Return of Meta-Narrative or End of Great Debate: Reflections on Complex International Relations Theory Traversing the Debates and Discourses of Social Sciences

Dr. Rafida Nawaz
Assistant Professor,
Department of International Relations,
Bahauddin Zakariya University Multan,

Syed Hussain Murtaz
Researcher Scholar
International Relations
Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan,

Abstract

The paper aims to trace the genealogy of debates and discourses in the field of Social Science with special emphasis on discipline defining debates in International Relations. Briefly discussing the debates of collective and individual; universal and particular going on in various disciplines of Social Sciences, the prime focus of study will be the most recent trends and approaches for the study of International Relations; from post-positivist epistemological and ontological concerns and importance of standpoint to Post-Post Positivist notion of Complexity; and need to borrow and incorporate the methods of Natural, Physical and Life Sciences to understand the multifaceted reality of the ever-changing and dynamic social world.

Key Words: Discourse, Epistemology, Post-Positivism, Eclecticism, Complexity Framework, Social Sciences)

Introduction

International Relations as a discipline incarnated from the ashes of the First World War. The event witnessed the worst expression of human nature; human urge to dominate and kill for material ends; yet discipline started with the belief in human desire to live in peace, accommodation and prosper. The first research in International Relations was based on presumed human wish & will to coopt and coexist. As main concern of discipline was to avoid the inevitable, i.e. the War; discipline itself became a battle turf for the paradigms, serving as ideologies demanding religion like adherence to researchers. The truth claims of paradigm led to debates that according to Lake never to be concluded as followers of all paradigms were blind to reality mirror of "other" paradigm. Divide on human nature; science & normativity; security dilemma, collective security & exploitation; state and human security; development & ecological footprint; and multiple overlapping standpoints under the rubric of post-positivism focused on the importance of identity shaped by the lived experience, raised dissenter voices to include personal experiences as political ones in the mainstream; constituted the agenda of unending debates in International Relations. Truth claims were presented by all positions as active participants in the politics of truth and knowledge claims of IR. Though it is considered that Realist paradigm is successful in establishing the regime of truth in International Relations, yet the presence of a multitude of voices on edges of discipline providing reflective prisms to established hegemony makes discipline a democratic space of dialogue and discourse. In this game of paradigmatic truths, the serious researcher according to Lake always followed a middle path based on Eclecticism, methodological pluralism and cross-sectional levels of analysis often borrowing from the research in other fields of social and natural sciences. (Lake 19 (3) 2013) Fifth debate or Complex International Relations theory emerged after the chaotic post-positivist debate with multiple nonconformist voices of identity and being; aims to find a synthesis, consensus and a loose commensurability between linear & non-linear vectors. Its ambivalent acceptance & rejection of reflexive critical IR theory and construction of

inter-relation yet separation of human and non-human systems is an attempt to make International Relations an inclusionary body of knowledge equipped with methodological tools and expressions of a varied and broader phenomenon across and beyond the time-space matrix.

The paper aims to trace the genealogy of debates and discourses in the field of Social Science with special emphasis on discipline defining debates in International Relations. Briefly discussing the debates of collective and individual; universal and particular going on in various disciplines of Social Sciences, the prime focus of study will be the most recent trends and approaches for the study of International Relations; from post-positivist epistemological and ontological concerns and importance of standpoint to Post-Post Positivist notion of Complexity; and need to borrow and incorporate the methods of Natural, Physical and Life Science to understand the multifaceted reality of the ever-changing and dynamic social cosmos will be the concern of this study.

The paper is divided in following segments.

1. A Genealogical Overview of Discourses in Social Sciences
2. Development of International Relations Theory
3. Return of Meta-Narrative: Fifth Debate and Complex International Relations Theory

1. A Genealogical Overview of Discourses in Social Sciences

First humans were perhaps the first researcher, who observed the changing phenomenon of nature and adjusted life with unchangeable forces of nature. Francis Fukuyama seminal work on Globalization "End of History and Last Man", starts with the beginning of History and First Man, who set on his voyage with the tools of understanding, exploration and experimentation. (Fukuyama 1992) To overcome the inherent fear in his nature, the humans grouped in communes and developed the norms of rights and wrongs to tame their wild instincts. They developed structures and organizations based on the functional division of labour. They embraced multiple roles

to meet the multifaceted requirements of different institutions, like family, economy, polity and society, at the same time. Here arises a question: is there an inbuilt human nature that comes to play while performing multiple duties or human self is a combination of varied natures that changes with the role one embrace. The understanding of human psyche became the basis of understanding for the working of societal norms, cultures, societies, institutions and most importantly conflict on different levels of analysis.

But from where humans drive their nature, is the first and basic question of Sociology. Whether an individual make society or it is a society that makes the individual subject? The concept of an "embedded subject", within multiple relations of domination and subjection, remained central to the development of human society and the process of change towards a better future. From the concept of "collective consciousness" and "mechanical solidarity" (Durkheim [1893] 1997) of Emile Durkheim to psychoanalytical theories of Lacan and Cooley, all provided explanation of diverse human behavior in different roles and situations though with different lenses.

But what is meant by "collective" that impacts the consciousness and shapes the identity. With whom the individual is bonded in a relation of responsibility, sacrifice, and loyalty, i.e. to his community or to humanity, is the central proposition of debate between Communitarian and Cosmopolitan schools of thought in International Relations. (Rawls, A Theory of Justice 1971) (Rawls, Political Liberalism 1993) As far the notion of Human Rights is concerned, the claims of universality are detested by the adherents of particular cultures declaring the doctrine of human rights as Eurocentric in origin and mask for the power interest of hegemonic powers. The notion of "Human Being" is also contested in present discourses on bases of identity. The Feminists like J. Anne Tickner want to replace the dictum "human being", with "gendered beings". (Tickner 1988 17 (3))

The record of human activities is history, that itself is a contested arena. The present discourses on history and historiography are divided on the question of horizontal, linear deterministic analysis as priori presupposition of history writing or the alternatives provided by Postmodernist, Post-

76

Structuralist, and Postcolonial schools of historiography believing in nonlinear multilayered explanations of events, processes and outcomes.

The question of power and resistance remained a central theme of history. In Phenomenology of Spirit, the Hegel provided a philosophy of history and dialectics between opposite forces as a mode of unfolding future, as the future is rooted in present. The concept of dialectics implies that conflict remained basic to human interactions. More than anywhere else dialectics and discourse between opposite, incommensurable ideas leading to a clash first and ending in a synthesis combining the valid elements of opposite ideas; is forcefully present in genesis and evolution of knowledge.

A time travel to Plato academy of Philosophers will give us the manifestation of dialogue going on between two geniuses, who used to enjoy the same cordial relation with each other that fire enjoys with the dynamite according to Will Durant. (Durant 1926) Hence dialectics between opposite ideas unfolded and shaped the next generation knowledge and it is true for all disciplines. The development of the Biology as subject revolves around the Aristotlean conjecture that life can come into existence from non-life, and its refutation by the various unnamed scholars, remained central concern of debate and research for ages in the field of life sciences.

The field of knowledge cannot be assumed as an open space, where one can enter with innovative ideas, and welcomed by a democratic academic community, celebrating difference. The Orthodoxy of tradition and rigidities of beliefs, suppressed, marginalized, trivialized and exiled many voices. The fate of Gallelio is known. In Words of famous poet Faiz Ahmad Faiz "Ham jo Tareek Rahon main maray gay", Solion say chun k hamaray Alam , Aur niklain gay Ushaq k Qaflay"…..jin ki rah e talab say hamaray qadam….Kam kar gay dard k faslay" . (We, who were crucified on dark roads: From Alter, others will pick our flag: As we are the ones who decreased the length of their long painful course to destiny)

 Hence the priories, assumptions, beliefs, perspectives and norms affected and determined the course of knowledge development. Knowledge claims can also be considered as "regime of truth", representing particular interests. Mitchel

Foucault nexus power/knowledge (Merquior 1985) very well applies to the field of epistemology. Knowledge could have been different if we had opted for a different course. It's the "Road not taken", that has taken us to the path where knowledge can be used for the destruction of humanity and its instrumental value for the service of capitalist hegemonic interests, and in present scenario for the sake terrorism too i.e. Bioterrorism, Chemical weapons and greenhouse gases are also the dark impacts of knowledge/power on human and planetary history. The voices that were exiled, the ideas that were trivialized could have made a real difference, but there are many ifs and buts. Process of exclusion and inclusion shaped the course of knowledge and determined human systems

1.1   Questioning the Notion of Objectivity and Universalism

Despite the claims to objectivity, research remained an application of perspective on realities or translation of facts in accord to a perspective in all fields of knowledge including hard sciences; though, it is the field of Social sciences that is criticized most for its inherent human flaws of prejudices, biases and subjectivity. To overcome its inherent deficiency, the social sciences opted for the rigorous method of Positivism and adopted scientific methodology to predict future and formulate general laws of human behavior applicable across time and space. But Social Sciences remained a contested terrain with no priori belief system acting as basis of normal science. Yet, it is more open space than the imposed universality of natural sciences. When logical Positivism was at its zenith in 1934, Karl Popper was developing the critical paradigm that repudiated from justification accounts of knowledge based on inductive logic of science and replacing it with critical reorientation and method of falsification. (Popper [1963] 2004)

1.2   Social Sciences: An Open Arena with Co-Existence of Multitude of Paradigms

It is the arena of Social Sciences that welcomed Karl Popper and Thomas Kuhn, a mathematician and Physicist by training as philosophers of Social Sciences. The real beauty of social

science lies in its heterogeneity that makes it a colorful mosaic of ideas, sustaining and contrasting, cutting edges and penetrating deep, in a way that multiple schools of thought can borrow from each other. It is a friendly neighborhood that coexists despite its differences. Sometimes differences are on the usage of terms that appear contrasting. What Kuhn call Paradigm, normal science, anomaly and Paradigm shift (Kuhn 1962), Mitchel Foucault call Episteme, Continuity, Phenomenon of Rupture, and Epistemic break. (Foucault, Archaeology of Knowledge 1972) Where both synthesize on the role of priories that limit the range of thought and ideas, the similar concept is renamed by the school of French Historians, Annals represented by Fernand Braudel as *'mentalities',* and structural time. (Burguiere 1982 Vol:24 No. 23)

The research in Social Sciences represents multiple perspectives i.e. empirical/interpretive, qualitative/ quantitative, De-constructivist/ Re-constructivists, verification /falsification, History of echelons of power/ subaltern history from below, personal experiences and collective consciousness etc. The discipline of International Relations before 1919 remained a sub-discipline of Political Science, History, Economy, and Law. It evolved on cross-sections of multiple fields of social sciences when the Great War first in nature brought to fore the question of human nature. According to Jørgensen, as a result of liberation, secessionist movement discipline of International Relations freed itself from mature disciplines like history, philosophy, sociology, law and Political Science. It was the matter to establish the raison d'être of discipline, and construct its distinctiveness that boundaries were not only drawn between different fields of social action and inquiry. (Jørgensen 2010, 28)

2. Development of International Relations Theory

Theory is "reflective thought" (Brown 2005, 7) guiding research agenda; at the same time challenging prejudices, traditional world view and conventional wisdoms; grasping not only the realities of the day but also conceptualizing the world, simplifying complexity and outlining the feasibility of enquiry. (Jørgensen 2010, 6) Academic nationalism drew the

disciplinary map of social sciences in second half of nineteenth century when the Economics seceded from the Political Economy and agenda of the sociology, politics and social theory was differentiated. International Relations remained unidentified till 1919, when war guilt of 1914-18, persuaded the thinkers, and politicians like Woodrow Wilson about new ways of thinking in the field of International politics. More than any other discipline of Social Sciences, IR remained a theoretical conscious social science. (Brown 2005, 19) It not only included theorizing but also tried for meta-theorization, i.e. reflections on theory. The diverse theoretical traditions of International relations casted reflections on ontology, epistemology, agent-structure problem and level of analysis matrix, at the same time addressing the most basic question about nature of human inspired from the tradition of social and political theory, despite the fact that discipline was not immune from the power politics and hegemonic dominance of USA. Academic disciplines were not free from USA will to dominate structure and impose order in name of scientific revolution. Revolution excluded political theory from domain of International Relations that provided the very basis of defining paradigms of IR, i.e. Realism, Liberalism and Structuralism by owing to political theorists like Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, Machiavelli, Kant and Karl Marx. English School in British Empire was founded to keep the spirit of classical version of IR theory alive. Not following the American trend British theorists tried to British theorists guided the research agenda and the study of politics (internal & external) interdisciplinary in nature rooted in political theory. In sway of science they tried to keep the normative thread of discipline alive and paved the way for constructivist bridging between paradigms in coming years. (Jørgensen 2010, 38) But still discipline remained Eurocentric in nature and non-western accounts of theory remained on the margins of discipline.

Another problem of International Relations theoretical discourses were the development of International Relations theory in dominant paradigms. Burchill is of the view that history of discipline is not objective but 'paradigm dependent'. (Burchill 1996, 11) Though Robert Cox divide the IR theorizing in two broad camps, i.e. Problem-solving theories

legitimizing the status quo and Emancipatory critical theory questioning the order of present and possibilities of changing and transforming the order. Cox proposes the purposefulness of both types of theories in his famous dictum "theory is always for someone and for some purpose". (Burchill 1996, 19) According to this theorem Theories can be creation of one or more individuals in a specific time-space context that is the case in other disciplines of Social sciences like Sociology, Political theory and philosophy. IR as a discipline according to Jørgensen is afraid of theorists. The individual efforts about creative theorization were discouraged throughout history of discipline and theorists have either to explain and interpret phenomenon according to belief system of dominant paradigms. (Jørgensen 2010, 26-27) Even the theorists repudiating from dominant paradigms like Carlos Escudé[1], Mohammed Ayoob[2] and Amitav Acharya had to add the suffix of 'Realism' with their theories only because their work was state-centric in nature.

2.1   First Discipline Defining Debate Realism in Guise of Liberalism

Though a close reading of both participants of first debate of International Relations i.e. Realism and Liberalism reveal that theory was the missing link that connected both paradigms. Despite the quasi-religious adherence to paradigmatic principles both paradigms borrowed heavily from thousands years long tradition of theory rooted in city-state realpolitik of Hellas. (Nawaz Vol II. No 1 (January- June) 2016) It was a debate between adherents of Thomas Hobbes and John Lock drawing a caricature of human nature, the question of anarchy and security. The first research question of Discipline of IR was "where the major causes of war are can be found". All the three possible answers i.e. within human nature; within the structure of independent states; within state system are rooted in political theory. War remained there though Liberals believed that it can be avoided through control of instincts or by a war to end all wars[3]; hence giving a tacit approval to Realist notion that war is inevitable. (Waltz 1959) The other liberals conceived a peaceful order if self-seeking spirit of human beings is altered with spirit of sacrifice, cooperation and trust. They were of the

view that production will flourish peace and distribution will be based on equity if all nationals are free to seek their interests anywhere in the world. (Waltz 1959) Realist claimed that "what ought to be" and ethical considerations will not shape the real world that stands on competitive spirit of human beings. First great debate as the clash of titans did not ended but it made IR a Janus faced discipline with two facets of conflict and compromise. The debate to this day is the continued thread of history of discipline. (Lake 19 (3) 2013)

2.2   (Un)Scientific Revolution in International Relations: Debate on Methodology

In 1960's both paradigms were named 'traditionalist" (Classical Realism, Liberalism and English School) by the revolutionary scientism/behaviouralism. Behavioralists were in search of recurring patterns. They disdained the uniqueness of particular events and episodes and tried to classify events, to highlight the commonalities across e.g interstate conflict. Their mode of inquiry was based either on deduction, or on induction grounded in empiricism. Law like generalization was the prime objective of research. According to Lake, "it was not an emphasis on science but particular kind of science". (Lake 19 (3) 2013) This emphasis limited the horizons of inquiry and discouraged individual's efforts to theorize in specific context of time and space. The result was the mega ideational structures of theory "ready to consume" for researchers, to comprehend, apply, celebrate or critique. The researchers have to box themselves in mega paradigmatic tradition compromising the agency of thought and creative role of individual. (Jørgensen 2010, 26-27) The limitation of scientific inquiry was identified by Hedley Bull by acknowledging the fact that "no scientific theory could ever capture the interplay of many facets, nor explain choices of human beings who could learn by experience". (Lake 19 (3) 2013) Though two approaches were seemingly incommensurable, it was identified by Vasquez that core assumptions of so called traditionalist approaches were reproduced and molded in the Behavioralist mold adding an affix of "neo" to Realism and Liberalism. (Jørgensen 2010, 20)

2.3 Inter-Paradigm Debate and International Political Economy

Three D pyramidical shape of International Relations appeared in 1970, with inter-paradigm debate between realism, liberalism and radicalism. Though the Radical believes were considered to be incommensurable by the dominant mainstream paradigms and they were excluded from disciplinary mainstream, yet Structuralism/ Marxism provided the alternative reality of the discipline. Robert Gilpin is of the view that Marxist thought is rooted in liberal tradition and have the same or similar view on globalism as end of history. On the other hand the Realist economic feature, i.e. economic nationalism started with mercantilist ideas that emphasized on zero-sum strategy of trade that was in reality an initial stage of modern day liberal view on trade. (Gilpin 2016) The excluded tradition of debate Structuralism contributed in development of International Relations in form of Modern World System theory by Immanuel Wallerstein based on Fernand Braudel work of history and civilization. The work of Wallerstein breaks the interdisciplinary boundaries of economics, sociology, politics, and international relations. (Wallerstein 2014) making him a key figure of novel approach in International Relations, i.e. Historical Sociology. Third debate was about the structure of international politics that according to liberals and Marxist caused conflict. Hence conflict according to this debate was about resources divided in interstate system. Liberal belief is on interdependence and sharing while Marxist focused on exploitative nature of core-peripheral structure of state. But do economics shape the identities and does exploitation is limited to interstate system or traverse down the social fabric.

2.4 Struggle of inclusion, Politics of Identity and Fourth Debate of International Relations

Unresolved third debate gave rise to hydra shaped fourth debate of International Relations focusing on identity, seeking place to normative questions like slavery, violence, intolerance, charity and kindness and bringing back political theory to International mainstream. Their disbelief in scientific mode of inquiry and belief in social change and emancipatory action

politics made them Post-Positivists. According to Lake, it is like fracturing the field into multiple, overlapping identity groups. Ontologically non-positivist belief is about subjective observation limited to observable phenomenon. Purpose of inquiry according to these Post-positivist groups is to understand how the world came to be as it is and move the world in an ethical direction. (Lake 19 (3) 2013) Main contribution of the Post-positivist in field of International Politics is on re-conceptualizing the notion of SECURITY and identity as the base of observation. They merged the concept of national interest that was considered to be the base of IR and ir with identity, arguing that politics of identity is in practice originate the interests, hence interests are identity based. Tickner reformulation of Morgenthau six principles of power politics on basis of gender division of human society is one seminal example of identity politics of interests. (Tickner 1988 17 (3)) Security theorization on post-positivist lines has broadened the security focus of research making military as only one of five aspects. The other four are political, economic, society and environment. Hence Security is no more analyzed on inter-state level of analysis. Sub-state and supra-state level of analysis is added in the horizon of securitization, and focus is being shifted from state to individual (human). Various phenomenons's like migration, climate, and religion are included in causes of conflict. (Jørgensen 2010, 170-77)

Many postmodernists like Bourdieu and Foucault work on both sides of positivist/post-positivist divide. (Lake 19 (3) 2013) Postmodernists opened the field of IR for a more inclusive inquiry as they give primacy to epistemology over methodology. Method becomes subservient to ontological and epistemological questions and can be opted according to given scenarios of study. Fourth debate of IR paved way to eclectic IR theory rooted in political thought, more inclusive in nature breaking the dictates of Eurocentric of US hegemonic disciplinary boundaries.

3. Return of Meta-Narrative: Fifth Debate and Complex International Relations Theory

The History of Social Sciences, in the 20th and 21st century, witnessed multiple orientations of research. It fell under the spell of positivism and scientism, followed by the entry of a post-positivist orchestra that deconstructed the orthodox trends of research from various standpoints i.e. the De-constructivist phase of Social Science research. At present, a post-post-positivist debate also known as fifth debate is knocking at the doors of social sciences. Borrowing from Physics and other natural sciences, it believes in the conjectures of complexity theory (CT). It aims to reconcile the differences between the seemingly incommensurable believes of multiple standpoints, by building an overarching assumption, based on the supposition that any process and event is resultant of a large number of variables and actors, interacting in a nonlinear manner.

Complex International Relations Theory takes the belief in "makeable world", human agency to determine the course of history on the linear vector with skepticism. It takes as a priori the 'non-linear' flows and multiple options of possibilities. It also believes that human subjectivities are in flux.

- To understand the complexity of system one must cast objective as well as a subjective gaze to understand and explain the patterned yet chaotic relations leading to nonlinear or multi-linear (un)determinism.
- To understand objectively the complex system, one must have an understanding of the multitude of components, with a multitude of feedback loops, and profuse interactions among subsystems of a complex system that are complex in their own respect.

Subjectively Complex International Theory believes in the limit of human comprehension to explain and predict the outcome of ever-changing processes in a complex world. It takes a priori assumption that (con)sequences can be unfamiliar, unexplained, and unplanned. CT believes in Eclecticism, i.e. an approach that goes beyond the notion of the rigidity of a single paradigm, and a belief in commensurability of various elements. The principle of eclecticism becomes a necessity because Positive/Post-Positivist debate focused less on explaining the

world politics and agent relationship with structure and more on the set of quasi-religious ideas about human identities and the nature of humans driven from those identities. (Lake 19 (3) 2013)

Jørgensen is of the view that idea of identity and human nature is inherent in theoretical traditions explaining multiple phenomenas of international system. (Jørgensen 2010) Hence, to explain the complex nature of international system variety of eclectic mid-level theoretical approaches are needed to explain the difference between the foreign policy of different counteries. Furthermore, the so-called inside/outside dichotomy must be blurred and conscious effort have to be made to opt methodological pluralism; and a multi-level approach to analyze political processes in-spite of taking it as wholes must be the focus of the study. (Lake 19 (3) 2013) Lake is of the view that IR theory must be self-consciously eclectic, including different paradigmatic principles relating to complex bits of intertwined realities. Hence a Complex International Relations Theory is

- *dialogic* in principle allowing the duality of agency-structure and creates a unity of the whole;
- believing in the principle of *recursivity*, where causes are effects and effects in turn become causes;
- based on *holongramic* principle i.e. the notions of Holon's means Wholes/Parts, where wholes become part of greater wholes and parts become a system in their own respect.

These principles are needed because the international arena is a complex adaptive, makeable system. That is not only a cluster of interrelated, interconnected activities making it a complex system with an everchanging relationship between Parts and Wholes. Complex International Relations Theory (CIRT) believes that the system is not rigid but has an inbuilt adaptive capacity to cope with challenges. (Kavalski 2007, Vol:20 No.3)

Conclusion

To Jørgensen, the method must be subservient to theory. (Jørgensen 2010) Hence, the complexity framework belief not only in Inter & Intra-paradigmatic commensurability but also a

nexus of different disciplines not only form social sciences but also physical and numerical sciences. International arena suggested by CIRT is practically a combination of events and impressions; partly constructed and partly experienced. The framework integrates ecological, economic, social, institutional and administrative processes expanding the horizons of human activity and begging for analytical tools from social and natural sciences. (Kavalski 2007, Vol:20 No.3) It is a shift from Epistemology focused by Post-Positivists to Ontology where knowable reality can also be made differently. Hence understanding reality means that a relationship is imaginatively and cognitively constructed on the bases of available knowledge. It establishes a network of observers who are also the creators of consciousness, as humanities are not mechanical but active and creative to make laws compatible and adaptable with changing scenarios. CIRT resonating the emancipatory claims of political theory insist that complex system will compel the strongest to act in ways that limit its power and reduce the vulnerability of the weakest link of the loop. (Kavalski 2007, Vol:20 No.3)

We may call the Fifth debate, the end of great debate or adoption of a mega theoretical approach based on eclecticism. It does not hold on the rigid pre-assumptions, constituting a quasi-religious belief system of a single paradigm and standpoint of international politics. History of International Relations as a discipline was also the history of wars: the "paradigmatic wars", contesting on truth status of their belief system. (Lake 19 (3) 2013)

Proponents of CT brought to attention the fact that mainstream IR scholars divided on the issues of pessimistic/ optimistic human nature, individualism/ collectivism, cosmopolitan/Communitarian, universal/particular, objective/subjective, and inside/ outside dichotomies, taking an Either-Or standpoint have limited the horizons of their thought. The power of their theories to explain, understand or predict is limited as they don't expect the finitude of their comprehension limited by the prioris, and there is no place of uncertainty and unanticipated consequences in traditional IR theory. The idiom of complexity has integrated the two seemingly incommensurable themes, i.e. fragmentation and integration.

While acknowledging the concepts of being and identity in a fragmented world as given, it focuses on the conditions of possibility, i.e. the possibility of becoming.

Complex International Relations Theory does not take power hierarchy as given; with the vulnerability of the weak as fact. It is reminiscent of Foucauldian idea that 'power is not a possession, and exercised from top to bottom. It circulates between bodies and forms a net-like structure'. (Merquior 1985) CT believes in the working of a complex system in a way that limits the power of the strongest states of the international system reducing the vulnerabilities of the weak and the weakest.

CT takes the world as an open and flexible assemblage. It challenges the assumption of Scientism in law like generalization applicable beyond time & space; Realist belief in the state as a unified actor operating on basis of self-help in a conflict-prone world, also denying the assumption of institutionalized collective security system advocated by the Liberals. It believes that the system has properties as well as there is a possibility of emergent properties; system oscillates from linear to nonlinear vector. In an ever-changing world, the multitude of actors has to find a balance between order and chaos, and their subjectivities are in process of flux and becoming with ever-evolving environment. The critics of CT believe it to be the end of theory, but deep analysis reveals that it rather ends of debates between theories, as a complex system needs a synthesis of plural theories (real not metaphysical) in a multitude of combinations, explaining and understanding the various facets of reality.

References

1   Peripheral Realism is theory presented by Carlos Escudé in context of Argentine, where he took account of realities of a middle power state like Argentine that have to choose between gun and butter; hence Escudé builds the case of choosing a better life style for the population in place of egoistic power politics.

2   Subaltern Realism is theory presented by Mohammed Ayoob (Ayoob 1995) and later developed by Amitav Achary (Achary 1997). The theory takes account of self-determination movements based on identity politics posing real threat to existence of postcolonial third world states.

3   According to Kenneth Waltz the Liberals oscillate between two poles: the optimistic non interventionism of Immanuel Kant Codlben and Bright on the one hand ans interventionist ideas of Paine, Mazzini and Woodrow Wilson. To Woodrow Wilson, either War was a crusade or it is a crime, …as we are fighting for peace….for permanent peace. (Waltz 1959, 103-111)

4. Achary, A. (1997). Periphrey as Core. In M. C. Krause, Towards Critical Security Studies (pp. 299-328).

5. London: UCL Press .

6. Ayoob, M. (1995). The Third World Security Predicament: State making, regional confict and the

7. International system . Boulder, London: Lynne Rienner Publishers .

8. Booth, K. (2010). International politics: the inconvenient truth. In K. Booth, Realism and World Politics

9. (pp. 325-342). New York: Routledge.

10. Booth, K. (2010). Realism Redux: Contexts, Concepts and Contests. In K. Booth, Realism and World

11. Politics (pp. 1-14). New York: Routledge.

12. Brown, C. (2005). Understanding International Relations. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

13. Burchill, S. (1996). Introduction. New York: Palgrave.

14. Burguiere, A. (1982 Vol:24 No. 23). The Fate of History of Mentalities in the Annales. Comparitve Studies

15. in Society and History , 424-437.

16. Durant, W. (1926). The Story of Philosophy The Lives and Opinions of the Great Philosophers. New York:

17. Simon & Schuster.

18. Durkheim, E. ([1893] 1997). The Division of Labour in Society. New York: Free Press.

19. Foucault, M. (1972). Archaeology of Knowledge. New York: Pantheon Books.

20. Foucault, M. (2002). What is Critique. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

21. Fukuyama, F. (1992). The End of History and the Last Man. New York: Free Press.
22. Gilpin, R. (2016). The Political Economy of International Relations. Princeton : Princeton University Press.
23. Jørgensen, K. E. (2010). International Relations Theory. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
24. Kavalski, E. (2007, Vol:20 No.3). The Fifth Debate and the Emergence of Complex International Relations
25. Theory: Notes on the Apllication of Complixity Theory to the Study of International Life.
26. Cambridge Review of International Affairs , 435-454.
27. Kuhn, T. (1962). The Structure of Scientific Revolution. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
28. Lake, D. A. (19 (3) 2013). Theory is Dead, Long Live the Theory: The End of Great Debates and the rise of
29. Ecclecticism in International Relations. European Journal of International Relations, 567-587.
30. Merquior, J. G. (1985). Foucault. London: Fontana Press.
31. Nawaz, R. (Vol II. No 1 (January- June) 2016). Reflections on State-Centrism (the Realist Paradigm) in
32. International Relations from Peripheral Realist Standpoint. Journal of Historical Studies, 40-60.
33. Popper, K. ([1963] 2004). Conjectures and Refutations The Growth of Scientific Knowledge. New York :
34. Routledge Classics.
35. Rawls, J. (1971). A Theory of Justice. Massachussets: Harvard University Press.
36. Rawls, J. (1993). Political Liberalism. New York: Columbia University Press.
37. Tickner, J. A. (1988 17 (3)). Hans J Morgenthau's Six Principles of Political Realism: A Feminist Re
38. formulation. Millenium , 429-440.
39. Wallerstein, I. (2014). Historical Capitalism. New York: Verso.
40. Waltz, K. (1959). Man, the State and War. New York: Columbia University Press.