

Review of: "Geopolitical constructs of international politics - their cultural & ideological roots"

Wei Tao

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Reviewer's Comments on "Geopolitical constructs of international politics - their cultural & ideological roots"

The author questions the necessity and rationality of the Peace of Westphalia and attempts to propose alternative solutions by examining certain special arrangements in international relations before the Peace of Westphalia and the problems arising in international relations after the Peace of Westphalia. The author's efforts in this regard are commendable, and it is essential to reflect on the flaws of the Peace of Westphalia and the challenges it poses to the modern world. However, it is necessary to note that the Peace of Westphalia has an undeniable impact on any organization and individual at present. Currently, there is no complete or systematic alternative to replace it. Any attempt to simply negate it and construct alternative solutions may risk throwing out the baby with the bathwater.

I encourage the author to further refine the structure of the paper and deepen its content to produce more constructive results. My suggestions are as follows:

1. Consider adjusting the title: The current title does not effectively convey the main theme of the paper. Throughout the text, there is limited exploration of culture and ideology. The Peace of Westphalia is a key focus of the paper, and it should be reflected in the title.
2. Improve the paper's structure: The introduction is too simplistic. It is essential to expand the literature review, add more background information, and discuss the significance of the research. Additionally, the conclusion and discussion sections need to be supplemented to clearly state the paper's contributions and limitations.
3. Exercise caution in comparative studies: The author attempts to compare international arrangements before and after the Peace of Westphalia, suggesting positive effects before and more conflicts after. It is crucial to be cautious in comparative studies, especially if compelling and relevant examples are not provided. Moreover, the assertion that pre-Westphalian international arrangements were flawless or universally applicable is questionable. Consider whether this comparison is truly meaningful in addressing current global conflicts.
4. Address logical flaws in the analysis: The analytical logic of comparing the superiority of pre-Westphalian international arrangements, the shortcomings of post-Westphalian arrangements, and proposing alternative solutions contains apparent flaws. The examples provided mainly demonstrate attempts to coordinate territorial conflicts, without delving into the essential characteristics of these conflicts. Additionally, the proposed "alternative solutions" primarily focus on avoiding conflicts without offering substantial alternatives to address the limitations of the Peace of Westphalia. I suggest

clarifying the limitations of the Peace of Westphalia in conflict resolution and then proposing alternatives that address these specific limitations. Explore solutions related to coordinating external conflicts, drawing from beneficial experiences in pre-modern international relations, and designing cooperation frameworks among major powers.

5. Address biases in understanding the Peace of Westphalia: The author's perception of the Peace of Westphalia appears biased. I recommend consulting relevant literature such as Croxton (1999), Caporaso (2000), Krasner (2001), Newman (2009), Schmidt (2011), and Ringmar (2012). Engaging with these works can provide a more comprehensive understanding of the historical context and nuances of the Peace of Westphalia, which would enrich the analysis.

If the author can effectively address these shortcomings in the paper, I believe it could be considered for publication.