

4) One of the main things that liberalism does in terms that is different than the other forms of theoretical approaches is that upon looking at the individual approaches we can base what the states might do based on this outlook. For example, individuals along with individual organizations within the United States are typically at the forefront for helping lead negotiations with other countries. The task of the government then is not to have an outlook about particular products such as oil but rather make sure that there is a level playing field for all in order to achieve the same reward and ensure competition, which inevitably will stimulate the global economy. Such as this, the bureaucratic/organizational model is used a lot by liberalism in that it says international relations can be seen to be effected by an individual level in state actors. Individual level decisions by companies can affect bureaucracies which affect decisions by state actors and then affect the rest of the world politics.

The individual level changes can be seen at the leadership change level in that whenever prominent states have an actor change leaders inevitably have a reflection upon the rest of the world dynamics based on their own personal characteristics. Example: Mikhail Gorbachev for the soviet union completely redefined security for them but eventually because of him led to the downfall of the soviet union. Individual leaders affect political institutions when weakness is present, affect institutional constraints when those are limited and when the situation at hand is unusual in the respect that people need someone to look to when new things come to the forefront.

Psychological examinations of individual actors are one that evokes responses that are consistent with cognitive responses seen in different mechanisms.

5.) Yes they matter, mass public opinion can sway the view of the elites thus reflecting change within international relations. Because Democracy, especially ours reflects a mood of plurality public opinion plays a tremendous role as those who shout together and become the loudest gets their voice heard. Public attitudes almost directly relate and encourage the action on certain political matters while the public opinion can directly shut down the other political agendas as the public does not care about it.

Examples:

The Iran, US hostage negotiations

Public input affecting whether or not to join the European Union.

6.) A reform was suggested to reform the UN's management problems as there were scandals that happened that included bribery and extortion. Combined UN and the World Trade Organization.

Security reform was the next one.

7.) Post Cold War the UN has been instructed to intervene in situations deemed threatening to international peace and security. That provision enables the security

council to take measures both economic and military to prevent or deter threats to international peace. I believe that the United Nations indeed needs to broaden its range of activities and responsibilities as things have indeed changed throughout the world. It is the responsibility of the world as an efficacy to go through and make sure that the rules that are innate to humans are followed and therefore are not violated. If the UN does not do that then who else would? It would be left to specific state actors thus increasing the likelihood of certain states not liking certain actions that are taken. If actions are taken as an efficacy then an effective action can be taken in order to preserve the likelihood of preserving international peace.

8.) No you cannot, the 3 levels of analysis encompass everything that could possibly happen because of the cause of war. The advantage to using more than one level of analysis for war is that your explanation can overlap thus increasing your likelihood of being able to tell what is deemed the actual cause.

Three levels of analysis:

Individual

- Aggressive characteristics of leaders
- Misperceptions by leaders
- Attributes of masses (innate behavior or flawed character)
- Communications failure

State/society

- Liberal capitalist states, according to radicals
- Non liberal/nondemocratic states, according to liberals
- Struggle between groups for economic resources

International system

- Anarchy
- Lack of an arbiter
- Prominence of long cycles of war and peace
- Power transitions
- Aggressiveness of the international capitalist class

9.)

Positive Rights: basic necessities that are prescribed by the government to the people, and sometimes are obligated to do so. (Health care, right to education, food, home,)

Negative Rights: The government shall make no law against \_\_\_\_\_  
(laws against discrimination, laws supporting free speech, civil rights and liberties)

Most important ones to protect are positive rights as they are necessary in order for people to survive and therefore be protected first.

10.) Globalization from Bretton Woods on.

In 1977 the US returns to the gold standard. This is in line with the other powerful nations and the United States. This establishment led to the creation of the world welfare in order to start aiding other countries that are poor.

11.) similar to 9

12.) Marxism proposes radicalism, which says that competition is key in order to keep spreading capitalism. Radical states who like this model of keeping competition high may choose not to participate in the international political economy

Statists propose comparative advantage. States should produce and export those products which they can produce most efficiently to give them a competitive edge on the competition. In every state there are naturally differences in resources, labor force and land values thus states should produce those products that effectively can be produced the best most efficient in their state. Gains from trade are maximized for states then but individual people can be hurt from this as they might be producing something that isn't liked within that state as far as "efficiency" so the government should intervene.

13.) Terrorism is the use of violence against civilians by non state actors to attain political goals.

Terrorism can be described as many things but often it is when those who are being oppressed and have run out of peaceful acts and therefore lash out in violent attacks.

Terrorism is different than other forms of political violence in that with terrorism it is a small set of people that intend to cause chaos and change via violence. Political violence is aimed at repressing another while terrorism aims at changing another country via what is caused by the violence.

Different types of Terrorism:

- State terrorism
  - Intimidation- to crackdown on the forces against them within their country
  - Coerced conversion
    - The state convinces people to adopt a particular set of ideals
  - Genocide- seen through the nazis
- Bioterrorism
- Cyberterrorism
- Economic terrorism
- Nuclear terrorism with WMDs

Is terrorism committed by states different than the committed by sub-state actors?