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Mariya Puriy (UPV/EHU)
The question about the World Order in the 21st Century: Potential Possibilities and Scenarios – Multipolarity and hegemony
There has been a change in the power balance, which can be approached from three competing interpretations or paradigms: the neo-realist / the globalist (nG actors) / and the regionalist (new peripheries)
The realist paradigm is still dominant and shows States willing to gain power, and it is the struggle between them that generates power balances or imbalances, with regional and global hegemon aspirations.
Currently the world power balance is one where there is a hegemon 1 (US) + 4 (China, Jap, EU, Russia) + BRICS (Regional hegemon aspirations) + state and non-state actors (eg Al Quaeda, Daesh, multinational corporations) What we have is a unipolar hegemony or asymmetric balance with one leader, and this leader seeks strong alliances like EU-USA working together, also with Japan / China / Russia (post Soviet area and Buffer States)

Patrick Müller (Ikerbasque)
The Multipolar situation can be approached from different perspectives but the two main paradigms remain, neoliberalism (neoinstitutionalism) and neorealism NR in contrast
In a nutshell, NR as regards MultiPolar order: Power is shifting from state actors and redistributed in the International system. Several major powers are at play. MultiPolar systems are not very stable. ColdWar biPolar system was quite stable, there were fewer powers, and the Nuclear option assured mutual destruction and could be ruled out. By contrast, in a multiPolar order norms and governance become more difficult, they are only operative when backed by powerful actors and implemented.

Neoinstitutionalists do not agree with this interpretation, they look more into economics than security and are more concerned with global interdependence and global institutions (IMF, World Bank). Once you have more actors you try to accommodate them, especially as they gain normative power.

When applied to the EU, the questions of security and of renegotiating global institutions to accommodate new actors touch on sensitive matters: EU has a challenge to evolve as a security actor (hard security issues realists focus on; still much in the hands of MS). A lot of external pressure but very little reform in the issue of security. As regards accommodating newcomers the EU has concerns as a normative power (civilian power) internal values and identity are to be projected externally, peaceful means, humanitarian intervention. Compromises on your own values and identity, not only in HR but also on trade, OGM, climate change. Refugee crisis as an example, conflicts that go to its identity, live up to your values, grant asylum. Not easy. Compromising with Turkey.

Luis Peral
(Analyst, EU-Asia, European Institute for Swecurity Studies)
We should focus more on trends, not on static pictures. The trend is one where state actors are losing power, and there is a democratisation deficit as a result as well.
We are using old categories and applying them to new realities. This happens everywhere all the time
who are the drivers? Private companies are always at the background Polycentrism (more and more countries will try to sit at the table, always newcomers want to play at the real DM fora); In the world 50 countries will be relevant in this sense, blocking power rather than pro-active decisions (because of lack of resources) They will not offer an alternative Gov model But there will be less interstate conflict: conquering other countries is exceptional This does not mean violence will not increase but it will be different. The EU weakens in a world where transnational networks are possible. Alliances changing New non-state actors on an equal footing with states. Why has the paradigm changed? The new world order: C-20 C-30 and C-40 countries, (mega)cities, companies, eg all competing in the fight against climate change Can military power change anything anywhere? Siria, or anywhere. You need to change private companies Unaccountable security providers and private actors (who make their profit from conflict and war) in Afghanistan risk jeopardising the very goals of the US administration: a state of emergency is a source of profit for these companies. Limits of military power (Syria, Lybia) Morenes explained his main driver would be economic diplomacy (Gvt helping private companies make profit) That is the new rationale Ikea in Morocco (Sweden changes its view on Sahara) Non-state actors become key players. In old protectionist theories it was similar, now it is largely consumers asking gov to control companies so they dont delocalise, and companies ask gov to open borders and eliminate trade restrictions Gap in global gov today. Fragmentation explains the world order today; there can be multiplicity without fragmentation but then you need adequate global governance If no global gov then you get fragmentation A Vacuum filled by empowered non-state actors Privatisation of international security. Public security by private providers or security provided for a few actors (even humanitarian aid) Also in terms of Trade and TTIP, and ISDS Also in social rights, IHO cannot decide the international health policy, what is the strategy to fight aids globally, or to combat new diseases and epidemic, Even in election support, EU is subcontracting to NGOs to monitor elections in Africa, not UNDP anymore DM process is made more complicated. Also in terms of space exploration, SPACE X Universal systems of governance Some positive signals, likelihood of war is decreasing. Fragmented systems are not stable but bipolar world does not allow freedom of non hegemons either, so fragmented system can be more democratic

**Debate**

Blocking power and access to the threshold, access to the fora still matters a lot nik: Turkey? Iran? Japan and S. Korea? Australia? India? How do you move to multipolar? Is it easier from unipolar or from bipolar systems? Nik: Nola interpretatu Obama-k Hiroshiman esandakoa: We should never forget what happened, Memory of Hiroshima must never fade States still standing behind their companies
NATO in Pakistan making room for NGOs to step in, or even armies acting as humanitarian NGOs. This was a possibility as we saw in Bosnia (refugee situation was contained) but Protection of civilians
National companies backed by states, yes but, there is a global financial elite, not necessarily controlled, but they use their own countries and governments. A clash of middle classes but companies backed by states when they need them

Values, the grammars of values are not universal whereas the grammars of interests and power are. Understanding of universal values is in need of serious revision, eg refugee law, what is development aid? There is a combination of trends, but sometimes states uphold their interests but convert them into a value discourse
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Alejandro Colas (Birbeck.autor de Imperio) Formas de Imperio y dialéctica histórica de formas de legitimación
Los imperios facilitan una comunicación entre iguales a través de distintos espacios (e.g. lenguas imperiales como el inglés o el español) que puede ser un punto de partida para relaciones internacionales
coda: El siglo americano, the American century (temporal: siglo, 1945; es territorial: estadounidense, universalista por su expansión, jerarquía y orden, que fue muy bien recibido en Europa y en Asia, pero conlleva una particularidad sobre las formas de producción taylorista, el mercado, sobre la vida moral, consumo del alcohol, prácticas sexuales, ocio), una cierta escatología moderna de progreso (del neuzeit, lo cíclico, Koselek), la idea del fin de la Historia y de la contienda (es la versión neocon, Wolfovich), la idea de que el siglo americano es para los siglos de los siglos; esto tiene de revolucionario que pretende una transformación radical (como se intentó con la administración de Bremer en Iraq)

David Wellman (De Paul, autor de Sustainable Diplomacy), Diplomacia y Religión: Pensar y Hacer política en un mundo post-secular
Dominance of raison detat as the basis for relationships between states.
Religion, the missing dimension of statecraft
shared spiritual values (important for diplomacy and nations amongs nation-states), moral claims as practised and understood. Enlightenment contrast between progress and religion
Religious culture : religious symbols or actions / language or imagery / appeal to ethical norms / cultivation by national leaders that the state acts inspired by religious values / interconnections of religious levels
What religious questions should be incorporated into diplomacy? Positionality (avoid generalizations), not draw conclusions from own experience without further research or method, diplomats must engage in deeper fieldwork about the country. Theologians recommend focus on interreligious engagement (relations, dialogues and commonalities), and also be sensitive to the intrareligious differences (understanding the theological positions, esp associated with exclusivist claims: my religion is the only true one, this will not make you a good diplomat). You need to start from the mainstream traditional interp and then understand the extremists. Scholars of sacred texts recommend diplomats to begin with the interpreters of those texts (the history of interpretations, who and why gets to interpret the texts)
Religious and cultural pluralism, multiple and competing subjectivities (no need to defer to any particular body for the truth).
In the context of the global ecological crisis, opportunities for global peacebuilding. Building bridges. Historic language of diplomacy, but now the language of the common ecosphere: drinkable water, breathable air, sustainable production and consumption, sharing, respect for nature, (the language of creation), the age of the Anthropocene, which began in 1610 (ecological depletion, borders artificially imposed on the ground). Potential for regional bodies to escape the dominant economic dimension of international relations, A new level of human impact into the ecosphere highlighting the new common concerns.

Ecological realism, the sustainable and the unsustainable (ecological equilibrium), an imperfect attempt, a paradigm shift even about accountability, considering all the complexities of diplomacy (substate, nation-states). Any permission to destroy the Earth?

Track-One and Track-Two diplomacy

The ecological crisis is not just a material but also a spiritual crisis, the religiously literate diplomat has to incorporate this dimension. The draught in Siria

El realismo ecológico, cómo se contrasta con un idealismo ecológico. Se trata de un realismo? No es más un idealismo