

**Polylateralism:
diplomacy's third
dimension by
geoffrey wiseman**



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

COURSE OVERVIEW Geoffrey Wiseman - " Polyilateralism: Diplomacy's Third Dimension" - two basic forms of diplomacy that have evolved over the years: bilateral (conduct of relations between two states) and multilateral (conduct of relations between three or more states at permanent or ad hoc international conferences - agree that polyilateralism constitutes diplomacy's third dimension (conduct of relations between official entities and at least one unofficial nonstate entity) - define state actors as 192 member states of UN definitions from Florini and Price of transnational actors don't classify " bad" nonstate actors...Keck and Sikkink definition doesn't realize that NGOs are typically divided into two types (advocacy and service) - transnational connotes interaction, whereas polyilateral diplomacy has advantage of connoting purposive diplomatic interactions and is thus extension of bilateral and multilateral - rise of global civil society after cold war with 1998 Ottawa treaty banning anti-personnel land mines - during the 1990s, rise in second track diplomacy (methods of diplomacy outside formal governmental system and virtual diplomacy (process of direct global and transnational communication and bargaining between states etc through new technologies) - use 6 hypothesis to test robustness of the polyilateralism concept - 1) state capacity for diplomatic innovation is generally underestimated...underestimated state resilience and overestimated transnational civil society actors flexibility and innovation...problem is zero-sum thinking because state does not need to go into decline for transnational civil society actors to play a stronger global role...the goal should be to promote a democratic state environment in which both state and transnational civil society actors flourish - 2) small and middle-sized state diplomatic institutions are more likely to innovate and cooperate with

<https://assignbuster.com/polyilateralism-diplomacys-third-dimension-by-geoffrey-wiseman/>

transnational civil society actors...middle power polylateralism hasn't quite lived up to the promise implied in the middle power literature in recent years...state size may be less of a factor in explaining a disposition toward transnationalism than is the political disposition of the government in power

- 3) democracies are more likely than semi-democracies and non-democracies to innovate polylaterally...as countries move toward democracy they are more likely to engage in polylateral diplomacy (ex: Mexico and Turkey)
- 4) states will welcome transnational civil society actors more in low politics than in high politics...low politics = human rights while high politics = national security...not true there is evidence that transnational civil society actors are injecting their way into some aspects of high politics such as nuclear non-proliferation...work more closely with UN and EU...hypothesis that high politics polylateralism is generally resisted by governments is historically true but by no means absolute setback in 9/11
- 5) state diplomats are more likely to engage with NGOs involved in long-term policy influence (cooperative model) than with those pursuing highly politicized short-term campaigns or protests (conflict model)...true...spectrum of cooperation to confrontation
- 6) state responsiveness to transnational civil society actors will vary significantly with decision phase...true the spectrum is issue framing/agenda setting/issue mobilization/negotiation/final implementation - evidence is mixed but even if polylateral diplomacy not fully conceptualized...don't be too quick to say there is global solidarity but remain optimistic

Ahmed and Potter – “NGOs in International Politics” (professor at Northern Kentucky University and professor at University of Michigan) - Oxfam: during WWII Greece occupied by German army...

professors from Oxford University created Oxford Committee for Famine
<https://assignbuster.com/polylateralism-diplomacy-third-dimension-by-geoffrey-wiseman/>

Relief (OxFam)...establish relief facilities in wake of natural disasters and civil wars - Yunus, professor at University of Chittagong founded Grameen Bank... huge gap between mainstream economic theory and actual conditions of poor citizens...started bank with personal funds to provide smaller loans to poorer people no collateral needed.. universal repayment by borrowers - Harry Wray founded CANHELP Thailand visit former student to realize absence of primary school so organize group to help build schools in poorest regions... leadership mainly one man show - adopts UN definition of NGOs: any international organization which is not established by inter-governmental agreement shall be considered a NGO...can't be profit-making, not advocate violence, can't be school, political party, and must be general than restricted to a certain country - northern NGOs = industrial democracies while southern NGOs = developing countries - NSA vs. NGO...NSA includes multinational corporations, organized crime groups - reasons why not enough attention given to question of how NGOs fit into mainstream IR theory...1) study of organizations crosses disciplinary and theoretical boundaries also many studies of NGOs discuss in technical terms specific to disciplines outside of social sciences such as agriculture 2) mainstream IR theory tended to ignore emergence of these new actors in areas directly concerned with international politics...still focus on nation-state (realism with self-help system) maybe should focus on liberalism - regime theory = an outgrowth of interdependence theory...regimes are conventionally defined as sets of principles norms and expectations that guide behavior in certain areas of international politics consist of participating governments and international laws and studies of regimes constantly point to non-state actors - crucial problem in studying NGOs within framework of IR is that they

<https://assignbuster.com/polylateralism-diplomacys-third-dimension-by-geoffrey-wiseman/>

organize for action in ways that aren't readily seen in traditional political science terms - NGOs take power in nontraditional forms that don't always appear political - 2 approaches to IR that emerged in 1990s are more congenial to study of NGOs: 1) transnationalism (regular interactions across national boundaries when at least one actor is non state actor) and 2) constructivism (interests, identities, and roles are socially defined...criticize realist assertion that anarchy creates self-help the environment or the international system is not fixed and immutable and therefore doesn't determine actors' behavior...focus on ideas norms communities which are most conducive to exercise of NGO influence) - constructivism addresses critical issue in what kind of power NGOs have because talk about power of communication...power of NGOs is to persuade - transnationalism and constructivism are useful tools for understanding how NGOs influence international politics and civil society because NGO interactions with one another and other actors are transnational and potentially transformative

NGOS AS DIPLOMATIC ACTORS Ahmed and Potter " NGOs in International Politics/ NGO Relations with States" (Senior at Brookings Institute and chair of corporate eco-forum) - four interactions between NGOs AND STATES: **NGOS INTERACT WITHIN THE STATE, NGOS AS COLLABORATORS WITH STATES, NGOS AS OPPONENTS OF STATES, NGOS AS SUBSTITUTES OF STATES** Florini and Simmons " What The World Needs Now? " - define transnational civil society as 1) includes only groups that are not governments or profit seeking private entities 2) transnational involving linkages across national borders 3) takes a variety of forms - civil society uses soft power

Joseelin and Wallace “ Non State Actors in World Politics: A Framework” - definition: actors that are largely autonomous from central governments but emanate from civil society, market economy, or non state political impuls - contrivuted to globalization and created foundation for international civil society - question is not whether NSA plays a role, its how they affect the system Halliday “ Romance of Non State Actors (irish writer and academic) - romantic belief that non state actors are all powerful and benevolent forces have ended as result of increasing numbers in NSAs, maintenance of an ethical distance from NSAs, questioned efficacy of NSAs, and study of NSAs from a post-cold war perspective and a globalization perspective - gives types of non state actors: NGOS, business groups, political organizatins, religious entities, criminal organizations - importance of media but realize not all transparent asses NGOs and the comfortmy of the NSA to democratic and good governance norms Langhorne “ Diplomacy of Non-State Actors” (professor at Rutgers) - movement away from state system: 1) increase in NSA globally 2) info revolution 3) diplomatic inveolement by experts in fields outside of diplomacy 4) difficulty to pursue national interest 5) increase in the importance of economic diplomacy - three actors: 1) states 2) transnational social movement organizations (TISMO) and 3) transnational commercial organizations (TCO) - wealthy TSMOS ave established wider and more professional presence in the UN Schmitz “ being almost like a state” - NGOS hope to increase power and influence by effectively mimicking states - structure organizations around a state model to obtain more autonomy, have research and info gathering capabilities - not self-sustaining so have to promote issues they see as most appealing globally and profitable...biased Simmons “ Learning to Live With NGOs” - use four methods to influence: 1) <https://assignbuster.com/polylateralism-diplomacys-third-dimension-by-geoffrey-wiseman/>

agenday setting 2) negotiating outcomes) conferring legitimacy 4) making solutions work - rise of global idiots = groups seize on issues that promote their image and fundraising efforts instead of public interest - agenda setting = force leaders and policymakers to pay attention ...negotiate outcomes: multilateral treaties, built trust and continue negotiation 3) confer legitimacy = withholding public and political support 4) making solutions work = can do what government can't do - NGOS must accept limitations and governments must be open to public scrutiny Aviel " Role of Nonstate Actors" (professor ad chair of IR at San Fran Univ) - unlikely that reforms that would give nsa just as much power in nation states in multilateral diplomacy will be implemented - best time to influence world conference is during preparatory process - NGO depend on government funding so opposition force to governments is limited since govt can rely on own military and commercial contracts WEEK 3

Ryall " review of catholic church as transnational actor" - future shape ad direction of catholic church is uncertain beause diversity of views result in varying responses to social and political issues that the church faces as transnational actor - church deserves unique lace due to cast sie range of actors and interests in every sphere - has expressive power = use of symbols, language, culture, media - only religious body with permanent observer status at UN and maintains diplomatic relations with 168 countries - Holy See successfully lobbied in two UN sponsored meetings for abortion... not able to stop liberalizing trends but interefere with establishment of international consens on abortion - holy see = basically government of roman catholic church with pop as top Hansen " give Guantanamo back to

cuba" - debate should encompass not only history of abuse of last decade but also manner in which US acquired base - denied Cuban government voice in peace proceedings - Guantanamo must be returned to Cuban government since this is an example of American hypocrisy Wittes " How the next 10 years of Guantanamo should look" - focus on improving detention system - need to abandon illusion of seeking to close facility - prisoners in Guantanamo have access to more due process rights than do prisoners elsewhere

Classifying the ICRC - International Committee of the Red Cross - exemplifies Schmitt argument of NGO mimicking states ICRC serve specific population, " citizenship" consists of those afflicted by armed conflict and violence - participating in activities furthers their foreign policy agenda

Finnemore " Geneva conventions"(prominent constructivist scholar) - institutionalized the Red Cross, conventions are products of non state action made possible of actions of individuals who formed the organization but also persuaded states to follow - established RED CROSS as main medical service for armed services relief - 1) ensure humane standards of treatment and neutrality status for noncombatants particularly medical personnel 2) provide aid to prisoners of war and facilitate return 3) to provide humanitarian aid to non state forces during civil conflict 4) humanitarian treatment for political prisoners

Finnemore " norms and war: the ICRC and the Geneva conventions" - argues that war is now highly regulated due to Geneva conventions for example - fundamental problem of ICRC is assertion of humanitarian norms against ideals of state sovereignty - realist perspective: 1) desire for reciprocity 2) need to recycle troops back into war effort 3) legitimization of democratic states BUT SHE REFUTES THIS - Geneva conventions were unilateral so not reciprocal 2) medical care was poor 3)

<https://assignbuster.com/polylateralism-diplomacys-third-dimension-by-geoffrey-wiseman/>

least democratic states were amongst most supportive of ICRC - the Geneva conventions were about duties and responsibilities not interest so realism gives too few tools to understand...constructivist tools of society and normative understanding which best explain Jus in bello vs. jus ad bello - just in bello (law of war) = international humanitarian law, humanitarian concern during war and disregard reason of causing war - just ad bellum (right to war) = limit resort to force between states...focuses on whether entering the war is just or not ICRC - established in Geneva - visit detainees, protect civilians, reunite families, promote economic security, provide clean water

WEEK 4 Wiseman : what is tingo (professor of ir and public diplomacy) - tingo = temporary international ngs are ad hoc transnational investigative mechanisms that involve range of present and former government officials - purpose is to conduct an inquiry in hopes of introducing new general ideas and particular proposals to problem of international or global significance - Lucks assessment of blue ribbon commissions: 1) produce new ideas, concepts and proposals 2) gain attention of top policy makers in UN 3) acquire enough attention by media and public 4) convince significant players in official policy making process to become advocates 5) demonstrate shelf life for at least five years - shelf life can be sustained to further promote concepts, based on timing can have influence on thinking of particular leaders facing dilemmas, can produce norm and policy entrepreneurs - difficult to establish causal connection with ideas proposed by TINGO, receive limited expert level support, may not appeal to groups due to political nature, short lived, run sometimes by organizations in particular parts of the world Higgot and Stone " limits of influence: FOPO think tanks in Britain and USA" - growth of think tanks mirrors trend in <https://assignbuster.com/polyilateralism-diplomacys-third-dimension-by-geoffrey-wiseman/>

three phases of think tanks in history: 1) old guard (secrecy and select membership 2) cold war tanks (higher level of overt commitment, broadening spectrum of policy, large with in house research staff and large budgets, specialized studies, non-partisan 3) new partians (smaller operations with optimal concentraions of skill more achievable through specialized arrangements and smallness which was maintainable through modern telecommunications - main difference between American and British: competition for funding more intense in US, greater range, insitutiaonlization of CIA, national security council etc has presented new opportunities for think tanks in the US, british FOPO develop more in universities and bureaucrcacies Abelson “ Think Tanks in the US” (director of canda us institution and centre for American studies) - four generations of think tanks 1) first generation: Carnegie endowment for international peace, hoover institution on war revoluion and peace...able to stay unbiased in policy recommendations didn't receive government funding or did little... place emphasis on scholarly research attract attention in academic community - 2) second generation: RAND = crucial contributor to department of defence in power war years advising air force particularly those of nuclear nature...provide key analysis and advice on how to defend nation...analysis as potentially being biased - 3) third generation: influence Washignton public policy community by imposing ideological agenda on them - 4)fourth generation: legacy based think tahnks such as carter center and Nixon center...concerned with further developing policial and ideological beliefs after terms in office WEEK 5

Freund "philanthropy an American institution" - main legendary figures in philanthropy are Carnegie and Rockefeller - Carnegie was originator of modern philanthropy focus is towards support of the individual as opposed to communal and class interest - narcissistic tradition = create conditions for others in order to receive his financial support and establish own institutions to achieve his personal vision for better society - Rockefeller more influential because listen to educators since then advisement and creativity has become standard - philanthropy strong in US because it is means to keep us competitive as a nation competition is in American tradition Bill and Melinda Gates philanthropic efforts carried out on much larger scale, particular causes largely impacted and philanthropies experiencing greater shift towards bigger issues,, movement away from old philanthropy (focus on having own organizations instead of mediating organization to do the work), more often politicized and viewed as financial strategies - pros: access to lots of money, status as global celebrity, not national or politically affiliated - cons: close affiliation with business, large amounts of money and celebrity of Gates invites heightened scrutiny, enormous responsibility from so much money and have potential to be good or bad confessor "policy making billionaires" (political reporter for NY TIMES) - growing gap between rich and poor widening partisanship and decreasing trust in government has created policy making billionaire - sees itself as more effective than the government since latter is slow - philanthropists can be seen as being benevolent or undemocratic.. maybe find a middle path such as Zuckerberg and Bloomberg for schools