This study examines the impact of revolutionary states upon international society. These states have always posed major problems for the achievement of world order: revolution is often accompanied by international as well as civil conflict, while revolutionary doctrines have proven to be highly disruptive of the existing structure of international politics. Conversely, the prevailing international order presents fundamental difficulties for some revolutionary states. The belief system on which its revolution was founded and which legitimized the assumption of state power by the revolutionary elite is certain to run counter to the prevailing political doctrines of many other states. David Armstrong asks whether revolutionary states are ‘socialized’ into adopting acceptable patterns of international behaviour, or whether it is the international society that is forced to change when these new states appear. He looks in detail at the French, American, and Russian revolutions and at several post-1945 revolutionary states. He also examines the relationship between revolutionary states and the principal ordering devices of an international society: international law, diplomacy, and the balance of power. His book is a significant contribution to the ‘English School’ literature, whose central concept is that of an international society. It shows how the interaction between revolutionary states and the established norms, rules, and institutions of international society works to produce change in both the revolutionary state and international society itself. As such it elucidates the dynamic aspects of international society.
Sir Harold Nicolson’s conception of international order, with its roots in ancient Greek and Roman political theory, was central to his ideas about international society. It encompassed the principal elements of foreign policy, the operation of the balance of power, and the role of international law in world affairs. More particularly, he focused on the effectiveness of collective security and the League of Nations during the inter-war period when Great Britain was moving from a period of imperium over her former colonies to one of dominion over emergent Commonwealth nation-states. He was by turns optimistic and pessimistic about the UN as an instrument for securing and maintaining international order. Nicolson’s experience as a diplomat also led him to attach great importance to national character and prestige as factors in foreign relations and diplomatic negotiation; they are rarely absent from his analyses of international affairs.

This chapter takes issue with a traditional approach that has tried, unsuccessfully, to separate order from justice. It argues that a solidarist consciousness has been developed, arising from a wide range of social, political, economic, and technological forces. These developments make a retreat to pluralist state-based conceptions of international order and justice impossible. Yet the chapter acknowledges, too, that attempts to move towards promoting some conception of global justice are still constrained because these attempts have to be made in the context of a global political order that remains heavily structured around inherited pluralist mechanisms that reflect various types of inequality.
The relationship between international order and justice has long been central to the study and practice of international relations. This book sets current interest in that relationship within a broad historical and theoretical context, and underscores the complexity and tensions inherent in agreeing on, establishing, and sustaining a just world order. The chapters examine a wide range of state and transnational perspectives on order and justice including those from China, Europe, India, Russia, the US, and the Islamic world. Other chapters investigate how the order/justice relationship is mediated within major international institutions including the UN, the World Trade Organization, the International Monetary Fund, and the World Bank.

Sir Harold Nicolson and International Relations
Derek Drinkwater

Sir Harold Nicolson (1886–1968) is well known as a historian of diplomacy and diplomatic thinker. Yet his achievements in other fields—as a man of letters, gardener, broadcaster, and an unorthodox marriage—have obscured his contribution to the realm of international theory. Nicolson’s diplomatic background and upbringing in a diplomatic household, followed by an Oxford classical education and twenty years in diplomacy, combined to forge a distinctive philosophy of international affairs. As a diplomatic practitioner between 1909 and 1929, Nicolson was ideally placed to observe the maelstrom of international politics, and as an anti-appeasement and wartime MP (1935–1945) he became a highly regarded authority on international relations. During and after the Second World War, he turned his mind to the questions of a united Europe and global peace. Central to Nicolson’s international thought is a conception of international order rooted in ancient Greek and Roman political theory and history. It represents a synthesis of realism and idealism to form liberal realism, his distinctive approach to resolving the major dilemmas of peace, war and, power for the twentieth and later centuries. Between the 1910s and 1960s, Nicolson’s international thought evolved from an idealist outlook on international relations at the 1919 Paris Peace
Conference, to one of limited realism after the Locarno Pact (1925), to a more realist, and ultimately liberal realist, approach during the 1930s. Henceforth, Nicolson sought to develop policies and devise practical means of addressing international problems on the basis of both ethical considerations and those of Realpolitik. He concluded that Hitler and Mussolini had to be dealt with through dialogue backed by overwhelming force, and that a European federation, world government, and universal peace in the Kantian sense were possibilities, but only when supported by the necessary institutional foundations and military safeguards.

Violence, Order, and Terror
Richard Devetak

In his chapter on the rise of terrorism, the author points to two principal challenges to international society: first, terrorism challenges the state's monopoly of legitimate violence (which is also being eroded in a number of other ways); and second, the reaction that Al-Qaeda has drawn from the USA threatens to create as significant a problem for international society as terrorism itself. The author opens his discussion with a brief survey of the nature of terrorism and the position it has held in the thought of the English School of International Relations: with only one or two minor exceptions, English School writers tended not to incorporate terrorism into their study despite the proliferation of terrorist incidents in the 1970s, and Hedley Bull identified terrorism as simply one of several types of 'private international violence'. The author suggests two reasons for this apparent oversight: the School's state-centrism and its resistance to presentism. After discussing the changing nature of terrorism in both its non-state and state varieties, he moves on to address how terrorism poses a threat to contemporary international order, focusing in particular on terrorism as a breakdown of the state's monopoly on legitimate violence that is essential for the proper functioning of international society. The last part of the chapter describes the rise of the 'new terrorism' – which is characterized by religious motivation, greater lethality of attacks, greater technological and operational competence, and the desire to obtain weapons of mass destruction – and its impact on international society, and concludes by arguing that US attempts to tackle terrorism by undermining the basic principles of international society may only help to exacerbate the problem by casting further doubt on the relevance and legitimacy of international order.
Russian Perspectives on Order and Justice
S. Neil MacFarlane

in Order and Justice in International Relations

MacFarlane argues that Russian perspectives on order and justice are deeply rooted and are basically inconsistent with liberal thinking. These perspectives strongly reflect the country's geographical and historical experiences. The leaders of the country have generally ignored solidarist ends and have remained wedded to the promotion of a state-based order in which multipolarity prevails, multilateralism is to be avoided, and the Russian loss of status is recovered along with its material power. Russian leaders remain concerned with interstate justice in the context of a re-established domestic and Russian-led regional order.

An Uneasy Engagement: Chinese Ideas of Global Order and Justice in Historical Perspective
Rana Mitter

Mitter's study argues that until the late Qing, concepts of international order and justice were alien to China's imperial rulers. Subsequently, however, in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, China perceived itself to be the victim in an unjust world of aggressive, powerful, Western states. Contemporary Chinese perceptions of a just international order have been shaped by such past experiences and encompass a strong element of restitution. Its justice claims start with the Chinese state itself rather than with the needs of a broader global community.

Order/Justice Issues at the United Nations
Adam Roberts

in Order and Justice in International Relations
This chapter examines the order/justice issue within the institutionalized context of the UN. It asks whether the UN and its members have achieved a substantive consensus on the content of international justice, and concludes that the underlying tension evident in the UN Charter between rules designed to bolster interstate stability and those aimed at the promotion of justice still persist. Nevertheless, it also argues that the pursuit of various justice issues has long been seen as a legitimate part of UN activities; thus, despite the controversies such activities generate, the UN's interest in justice issues will continue.

Order and Justice Beyond the Nation-State: Europe's Competing Paradigms
Kalypso Nicolaidis and Justine Lacroix

in Order and Justice in International Relations
Published in print: 2003 Published Online: November 2003
Item type: chapter

The authors focus on the European Union both as a regional organization with distinctive norms and practices, and as a grouping of states that reflect specific individual traditions and views. The chapter describes two core paradigms: the national and the post-national. The national paradigm is recognizably realist and state-centric in approach. It suggests that the focus of external behaviour should be the promotion of order via traditional power-political means and for traditional state-based normative ends. The post-national paradigm, however, reflects a more cosmopolitan understanding of global society in which Europe's institutional and substantive understanding of justice questions can be reflected in its policies beyond EU borders. These propositions are tested in three issue areas. The authors conclude that while the EU may have the capacity to shape an order/justice agenda beyond its borders, its members have not yet agreed what that agenda should be.

Introduction
David Armstrong

in Revolution and World Order: The Revolutionary State in International Society
Published in print: 1993 Published Online: November 2003
Item type: chapter
To what extent do revolutionary states succeed in altering the international society of which they find themselves members, and to what extent does it succeed in ‘socializing’ them? On what basis can international order be built in a world where revolutionary states may even deny the very existence of a society of states with common interests, rules, and institutions? These are the central questions considered in this book, and the Introduction considers in more detail what the four key terms that are employed throughout the book—‘revolutionary state’, ‘world order’, ‘international society’, and ‘socialization’—mean. It also suggests some of the implications of the book for theoretical aspects of international relations, particularly the concept of an ‘international society’.

International Society and America's War on Terrorism

Jason Ralph

in Defending the Society of States: Why America Opposes the International Criminal Court and its Vision of World Society

Published in print: 2007 Published Online: September 2007
Item type: chapter

The evidence presented in previous chapters contributes to the general argument that the US defends the idea of a society of states because it is in the kind of society that America can preserve a preferred self-image and can best advance its particular interests. This chapter develops that argument one stage further by focusing on the US response to the terrorist attacks of 9–11. From the perspective of the Bush administration, only those fighting on behalf of sovereign states could claim a right to lawful belligerency and the right to protection under the laws of war. Dealing with the terrorist threat through the norms of the society of states, therefore, provided additional normative criteria to delegitimize Al Qaeda and it put the issue of counter-terrorism in a legal and political setting the US could, as the most powerful state, more or less dictate. The chapter provides historical context to this policy by focusing on the US rejection of Protocol I additional to the Geneva Conventions and illustrates how US lawyers also used the concept of sovereignty in an attempt to escape the oversight of national as well as international courts.
Conclusion
David Armstrong

in Revolution and World Order: The Revolutionary State in International Society
Published in print: 1993 Published Online: November 2003
Item type: chapter

The study has tried to maintain a focus on the interaction between revolutionary states and the sovereignty-based notion of international society that has been termed here ‘the Westphalian conception of international society’. International order is a fundamental principle of international society and also one that has been frequently challenged by revolutionary states. It is possible to discern elements of a pattern in the interaction between international society and revolutionary states. There is always a close relationship between the domestic and foreign policies of revolutionary states. Revolutionary states encounter strong pressures to become socialized into the international society of which they find themselves part, but they have also over time influenced processes of change within international society.

Order, Justice, and Global Islam
James Piscatori

in Order and Justice in International Relations
Published in print: 2003 Published Online: November 2003
Item type: chapter

This chapter examines some of the conceptions of order and justice that are present in the Islamic world. It argues that many Islamic states have been willing to accommodate themselves to an international society based on the idea of sovereign equality. However, one of the impacts of globalization has been to shift the allegiances of some members of these states from territorially based political communities to those based on religious or cultural identity. Some of the radical Islamist groupings that have emerged in recent years and have voiced a range of grievances are seeking nothing less than the overturning of prevailing international and domestic orders. Although the outcome of this complex challenge is impossible to predict, one consequence is that it has created space for the emergence of a new and possibly transformational Islamic civil society, which directs its attention principally to the reform of Muslim societies themselves.
The author submits that the English School of International Relations could usefully engage in a dialogue with the literature emerging under the umbrella label of Critical Security Studies (CSS), suggesting that the security of individuals should be incorporated into the understanding of international society. He begins by providing a brief description of CSS, identifying it as a deeper (in that it recognizes that security is derived from societal assumptions about the nature of politics), broader (in that it recognizes that security extends beyond the threat and use of military force), and more focused (on emancipation) approach to understanding security. He then frames his discussion of CSS and the English School around four central questions: the first asks what is security, the second asks whose security should be prioritized, and the third asks what counts as a security issue. The approaches of the English School of International Relations offer a restricted response to all three of these questions, and CSS also challenges the School's belief in the central value of international order by insisting that in the long run human emancipation may involve the removal of international order as the primary value. Finally, the author asks who or what can provide security – what is to be done to promote an emancipatory politics of security in the contemporary era.

Humanitarian Intervention and International Law
James Pattison

It is often claimed that humanitarian intervention should be undertaken only by those interveners whose action would be legal according to current international law. This chapter considers this assertion by assessing the moral importance of an intervener's legal status. It begins by suggesting that, according to the current international law on
humanitarian intervention, UN Security Council authorization is required for an intervener's action to be legal. It then critically examines—and largely rejects—a number of possible arguments for the importance of an intervener's legal status. In particular, it considers the arguments that (a) legal interveners derive their authority from morally valuable procedures; (b) illegal humanitarian intervention is itself abusive; (c) illegal humanitarian intervention leads to abusive intervention; and (d) illegal humanitarian intervention undermines international order.

On Global Order
Andrew Hurrell

This book provides an introduction to the analysis of global political order — how patterns of governance and institutionalization in world politics have already changed; what the most important challenges are; and what the way forward might look like. The first section develops three analytical frameworks: a world of sovereign states capable of only limited cooperation; a world of ever-denser international institutions embodying the idea of an international community; and a world in which global governance moves beyond the state and into the realms of markets, civil society, and networks. Part II examines five of the most important issues facing contemporary international society: nationalism and the politics of identity; human rights and democracy; war, violence, and collective security; the ecological challenge; and the management of economic globalization in a highly unequal world. Part III considers the idea of an emerging multi-regional system; and the picture of global order built around US empire. The conclusion looks at the normative implications. If international society has indeed been changing in the ways discussed in this book, what ought we to do? And, still more crucially, who is the ‘we’ that is to be at the centre of this drive to create a morally better world?

This book is concerned with the fate of international society in an era of globalization and the ability of the inherited society of sovereign states to provide a practically viable and normatively acceptable framework for global political order. It lays particular emphasis on the different forms of global inequality and the problems of legitimacy that these create, and on the challenges posed by cultural diversity and value conflict.
This chapter examines the idea of political nationalism. It argues that the resilience of nationalism is one of the core planks of the pluralist view of international relations. Nationalism shows few signs of receding as a major feature in Russia, China, and India. Moreover, although disguised by its own ideology of civic patriotism, the United States has long been a strongly nationalist society and, in the face of the external challenge from terrorism and a domestic political shift to the right, this element has become still more prominent. Yet, whilst reinforcing the apparent naturalness of living in a world of states, the idea and the practice of national self-determination has proved a major source of conflict and opened up a series of unresolved dilemmas. The seriousness of these problems has pushed international society in a generally solidarist direction and led to a range of strategies of mediation: attempts to acknowledge both the political power and moral claims of national self determination but in ways that minimize its damage to international society. The most important of these involve attempts to restrict the application of the principle, to unpack the link between nationalism, state sovereignty, and self-determination, and to manage cooperatively the conflicts that inevitably arise.

Empire reborn?
Andrew Hurrell

This chapter examines the relationship between empire and global political order. The discussion proceeds as follows. The first section unsettles some of the assumptions that are often made about empire, in particular about the inevitability of the end of empire; the redundancy and outmodedness of empire as a form of political order, and the consequent implication that the natural focus of international relations should be the relations amongst states or nation-states. The sheer extent of the power of the United States and the apparent obviousness
of the view that we are living in a unipolar world have brought back the language of empire and have led many to see the United States as an imperial power. The second section considers how we should understand that power. It argues that notions of informal empire provide some analytical purchase, but neglect both the consistently important role of military power and coercion in the evolution of US foreign policy, and the importance of rules, norms, and institutions — what one might call the formal side of so-called informal empire. The third section examines five of the most commonly cited reasons for the demise of both empire and top-down hierarchical conceptions of international order more generally. Rather than comparing the extent and character of US power directly with that of other hegemonic states, it asks how these five factors may have changed in ways that would make a hegemonic order viable and potentially sustainable.

Order versus Justice: An American Foreign Policy Dilemma
John Lewis Gaddis

in Order and Justice in International Relations

Gaddis primarily focuses on US dilemmas over the relationship between order and justice throughout the twentieth century. He argues that from the time of Theodore Roosevelt to that of Richard M. Nixon, a concern for order had superseded a concern for justice. After that time, and especially in the post-Cold War era, these two concepts were finally to be brought together in ways that could be said to have been destabilizing world order. Nevertheless, once entwined, it has been difficult for the US to disentangle the promotion of order from justice even during its post-September 11th struggle against terrorism. In order for the US to be successful in the promotion of its order and justice agenda, the author concludes that US hegemony needs to be coupled with legitimacy, consent, and a modesty of aims.