Example 1:

Short answer

1. Justice is what makes survival worthwhile. In Tolkien’s Lord of the Rings*,* he uses three societies to demonstrate justice: Mordor, The Shire, and Rivendell. These places are organized in different ways, different levels of safety, and different predictable status quos. The societies are limited by injustice

Mordor is probably the clearest example of an unjust society. It is a militarized dictatorship. The people are under Sauron’s power. Saruman believes he must ally with Sauron because only the wise people can order good.

The Shire is relatively just. It’s characterized by peace and prosperity and has a clan-like structure in which families manage their own affairs. The class system is much more flexible than Mordor. However, internal social hierarchies exist and there is a gap between the rich and poor. There is limited upward mobility in class structure for the working class. An example of this is the Gamgee family, who have remained gardeners for three generations, yet Sam dresses in the same clothes or Frodo, who is of a much higher class.

There is also a global hierarchy in the Shire. The hobbits are very sheltered and unaware of the outside world. They depend on Gondor for protection. A real world example of these injustices is the caste system in India.

Rivendell is also relatively just. It is much admired by others and considered a refuge and stronghold because of its power, but it is power limited. The purpose of their power is to preserve and heal, not for military power.

There are patriarchal and gender social hierarchies in Rivendell. Even though the most powerful elf is the female Galadriel, men belittle females to protect them. Women also have very little say in marital decisions. Although there are gender hierarchies, females can still pursue their own goals.

Some real world challenges are that even if classical liberalism is considered the best explanation it may not be realistic. Also, critical and radical theories get rid of what is “not ought to be.”

Challenges in LOTR are that order comes at the expense of others and there is still unjust domination such as the unjust class structure in the Shire.

Long Essay #1

The “Second Great Debate” in IR focused on what states can and should do in their pursuit of power and security. It analyzed whether states pursued absolute or relative gains and how this affected international affairs. Neoliberalism and neomarxism are two perspectives that came out of this debate; however, the English school, rational choice, and neorealism came into the spotlight as well.

The English School’s main idea is that even under an anarchic international system, the world has always been, and is now an “international society of states.” Being an international society, the world’s affairs are conducted through dialogue and ideas of common interest that benefit the society as a whole. This diplomacy-driven perspective, which originated in England, has been described as a “softly optimistic” perspective that trusts in the possibility of interstate communication, agreeableness, and union. However, the English School still does now acknowledge that interstate conflict is bound to happen in the absence of some form of interstate dialogue. Similarly, the English school is seen as a middle-road concept between classical realism and classical liberalism because English School theorists believe in the inherent goodness of humankind (liberalism) but also believe external peace is not a legitimate hope (realism).

Legolas acts as a prime example of the English School ideas. He is a loyal member of the Fellowship, where he treks alongside men from multiple races (men, dwarves, wizards, hobbits), symbolizing the international society of states. Legolas trusts in the goodness of the mission, although in the films he seems to think the hobbits are being sent to their death. These two ideas represent liberalism and realism, and how English School goes between the two. Legolas overcomes post strife with the dwarves to befriend Gimli; this illuminates the English ideas of dialogue and common interest for the betterment of all. Although many characters seem to fulfill all these conditions, Legolas represents the Elven ideals of diplomacy and thus best represents the English school.

The UN serves as a real-world example of English School thought. The UN indeed is an international society of states that allows for dialogue and discourse of common interest. The UN, working forwards the good of all, is forever optimistic that international cooperation can help prevent conflict.

The perspective of rational choice is best described by looking at LOTR’s main wizards, Saruman and Gandalf. Saruman represents unbounded rationality, whereby actors perfectly maximize their interests and always choose the benefits in a benefit/cost situation, regardless of how bad the cost consequences may be. Saruman’s choice to join Sauron maximizes his interest of being powerful and it also fails to see the cost of being used by Sauron. Saruman only capitalized on the benefit of uniting with the seemingly stronger side of the battle, but failed to see what the dire cost would be if he failed \*the cost was he lost all power at Isengard and [in the movie] he died).

Gandalf represents bounded rationality by making choices informed by self-awareness and psychological awareness. Although bounded rationality may appear to be more time consuming, it includes all available info, lets see all sides and consequences of a decision, and allows for a more well-informed decision. For example, Gandalf was able to determine that destroying the ring would be the best choice of action. This he decided after consulting at Elrond’s Council. His bounded rationality let him see that the biggest benefit would come from destroying the ring, not using it.

 Neorealism focuses on relative gains and states that interstate conflict is inevitable in an anarchical international system. The main variable is the distribution of military power. The third main concept is that a security so all states desire security. Bipolarity is the most favorable situation, as no single state or group of states can overtake another. Defensive realism, the idea that states want enough power to protect themselves, is shown through Baromir. He wants the ring so Gondor can be defended; he would not use it to take power, only to help his people. From a US point of view, the US is an example of defensive realism. We know that interstate conflict is inevitable, so we always want enough military power to defend ourselves. The US does not exhibit offensive realism because we do not aim to militarily take over the rest of the world.

 Offensive realism is shown by the Witch King. He wants Mordor to have as much power as it can to maximize its security. Mordor desires to be a hegemon and rule the world and the ring will aid them in doing so. Both parts of neorealism emphasize relative power and relative gains as being determinant in how secure a state is. Boromir wants as much power as needed to protect himself and his city, but the Nazgul desire all the power they can get so their security can reach its full potential. North Korea is seen as an example of offensive realism, as they continue to try to enhance their nuclear firepower so they can stay a state of “security.” However, their people’s safety/security is another question.

Short Answer #3

 In IR, a “paradigm” is a way we order our study. It is a way in which IR scholars look at the world and how to deal with the world. Paradigms attempt to describe, explain, predict, and control all past, present, and future events in IR. This is often very difficult to do, and there is no “right” way to do so, thus we have developed two primary paradigms.

 Problem-solving paradigms attempt to study the world and its problems and explain why the world is the way it is. The unit of emphasis is the state, as interstate interactions are heavily looked at by this type of paradigm. Empirical forms of study/research are employed by problem-solving paradigms, and objective truth is considered to be possible. As long as multiple scholars come up with the same general answer over a long time, “objectivity” can begin to be established.

 If problem-solving theorists are physicists, then critical theorists are anthropologists. Criticalparadigms try to determine how the world should be and then explain how to get there. The primary unit of emphasis is the individual, as critical theory is more concerned with the person instead of the state. Study/research is done on a more interpretive basis than the empirical methods of problem-solving paradigms. Critical theorists are not big supporters of the possibility of objectivity, as they believe all study is affected and driven at least partly by the scholar, and that any person may see differnt things in the same set of information. Finally, critical paradigms are highly concerned with emancipation.

Short Answer #2

 Miles’ Law says, “where you stand depends on where you sit.” This has two key underlying ideas. First, it basically means that a politician’s stance on an issue (or overall stance/political ideals) are affected by the role he plays. However, this law also applies to scholars of IR studying these politicians. The ideals and concepts espoused by a particular scholar will be affected by his/her background in life, in politics, in anything he/she has experienced. Thus, “what you think depends on who you are,” essentially is what Miles is saying. Realizing this can allow scholars to see why they have the viewpoints they do, since our viewpoints are heavily informed by our personal history.

 Taking an example from LOTR, Sauron believes the ring will go to Gondor and be used by the Free Peoples. Sauron never even considers the ring may be destroyed, because his “seat” of wanting eternal and dominant power causes his “stance” to make him believe that everyone will want what he wants. In fact, the Free Peoples do not want to use the ring (as decided in Rivendell), and their “seat” lets them see Isildur’s failure as a reason to destroy the ring.

 In terms of the real world, the example of the illegitimate election of Ahmadinejad and the choice to air LOTR nationwide illuminates a classic instance of Miles’ Law. To the people of Iran, the credits of the film “In edamedore. This will continue,” highlights the idea that Mousavi was cheated and that the people do not need to accept the illegitimacy, but instead wait until the time is right to bring back the power to the rightful person. Ahmadinejad’s “seat” caused him to think that LOTR might capture the attention of any angry people and calm them down over the course of an epic story that may take their minds off real-world concerns. Instead, the films had the opposite effect and instilled feelings of rebellion in the people.

1. How can the world be made a safer place:

First, in order to have a safer world, we have to have a proper order. Order is the precondition to society. To have a good order means to have a stable and predictable status quo in the society, that supports the same goal and interest within it, and help to eliminate violence and reduce chaos.

The main issues. WMD’s, terrorism, war, human rights. The presence of all these can make the society insecure and not safe especially to women and minority.

LOTR example: When the Fellowship of the Ring was on their quest to take the ring to mountain doom, they faced a lot of obstacles. They faced a lot of enemies that are trying to destroy them and take the ring from Frodo. We can see from the movie, women and children are the victim of war. They had to leave their town and the children have to be separated from their mothers. They felt insecure that they have to look for another shelter; they have no food and other primary resources.

Real world example: The \_\_\_ or nuclear weapons by North Korea, Iran, \_\_\_\_ and so on, threatened their citizen. They’re afraid to get out of their houses because they know they could get killed anytime. The interstate war between Afghanistan and Iraq caused defects to their civilization. So, in order to have a safer place, states should have a better order. They should know what is the right time to use weapons, they have to endure \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ by \_\_\_ engaging in weird organizations such as Peacecorps, humanitarian aid. Conflicts can also be reduced by having better communication among states.

How can the world be made a better place?

To answer this question, we have to consider justice. But can we create justice for all that’s the hard problem. We are able to resolve justice for some people, but other injustices will remain for some people. By resolving injustices, we can improve the status quo of people, but there will be no or little social change.

Main issues: globalization, population growth, global health, environmental issues

In Real world example:

* The expansion that China and India are having will make some parts of each country better off, but there will also poor people remained. There will always be a gap between the rich and poor.
* With the increasing population, the need of natural/primary resources is also increasing. The stats have to be able to provide ways so they all can get access to the resources.
* Global health is another concern, so many diseases are spread so fast globally. States have to provide a better facilitation for preventing and also curing them from the diseases.

In LOTR: Injustices can be seen from the Mordor. We can find militarized and dictatorial governance in there. Sauron expands his power as strong as he can be without concerning other people’s interest. As long as he can dominate the world, he won’t care about his workers lives. In contrast, we can see more just place in the Shire and Rivendell. Although it’s not a perfect just place, but still, its more just compared to Mordor. We see in the Shire, people are so happy, they play 6 times a day, they gather in community gatherings, they treat others well, but there’s still social gap in the society. Although in the end, Sam was elected as Mayor in the shire, he still calls Frodo as Mr. Frodo. In Rivendell, we can also see more just place compared to Mordor. The place is light, bright, happy. The elves treat each other well, but there’s still injustices that can’t be resolved. That is, gender issues. Women’s interests are not important in there, but on the other hand, the strongest elf Gadrielle. In addition, women also can influence their lives about what to do with it.

So, in conclusion, to have a better place, we have to prioritize justice. Make the place a peaceful place for the citizens to live in by improving facilities like access to resources, education, etc. But injustices can’t all be resolved. Some injustices are still remained, like social norms. To solve injustices, first we have to consider the question, “is what we do to make some people better off, worth the loss of other people’s interest?”