *Theory of International Politics* (1979) seeks to provide a scientific explanation of the international political system. He takes some elements of classical realism as a starting point—e.g., independent states existing and operating in a system of international anarchy. But he departs from that tradition by giving no account of human nature and by ignoring the ethics of statecraft. His explanatory approach is heavily influenced by economic models. A scientific theory of IR leads us to expect states to behave in certain predictable ways. In Waltz's view the best IR theory is one that focuses centrally on the structure of the system, on its interacting units, and on the continuities and changes of the system. In classical realism, state leaders and their international decisions and actions are at the centre of attention. In neorealism, by contrast, the structure of the system that is external to the actors, in particular the relative distribution of power, is the central analytical focus. Leaders are relatively unimportant because structures compel them to act in certain ways. Structures more or less determine actions. According to Waltz's neorealist theory, a basic feature of international relations is the decentralized structure of anarchy between states. States are alike in all basic functional respects—i.e., in spite of their different cultures or ideologies or constitutions or histories, they all perform the same basic tasks. All states have to collect taxes, conduct foreign policy, and so on. States differ significantly only in regard to their greatly varying capabilities.

Robert Jackson, Georg Sorensen, Introduction to International Relations: Theories and Approaches, Oxford University Press, Birleşik Krallık, 2010, sf.79-80

Vocabulary

Depart from

Statecraft

Compel

Anarchy

Determine

Decentralized

Translation

4. A second approach, closely identified with the realist school of thought, conceives of the national interest in terms of some basic assumptions about the nature of international relations and the motivations of states. These include the idea that anarchy makes security the paramount foreign policy concern of states. Security, in turn, requires the acquisition and rational management of power (which can never be wholly divorced from military force), and only policies conducted in this spirit can serve the national interest. Of course, this approach depends on the truth of the underlying assumptions. At the risk of oversimplifying a very complex debate, there are at least two problems with this approach. First, it often suffers from the resort to tautology in that interest is often defined in terms of power, and power in terms of interest. It is not very helpful to say that nations must seek power because they seek power! Second, there is an important tension between free will and determinism in the realist approach. For if international relations are indeed determined by a struggle for power, it should not be necessary to exhort leaders to abide by the national interest as defined by realists. If it is necessary to do so, the alleged constraints of anarchy cannot be invoked as the basis for identifying the national interest.

Martin Griffiths, Terry O'Callaghan, Steven C. Roach, International Relations Key Concepts, Routledge, Londra, 2008, sf.217

Vocabulary

Conceive

Abide

Tautology

National Interest

Divorce

Oversimplify

Exhort

Constraint

Translation

5. In discussing several of the more important intellectual precursors of realism, the concept of power was mentioned time and again. Any attempt to give the reader a more complete understanding of the realist image of international relations starts with a discussion of this crucial term. Power is the core concept for realists. Having said this, it is rather ironic that even among realists, there is no clear consensus on how to define the term power. Some realists understand power to be the sum of military, economic, technological, diplomatic and other capabilities at the disposal of the state. Others see power not as some absolute value determined for each state as if it were in a vacuum but, rather as capabilities relative to the capabilities of other states. Thus, the power of the United States is evaluated in terms of its capabilities relative to the capabilities of other states. Both of these definitions – whether treating capabilities of a state in isolation or relative to the capabilities of other states- assume a static view of power. Power is an attribute of the state that is the sum of its capabilities whether considered alone or relative to other states. An alternative, dynamic definition of power focuses on the interactions of states. A state's influence (or capacity to influence or coerce) is not only determined by its capabilities (or relative capabilities) but also by (1) its willingness (and perceptions by other states or its willingness) to use these capabilities and (2) its control or influence over other states. Power can thus be inferred by observing the behavior of states as they interact. The relative power of states is most clearly revealed by the outcomes of their interactions.

Vocabulary

Perceptions

Consensus

Coerce

Reveal

Capabilities

Disposal

Infer

Interact

Translation

6. This notion – the ‘security dilemma’ – is based on the complex relationship between ‘intentions’ and ‘capabilities’, and the ways in which the system of sovereign states encourages emphasis on the latter rather than the former, with the result that a spiral of insecurity may emerge on the basis of misperception. Thus, because there is a background level of possible insecurity even in an international order where the majority of states are unaggressive and broadly satisfied with life, states feel obliged to preserve the means of self-defence and to do so in a cost-efficient but also effective way, which sometimes involves enhancing this capacity. However, the capacity to defend oneself is also, most of the time, a capacity to act offensively. On the same chain of reasoning that leads the first, peaceful state to preserve and occasionally enhance the effectiveness of its armed forces, a second state may see this as a potentially hostile act. The defensive intentions – which cannot easily be demonstrated, much less proven – will be less important than the offensive capabilities. If the second state reacts to these capabilities by expanding its own coercive capacity this is likely to be perceived as potentially hostile, and so the spiral sets in. The US debate over National Missile Defense offers an interesting illustration of the reasoning here; a partial missile defence for the US would be purely defensive in intent, designed to deter attacks from ‘rogue’ states, but, if effective, such a system would render less credible Russian and Chinese deterrent forces and probably stimulate them to upgrade their systems, in turn increasing US anxiety, and so on.

Chris Brown, Kirsten Alnley, Understanding International Relations, Palgrave, New York, 2005, sf.93-94

Vocabulary

Spiral

Self-defence

Set in

Render

Oblige to

Cost-efficient

Rogue

Credible

Translation

7. Realists distinguish between authority and power. When they use the term anarchy, they are referring to the absence of any hierarchy of legitimate authority in the international system. There is hierarchy of power in international politics, but there is not a hierarchy of authority. Some states are clearly more powerful than others, but there is no recognized authority higher than that of any state. Anarchy, so understood, is the defining characteristic of the environment within which sovereign states interact. Violence and war may be evident, but so too are periods of relative peace and stability. This absence of any superordinate or central authority over states (such as a world government with authority to enforce rules and to maintain order) is fundamentally different from domestic societies, where an authority exists to maintain order and to act as an arbiter of disputes. Exceptions would be cases of total government collapse or in civil wars when legitimate authority may be unclear. Realists argue that the absence of a central and overriding authority helps to explain why states come to rely on power, seeking to maintain or increase their power positions relative to other states. For one thing, the condition of anarchy is usually accompanied by a lack of trust among states in this environment. Each state faces a self-help situation in which it is dangerous to place the security of one's own country in the hands of another.

Vocabulary

Evident

Relative

Arbiter

Situation

Trust

Fundamentally

Legitimate

Superordinate

Overriding

Self-help

Domestic

Maintain

Translation