

Is realism more
persuasive than
liberalism politics
essay



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

The two key concepts of international relations are realism with share a pessimistic view of human nature and liberalism that has an optimistic view to the rise of modern states.

Realism has more persuasive account in international relations because of his pessimistic critic of human nature. As to realism definition the belief that within human morality there will always be conflict among people. In international relations realist believe that war is the only ultimate resolution of avoiding conflict.

Liberalism is the international theory that holds takes positive view of human nature because human beings have ability to reason. liberalism believe that human being are self interested but also recognize that people share common interests therefore they co-operate with one another.

Liberalism has a core belief in progress assumptions, for example Robert Keohane argued that liberals believes on the possibility of increasing progress.

The key argument of liberalism is the aspiration to create people society where the potential can be achieved. They believe that citizens have to be brought up to do hard job. Even it the different liberals' opinions in what the government role should have or be included. Classical liberal suggest that the government should not have a large functions, only three important functions are related to them such as, to guarantee order and law, to maintain protection against internal and external enemies, lastly to increase support to the two preceding functions. However modern liberals suggest that the states exist to help citizens and also themselves. The state plays

<https://assignbuster.com/is-realism-more-persuasive-than-liberalism-politics-essay/>

important function, Liberals and conservatives strongly argued that the government is very important and play an important role in the assistances of citizens but realist don't accept the same idea.

One of the most important idea of liberalism is related with freedom, that meant that all people in the world have the right to be free (natural freedom) but liberals don't trust in full freedom because they believe that people do not do what they want to do, if everyone should do what they want it would give the rely right. That should bring people in pluralism idea where is seeing as the diversity of opinion. Even if realists would see pluralism idea as strong because of the variety of opinions and is causing change in social aspect. About freedom conservatives differ with classical liberal because they suggest that freedom lead to " negative freedom" where everyone do what they like on every occasion they want, conservatives do not argue with that idea because they believe that individual freedom do not have the same power as the law. The conservative idea is that the law is a strong instrument to sustain peace and promote freedom from citizens that want to take the freedom and rights from the others people.

Freedom is closely connected with the doctrine of laissez-faire which advocated minimum regulation and maximum freedom of action for the entrepreneur according to Goodwin. (Barbara Goodwin, 2007, pg 36, 41)

Liberal belief in " reason" human rationality because they argued that human are completely able of achieve their own personal interests. Liberal sees reason as scientific knowledge and as a form of progress but conservative don't belief in that. Liberalism can suggest that belief in

progress but conservative belief that the knowledge came from the earlier period. Reasons have never supported the idea of paternalism because paternalism is compare as authority and also helps direct that inferior level and the conservatism argued that the government is important for control of citizens.

Liberalism has always repudiated the idea of real interests, arguing that that way lie paternalism and even totalitarianism, this means that only subjectively felt or expressed interests can count. Liberals also reject the Marxism contention that people en masse can be deluded about their interests and suffer widespread false consciousness, since this erodes the concept of rationality. According to Goodwin logically, argued that, Liberalism is a flexible and adjustable ideas; it has presided over what were arguably three of the most progressive and liberating centuries of human history. It should therefore be credited with many of the advances of this era even if it is also rightly blamed for many of our endemic social problems. (Barbara Goodwin, 2007, pg, 63)

Realist view of human is based on the focus of individual and their own well-being. Realist believes that human have an aggressive relation with each others. Realists focus on domestic political life because they believe that the political world is consisted of international anarchy of sovereign states. Realism strongly focuses on state values, it national security and ensure state survival. Power allows states to act freely on strength resistance of each state due to their belief of anarchy government and non-existence authority in international relation. State can use their power only if they can justify their action base on evidence of their state security. According to <https://assignbuster.com/is-realism-more-persuasive-than-liberalism-politics-essay/>

realism states are allowed to act while using their power as long as they can evidently justify their action. Realists believe that international relations can only improve unless an effective global democracy is put in place to prevent anarchy.

Hans Morgenthau is a classic realist thinker of international relations of the twenty century; he argued that women and men have “ will to power”. That is in particular clear in government and also specifically in global politics.” Morgenthau view suggested that whatever states objectives are the will always use power to maintain the values. According to him political activities are focus on use of power. The main concept of foreign policy is to ensure protection and defence of state interests in the political world. The great power has demonstrated effectively in modern world because of the claim of perceptive human nature to authority of the state, and they understand state behaviour as being a conflict.

In the realist concept or ideas actors of the world politics are perceived as being less helpful or not important. For example International organizations, NGOs (Non- governmental organisations) and people. The main concern of realism is the state survival and protection of nation from danger. Realist argued that is the reasons to make foreign policy, and according to the realist all government in the world defend their own national interest because of self interests.

Realists consider that the life of human would be terrible with no protections of state, and they also believe that there would be dreadful conditions in the people's life and the value of state would not be certain.

<https://assignbuster.com/is-realism-more-persuasive-than-liberalism-politics-essay/>

All the country states are seen as the defender of its land or region, and the value of life, according to Hobbes. All the foreign policies decisions should be done, on bases of the national interest. Ethics and human society cannot be extensive into the relationships of international relations.

Realism is best compared with egoism or the absence of any formal system of government in a society. For example structural realists believe that international politics is important to try to overcome problem relating with power, but classical realist contrast this idea seeing that is a product of human nature, post-war realist, Hans and Morgenthau argued that the nature of man is the necessary description of international politics such fear, competition and war can be explained and also argued that, the most important aspect to consider is that festive people have to recognize that laws exist and think the most right polices that are regular with the basic fact that human beings are flawed creatures . The structural realists are more focus to the international anarchy. According to John Herz discussed that “ international anarchy guarantees the centrality of power; structural realism can be called also neo-realists”.

The biological realist focus more in human nature, in this theory is more evident that people are product of nature in action.

Realist are considered more aggressive in foreign policy, they have always missing credibility for example Morgenthau went against the US war in the Vietnam to the point of rational understanding of national interest. Another good example is the US invasion war in Iraq; I would illustrate this as realism’s council against the use of force.

Realists in 1990 said, that Saddam Hussein in Iraq war proves that war and use of force represent dangers to the population and country. The liberal came with a different definition against the realist's views of the Iraq situation or problems. They have seen the Middle East politics as exception. The liberal also argued that the world is moving towards the anarchy of sovereign state system.

These contradictory ideas on the nature of global politics and how it is change will not rapidly be accepted. The realists' stress permanence; the liberals stress change. Both claim the high ground of realism with a small. Liberals have a tendency to see realists as cynics whose interest with the past blinds them to change. Realists, in turn, call the liberals utopian dreamers.

Liberals also argue that economic power has replaced military power as the central medium of international politics, this is greatly overstated. Security is like oxygen. It is often taken for granted when it is present, but you will think about nothing else once you begin to miss it. Realists rightly argue that economic instrument still cannot compete with military forces in their coercive and deterrent effects. Economic sanctions by the United Nations compelled neither Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait in 1990 according to Nye and Joseph. (Nye, Joseph S. 1997, pg 55, 20 190)

Hoffman argued that the core of liberalism continues is self-discipline, moderation, cooperation and peace where the real meaning of international politics is exactly the opposite troubled peace, at best or the state war. For example there was a brief resurgence of liberal sentiment at the end of the

Second World War with the birth of the United Nations, although this beacon of hope was soon extinguished by the return of cold war.

After 9/11, the US government has gain more power over the people, and they have consolidated their power to act against terror, and the states that help and give support to terrorist activities.

Realism is more persuasive than liberalism because it as a realistic explanation of dynamics of the political world in the realist live and the name represents almost an unfair advantage in terms of student' initial reaction to it. However, realism should be regarded just as name for an exacting way of opinion about the world; a label which is understood to imply certain basic assumptions.

According to Steans and Pittsford argued also that, realists are malicious to the people, realists are necessarily heartless people who do not worry about malnourishment, authoritarianism and rainforests as long as the global system persists and conflict are unspoken and perhaps limited or controlled as much as possible.(Steans and Patti ford, 2001, pg 42).

Rationality provides the final strategy to save realism as a general theory of international relation. For example, Kydd claims that " the fundamental assumption behind realism is that states can be helpfully idea of as unitary rational actors substitute strategically under anarchy" (1997: 120).

Numerous others realists also appeal to what Robert Keohane calls " the reason assumption: world politics can be seen as if states were unitary rational actors". Morgenthau argued that state " act, as they must, in view of their interests as they see them" (1962a: 278).

<https://assignbuster.com/is-realism-more-persuasive-than-liberalism-politics-essay/>

The issue is how they see them. Interests become interesting only when they acquire substance which is provided not by calculating, instrumental reason but by the passions (interests, desires). Realism is distinguished from other theories not by the rationality assumption, but by its substantive specifications of the interests of states leaders, and citizens. (Donnelly Jack, 2000, pg 64, 65).