



7

Theory and World Politics: Liberalism

I. Ön Hazırlık

Bu bölümde ana akım uluslararası ilişkiler teorilerinden birisi olarak kabul edilen Liberalizm ele alınacaktır. Uluslararası İlişkiler literatürü içerisinde realist teorisyenlerin aksine liberal teorisyenler genel olarak daha iyimser bir bakış açısına sahiptirler ve uluslararası ilişkilerde barış ve işbirliğinin mümkün olabileceği düşüncesini savunmaktadırlar. Devletlerarası ilişkilerin ekonomik boyutunu öne çıkaran liberal teorisyenler, uluslararası kurumlar aracılığıyla uzlaşmazlıkların aşılabileceği düşüncesi üzerinde durmaktadırlar. Uluslararası ortamda çatışmaların giderek daha da şiddetlendiği günümüz dünyasında Liberalizmin bu iyimser bakış açısı ağır eleştirilere maruz kalsa da uluslararası kurumların giderek daha fazla güçlenmesi liberal varsayımların gücünü korumasını sağlamaktadır.

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

Klasik liberalizm, neoliberalizm, demokratik barış teorisi, barış, karşılıklı bağımlılık,

II. Çeviri Çalışması: Aşağıdaki metinleri tercüme ediniz.

1. Although some realists condemned it as a form of idealism in the late 1930s and just after the Second World War, liberal internationalism became the focus of renewed attention at the end of the twentieth century. At least for a short time in the early 1990s, particularly after the Gulf War and the collapse of the Soviet Union as well as communism, it seemed to many that the dream of world order – most often associated with the statecraft of President Woodrow Wilson during and after the First World War – had a chance of being realised. Some of the optimism of that period has since disappeared, and it is becoming clear that liberal internationalism faces many theoretical and practical challenges. Liberal internationalism is essentially a project to transform international relations so that they conform to models of peace, freedom, and prosperity allegedly enjoyed within constitutional liberal democracies such as the United States. Indeed, at least in terms of political rhetoric, the United States has been the leader in promoting liberal internationalism of one kind or another in the twentieth century.

Martin Griffiths, Terry O'Callaghan, Steven C. Roach, International Relations Key Concepts, Routledge, Londra, 2008, sf.180

Vocabulary

condemn

associate with

statecraft

conform to

prosperity

allegedly

Translation

2. Liberals generally take a positive view of human nature. They have great faith in human reason and they are convinced that rational principles can be applied to international affairs. Liberals recognize that individuals are self-interested and competitive up to a point. But they also believe that individuals share many interests and can thus engage in collaborative and cooperative social action, domestically as well as internationally, which results in greater benefits for everybody at home and abroad. In other words, conflict and war are not inevitable; when people employ their reason they can achieve mutually beneficial cooperation not only within states but also across international boundaries. Liberal theorists thus believe that human reason can triumph over human fear and the lust for power. But they disagree about the magnitude of the obstacles on the way to human progress (Smith 1992: 204). For some liberals it is a long-term process with many setbacks; for others, success is just around the corner. However, all liberals agree that in the long run cooperation based on mutual interests will prevail. That is because modernization constantly increases the scope and the need for cooperation (Zacher and Matthew 1995: 119).

Robert Jackson, Georg Sorensen, Introduction to International Relations: Theories and Approaches, Oxford University Press, Birleşik Krallık, 2010, sf.101

Vocabulary

apply to

self-interested

competitive

engage in

triumph

lust

Translation

3. Underlying liberal internationalism – the projection of liberal thought and political principles to the international realm – is the assumption that one can apply reason to extend the possibilities for individual and collective self-rule, or freedom. Liberal internationalism emerged as a coherent worldview in the Enlightenment and reached its height as a systematic statement of international reform with Woodrow Wilson’s Fourteen Points, intended to form the basis of the post-World War I peace. Liberals tended to believe that the outbreak of World War I had vindicated their critique of the prevailing system of International Relations (IR) and sought to establish a liberal peace marked by open diplomacy, the right of self-determination, free trade, disarmament, the peaceful settlement of disputes, and the establishment of an international security organization in the form of the League of Nations. The role of the League would be to resolve differences between states, guarantee their political independence and territorial integrity, and address a range of other contemporary international questions such as the position of labor and minorities. However, hopes for a reformed world, already badly damaged by the punitive Versailles Peace Treaty (1919), were shattered with the militarization and expansionism of Italy, Germany, and Japan in the 1930s, culminating in World War II. These events and the rapid onset of the Cold War after 1945 generated a number of influential realist critiques that were widely (if not necessarily fairly) perceived as devastating to liberal internationalism, both as an intellectual construct and as a guide to the practical conduct of IR. Since the 1980s, however, liberal internationalism has attracted renewed interest both on empirical and on normative grounds, and it may be that IR is moving toward a position in which it can provide a more satisfactory account of liberal internationalism’s legacy, potentialities, and limitations.

John MacMillian, “Liberal Internationalism”, International Relations Theory for the Twenty-First Century: An Introduction, Editör: Martin Griffiths, Routledge, New York, 2007, s.21

Vocabulary

self-rule
resolve

vindicate
integrity

Translation

4. Interdependence means mutual dependence: peoples and governments are affected by what happens elsewhere, by the actions of their counterparts in other countries. Thus, a higher level of transnational relations between countries means a higher level of interdependence. That also reflects the process of modernization, which usually increases the level of interdependence between states. The twentieth century, especially the period since 1950, has seen the rise of a large number of highly industrialized countries. Richard Rosecrance (1986, 1995, 1999) has analysed the effects of these developments on the policies of states. Throughout history states have sought power by means of military force and territorial expansion. But for highly industrialized countries economic development and foreign trade are more adequate and less costly means of achieving prominence and prosperity. That is because the costs of using force have increased and the benefits have declined. Why is force less beneficial for states and trade increasingly so? The principal reason, according to Rosecrance, is the changing character and basis of economic production, which is linked to modernization. In an earlier age the possession of territory and ample natural resources were the key to greatness. In today's world that is no longer the case; now a highly qualified labour force, access to information, and financial capital are the keys to success. The most economically successful countries of the post-war period are the 'trading states' such as Japan and Germany. They have refrained from the traditional military-political option of high military expenditure and economic self-sufficiency; instead, they have chosen the trading option of an intensified international division of labour and increased interdependence.

Robert Jackson, Georg Sorensen, Introduction to International Relations: Theories and Approaches, Oxford University Press, Birleşik Krallık, 2010, sf.106

Vocabulary

interdependence

transnational

prominence

division of labour

Translation

5. As a concept, interdependence began to be examined in earnest in the early 1970s. According to some scholars, three major changes were taking place in international relations. First, states were becoming increasingly interdependent across a variety of issue areas, from consumer goods to security. Second, the decision-making capacity of states vis-à-vis the global economy was weakening. Third, the more interconnected states were becoming, the more vulnerable they were to disruptions and events in other parts of the globe. As evidence of these changes, interdependence theorists pointed to significant increases in transnational capital flows and technology transfers, the rise of multinational corporations, the thawing of relations between the superpowers, the growing importance of international institutions (both governmental and non-governmental), and the growing permeability of borders. Moreover, issues such as human rights, poverty, development, the environment, and energy politics had forced their way onto the foreign policy agenda of states. To many theorists of interdependence, the crude power politics of the cold war years appeared to be giving way to a more cooperative and rule-governed world. It is important to understand that the theorists of interdependence were not just talking about increased interconnectedness in a variety of issue areas. The shift was also qualitative. The world was changing. The realist view that states were independently pursuing their national interests did not seem to present an accurate picture of the way states acted under conditions of what Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye called ‘complex interdependence’.

Martin Griffiths, Terry O’Callaghan, Steven C. Roach, International Relations Key Concepts, Routledge, Londra, 2008, sf.157-8

Vocabulary

interdependent

interconnected

vulnerable

disruption

Translation

6. In contemporary IR liberals continue to argue that interdependence compels states to cooperate much more extensively than they had done before. As we will see below, there is now an extensive neo-liberal institutionalist literature on the nature and functions of regimes and institutions in international relations. Moreover, modern states are incapable of meeting the complex and diverse needs of their citizens without cooperating with other states. International institutions and regimes become necessary to coordinate the ever-more-powerful forces of interdependence. Large and small states, developed and underdeveloped, are members of some or all of these institutions and all are said to benefit to some degree from cooperation. Although conflict is always present, institutions, or regimes, provide the fora for states to settle their differences without resorting to war. In summary, for liberals cooperation is possible because the nature of twentieth-century science, technology and economics has produced interdependence between states, and other actors, such as non-governmental organisations, multinational corporations or international institutions. In some cases interdependence has forced states to give up some of their sovereignty and independence to international institutions, like the UN and EU. Increasingly, states are being required or compelled to engage in more intensive forms of cooperation which frequently give rise to regimes to regulate behaviour over a range of issues areas.

Jill Steans, Lloyd Pettiford, Thomas Diez ve Imad El-Anis, An Introduction to International Relations, Pearson, İngiltere, 2010, s.41-2

Vocabulary

institutionalist

underdeveloped

fora

resort

Translation

7. The dual themes of domestic legitimacy and the extent to which liberal democratic states exercise restraint and peaceful intentions in their foreign policy have been taken up more recently by Doyle, Russett and others. In a restatement of Kant's argument that a 'pacific federation' (foedus pacificum) can be built by expanding the number of states with republican constitutions, Doyle claims that liberal democracies are unique in their ability and willingness to establish peaceful relations among themselves. This pacification of foreign relations between liberal states is said to be a direct product of their shared legitimate political orders based on democratic principles and institutions. The reciprocal recognition of these common principles – a commitment to the rule of law, individual rights and equality before the law, and representative government based on popular consent – means that liberal democracies evince little interest in conflict with each other and have no grounds on which to contest each other's legitimacy: they have constructed a 'separate peace' (Doyle 1986: 1161; Fukuyama 1992: xx). This does not mean that they are less inclined to make war with non-democratic states, and Doyle is correct to point out that democracies maintain a healthy appetite for conflicts with authoritarian states, as recent conflicts in the Middle East and Central Asia attest to. But it does suggest that the best prospect for bringing an end to war between states lies with the spread of liberal-democratic governments across the globe. The expansion of the zone of peace from the core to the periphery is also the basis of Fukuyama's optimism about the post-Communist era (Doyle 1986, 1995, 1997; Russett 1993).

Scott Burchill, "Liberalism", Theories of International Relations, Editörler: Scott Burchill ve diğ erleri, Palgrave, New York, 2005, s. 60

Vocabulary

restatement

pacific

reciprocal

evince

Translation