

receive comes via international media and diplomacy around major incidents,”<sup>66</sup> and this paper agrees that further action is needed then after the fact responses. While world leaders met in 2010 in New York to discuss accelerating progress toward achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), Ongachi has called into question why the LGBT community has been deliberately left out of these goals. He stated “what happens to all those gays and lesbians who don’t make international headlines but suffer discrimination on a daily basis...who are increasingly under threat.”<sup>67</sup> In this sense, Ongachi’s suggestion that LGBT rights should be the Ninth MDG in Africa is legitimate; in fact this paper implores the United Nations to adopt LGBT equality as the Ninth MDG. The International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission and Sexual Minorities of Uganda have called for the needed reform of Uganda’s stance towards LGBT rights in the following five areas:

- (1) Reform of impunity for torture and cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment.
- (2) Reform of the police system to ensure accountability for abuse of police powers.
- (3) Reform of Uganda’s Penal Code to remove the discriminatory Articles 140, 141 and 143.
- (4) Reform of Uganda’s HIV/AIDS “Abstinence-until-marriage” policy.
- (5) Reform of the same-sex marriage prohibition recently added to the Ugandan Constitution.<sup>68</sup>

These are the required standards that every country should strive to adopt if they wish to stand true to committing LGBT rights equal to human rights. While it might be getting worse for LGBT rights at the moment in Uganda, hopefully Africa can learn to accept LGBT rights as human rights.

## An Evaluation of Waltz’s Structural Realism and the Suggestion of a Harmonized Theory

Cassandra Muldoon

International relations theory aims to understand, explain, and at times predict international events and their outcomes. Neorealist theory, from which Kenneth Waltz’s structural realism is derived, is no different. It aims to “define the structure of international political systems” through a revision of Morgenthau’s Realist theory and the establishment of an “autonomy of international politics.”<sup>1</sup> Morgenthau’s Realism, however, is faced with many limitations that are accentuated when contrasted with liberalism and constructivism. Hence, although an upstanding political theory, Waltz’s structural realism is exclusively effective in dealing with past events. However, in combination with the aforementioned theories, structural realism may contribute to the creation of a harmonized political theory. In this paper, Waltz’s structural realism will be outlined in order to set the parameters for its examination. Then, both liberal theory and constructivism will be presented as challenges to structural realism and to each other. Finally, this paper will suggest a revised structural theory that reforms its weaker points and moves towards the establishment of a harmonized theory.

Structural realism is predicated on the assumption that the “structure of the international political system is defined first by its organizing principle, which is anarchy.”<sup>2</sup> As such, units are “ordered” by the same fundamental forces making them “functionally alike”, for as they compete with one another, they will begin to “imitate each other and become socialized to their systems.”<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Kenneth N. Waltz, *The Origins of War in Neorealist Theory* (Orlando: Harcourt Brace College Publishers, 1999), 49.

<sup>2</sup> “Kenneth Waltz,” 2003 episode of *Conversations with History* (University of California, Berkley, 1982-2011; youtube.ca) 23:16 – 23:30.

<sup>3</sup> Robert Keohane, *Realism, Neorealism and the Study of World Politics* (New York: Colombia University Press, 1986), 14.

<sup>66</sup> Ongachi, “Africa: Gay rights.”

<sup>67</sup> Ongachi, “Africa: Gay rights.”

<sup>68</sup> International Gay & Lesbian Human Rights Commission and Sexual Minorities of Uganda, “Report on the rights.”

Given these parameters, there appears to be homogeneity among states, which allows broad statements to be made regarding unit interplay and the formation of an international system. Structural realists claim that states ultimately seek their preferences, which are only achievable with security. As a result, it becomes “deeply competitive [struggle], a zero-sum affair,”<sup>4</sup> as security becomes state priority, and all states have the same goal of achieving security.

In a “self-help” system, this is achieved through the “distribution of capability among [the] units” existing in the system.<sup>5</sup> In such a system, “the more capable [states shape] the realm, [and pose] the problems the [other units] have to deal with.”<sup>6</sup> It is for this reason that “weaker states [will] balance against, rather than bandwagon with, more powerful rivals.”<sup>7</sup> Hence the inclusion of the Prisoner Dilemma in structural realism, observed in Waltz’s evaluation of the emergent powers during World War One, in which “the approximate equality of partners in both the Alliance and the Triple Entente made them closely interdependent.”<sup>8</sup> This interdependence was propagated by the fear of being “alone in the middle of Europe”<sup>9</sup> should a state defect from their alliance.

Waltz explains that “excessive weakness may invite an attack that greater strength would have dissuaded an adversary from launching,” though “excessive strength may prompt other states to increase their [strength].”<sup>10</sup> It is therefore necessary to acquire a moderate level of power – one that is neither meek nor mighty. This phenomenon is referred to as the “balance of

power.”<sup>11</sup> Power is further delineated based on whether it is absolute or relative; the international system then becomes a system in which states compete for relative power. The level to which a unit seeks power in the realm of structural realism is a point of contention: where offensive realists believe that states seek the maximum amount of power in order to become a regional hegemony, defensive realists believe that states “merely [seek] to survive” and that through “balancing alliances,” security can be guaranteed.<sup>12</sup> Waltz is of the latter belief – through having just enough power, states can acquire enough security to pursue preferences. Consequently, “peace is fragile” and in order to prolong peace “some or all of the principle actors” need be involved in the “destabilizing developments.”<sup>13</sup>

The system can be organized optimally in one of three ways according to structural realists. Firstly, the system can be unipolar, in which there is one great power. Waltz warns against such a system as there is a lack of power moderation, and unless the unipolar state has balanced internal politics, constrained government activity abroad and balanced military spending, it can lead to the disposal of, or abuse of, power. Secondly, the system can be a multipolar system, in which there are more than two powerful states. Waltz explains that multipolar worlds would also be unfavorable as “dangers are diffused, responsibilities [are] unclear, and definitions of vital interests are easily obscured.”<sup>14</sup> What is left, then, is a bipolar system in which there are two principle units. Waltz asserts that a “superpower relationship” is the best system in which to operate on the basis that “a world in which there were two balancing powers limiting the actions of the other [is] likely to be a far more stable world than one in which there were several competing states.”<sup>15</sup> This is perfectly exemplified by the US-USSR split that was, according to Cox, “the best

<sup>4</sup> Michael Barnett, *Social Constructivism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 165.

<sup>5</sup> “Kenneth Waltz,” 2003 episode of *Conversations with History*, 24:16 – 24:30.

<sup>6</sup> “Kenneth Waltz,” 2003 episode of *Conversations with History*, 24:37 – 24:39.

<sup>7</sup> Stephen M. Walt, *International Relations: One World, Many Theories*, 31.

<sup>8</sup> Kenneth N. Waltz, *The Origins of War in Neorealist Theory*, 53.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid.

<sup>10</sup> Kenneth N. Waltz, *The Origins of War in Neorealist Theory*, 50.

<sup>11</sup> Robert Keohane, *Realism, Neorealism and the Study of World Politics*, 2.

<sup>12</sup> Stephen M. Walt, *International Relations: One World, Many Theories*, 31.

<sup>13</sup> Kenneth N. Waltz, *The Origins of War in Neorealist Theory*, 53.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid, 54.

<sup>15</sup> Michael Cox, *From the cold War to the War on Terror*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 72.

way of organizing society.”<sup>16</sup> The conflict was limited by the scope of each unit’s respective understanding of the consequences of their actions, and was founded by the idea that there was an unspoken understanding between the parties: “[an] overriding need to prevent nuclear war that neither could win without destroying the world.”<sup>17</sup>

Insofar as the state is the principle actor, and anarchy is the structure’s ordering principle, liberalists concur with structural realists. However, in most other ways it is largely dichotomous to, and broadly challenges structural realism. Where realism focuses on the propensity for conflict among states, it fails to provide alternatives or solutions to the bleak reality it conveys. Liberalism identifies alternatives to “mitigate these conflictive tendencies.”<sup>18</sup> Through increased economic interdependence, the spread of democracy “based on the claim that democratic states [are] inherently more peaceful”, and the increased popularity of international institutions (and cooperation) the world system could achieve peace. This is predicated on the notion that states would be open to “[overcoming] selfish state behavior...by encouraging states to forgo immediate gains for the greater benefits of enduring cooperation.”<sup>19</sup> Given the successful example of the European Union, liberalists find the aforementioned possibilities realizable. Suggesting that cooperation could exist among state actors fundamentally conflicts with structural realists’ vision of self-help, though the involvement of non-governmental organizations, it can be explained. The actions of organizations such as the International Energy Agency, the International Monetary Fund, and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade suggest that cooperation and forgoing short-term benefits for long term gain is widespread among state initiative. Cooperation is heightened through the understanding of relative and absolute gains – where relative gains implies that a state has achieved more than another state, and absolute

gain implies achieving the most among all competing states. Structural realist theory asserts that states will not cooperate unless they are the relative gainers. Liberal theory “[implies] that cooperation [is] more pervasive” than the relative gain activity of realists.<sup>20</sup>

Cooperation is furthered by the idea of globalization. Structural realists claim that “globalization could not change the essence of how politics [was] conducted between states or the fact that international relations [was] bound to remain a primarily political activity.”<sup>21</sup> On the other hand, given their acceptance of NGOs and their focus on domestication of international politics and inclusive economics, liberalists acknowledge the effects of globalization on politics. Realist theory limits the scope of politics to foreign politics, given their understanding of state activity as being homogeneous. Liberalists, however, acknowledge that it is hard to predict actor’s behaviour because of the inherently competitive nature of the system. For this reason, domestic politics are important to liberalists in understanding international politics.

Finally comes the idea of power; structural realist theory believes that the state’s main instrument in accomplishing goals is “economic and especially military power.”<sup>22</sup> This is in opposition to liberalist theory, which names the harmonization of “institutions, economic exchange, [and] promotion of democracy” and ideas as the main source of power.<sup>23</sup>

Constructivist and liberal theory agree that ideas are of prime importance. However, where ideas are only part of liberal theory’s definition of power, they encompass a large portion of constructivist theory. Constructivism claims that both liberalism and structural realism exist in the realm of rational choice – a “social theory that offers a framework for understanding how actors operate with fixed preferences which they

<sup>16</sup> Michael Cox, *From the cold War to the War on Terror*, 72.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid.

<sup>18</sup> Stephen M. Walt, *International Relations: One World, Many Theories*, 30.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid. 32.

<sup>20</sup> Stephen M. Walt, *International Relations: One World, Many Theories*, 32.

<sup>21</sup> Michael Cox, *From the cold War to the War on Terror*, 75.

<sup>22</sup> Stephen M. Walt, *International Relations: One World, Many Theories*, 38.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid.

attempt to maximize under a set of constraints.”<sup>24</sup> In comparison, constructivist theory is more concerned with the relationship between “agents and structures.”<sup>25</sup> In this context, structural realists focus more on the structure – that is, the parameters of the system whose roots lie in anarchy. Constructivism allows that the agent involved in the structure can act within it, or alter it. As such, semi-autonomous “individuals” are main actors which, albeit empowering, is inconsistent with realist theory’s state-actors, for it negates the central role of the state and, thus refuting the validity of power balance between states.<sup>26</sup>

Constructivism does not, however, seek to predict the future, as “it cannot predict the content of ideas.”<sup>27</sup> The theory asserts that common understanding of material objects “[does] not exist in nature but [comes about] through acts of creation” by society.<sup>28</sup> As such, understanding is transient as different social construction suggests “suggests difference across context rather than a single objective reality.”<sup>29</sup> Thus, constructivists reject timeless laws and contingent generalizations, on which the entire premise of structural realism is built. It is upon these different social constructions that a reality is formed, a reality that shapes “legitimate action,” a minimalist social organizing principle, and diverging greatly from Waltz’s anarchy argument.<sup>30</sup> Wendt addresses realist’s anarchy by claiming that “anarchy is what states make of it” – giving agency to different beliefs and practices in the context of organization and world politics.<sup>31</sup>

Anarchy as a defining principle is agreed upon by both structural realists and liberals, though refuted by constructivists on the basis that reality is but a social construct; thus, the meaning of anarchy is dictated by “elites” and

other thinkers.<sup>32</sup> In the harmonized theory being constructed based on criticism of these theories, anarchy is considered to be a term that best described the world during times of war and strife, where structural realism finds its roots. Social constructs have associated the term with disorder and, at times, war; this is not the state of the world. States organize through both foreign and domestic policy; even in conflict there is order, as order is the ends being pursued. In this way, the organizing principle of society then is a *tabula rasa* by those who choose it to be so – hence, it is in states choices that society finds its organizing principles. This also addresses inconsistent thoughts on the homogeneity of states, where liberals agree they argue that states are all unique, and structural realists believe they are homogeneous; it is through accepting the principle of change as a constant that state behavior is affected. In effect, it is the culmination of social, financial and foreign forces, and the meaning added to them by states that dictate the behavior of a state. It is dichotomously and simultaneously the rational choice and social construct that shapes state interaction.

The end goal of interaction is also a contentious point, though one very important to address in the construction of a harmonized theory. Structural realists believe that it is preferences or state interests by means of security, and hence power, that is pursued by states. Waltz asserts within this spectrum that one of the states’ preferences is security. Liberalism, however, states the domestication of international politics as the end goal of states. Waltz is correct in his assertion, though partially so. It is global safety that is sought – although primary interests are internal, the wish for successful and complete external cooperation is also paramount in understanding states’ goals. Though it may be idealistic, it is through the security of other states that a state is most secure. Where realism suggests that it is through possessing moderate power that security is achieved, a comprehensive theory would assert that it is in fact through ensuring that other states are secure that internal security is achieved, as foreign threat is reduced. This agrees, then, with realism’s and Waltz’s idea of self-help actions. Actions are meant to benefit self first, though with

<sup>24</sup> Michael Barnett, *Social Constructivism*, 162.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid.

<sup>26</sup> Stephen M. Walt, *International Relations: One World, Many Theories*, 38.

<sup>27</sup> Stephen M. Walt, *International Relations: One World, Many Theories*, 38.

<sup>28</sup> K. M. Fierke, *Constructivism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 168.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid.

<sup>30</sup> Michael Barnett, *Social Constructivism*, 163.

<sup>31</sup> Michael Barnett, *Social Constructivism*, 164.

<sup>32</sup> Stephen M. Walt, *International Relations: One World, Many Theories*, 38.

the proposed harmonized theory, it is in helping one's self that foreign states are also being helped. In this way, as liberalists suggest occurred in the European Union, at times individual interests are forgone for the good of the "superpower."<sup>33</sup>

With aims of cooperation and a common goal between states – which is ultimately to achieve the greatest amount of security for one's neighbors and thus benefit one's self – relative gains no longer exist. Where structural realists valued relative gains, and used them to dictate state participation, given reviewed incentive, relative gains become absolute gains for all, as when other states gain the home state also gains.

Lastly, Waltz claims that bipolar state organization is normative. Liberalists claim that "unipolarity" in conjunction with "international institutions" is the ideal form of state organization.<sup>34</sup> Both systems of unipolarity and bipolarity imply that there is division in intention and goals, though given the harmonized idea of security as a common end, there should ideally be no division. It is for this reason that either multipolarity between many economically and culturally similar states exists as the organizing principle, or that there be one inclusive state representing all the countries in the world.

It is thus believed that though it is an outstanding political theory, Waltz's structural realism is exclusive, limiting itself to the understanding of historic Western-based politics and thought. Therefore, it is through a harmonization of the three theories – Waltz's structural realism, liberalism and constructivism, that a comprehensive and inclusive theory is established. As there are many theoretical dichotomies that arise when comparing structural realism to both liberalism and constructivism, it is difficult to assign one theory as being most persuasive. Each specializes in addressing a facet of state relation. For this reason, an amalgamation of elements of the three aforementioned theories is recommended to arrive at a workable model.

## The Impact of Clientelism on Sudan and the Implications for a Sustainable Peace

Geoffrey Campbell

Sudan's history, riddled with internal and external conflicts, has provided the basis for hundreds of books to be written regarding the issues of war and peace in Sudan. Over the last fifty years, the world has witnessed numerous attempts by Sudanese leaders to be outspoken about peace while at the same time waging war.<sup>1</sup> In order to understand the complex nature of conflict in Sudan, it is imperative to have an understanding of the role that identity has played in Sudan's history. The account provided here does not portend to be comprehensive in either the breadth or depth of Sudan's long and complicated history, but will examine the crucial elements in many recent conflicts in Sudan's tumultuous history. Specifically, this paper will argue that clientelism has made a crucial impact on Sudan's tumultuous history by promoting conflict and therefore, resolving clientelist policies is crucial to building a sustainable peace in Sudan.

Sudan's political situation is complex which reflects its long history tormented by the legacy of colonialism. In order to provide context, this paper will now briefly outline Sudan's history from colonial times to the signing of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement in 2005.

In 1881, Muhammad Ahmad, a religious leader declared that he was the mahdi, the divinely inspired deliverer of the Islamic faith.<sup>2</sup> He took advantage of the widespread resentment that the "exploitation and maladministration" under colonial rule by leading declaring jihad, or holy war against the British, which unified western and central Sudan, further culminated in a nationalist

<sup>33</sup> Michael Cox, *From the cold War to the War on Terror*, 75.

<sup>34</sup> Kenneth N. Waltz, *The Origins of War in Neorealist Theory*, 54.

<sup>1</sup> Iyob, Ruth and Gilbert M Khadiagala, *Sudan: The Elusive Quest for Peace*, (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc., 2006), 13.

<sup>2</sup> John H. Clarke, "Mohammed Ahmed, (The Mahdi) Messiah of the Sudan," *The Journal of Negro Education* 30.2 (1961): 157.