

**INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND CHANGE:
A KUHNIAN INTERPRETATION**

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

of

RHODES UNIVERSITY

by

JACOBUS SCHOEMAN

November 2005

ABSTRACT

International Relations and Change: A Kuhnian Interpretation

Using notions of change developed by Thomas Kuhn, the thesis argues that the rise of globalisation and the end of the Cold War presented the Westphalian or state-centric paradigm of international relations with a Kuhnian paradigm “crisis”. As a result, both the theory and the practice of international relations are in the midst of (what Kuhn calls) a “paradigm shift”. Emerging from this shift is (what is described in this work as) “Access World” and “Denial World” – a particular global configuration of the practice of international relations. Kuhn’s idea of “incommensurability” seems to typify the relationship between the two components of this bifurcated configuration of the international. Both intellectual risk-taking and political courage are required if the ontological struggle raging between “Access World” and “Denial World” is to be settled. This will pave the way for a new paradigm to emerge. Kuhn provides us with the insight that, to achieve this ontological breakthrough, a fundamental change in our vision of the discipline of International Relations, but also of the world of everyday international relations, is required. This entails recasting the study of International Relations as an emancipatory project and by recognising the centrality of

human beings in the practice of international relations. Only if this is done, will we be able to arrive at a cosmopolitan political bargain that is appropriate for the 21st century.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
PREFACE	xiii

CHAPTER ONE: THE STATE OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS – WESTPHALIA TO THE WALL	1
1.1 Problem statement	1
1.2 Literature review	6
1.3 Objectives	13
1.4 Methodology	14
1.4.1 The concept of “globalisation”	17
1.4.2 The concepts of “modernity” and “postmodernity”	21
1.4.2.1 Modernity, postmodernity and international relations ...	26
1.4.3 Supplementary methodological markers	29
1.5 Chapter layout	34
1.6 Conclusion	37

CHAPTER TWO: “THE POSSESSION OF COMMUNITIES” – THOMAS KUHN, INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND THE MAKING OF KNOWLEDGE	38
2.1 Introduction	38
2.2 The time-bound nature of theoretical knowledge	39
2.3 The purpose-bound nature of theoretical knowledge	40

2.4	Problem-solving theory and critical social theory	42
2.4.1	Problem-solving theory, critical theory and constructivism	46
2.4.2	Problem-solving theory, critical theory and post-positivism ...	50
2.5	Thomas Kuhn, knowledge and international relations	53
2.5.1	Thomas Kuhn and the time-bound nature of theoretical knowledge	59
2.5.1.1	The introduction of “Big Science”	60
2.5.1.2	The onset of the Cold War	61
2.5.1.3	The student movement of the 1960s	61
2.5.1.4	Kuhn’s involvement with the “General Education in Science” programme	62
2.5.1.5	Thomas Kuhn’s “intellectual epiphany”	63
2.5.2	Thomas Kuhn and the purpose-bound nature of theoretical knowledge	66
2.5.3	Thomas Kuhn, critical theory and problem-solving theory ...	69
2.6	Explaining the Westphalian paradigm’s knowledge deficit ...	73
2.7	Conclusion	76

CHAPTER THREE: BUDDY CAN YOU PARADIGM?

THOMAS KUHN, INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

AND THE NATURE OF CHANGE **79**

3.1	Introduction	79
3.2	A critical discussion of Thomas Kuhn’s views on change	80
3.2.1	The period of “pre-paradigmatic” science	81
3.2.2	The period of “normal science”	82
3.2.3	The awareness of anomaly	86

3.2.4	The period of “crisis”	86
3.2.5	The response to “crisis”	87
3.2.6	The “scientific revolution”	88
3.2.6.1	The concept of “incommensurability”	93
3.2.6.1.1	Kuhn’s original formulation of the concept of “incommensurability”	96
3.2.6.1.2	Changes in Kuhn’s views on “incommensurability”	97
3.2.6.1.3	Thomas Kuhn and the bridging of “incommensurability”	99
3.2.7	A new period of “normal science”	102
3.3	The relevance of Thomas Kuhn’s views on change for the social sciences	103
3.3.1	Kuhn’s contribution as a social scientist	107
3.3.2	The centrality of language in Kuhn’s theory	108
3.3.3	Kuhn as facilitator of an understanding of social change	109
3.3.4	The “Kuhnianization” of the social sciences	109
3.4	The relevance of Thomas Kuhn’s views on change for international relations	111
3.5	Making sense of International Relations’ and international relations’ ontological battles	121
3.5.1	Responses to the paradigm shift in international relations	123
3.5.1.1	The blurring of the existing paradigm	124
3.5.1.2	A division of society into competing camps or parties	124
3.5.1.3	Tension between apparently incommensurable schools of thought	126
3.5.1.4	A return to a situation akin to the “pre-paradigm” state	127

3.5.1.5	The absence of a shared body of theory and methodology ..	128
3.6	Conclusion	130

CHAPTER FOUR: DIMENSIONS OF “WESTFLAILIA”:		
THE CONCEPT OF SECURITY		
4.1	Introduction	133
4.2	The concept of security: theoretical anomalies	137
4.2.1	The “broadening” of the concept of security	141
4.2.2	The “widening” of the concept of security	142
4.3	The concept of security: practical anomalies	145
4.3.1	Changing game pieces	148
4.3.1.1	The example of Al Qaeda	149
4.3.2	A changing game board	150
4.3.2.1	The changing face of war	151
4.3.3	Changes in the rules of the game	155
4.3.3.1	Concerns regarding long-range technological changes	159
4.3.3.2	Concerns regarding changes in the global economic fabric	160
4.3.3.3	Concerns regarding changes in the ideological matrix	161
4.4	Security as a dimension of the paradigm shift in international relations	163
4.5	Conclusion	167

CHAPTER FIVE: DIMENSIONS OF “WESTFLAILIA”:	
THE CONCEPT OF SOVEREIGNTY	169
5.1 Introduction	169
5.2 The concept of sovereignty: theoretical anomalies	170
5.2.1 Constructivist criticism of the concept of sovereignty	175
5.2.2 The emergence of the environment as an issue area in International Relations	181
5.3 The concept of sovereignty: practical anomalies	184
5.3.1 Questions surrounding the sovereignty of the nation-state: the internal dimension	186
5.3.1.1 The phenomenon of “failed states”	186
5.3.1.2 The phenomenon of “quasi-states”	188
5.3.1.3 The phenomenon of “pseudo-states”	189
5.3.1.4 The growth of criminal organisations	190
5.3.1.5 The question of taxation	192
5.3.1.6 The onset of a worldwide “organisational explosion”	193
5.3.1.7 Links between sub-national authorities	194
5.3.2 Questions surrounding the sovereignty of the nation-state: the external dimension	196
5.3.2.1 The presence of global economic and financial architecture	197
5.3.2.2 The influence of Transnational Corporations (TNCs)	198
5.3.2.2.1 The role of Transnational Corporations (TNCs) in the media sector	200
5.3.2.3 The influence of cutting-edge technology	201

5.3.2.4	The role of supranational political and economic organisations	202
5.3.2.5	The emergence of encompassing normative frameworks ..	205
5.3.2.6	The global role of the United States	207
5.4	Sovereignty as a dimension of the paradigm shift in international relations	210
5.5	Conclusion	213

CHAPTER SIX: DIMENSIONS OF “WESTFLAILIA”:

THE CONCEPT OF IDENTITY	215	
6.1	Introduction	215
6.2	The concept of identity: theoretical anomalies	216
6.2.1	Constructivist criticism of the concept of identity	223
6.3	The concept of identity: practical anomalies	228
6.3.1	Sub-national challenges to identity	230
6.3.1.1	The challenge of ethnicity	230
6.3.1.2	The challenge of “consumer sovereignty”	234
6.3.2	Supra-national challenges to identity	235
6.3.2.1	The rise of the European Union (EU)	235
6.3.2.2	The creation of the Internet and of the World Wide Web (WWW)	237
6.3.2.3	The proliferation of social movements	238
6.4	Identity as a dimension of the paradigm shift in international relations	241
6.5	Conclusion	244

**CHAPTER SEVEN: SECURITY, SOVEREIGNTY,
AND IDENTITY REVISITED: ACCESS WORLD**

AND DENIAL WORLD 247

7.1 Introduction 247

7.2 The concepts “Access World” and “Denial World” 253

7.3 Characteristics of Access World and Denial World 255

7.3.1 The question of “affluence” 255

7.3.2 The question of “mobility” 255

7.3.3 The question of “connectivity” 256

7.3.4 The question of “agency” 257

7.4 The architecture of the Access World/Denial World
configuration 259

7.4.1 Access World, Denial World and existing nation-states 266

7.5 The inhabitants of Access World and Denial World -
Davos Man and Porto Alegre Woman 273

7.5.1 The spectrum of views in Access World and Denial World 277

7.6 The interaction between Access World and Denial World in
theory 279

7.7 Conclusion 286

**CHAPTER EIGHT: WORLDS IN COLLISION? ACCESS
WORLD, DENIAL WORLD AND THE QUESTION**

OF INCOMMENSURABILITY 288

8.1 Introduction 288

8.2 The interaction between Access World and Denial World in
practice 290

8.2.1	The Denial World perspective	292
8.2.1.1	Perspectives with regard to security	292
8.2.1.2	Perspectives with regard to sovereignty	298
8.2.1.3	Perspectives with regard to identity	299
8.2.2	The Access World perspective	301
8.2.2.1	Perspectives with regard to security	302
8.2.2.2	Perspectives with regard to sovereignty	306
8.2.2.3	Perspectives with regard to identity	310
8.3	The implications of the interaction between Access World and Denial World	315
8.3.1	The choices and actions of Access World	315
8.3.2	The choices and actions of Denial World	320
8.3.3	Access World/Denial World interaction: possible futures	325
8.3.4	The Access World/Denial World configuration – a global emerging class structure?	327
8.3.5	The role of the Bush administration and of Al Qaeda within the Access World/Denial World framework	330
8.4	Access World and Denial World: a case of Kuhnian “incommensurability”?	338
8.4.1	“Strong incommensurability”, “weak incommensurability” and international relations: an assessment	339
8.5	Conclusion	348

**CHAPTER NINE: BEYOND WESTPHALIA –
RE-IMAGINING INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS 350**

9.1	Introduction	350
-----	--------------------	-----

9.2 Thomas Kuhn and the search for a new international relations .. 353
9.3 Re-imagining international relations: theoretical implications .. 355
9.4 Re-imagining international relations: practical implications 358
9.5 Conclusion 362

BIBLIOGRAPHY 365

PREFACE

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to:

- Professor Peter Vale, Nelson Mandela Professor of Politics at Rhodes University, who inspired me to imagine a new world of international relations.
- My wife, Michele, whose support was always unwavering, and my daughter, Smilla, whose generation will inherit the issues.
- The South African Department of Foreign Affairs for financial support.
- Ms. Anne Moon and Ms. Debbie Martindale from Rhodes University Library for their friendly and prompt assistance.

The thesis is a manifestation of God's all-encompassing grace without which the project would not have been completed.

JACOBUS SCHOEMAN

November 2005

CHAPTER ONE

THE STATE OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS - WESTPHALIA TO THE WALL

1.1 Problem statement

“Humans are a meaning-creating species, and ‘international relations’¹ is one of the stories we tell ourselves, to give meaning to our lives.” (Booth, 1996:338.) There has long been a desire to ground meaning in foundations that would last through space and time. But such Archimedean points are too demanding for the complex and evolving human story. Booth (1996:338) suggests that a better option may be to rely on suitable anchorages for our ideas, which shift as the human journey continues, but which offer the promise, in their own context, of answering crucial questions.

International Relations reflects on this human journey which sometimes moves through flat landscapes, and sometimes through mountain passes. Most of these passes are only topography with little or no difference in climate, language, or culture between the valleys on either side. But some passes are different; they are “true divides” (Drucker, 1989:3). International relations have, in the past, traversed these arduous passages. Once they have been crossed, the social and political landscape changes. The social and

¹ In order to distinguish fields of study/disciplines from practice and from existing systems, the former are capitalised in the thesis: e.g. International Relations, while international relations refer to the practical interaction between actors on the global scene or to the system of international relations as it currently exists.

political climate is different and so is the social and political language. There are, Drucker (1990:3) insists, “new realities”.

Ignatieff (1993:2) asserts: “If the twenty-first century has already begun ... then it began in 1989”. In this year, international relations entered such a historic “crossing-over” period from which it is yet to emerge. Draper (1997) comments that the fall of the Berlin Wall proved to be a “historical instant” that changed “old verities” (also see Chomsky, 1998:45). Peter Vale (2003:70) argues that “(a)fter those momentous hours on Friedrichstrasse in November 1989, all previous positions were closed off ...”. Across the whole spectrum of human activity, “new realities” were asserting themselves.

The old emphasis on geopolitics was waning, and new items were being drawn to the surface of international relations (Vale, 2003:72). In a broad theoretical framing, these were to be called “globalisation” and were driven by the quickening tempo of, amongst other issues, technology, financial flows and communications (Vale, 2003:72). Humanity seemed to have little control over these fast-moving changes and fluidity appeared to have become the hallmark of developments in the international arena. Rosenau (1990:7) expresses a similar sentiment when he refers to a period of “global turbulence” which has commenced with uncountable actors (in addition to the nation-state) transforming the political landscape at remarkable speed.

Especially after 1989, the relevance of the nation-state, the “terminal entity” (Rosenau, 2002:23) of international relations, and the primary point of reference of the discipline of International Relations, was increasingly being

questioned. The sociologist Daniel Bell clearly foresaw this problem when he remarked that “the nation-state is becoming too small for the big problems of life, and too big for the small problems of life” (Bell, 1988:B3). With this statement, Bell encapsulated the dilemma of the nation-state as a structure unable to respond to “big” challenges such as unchecked global capital flows and pandemics such as bird-flu or to “small” challenges such as addressing job losses at the local level and tending to complaints that government is perceived as being far away and unresponsive.

Increasingly unable to shed light on contemporary developments, the content of a constellation of concepts closely associated with or orbiting the nation-state – concepts such as sovereignty, security and identity – was similarly being questioned. Ken Booth famously remarked, as early as 1991, that “(o)ur work is our words, but our words do not work any more” (Booth, 1991a:313).

Shaw (2000a) shares this view, remarking that the very meanings of core concepts change in a period of transition. Apparently overtaken by the speed and scope of change, the theoretical content of these concepts, and the real-life developments to which they had effectively spoken in the past, were no longer aligned.

The end of the Cold War thus represented, in more ways than one, the closing of a chapter. International relations found itself in new territory confronted by “a fundamentally different political environment” (Tarry, 1999). Weiss and Hayes Holgate (1993:258) comment that “(e)verything, in both theory and practice, that had been taught about the international system

seems to have acquired an antique aspect”. The conceptual benchmarks that had guided policy and international relations analysis for decades had been stripped away (Saunders, 1999; also see Lawson, 2002a:xi).

The case will be made in the thesis that, especially since 1989, a carefully constructed body of knowledge, having an echo in a socially constructed reality, both in place and not having changed fundamentally since the signing of the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648, were no longer able to provide answers to the questions being addressed to it. This shared and constant frame of reference used for the purpose of both acting in and theorising about the international, proved to be inadequate. Scholte (2001:21) sees no other alternative but to declare that Westphalian international relations are “past history”.

What is described in this thesis as the “Westphalian paradigm” had effectively become obsolete and the events of 1989 merely confirmed this. The loss of this guiding principle of international relations led to disarray and confusion. Both theorists and practitioners were “overwhelmed by or oblivious to some of the complexities of post-international politics, the interdependence that sustains it, and the structural relations that underpin it” (du Plessis, 2001a:135).

In all instances, the crisis was essentially an ontological one - that is - having a bearing on how we understand international relations or on how we perceive the world of international relations to be. Robert Cox insists that:

(o)ntology lies at the beginning of any enquiry. We cannot define a problem

in global politics without presupposing a certain basic structure consisting of the significant kinds of entities involved and the form of significant relationships among them ... There is always an ontological starting point (Cox, 1996a:144).

Adherence to the Westphalian paradigm implied a set of ontological commitments – commitments that determined “what is *real*” (Willetts, 2001:361 – italics in original) in international relations. Mainstream assumptions, previously viewed as irrefutable, now apparently no longer held true. The “shaky ontological foundations” (Reus-Smit, 2001:586) on which International Relations as a discipline, as well as the practice of international relations, had been constructed, were fully revealed. New sets of problems emerged that the old ontologies seemed unable to account for or cope with (Cox, 1996a:145).

The need for “new thinking” (Booth, 1991b:ix) or for a “new agenda” (Lawson, 2002b:3) to resolve this crisis became increasingly evident. Bereft of its “strategic and conceptual bearings” (Stremlau, 1999:64), new explanations were sought for changing roles and relations. What was necessary were new ways of seeing the world – a new ontology - and the crafting of the language to make this ontology plausible and comprehensible.

It is to this critical and pivotal debate on international relations and change that the thesis hopes to contribute. It will be argued that, as far as contemporary international relations are concerned, and despite the obvious need for a new worldview, scholars and politicians alike remain “prisoners” of the prevailing Westphalian- or state-centric paradigm (Rosenau, 1990:39).

Unwilling or unable to escape the premise of nation-state predominance, scholars and practitioners of international relations are constantly tempted to cling to familiar assumptions about issues such as security, sovereignty and identity. The thesis thus makes a strong case for a paradigmatic “jailbreak” (Rosenau, 1990:39) that will allow for new ways of seeing the world of international relations, both in theory and in practice.

1.2 Literature review

Since the publication of his book “The Structure of Scientific Revolutions” in 1962, the concepts coined by Thomas Kuhn have been applied in the natural and social sciences. At the centre of Kuhn’s theory is the notion of a “paradigm”, derived from the Greek word *paradeiknyai* meaning “to show side by side” (Cocconi, 2002).

Although central to Kuhn’s theory, the content of the paradigm concept has always been contested. Margaret Masterman (1970:61), for example, complained that in his book Kuhn uses the paradigm concept in no less than twenty-one different ways. “The vagueness of what is, after all, a central concept of Kuhn’s theory is also a reason this notion so quickly became the focus of criticism.” (Hoyningen-Huene, 1993:131-132.)

Given the various definitions of the concept, the most useful (from an ontological point of view) is Kuhn’s own description of a paradigm as “what the members of a scientific community share, *and*, conversely, a scientific community consists of men who share a paradigm” (Kuhn, 1996:176 – italics in original). Rephrasing some of Kuhn’s views (Kuhn, 1996:6), these

“shared” aspects include a common framework, the latter which Kuhn (1970a:242) maintains is “a prerequisite”, a shared worldview that helps to define problems, a set of tools and methods and modes of resolving the research questions deemed askable.

Adopting a paradigm, Maclaurin (2005:2) asserts, means adopting a way of seeing the world. Remaining with the ontological perspective, now in the International Relations context, MccGwire (2001:777) defines a paradigm as “a mixture of beliefs, theory, preconceptions and prejudices that shapes ideas of how the international system works, generates expectations and prescribes appropriate behaviour”.

Javaid (1997:2) notes that, while Kuhn cannot claim total credit for coining the term “paradigm”, no intellectual work had popularised the word like Kuhn’s. The concept of “paradigm” subsequently became widely and generally entrenched in both academic and popular texts (Hoyningen-Huene, 1993:xv). Kuhn’s book is prescribed reading for most university courses on the history and philosophy of science.

Fuller (2002:172) concludes that “(b)ased on sales, translations, and citations, it may turn out to be the most influential single work on the nature of science in the twentieth century”. Given its widespread use, the question may therefore rightfully be asked: Why turn to Kuhn again as a theoretical point of departure? Why “flog this notion of ‘paradigm’ any further?” (Masterman, 1970:69), given its imperfections?

The answer to this question is that Thomas Kuhn’s theory provides the

International Relations researcher with a powerful instrument with which to engage the concept of change. Vale (2004:242) asserts that the “promise of deep-seated conceptual change ... is the inherent in the idea of the paradigm”.

Underlining the importance of change as a concept in International Relations, Holsti (1998:2) notes that one of the most important features distinguishing different schools of thought about International Relations is the notion of change. The same author, however, and importantly, adds that despite its critical importance, the concept of change remains under-theorised in International Relations literature.

Holsti (1998:2) laments that “[in International Relations] we do not have even the beginning of a consensus on what constitutes change or transformation in political life” (also see Burch, 2000:182; Linklater, 1998:3-8). Pointing out this same weakness, Vale (2003:13) contends that “neither academia nor the policy end of international politics has demonstrated a capacity to anticipate change, let alone adequately explain its immediate impact”.

In the introduction it was argued that contemporary international relations is currently in the midst of a “crossing-over” period that commenced in 1989. In this period, the concept of change seems to be different in terms of its ramifications (the impact of change now progressively seems to be global) and in terms of its defining feature (the year 1989 apparently signalled the onset of a period of fundamental change in international relations).

It is against this background that Thomas Kuhn's theory becomes even more relevant, as it allows for more than merely a better grasp of the concept of change. Kuhn's theory also speaks directly to periods marked by profound change – it talks about episodes of “crossing-over”. In this context, and as will be explained, Thomas Kuhn's theory addresses yet another aspect which has not been adequately dealt with in International Relations literature.

Hence, the second reason for choosing Kuhn's theory is the insight that it brings pertaining to an understanding not only of change in general, but of periods of fundamental or pervasive change specifically. Kuhn addresses Laxer's concern that “(a)lthough our society is constantly awash in the rhetoric of change, fundamental change is nonetheless exceedingly difficult to imagine” (Laxer, 1998:58).

Kuhn's conception of the type of change that accompanies a “scientific revolution” (Kuhn, 1996:2) provides insight into the epochal change confronting international relations today. The concept of a “paradigm shift” (Kuhn, 1996:150) has the potential to reflect something of the “cataclysmic change that precludes the effective operation of social structures and processes and destroys long-held convictions about the world” (De Santis, 1996:xi).

Kuhn's ideas of revolutionary change provide the basis for a credible response to critics such as Ruggie (1993:143-144) who argue that International Relations as a discipline has never been very good at explaining periods of “fundamental discontinuity” in the international system (also see Hopmann, 2003:101). Pointing perhaps to the crux of the

matter, Shaw (2000a) lays the charge that “theories of political change have not seriously grappled with the global”. Nef (1999:5) also underlines this shortcoming when he asserts that “scholars have been slow to react to global transformations and to fill the intellectual void”. Kuhn’s theory provides an instrument with which to address this particular concern.

If, as De Santis (1996:xi) argues, this period of cataclysmic change has destroyed long-held convictions about the world we live in, using Kuhn’s theory thirdly seems to be justified because it allows for a better understanding of change from an ontological perspective. In this context, ontological concerns are those that “you recognize as the factors you will invoke to account for social life” (Taylor, 1989:159). Harper (2000) states that Kuhn’s book is about more than the method of scientific enquiry; it is about human ways of perceiving reality (or of seeing the world). Kuhn himself acknowledges that a paradigm shift indeed implies a change of worldview (Kuhn, 1996:111).

Kuhn’s theory therefore creates the space, especially in periods of uncertainty and confusion, for a change of worldview, for breaking out of the mould, and for exploring new and original ontologies. Here is agreement with Walker (1993:82) who insists that differences between approaches to contemporary international relations must be addressed at the level of basic ontological assumptions.

This leads to the final reason why Kuhn, who once described himself as a bit of a “troublemaker” (Kuhn, 1970a:246), might have a recipe to breathe new life into International Relations - a discipline which stands accused of

displaying “little imagination and almost no conceptual adventure” (Vale, 2004:240). Kuhn was never afraid to challenge orthodoxy – individuals challenging the status quo and imagining worlds beyond the conventional are, indeed, at the heart of Kuhn’s theory.

As will be argued in Chapter Two, Kuhn’s views are compatible with critical theory, a strand that can be traced throughout this study. Critical theory argues that emancipation should be given precedence over traditional International Relations themes such as power and order (Booth, 1991c:539). Thomas Kuhn’s theory allows for change with emancipatory intent; it allows for an approach to change which puts humanity, and not the nation-state, at the heart of the International Relations project.

Tying these various arguments together, and at a first level, Thomas Kuhn’s theory provides an instrument with which to engage the concept of change. More importantly still, it provides insight into periods of fundamental change such as the one prevailing in contemporary international relations.

Arguing that international relations should come to grips with the pervasive dynamics of transformation or with “new realities” (Drucker, 1990:3), the study represents an attack on the “states-are-forever habit” (Rosenau, 2002:23), the latter which is at the heart of the Westphalian paradigm. A “paradigmatic jailbreak” is required if International Relations wants to counter accusations such as that lodged by Erickson (1985:5) that “in the social sciences, paradigms don’t die; they develop varicose veins and get fitted with cardiac pacemakers”.

This attack on the “states-are-forever habit” also includes criticism of its conceptual substructure. Deibert (1997:169) asserts that, as they are utilised today, traditional concepts act as ontological blinders rather than as aids to understanding. This inevitably leads to “one-eyed social science” (Strange, 1996:195). Especially when it comes to addressing change, these concepts are inadequate.

Walker (1993:78) states that analysis remains caught within “what are essentially seventeenth- and eighteenth-century conceptions of space and time”. In the conceptual jails in which they lived and worked, academics’ and policymakers’ paradigms served them well as creative guides to the framing and analysis of problems. The same conceptual equipment now, however, blinds them to change that lie outside its scope (Rosenau, 1990:37).

At a second level, Thomas Kuhn’s theory facilitates an understanding of change from an emancipatory perspective. This change entails that humanity is put at the centre of international relations. International relations should provide a voice to humanity – especially to “the poor, oppressed and otherwise disadvantaged” (Wapner, 2002:167).

Drawing on the latent idealism in Kuhn’s theory, there is a belief that international relations could be other than it is at both the theoretical and practical levels. There is a need to move beyond our “constrained imaginations” (Booth, 1998a:344) and to explore how we “can get from the present to a better future” (Rorty, 1999:231). The Westphalian paradigm’s “preselected ontology” (Vale, 2003:2) must be forsaken to allow for new

ways of seeing international relations.

The study concludes that there is a dire need for new ontologies – for new ways of seeing the world. Only if this is done will the building conflict between (what I will call) “Access World”² and “Denial World” be averted and will the discipline of International Relations remain viable and its lexicon relevant in a turbulent and fluid global environment.

1.3 **Objectives**

Three main strands of Kuhn’s work are used in the study to explore the themes under discussion. This is the already mentioned notion of a “paradigm shift”, the notion that scientific knowledge is the result of an intrinsically revolutionary- and not of a linear, cumulative process, and, added to these, the idea of “incommensurability” (Kuhn, 1996:148).

Following from this, and through a Kuhnian lens, the study endeavours to answer three key questions:

- Why, especially after the fall of the Berlin Wall, was the extensive body of international relations knowledge proving to be progressively more inadequate?

- Why, sixteen years after the fall of the Berlin Wall, is the intense ontological debate in both the real-world and theoretical contexts,

² In the thesis the concepts “Access World” and “Denial World” refer to an emerging global bifurcated configuration of international relations. Henceforth reference will only be made of Access World, Denial World and/or of the Access World/Denial World construct.

regarding the changed and changing nature of international relations, still raging?; and

- Why do proponents of various positions in these debates often “talk-through-each-other” (Kuhn, 1970a:231-232), not reaching an understanding and apparently having irreconcilable views of the world?

1.4 **Methodology**

As stated in the introduction, the study aims to make a contribution to the debates raging in both the theoretical and practical spheres of international relations. These debates primarily focus on what has been described as “the Westphalian paradigm”.

For the sake of clarification, it should be pointed out that this concept derives its name from the Treaty of Westphalia, which was signed in 1648. Westphalia represented “the procedural starting point of modern European international society” (Jackson, 2001:43).

This treaty contains an early official statement of the core principles that came to dominate world affairs during the subsequent three hundred years (Scholte, 2001:20). Westphalia put the sovereign nation-state at the centre of international relations. Subsequently, Caporaso (2000:1-2) contends, and for both academics and practitioners of international relations, “the Westphalian model has served as a point of departure and baseline against which the more complex empirical world is compared”.

The point was similarly made in the introduction that the debates in both International Relations and in international relations are primarily of an ontological nature. The ontological perspective is indeed a main theme featuring throughout the thesis. The study deals with these ontological debates at a higher or macro level. Because of this, an in-depth analysis of the history of concepts, and of the various schools of thought pertaining to each, lie beyond the scope of this study. A degree of generalisation is unavoidable. As Albrow (1996:24) acknowledges: “We cannot arrive at the specific characteristics of any epoch without generalization and abstraction”.

The approach adopted in the study is “maximalist” as Stoett (1999:viii) defines it. According to Stoett (1999:12) maximalist understandings “serve as intriguing heuristic devices, since they challenge conventional wisdom and our analytical imaginations”. To reinvent our human future in a manner that is appropriate for tomorrow’s world, “persuasive big pictures” (Booth, 1998a:346) of international relations have to be created (also see Huntington, 1996:29).

To be able to address these ontological issues effectively, there will be interplay between or a juxtaposition of theory and practice throughout the thesis. This interplay can however be achieved as a result of the fact that the theory and practice of international relations exist together in an almost symbiotic relationship. Walt (1998:29) argues that “there is an inescapable link between the abstract world of theory and the real world of policy”.

Political theorists are, in many ways, the “content providers” (Waters, 2001:135) to policy formulators. Vale (2003:8) rightly refers to “the power

afforded to epistemic communities to make the discourses that continuously fashion state practice” (also see Evans & Newnham, 1998:150). The International Relations enterprise, Pasha (2003:112-113) contends, is a part of the political world, rather than simply its explanation.

The implementation of policies, however, also shapes the discipline of International Relations. The inverse is thus similarly true, with policies and actions by political actors paving the way for new theories or ways of seeing the world. Booth (1998b:18) points out the close relationship between political power and agenda-setting potential.

Investigating the meaning (or changed meaning) of concepts is a central objective of the study. However in the social sciences concepts are, almost without exception, contested. Three of these – security, sovereignty, and identity (and the debates around these), are addressed in subsequent chapters. It is argued that, in a Westphalian frame, the meanings that attached to these concepts were constructed in a specific way and revolved around the nation-state as a nodal point. However, in the contemporary paradigm shift in international relations, the content of these concepts no longer matches political realities - they have to be recast to remain valid and meaningful. A scientific revolution, Kuhn (1977:117) reminds us, is also a revolution in concepts.

At this early stage, and as part of the discussion on methodology, it is necessary to clarify the meaning assigned to a concept which features prominently throughout the text but which has only been mentioned briefly before. The term referred to is “globalisation”.

1.4.1 The concept of “globalisation”

However much the term globalisation has been criticised, no one has been able to dispense with it since it first gained general currency. It is now invoked as much by the policy community as by academics. Coker (2002:7) contends that it is not difficult to detect the Hegelian *Zeitgeist* hovering over this kind of thinking: the notion that there is a common spirit of the times discernible in all the activities of an age. Albrow (1996:85) maintains that globalisation is now “the most used marker for a profound social and cultural transition”. “Globe-talk”, as Holton (1998:1) describes it, has seeped into the vocabulary of all spheres of society.

The controversy surrounding the concept is, however, locked up in exactly this - its widespread use, in a range of contexts, leads to a situation where definitions of globalisation abound and where no generally accepted definition of the concept exists. Stoett (1999:97) asserts that “(i)ts popularity is testament to its ambiguity”. Globalisation is also an ideologically loaded concept, which makes the need to accurately define the concept even greater (Kegley Jnr., 2002:64; also see Holton, 1998:18-19).

In an effort to circumvent both the ambiguity surrounding, as well as the ideologically charged nature of the concept, globalisation (as utilized in the study) will be linked to one generally accepted attribute of the phenomenon. In this regard, there is concurrence with Cooper (2002) that “the central point of globalisation is that it has eroded the distinction between internal and external” (also see Steans, 2002:58). The world has, in a sense, become “full” (Horsman & Marshall, 1995:38).

Speaking of the “End of History” (Fukuyama, 1992:ix) may be premature but, in the context of the debate on globalisation, one can speak with growing confidence of the “End of Geography” (O’ Brien, 2004:1). The international-domestic boundary has, to a large extent, been rendered obsolete (Lawson, 2002b:10; also see Laidi, 1998:97).

Cochrane and Pain (2000:15-17) argue that focusing on the distinctive features of globalisation could contribute towards an understanding of this mercurial concept. These authors list globalisation’s characteristics as follows:

- Stretched social relations – it is argued that cultural, economic and political processes in society are increasingly **stretched** across nation-state boundaries so that events and decisions taking place on one side of the world have a significant impact on the other.
- Intensification of flows – the stretching of social relations seems to be associated with an **intensification** of flows and networks of interaction and interconnectedness that transcend nation-states.
- Increasing interpenetration – the increasing extent and intensity of global interactions is changing the geography of the relationship between the local and the global. As social relations stretch there is an increasing **interpenetration** of economic and social practices, bringing apparently distant cultures and societies face to face with each other at a local level, as well as on the global stage.

- Global infrastructure – interconnections that cross nation-state boundaries operate outside the systems of regulation and control of individual nations and are global not only in their operations but in their institutional **infrastructure** (Cochrane & Pain, 2000:15-17 – bold type in original).

The familiar ontological space of the Westphalian paradigm with its clear demarcations of Inside and Outside – to use Rob Walker’s 1993 metaphor – no longer exists (Walker, 1993:1). Globalisation has truly rendered incomprehensible the *international* in international relations, with its concomitant division of what is “domestic” and what is “foreign” and this, in essence, is the crisis international relations now faces (see Scholte, 1996:48-49; Rosenau, 1990:6).

Mittelman (2002a:7) expands on this theme and argues that, in the absence of divisions of “Inside” and “Outside” or “domestic” and “foreign”, globalisation blurs many dualities – state and non-state, legal and illegal, public and private (also see Kegley Jnr., 2002:63). Devetak (2002:169) similarly argues that different domains of social activity are being globalised, including the economic, political, technological, military, legal, cultural and environmental.

Tying the concept of globalisation to the removal of the Inside/Outside distinction assists in dealing with the concepts of sovereignty, security and identity as they currently manifest themselves. The way in which these concepts take shape in the paradigm shift in international relations, ultimately provides the rationale for the development of the concepts of

“Access World” and “Denial World”, elaborated in Chapters Seven and Eight, as it focuses attention on the “increasing globalization of social relations” (Maclean, 1981:104). Holton (1998:16) argues that globalisation now forms a reference point for those who reject it as much as for those who celebrate it - another idea which will be refined throughout the thesis.

Engaging the concept of globalisation is essential, given its prominence, and even more so when viewing it through the lens of critical social theory. In this regard Dalby states that:

(t)he modes of contemporary thinking about global politics are ... a crucial matter for scholarly investigation, not least because old patterns of thinking may recur to perpetuate the geopolitical practices of the past, albeit now dressed up in the new ideological guises of discourses of globalization (Dalby, 1996:30).

Highlighting the ontological dimension of globalisation, Holton (1998:15-16) argues that globalisation involves the way in which we understand, experience, and act within the world and not simply the large transnational structures that form the subject matter of international relations. Globalisation is very much about “the ways in which we think of social life and our place within it” (Holton, 1998:33). It is therefore not only an abstract or theoretical process – it is a powerful force which touches and changes human lives on a daily basis (see Booth, 1998b:21).

Held (2000a:177) likewise argues that the debate about globalisation is not simply an academic one. It is also a political debate about the profound

transformations going on in the world today. At stake are questions about the ethical and institutional principles that might (or should) structure the organisation of human affairs and the form a future international relations paradigm should take. Globalisation, McGrew (2000:130) argues “has a human face even though it is often obscured from public view”.

When writing subsequent chapters it became obvious that, when discussing globalisation, clarifying the concept “postmodernity”, and its predecessor “modernity”, become necessary – almost inevitable. Globalisation is described as a “unique feature of late 20th century and early 21st century life”; postmodernity refers to “aspects of contemporary social conditions that are the result of this” (Anon, 2005a). Comparing and understanding these two imaginings of global space is thus indispensable to be able to get a firmer grasp on the concept of change. On the other hand the nation-state project is deeply rooted in modernity as will subsequently be argued. Juxtaposing this concept with globalisation (and with postmodernity) thus similarly becomes essential.

1.4.2 **The concepts of “modernity” and “postmodernity”**

Modernity was a period that saw the rise of rationalism, scientism and linear notions of progress (Rifkin, 2000:188). It was a period characterised by a belief – some might call it a faith – that the world runs by immutable laws that are knowable and that can be exploited to advance the human condition. Jeremy Rifkin argues that:

(t)he moderns replaced faith with ideology, convinced that the human mind

is capable of synthesizing the vast store of available knowledge into testable theories that could explain the origin, development and workings of the natural world (Rifkin, 2000:188).

Closely linked to this was the idea that an unproblematic distinction could be made between the observer and that what was being observed. Modernity was constructed on the idea, or rather a resolute conviction, that there exists not only a knowable-, but also an objective reality.

In this sense, modernity is an example of a foundational theory, where a foundationalist position is “one that thinks that all truth claims (i.e. about some feature of the world) can be judged true or false” (Smith, 2001:227). Foundationalists look for meta-theoretical (or above any particular theory) grounds for choosing between truth claims.

Modernity can similarly be classified as an explanatory theory where the latter refers to theories that see the world “as something external to our theories of it” (Smith, 2001:226). Modernists contend that the natural world and the social world are the same and can therefore be studied using the same methodology.

The postmodern, by contrast, is built on an entirely different set of ontological assumptions. To begin with, postmodern scholars reject the very idea of a fixed and knowable reality. Jean-Francois Lyotard states that “(s)implifying to the extreme, I define postmodern as incredulity towards metanarratives” (Lyotard, 1984:xxiv). The key word here is ‘metanarrative’, by which is meant a theory that asserts it has clear foundations for making

knowledge claims and thus involves a foundational epistemology.

Grand, supposedly universal stories such as religion which have defined culture and behaviour in the past is rejected in favour of a variety of more local and sub-cultural ideologies, myths and stories (Anon, 2005b). Postmodernity is therefore essentially concerned with deconstructing and distrusting any account of human life that claims to have direct access to “the truth”.

The idea of indeterminacy was also introduced into the scientific debate, arguing that the notion of a detached, impartial observer recording nature’s secrets in an objective fashion is an impossibility. The sheer act of making observations brings the observer into direct participation with the object of his or her enquiry, therefore biasing the results. Far from being detached, every human being is both player and participant, always affecting, and being affected, by the world he or she attempts to manipulate and influence (Rifkin, 2000:191).

Postmodern theories are anti-foundational where anti-foundationalists believe that truth claims cannot be so judged since there are never neutral grounds for doing so; instead each theory will define what counts as the facts and so there will be no neutral position available to determine between rival claims. Postmodernists therefore reject the search for meta-theoretical grounds for truth claims, and that “believing there to be some is itself simply a reflection of an adherence to a particular view of epistemology” (Smith, 2001:227).

Instead of focusing on meta-narratives, postmodernity focuses on power-knowledge relationships and textual strategies that include deconstruction and double reading (see Derrida, 1976). Whereas modernity was a search for certainty, postmodernity recognises uncertainty as the consequence of the “collapse of foundationalist meta-narratives that previously attempted to provide comprehensive answers to questions of human existence” (Waters, 1995:54).

Where modernity has been typified as an explanatory theory, postmodernity is constitutive in nature. Constitutive theories argue that our theories actually help construct the world. The “fact” waiting to be discovered cannot be perceived independently from the social framework in which perception occurs (Smith, 2001:235). All knowledge is constituted by human interests.

Postmodernists share the belief that modernity has run its course because the notions of science and rationality that distinguish it have proven to be ill-founded. Whereas modernity was informed by the Enlightenment ideal of providing foundations for knowledge, postmodern thinking refers to a set of ideals of philosophical themes indicating the impossibility of any ultimate foundations for knowledge, and, accompanying this, recognising the inevitably situated and historical character of knowledge.

A new philosophical framework was therefore established for rethinking reality. Grenz (1996:165) contends that postmodern approaches question the Enlightenment assumption that knowledge is certain and that the criterion for certainty rests with our human rational capabilities.

Today, chaos theory, catastrophe theory and complexity theory all reflect the new scientific emphasis on contingency, indeterminacy, embeddedness and diversity in the natural world (Rifkin, 2000:193). Where modern science looked for ultimate truths and fundamental principles, postmodern science looks for unexpected possibilities and emerging patterns. Postmodernists argue that the enormous complexity and indeterminacy of human behaviour, across all its cultural, religious, historical and linguistic variations, means that there can be no single interpretation of global reality (Baylis, 2001:268).

Nature is seen more as a series of continuously creative acts than an unfolding of reality based on unalterable laws. The scientific preoccupation with truth becomes less interesting to scholars than the collective quest to find meaning. The idea of inescapable linear progress toward an agreed-upon future ideal-state is eschewed. Postmodernists celebrate the diversity of local experiences that together make up an ecology of human existence (Rifkin, 2000:195).

Nowhere have postmodern ideas been more deeply felt than in the social sciences (Rifkin, 2000:193). If there is no fixed and knowable reality, but only the individual realities we create by the way each of us participates in and experiences the world around us, then the world, according to the postmodernists, is a human construct.

It is a world created by language and held together by metaphors and agreed-upon shared meanings, all of which can and do change with the passage of time. "Reality, it seems, is not something bequeathed to us but rather something we create, whole cloth, by communicating it into existence."

(Rifkin, 2000:193.) Reality, then, is a function of the language we use to explain, describe, and interact with it.

1.4.2.1. **Modernity, postmodernity and international relations**

As far as international relations is concerned, there exists a close link between modernity and the development of political communities tied to particular pieces of land, and formed into nation-states (Held, 2000b:2). Modernity was interwoven with the Westphalian paradigm with its clear demarcations, notions of “Inside” and “Outside” and its perception of the nation-state as an all-encompassing “container” of society (Taylor, 1999:14). In the words of Gray (2003:16), the nation-state is a “distinctively modern construction” (also see Waters, 1995:36; Shaw, 1995). Indeed, the abstract principles, norms and practices that constitute the Westphalian system of states became the central organising features of modern political life.

A postmodern view of international relations rejects these notions. Far from nation-states being discrete power containers, and in a globalised world, they are viewed as more akin to “a space of flows” (McGrew, 2000:135). Nation-states now become spaces permeated and transgressed by global and transnational flows and networks.

McGrew (2000:146-148) explains that a communications revolution has facilitated the rapid flow of ideas, information, images, and money across continents; a transportation revolution has hastened the boundary-spanning flow of people and goods; an organizational revolution has shifted the flow of authority, influence, and power beyond traditional boundaries; and an

economic revolution has redirected the flow of goods, services, capital and ownership among countries. The diversity, depth and direction of these flows constitute new spaces of action outside of the rules made by states.

The fundamental ideas of the Westphalian paradigm are therefore challenged as political space is no longer seen to be “coterminous with national territory and national governments are no longer the sole masters of their own or their citizens’ fate” (McGrew, 2000:142). Power and politics now flow through, across and around territorial boundaries (McGrew, 2000:148). “Structural rigidities and ideological certainties have given way to social revolutions and territorial fluidities.” (Walker, 1993:2.) There is a firm conviction that the nation-state as the central institution of modern society may no longer be suitable as the organising focus of international relations inquiry.

It was therefore “misleading to essentialise the Westphalia reality as if it was not embedded in a changing historical matrix of ideas, technologies, ideologies, structures, and practices” (Falk, 2002:154). Nation-states are now submerged in a dense web of social, economic, and political relations which transcend national borders, in turn creating overlapping, rather than territorially exclusive “**communities of fate**” (McGrew, 2000:149 – bold type in original).

In the global neighbourhood, all politics are ultimately global. Talking about international relations in the context of change, Walker (1993:20) argues that many of the intellectual perspectives opened up by the postmodern turn can be understood as a way of trying to make some sense of what it might now mean to speak of world politics rather than of international relations.

In the final instance mention should be made of the fact that postmodernists value the so-called “other”; they aim to give a voice to the poor and the oppressed in an attempt to limit the hegemonic tendencies of the powerful. Underlying this commitment to emancipation, postmodernists aim to expose international relations as a discursive practice, “a process by which identities are formed, meaning is given, and status and privilege are accorded – a process of knowledge as power” (George, 1994:216).

A previous section noted that globalisation is a powerful force in international relations that elicits emotional debate. Flagging an idea which will be further developed in Chapters Seven and Eight, attention is drawn to the so-called alternative-globalisation movement, focussing on failures to distribute the gains of economic growth among the peoples of the world on an equitable basis and in greater accordance with human needs.

In the literature the alternative-globalisation movement is closely associated with a postmodern approach (Anon, 2005b). This is in contrast with modernist views that globalisation, linked to unbridled and unfettered “turbo-capitalism” (Luttwak, 1999:4), will eventually benefit humanity as a whole.

Critical theory will be further explored in Chapter Two. What needs to be stated here, is that reflectivist theories (theories that reflect on aspects of the social), such as postmodern and critical theory, have had the important effect of undermining the Westphalian paradigm’s claim to be delivering “**the truth**” (Smith, 2001:227 – bold type in original). Held (2000a:176) asserts that facts and evidence don’t simply speak for themselves. “Facts” and

“evidence” have to be interpreted and made sense of within the context of the constructed reality within which they are being applied.

Reflectivist theories therefore argue that the identities and interests that the Westphalian paradigm presented as given and which it saw as resulting in the international relations we observe are not in fact given but are things that have been created. “Having created them, we could create them otherwise; it would be difficult because we have all internalized the ‘way the world is’, but we could make it otherwise.” (Smith, 2001:244.) Change (and more specifically change for the better) is therefore at the heart of reflectivist theories.

The challenge is to steer International Relations in this direction and to re-imagine international relations as will be argued in Chapter Nine. For the moment, however, Political Science and sub-disciplines in its fold such as International Relations stand accused of being “non-globalized and modern, as opposed to postmodern, disciplines” (Waters, 1995:33). The analysis of international relations remains “situated within the broader ambitions of a modernist social science” (Walker, 1993:55; also see Wapner, 2002:167).

1.4.3 **Supplementary methodological markers**

While engaging key concepts, nagging questions such as: Whose security? Whose sovereignty? and Whose identity? kept appearing. This matter goes to the core of the study. The whole thrust of the thesis is that, in a globalised world, these concepts have become indivisible. “Globalization has irreversibly linked our destinies.” (Axworthy, 1999:2.)

Nef (1999:6) notes that domestic concerns have become so entangled with external factors that the distinction between national and global is merely semantic. The thesis thus develops the argument that, eventually, human interaction and human choice on a global scale will determine the nature of a future paradigm.

Following from this, it is argued in the study that the basic unit of analysis or “referent” for understanding international relations should no longer be the state, but humanity as a whole. In international relations, new forms of transnational solidarity and a single global economy are removing the distinctions between national and international politics.

It therefore makes sense to focus on “people rather than states” (Vale, 2003:2; also see Dalby, 1996:33). Devetak (2002:178) conveys a similar sentiment when he remarks that “(h)umanity, therefore, seems to have taken on added significance as a political concept” while Allott (1997:355) argues that “the proper study of International Studies is humanity”.

Globalisation demands the recognition of the enmeshment of everyday interpersonal relations with those between communities and states. At a deeper level, there is agreement with McSweeney (1999:169) that the social order is a unity, and the logic and dynamics of international relations are of a piece with the routine interactions of individuals. This approach also acknowledges that “we should think about every human being as a potential actor in world politics” (Nossal, 1998:121) – an idea that has been proven with devastating effect by individuals such as Osama Bin Laden.

This study is invariably influenced by the researcher's own ideological points of departure and perceptions (ideas which will be discussed in Chapter Two). Put another way, the narratives we choose reveal something not only about how we see the world but also about how we want to see it; how we connect or fail to connect the dots reveals as much about our interior landscape as it does about the reality around us. Almond (1988:830) underlines this problem when he remarks that "there is no political science in the positivist sense, that is, a political science separable from ideological commitment".

Faced with this dilemma, it is virtually impossible to find an objective escape route. The best that can be done under the circumstances is explicitness on the part of the researcher about the underlying values, experiences and analytic commitments that guide and inform his or her work. This, in turn, assists in making transparent the framework within which the study is being undertaken.

In this regard, and as has been noted before, the researcher should be seen as writing from the perspective of critical social theory. The term critical social theory represents a research tradition based upon the use of the critique as a method of investigation (McCarthy, 1991:1-2). The thesis therefore critically engages the topic under discussion and this inevitably ignites deep-seated ontological concerns.

Critical social theory has a long intellectual tradition rooted in a strand of thought which can be traced back to the Enlightenment and to the writings of Kant, Hegel and Marx (Anon., 1999). The first generation of critical

theorists worked in Germany between World War I and World War II and became known as the “Frankfurt School” (Smith, 2001:233) - their influence remains to this day. Figures that have given shape to this approach in more recent times include Robert Cox, Andrew Linklater and Richard Devetak – authors whose contributions informed many ideas contained in this thesis.

This approach is useful as it allows the researcher to move beyond a realist discussion of interacting states to examining international relations as an integrated whole and to promote the idea of a “people-centred discourse” (Vale, 2003:8). Walt (1998:41) notes that, from a critical perspective, “the central issue in the post-Cold War world is how different groups conceive their identities and interests” – ideas explored in greater detail in subsequent chapters.

Critical theory is an approach that “abhors complacency” (Vale, 2003:22). It scrutinises and questions, pro-actively engaging “reality” or “the facts”. In this sense, it would therefore seem to be ideally suited as a prism or lens through which to investigate the fast and ever-changing world of contemporary international relations in order to “open up the possibility of transcending contemporary society and its built-in pathologies and forms of domination” (Devetak, 1996:146).

Critical theory advocates “a greater tie between theory and practice and a greater connection between thought and action in specific settings” (Schram, 2003:837). It is an approach that wants to:

ask interesting questions that speak to, and that listen to, ongoing social and

political struggles. In this sense, the task of social science is to give voice and clarity to the multiple forces and social movements that help constitute world politics (Klein, 1992:166).

Critical theory pays less attention to the boundaries of states and more to the “flows and fractures” (Dalby, 1996:39) that run across these boundaries.

Ken Booth believes that “making the political world intelligible these days requires a global and eclectic approach, and the borrowing of insights from a range of perspectives” (Booth, 1991c:537). Especially within the context of critical social theory, disciplines such as cultural studies, feminism and environmental studies often yield illuminating insights.

These approaches have shifted the boundaries away from the study of nation-states towards the more comprehensive realm of intersocietal relations. The approach adopted in the study is therefore inter-disciplinary and eclectic, insofar as it can contribute to speaking to the problem at hand.

The study endeavoured to heed Pye’s warning, as early as 1975, that “the greatest failure of modern social sciences has been their inability to examine Western societies with a critical light” (Pye, 1975:5). Rogers also warns against this and states that:

(m)ost international relations texts place their primary emphasis on the role of Western states in global affairs, with relatively little concern with wider global trends and almost none with the marginalized majority of the world’s population (Rogers, 2000:146).

A concerted effort was therefore made to analyse the problem from a multi-centric point of view. This approach is especially critical for understanding the evolving Access World/Denial World configuration of international relations, a topic which will be addressed in-depth in Chapters Seven and Eight.

References to the works of Kuhn's contemporaries, eminent scholars such as Sir K.R Popper and Paul Feyerabend, appear throughout the text. These academics were, however, also amongst some of Kuhn's most severe critics. Studying their views have illuminated ideas developed by Kuhn, albeit from different angles, and this has been rewarding. It has served to further clarify some of Kuhn's own views and points of departure and is included for this purpose.

Finally, mention should be made of the fact that the Harvard style of referencing is utilised in the study. However, the page numbers of Internet-based sources are not reflected in the text, as electronic sources often have no clearly defined page sequence (Damarell, 2005:20). In these instances only the year of publication is indicated, while the Uniform Resource Locator or URL is listed in the bibliography. The exception in this case, Damarell (2005:20) points out, is references to Acrobat documents or so-called PDF files as these are photographic replicas of original print sources that come complete with page numbers.

1.5 **Chapter layout**

The study consists of nine chapters. In Chapter One, an effort has been made

to state the nature of the problem as clearly as possible. The Chapter identifies three key questions to which the rest of the text will speak.

Chapter Two attempts to shed more light on the concept of knowledge (more specifically in the field of International Relations) and on its making. This Chapter forms the theoretical canvas for the rest of the study, and attempts to place the thesis within a broader academic discourse namely that of critical social theory and social constructivism. The chapter aims to illustrate the extent to which these approaches' understanding of knowledge and its making can be aligned with those of Thomas Kuhn. The chapter finally endeavours to provide an answer to the question of why, with the fall of the Berlin Wall, international relations knowledge became inadequate.

Chapter Three is dedicated to analysing the broader tenets of Thomas Kuhn's theory of change, which represents the *leitmotif* of the study. Chapter Three is strategic as far as the flow of the thesis' main arguments are concerned, and serves as a general point of reference. It interrogates, in a Kuhnian context, the key question as to why the ontological debate concerning international relations and change, in both the real-world and academic contexts, is still continuing today.

Chapters Four, Five and Six deal with the concepts of security, sovereignty and identity respectively. These are dealt with as case studies and the aim in each chapter is to lay bare, by stating practical examples, the anomalies that have arisen with regard to the traditional understanding of each of these concepts. It is furthermore argued that, collectively, these anomalies precipitated a crisis in the discipline of International Relations as well as in

the context of international relations. In addition, these chapters endeavour to determine how these concepts now manifest in the paradigm shift in contemporary international relations.

Chapter Seven builds on the insights garnered in the previous three chapters. It argues that the ways in which security, sovereignty and identity manifest in the paradigm shift in international relations, give rise to what is described as the global Access World/Denial World construct. This chapter investigates various dimensions of this construct and expounds on the inhabitants of these two worlds.

Chapter Eight seeks to answer the final of the three questions posed in Chapter One. It investigates why proponents of various positions in these ontological debates seem to be “talking-past-each-other” and have apparently irreconcilable views of the world.

It will be argued in this chapter that the search for a new international relations will necessitate “translation” (as Kuhn explains it), against the background of a breakdown in communication between Access World and Denial World. This translation is essential because Access World and Denial World have different perceptions of, and, based on these, different approaches to the social construction of security, sovereignty and identity. Only once these ontological struggles have been settled, can a new paradigm of international relations emerge.

Chapter Nine contains the study’s conclusions, and attempts to draw the various theoretical and practical strands together in an integrated whole. It

points out the implications thereof for academics, for practitioners of international relations, and for humanity as a whole. An own vision is developed in which the value of Thomas Kuhn's theory (in the context of the study) is assessed, and in which the findings of the study are interpreted.

1.6 **Conclusion**

Westphalia, Ken Booth (1999:65) writes, "had represented a sort of anchorage". Chapter One painted, in broad brushstrokes, a picture in which students of International Relations and practitioners of international relations alike find themselves out at sea, without an anchor, "having pushed away from one shore yet still a distance from the other side" (Imparato & Harari, 1994:xx).

International relations has entered uncharted waters with the Westphalian or state-centric paradigm no longer able to provide answers to new and pressing questions that confront it at the beginning of the 21st century. Subsequent chapters will proceed, on the basis of Kuhn's theory, to provide an interpretation of this vexing relationship between international relations and change in the contemporary world.

CHAPTER TWO

“THE POSSESSION OF COMMUNITIES” - THOMAS KUHN, INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND THE MAKING OF KNOWLEDGE

2.1 Introduction

Similar to inquiries elsewhere in the social sciences, this thesis shares the goal of attempting to gain an understanding of the process of revolutionary social change that has been the hallmark of the post-1989 period. The study endeavours to establish why both societies and the social sciences are in a state of flux. However, by adopting a critical framing, it also seeks to achieve more – it wants to “both understand and to change the very world it seeks to analyse” (Vale, 2003:16).

An appreciation of these processes of change is, however, impossible without understanding the processes that create our understandings of the world. To change the world, as critical theory attempts to do, we must therefore engage “the intellectually demanding task of ascertaining how it is that we know – and why we know” (Vale, 2003:21). A discussion of the nature of knowledge, and of the production or the making of knowledge, is thus indispensable; hence this chapter.

Pursuing this line of thinking, the chapter posits and continues to defend two key positions. These are that theoretical knowledge is time-bound as well as

purpose-bound or, as Evans and Newnham (1998:106) put it, “that all knowledge is historically and politically based”. Explaining these notions, Robert Cox notes that:

(t)he ontologies that people work with derive from their historical experience [time-bound] and in turn become embedded in the world they construct. What is subjective in understanding, become objective through action [purpose-bound] (Cox, 1996a:145).

Cox (1996a:145) adds that these are the “embedded structures of thought and practice” – the non-physical realities of political and social life – which are thought into being and which exist and persist for long periods of time.

In the latter section of the chapter, a distinction is made between problem-solving theory and critical social theory as two distinct ways of engaging- and of putting international relations knowledge to work. The relationship of critical theory to constructivism and to post-positivism is furthermore highlighted. In the final section of this chapter, these ideas are interpreted in a Kuhnian context. This section provides an answer to the question: Why, post-1989, did international relations’ knowledge base seem to have become bereft of meaning?

2.2 **The time-bound nature of theoretical knowledge**

Knowledge is always time-bound, situated, embedded or contextual. “It was Immanuel Kant, in his *Critique of Pure Reason*, who suggested that what we know and the conditions under which this knowing came about are

inexorably tied.” (Vale, 2003:14.) Richard Devetak (1996:146) also draws attention to this point when he suggests that “knowledge is always, and irreducibly, conditioned by historical and material contexts”. Time and history are therefore not added dimensions to the research process; they are, rather, an integral part of the constitution of social action.

It therefore has to be recognised that how things develop depends in part on where they develop, on what has been historically sedimented there, and on the social and spatial structures that are already in place. Barnett (2000:167) comments that “(t)he way in which we view the world around us is coloured, even determined, by our experiences” while Booth (1998b:1-2) contends that “we live, simultaneously, in our pasts, presents, and futures. What we do is always shaped by the collision or collusion of memory and moment, hope and fear” (also see Cox, 1996b:87).

If it is accepted that knowledge is situated, embedded or contextual, the relationship between knowledge and political organisation becomes a powerful thread in social theory (Vale, 2003:5). Truth, indeed lies in power, as Lakatos (1970:93) asserts. The inverse is also true in the sense that power is a knowledge-producer. All power requires knowledge and all knowledge relies on and reinforces existing power relations. There is thus no such thing as “truth”, existing outside of power.

2.3 **The purpose-bound nature of theoretical knowledge**

As much as it is time-bound, knowledge is purpose-bound or value-laden. Robert Cox famously remarked that “(t)heory is always *for* someone and *for*

some purpose” (Cox, 1996b:87 - italics in original). To this Cox adds that:

(t)here is, accordingly, no such thing as theory in itself, divorced from a standpoint in time and space. When any theory so represents itself, it is the more important to examine it as ideology, and to lay bare its concealed perspective (Cox, 1996b:87).

Apparently objective facts are open to subjective interpretation as has already been argued in Chapter One. There exists a very real danger of mistaking our own cultural or contextually specific assumptions and preconceptions for reflections on an objective world. There is “no non-*ad hoc* way to divide sensory experience up into what is ‘given to the mind’ and what is ‘added by the mind’” (Rorty, 1999:177 – italics in original). “Facts” are theory-laden, Nicholson (1992) points out, and adds that there is no such thing as ‘brute facts’ but only facts as determined within a theoretical framework.

Knowledge is therefore not “neutral” but always serves particular values or interests. The result of the value-ladenness of knowledge, akin to the result of its contextuality, is that it is tied to power and to the powerful in very specific ways. The truism that knowledge is power can therefore (again) be inverted, and the argument made that power produces knowledge and this knowledge, in turn, is used as a basis for the construction of social relations in a specific way and to serve specific interests (see Geller and Vasquez, 2004:1). Linking this to the concept of class, an idea which will be further developed in Chapter Eight, Laxer (1998:47) remarks that dominant social classes expound a worldview that make their rule, their values, their way of

life appear natural and therefore legitimate and beyond challenge.

2.4. **Problem-solving theory and critical social theory**

On one broad reading, the history of social science has been a continual struggle between orthodox and critical knowledge, that is, between “understanding that sustains prevailing patterns of social relations and understanding that challenges them with emancipatory intent” (Scholte, 1996:43). In terms of the way in which they deal with or engage the concept of “knowledge”, two schools can be distinguished. Robert Cox (1996b:88) identifies these as “problem solving theory” and “critical theory” respectively.

Problem-solving theory takes the world as it finds it, with the prevailing social and power relationships and the institutions into which they are organised, as the given framework for action (Cox, 1996b:88). The general aim of problem-solving theory is to make these relationships and institutions work smoothly by dealing effectively with particular sources of trouble rather than by challenging its very basis (Lawson, 2002b:10).

Working within this order serves to preserve it, thereby perpetrating existing inequalities of power and wealth. It is therefore inherently conservative and status quo oriented. Problem-solving theory is, Peter Vale (2004:243) asserts, the “controlling and process-driven end of international relations scholarship”.

Critical theory, on the other hand, is critical in the sense that it stands apart

from the prevailing order of the world and asks how that order came about (Cox, 1996b:88). Critical theory, unlike problem-solving theory, does not take institutions and social power relations for granted but call them into question. It concerns itself with their origins and aims to establish how and whether they might be in the process of changing. “It is directed towards an appraisal of the very framework for action, or problematic, which problem-solving theory accepts as its parameters.” (Cox, 1996b:88-89.)

For problem-solving theory, the main theoretical preoccupation is to let the “facts” speak for themselves. However, this particular construction of reality hides the innumerable values and deep-seated prejudices that make for both “established knowledge and establishment knowings about the world” (Vale, 2003:22). “The “fact” or the “truth” is never as unbiased as problem-solving theory seems to imply – a theme that recurs throughout this chapter. Collusion with power is deeply, but often very subtly, entrenched in problem-solving theory.

As a result of these hidden dimensions, critical theory rejects this approach. For critical theorists the “facts” are never enough – especially in a field such as international relations with its rituals of state-centred power. Critical theory relentlessly probes social knowledge and its politics (Vale, 2003:22). It maintains that what is presented as reality is always the construction of someone’s reality. Knowledge is not “found” or “discovered” but has an architecture that has effects – excluding some things and people, including others and generating its own “violences” (Geller and Vasquez, 2004:3).

In contrast with problem-solving theory, and through the exposure of the

social basis of knowledge, power and values, critical theory liberates international relations theory to the extent that injustices and inequalities built into the prevailing order can be addressed (Evans & Newnham, 1998:107). Problem-solving theory is “reformist” while critical theory is “transformist” (Thomas, 2002:85). Critical theory does not flinch from the need to “speak truth to power” (Brand, 2004) as power is often most pervasive and effective amidst the silences of received wisdom.

Calhoun states that the task of critical theory is to subject “concepts, received understandings, and cultural categories constitutive of everyday life and public discourse to critical theoretical reconsideration” (Calhoun, 2000:505). This is done in order to interrogate the “prevailing order of social and political modernity through a method of immanent critique” (Devetak, 1996:146).

Only this systematic critique of society can demystify how power, position, and privilege relate to class, group and personal inequalities. Critical theorists argue that knowledge that is taken for granted has come to be taken for granted under specific conditions – conditions that they increasingly view as suspicious in many contexts.

Calhoun (2000:537) maintains that critical theory demands critique in four senses. These are:

- an engagement with the contemporary condition that is rooted in a belief that the existing state of affairs does not exhaust all possibilities;

- an account of the conditions, historical and cultural, on which the theorist's own intellectual activity depends;
- a continuous re-examination of constitutive categories and conceptual frameworks, including their historical construction; and
- a confrontation with other forms of social explanation, showing up their good and bad points, and building towards stronger foundations for understanding and emancipation.

Expanding on these ideas, Bohman (1996:190) contends that critical theory “must explain what is wrong with current social reality, identify actors to change it, and provide clear norms for criticism and practical goals for the future”. This supports the point by du Plessis (2001b:16) that critical theory is irreducibly related to social and political life. It reflects on the present as a social and historical product and analyses prospects for emancipatory change (Devetak, 2002:171).

Critical theory reveals that the “facts” are never beyond questioning; that “reality” is not always what it seems. However, and at the same time, this realisation allows us to grasp more clearly the true, albeit more complex, nature of international relations. Whereas problem-solving theory is “a guide to tactical actions which, intended or unintended, sustain the existing order”, critical theory provides a “guide to strategic action for bringing about an alternative order” (Cox, 1996b:90).

Critical theory deals with changing reality and so must continually adjust its

concepts to that reality. Whereas problem-solving theory gives a perspective, critical theory aims to achieve a perspective on perspectives, opening up the possibility of choosing a different valid perspective from which the problematic becomes one of creating an alternative world (Cox, 1996b:88).

Making the link between critical theory and globalisation, Scholte maintains that:

(t)heorists of this bent approach the question of globalization with an awareness that the modern world system has produced widespread violence, arbitrary hierarchies and avoidable deprivation. Critical discourse recognizes that, given the historical record, the rise of supra-territoriality could well involve an extension and reinvigoration – perhaps in new forms – of imperialism, xenophobia, patriarchy, racism, militarism, authoritarianism, fundamentalism, nihilism and other recurrent predicaments of modernity. Globalization’s transformation of the space-time dimension of social life should therefore be greeted not with conservative disavowals or liberal confidence, but with vigilance (Scholte, 1996:51-52).

Mittelman (2002b:3) concludes that globalisation has opened up new possibilities, but that it is also a process containing many myths and traps. Various groups are actively seeking to co-opt the knowledge and the language of globalisation for their own purposes.

2.4.1 **Problem-solving theory, critical theory and constructivism**

Constructivism draws on a sociological chain enunciated in the mid-1960s by Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann (Vale, 2003:16). “Society is a

human product. Society is an objective reality. Man is a social product ... an analysis of the social world that leaves out any of these three moments will be distortive” (Berger & Luckmann, 1967:79).

Extending these ideas to the realm of international relations, Kuah argues that political reality – insofar as it appears real to us – “is *made*, not uncovered” (Kuah, 2003:29 – italics in original). Moreover, the whole gamut of our political knowledge and practices are grounded in, and indeed inseparable from, the making of that political reality.

Ontologically, constructivists thus argue that actors are inherently social, that their interests and identities are socially constructed, and that they are the product of social structures. Constructivists try to make sense of social relations by explaining the construction of the socio-political world by human practice (McSweeney, 1999:104). From this it is already clear that constructivism can be grouped with reflectivist approaches such as critical theory, rather than with rationalist approaches (such as problem-solving theory) which view political actors as “atomistic, self-interested and rational” (du Plessis, 2001a:141).

According to du Plessis (2001a:144), the emergence of constructivism was the result of the challenge levelled at critical theorists to move beyond theoretical critique to the substantive analysis of international issues. It represented an attempt to utilise the space created by the end of the Cold War to put forward alternative explanatory perspectives. Critical theory and constructivism are therefore closely interlinked.

Elaborating on this point, Vale (2003:15) argues that social constructivist approaches to theory produce compelling alternative explanations in the unfolding story of post-Cold War international relations knowledge and can help to unsettle orthodox approaches to knowing the world (also see Geller and Vasquez, 2004:1). Of specific importance for the purposes of this study is Fierke's (2002:133) remark that "(t)he shift to an understanding of international politics as a social and political construction expands the potential for formulating questions related specifically to processes of change".

Constructivists, instead of taking the nation-state for granted and assuming that it simply seeks to survive, regard the interests and identities of states as a "highly malleable product of specific historic processes" (Walt, 1998:40; also see Coward, 1999:4,5). Using this approach, the nation-state is exposed as an ideational structure, rather than as a material entity.

The social world can be viewed as a grid, superimposed on the natural world by those in power, with the objective to further specific interests. A central characteristic of constructivist theory (similar to that of critical theory) is therefore the recognition of the political nature of knowledge and the intimate connection between knowledge and interests (Krause, 1994:611).

Security, sovereignty and identity are, likewise social constructs; products of specific historical processes, a series of ideas and practices that "have created a received, not a predetermined, end" (Vale, 2003:16). What is today called security or sovereignty or identity, is therefore "temporal and primarily geared to further the advantage of the already advantaged" (Vale,

2003:17). Holton (1998:139) states that “(w)e are dealing here not simply with ostensibly neutral social science concepts, but with matters that are charged with high levels of emotional force and embedded in often deeply held values”.

Staying with this subject, but also recapping ideas explored in Chapter One, Loriaux (2004) explains that the concepts of social life that we habitually treat as “external objects” – such as nation-states – are social constructs. They occupy and guide the mind, explain the world to us and inform and constrain our action in it. They generate and justify routines – secular rituals – that embed themselves in discursive and institutional habit. As they guide our action in the world, they mould, through the medium of our actions, the world they claim to describe.

And yet, even though we are “prisoners” of these constructs, we are not prisoners of any particular construct. We can contest the construct that has become hegemonic by discovering or elaborating rival constructs. We can contest it by problematising the referential power of the language that convey it. We can trace its origins so as to show that it arose not from nature but from some generative discursive act. Summing up Loriaux’s ideas, it becomes clear that social constructs can be changed.

Caught up in the prison of the “states-are-forever habit” as Rosenau (2002:23) described it, the concepts and knowledge claims that came to dominate the discipline of International Relations were likewise contingent on specific power relations and at the same time reflected certain vested interests. Within the context of Westphalia, and until 1989, the specific

construction of concepts such as security, sovereignty and identity had thus privileged the idea of nation-states and their interests and continuously reinforced statist interpretations, rather than offering alternative readings of international relations (Vale, 2003:24).

2.4.2 **Problem-solving theory, critical theory and post-positivism**

Rationalist approaches in International Relations are based on the theory of positivism. Positivism sees the world as existing objectively and claims that subject and object must be separated in order to theorise properly (du Plessis, 2001a:141). Positivism represents a belief that there is only one kind of knowledge, of which the laws of natural science provide the model. Positivist social scientists attempt to discern the laws that govern society and such laws are seen as operating in much the same way as the laws of physics.

For positivists, Peter Vale emphasises:

there is only one objective truth to be discovered, empirical reasoning is the correct form of reasoning, and finally there can be a distinction between observer and observed. Post-positivists reject this: reason both silences and marginalizes; instead of reason constructing the world, the world is socially constructed. As a result, it is not possible to divide the observer from the observed. Theories construct the facts of the social world, and truths are socially defined (Vale, 2003:18).

Similar to rejecting rationalist views on the nature of political actors (such as nation-states), positivism is rejected by critical theorists. Critical theory aims

to “move beyond positivist framings” (Vale, 2003:18) of international relations and the concepts associated with it. It represents the “post-positivist era” (Lapid, 1989:235) in International Relations. Now “understanding” becomes as important, if not more important, than “measurement” (Goldsmith, 1994:4). It is argued that rationalism marginalizes contending perspectives and may even distort political rhetoric, practice and policy.

Authors such as Halliday (1996:319) go as far as stating that positivism “has been an almost wholly unmitigated catastrophe for the study of international relations” (also see Sinclair, 1996:5). Critical theory questions the presumed apolitical nature of positivist theorising and is concerned with the concealed perspectives, the social and political purposes of knowledge, the cognitive interests and assumptions of the observer, and the way in which key actors construct their images of the world (du Plessis, 2001b:16-17).

Whereas positivism serves as the substructure for rationalist approaches such as problem-solving theory (aimed, as has been noted, at maintaining the status quo), post-positivism can be closely aligned not only with critical theory but also with a constructivist approach to International Relations. Post-positivism focuses on change and on the outcomes of change, particularly keeping in mind justice and the happiness of individuals and communities. It is concerned with change that “champions justice” (Vale, 2003:9) and with changing the social order in an emancipatory direction. It is about change not only in the sense of movement, but in the sense of remaking.

Scholte (1996:51) notes that “critical knowledge has as its primary

conscious purpose to identify disempowerment and promote politics of emancipation”. Critical theory indeed places the powerless and dispossessed at the heart of theory and emancipatory political practice (Wheeler, 1996:128).

In the post-positivist tradition, Schram states that:

a political science that forgoes the dream of a science of politics in order to dedicate itself to enhancing the critical capacity of people to practice a politics is, for me, an exciting prospect. A political science that does this to enhance the capacity to challenge power from below is all the more exciting. I would argue that the new political science would not just be more politically efficacious but also more intelligent, offering more robust forms of knowledge about politics (Schram, 2003:838).

The “search for meaning” Booth (1996:338) contends, now becomes as valid a scientific objective as “the accumulation of knowledge”.

A final important point that must be made is that critical theory, firmly interlinked with both constructivism and post-positivism, is not aimed at promoting “millenarian fantasies of total redemption through political action” (Luke, 1991:22). The point of departure in the study is that critical theory should take a “more empirical and policy-oriented turn, so as to answer one of the most frequent and damaging charges against it (Vale, 2003:3).

Theory must guide practice by offering new possibilities, in changed circumstances, by helping practitioners to see what lies behind the

immediate horizon. Although not being one of the key concepts utilised in this study, Booth's notion of "utopian realism" (Booth, 1991c:537) - which seeks to combine a normative with an empirical approach to international relations - now comes into play, and this idea will be further elaborated in the final chapter of the thesis.

A review of the application of Thomas Kuhn's theory in a number of fields of study, ranging from art history to psychology to architecture, reveals a common thread namely the statement that the study is being undertaken "using Thomas Kuhn's theory as analogy". This was also the original point of departure of this study, but to further strengthen the case for using Kuhn's theory, and to guard against mere superimposition, efforts have been made to probe deeper.

Subsequent sections of this chapter will thus illuminate Kuhn's views and illustrate that these views are compatible with and indeed supports a critical approach to International Relations. The final section goes even further, and puts forward an answer (from a Kuhnian perspective) to the first of the three key questions posed in Chapter One.

2.5 **Thomas Kuhn, knowledge and international relations**

With the publication of "The Structure of Scientific Revolutions" in 1962, Thomas Kuhn inaugurated a new epoch in the understanding of science (Anon., 2005c). Kuhn came to the important conclusion that a distinction can be made between phases of "normal science" (Kuhn, 1996:23) and "scientific revolutions" (Kuhn, 1996:92) – there is a successive transition

from one paradigm to another via what has become known as “paradigm shifts” (Kuhn, 1996:150).

Exploring further the idea of a paradigm shift, Conant and Haugeland (2000:1) remark that, from a Kuhnian perspective, the “history of science is not gradual and cumulative, but rather punctuated by a series of more or less radical ‘paradigm shifts’”. While periods of normal science are characterised by evolutionary change, revolutionary change is at the heart of a paradigm shift. Kuhn’s views on change will be revisited in greater detail in Chapter Three. However, as important as Kuhn’s ideas about change, are his unconventional ideas about knowledge (in this case scientific knowledge) and its making. It is to this aspect of Kuhn’s work that the focus will now be diverted.

Kuhn (1996:1-2) postulates that, traditionally, scientific development has been viewed as the piecemeal process whereby items are added, singly and in combination, to a constellation of facts, theories and methods – an ever-growing stockpile - as it were - that constitutes scientific technique and knowledge. Kuhn rejects the development-by-accumulation thesis. He states that, in a paradigm shift, the notion of the linear growth of knowledge is severely disrupted; indeed severed. Schram offers a powerful assessment of this: “What was most radical then about Kuhn’s notion of paradigm is that it unmasks the necessary fiction that the twentieth century metastory of science teaches us about the growth of objective knowledge” (Schram, 2003:846).

Kuhn thus offers an alternative analysis, positing that the relevance and validity of scientific knowledge depends heavily on its contextual conditions

and on the commitments of individuals. Kuhn rejects the idea of conceptualising scientific progress as gradual and continuous development towards an objective and immortal truth.

As noted in Chapter One, Kuhn includes in the notion of “paradigm” a common framework, a shared worldview, a set of tools and methods, and modes of resolving the research questions deemed askable. However, when a paradigm shift takes place, Kuhn argues, its carefully constructed worldview as well as its language become obsolete. The way meaning attaches to concepts is no longer comprehensible (Kuhn, 1996:149). The paradigm’s “reality” or its “facts” no longer makes sense.

These now look different than before because, in terms of successive paradigms, the paradigm indeed determines the content of “reality” or of “the facts”. It becomes clear that these (apparent) certainties are rooted in and bounded by the paradigm. Within a Kuhnian context “the facts” or “reality” is therefore much less certain than these terms imply. Paradigms are exposed as human constructions. They are “mental creations, shaped and influenced by the knowledge existing at the time they arise” (Olsen *et al.*, 1992).

An example of what Kuhn considered to be a paradigm shift, or scientific revolution, will assist in shedding light on this issue. Kuhn uses the change from Ptolemaic to Copernican astronomy as a classic example of a paradigm shift. Various references to this example will be made throughout this study and it therefore needs to be explained in greater detail.

Kuhn explains that the Ptolemaic system of astronomy was devised by the Alexandrian scholar Ptolemy and developed during the two centuries before Christ and the first two after. The Ptolemaic system was admirably successful in predicting the changing positions of both stars and planets. It represented a “mature science” or a fully-fledged paradigm (Kuhn, 1996:69). According to Harman (1998:2) the Ptolemaic interpretation of the heavens “had become firmly entrenched in astronomical thought, virtually as an article of faith”. The Ptolemaic system essentially espoused a geocentric view, with the firmament a vast spherical crystalline shell revolving around the spherical earth, with additional mechanisms supporting the sun, moon and planets (Harman, 1998:2).

But despite its relative success, Ptolemy’s system never quite conformed to the best available observations. Despite efforts to (through research) refine the theory and eliminate existing discrepancies, awareness of the latter anomalies steadily grew. “By the early sixteenth century an increasing number of Europe’s best astronomers were recognizing that the astronomical paradigm was failing in application to its own traditional problems.” (Kuhn, 1996:69; also see Harman, 1998:2-3.)

This recognition was prerequisite to Copernicus’ rejection of the Ptolemaic paradigm and his search for a new one. The astronomical crisis that Nicholas Copernicus identified was (as is the case with any paradigm) multidimensional. Within the historical context it included issues such as social pressure for calendar reform and the rise of Renaissance Neoplatonism (Kuhn, 1996:69). However, technical breakdown remained at the core of the crisis.

It was the issue of technical breakdown which Copernicus eventually addressed with his theory of heliocentrism – a theory which posited that the solar system is centred round the sun - and not around the earth - as had been believed for centuries; that the earth rotates daily on its axis; and revolves around the stationary sun on an annual basis (Harman, 1998:3). The implications of this were far-reaching.

Kuhn observes that:

(b)efore it [the emergence of Copernican astronomy] occurred, the sun and moon were planets, the earth was not. After it, the earth was a planet, like Mars and Jupiter; the sun was a star; and the moon was a new sort of body, a satellite (Kuhn, 2000a:15).

Kuhn continues:

(w)hen referential changes of this sort accompany change of ... theory, scientific development cannot be quite cumulative. One cannot get from the old to the new simply by an addition to what was already known. Nor can one quite describe the new in the vocabulary of the old or vice versa (Kuhn, 2000a:15).

The Copernican astronomer and the Ptolemaic astronomer therefore inhabited worlds built on different sets of knowledge. Harman explains that the scientific revolution that followed from Copernicus was so profound that if you could theoretically speak to a well-informed citizen in 1543 (the year in which Copernicus' book "On the Revolution of the Celestial Spheres" was published) and then to the same person one hundred years later, the

fundamental basis of the conversations would be completely different.

Harman (1998:5) argues that Copernican ideas became one focus of controversies in religion, philosophy and social theory. Explaining this statement, Harman concludes that:

(t)oday we know that the transformation in thought that is symbolized by the Copernican episode reached far outside astronomical and philosophical debate; it was part of an even broader transformation, involving the whole way of looking at the world – the transformation that we now call the ‘scientific revolution’ (Harman, 1998:5).

Within the context of the worldview that dominated Europe for about one thousand years, Kuhn illustrates how, in one fell swoop, the entire body of knowledge concerning the universe that mankind had come to trust was revolutionary dismissed (see Kuhn, 1996:68-69). With his discovery and theory of heliocentrism, Copernicus changed the world in a way that is still being felt today.

The paradigm shift brought about a new theory, but also a new ontology or worldview as well as a new way in which meaning attached to concepts within this framework. Copernican astronomy, according to Kuhn, was “a revolution for everyone” (Kuhn, 1970a:252). Ironically, Waters (1995:4) points out, globalisation might never have come about if it had not been for the Copernican revolution. It was only this discovery that convinced humanity that it inhabited a globe.

Copernicus' theory of heliocentrism is also an excellent example of the incommensurability of paradigms (a concept which will be explored further in later chapters). It is impossible to ontologically reconcile the earth-centred and sun-centred theories of the solar system. Nicholson (1992) makes the case that the central tenets of the one directly contradict the central tenets of the other. One has to accept one or the other. Discussion between their respective proponents is futile and a synthesis between the two is unattainable.

The next section continues to explore the more philosophical underpinnings of Kuhn's theory, drawing these closer to the ideas on the creation of knowledge as elaborated in the first part of this chapter. This specifically pertains to the arguments that theoretical knowledge is time-bound as well as purpose-bound. An effort is made to illustrate that the substructure of Kuhn's theory is compatible with the approach known as critical social theory, the latter representing the broader theoretical backdrop to the study.

2.5.1 Thomas Kuhn and the time-bound nature of theoretical knowledge

Kuhn's thinking, and his theory on paradigms and paradigm shifts, were conditioned by historical and material contexts. His own life, perhaps, provides the best example of this. Kuhn, the "reluctant revolutionary" as Horgan (1991:14) describes him, was very much a product of his time (Hacking, 2002:6). His ideas were influenced by the notion of so-called "Big Science", by the onset of the Cold War era and by the student movement of the Sixties.

2.5.1.1 The introduction of “Big Science”

Kuhn spent the final World War II years in research related to radar, first with the Radio Research Laboratory at Harvard and later in Europe with the US Office of Scientific Research and Development. He then returned to the United States and to Harvard University where he received Masters and Doctoral degrees in 1946 and 1949 respectively (Timmermann, 2003:1). At Harvard his views on paradigms as inclusive constructs (governing the practice of science in specific disciplines) was influenced by the so-called “Big Science” (Anon., 2005c) environment in which he now worked.

“Big Science” referred to the organisation of large numbers of scientists bringing different bodies of expertise to a common research project. Harvard University was a hub for scientists who promoted the idea of “Big Science”. The President of Harvard, James Bryant Conant, had been instrumental in bringing this German, large-scale “industrial” model of scientific research to the American academic establishment (Anon., 2005c).

The original “Big Science” model was the Manhattan Project, undertaken during the Second World War to develop an atomic weapon for the United States government. James Conant - whom Eng (2001:11) describes as Kuhn’s primary patron and mentor - was one of the architects and administrators of the Manhattan Project. At Harvard, Kuhn studied and worked in a “Big Science” milieu with the idea being implemented in various areas such as particle physics, antibiotics research and molecular biology (Timmermann, 2003:3).

2.5.1.2 **The onset of the Cold War**

Babich (2003:103) secondly refers to the influence of Cold War political circumstances on Kuhn – indeed, she notes that his crucial and formative intellectual work found expression during this period. Waters (2001:142) asserts that the Cold War undoubtedly influenced Kuhn as a student and young professor and contributed to his sense of how positions develop and become rigid so that the warring parties are continually talking at cross purposes.

At this point, Kuhn already sensed how excruciatingly difficult escape from a paradigm could be. Kuhn's work was thus published against the background of increasingly inflexible Cold War positions and, as the Cuban Missile Crisis played itself out in the same year as the publication of his book, with the spectre of nuclear war a distinct possibility.

2.5.1.3 **The student movement of the 1960s**

The early sixties, however, not only witnessed inflexible positions developing in international relations. It was also an epoch typified by growing leftist student action (see Findley & Rothney, 1986:327-330) and by the arrival at university of the generation that came to be known as the “Baby Boomers” (Anon, 2005d). Where the walls going up around the world (work on the Berlin Wall started in 1961) informed Kuhn's ideas regarding paradigms, Kuhn's notions of revolutionary change and of paradigm shifts mirrored the Baby Boomer's youthful spirit and the indomitable belief that change for the better was possible.

In combination, “The Structure of Scientific Revolutions” was the “perfect Sixties product” (Franklin, 2000). At the heart of Kuhn’s book was a sense of idealism; the promise of liberation. “With one essay, he [Kuhn] managed to capture the rebellious *Zeitgeist* of his generation and somewhat unwittingly turned the prevalent social angst of his time against even so sacred an enterprise as science itself.” (Javaid, 1997:5.)

2.5.1.4 **Kuhn’s involvement with the “General Education in Science” programme**

As noted, Kuhn’s idea of being inducted into a paradigm was linked to and influenced by his own relationship with James Conant, one of the “action-intellectuals” (Eng, 2001:11) who defined America’s early Cold War vision (Franklin, 2000). Kuhn acknowledges that Conant first introduced him to the history of science and thus “initiated the transformation in my conception of the nature of scientific advance” (Kuhn, 1996:xiii).

It was Conant who had recruited Kuhn into the “General Education in Science Programme” in 1947 (Kuhn, 2000b:275). The course was explicitly aimed to give future policy-makers in the social sciences at Harvard a broad understanding of science (from the perspective of the natural or ‘hard’ sciences). “In the era of the atomic bomb, Sputnik, and the moon race, of penicillin, DNA, and the pill, it was clear that science had much greater social implications than had been thought only a decade or two before.” (Franklin, 2000.)

However, as will be elaborated in Chapter Four, “Big Science” increasingly

presented science with a public relations problem (Timmermann, 2003:3). Was science a force for good or a force of destruction? The course devised by Conant was thus also aimed at addressing science's "image" problem. The focus of the course was to be historical case studies.

Franklin (2000) explains that Conant and Kuhn agreed that carefully chosen episodes in the history of science, dating from early modern times before science had become too complicated, would allow the students to engage with the excitement of discovery, the interplay of hypothesis and experiment and the conflict of personalities and ideas. It would, they argued, make the course much more interesting – it would give science a storyline, engaging the students' emotions and encouraging them to take sides.

2.5.1.5 **Thomas Kuhn's "intellectual epiphany"**

Against the background of his involvement with the "General Education in Science Programme", Kuhn started to read old scientific documents, something, he himself admitted, he had never done until that stage. As he looked through Aristotle's "Physica", to name but one example, he realised how astonishingly unlike Newton's were its concepts of motion and matter. He was perplexed by the apparently blatant errors in Aristotle's text, when compared with that of Newton.

In 1947, however, Kuhn's period of enlightenment began. Attempting to reconcile the seemingly obvious flaws in the texts, Kuhn experienced "an intellectual epiphany" (Javaid, 1997:2). He perceived, in a rudimentary way, an alternative way of reading the texts. "He suddenly realized that Aristotle's

ideas were not “bad Newton”, but different ways of looking at the same thing.” (Javaid, 1997:2.) The two scientists’ ontological positions, their way of seeing the world, were different (Kuhn, 1977:xi-xii; also see Van Gelder, 1996:B7). Kuhn realised that Aristotle and Newton inhabited different paradigms.

Kuhn could now explain his own initial inability to understand the differences between the two texts. These old text were being misread by modern scientists because they were not being read in context, but rather (and incorrectly) from the perspective of the prevailing scientific paradigm.

Now, Van Gelder asserts:

Einstein’s theory of relativity could challenge Newton’s concepts of physics. Lavoisier’s discovery of oxygen could sweep away earlier ideas about phlogiston, the imaginary element believed to cause combustion. Galileo’s supposed experiments with wood and lead balls dropped from the Leaning Tower of Pisa could banish the Aristotelian theory that bodies fell at a speed proportional to their weight. And Darwin’s theory of natural selection could overthrow theories of a world governed by design (Van Gelder, 1996:B7).

It became clear to Kuhn that works which had been viewed as containing universalist lessons did, in fact, not yield trans-historical insights or represent part of a linear progression of knowledge. These works were rather narratives constructed within socio-historical contexts by thinkers committed to certain political orientations and building on paradigm-specific sets of knowledge.

As noted in this section, the importance of the influence of historical and material contexts was reflected in Kuhn's own circumstances, but also in his theory. Kuhn acknowledges the time-bound nature of knowledge in his own work when he states that "(m)eanings are a historical product, and they inevitably change over time with changes in the demands on the terms that bear them"(Kuhn, 2000c:36).

Hay expands on this point and notes that:

(a)ll actors rely upon more-or-less conventional, more-or-less *paradigmatic* mappings of the contours of the terrain. All these distort and simplify the context, all these circumscribe the parameters of what is considered possible, to some extent in the very process of rendering 'reality' amenable to strategic intervention (Hay, 1997:1097 – italics in original).

Kuhn's theory and his revolutionary views on the creation of knowledge were criticised from many quarters and in many contexts. Kuhn's views on the contextual nature of knowledge - his contention that the underlying social/political/historical institutions of the scientist's environment shape a paradigm - made scientists uneasy. It allowed for the notion of science being influenced from the "outside", making it less objective than scientists would like to admit (Johnston, 2004).

Fierce criticism of Kuhn's views should, however, not come as a surprise. Flying in the face of traditional views in the natural sciences, Kuhn boldly asserted that knowledge could not be understood outside of the social context in which it was anchored. Kuhn insisted that immersion in a

paradigm invariably influenced observation. Some of Kuhn's contemporaries strongly rejected Kuhn's views. Imre Lakatos, for example, alleges that Kuhn's views on scientific revolutions promoted nothing less than "mob psychology" (Lakatos, 1970:178).

Thomas Kuhn, however, also had his supporters. Instead of criticising, Rorty (1999:176) rather insists that this exposure of the contextuality of knowledge represented one of Kuhn's major contributions, as it illustrated that natural scientists do not have a special access to "reality" or to "truth". The natural scientists' findings are, as is the case in the social sciences, inevitably shaped by the embeddedness of knowledge in a socially constructed reality.

2.5.2. Thomas Kuhn and the purpose-bound nature of theoretical knowledge

In line with his views on the contextual nature of knowledge, Kuhn did not adhere to the notion of value-free science. He clearly acknowledged the value-laden or purpose-bound nature of the scientific enterprise.

Kuhn states that:

(w)hat one must understand, however, is the manner in which a particular set of shared values interacts with the particular experiences shared by a community of specialists to ensure that most members of the group will ultimately find one set of arguments rather than another decisive (Kuhn, 1996:200).

When ‘values’ begin to interact with ‘experience’, one starts to find normative rather than objective views being presented. Inherent in any scientific theory, and, consequently, any paradigm, are the opinions and personal beliefs of those who proposed the theory (Story, 1996:3). Our observations are dependent on our prior beliefs and expectations and these, in turn, are shaped by the paradigm. The paradigm thus supplies the preformed and relatively inflexible box and what are perceived to be the “facts” or “reality” must conform to this. A very specific kind of knowledge is therefore “embedded [in the paradigm’s] terms and phrases” (Kuhn, 1970a:271).

A “fact” or “reality” can be supported only in accordance to its relative position within the paradigm; it cannot be a scientific “given” (Boysen, 2002:1). Knowledge is indeed “designed” for a specific paradigm (Kuhn, 1970b:19). The paradigm, which colours the “facts” or “reality” in a specific way, now inevitably becomes a key determinant of the scientist’s ontological framework. Luke (2000:208-210) explains how the paradigm can act as an “ontological stabilizer”, defending and helping to reproduce the social and political status quo.

Kuhn ended up showing that positivism’s “supposed objective facts were more context dependent, value-laden and theory-laden than it was prepared to admit” (Schram, 2003:847; also see Bird, 2003:125). He highlighted the politico-normative dimension of paradigms and argued that the latter both grounded and enabled the paradigm to function. The scientist engages “reality” not only based on his or her training and methodological discipline – he or she simultaneously perceives reality through a prism fashioned by

past experience and present values. What is perceived to be “facts” or “the truth” is generated from within the paradigm.

The language utilised by adherents to a specific paradigm is also not neutral. Their moral and social world is constructed by the manner in which they choose to apply their inherited “normative vocabularies” (Skinner, 1999:63). In comments which could only be labelled as constructivist, Kuhn (1970b:12) maintains that paradigms are “imaginative posits, invented in one piece for application to nature” (Kuhn, 1970b:12) while their languages “impose different structures on the world” (Kuhn, 2000c:52). Higgins (2004) explains that, in a Kuhnian sense, “truth” or “laws” are not internal to language. Their acceptance as truth or laws has more to do with historical, societal and disciplinary factors, and thus with irreducibly social conditions, than with any external “objective” criteria as such.

Kuhn illustrated that truth-claims must always be considered relative to the group and relative to the circumstances in which they are made. While the narrative of positivism makes its hero look like “a pure intellect, a cognitive being so sternly self-disciplined as to deal only in information, needing neither imagination nor emotion” (Midgley, 1995:79), Kuhn refuses to accept this version of knowledge-making.

As was the case with his views on the time-bound nature of scientific knowledge, Kuhn’s views on the purpose-bound nature of scientific knowledge was similarly criticised. His views struck at the heart of the traditional view of science which takes for granted that objective reality and ultimate truth exist and that scientists are gradually approaching it through

cumulative progress.

Kuhn agreed that science evolves, but he rejected the idea that the evolution of science is goal-directed. Kuhn rejects both the view that later science builds on the knowledge contained within earlier theories and the view that later theories are closer approximations to the truth than earlier theories.

If there is a constant element concerning Thomas Kuhn's theory, it is the controversy that has surrounded it since its first publication. When discussing his views on the purpose-bound nature of theoretical knowledge, it would thus seem logical that also here he would have not only detractors, but also supporters such as Bird (2004) who contends that Kuhn's most obvious achievement in this instance was to have been a major force in bringing about the final demise of logical positivism (also see Packer, 2004).

2.5.3 Thomas Kuhn, critical theory and problem-solving theory

When comparing problem-solving theory, and its approach to knowledge and its making, with that of critical theory, Kuhn would seem to naturally veer towards the latter and towards constructivism and post-positivism. By replacing the logic and philosophy of science with its history and sociology, Kuhn anchored his theory in social constructivism (Franklin, 2000).

Paradigms, as Thomas Kuhn showed more than forty years ago, are not concerned with "the limited choices offered by problem-solving theory; they are concerned with the fundamental assumptions of whole areas of scientific enquiry" (Vale, 2004:242). Kuhn is concerned with "the dynamic process by

which scientific knowledge is acquired rather than with the logical structure of the products of scientific research” (Kuhn, 1970b:1). He proves conclusively that science is a social process in addition to being a rational one.

Similar to critical theory, the paradigmatic view of science postulates that the growth of a body of scientific knowledge is closely linked to, and actually dependent upon, a continuous and relentless interrogation of the “truth”, of the “facts” and of “reality”. Masterman (1970:68) notes that Kuhn “does not presuppose anything; not even, initially, his paradigms. He researches into the real history, and broods; he reads scientific teaching textbooks, and wonders”.

Kuhn continuously questioned whether scientific clarity and rigour was as clear, rigorous and scientific as many believed (Rorty, 1999:177; also see Schmidt, 2002:9). Indeed Kuhn’s work punctured the widely held notion that scientific change was a strictly rational process. Brown (1992:208) notes that Kuhn’s views are closely aligned with anti-foundationalism, a broad category which includes critical theory.

As is the case with critical theory, Kuhn’s theory of science has change as its point of departure – this is in direct contrast with problem-solving theory which is preoccupied with maintaining and streamlining the existing social order. Kuhn would most likely agree with the statement that:

positivist ... methodologies tend to occlude, indeed preclude, an adequate consideration of the role of ideas, the ideational and the discursive, in the

mediation of political processes and hence political change (Hay, 1997:1093).

Kuhn (1996:181) challenges the scientist to, if necessary, question the whole “constellation of group commitments” - beliefs, values, and techniques - that form the frame of reference of a scientific community. As far as International Relations is concerned, academic training all too often rests on the belief that the lifeworld of the international consists of receiving stable ontologies and massaging them, rather than understanding that the social has constructed a particular configuration (Vale, 2003:13). If theories now in use, such as evolution or gravity, can, in theory, be overturned, then we cannot interpret any scientific theory as a reliable representation of reality (Stenger, 2000) – exactly the same holds for International Relations.

Based on theories such as that of Kuhn, the practical implication has been that there is a growing number of political scientists who:

have signed on to a movement to challenge the dominance of positivistic research, particularly research that assumes political behavior can be predicted according to theories of rationality and that such predictions underwrite cumulative explanations that constitute the growth of political knowledge (Schram, 2003:835).

They have been sensitised to views such as those espoused by Hopmann who remarks that the attempt to theorise about international politics is not and cannot be a completely neutral process in which an objective observer reports on an external material reality. “Theory can mask and even reinforce patterns of hierarchy and interest.” (Hopmann, 2003:97.)

According to Rosenau (2003:205) students of world affairs have become increasingly sensitive to the inextricable links between their normative perspectives and their empirical observations and theories. Through the creation of the concept of a paradigm shift, Kuhn's views on knowledge creation is positioned much closer to construction than to cumulation.

To conclude this section of the chapter, and in light of criticism of, especially, Kuhn's views on the creation of knowledge, Masterman turns the question around and asks what happens "if we do *not* follow up Kuhn's thought any further; i.e. what happens if we drop his whole paradigm idea?" (Masterman, 1970:87 – italics in original).

In this regard, Masterman concludes that:

(i)t may be difficult both to ascertain Kuhn's thought, and to develop it; but if we do not make the effort to do this, then it seems to me that we are left in a very disturbing position indeed. For ... however much we may cavil at Kuhn's conclusions in detail, we are not going to be able to go back to where we were before Kuhn and his immediate predecessors began to get at us. Their protest against the unconscious dishonesty and the swings of bias with which the history of science has been done in scientific textbooks up to now cuts far too deep; and so does their outcry against the oversimple and distorted accumulative view of science which has resulted from reading the textbooks as though they were the real history ... So, if we retreat from all further consideration of Kuhn's 'new image' of science, we run the risk of totally disconnecting the new-style realistic history of science from its old-style philosophy: a disaster (Masterman, 1970:87).

Kuhn's legacy is, to this day, contested. But perhaps his most important

contribution was his insistence that the process of science, and the knowledge on which it is founded, is fundamentally human, that discoveries are the product not of some plodding, rational process, but of human ingenuity intermingled with politics and personality (Javaid, 1997:6) – that science was, in the end, a social process and that change is always possible.

2.6 **Explaining the Westphalian paradigm's knowledge deficit**

Kuhn's arguments in the previous sections, paraphrased, support the view that a world characterised by ever-changing sets of knowledge challenges the notion of absolute truth and contests the existence of a society founded upon such truth. This schema, applied to international relations, would seem to go some way towards explaining why established knowledge in International Relations seems woefully inadequate to deal with contemporary questions and challenges. The events of 1989 would indeed seem to be a vindication of Kuhn's theory which sought to replace the orthodox textbook account of the history of science with the idea of a discontinuous history marked by scientific revolutions.

Informed by Kuhn's views on change and knowledge, it is reasoned that, in 1989, the Westphalian paradigm, its central tenets not having been fundamentally disputed since the signing of the Treaty of Westphalia, found itself in a crisis. It was now faced with change on a revolutionary scale and the validity of its knowledge was being critically disputed. Until this point there was a presumption that the nation-state was the only effective institution available for managing the affairs of large aggregates of people and their societies (Rosenau, 2002:25).

The “states-are-forever habit” (Rosenau, 2002:23) had until now been buttressed by a set of “ontopolitical assumptions” (Connolly, 1995:1). These assumptions had ensured its almost unparalleled hegemony both as principle of political organisation and as the concept in, and through which, the political had been comprehended. This presumption was so fully ingrained in the culture of modernity that it was not treated as problematic. Westphalia - a “state-centric, sovereignty-oriented, territorially bounded global order” (Falk, 2002:147) – had gone virtually unchallenged for more than 350 years (also see Caporaso, 2000:1-2).

As the Berlin Wall was being broken down, the East-West standoff increasingly lost its meaning (see Lawson, 2002a:xii). This final chapter in the history of Westphalia was truly a “non-cumulative developmental episode in which an older paradigm is replaced in whole or in part by an incompatible new one” (Kuhn, 1996:92).

The world now rather looked like a field of scattered and disparate forces, congealing in places difficult to predict and gathering momentum which no one really knew how to arrest (Bauman, 1998:58). The Westphalian paradigm’s theory, worldview and concepts were ill-equipped to deal with this fluid situation. In 1989, the Westphalian paradigm experienced its moment of crisis when the “porous, performed and radically contingent character of the nation-state” (Coward, 1999:5) - the centrepiece of the Westphalian paradigm - was laid bare.

Smith (2001:225) argues that, theoretically, the paradigm lost its explanatory power in the face of the dissolving bipolar system. Practically, it was unable

to deal with the rise of non-state actors, social movements and radically expanding global transactions. Waters (1995:100) points out that the state could no longer offer security; trade and financial markets were internationalised; drug syndicates and terrorists no longer respected borders; and the issues of AIDS and ecology were likewise not very susceptible to state action.

The way in which concepts were traditionally conceived, no longer addressed the situation of real-life politics. Issues such as security, sovereignty and identity, their content progressively questioned, were finally emasculated in 1989. “Revolution”, Pajares (2003) concludes “is not cumulation; [it] ... is transformation”.

Approaches to international relations dating from the Cold War era were often “ahistorical, derivative, and bound up with highly forced narratives” (Vale, 2003:3). They therefore supported the idea of continuity or of a problem-solving approach to international relations which now no longer seemed applicable. But have sufficient attempts been made to replace International Relations and international relations’ outdated sets of knowledge with new ones suitable for the 21st century?

The argument posited in the thesis is that, caught up in the turbulence of a Kuhnian paradigm shift, this matter has not yet been sufficiently addressed. In terms of international relations, the post-Cold War world remains “paradigm-less” (Booth, 1998b:21; also see Rosenau, 1990:5). This would then also explain the ongoing crisis in both International Relations and in international relations where Westphalian ways of knowing continue to

inform current thinking in many circles – an element which will be further developed in Chapter Eight. Contemporary approaches are, erroneously, often still rooted in knowledge generated from within the Westphalian paradigm.

Kuhn (2000d:219) states that knowledge and the concepts to which they give life are “the possession of communities”. This knowledge is contextual and embedded and, at the same time, purpose- or value-laden. These communities are “the producers and validators of [the paradigm’s] scientific knowledge” (Kuhn, 1996:178). For the communities of international relations, which include the academic and the policy-making fraternity, and relying on “the form of organization offered to politics by the experience of Westphalia” (Vale, 2003:29), this knowledge supported a state-centred ontology as the dominant paradigm.

It was, and in many cases still is, viewed as a naturally occurring reality or as the central “fact” of international relations. In the years leading up to, but especially in 1989, this knowledge, trusted by so many for so long to reliably solve the puzzles of international relations, was, however, invalidated. A paradigm shift or “transformation of the world” (Kuhn, 1996:6) is underway and there is a dire need for new knowledge in a new environment.

2.7 **Conclusion**

This chapter has probed the assumptions on which knowledge is founded, proceeding from the premise that knowledge and its making is both time- and purpose-bound. Thomas Kuhn’s seminal work on the dynamics of

scientific discovery, “The Structure of Scientific Revolutions”, in which he describes the “paradigmatic” organisation of science, has proven to be illuminating, also for International Relations.

Scientific progress, says Kuhn, has little to do with the smooth, uninterrupted accumulation of knowledge. Rather, scientific progress is the product of disagreement and debate between communities of scientists with different worldviews (or ascribing to different paradigms) and with one paradigm (and its body of knowledge) ultimately emerging in triumph. What Kuhn did was to position the human factor centrally in the process of knowledge creation. Kuhn proved that scientific knowledge changed, not through confrontation with the “facts”, but by a social struggle between contending interpretations of intrinsically ambiguous evidence.

Speaking about the social sciences in general, Shaw insists that the beginning of the twenty-first century represents nothing less than “a deep crisis for the social sciences” (Shaw, 2000a). This, in turn, has given rise to the most exhaustive transformation of the structures of social knowledge in recent times. It would seem that the core disciplinary subjects in the social sciences have been unable to reconstitute themselves in global terms and remain imprisoned by their inherited ontological worldview.

Applying Kuhn’s theory in the context of international relations specifically, this chapter has argued that the year 1989 witnessed the Westphalian paradigm’s moment of crisis, rendering unintelligible the accumulated body of international relations knowledge that existed up until that point. This represents one of the key themes of the thesis. Chapter Nine points out that

new forms of knowledge production will need not to evade, but to engage with the issues which the modern nation-state “has solved so elegantly, if violently, and never completely, in the past” (Shaw, 2004:19).

We move now to Chapter Three which will delve further into Kuhn’s theory, proceeding from his views on the knowledge assumptions on which science is founded to his views on the evolution of science, and especially focussing on his idea of a scientific revolution or paradigm shift. An elaboration of this concept will be used as a basis for answering the second key question posed in Chapter One. This, it will be recalled, concerns the continued and intense ontological debate, in both the practical and theoretical contexts, regarding the changed and changing nature of international relations.

CHAPTER THREE

BUDDY CAN YOU PARADIGM? THOMAS KUHN, INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND THE NATURE OF CHANGE

3.1 Introduction

In 1962, Thomas Kuhn published his book, “The Structure of Scientific Revolutions”. The book was destined to become the best-selling academic book of the twentieth century. During the period 1976-1983, and using the Arts and Humanities Citation Index as source, Kuhn’s book emerges as the most cited single work (Franklin, 2000). After he passed away in 1996, Kuhn was described as “the most influential philosopher to write in English since the Second World War” (Rorty, 1999:175).

This has also translated in popular literature where the concepts “paradigm” and “paradigm shift” were and continue to be utilised (and sometimes abused) in many contexts. The cartoon character Dilbert warns against “a paradigm shifting without a clutch” while Stenger (2000) wryly comments on the over-usage of Kuhn’s theory by asking “Buddy, can you paradigm?” What is, however, indisputable, is the impact Kuhn’s book had, and this still reverberates through the natural and social sciences today.

Chapter One noted that Thomas Kuhn’s theory would be utilised in this study to elucidate and explain change within the context of contemporary

international relations. Kuhn's theory is valuable because it provides the researcher with an instrument to specifically address periods of tumultuous or fundamental change; it clarifies ontological change or change of worldview; and it accommodates change with emancipatory intent or a critical approach to change.

This chapter commences with a synoptic overview of Kuhn's theory of paradigmatic change – viewed from an ontological angle. As explained in Chapter One, ontological change represents the main interest of the work, as the Westphalian paradigm's crisis is fundamentally an ontological one.

The second section investigates the relevance of Kuhn's work for the social sciences – a highly contested question that needs elaboration. What, therefore, is the value of Kuhn's work beyond his domain, if any? With this settled, the third section focuses on the applicability of Kuhn's theory to international relations specifically, especially in the context of this study's main objectives.

3.2 A critical discussion of Thomas Kuhn's views on change

Thomas Kuhn asserts that scientific development represents a continuous process of “discovery through paradigm destruction” (Kuhn, 1996:97). Distinctive periods and moments of this process can be distinguished and will be highlighted. The point of departure here is the so-called “pre-paradigmatic” period when no paradigm has yet asserted its authority in a specific discipline.

3.2.1 The period of “pre-paradigmatic” science

Kuhn suggests that the early developmental stages of most sciences have been characterised by continual competition between a number of distinct views of nature, each partially derived from, and all roughly compatible with, the dictates of scientific observation and method.

What differentiated these – shall we say – pre-paradigmatic schools was not one or another failure of method – they were all “scientific” (in the sense of adhering to the acceptable scientific norms, practices and procedures of the day) - but the fact that they had diametrically opposed ways of seeing the world and of practicing science in it (Kuhn, 1996:4).

Kuhn explains this variance by positing that each school’s ontological point of departure, although restricted by observation and experience which fitted into a range of admissible scientific belief, also included “an apparently arbitrary element” (Kuhn, 1996:4) compounded of personal and historical accident.

Kuhn continues to argue that this element is always a formative ingredient of the beliefs espoused by a scientific community at any given time. At this stage, no one paradigm has become dominant. Research is arduous because there is an absence of at least some implicit body of intertwined theoretical and methodological belief that permits selection, evaluation, and criticism (Kuhn, 1996:15-16).

A point is, however, reached where a field of study crosses the divide

between what might be called its “prehistory” as a science and its history proper (Kuhn, 1996:21). At this point one of the pre-paradigmatic schools has triumphed and has asserted its supremacy. This school has now evolved into a “mature science” (Kuhn, 1996:24) and a period of “normal science” (Kuhn, 1996:10) ensues.

3.2.2 **The period of “normal science”**

A phase of “normal science” in a specified subject field is characterised by, and closely associated with, the dominant paradigm or frame-of-reference which is accepted by the scientific community. The paradigm sets the parameters within which the scientific community conducts its activities.

Kuhn describes “normal science” as “research firmly based upon one or more past scientific achievements, achievements that some particular scientific community acknowledges for a time as supplying the foundation for its further practice” (Kuhn, 1996:10) or as “the genesis and continuation of a particular research tradition” (Kuhn, 1996:11).

He also refers to a period of “normal science” as a “paradigm in operation” (Kuhn, 1996:11). Johnston (2004) contends that “if there was a ‘most important’ piece of a given paradigm, it would be the guiding principles and ontological assumptions of the science functioning within the paradigm”.

The paradigm guides the activities of the scientific community. Weinberg (1998) remarks that in these periods there is a “consensus view” on the practice of science. Through training and by way of tradition, amongst

others factors, members of the scientific community are initiated into this paradigm. Researchers whose research is based on shared paradigms “are committed to the same rules and standards for scientific practice” (Kuhn, 1996:11).

To better explain this idea (in an ontological sense), Baylis and Smith’s (2001:2-3) comments are insightful. Noting that the world is viewed differently by different observers, these authors use the analogy of sunglasses with different coloured lenses – put on the red pair and the world looks red, put on the yellow pair and it looks yellow. The world is not any different, it just looks different! “Reality” is constructed differently, depending on the ontological lens through which the observer is looking. As will be argued later in this chapter, the Westphalian paradigm reigned supreme in international relations from 1648 to 1989. Seeing the world through a lens coloured by Westphalia, the “reality” of a state-centred world emerged as the logical next step.

In periods of “normal science” research is directed or “paradigm-based” (Kuhn, 1996:18). The individual scientist does not question the parameters which the paradigm sets – the paradigm is “trusted implicitly” (Watkins, 1970:27). Under these conditions, there is no longer a “constant reiteration of fundamentals” (Kuhn, 1996:18) and research rather amounts to a strenuous and devoted attempt to force nature into the preformed and relatively inflexible conceptual boxes supplied by the paradigm.

Johnston (2004) maintains that in these periods, scientists do not worry about ontological assumptions – all of these assumptions are already

characterised by the paradigm. "Normal science" is predicated on the assumption that "the scientific community knows what the world is like" (Kuhn, 1996:5). Ontologically, the paradigm provides a view of the world, but at the same time its vision is constrained within an inherited intellectual horizon. Working within a paradigm implies that "there is a tradition, an origin, a code, a centre, a home from which one can set out to explore the contingencies and transformations of the world outside" (Walker, 1993:44).

Kuhn compares periods of "normal science" practice to building jigsaw puzzles or completing crossword puzzles, where, with both, a defined framework or structure with delineated borders already exist. He likens the functioning of a dominant paradigm to rules governing a game, like chess. The paradigm, as Kuhn puts it, "provide model problems and solutions to a community of practitioners" (Kuhn, 1996:x). For a period the paradigm provides a map of what the world looks like – of what it does, and does not contain; but in certain areas, the map may be drawn only in outline, and the scientist's task is to help fill in the detail. The scientist is ontologically locked into the paradigm within which he or she practices science.

Vasquez expands on Kuhn's paradigm concept and states that:

(t)he concept of paradigm, then, could be stipulatively defined as the fundamental assumptions scholars make about the world they are studying. These assumptions provide answers to the questions that must be addressed before theorizing even begins ... and such questions may be: What are the fundamental units of which the world is composed? How do these units interact with each other? What interesting questions may be asked about these units? What kinds of conceptions will provide answers to these

inquiries? By responding to these questions, the fundamental assumptions form a picture of the world the scholar is studying and tell the scholar what is known about the world, what is unknown about it, how one can view the world if one wants to know the unknown, and finally what is worth knowing (Vasquez, 1983:5).

According to Kuhn a paradigm not only comprises of a commitment to a specific theory or set of theories. The commitment also extends to research techniques as well as assumptions and postulations concerning that which is being studied, namely the specified subject field. It extends to the “experimental and the observational” as Kuhn (1996:30) puts it.

This implies that the paradigm shapes fundamental assumptions concerning not only theory, but also concerning the reality (subject field) which is being studied by the scientist. The scientist’s paradigm colours vision, not only in an inward-looking-, but also in an outward-looking sense. The paradigm determines the way in which the world or “reality” is seen and experienced.

Explaining this in the context of international relations, Rosenau asserts that:

(i)asmuch as our views of change and continuity derive from our philosophical perspectives, we are likely to see the course of events as confirming the framework we employ to interpret them. Thus, our paradigms are perpetuated, and we find it difficult to remain open to altering or abandoning them even if the real world appears to be inconsistent with them (Rosenau, 1990:92).

In the face of this inconsistency, and even when a dominant paradigm has

established itself and a period of “normal science” follows, some “element of arbitrariness” (Kuhn, 1996:5) is always present. When fundamental inconsistencies begin to arise within a period of “normal science”, this element of arbitrariness makes it impossible to suppress the former indefinitely. This is the “essential tension” (Kuhn, 1996:79) implicit in scientific research.

3.2.3 **The awareness of anomaly**

Discoveries or “novelties of fact” (Kuhn, 1996:52) and inventions or “novelties of theory” (Kuhn, 1996:52) both come into play here. According to Kuhn both these commence with the awareness of anomaly, that is, the recognition that nature has somehow violated the paradigm-induced expectations that govern “normal science”. The presence of an anomaly or anomalies does not, however, yet present a crisis.

According to Kuhn (1996:64) this awareness merely opens a period in which conceptual categories can be adjusted until the “initially inconsistent has become the anticipated”. Very importantly, however, is the fact that anomaly appears only against the background provided by the paradigm. The more precise and far-reaching the paradigm is, the more sensitive an indicator it provides of aberrations and hence of an occasion for paradigm change (Kuhn, 1996:65).

3.2.4 **The period of “crisis”**

When irregularities start appearing repeatedly and the latter cannot be

aligned with professional expectation, the profession can no longer avoid the anomalies that subvert the existing tradition of scientific practice (Kuhn, 1996:6). Thus, when the awareness of anomaly lasts long- (or penetrates deep) enough one can describe the field affected as being in a state of “increasing crisis” (Kuhn, 1996:74). There is a “persistent failure of the puzzles of normal science to come out as they should” (Kuhn, 1996:68). Anomalies – the results the paradigm cannot explain or “contradictions between theory and experience” (Zoglauer, 2002) – accumulate and eventually make the paradigm unsustainable.

The result is that research now starts to resemble that conducted under the competing schools of the pre-paradigm period, which is another typical effect of the crisis. According to Kuhn, the direct response to a crisis of this magnitude is the emergence of a “novel theory” (Kuhn, 1996:75). This loosens the rules of normal puzzle-solving in ways that ultimately permit a new paradigm to emerge. The crisis therefore evokes an alternate candidate for paradigm (Kuhn, 1996:145).

3.2.5 The response to “crisis”

Kuhn describes the ensuing situation as the “response to crisis” (Kuhn, 1996:77), noting that it displays a number of hallmarks. These include blurring of the existing paradigm (Kuhn, 1996:84), a subsequent division of society into competing camps (Kuhn, 1996:93), tension between conflicting schools of thought adhered to by each of these camps or parties (Kuhn, 1996:96), and a return to a situation akin to the pre-paradigm state. In the latter situation each camp again endeavours to fit “reality” to its own

ontology or view of the world (Kuhn, 1996:101).

Crises, then, are a necessary precondition for the emergence of novel theories. The question, however, remains how scientists respond to these crises? Kuhn makes the important point that scientists do not renounce the paradigm that has led them into crisis. “The decision to reject one paradigm is always simultaneously the decision to accept another, and the judgment leading to that decision involves the comparison of both paradigms with nature *and* with each other.” (Kuhn, 1996:77 – italics in original) Surprises, anomalies and crises, are, according to Kuhn, the signposts that point the way to a period of extraordinary science - to a “scientific revolution” or to a paradigm shift.

3.2.6 **The “scientific revolution”**

Kuhn describes the transition to a new paradigm as a “scientific revolution” (Kuhn, 1996:3). A “scientific revolution” takes place when the dominant paradigm is shattered as a result of unsolvable problems and anomalies or as a result of “violations of expectation” (Kuhn, 1996:xi). Kuhn alternatively describes “scientific revolutions” as “those non-cumulative developmental episodes in which an older paradigm is replaced in whole, or in part, by an incompatible new one” (Kuhn, 1996:92) or as the “tradition-shattering complements to the tradition-bound activity of normal science” (Kuhn, 1996:6).

In a historical sense, Kuhn refers to “scientific revolutions” as major turning points in scientific development associated with names such as Nicholas

Copernicus, whose theory of heliocentrism was explained in Chapter Two. It is a period when the “fundamental tenets” (Kuhn, 1996:163) of a field are at stake.

According to Kuhn (1996:6) “scientific revolutions” display a number of shared characteristics. These include that each:

- necessitated the community’s rejection of one time-honoured scientific theory in favour of another incompatible with it;
- produced a consequent shift in the problems available for scientific scrutiny and in the standards by which the profession determined what should count as an admissible problem or as a legitimate problem-solution;
- transformed the scientific imagination in ways that could ultimately only be described as a transformation of the world in which scientific work was being done; and that each
- of these type of scientific revolutions were almost always controversial.

Kuhn refined his thinking on the characteristics of “scientific revolutions” by isolating three generic elements:

- Scientific revolutions involve a relatively sudden and unstructured

transformation in which some part of the flux of experience sorts itself out differently and displays patterns that were not previously visible (Kuhn, 2000a:17). “In revolutionary change one must ... live with incoherence” Kuhn (2000a:29) writes.

- Scientific revolutions refer to a change in the way words and phrases attach to nature and to change in the way their referents are determined. The way meaning attaches to concepts is no longer comprehensible. Kuhn states that “the distinctive character of revolutionary change in language is that it alters not only the criteria by which terms attach to nature but also, massively, the set of objectives or situations to which those terms attach” (Kuhn, 2000a:29-30). Language, therefore, is a coin with two faces, one looking outward to the world, the other inward to the world’s reflection in the referential structure of the language itself. Our language and our knowledge of the world are indissociably entwined (Tresch, 2001:306). Paradigms therefore have an important semantic function in fixing the meaning of scientific terms.
- Scientific revolutions involve a central change of model, metaphor, or analogy – a change in one’s sense of what is similar to what, and of what is different (Kuhn, 2000a:30). Before a scientific revolution, objects or situations are juxtaposed and said to be the same or similar. They form a pattern of similarities, durably clustered together as examples of the same thing yet, simultaneously, separated from objects or situations with which they might otherwise have been confused.

Before the new contender for paradigm becomes the dominant, and so ushers in a period of “normal science” (Kuhn, 1996:10), the paradigms exist next to each other. It should be clarified here that the competition is from alternative paradigms “including the displaced one” (Barnett, 2000:167) and all of these are, according to Kuhn, mutually exclusive.

In the context of International Relations, the “displaced” paradigm refers to the Westphalian paradigm. Mathews’ assessment thus seems to be correct when she states that “(d)uring the transition, the Westphalian system and an evolving one [in fact a number of evolving competitors] will exist side by side” (Mathews, 1997:66).

Explaining his idea of contending paradigms being mutually exclusive, Kuhn notes that:

(l)ike the choice between competing political institutions, that between competing paradigms proves to be a choice between incompatible modes of community life. Because it has that character, the choice is not and cannot be determined merely by the evaluative procedures characteristic of normal science, for these depend in part upon a particular paradigm, and that paradigm is at issue. When paradigms enter, as they must, into a debate about paradigm choice, their role is necessarily circular. Each group uses its own paradigm [with its own knowledge, concepts and worldview] to argue in that paradigm’s defence (Kuhn, 1996:94)

Choosing to side with the proponents of the new paradigm therefore essentially amounts to an act of faith. It becomes, to a large extent, an extra-rational choice. Although arguments can play a role in the process, no single

“generic” argument unites scientists who become proponents of the new paradigm. According to Kuhn, this “conversion” sometimes taken place in instances where all the available and sound technical arguments point in the opposite direction (Kuhn, 1996:158). Kuhn (1996:94) concludes that, whatever the force of the arguments put forward, the status of the circular argument is only that of persuasion.

Because the paradigms cannot be successfully compared, based on their aforementioned mutual exclusivity, the competition between them is thus a contest which can be clinched neither by submitting some form of proof, nor by conducting experiments, calling on logical thought to prevail or by engaging in extensive discussions.

Kuhn is of the opinion that these paradigms may not only be “incompatible” but are often actually “incommensurable” (Kuhn, 1996:103). Since the superiority of one theory to another is something that cannot be proven in debate (Dohmen, 2003:7) these theories represent “incommensurable ways of seeing the world” (Kuhn, 1996:4).

At this point it is necessary to digress somewhat and to purposefully focus on the concept of “incommensurability”. This is imperative because an understanding thereof will ultimately provide the basis for an answer to the third of the three key questions posed in Chapter One.

“Incommensurability” relates to the phenomenon that proponents of various positions in international relations debates often “talk-through-each-other” (Kuhn, 1970a:231-232). This breakdown in communication is the result of

their divergent ontological points of departure - the latter resulting in apparently irreconcilable views of the world.

3.2.6.1 **The concept of “incommensurability”**

According to Kuhn the term “incommensurability” had been borrowed from mathematics to describe the relationship between successive scientific theories (Kuhn, 2000c:33). The term relates to the mathematical theorem stating that:

(t)he hypotenuse of an isosceles right triangle is incommensurable with its side or the circumference of a circle with its radius in the sense that there is no unit of length contained without residue an integral number of times in each member of the pair. There is thus no common measure (Kuhn, 2000c:35).

Paradigmatic incommensurability not only applies to successive periods of “normal-scientific tradition” (Kuhn, 1996:103) but also impacts directly on the language of successive and contending paradigms.

In this regard Kuhn asserts that:

(m)y claim has been that key statements of an older science, including some that would ordinarily be considered merely descriptive, cannot be rendered in the language of a later science and vice versa. By the language of a science, I here mean not only the parts of that language in actual use, but also all extensions that can be incorporated in that language without altering components already in place (Kuhn, 2000c:55)

Incommensurability, which Ronen (1998) defines as lack of continuity or overlap between scientific ontologies, therefore also carries an important epistemic consequence: there is apparently no neutral language given to those holding to diverse paradigms, no third language capable of formulating both (Ronen, 1998). According to Kuhn (1996:268) “languages cut up the world in different ways, and we have no access to a neutral sub-linguistic means of reporting”. Ronen continues to argue that this notion of epistemic split as part of the doctrine of incommensurability stands against a long philosophical tradition that in one way or another assumes the continuity of knowledge.

Conceptually, a paradigm shift is therefore also a “meaning-shift” as Lakatos (1970:109) calls it. This is in line with Kuhn’s view that in much of language learning two sorts of knowledge – knowledge of words and knowledge of nature – are acquired together, not really two sorts of knowledge at all, but two faces of the single coinage that a language provides (Kuhn, 2000a:31). Language therefore embodies worldview, as Jacobs (2002:107) observes.

Paraphrasing ideas developed by Sankey (1991:414) it can be stated that, as paradigms are altered and eventually replaced, the concepts employed by these paradigms also change. Such conceptual change manifests, at the semantic level, in differences in the meaning of the vocabulary of the respective paradigms.

New terms with new meanings are introduced, and old terms shift their meaning in the transition between paradigms. Conceptual change is therefore

an integral part of paradigm change, and semantic variance between paradigms is the result.

Sankey (1991:414) furthermore contends that the idea that shifts in meaning are an integral part of a paradigm shift thus also underlies Kuhn's thesis that successive paradigms may be incommensurable. Kuhn argues that the languages of semantically variant paradigms fail to be fully inter-translatable, and the content of such paradigms can therefore not be directly compared.

For without being expressed in synonymous vocabulary, no consequence of one paradigm can assert or deny a statement the same in meaning as a consequence of the other. Kuhn describes paradigms, the content of which is thus incomparable because of such translation failure, as being incommensurable.

Kuhn's concept of "incommensurability", similar to that of his key "paradigm" concept, is contentious. Incommensurability, described by Harris (2004:4) as "Kuhn's second most popular term", is indeed one of the most problematic and controversial issues in his theory (Hoyningen-Huene, 1993:207).

Whether communication between competing paradigms, or the bridging of incommensurability, is possible, is at the heart of the mechanics of paradigm shifts and is a question Thomas Kuhn pondered throughout his career. He was working on a book on incommensurability (which he never finished) until his death in 1996.

Speaking about this project in 1991, Kuhn acknowledged that:

(n)o other aspect of *Structure* has concerned me so deeply in the thirty years since the book was written, and I emerge from those years feeling more strongly than ever that incommensurability has to be an essential component of any historical, developmental, or evolutionary view of scientific knowledge (Kuhn, 2000e:91 – italics in original).

When trying to understand the concept of “incommensurability”, it is therefore to Kuhn’s original book “The Structure of Scientific Revolutions” that we first have to return.

3.2.6.1.1 **Kuhn’s original formulation of the concept of “incommensurability”**

The concept of incommensurability was not developed well in Kuhn’s original book (Hoyningen-Huene, 1993:212). In “The Structure of Scientific Revolutions” Kuhn himself admits that, when talking about the incommensurability of competing paradigms, “(i)n a sense that I am *unable to explicate further*, the proponents of competing paradigms practice their trades in different worlds” (Kuhn, 1996:150 – italics in original). This statement already implies room or space for variance of interpretation - an issue on which we will subsequently touch.

Kuhn’s views on incommensurability may thus be best understood as having evolved and developed over a period of time – indeed over decades (Hoyningen-Huene, 1993:208; also see Sankey, 1993:759). Conant and

Haugeland confirm this and point out that Kuhn's own understanding of how to best characterise paradigm shifts had itself undergone a number of shifts. They add that later in his career he attempted to rethink and extend some of his "revolutionary" hypotheses (Conant & Haugeland, 2000:1) such as the one on "incommensurability".

3.2.6.1.2 Changes in Kuhn's views on "incommensurability"

In line with these remarks, it is maintained in the thesis that Kuhn's views on incommensurability progressed from, borrowing terminology from Thagard and Zhu (2001:3), "strong incommensurability" to that of "weak incommensurability", or from radical incommensurability to a more tempered version (also see Dohmen, 2003:54). Kuhn describes this more modest version of incommensurability as "local incommensurability" (Kuhn, 2000c:36).

This "softening" of Kuhn's views on incommensurability was linked to the fact that, where Kuhn had originally borrowed the term from its mathematical home (Kuhn, 2000c:33), he increasingly started applying it in the context of language in his later works (Conant & Haugeland, 2000:4). "The phrase 'no common measure' [as used in the mathematical sense] now becomes 'no common language'." (Kuhn, 2000c:36.)

Kuhn argues that, in terms of "local incommensurability", the problem of translatability now have a bearing only on a small subgroup of (usually interdefined) terms and sentences that contains them, rather than on different languages *in toto* (Kuhn, 2000c:36). It is now possible to contain translation

failure to a localised cluster of terminology within the language of theories (Sankey, 1993:760).

In respect of this tempered version of incommensurability, the concept is no longer an impediment that cannot be breached but rather a statement of the difficulties involved with inter-paradigm communication during a paradigm shift. In his earlier usage of the term (in the mathematical sense) the notion of “incommensurability” had merely functioned “metaphorically”, Kuhn (2000c:36) now explains.

In his later works, he emphasised that his intention had never been to equate incommensurability with incommunicability. “The claim that two theories are incommensurable is more modest than many of its critics have supposed.” (Kuhn, 2000c:36.) Thagard and Zhu (2001:1) believe that, with regard to “weak incommensurability”, linguistic, conceptual, ontological and explanatory impediments can be overcome.

In Chapter One we learnt that it is often rewarding to turn to the work of Kuhn’s contemporaries who illuminated from different angles ideas developed by Kuhn. To try to better comprehend the idea of “weak incommensurability”, the views of Sir Karl Popper, who had a more flexible approach to the concept, is revealing.

Popper states that:

I do admit that at any moment we are prisoners caught in the framework of our theories; our expectations; our past experiences; our language. But we

are prisoners in a Pickwickian sense: if we try, we can break out of our framework Admittedly, we shall find ourselves again in a framework, but it will be a better and roomier one (Popper, 1970:56).

Having clarified that it is possible in theory, the question, which now needs to be answered, is how to move beyond incommensurability? How do you engineer a paradigmatic jailbreak? Coming to the rescue, Kuhn acknowledges that “men who experience such communications breakdowns must ... have some recourse” (Kuhn, 1996:201). The answer, he claims, is the use of translation.

3.2.6.1.3 **Thomas Kuhn and the bridging of “incommensurability”**

Kuhn (1996:192-203) observes that if two people stand at the same place and gaze in the same direction, it could be expected that they receive closely similar stimuli. People, however, do not see stimuli – the stimuli are transformed through neural processes into sensations. These sensations differ from individual to individual irrespective of the fact that the original stimuli were the same.

Following from this, Kuhn argues that these individuals or groups which have “systematically different sensations on receipt of the same stimuli, do *in some sense* live in different worlds” (Kuhn, 1996:193 – italics in original). These individuals or groups have “incommensurable viewpoints” (Kuhn, 1996:200) and this will become evidently clear when these individuals or groups try to communicate with each other.

Kuhn (1996:202), however, affirms that the parties involved in the communications breakdown, “can ... recognize each other as members of different language communities and then become translators”. Through a process of interaction it is thus possible to arrive at a point where “(e)ach will have learned to translate the other’s theory and its consequences into his own language and simultaneously to describe in his language the world to which the theory applies (Kuhn, 1996:202).

To this Kuhn adds that:

(s)ince translation, if pursued, allows the participants in a communication breakdown to experience vicariously something of the merits and defects of each other’s points of view, it is a potent tool for both persuasion and for conversion (Kuhn, 1996:202).

In the thesis’ closing chapter, it will be argued that it is in the domain of “translation” that the role of International Relations scholars and of practitioners of international relations will become critical in the coming decades. The responsibility will fall to these individuals to, as “professional translators” (Kuhn, 2000f:60), concretise theories and create conditions under which humanity can experience a Kuhnian type of “conversion”.

This “conversion” refers to the sensation Kuhn describes as the “scales falling from their eyes” or of the “lightning flash” that “inundates” a previously obscure puzzle, enabling its components to be seen in a new way that for the first time permits its solution (Kuhn, 1996:122).

Thomas Kuhn, however, warns that the translator's task is an unenviable and delicate one as will likewise be pointed out in Chapter Eight. Kuhn states that the translator:

must find the best available compromises between incompatible objectives. Nuances must be preserved but not at the price of sentences so long that communication breaks down. Literalness is desirable but not if it demands introducing too many foreign words which must be separately discussed in a glossary or appendix. People deeply committed both to accuracy and to felicity of expression find translation painful, and some cannot do it at all (Kuhn, 1970a:267).

Despite the difficulties involved, and once humanity has undergone this conversion, it will look at the world from an ontologically different vantage point – it will see a new paradigm through new eyes. A stage would have been reached where it will become evident that there has been “a global sort of change in the way men viewed nature and applied language to it” (Kuhn, 1977:xiii). At that point the way would have been paved for a new consensus and for a new paradigm of international relations to emerge.

Ontologically speaking, and despite the heated debate surrounding the exact meaning of the concept of “incommensurability”, Kuhn comes to the conclusion that a paradigm shift presents not only a new perception of science and of the language of science, but of the world (Kuhn, 1996:144). A change of paradigm is a change in the way of seeing, a translocation of a conceptual net through which scientists look at the world (Ronen, 1998).

In the words of Baylis and Smith, it entails exchanging a red ontological lens

to view the world with for a yellow one, say. But what follows next? What happens when incommensurability has been bridged and a new paradigm has asserted itself?

3.2.7 A new period of “normal science”

This section of the chapter has scrutinised the various elements of Kuhn’s theory of scientific development. He has posited that work in a scientific discipline progresses from a pre-paradigmatic phase to a phase of “normal science”. When anomalies arise that question the fundamental assumptions of this paradigm, the paradigm enters a period of crisis which is only resolved when a new paradigm has taken its place. A new period of “normal science” now commences. The new paradigm provides the knowledge, worldview, and questions and model answers for the scientific community to be able to proceed with their endeavours.

Following on these arguments, the focus now reverts to the Westphalian paradigm. A case will be made in the final section of this chapter that, in 1989, the awareness of anomaly had lasted long enough and penetrated deep enough to make it clear that the Westphalian paradigm was in a Kuhnian state of “crisis”. The “fundamental tenets” (Kuhn, 1996:163) of the field were now once more at issue.

The picture it presented of the outside world, but also the world’s reflection in the language of Westphalia, was distorted. Therefore, Westphalia as a model of international relations had become largely redundant. The year 1989, as has been observed before, became a “symbol of historic ruptures

that have been felt everywhere” (Walker, 1993:2).

To prepare the ground for this appraisal of Kuhn’s theory within the context of International Relations, an assessment will firstly be made of the broader impact of Thomas Kuhn’s theory outside of the realm of the physical sciences. It must be established what the relevance of Kuhn’s theory has been for the social sciences in general.

3.3 **The relevance of Thomas Kuhn’s views on change for the social sciences**

The question of whether or not Kuhn’s theory and his views on change can be transferred and made applicable within the realm of the social sciences is highly contested. Some scientists argue that using Kuhn’s theory (which was originally written within the context of the physical sciences) is not even applicable as a template in the biological sciences.

These scientists note that “knowledge about the circulatory system, for example, from the Renaissance through the nineteenth century to today, has been more cumulative than in the physical sciences: there are abiding truths about the operation and treatment of the human heart” (Siegel, 1996).

This philosophical exchange widened to the extent that so-called “science wars” (Babich, 2003:100) ensued with leading scientists accusing theoreticians such as Kuhn of being part of a conspiracy to discredit the scientific method, rationality and truth (see Rorty, 1999:176; Waters, 2001:138).

Applying Kuhn's theory in the social sciences is challenging. Schram contends that:

regardless of the fact that both natural and social science are forms of learning in context that produce value-laden facts, social life, as opposed to the objects of natural scientific enquiry, involves multiple interpretive lenses offering a cacophony of competing perspectives emanating from its origins in conscious, thinking human beings (Schram, 2003:847).

Explaining this further, McSweeney (1999:105) remarks that the social order is inherently unstable in respect of any attempt of the professional observer to capture it in a model capable of natural scientific procedures of analysis. This is not merely the consequence of data complexity, or the intrusion of values into the research process, or the so-called 'saturation' of facts by theoretical assumptions. The problem lies in the nature of the irreducible unit of the social order itself – social action – the constitution of which makes it impossible to detach theorist from action, explanation from what is to be explained, structural components from structured.

However, in this thesis a case is made for the applicability of Kuhn's theory to the social sciences in general, and, subsequently, to International Relations specifically. There is concurrence with Tresch (2001:302) who maintains that Kuhn's theory can be "productively extended" to other areas of research, also in the social sciences (also see Olsen *et al.*, 1992). A number of arguments are submitted in support of this position.

George Sarton is generally viewed as the founding father of the discipline of

history of science in the United States (Anon., 2005e: also see Kuhn, 1977:148). Following in the tradition of Sir Francis Bacon and Auguste Comte, Sarton asserted that “the acquisition and systematisation of positive knowledge are the only human activities which are truly cumulative and progressive”, and, furthermore, that “progress has no definite and unquestionable meaning in other fields than the field of science” (Sarton, 1927:3-4).

Kuhn dispels this argument with a theory that raises awareness of the fact that “science is fundamentally a social undertaking” (Conant & Haugeland, 2000:3). He rebukes Sarton and says that, despite Sarton’s immense contribution to the field of history of science, “the image of their speciality which he [Sarton] propagated continues to do much damage even though it has long since been rejected” (Kuhn, 1977:148).

Kuhn refuses to acknowledge that the natural sciences enjoy a special relationship to reality. Indeed, Kuhn asserts that he doubts whether practitioners of the natural sciences possess firmer or more permanent answers to questions related to the nature of legitimate scientific problems and methods than their colleagues in the social sciences (Kuhn, 1996:x).

This view is echoed by Mittelman (2002a:10) who declares that “(t)here is nothing ... to prevent joining Kuhn’s insight about theoretical innovation with a broader analysis of social conditions”. Nordgren (1996) believes that the “explanatory strength of this view of scientific discovery is due to the fact that it originates in the social sciences as Kuhn acknowledged was the source of his first insights” (also see Kuhn, 1996:viii). If, as Kuhn (1996:4)

contends, history and sociology form an integral part of the basis of the scientific undertaking, then the natural and the social sciences are, in fact, much closer to each other than many would have us believe.

In his work “Science and Human Values”, first published in 1956, Bronowski similarly asserts that science, whether practical or theoretical, is an imaginative act on par with the arts. Both involve leaps of imagination, and both take as their goal the search to find meaning in our experience. Both do so by exploration of hidden likenesses. In fact, he says, there is no distinction between science and poetry - both are aspects of a single creativity. Science, Bronowski concludes, “is as integral to our culture as the arts” (Bronowski, 1990:73).

Innovation, creativity, determination, imagination – clearly all social traits – drove individuals such as Copernicus to make stunning scientific breakthroughs. All these individuals were finely attuned to the “essential tension” (Kuhn, 1996:79) present in the scientific endeavour. Giving further credence to this view, Hung (2001:289) maintains that Kuhn’s paradigms are generic theories, with applicability in areas other than the physical sciences (also see Tresch, 2001:302).

This “transformation of the scientific imagination” (Kuhn, 1996:6), shows up especially in times of trouble, with the potential for more or less radical change. It is only because individuals working in a common research tradition are able to arrive at differing judgements concerning the degree of seriousness of the various difficulties they collectively face that some of them will be moved individually to explore alternative (often – as Kuhn

likes to emphasise – seemingly nonsensical) possibilities. At the same time, however, others will continue to attempt doggedly to resolve the problems within the parameters of the existing paradigm.

The fact that the latter are in the majority when such difficulties arise is essential to the fertility of scientific practice. For, usually, the problems can be resolved, and eventually are. In the absence of the requisite persistence to find those solutions, scientists would not be able to home-in, as they do, on those rarer, but crucial, cases in which efforts to introduce radical conceptual revision are fully repaid (Conant & Haugeland, 2000:3).

3.3.1 **Kuhn's contribution as a social scientist**

The first reason that is consequently put forward to support the notion that Thomas Kuhn's theory can be applied in the social sciences is the contention that Kuhn's principal academic contribution was as a social scientist.

Kuhn acknowledged that theoretical physics was his area of expertise (Kuhn, 1977:3). Despite this acknowledgement, he was a historian of science, rather than a science practitioner. "The Structure of Scientific Revolutions" was a landmark study focusing on "the historical record of the research activity itself" (Kuhn, 1996:1).

Although Kuhn's book was about science it was not a scientific document in the narrow sense of the word. Olsen *et al.* (1992) observe that Kuhn derived the idea of paradigms from the fields of history and literature and applied it to science, demonstrating the extent to which scientific thinking is

influenced by non-scientific beliefs and values.

3.3.2 **The centrality of language in Kuhn's theory**

A second reason for arguing for the use of Kuhn's theory is the centrality of the issue of language in Kuhn's theory. While language is associated more with the social- than with the physical sciences, language, ultimately, is the medium through which knowledge-seekers convey their findings. The practitioners of the physical sciences are faced therefore with the same limitations of language than are their counterparts in the social sciences – they do not practice science on a higher plane.

Masterman, referring to the physical sciences, remarks that “the evident fact is that the scientist working in a new science is constructing and extending a crude analogy *by using speech*, with or without the help of mechanical apparatus or of mathematics” (Masterman, 1970:81 – italics in original). Metaphors, analogies and models are a crucial aspect of theory formation, even in the most rigorous sciences. They assist in conceptual clarification and the development of systems of classification.

It may therefore well be, Walker (1993:97) remarks, that much of what we understand to be scientific analysis has been articulated within a realm where “the dangers of misanalogy” or “the slippages in meaning” are ever present. In this sense, Walker (1993:97) continues, there is no distinction between the realms of science and that of the humanities. Scientists in the natural sciences are “locked in language” (Loriaux, 2004) to the same extent than their counterparts in the social sciences.

3.3.3 **Kuhn as facilitator of an understanding of social change**

Thirdly, and to reiterate a point made in Chapter One, Thomas Kuhn is relevant for the social sciences because he provides an entry point for engaging the concept of “change”. Moreover, his theory facilitates attempts to capture and explore periods of momentous social change (such as the one which commenced in 1989). In doing so, it reasserts the utility of his theory in the context of the social sciences. Kuhn allows us to see that social change does not respect the boundaries of disciplines and the tidy boxes that social scientists have tried to squeeze their subject matter into.

Culture, politics and other social factors interlace with economic factors to produce and reproduce diverse forms of inequalities, major social divisions and conflicts. Kuhn points the way to an answer to the often-stated assertion that, if the social sciences are to retain and extend their relevance in the twenty-first century, there can be little doubt that they will have to contribute towards an understanding of social change (Goldblatt & Woodward, 2000:vii).

3.3.4 **The “Kuhnianization” of the social sciences**

Finally, the utility of Kuhn’s theory is illustrated by the phenomenon where all of the social sciences, and all of the learned professions, have by now gone through a process of “Kuhnianization” (Rorty, 1999:181; also see Hoyningen-Huene, 1993:xx).

This process has been marked by an increasing willingness to admit that

there is no single model for good work in an academic discipline, that the criteria for good work have changed throughout the course of history, and probably will continue to change. An increasing number of International Relations scholars are therefore turning to Thomas Kuhn in an effort to better understand their own field of study (Schmidt, 2002:9).

Rorty's remarks furthermore support views expressed in Chapter Two, where mention was made that a growing number of International Relations scholars "have signed on to a movement to challenge the dominance of positivistic research and its approach to the making of political knowledge (Schram, 2003:835).

These scholars have joined the ranks of noted academics such as R.B.J Walker who has developed a sceptical stance on understanding 'world politics' through the categories of modern theories of 'international relations' (Walker, 1993:ix). Sound academic work does not have to fit into the paradigmatic box provided by the Westphalian paradigm to be relevant or topical. Within the larger framework of critical theory, approaches such as constructivism are gaining more prominence and are transforming themselves from being "rebel sons" to being respected members of the "House of IR" (Agathangelou & Ling, 2004a:28).

We turn now to the relevance of Thomas Kuhn for International Relations. It will be argued that Kuhn's ideas can be successfully extended to the discipline of International Relations, and that it yields insights into contemporary International Relations questions that few other theories do.

3.4 The relevance of Thomas Kuhn's views on change for international relations

We commence with thoughts on the contemporary process, colloquially called “global change”, and to the shifts associated with this. At the outset one should take note of Rosenau’s warning that “(t)he raw premise that change is under way offers no guidelines as to where to look for it and how to appraise it” (Rosenau, 1990:69). Disassembling, engaging and positioning the concept is therefore of the essence.

As hinted in Chapter One, global change has proven to be complicated – “... impossible to predict, impossible to understand, impossible to control: constantly on the move, it challenges perceptions and impressions” (Vale, 2003:13; also see Rosenau, 1990:5). “The swift succession of events is already enough to induce vertigo, even among journalists, policy-advisors and other mediators of the moment.” (Walker, 1993.)

In Chapter Two, critical theory provided us with the insight that perspectives of “reality” are both time-bound and purpose-bound. These perspectives reflect a “reality” which serves specific interests within a specific historical context. Constructivism reveals that this “reality” is created through human action; not uncovered like some kind of natural phenomenon. It is an ideational structure in which interests and identities are purposefully crafted in specific ways.

Using the insights provided by critical theory and constructivism, the search for a deeper understanding of global change must probe the ideas that first

conceived, then helped to form, the construction of a particular social configuration at the international level. This points back in history to the signing of the Treaty of Westphalia (see Harbutt, 2002:398). Using “the form of organization offered to politics by the experience of Westphalia”, a state-centric configuration established itself as a “naturally occurring reality” (Vale, 2003:29).

Commenting on the linkage of ‘nation’ and ‘state’ in this process, Shaw remarks that:

in the early post-war decades ... world order could only be conceived in terms of the international. In a world of nation-states, internationality represented the relations between units and actors under this single, simple rubric. The inter-national, of course, meant inter-state, since states were mostly assumed, by definition, to represent ‘their’ nations. The relationship between state and nation was unproblematic, indeed symbiotic (Shaw, 2000a).

Lawson explains this further by maintaining that “the particular historical achievement of Westphalia was not only to put into practice what Hobbes and others had theorized in terms of the sovereign state ... but to set in train the development of a *system* of states” (Lawson, 2002c:209-210 – italics in original). As states increasingly took the form of nation-states, people came to refer to ‘international’ as well as inter-state relations and frequently described the Westphalian order as the ‘international system’ (Scholte, 2001:20).

Phrased somewhat differently, “states came to partition the entire globe into

separate politics with ‘the international’ being constituted only in the relations between sovereign states – and with no empty space between them” (Jarvis & Paolini, 1995:4). Population, territory, authority and recognition were combined into a single, unproblematic actor: the sovereign nation-state. The nation-state offered a powerful conceptual and political vehicle around which the reorganisation of social relations would take place.

The nation-state became the “dominant organizational paradigm in international politics” (Vale, 2003:11) or the “terminal entity” in international relations (Rosenau, 2002:23). By the end of the 20th century, the idea of the nation-state and a world geography defined by national boundaries had evolved to a position of conceptual dominance, as had principles of international relations built upon them (March & Olsen, 1998).

The holding power of this state-centric idea on the discipline of International Relations was substantial and this hold increased over time. Knowing what “the world is like” - as Kuhn (1996:5) has put it - was based on knowledge generated from within this paradigm. This knowledge formed the basis and the foundation not only for practising International Relations, but also dictated a worldview – an ontological lens through which international relations was perceived. Watkins observes that “it is in the nature of a paradigm to enjoy a monopoly in its hold on ... thinking” (Watkins, 1970:34).

This configuration, manifesting itself over the past forty years as the well-known East-West standoff or Cold War era provided the blueprint for the development of International Relations into Kuhn’s “mature science”. The

Westphalian paradigm guided thinking, shaped views and provided successive generations with the language or the “conceptual boxes” with which to interpret and explain the world of international relations. As is the case in a period of “normal science”, the state-centric paradigm was taken for granted.

The course, as well as the discourse, of international relations was cast in the frame of Westphalia. The language of Westphalia became the language of International Relations – insightful in light of the statement by Putnam (1990:28) that “elements of what we call ‘language’ or ‘mind’ penetrate so deeply into reality that the very project of representing ourselves as being ‘mappers’ of something ‘language-independent’ is fatally compromised from the start”.

Huntington gives a good synopsis of the content of this paradigm as it manifested in practice. He explicates that:

(t)he world was divided between one group of relatively wealthy and mostly democratic societies, led by the United States, engaged in a pervasive ideological, political, economic, and, at times, military conflict with another group of somewhat poorer, communist societies led by the Soviet Union. Much of this conflict occurred in the Third World outside of these two camps, composed of countries which often were poor, lacked political stability, were recently independent and claimed to be non-aligned. The Cold War paradigm could not account for everything that went on in world politics. There were many anomalies, to use Kuhn’s term, and at times the paradigm blinded scholars and statesmen to major developments, such as the Sino-Soviet split. Yet as a simple model of global politics, it accounted for

more important phenomena than any of its rivals; it was an indispensable starting point for thinking about international affairs; it came to be almost universally accepted; and it shaped thinking about world politics for two generations (Huntington, 1993:186-187).

From the opposite perspective, Rob Walker, addressing the intellectual side of the equation, makes the point that the very practices of international relations thinking excluded important questions about the possibility of change in international relations.

Walker argues that:

modern theories of international relations ...systematically reify a historically specific spatial ontology, a sharp delineation of here and there, a discourse that both expresses and constantly affirms the presence and absence of political life inside and outside the modern state as the only ground on which structural necessities can be understood and new realms of freedom and history can be revealed (Walker, 1993:ix).

The nation-state is elevated as the “precondition for politics” (Shaw, 2004:11) and, with the passing of time, the original source of this idea is lost in the celebration of a variety of empiricist and positivist epistemologies. Walker (1993:12) ventures that there is “a systematic forgetting of the conditions under which [international relations] has been able to sustain both its knowledge claims and its ideological reach”.

This “politics of forgetting” (Walker, 1993:159), however, has far-reaching implications. It structures research in ways that then operate to perpetuate

the political order whose construction and history is lost in tales of the scientific analysis of eternal patterns and returning tragedies. Once “highly controversial claims” have now been turned into “unproblematic assertions” (Walker, 1993:180).

The possibilities of thinking and acting politically are closed off by the practices of statecraft that operate in terms of the self-understandings perpetuated by mainstream International Relations thinking (see Shaw, 2000a). This process represented a sense of “Westphalian closure” (Vale, 2003:46) – it “confirmed lines of demarcation by establishing boundaries that in succession marked sovereignty and marked out the state” (Vale, 2003:46).

Shaw (2000a) comes to the conclusion that “the discipline of International Relations, much more than the core social sciences, was a Cold War product: it represented the bifurcation of superpowers and blocs rather than the burgeoning global relations that underlay them”. Agnew (1998:51) similarly makes clear that international relations theory has often found itself in a “territorial trap” where assumptions of states as fixed units of sovereign space, of a polarity between domestic and foreign affairs, and of states as the ‘containers’ of societies, constrain theorising because of the limits that boundaries imply.

As far as International Relations is concerned, there is disagreement with authors such as Reagan (1967:1385) who contend that the social sciences “are in what Kuhn might call a ‘pre-paradigm’ stage of development in which consensus has yet to emerge on basic concepts and theoretical

assumptions”. The counter-argument is made that Westphalian-type International Relations, especially in terms of its ontological points of departure, represented a fully-fledged paradigm, having grown out of “international law, diplomatic history, the peace movement, moral philosophy, geography and anthropology” (Schmidt, 2002:6). The Westphalian paradigm came to resemble the “consensus view” on international relations as Weinberg called it earlier in this chapter.

According to Holsti (1995:5), the Westphalian paradigm or “dominant model of international relations” was constructed on five core premises. These included the conviction that:

- the proper domain of study of International Relations comprised the causes of war and the conditions for peace, security and order;
- nation-states operated in a system characterised by anarchy, understood as the absence of any overarching authority in the international sphere. In this “self-help” system conflict is therefore not an aberration, but the natural state of affairs;
- the focus of International Relations should be geographically-based groups as the central actors in the international system. Since the signing of the Treaty of Westphalia, the nation-state emerged as the dominant unit of analysis;
- nation-states act rationally and are guided by the logic of the “national interest”, usually defined in terms of survival, security, power and relative capabilities; and

- the nation-state can be conceptualised as a unitary actor. Because the central problems for nation-states are starkly defined by the nature of the international system, their actions are primarily a response to external rather than domestic political forces (Holsti, 1995:4-5).

Following from this, the thesis similarly asserts that the view of International Relations as a “multi-paradigm science” (Masterman, 1970:74) or of the so-called “inter-paradigm debate” (Smith, 2001:225) in International Relations is questionable. It is rather argued that the Westphalian paradigm, directly or indirectly, set the parameters for both intellectual and practical engagement with international relations.

Smith (1996:11), for example, explains that the inter-paradigm debate, involving realism, pluralism and globalism/structuralism, was indeed very narrow. He contends that it offered “three versions of one world, rather than three genuine alternative views of international relations” (Smith, 1996:11). Biswas similarly contends that these three approaches were all profoundly influenced by the state-centric view of international relations (Biswas, 2002:177). These approaches could perhaps be better understood as “alternative theories within a common paradigm and not as separate paradigms” (Nicholson, 1992) or as examples of Kuhnian “speciation” as Conant and Haugeland (2000:3) describe it.

Further explaining the dominant position of the Westphalian paradigm, Walt (1998:30) asserts that “(r)ealism emphasizes the enduring propensity for conflict between states; liberalism identifies several ways to mitigate these conflictive tendencies; and the radical tradition describes how the entire

system of state relations might be transformed”.

Caporaso (2000:2) adds that “(e)ven studies of dependency ... use the nation-state along with a heavily idealized notion of an autonomous national economy as counterfactual reference points”. Holm and Sorensen (1995:1) conclude that “(t)he usefulness of the realist, liberalist, and Marxist paradigms appears to have decreased significantly”.

However, and even before 1989, cracks started to appear in the Westphalian edifice. There were “anomalies” or “violations of expectation” as Kuhn described them (also see Holm & Sorensen, 1995:1). During the course of the 1980s the discipline of International Relations already “had its foundations severely shaken” (Lawson, 2002b:4). Kal Holsti believed that international relations theory was “in a state of disarray” as a result of challenges which had broken down “a three-centuries long intellectual consensus” concerning international relations (Holsti, 1987:1-2).

There was no longer a fundamental consensus in the discipline of International Relations. New conceptions and images of the world, and how it works, had arisen (Holsti, 1987:1-2). It was clear that a period of “normal science” in International Relations was drawing to a close as there was a “persistent failure of the puzzles of normal science to come out as they should” (Kuhn, 1996:68). Finally, the year 1989 represented the effective collapse of the Westphalian paradigm under the weight of its inadequacies.

Accepted political processes and long-held political agendas appeared overtaken by new concerns that, it seemed, no longer accepted the view that

the state was the centrepiece of international society. Against the background of globalisation, and seen through the combined lenses of sovereignty, security and identity, the nation-state no longer seemed able to provide answers to the key questions of international relations. Phrases such as “the end of the nation-state” (Ohmae, 1995), “the retreat of the state” (Strange, 1996), and “the decline of the state” (Van Crefeld, 1999) abounded.

It is, however, important to keep in mind Kuhn’s statement that anomaly appears only against the background provided by the paradigm – in this case the Westphalian model. This framework which had supplied both fundamental assumptions about the world (or a worldview) as well as the language to interpret and explain the world with, was now finally proving to be inadequate. The time when the paradigm “could be taken for granted” had passed. Vale (2004:240) contends that “those near-Archimedean beacons of surety and security in Cold War International Relations – East and West – were suddenly without anchorage”.

A quickly unfolding situation, which could not be explained in terms of the existing paradigm, precipitated a crisis. In Kuhnian terms a situation arose which altered “the historical perspective of the community that experienced it” (Kuhn, 1996:xi). Put differently, the inevitability of a paradigm shift (both in theory and in practice) was clear. This assertion takes us back to the second key question posed in Chapter One: How does one make sense of the ongoing ontological rifts which persist in both the theory and practice of international relations since the end of the Cold War?

3.5 Making sense of International Relations’ and international relations’ ontological battles

McSweeney (1999:201) contends that “the science of the international” has been under sustained attack since the middle of the 1980s – not simply by peaceniks and utopians on ethical grounds alone, but by scholars rigorously examining the assumptions and claims of the Westphalian paradigm and exposing its inadequacies. This sustained attack led, in 1989, to a paradigmatic crisis in international relations and to the onset of a paradigm shift. At that stage, the fit between the Westphalian paradigm and swiftly unfolding developments in international relations became incongruous.

The answer to the question posed above, this study argues, is that international relations is still in the midst of this paradigm shift in both a real and a theoretical sense. Describing this differently, Murphy (1996:110) refers to disjunctions between the political organisation of territory and the geography of economic, social and political life that are shaking the territorial assumptions of the post World War II world at its foundations. International relations has entered an interregnum between the old and the new. We are deeply immersed in a transformation likely to foster a new worldview about the essential nature of human affairs, a new way of thinking about how international relations unfold.

Solovyov asserts that:

the transitional process that is underway now in the sphere of international relations is going beyond the customary stereotype of shaping the “post-

Yalta” or “post-Potsdam” world order. In my opinion, there are all grounds now to speak of the shaping of a system of international relations that is fundamentally new in its substance, the post-Westphalia system (Solovyov, 2002).

The world is moving through a period which Heilbroner (1995:85-86) describes as a “transformational boom” of the kind that arises “when socio-economic maps change their configurations”. Contemporary international society is straddling the threshold of a widening cleft in history. Lawson (2002b:3) points out that the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 was a defining moment “that continues to define the present period”.

In this paradigm shift, social forces are, “almost by themselves”, shaping the future (Mercer, 1998:6) and the outcome of this process is yet to be determined (also see Holton, 1998:3). Rosenau & Durfee (1995:31) remind us that, in this paradigm shift, “international” matters are no longer the dominant dimension of global life. Various other dimensions have emerged which fundamentally challenge or offset the interactions between nation-states. The unfinished character of the global revolution, Shaw (2000b) argues, goes a long way to explain the many, often conflicting trends, associated with globalisation.

When discussing the issue of change, timescales unavoidably come into play. To support the argument that a paradigm shift in international relations is underway, keeping in mind that sixteen years have elapsed since the fall of the Berlin Wall, mention should be made that Kuhn himself acknowledges that paradigm shifts do not take place overnight (Kuhn,

1996:7). He admits that “considerable time elapses between the first consciousness of breakdown and the emergence of a new paradigm” (Kuhn, 1996:86; also see Nye, 1997:193).

According to Healy (1996) this process can take up to twenty years, more or less the lifespan of a scientific generation. “Frameworks must be lived with and explored before they can be broken” (Kuhn, 1970a:242). Against the background of Fernand Braudel’s idea of the “*longue durée*” (1995:34) the period since 1989 is merely a “thin wedge of change” as Caporaso (2000:14) describes it.

It is, therefore, plausible that a paradigm shift in international relations is still underway as it “takes time to redraw maps” and “to re-imagine geography” (Horsman & Marshall, 1995:63; also see Dalby, 1996:29). “A post-Westphalia world is *not yet*, although the dynamics of behavioural and linguistic subversion are eroding Westphalia foundations” (Falk, 2002:155 – italics in original). Falk (2002:155) furthermore asserts that “(i)n some genuine sense, the Westphalia world no longer exists, but neither has a post-Westphalia world been brought into being”. We are currently experiencing a post-Westphalian dawn (Falk, 2002:156).

3.5.1 **Responses to the paradigm shift in international relations**

As has been argued earlier, a Kuhnian crisis can be equated with the commencement of a paradigm shift in that specific field. The claim that International Relations, and international relations, are in the midst of a paradigm shift can therefore be further supported by explaining recent

developments in terms of Kuhn's characteristics or hallmarks of a period labelled as "the response to crisis".

3.5.1.1 **The blurring of the existing paradigm**

Solovyov (2002), echoing Kuhnian terminology, remarks that "(c)ertainly, the rules of the game laid down in the epoch of bipolar confrontation with its precise demarcation lines and the specifics of theorising about these rules are somewhat behind the realities of the contemporary world and need to be adapted". Without the Westphalian paradigm to frame inquiry and understanding of international relations there is no longer any agreement on what dimensions of international relations are important in the twenty-first century. The discipline of International Relations has, in a sense, thus reverted back to its "prehistory", to a situation *ante* the change from "discourse to discipline" (Farr, 1990:1028).

3.5.1.2 **A division of society into competing camps or parties**

In this period of uncertainty, and under the conditions explained above, there is increasingly a division of society into competing camps or parties. Reich (1998:2) maintains that "faced with the intellectual vacuum caused by the end of the Cold War, it was only natural that scholars in international affairs should grasp for a new organising principle around which to orient their work". The crisis has, in a Kuhnian sense, "evoked alternate candidates for paradigm" (Kuhn, 1996:145).

These alternate paradigms in International Relations take a variety of forms.

Ken Booth (1998c:49-52) identifies nine and labels these contenders as Global Order through Collective Security, the New World Order, Pax Americana, Old World Disorder, a World of Continental Sized Regions, the Clash of Civilizations, New World Disorder, North/South and as World Society. The “War on Terrorism” (Booth & Dunne, 2002a:ix) can definitely also be added to this list.

A comprehensive explanation of each will not be provided here, but the list confirms the existence of at least ten contemporary worldviews of contemporary international relations – all existing simultaneously; each with its devoted followers. Hermann (1998:606) describes adherents to these different paradigms as belonging to different tribes or ontological clans that are very territorial, “sniping at those who come too close and preferring to be with those like them”.

Walt remarks that:

scholarship on international affairs has diversified significantly since the end of the Cold War. Non-American voices are more prominent, a wide range of methods and theories are seen as legitimate, and new issues such as ethnic conflict, the environment, and the future of the state have been placed on the agenda of scholars everywhere. Yet the sense of *déjà vu* is equally striking. Instead of resolving the struggle between competing theoretical traditions, the end of the Cold War has merely launched a new series of debates. Ironically, even as many societies embrace similar ideals of democracy, free markets, and human rights, the scholars who study these developments are more divided than ever (Walt, 1998:35).

Paradigm proliferation in International Relations has been the order of the day. Academics and policy-making elites have energetically been regrouping, propagating the cause and the virtues of the various paradigmatic contenders. The practitioners of International Relations either remain ensconced in their own paradigmatic worlds or energetically criticise one or more of the other emerging “worlds” outlined before.

3.5.1.3 **Tension between apparently incommensurable schools of thought**

Recent debates in International Relations (and in international relations) have often displayed this “talking-through-each-other that regularly characterizes discourse between participants in incommensurable points of view” (Kuhn, 1970:232). International Relations seems to have returned to the pre-paradigm state with a number of distinct but incommensurable views of seeing the world competing for supremacy. Saunders alludes to this problem when he remarks that “(t)he inadequacy of the old paradigm in the face of new ... challenges means that fundamental principles ... become open questions” (Saunders, 1999).

In the context of International Relations, this tension exists between adherents to the existing paradigm (who still believe that the Westphalian model can satisfactorily provide the answers) and adherents to various new paradigms, as well as amongst the proponents of the various new schools. This is a tussle between the “para-keepers” and the “para-makers”, as Mittelman (2002a:2) calls these groupings, but also between the various “para-makers” .

The first group, is still trying to “save the theory” (Heterick Jnr., 1990) and posit that “the system of state sovereignty is resilient and remains the dominant structure in the world” (Mittelman, 2002a:6). In this contest the adherents to the old paradigm remain fully committed to the Westphalian paradigm while followers of the various new paradigms are, likewise, fully committed to their newly acquired points of view.

This trend allows, for example, Huntington’s theory of a “Clash of Civilizations (Huntington, 1996:13), to exist simultaneously with Francis Fukuyama’s theory of “The End of History” (Fukuyama, (1992:ix) - the latter which Ken Booth equates with a “New World Order” approach (Booth, 1998c:49). One theory foresees a future of polarisation; the other posits that international relations will increasingly move towards homogenisation. Both exist side-by-side within the paradigm shift in international relations; each has their ardent followers.

3.5.1.4 **A return to a situation akin to the “pre-paradigm” state**

In this period of “intellectual ferment” (Dalby, 1996:30), each camp or party endeavours to fit reality to its own view of the world as they live in different worlds. As Kuhn has noted, these groups do “*in some sense* live in different worlds” (Kuhn, 1996:193 – italics in original). “The subject’s means of understanding the world, instead of being an unproblematic causal relation between stimuli and perceptions, is theorized as a transformation of stimuli into sensations (“seeing-*as*”) according to the similarity and difference relations shared by members of a perceptual community.” (Tresch, 2001:304).

3.5.1.5 **The absence of a shared body of theory and methodology**

Under these new conditions, research is arduous (similar to that in the pre-paradigm phase) because there is an absence of at least some implicit body of intertwined theoretical and methodological belief that permits selection, evaluation, and criticism and which is universally accepted. The sense of being without direction or of being in search of a “new agenda” is typical of the discipline of International Relations in a contemporary sense.

Brown (1992:1) underlines this dilemma in International Relations when he states that “(t)here are virtually no neutral descriptive terms ... and each writer is more or less obliged to re-invent the subject matter from scratch or to risk serious misunderstanding”. The field of International Relations currently appears to be more of an “administrative holding company” than an “intellectually coherent area of inquiry or a community of scholars” (Hermann, 1998:606). International Relations, Kegley Jr., 2002:62) comments, appears to be in a state of “paradigmatic disarray”.

In an academic sense, there therefore continues to be a number of apparently incommensurable International Relations paradigms - “proto-paradigms” according to Mittelman (2002a:24) - that are vying for supremacy within the post-Westphalian context. Thomas (2001) states that these paradigms are based on different competing underlying assumptions about human nature, society, and the reasons or causes of human action. The different perspectives of international relations are rooted in different basic assumptions about humankind and about the world.

Similar to academics and policy-makers, the citizens of the globe are engaged in an ongoing struggle to make sense of, and to adequately respond to, a world which has changed irrevocably - and which continues to do so almost daily. To use the cliché, change, not continuity, is the constant in today's world.

Raising concern, however, is the perception that the inhabitants of the globe increasingly seem to be living in parallel dimensions, with those in the one having a radically different view of a world in the throes of globalisation from that of the other. The discourse between the two resembles a Kuhnian sense of "incommensurability" and the dire consequences of this are highlighted in Chapters Seven and Eight.

In summation, the crisis of the Westphalian paradigm has witnessed (in an ontological sense) the appearance of a number of apparently incommensurable approaches in International Relations and of apparently incommensurable worlds in international relations. Nef (1999:5) remarks that "(o)ur inability to structure paradigms to explain the present crisis as part of a global system and process ... is precisely at the core of the crisis of paradigms".

As far as this thesis is concerned, no specific choice is made in favour of any one of the various and contending "proto-paradigms" (Mittelman, 2002a:24). Rosenau and Durfee's idea of a "turbulence paradigm" (Rosenau & Durfee, 1995:33), however, succinctly explains the dynamics inherent to the paradigm shift itself. They describe the "turbulence paradigm" as a situation in which the fundamental patterns that normally bind and sustain

the continuities of international life are overcome by high degrees of complexity and dynamism.

This implies that, when the number, density, interdependencies, and volatility of the actors occupying the global stage undergo substantial expansion, international relations are viewed as having entered a period of turbulence (Rosenau & Durfee, 1995:34). The concept of the turbulence paradigm is used as the basis for the Access World/Denial World construct, which will be developed in Chapter Seven.

3.6 **Conclusion**

Thomas Kuhn is difficult to label, being both a “philosophically-minded historian and historically-minded philosopher of science” (Watkins, 1970:25). Chapter Three endeavoured to shed more light on Kuhn’s theory, especially the way in which it addresses the issue of change. The extent to which his views contribute to an understanding of change were investigated, in both the contexts of the social sciences generally, and of International Relations specifically.

In search of an explanation for the ongoing ontological struggles in both the theory and the practice of international relations, the conclusion is that international relations finds itself in the midst of a Kuhnian paradigm shift. A new international relations has not yet emerged – at best it can be asserted that a new paradigm is in its “formative stages” (Stremlau, 1999:64) or that it is “being born” (Attali, 1991:3).

Worldviews, as an integral part of paradigms, are “extremely encompassing in content and pervasive in adherence” (Olsen *et al.*, 1992); also see Vale, 2003:30). Kuhn, however, explains that, once a paradigm shift is underway, the old paradigm (and its worldview) has effectively been eclipsed. Ontologically, and in the context of international relations, this points to the Westphalian paradigm (seeing international relations in a state-centric way) becoming more and more irrelevant. After the fall of the Berlin Wall it was clear that the Westphalian or state-centric paradigm had “lost its explanatory relevance” (Herd & Weber, 2001). The Westphalian paradigm’s conceptual vocabulary was also not spared and Chapter Three highlighted this aspect

In an effort to describe this double failing, some observers coined the term “Westfailure” (McGrew, 2000:164) - although this term may be too strong. Using another pun, the term “Westflailia” may be more appropriate. Despite its limitations, it nevertheless conveys the idea that (without the Westphalian paradigm as an ontological anchor) scholars, policymakers and humanity are anxiously casting around for a new and dependable ontological framework that could guide their engagement with the world of international relations.

Chapters Four to Six aims to expose the extent to which the shortcomings of the Westphalian paradigm affected its concepts. These three chapters intend to highlight the anomalies arising with regard to three of these – security, sovereignty and identity - that came to be closely associated with this paradigm. In a broader sense the three chapters aim to illustrate that the key anomaly which arose within “(s)tate centric Westphalia” in an era of globalisation has been its “neglect of the whole, according primacy to the parts” (Falk, 1995:30).

It the final instance, each chapter investigates how these concepts are, instead, manifesting in new ways. An evaluation is made of the implications of this for international relations.

CHAPTER FOUR

DIMENSIONS OF “WESTFLAILIA”: THE CONCEPT OF SECURITY

4.1 Introduction

The contemporary international relations paradigm is based on the European state-system, a system that can be traced back to the signing of the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648. Ontologically, adherents to this paradigm understand the world as comprising of a multiplicity of sovereign nation-states coexisting in a condition of anarchy; a self-help system in which each is responsible for its own security; each is comforted by the idea of sovereignty; and in which each forges its own identity.

Chapters Four, Five and Six aim to deconstruct these “regimes of social ordering” (Vale, 2003:37). In these three chapters it will be argued that the Westphalian paradigm gave life to these concepts, and that it did so in a way which served specific interests. In a deterministic sense, the Westphalian paradigm provided a historically specific account of the nature, location and possible applications of security, sovereignty and identity.

These chapters will subsequently argue that the events of 1989 exposed a range of weaknesses with regard to each of these concepts – anomalies which are apparently incorrigible and which collectively contributed to the crisis of the Westphalian paradigm.

The point of entry in each chapter will be theoretical. The definition and evolution of each of these concepts will be critically scrutinised, within the framework of Westphalia, and an effort made to point out how aspects of these have become anomalous. The year 1648 will throughout be the point of departure, although some of these terms have a much longer philosophical history.

In the real-world or practical context, each chapter will provide a review of the intractable problems that have emerged in international relations with regard to security, sovereignty and identity. It will be argued that the existing paradigm has been unable to adjust to these, preparing the way for a Kuhnian paradigm shift.

After highlighting the conceptual and operational tensions related to these three concepts respectively, the three chapters will proceed to explain how, in the midst of the period of transformation, each concept manifests, or is being reconstructed, in the contemporary international relations environment.

From the introduction it is again clear that both theoretical and practical perspectives feature concurrently in this study. This aspect has been noted, but has not been clarified. Some remarks on the interplay between or juxtaposition of theory and practice are thus required, especially because the alternating theory/practice pattern emerges distinctly in Chapters Four to Six. What, for example, are the implications of this dual approach? Where does theory feature and where practice? Who represents theory and practice, respectively? For answers to these questions we turn again to Thomas Kuhn

for guidance.

Thomas Kuhn's theory could, in essence, be summarised as consisting of the following elements: paradigm – anomaly – crisis - paradigm shift - new paradigm. If Kuhn states that “the choice of a new theory is a decision to adopt a different native language and to deploy it in a correspondingly different world” (Kuhn, 1970a:277), one may venture that elements integral to the notion of “paradigm shift” are: new theory, new worldview, new vocabulary. This insight provides a useful starting point in the search for answers.

In terms of the representatives of “theory” and “practice”, this study aims to give a picture of the world from three different vantage points. The first of these provide a picture of the world from a practical point of view or from the point of view of humanity. These are the individual human beings who “live international relations instead of studying it” (Higgins, 2004).

Confronted with “global turbulence” (Rosenau, 1990:7) and with ongoing change at an ever-quicken pace, the planet's inhabitants - humanity – are being forced to view the world through new eyes or to “reconstruct the world(s) in which they live” (Walker, 1993:154). The constructed reality of the Westphalian paradigm no longer provides answers to the questions international relations pose. From this practical vantage point, it is argued, the paradigm shift therefore mainly concerns a new worldview.

The study, however, also reflects on the world from a theoretical vantage point. In this case the representatives referred to earlier include the academic

and policymaking fraternities respectively. These groups, although being part of international relations in the “real-world” sense (see Fierke, 2002:138; Holton, 1998:23), also engage international relations theoretically.

They are (or should be) concerned with the “new theory” and “new vocabulary” angles of international relations, in addition to that of a “new worldview”. But where does theory feature in this study, and where practice? What are its relative weights in the various chapters?

Whereas Chapters Two and Three were more concerned with theory, and with change in relation to the discipline of International Relations, Chapters Four to Six will highlight both theoretical and practical aspects related to the concepts of security, sovereignty and identity. In Chapter Seven the focus will remain on theory, with the elaboration of the concepts of Access World and Denial World and of the theoretical interaction between them.

Chapter Eight sees the pendulum swinging back to practice, to the “real-world”, attempting to answer the question of how humanity perceives, and responds, to “normative and material forces” which have exerted a significant effect on “changes in identity, perceptions of interest, and roles of institutions” (Doyle & Ikenberry, 1997:15).

The focus, in this case, is on international relations and change where the former refers to the practical interaction between actors on the global scene or to the system of international relations as it currently exists. In the concluding chapter, theory and practice converge. The implications of, and

possibilities opened up by change - for humanity, for academics, and for policymakers - are outlined.

As elucidated before, the next section of the chapter will proceed to consider the theoretical anomalies (here with regard to security) that appeared throughout the 1980s, and especially after 1989. It will be argued that these contributed to the current untenable status of the Westphalian paradigm.

4.2 **The concept of security: theoretical anomalies**

Within the Westphalian paradigm, definitions of security were invariably linked to the nation-state. The nation-state was therefore the primary referent of security and “(s)tate goals and state interests ... occupied the top of the security agenda” (Zacarias, 1999:xii). In terms of the security of the individual, Albrow (1996:38) contends that there was a convenient “linkage of the fate of the individual with the fate of the nation-state as a whole”.

Definitions of security were cast in language that referred to the absence of threats, especially of military threats, to the nation-state (Zacarias, 1999:121). Issues threatening security were thus perceived to be almost exclusively military in nature, and were typically situated outside of the borders of the nation-state (Zacarias, 1999:xiv,121). The way to address these threats, situated “outside” in an anarchic international system, was to develop an offensive military capability (Baylis, 2001:257).

Linking the two ideas expounded above, Evans & Newnham (1998:361) contend that there was “an obsession with the war/peace and

military/diplomatic dimensions of international relations and its fixation on the nation-state as key actor". These parameters determined the scope of International Relations as a discipline. Its recruitment by professional theorists and policymakers to their particular interest in modelling and practising international relations gave it a narrow, tangible objectivity that slipped easily into popular understanding. The state was accepted unproblematically as the primary referent of security analysis, and the principal instrument of attaining security was seen as military force.

Within the discipline of International Relations, the concept of security was thus cast within the mould of "national security" or "international security". Zacarias (1999:xii-xiii) explains that these referred to the security of individual nation-states and to the security of nation-states in relation to each other or to the state-system as a whole, respectively. Many derivatives of these two concepts were developed over the years but these could, in essence, be relayed back to one of the two primary conceptualisations of the term.

Kennedy (1991:1) aptly refers to the term "national security" and its sister term "international security". Arguing the same point, Kennedy (1993:130) states that "in a larger and more integrated sense, 'national' security becomes increasingly inseparable from 'international' security". It was only in the 1990s that it became evident that "(i)t is impossible to talk about national security separately from global ... security" (Nef, 1999:105).

International Relations thus studied issues of war and peace, within the military/political sphere and as they related to the nation-state. Subfields of

study such as Security Studies and Strategic Studies evolved from this. The focus was on the delineation of borders, the inscription of dangers and the mobilisation of defences. These disciplines' area of focus unavoidably shrunk. Booth (1996:330) remarks that where International Relations started out with a broad disciplinary agenda, "it had narrowed into the examination of the mini-worlds of military establishments and foreign offices".

Zacarias (1999:xii) supports Booth's argument when he remarks that "(t)he historic epoch and circumstances in which security studies emerged has contributed to the underdevelopment and the narrowness of the concept of security". There was little reflection on the fact that the predominantly military definition of security did not acknowledge that the greatest threats to human survival may not be military, but may be of an environmental, social or economic nature.

As the Westphalian paradigm increasingly became dysfunctional, especially given the tumultuous events of 1989, definitions of security and the approach to security, as set out above, similarly proved to be insufficient and unsustainable. In language which could have been borrowed from Kuhn, McSweeney (1999:1) states that the puzzlement with regard to security issues "sprang from events which followed the ending of the Cold War, which were clearly matters of security, but the facts of which could not be accounted for satisfactorily within the conventional framework".

Authors such as Ohmae, amongst others, started referring to "the myth of national security" (Ohmae, 1990:13). The realisation dawned on both academics and practitioners of international relations that "(w)e are in

political *terra incognita* with few familiar landmarks to guide us” (Drucker, 1990:3 – italic in original; also see Martin, 1999:822). The poverty of traditional notions of the concept of “security” was fully revealed.

This state of affairs has continued since the late 1980s with a general acknowledgement that the concept of security, as traditionally defined, has become inadequate. Buzan (1991a:180) remarks that security has become “a highly dynamic problem of uncertain dimensions” while Prins (1994:2) agrees that there is no “proper focus or issue for analysis within the realm of security”.

As in many other areas of International Relations, the events of 1989 thus acted as a catalyst for debate – a paradigmatic debate which has “become a preoccupation for the past decade” (Tarry, 1999). There was now general recognition that the concept of security should go beyond a military determination of threats. There was, likewise, a conviction that a relevant and viable definition of security should entail a shift away from the state as primary referent of security. Calls were made for new frameworks for thinking about security; “re-visioning security” (Tickner, 1995:175) was what was required.

Williams (2003:512-513) therefore concludes that International Relations has been challenged to consider questions surrounding the “broadening” of its agenda to include threats beyond the narrow rubric of state and military security. Apart from the “broadening” or “widening” (Tarry, 1999) of its agenda, International Relations must also respond to the challenge of “deepening” (Tarry, 1999) its agenda. There is now a need to include the

security concerns of actors ranging from individuals and sub-state groups to global concerns such as the environment. These have often been marginalised within a traditional state-centric and military conception of security.

4.2.1 **The “broadening” of the concept of security**

Authors such as Barry Buzan acknowledge the merits of a broadened concept of security. He states that a notion of security bound to the level of individual states and military issues is “inherently inadequate” (Buzan, 1991a:6). “I seek to demonstrate that a simple-minded concept of security constitutes such a substantial barrier to progress that it might almost be counted as part of the problem.” (Buzan, 1991a:1-2.)

Buzan claims that, as far as security is concerned, human collectivities are now affected by developments in five major areas. He lists these as the military, political, economic, societal, and environmental dimensions (Buzan, 1991a:133). Buzan (1991a:134) concludes that “all of these developments ... point to the centrality of interdependence in security issues”.

In this context Kennedy (1991:5) makes the important observation that, although developments such as global warming and international financial flows, population growth and robotics may seem to have little in common, their collective impact is still considerable. Collectively it breaks down our old distinctions between “national” and “international” - between “Inside” and “Outside” - and our old assumptions about issues that constitute a

potential threat to security. Observers such as Karen Fierke (2002:129) add issues such as migration and human rights to this broadened security agenda.

But apart from attempts to “broaden” the security agenda, calls were also made for the “deepening” thereof. “The deepeners ... ask the question of *whose* security is being threatened and support the construction of a definition that allows for *individual* ... referent objects, as opposed to the state.” (Tarry, 1999.)

4.2.2 **The “widening” of the concept of security**

Whereas traditional security literature focused on the state, calls for the ‘deepening’ of the security agenda shifted attention to “individuals, society, ethnic groups or nations, international institutions or communities and the globe” (Fierke, 2002:129). “Deepeners”, as Tarry (1999) describes them, highlight the need for change insofar as the referent object of security is concerned. The whole debate around “human security” came about as a reaction to traditional conceptions of security and in an effort to replace the state as the primary referent of security.

Caroline Thomas, one of the most prominent writers on human security, defines the concept as “a condition of existence in which basic material needs are met, and in which human dignity, including meaningful participation in the life of the community, can be realised” (Thomas, 2000:6). A perspective on human security in the contemporary era requires us to consider humanity embedded not simply within discrete sovereign states, but within a global social structure (Thomas, 2000:7).

Observers such as Karen Fierke and Caroline Thomas make the point that, when viewed as a commodity, the individual citizen is ultimately the “consumer of security” (Salmon, 1996:14) and his or her needs should therefore be paramount. Explaining this further, Bill McSweeney notes that approaches to security which ignore:

the human dimension is contradicted by the practical dependence of policy-makers and theorists alike on the human individual as the ultimate referent, or subject, of security. Thus the individual is ignored in conceptualising the idea of security at the state level, only to be reinstated as its basic rationale – as it must be – in order to make sense of, and legitimise, the policy derived. Contrary to the orthodox view ... security must make sense at the basic level of the individual human being for it to make sense at the international level (McSweeney, 1999:16).

The challenge of giving new theoretical content to the concept of security, however, still has to be fully met. Even though there has been an acknowledgement that thinking on security should extend beyond the borders of the nation-state and its military concerns, Stoett (1999:vii) contends that global security, a term that promises “some escape from the state-centricity of more limited security preoccupations, remains an embryonic term in need of conceptual nourishment”. Garcia-Segovo de Madero (2003:29) adds that “(s)ome of the original premises and forecasts are today being contested, and the guidelines of a new security world order are still difficult to identify” (also see Shaw, 1995).

Stoett (1999:23) furthermore asserts that “if an expanded concept of security is to be more than an empty rhetorical hull, it must promote analysis of those

contemporary insecurities which affect us all, as individuals and as part of a global ecosystem”. A useful definition of security should lay the basis for movement towards the abatement of insecurity. It should emphasise the prevention of the causes of insecurity, rather than the means to contain its symptoms. Of primary concern here is the kind of insecurity experienced by the bulk of the world’s population, especially in those sectors quantitatively and qualitatively more vulnerable and exposed. These are the security concerns of Denial World, as will be explained in Chapters Seven and Eight.

In concluding this section, it may be useful to see how the thoughts expounded in this section have filtered through to some extent to the practice of international relations. In the report of the UN Secretary-General’s high-level panel on threats, challenges and change, entitled “A more secure world: our shared responsibility”, six clusters of threats are identified which are of concern for the decades ahead. These are:

- war between states;
- violence within states, including civil wars, large-scale human rights abuses and genocide;
- poverty, infectious disease and environmental degradation;
- nuclear, radiological, chemical and biological weapons;
- terrorism; and
- transnational organised crime

(UN, 2004a:2)

Until the late 1980s, a narrow, state-centred, and military-focused definition of security served the needs of a discipline confident in its ability to map the international order objectively and to apply the methods of natural science to the relations between states. In 1989, these certainties were proven to be illusory. There was increasing unanimity that “globalization appears to be generating a new class of security problems in which dispersed processes pose dangers of large magnitude and incalculable probability” (Steinbruner, 2000:196). The UN report of 2004 attests to this realisation and to the realisation that humanity has entered an era of “mutual vulnerability” (UN, 2004b:6), as will be explained later in this chapter.

Following these remarks, the focus remains on the practice of international relations. The next section thus aims to expose the deep-seated security anomalies that have arisen, and that remain, when international relations continues to be viewed through the lens of Westphalia.

4.3 **The concept of security: practical anomalies**

Three “future-shaping influences” powered the Westphalian or state-centric paradigm - especially during the Cold War era (Heilbroner, 1995:13). Heilbroner identify these as science, economics and mass political movements. The events of the Cold War era were integrally connected with technological and scientific advance, which in turn were inextricably intertwined with the momentum of capitalism, which in its own turn was both a powerful source of, and eventually a target for, the popular political will (Heilbroner, 1995:65).

The vision of the future, from the vantage point of this paradigm, and in terms of science, economics and politics as harbingers of change, was one of hopefulness and of a belief in progress. Modernity was anchored in a firm conviction that change would herald a more secure future. Albrow (1996:13) states that a “sense of continual innovation held the age together”.

Hugh De Santis (1996:128) remarks that “even as communism ... heaped scorn on liberalism”, it was “no less committed to the underlying ideology of progress”. Communism, De Santis (1996:127) explains, actually sprang “from the disaffection and disconsolation of exclusion from the culture of progress” and eventually became “the new cathedral of progress for the dispossessed” (De Santis, 1996:128). Although rooted in different ideologies, both liberalism and communism carried with them the “(o)ptimistic idea of inevitable progress in the development of human society” (Lawson, 2002b:6; also see Albrow, 1996:70). Both, Howard (2000:65) argues, claimed “the heritage of the Enlightenment”.

Until 1989, the state-centric security paradigm endured. At its core was a clash between nation-states. The source of insecurity was quarantined, as it were, to the military arena with other sources of insecurity being subsumed within this. In both the East and the West there was still a firm belief in progress – a belief that human intervention, using the nation-state as a vehicle, could bring about increased levels of security.

Following in the positivist tradition of thinkers such as Henri de Saint Simon there was a belief that “progress in science and progress in ethics and politics go together” (Gray, 2003:27) and that “(p)rogress in society is a by-

product of progress in science. As knowledge advances, so does humanity” (Gray, 2003:29). Walker sums it up when he states that there was a perception that development is evolutionary and progressive and that modernity shall indeed be the salvation of mankind (Walker, 1993:4).

In contrast to Thomas Kuhn’s views, denying that an objective reality and ultimate truth exist and that science is gradually approaching it through cumulative progress, there was a firm belief that the rise of science, both natural and social, would disclose the reality of things. However, as the sun began to set on the Westphalian paradigm, three critical paradigmatic anomalies could no longer be suppressed, precipitating a crisis and preparing the way for a paradigm shift.

Before discussing these, it is useful to recall Kuhn using the analogy of a chess game to explain the functioning of a dominant paradigm (Kuhn, 1996:38). In this case, the game pieces, the format of the game board, and the rules of the game are fixed - they are beyond questioning. Making use of this imagery, it can be argued that, whilst the Westphalian paradigm was in place, the meaning of the concept of security was constructed in a very specific way. There were “model problems and solutions” (Kuhn, 1996:x).

In a nutshell this implied that:

- security related to the “security of the nation-state”;
- insecurity emanated from the political/military sphere; and that

- human progress, in the context of modernity, would translate to higher levels of security.

These views proved to be flawed in 1989. To recall ideas explained in Chapter Three, Kuhn notes that “the distinctive character of revolutionary change in language is that it alters not only the criteria by which terms attach to nature but also, massively, the set of objectives or situations to which those terms attach” (Kuhn, 2000a:29-30).

The concept of security, as it applied in relation to the game pieces (nation-states), the format of the game board (the political/military sphere of society) and the rules of the game (the view that progress would lead to increased levels of security), no longer provided credible answers in a fluid and dynamic situation. Globalisation is “changing the rules of the game for all players” (Lachapelle & Paquin, 2003:5). In the domain of security (but also in others) the Westphalian paradigm was confronted with a chess game where the number of game pieces, the format of the game board, and the rules of the game had all simultaneously changed. The implications of change of this magnitude were far-reaching, as will subsequently be explained.

4.3.1 **Changing game pieces**

After 1989, the Westphalian paradigm as a security environment with, as its subtext, nation-states, crumbled. Although the system of nation-states was still intact, voices were being heard which critically questioned the capability of the nation-state to provide security. George Soros argues that

where the assumption was always to view nation-states as pawns on a chessboard, “(w)hat goes on inside the pawns” (Soros, 1998:216), and to this could be added “beyond the pawns”, now seemed to be of overriding importance.

The growth of the Al Qaeda network attest to the inability of the contemporary nation-state to provide security to its citizens and reflect the rise of powerful new actors who diminish the ability of the nation-state to provide security. The next section will highlight this example in greater detail.

4.3.1.1 **The example of Al Qaeda**

In the contemporary international relations environment, the threat to security is often no longer other nation-states, but organizations, such as Al Qaeda, which is not bounded by geography. Gray’s asserts that, operating within the paradigm shift in international relations, Al Qaeda is a by-product of globalisation (Gray, 2003:1). Its most distinctive feature – projecting a privatised form of organised violence worldwide – was impossible in the past (Gray, 2003:1-2).

Threats such as Al Qaeda have hollowed out the concept of sovereignty, as will be argued in the next chapter. Kissinger (2002:31) gives some idea of the dilemma nation-states face with regard to terrorism when he points out that Osama Bin Laden’s base was on the territory of a national state, though his was not a national cause. Highly disciplined operatives were scattered around the globe, some on the soil of America’s closest allies and even

within America itself.

They enjoyed financial and organisational support from a number of countries – most frequently from private individuals ostensibly, not totally, under the control of their governments. Bases for terrorists have been established in several countries, but usually in areas where the governments could plausibly deny control, or were actually not in control, such as in Yemen, Somalia, Indonesia and Iran. Kissinger continues and states that:

(i)n this manner, the international system based on the sovereign nation-state is being transformed by a transnational threat that has to be fought on the sovereign territory of other nations over issues transcending the nation-state. Having no territory to defend, the terrorists are not subject to the deterrent threats of the Cold War; having as their aim the destruction of social cohesion, they are not interested in the conciliating procedures and compromises of traditional diplomacy (Kissinger, 2002:32).

Keohane (2002:80) contends that the attacks on the United States on 11 September 2001 signifies that, in contemporary international relations, informal violence has become globalised, just as formal, state-controlled violence became globalised for the superpowers during the 1950s. Not only are nation-states being confronted with new security challenges – security as an issue seems to have spilled over from the political/military sphere into many other societal spheres as well.

4.3.2 **A changing game board**

The assessment of the threat to security, with as it subtext military

confrontation, is no longer sufficient to meet emerging perils. The new type of security *problematique* is much more complex, varied and nuanced. Kofi Annan refers to “a new and diverse constellation of threats” which has arisen (Annan, 2003:8). Ethnic conflict, cultural diversity, national disintegration and civil war have become paramount. Issues of poverty, trade, finance, health, environment, communications, resource depletion, population, migration, technology, drugs, human rights, and refugees have all become part of the security equation, and the list goes on. This section will expand on change in but one dimension, namely the changing face of war.

4.3.2.1 **The changing face of war**

Focusing on change pertaining to this aspect is important, as, within the realm of security, preparing for- and waging war was one the key responsibilities of the nation-state. The Westphalian paradigm witnessed an era in which “political discourses were driven by war and its making” (Vale, 2003:70). Rosenau and Durfee (1995:40) contend that for more than three centuries the architecture of international relations has been founded on an anarchic system of sovereign nation-states that did not have to answer to any higher authority and that managed their conflicts through accommodation or war.

These ideas are best captured in statements such as those by Walter Lippmann when he asserts that “a nation is secure to the extent to which it is not in danger of having to sacrifice its core values, if it wishes to avoid war, and is able, if challenged, to maintain them by victory in such a war” (Lippmann, 1943:51). War in this instance traditionally referred to inter-state

violence, making use of professional armies equipped with military hardware.

Pointing out the sea-change with regard to the concept of war, a concept which has traditionally been at the heart of international relations, further serves to highlight just how ill-equipped international relations have been to deal with a range of security-related anomalies which have arisen (see Garcia-Segovia de Madero, 2003:30). Today, Howard (2000:102) laconically asserts, Tomahawk cruise missiles may command the air, but it is Kalashnikov sub-machine guns that still rule the ground. Based on more recent developments, it could well be argued that the suicide bomber induces as much fear as the nuclear warhead.

With the signing of the Treaty of Westphalia, the state claimed not only sovereignty, but “a legal monopoly of organized violence, and war between states came to be seen as the model for all types of military conflict” (Gray, 2003:71). From the Napoleonic wars until the collapse of the Soviet Union, the armed conflicts that ravaged Europe and the world were mostly between governments of sovereign states. However, during the last decade of the twentieth century, and in many parts of the world, the state’s monopoly of violence had broken down, further eroding traditional perceptions of security and responses to insecurity.

Weapons of mass destruction were at risk of being wrested from governments’ control and issues such as “nuclear terrorism” and “bio-terrorism” started to enter the security debate. The possibility of a new type of warfare was emerging, unforeseen by prominent theorists such as Carl

von Clausewitz. The world had entered the era of “post- Clausewitzian wars” (Gray, 2003:73) – a milieu in which the nation-state often displays its impotence in the face of new forms of organised violence.

Luke (1994:30) sums it up when he states that “old equations balancing the rational operations of man, the state, and war, as they have been drawn since 1648, are obsolete”. War is no longer a “continuation of policy by other means” (von Clausewitz, 1976:75) – the Clausewitzian link between war and policy has been broken and the result is often violence virtually for its own sake (George, 1992:165).

In the Middle East and the Balkans, Kashmir, Afghanistan and other areas of conflict, not only nation-states and their agents are waging war. Central among the protagonists are “political organizations, irregular militias and fundamentalist networks that are not controlled by any state” (Gray, 2003:72).

According to Lipschutz:

these wars are mostly *intrastate* and *social*, rather than *interstate* and *political*. Today’s wars are mostly between literal neighbours, not neighbouring states; the security dilemma has been domesticated and brought *into* the state (and, in some instances, down to the household level) (Lipschutz, 1995:218 – italics in original).

Wars are now often fought within countries by groups which have social, rather than political bonds. As will be explained in Chapter Six, these bonds

form around “certain shared or acquired characteristics such as appearance, religion, history, origins and language” (Lipschutz, 1995:218). What unites these contemporary social groupings is a reification of the division between the “Self” and the “Other”. James Der Derian (1995:33) asserts that “(t)he desire for security is manifested as a collective resentment of difference – that which is not us, not certain, not predictable”.

Developing the same idea, Mary Kaldor distinguishes between “old wars” fought within the context of the system of nation-states and so-called “new wars” (Kaldor, 2002: 21). The new wars involve transnational networks, which include both state and non-state actors – mercenary groups, warlords, as well as parts of state apparatuses. They are generally held together through shared ideologies, which tend to consist of exclusive claims to power and resources in the name of religion, ethnicity and identity.

These networks provide organising frameworks, through which ideas, money, arms, volunteers and mercenaries are channelled. They flourish in those areas of the world where the authority of states have become negligible as a consequence of the impact of globalisation on formerly closed authoritarian systems. “It is the ‘black holes’ where conflict has a long and bloody history, like Afghanistan, Chechnya, ... Bosnia or Somalia, that provide a focal point for these networks.”(Kaldor, 2002:22).

There is now also much greater awareness of the possibility of conflict arising from environmental stresses of one kind or another. The uneven distribution of natural resources coupled with the problems of pollution and environmental degradation could lead to rivalries over the availability or

distribution of scarce goods. The possibility of so-called “resource wars” (Evans & Newnham, 1998:479) loom ever larger.

Michael Klare (2002:25-26) describes resource wars as conflicts that revolve around the pursuit or possession of “critical materials” which include food supplies, water and sources of energy such as oil or gas fields. According to Klare (2002:25) these confrontations can take the form of internal struggles for control over a particular resource, a territorial dispute over contested border zones, a naval contest over critical waterways, or a regional power struggle in areas holding large supplies of natural resources, such as the Persian Gulf or the Caspian Sea region.

John Gray contends that the Gulf War of 1990 was the first of these resource wars, waged to prevent Kuwaiti and Saudi oil supplies falling out of Western control. He continues to argue that in future these resource wars will be “made more dangerous and intractable by being intertwined with ethnic and religious enmities (Gray, 2003:61).

An argument has been made thus far that, as far as the concept of security is concerned, the game pieces as well as the format of the game board has changed. However, and of crucial importance, the rules of the game no longer seem to be valid and binding, as the next section will contend.

4.3.3 Changes in the rules of the game

Today humanity’s vision of the future, in terms of science, economics and politics as agents of change which are closely linked to the nation-state, is no

longer one of hopefulness and of a belief in progress. According to Rorty (1999:232) there is an “inability to construct a plausible narrative of progress”. This inevitably leads to increased feelings of vulnerability and of insecurity. “The word *progress* has been turned into a curse.” (Waters, 2001:140 – italics in original).

In strands that will again be picked up in Chapter Seven, postmodernity progressively mirrors a sense not of exuberance but of soberness bordering on disillusionment. One observer laments that “the future ain’t what it used to be” (Anon., 2003a; also see Scholte, 2001:21). Grenz (1996:7) describes the prevailing mood well when he contends that postmodernity has witnessed the optimism of the last century being replaced by a “gnawing pessimism”. Giving a name or a label to this phenomenon, Klíma (1999:15) calls it “existential insecurity” or a kind of emptiness.

While there was an assumption in the West over the past two hundred years that knowledge would yield progressive mastery over the world, the world has not increasingly fallen under human control. Robert Heilbroner neatly sums up the prevailing mood when he concludes that “(r)esignation sums up the Distant Past’s vision of the future; hopefulness was that of Yesterday; and apprehension is the dominant mood of Today” (Heilbroner, 1995:69). As far as progress is concerned, a situation prevails in which there is “an absence of clear and legitimate rules of the game” (Nef, 1999:3).

The forces driving change in the contemporary era are the same as the ones which were present in the paradigm from which international relations is emerging.

Heilbroner contends that:

an attribute that links us indissolubly with the period we have left behind ... is the continued presence of the three forces that were the shaping determinants of Yesterday. The empowering gift of science, the relentless dynamic of a capitalist economy, and the spirit of mass politics still constitute the forces leading us into the future (Heilbroner, 1995:70).

This correlates with forces Jorge Nef (1999:6,7,9) identifies as long-range technological changes, changes in the ideological matrix and changes in the economic fabric (also see Hutton, 2001:2).

What now differentiates these forces from the way they had functioned in the Westphalian paradigm is that their intrinsic nature seems to have changed. In a postmodern milieu, they now appear as potentially or even actively malign, as well as benign; both as threatening and supportive, ominous as well as reassuring even in the most favoured nations – that is, the most fully capitalist, science-oriented, and politically democratic. “Indeed, it is precisely in those nations that the vision of the future has been most perceptibly altered.” (Heilbroner, 1995:13.) Kennedy (1991:26) warns that the challenges posed by the forces for change at work in the world today could be profound, unsettling, and perhaps disastrous in the future.

These forces are therefore no longer regarded unambiguously as carriers of progress. Rather, the outlook for the future has turned because negative aspects of those agencies for change – some previously unknown, some seen but largely ignored – are today widely recognised as warranting at least as

much, perhaps even more attention than their undisputed positive effects. We are “more sober about both progress and the future” (Coker, 2002:57).

There is an awareness of this triad of forces in our midst, while newly mindful of their dangerous side- or even direct effects. In a world of dwindling resources, economic inequality and unremitting violence, the belief in endless progress can no longer be sustained.

Goldsmith encapsulates these ideas when he states that:

humanity’s greatest leap forward in material prosperity has resulted in extreme social breakdown, and ... our greatest period of technological and scientific achievement has come to endanger the conditions which allow life on earth (Goldsmith, 1994:176).

These views find a clear echo in Kuhn’s work. Not only are paradigm shifts “non-cumulative developmental episodes” (Kuhn, 1996:92) but the progression from one period of “normal science” to the next does also not imply “progress” in the sense of denoting “a positive value judgement” (Hoyningen-Huene, 1993:182).

In Kuhn’s view, science does not have the ability to point itself in a progressive direction - to make an upward jump towards something “better” – when one paradigm is overturned and another takes its place. Kuhn rejects a view of the history of science as a “*history of progress*, of the ongoing triumph of “reason”, “scientific rationality”, or “the scientific method” (Hoyningen-Huene, 1993:15 – italics in original).

In a statement that again resonates in Kuhn's work, Gray contends that:

(i)f science drives history, it does not do so in any particular direction, or in conformity with any purpose. Racial domination and better education, increased longevity and genocide – these are only a few of the many divergent goals that science has served (Gray, 2003:108).

The things humans do with the knowledge they have about the physical world have a profound effect on human and nonhuman life. Referring again to Jorge Nef's schema, concerns are growing with regard to long-range technological changes, changes in the ideological matrix and changes in society's economic fabric (Nef, 1999:6,7,9).

4.3.3.1 **Concerns regarding long-range technological changes**

Thomas Kuhn would have been acutely aware of the power of technology, having lived and worked in the era of "Big Science". As noted in Chapter Two, Kuhn's mentor at Harvard, James B. Conant, was not only an academic, but also the man second in command of the Manhattan Project, which had developed the atomic bomb that was dropped on Japan.

In his farewell speech in 1961, outgoing United States President Dwight D. Eisenhower warned against the rise of a "military-industrial complex" (Eisenhower, 1961). President Eisenhower pointed out the close linkage between this construct and "Big Science" – "task forces of scientists in laboratories and testing fields" (Eisenhower, 1961). He concluded that "(a)kin to, and largely responsible for the sweeping changes in our

industrial-military posture, has been the technological revolution during recent decades” (Eisenhower, 1961).

As the rise of the military-industrial complex created growing unease during the years Thomas Kuhn’s spent at Harvard, there is growing unease today with regard to the ways in which technology – “the practical application of scientific knowledge” (Gray, 2003:42) – is being used. Issues such as cloning and stem cell research and the whole debate raging around genetically-modified foods create public anxiety and uncertainty. There is an increasing conjecture, intellectually, about the balance sheet of technology (Evans & Newnham, 1998:529).

Ken Booth states that:

(t)he twentieth century has taught us that progress (at least the type that became compulsive in the previous two centuries) could have a dark side. What gave us better medicines also gave us, through the conventions of international relations, better bombs. It came as a general surprise that progress in knowledge did not translate directly into progress in society, and certainly not into mastery over the future (Booth, 1998a:352).

4.3.3.2 **Concerns regarding changes in the global economic fabric**

As with science and technology, important changes have introduced new, pessimistic elements into the outlook for capitalism. Heilbroner asserts that:

even though capitalism is today a social order without external challenge, military or political, it seems difficult to imagine that it will easily resolve

the economic problems that spring from its nature and hover over its future
(Heilbroner, 1995:108-109).

George Soros goes even further and posits that the global capitalist system or what he calls “market fundamentalism” is today a greater threat “than any totalitarian ideology” (Soros, 1998:xxii). Authors such as Goldsmith (1994) and Handy (1998) now seriously doubt the mantra that all other issues in society should be subservient to what Goldsmith describes as “the arithmetic of GNP” (Goldsmith, 1994:5; also see Mittelman, 2002b:4).

Disruptive effects are, however, most likely to manifest themselves not in the spheres of science and technology or of capitalism but in that of the political arena. Steinbruner (2000:2) comments that diffuse forms of violence may pose a greater threat than traditional forms of mass aggression.

4.3.3.3. **Concerns regarding changes in the ideological matrix**

Evans (2004a) posits that the greatest threat to humanity is rooted in political questions – some of them with underlying economic and social causes – that are unresolved, unaddressed, incompetently or counter-productively addressed or deliberately left to fester, until they become so acute they explode.

He continues to argue that part of the fall-out of such explosions can be terrorism, but this is not in and of itself a self-propelling concept, or in and of itself an “enemy”. Rather it is a tool or a tactic, resorted to almost invariably by the weak against the strong – weak individuals, weak groups,

and weak states.

The questions of the “weak” and the “strong”, of who has access and who is denied access, and the configuration which is slowly starting to emerge, based on these distinctions, form the basis for the discussion in Chapter Seven. This chapter addresses Heilbroner’s concern regarding the level of political pressure that new groupings are willing to exert to realise their collective objectives (Heilbroner, 1995:89).

In the unfolding international relations paradigm, the forces of science and technology, capitalism and new political groupings have been unleashed. They now have the dual inherent propensity to either be risk multiplying- or risk diminishing forces depending on their application. The image of Western man “as the sovereign master of the universe, the source of rationality and identity, the standard against which everything else is judged” (Brown, 1992:223), all cast in the frame of modernity, is being fundamentally questioned.

Finally, and as has been alluded to previously, the issue of human survival has come strongly to the fore in the post-1989 era. According to Jorge Nef (1999:19) survival remains the base value of global politics, indeed, of all human agency. Any new approach to security should take cognisance of or reflect this fact, either implicitly or explicitly.

Stoett (1999:25) says that the terms sustainability and security should be interchangeable, as we all face the ultimate threat to sustainable life on earth presented by issues such as ozone layer depletion and global climate change.

Global security is, in essence, about survival and about sustainability (also see Lawson, 2002b:15). We are being reminded that planet Earth, for all its divisions, is a single unit (Kennedy, 1991:24).

The chapter thus far has attempted to highlight the anomalies that have arisen vis-à-vis the concept of security in both the theoretical and practical contexts. The image of the nation-state as an entity which reigns supreme within a given territory, patrolling and protecting its borders, and acting in ways which inexorably leads to “progress”, proved to be less simplistic than it first appeared. In international relations, a situation persists “where unity on the ‘rules of the game’ has broken down” (Maclaurin, 2005:1).

If we agree with Albrow that the configuration of the paradigm shift in international relations “derives its defining features from the global” (Albrow, 1996:78) then it is to the global we should now look for answers on how security manifests as a dimension of the paradigm shift in international relations.

4.4 Security as a dimension of the paradigm shift in international relations

The author Jorge Nef (1999:13) argues that, in a world where the security of humanity has been de-linked from the nation-state, and in which threats emanate from a range of sources, “mutual vulnerability” - a concept first used by Head (1991) - has become the distinctive characteristic of security as a dimension of this shift.

Mutual vulnerability refers to a situation in which one seemingly secure cross section of humanity (described in the thesis as Access World) is increasingly vulnerable to actions by another cross-section of humanity (described in the thesis as Denial World). Simultaneously, however, the vulnerability of Denial World, as a result of actions by Access World, becomes ever more visible. This dialectical process takes place in a way that conventional international relations have failed to take account of in the past (Nef, 1999:13). The process cuts both horizontally and vertically, across the borders of nation-states and right down to community-level.

Confirming this view, the Chair of the United Nations High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change, Anand Panyarachun, argues that we live in an age of unparalleled interconnection among threats and of mutual vulnerability between weak and strong (UN, 2004b:6). In today's world, a threat to one is truly a threat to all. We now live in the "common-risk society" (Shaw, 1995).

Against the background of the six clusters of contemporary threats identified by the United Nations in an earlier section, Shaw explains that common-risk has a different meaning for different cross sections of humanity. One cross-section of humanity may, for example, feel more threatened by terrorism; another's experience may be that its security is jeopardised by poverty. However, in a globalised world where humanity shares "a common social space" (Shaw, 1995), these threats overlap, despite the degree of variance. The security (or insecurity) of one ultimately affects the security of all; the key notion contained in the idea of the "common-risk society".

Arora (2002) notes that particular security issues may mutually reinforce each other, thereby creating local, regional, and global dynamics of unruly change. These comments lead Spence (2004:13) to believe that in contemporary international relations, security cannot be achieved absolutely and can never be attained unilaterally. Albrow remarks that global threats “effectively elide the distinction between international and personal security” (Albrow, 1996:159).

Steinbruner (2000:vii) points out that “the stronger have a much greater practical stake in the security of the weaker than has yet been recognized for reasons that have not yet been fully understood”. The security of cross-sections of humanity is threatened in different ways, yet their insecurity unavoidably impact on one another (see Nef, 1999:13). As will be argued in Chapter Seven, Access World should be concerned about the security concerns of Denial World – even if based only on self-interest. In a world where Inside/Outside distinctions are being erased by the forces of globalisation, mutual vulnerability has come to stay. Globalisation, in security terms, increasingly translates as mutual vulnerability.

These threats are increasingly detached from states both in terms of their origins, and their capacity to outflank control and regulation. Grievances bred elsewhere can have catastrophic consequences half a world away (Evans, 2001). As Osama Bin Laden, probably Denial World’s most radical spokesperson stated in a video address four days ahead of the United States Presidential elections in 2005: “As you undermine our security, we undermine yours” (Bin Laden quoted by Baier *et al.*, 2004). Stoett (1999:120) argues that “security for one state, or one empire, or one group of

elites, is an impossible dream in this age of mutual vulnerability”.

In the world as “one place” (Waters, 1995:39), Access World cannot forever postpone being touched by the majority’s experience of insecurity and physical dread. As the global terrorism campaign mounted throughout 2005, it became clear that Access World would increasingly share “(t)he pain at the periphery” (Soros, 1998:xiv).

As will be explained in Chapter Eight, elements in Access World believe that “global riot control” (Groom, 1999:34) will be sufficient to ensure Access World’s security. To the contrary, it is argued in the thesis that these attempts at keeping the lid on insecurity – “liddism” as Rogers (2000:10) describes it, will not be sustainable over the long-term and in an environment of mutual vulnerability.

Immanuel Kant wrote over two hundred years ago that humanity “cannot avoid living side by side with all others” (Kant, 1996:86). Since Kant, our mutual interconnectedness and vulnerability have grown rapidly. We no longer live in a world of discrete national communities. Instead, we live in a world of “overlapping communities of fate” (Held, 2002:56) where the trajectories of societies are heavily enmeshed with each other. In this world, insecurity can no longer be contained “Outside” while security, safety and peace of mind are maintained “Inside”. In our world, it is not only the violent exception that links people together across borders; the very nature of everyday problems and processes joins people in multiple ways (Held, 2002:57).

4.5 Conclusion

Chapter Four sketched a world in which “the rules of the game devised in relation to the structural dynamics of the European states system ... offer ... [a] seriously misleading account of contemporary trajectories” (Walker, 1993:163). The chapter highlighted security-related anomalies which arose, in both the theoretical and practical domains, and which contributed to the crisis of the Westphalian paradigm in 1989. At that stage it became clear that there was an urgent need for international relations to adopt a deeper, human-centred idea of security to replace the state-centred focus, and a broadening of the concept instead of a narrow, militaristic conception thereof.

The Chapter argued that, at the beginning of the 21st century, one cannot discuss international relations, and more specifically security as one dimension thereof, in anything but global terms. There is an urgent need to look “both beyond and within states to properly identify the threats facing humanity today” (Stoett, 1999:120; also see Steinbruner, 2000:196).

The Chapter concludes that security, within the context of the paradigm shift in international relations, can be best understood when referring to the security of humanity, being mutually vulnerable to threats emanating from a range of societal spheres, in a world that has become borderless.

Apart from the concept of “security”, few other concepts defined and delineated “Inside” and “Outside” in international relations as fundamentally as the concept of sovereignty. It is to this key building block of the

Westphalian paradigm that attention will now turn.

CHAPTER FIVE

DIMENSIONS OF “WESTFLAILIA”: THE CONCEPT OF SOVEREIGNTY

5.1 Introduction

The Westphalian paradigm originated in Europe, in 1648, but was enlarged in stages to encompass the world. This paradigm put in place that which globalisation has, more recently, steadily been undoing – with Westphalia the politics of Inside/Outside began its active construction. Rob Walker highlights the pervasive nature of this paradigm observing that, until today, Inside/Outside ideas of international relations continue to inform our understanding of how and where effective and progressive political practice can be advanced (Walker, 1993:13).

The decades after World War II represented the pinnacle of the Westphalian conception of world order. This included the extension of the nation-state system (and a specific conception of sovereignty) to Asia and Africa through decolonisation and the continued control over economic policy by the nation-state. Other durable trends included a preoccupation by governments with security in relation to war and peace, and a geopolitical focus on bipolarity that reflected the centrality of the encounter between two superpowers and their respective blocs of subordinate allies (Falk, 2002:147-148). The Cold War period, Hirst (2001:72) maintains, gave enhanced saliency to the sovereign nation-state.

However, with the unravelling of the Westphalian paradigm, commencing in the 1980s but especially after 1989, a constellation of concepts closely associated with it became anachronistic as well. Biersteker and Weber (1996:1) ask: “As questions begin to be raised about the criteria for recognizing the modern state, can challenges to the traditional idea of sovereignty be far behind?” Where Chapter Four focused on security as a social construction, Chapter Five will proceed to investigate both the theoretical and practical implications of the “breaking of the traditional ‘Westphalian’ frame of sovereignty” (Jayasuriya, 2004:19).

It will be argued that notions of sovereignty are not absolute but are indeed constructed and are being transformed along with the system of political knowledge in which it is embedded (Kuah, 2003:8). As a result there is a pressing need to rethink both the concept and practice of sovereignty. The final section of the chapter investigates the implications of these developments. It poses the question: How, given these fundamental changes, is sovereignty manifesting during this period of transformation in international relations?

5.2 **The concept of sovereignty: theoretical anomalies**

Sovereignty is “the wellspring for policy and law and the reference point for the judgement of social and individual behaviour and control” (Baker, 2004). As reflected in Baker’s statement, conventional (that is to say, state-centric) theories of International Relations have uncritically assumed the concept of sovereignty as the ontological starting point of its analyses of world politics (Kuah, 2003:3).

Sovereignty had become so embedded in the collective consciousness of its universal practitioners that the concept's basic tenets were taken for granted as "natural" or as fixed aspects of "reality". Sovereignty evolved into a concept accepted as "truth" by many scholars, statespersons and laypersons in much of the political discourse around the globe (Lombardi, 1996:153; also see Agnew, 2003:2).

Sovereignty, similar to concepts such as power, signifies a type of authority relationship (Rosenau, 2003:69; also see Williams, 1996:111). But, Lake (2003:304) suggests, sovereignty, like power, is defined "only with difficulty". It turns out to be a complex notion that combines several ideas and dimensions.

Krasner (2001:28) explains this by stating that sovereignty refers both to practices, such as the ability to control trans-border movements or activities within a state's boundaries, and to rules or principles, such as the recognition of legally independent territorial entities and non-intervention in the internal affairs of other states. As a type of authority relationship, sovereignty could perhaps be best understood as possessing both an internal and an external dimension. Sovereignty has two faces, as a result.

Internally, sovereignty refers to the ultimate or highest authority within the state. Thus it implies a hierarchical relationship between "the sovereign" and subordinates. Internal sovereignty, furthermore, requires effective control over the territory claimed by the state: territoriality brings together physical space and public authority (Caporaso, 2000:7; also see Scholte, 2001:22). In the absence of this control, there can be no ultimate authority and thus no

sovereign. Krasner (1999:1) refers to this type of sovereignty as “domestic sovereignty”.

Domestic sovereignty has typically been a prerequisite for nation-states to be recognised by the international community. Sovereignty thus entailed the recognition by other similarly recognised nation-states that this entity was “one of them”. Indeed, these were members of an emerging international system “that fostered and favoured such political entities” (Hirst, 2001:44).

Externally, and following the same thread, sovereignty implies a relationship of formal equality. As Kenneth Waltz (1979:88) describes it, between sovereign states, “none is entitled to command; none is required to obey”. Jackson (1993:25) refers to this as “juridical sovereignty”, and Krasner (1999:1) calls it “international legal sovereignty”.

The second face of sovereignty has traditionally been associated with the view that the external relations between states can be typified as being anarchic. Although semantically correct, it is not especially helpful to refer to anarchy as an absence of authority. Rather, anarchy, in this context, is a relationship comprised of authoritative actors who do not themselves possess authority over one another (Lake, 2003:305).

The two faces of sovereignty exist together symbiotically. Domestic hierarchy and international anarchy are opposite sides of the same coin. Hirst (2001:44) contends that the modern state and the modern international system developed together. As defined, one cannot exist without the other. “Sovereignty is, therefore, an *attribute* of units which, depending on the

referent, entails *relationships* of both hierarchy and anarchy.” (Lake, 2003:305 – italics in original).

Internal sovereignty refers to a supreme decision-making and enforcement authority with regard to a particular territory and population. External sovereignty on the other hand refers to its antithesis: the absence of a supreme international authority and hence the independence of sovereign states. Paradoxically, therefore, the doctrine of state sovereignty leads to the concept of international anarchy: the idea of a supreme authority within the state leads to a denial of the existence of a supra sovereign above the state. “Each state is ‘sovereign’ in international society, a law unto itself.” (Falk, 2001:790.)

Dunne and Schmidt (2001:142) contend that this notion of sovereignty having two faces lies at the heart of “modern Realism”. Taking a cue from “classical Realists” (Dunne & Schmidt, 2001:142) such as Thomas Hobbes, this vision of international relations effortlessly supports the three core elements of modern Realism – statism, survival, and self-help (Dunne & Schmidt, 2001:143).

Since the signing of the Treaty of Westphalia, Realists consider the sovereign state as the principle actor in international relations. Statism refers to the idea that the state (in this instance, the sovereign nation-state) is the legitimate representative of the collective will of the people (Dunne & Schmidt, 2001:143). Realists supported their view regarding the primacy of the nation-state by arguing that the nation-state controls the means of legitimate violence (an issue which will be revisited later in this chapter); is

the only institution that can wage war legally and legitimately; determines the movement of people; facilitates and coordinates national development; and has a large role in managing the economy (Nel, 1999:57).

Yet outside the boundaries of the state, Realists assert, a condition of anarchy exists. The presence of the two faces of sovereignty – of autonomy and equality – Hobbes concluded, leads to anarchy, to a war of all against all (Walker, 1993:147). Under anarchy, the survival of the state cannot be guaranteed. States therefore have to rely on power, traditionally defined narrowly in military/strategic terms, for survival. Survival emerges as the core national interest of nation-states (Dunne & Schmidt, 2001:144).

Under conditions of anarchy, self-help is the principle of action. Nation-states, in short, should rely on themselves to ensure their own well-being. Because, ultimately, survival is at stake, “*states are selfish actors who always seek to maximize their own interests, even at the cost of risking benefits that more than one state can share*” (Nel, 1999:55 – italics in original). Realists argue that nation-states have to act this way because the international system leaves them with no other choice – “*the **structure** of the international system condemns states to selfishness and self-reliance* (Nel, 1999:55 – bold type and italics in original).

These reciprocal arrangements, Wendt (1992:412) concludes, constitute a spatially rather than functionally differentiated world – a world in which fields of practice constitute and are organised around ‘domestic’ and ‘international’ spaces rather than around the performance of particular activities. Sovereignty came to be “inextricably linked with the nation-state

as a fixity in time and space” (Williams, 1996:118). There was also an insistence that the borders, which divide nation-states, be treated as inviolable (see Biersteker & Weber, 1996:13). Ingrained in this conception of sovereignty were the underlying notions of “Inside/Outside”, referred to in the epigraph to this chapter, as well as of “us-them” (Caporaso, 2000:10). The Westphalian paradigm firmly entrenched “the rift between community within and anarchy without” (Walker, 1993:67).

In summation, Pierson (1996:13) states that the territoriality of states, their claim to monopolistic powers of adjudication within their boundaries and the existence of an international order premised upon competing nation-states, are “definitive of one of the most important general approaches to the state – international relations”. Sovereignty is thus regarded as the enabling concept of international relations whereby states assert not only ultimate authority within a distinct territorial entity but also assert membership of the international community.

However, in the late 1980s inconsistencies with regard to both the internal and external dimensions of sovereignty started appearing in ever-quickenning succession. Autonomy in dealing with other states and exclusive competence with regard to internal affairs were both being eroded. The concept of sovereignty was exposed not as a “fact” or a “truth” of international relations, but as a human construction.

5.2.1 **Constructivist criticism of the concept of sovereignty**

Constructivists such as Biersteker, Weber, and Wendt emphasise that

sovereignty, in both its internal and external manifestations, is a socially constructed trait (also see Lake, 2003:308; Kuah, 2003:1). They question the “constancy of the dominant political-territorial order” (Murphy, 1996:81). They furthermore agree that the general acceptance of the current political-territorial order is a reflection of one particular and highly significant effect of the modern state system, that is, its role in shaping people’s thinking about the geographical structure and organisation of their world.

Biersteker and Weber (1996:3) contend that the modern state system is not based on some timeless principle of sovereignty, but on the production of a normative conception that links authority, territory, population and recognition in a unique way and in a particular geographical place.

They add that:

(a)ttempting to realize this ideal entails a great deal of hard work on the part of statespersons, diplomats, and intellectuals: to establish and police practices consistent with the ideal, its components, and the links between them; to delegitimize and quash challenges or threats; and to paper over persistent anomalies to make them appear to be consistent with the ideal or temporary divergences from the diachronic trajectory towards a pristine Westphalian ideal (Biersteker & Weber, 1996:3)

The appearance of permanence, or of sovereignty being a “natural” condition which had evolved effortlessly, is simply an effect of “complex practices working to affirm continuities and to shift disruptions and dangers to the margin” (Walker, 1993:163). In the tradition of Kuhnian periods of “normal science”, these “complex practices” included the sovereign nation-

state being “maintained, defended, ...reproduced ... and relegitimised on a daily basis” (Walker, 1993:168).

States are constantly made and remade through an array of minute rituals (Walker, 1993:168). Sovereignty is therefore not exogenous to the system but is produced through practice. The practice, in turn is based on knowledge generated from within the Westphalian paradigm. A Westphalian conception of sovereignty is ultimately time-bound and purpose-bound, in the language of Chapter Two.

Probing even deeper, constructivists posit that knowledge regarding sovereignty is not “found” or “discovered” but has an architecture that has implications – excluding some things and people and generating its own violences. A claim to sovereignty, for example, facilitates the drawing of borders, keeping some people “in” and others “out”, expelling (often forcefully) those who are “in” but should be “out” and making war or engaging in diplomacy when the “inside” is perceived to be under threat from the “outside”.

The concept of sovereignty is infused with the idea of not only “power”, but also the notion of “interest” and more specifically “national interest”; configured along the historical legacies of race, gender, class and culture. Shaw (2004:13) observes that sovereignty as a discourse and a practice “has worked to establish order by producing a space for politics that excludes ontological and epistemological questions, rigorously shielding them from politicization”. “Anarchy”, Alexander Wendt (1992:391) famously declared, “is what states make of it” and, within the context of Westphalia,

sovereignty was “made” and “spoken” in ways that accommodated specific powerful interests.

Despite these efforts to shape sovereignty in specific ways, Holton (1998:83) believes that it is erroneous to presume that there was ever a “Golden Age” when states possessed some kind of absolute control over their territory and the movement of resources, people, and cultural influences across their borders. On the contrary, sovereignty has always been conditional. This is partly because the sovereignty of any one nation has usually depended on recognition by other nations within the interstate system; partly because states have never been able to achieve absolute control of the transnational movement of people and resources across borders, even if they wanted to.

Even more so today, traditional conceptions of sovereignty are inappropriate as the world enters an epoch of intensifying globalisation. As Keohane (1995:169) argues, the form of sovereignty that developed in the 17th century was created under conditions of relatively low interdependency between nation-states. These conditions no longer apply. The higher levels of interdependency that apply in the early 21st century, with large flows of capital, technology and information across boundaries, have emerged within changing rules of sovereignty that are increasingly more conditional, negotiable, and complex.

Under conditions of “complex interdependence” (Keohane, 1995:176), sovereignty no longer enables states to exert effective supremacy over what occurs within their territories. In terms of sovereignty, nation-states now merely have legal authority that can either be exercised to the detriment of

other states' interests or that can be used as a bargaining tool for influence over others' policies and therefore to greater gains from exchange.

Rather than connoting the exercise of supremacy within a given territory, sovereignty now provides the state with a legal grip on an aspect of a transnational process, whether involving multinational investment, the ecology, or the movement of migrants, drug dealers or terrorists (Keohane, 1995:177). This line of argumentation leads to the conclusion that sovereignty has evolved and has become *“less a territorially defined barrier than a bargaining resource for a politics characterized by complex transnational networks”* (Keohane, 1995:177 – italics in original).

Many of the erstwhile “facts” regarding sovereignty have therefore been found wanting in light of the events of 1989 and of subsequent years. As with numerous other International Relations debates after 1989, the focus has moved to issues related to the “erosion” or “collapse” of sovereignty in the face of globalisation (see Camilleri & Falk, 1992 and Shapiro & Alker, 1995).

Scholte, for example, remarks that the state has lost the regulatory capacity to meet the criteria of sovereignty as traditionally conceived. State sovereignty, he says, was premised on a territorial world in which governments exercised “total and exclusive authority over a specified territorial domain” which they could “keep under strict surveillance” (Scholte, 2001:22). Yet when, with globalisation, social relations acquire a host of non-territorial qualities, and borders are dissolved in a deluge of electronic and other flows, crucial pre-conditions for effective sovereignty

are removed.

Groom asserts that:

(w)hatever the theoretical and juridical claims of absolute sovereignty, its exercise in practice is relative. In a situation of complex interdependence, the stage might have been reached whereby notions of sovereignty have been sufficiently attenuated that their utility as a starting point for analysis is so diminished that the need for a re-conceptualisation is in order. Sovereignty in the sense of a competent and legitimised autonomy is now exercised by a variety of actors and not only by states. Moreover, the sources of social power are varied and changing (Groom, 1999:31).

The separation of the domestic and foreign policies of the nation-state, for so long a cardinal feature of the classic approach to international relations, is now regarded as naïve and myopic. Few, if any, states are today completely shut off either from the outside world or from domestic consequences of their own foreign relations. Rosenau (2003:70) states that, “with the distinction between domestic and foreign affairs increasingly confounded, the sovereignty of states can seem increasingly peripheral”.

All states are to some extent, and increasingly, penetrated by actors from the outside. Wilson and Donnan (1998:1) claim that “(i)nternational borders are becoming so porous that they no longer fulfil their historical role as barriers to the movement of goods, ideas, and people, and as markers of the extent and power of the state”. Knowledge based on Inside/Outside distinctions is exponentially being dismantled.

A practical example best illustrates the “porousness” (Lawson, 2002b:10) of the boundaries of sovereign nation-states in contemporary international relations. In this instance, the focus will be on the way in which traditional theories of sovereignty is being challenged by the rise of the environment as a new issue area in International Relations.

5.2.2 The emergence of the environment as an issue area in International Relations

Environmental threats do not heed notions of “Inside” and “Outside”. Instead, some argue that the political fragmentation of the planet is one of the primary obstacles to an effective response to the environmental crisis (Murphy, 1996:108). Issues, like pollution, are manifestly transnational; they have an effect across borders. To this list can be added acid rain, desertification and global warming (Art, 2001:758).

If the threats are transnational, so should be the solutions, according to this logic. These issues are “intermestic” (Manning, 1977:306), that is, bridging the distinction between international and domestic, and traditional conceptions of sovereignty (as applied by nation-states) were not designed to deal with these.

Lorraine Elliott contends that:

(e)nvironmental change, no longer ... easily accommodated within the politically bounded space of the state, calls into question the reality and utility of sovereignty as a fundamental international norm and draws

attention to debates about the adequacy and authority of the state (Elliott, 2002:116).

She adds that:

(t)he territorial integrity of the state appears increasingly precarious in the face of environmental challenges. The capacity of the state to respond unilaterally and effectively is weakened in the face of the increasing trans-boundary nature of environmental degradation (Elliott, 2002:116).

Doubts concerning the nation-state's ability to fulfil its responsibilities of providing its citizens with security and justice - in this case a secure environment and environmental justice - or to defend its citizens against environmental threats from the "Outside", create ambivalence about its normative appeal as the basis for political community. The limitations of sovereignty as a key organising principle of international relations and the increasing frailty of territorial boundaries are openly acknowledged in the face of the interdependencies revealed by trans-boundary and global environmental degradation.

The causes of environmental degradation and attempts to address these problems provide an important example of the inapplicability of the internal/external distinction in an era of globalisation. Environmental problems arise not from discrete acts in individual nation-states but are "fundamentally rooted in the process of globalisation which has rendered the territorial state incapable of fulfilling its traditional functions" (Thomas, 1993:3).

This example, the environmental *problematique*, touches on issues pertaining to human rights, democracy, accountability, gender, ideology and power. These issues, of course, have local manifestations, and there are different degrees of relative autonomy in the manner in which national societies can respond to them.

Williams, however, points out that these are simultaneously local, national and global issues (Williams, 1996:118). The biosphere has become an active player in human affairs. In the context of global warming, Booth (1991d:15) warns that the global Cold War has ended, but the politics of a hotter earth threaten to be no less troublesome.

Ultimately, and referring back to the issue of survival, humanity depends on the planet for its continued existence. There is an increasing recognition that Earth's reproductive capacities and abilities to maintain ecosystem health are finite and fragile yet "(h)uman-induced ecological degradation has never been worse" (Scholte, 2001:19).

Ignoring nature's ultimate sovereignty is folly, Wapner (2002:171) cautions. Nature ultimately decides the limits of human intervention, not the other way round. Environmental phenomena such as Hurricane Katrina proved in 2005 how vulnerable even the remaining superpower is to the "environment as a hostile power" (Kaplan, 2001:19).

If, as Held (1993:238) contends, globalisation has blurred the distinction between national and international, transformed the conditions of national decision-making, altered the legal framework and administrative practices of

the state, obscured lines of responsibility and changed the institutional and organisational content of national politics, then sovereignty as a concept is of limited applicability (also see Williams, 1996:118). But what are the practical implications of these assertions? Are anomalies also showing up with regard to the practice of international relations? It is to this aspect that we now turn.

5.3 **The concept of sovereignty: practical anomalies**

The nation-state's claim to be sovereign gave rise to very concrete forms of political practices. However, as in the theoretical domain, discrepancies in implementing the routines of statecraft kept resurfacing after 1989. In terms of globalisation referring to the Inside/Outside distinction in international relations having disappeared, or of the world having become borderless, a number of persisting trends challenged and continue to challenge traditional notions of sovereignty.

Arjun Appadurai observes that:

even a cursory inspection of the relationships within and among the more than 150 nation-states that are now members of the United Nations shows that border wars, culture wars, runaway inflation, massive immigration populations, or serious flights of capital threaten sovereignty in many of them (Appadurai, 1996:20).

In practice, the Westphalian presumption of state sovereignty increasingly has difficulty supporting a number of "border-erasing trends" (Mathews,

1991:3) that are emerging. In many instances, this “border erasing” is not even required. In the Sahel region of North Africa, to name but one geographical area, borders – those inviolable divisions where one nation-state’s sovereignty ceases to exist and that of another nation-state comes into existence – have for years been nothing but a small customs hut in the desert with thousands of kilometres of nothingness to either side.

James Rosenau, elaborating on the practical conditions under which sovereignty is challenged, mentions that:

(s)tates cannot prevent ideas from moving across their borders. They cannot control the flow of money, jobs, and production facilities in and out of their country. They have only minimal control over the flow of people and ... virtually no control over the flow of drugs or the drift of polluted air and water. Their capacity to promote and maintain cohesion among the groups that comprise their society is at an all-time low as crime, corruption and ethnic sensitivities undermine any larger sense of national community they might have had. Cynicism towards politicians and major institutions is widespread and people increasingly perceive no connection between their own welfare and that of their communities. Selfishness and greed have replaced more encompassing loyalties. Thus many states are unable to enforce laws, prevent widespread corruption, collect taxes or mobilize their armed forces for battle (Rosenau, 2002:23; also see Blaney & Inayatullah, 2000:29-30; Jackson & Sørensen, 2003:281).

Observers such as Rosenau and Durfee contend that, alongside the traditional world of states, a complex, multi-centric world of diverse actors has emerged replete with structures, processes, and decision-rules of its own. These “sovereignty-free actors” (Rosenau & Durfee, 1995:40) of the multi-

centric world now each represent a competing location for authority in international relations. Baker (2004) concludes that the degree of confusion and fluidity on today's political map has probably not been rivalled since the Middle Ages.

The following section will proceed to discuss, in greater detail, specific instances of this breakdown of national sovereignty. The discussion will firstly focus on internal challenges to sovereignty (generated within the borders of the nation-state) after which external dimensions of this challenge (generated outside the borders of the nation-state) will be discussed.

5.3.1 Questions surrounding the sovereignty of the nation-state: the internal dimension

Apart from sovereignty referring to the ultimate or highest authority within a nation-state, sovereignty also implies - as Max Weber suggested - that the state is in exclusive control of the means of violence within its domestic jurisdiction, that is, within a demarcated geographical area (Weber, 1978:314). A number of developments since 1989, however, point in the opposite direction.

5.3.1.1 The phenomenon of "failed states"

Take the existence of so-called "failed states". Evans & Newnham (1998:167) describe this phenomenon as "the breakdown of law, order and basic services in a number of multi-ethnic states". Krasner (2001:22) explains that well-ordered domestic polities have both legitimate and

effective authority structures but that failed states have neither of these. This phenomenon is often accompanied by bitter communal conflict, violent ethnic nationalism, militarism and possibly endemic regional conflict. These countries see the withering away of central government, the rise of tribal and regional domains and the growing pervasiveness of war (also see Black, 2001:36).

Referring to, for example, the “alleged sovereignty” (Luke, 1994:5) of Sierra Leone as one example of a “failed state”, Luke maintains that “something other than what the old scripts tell us should happen is happening” (Luke, 1994:5). Is Sierra Leone, for example, the sort of territorial sovereignty described in the typical scripts of the Westphalian paradigm?

It is a place on a map with national borders, a national capital, and a national territory surrounded by similar entities that are located on the map as well as on the ground in West Africa. Sierra Leone’s presence outside of these diplomatic/cartographic representations, however, varies widely from the typical Westphalian text (Luke, 1994:5).

Kaplan (2001:7-9), writing in 2001, posits that an army captain controls Freetown, Sierra Leone’s capital, and some regions of the countryside during the day. After sundown, and throughout most of the interior, no one has supreme power, while many criminals, renegade military commanders, guerrilla movements and village chiefs wield a controlling influence, but only in the narrow locales where they are operating at the time.

Meanwhile, hundreds of thousands of Sierra Leone’s citizens have been

displaced by constant war and live in Guinea or Liberia. Sierra Leone's natural resources, like diamonds and tropical hardwoods, are being looted, while its people are being displaced as refugees. Diamonds from Sierra Leone mines are more readily available for sale in Liberia, and only six percent of the country remains in primary rain forest (Kaplan, 2001:9).

Within the context of "failed states", Gray (2003:73) contends that hundreds of millions of people are living in similar conditions of semi-anarchy. He cites as examples areas in Africa, regions in Russia, parts of Afghanistan and Pakistan, Latin American countries such as Colombia, Haiti in the Caribbean, and regions of Europe such as Bosnia. He adds that in Chechnya and Albania there is nothing resembling an effective sovereign state.

5.3.1.2 **The phenomenon of "quasi-states"**

Jackson (1993:13) secondly refers to "quasi-states" which have fragile or ineffective political institutions that can claim little, or no legitimacy from the population. By definition, these nation-states "are deficient and defective as apparatuses of power" (Jackson, 1993:168). These states acquired sovereignty and international recognition as part of a historical process even though they lacked the internal resources and consensual foundations to provide for their own development.

As a result of this, these states have "equal sovereignty" (Jackson, 1993:22), when compared to other nation-states, but the nature of this sovereignty could be described as "negative sovereignty" (Jackson, 1993:25) rather than as "positive sovereignty" (Jackson, 1993:23). In quasi-states, sovereignty is

more juridical than empirical. According to Jackson & Sørensen (2003:284), the traditional assumptions of sovereignty do not apply to such weak states.

5.3.1.3 **The phenomenon of “pseudo-states”**

In a phenomenon which Hochschild (2004) describes as “pseudo-states”, sovereignty is similarly lacking. Hochschild describes “pseudo-states” as countries where “most real power is in the hands of someone else” and he refers to the Palestinian Authority, Iraq (post Saddam Hussein) and Kosovo as examples. “Power” here refers to aspects such as control of the military as well as to access to financial means or a budget (Hochschild, 2004).

Pseudo-states are viewed as a global network of islands of “transitional” or “incomplete” statehood (Kolossoff & O’ Loughlin, 1999:1). These entities have achieved varying but low levels of recognition by the international community and are often highly involved in local wars. Their unsettled political status makes further conflict a distinct possibility.

Pseudo-states, such as the Transdniester Moldovan Republic (TMR) in the border region between Russia and Ukraine, expose the false impression that nation-states’ control extends to the boundaries of neighbouring states in all cases (Kolossoff & O’ Loughlin, 1999:4). This is yet another example illustrating how the content of the concept of sovereignty has become inappropriate.

Each of these cases involve political entities with some but not all of the trappings of sovereignty. Jackson & Sørensen (2003:281) conclude that “if

sovereignty means that governments must actually be in control within their own territory, then there is reason to doubt the efficacy and extent of sovereignty”.

5.3.1.4 **The growth of criminal organisations**

Linked to the failure of nation-states to execute their sovereign responsibilities within their borders, is the growth of criminal organisations in the ensuing vacuum. Where these organisations were in the past largely homegrown and operating internally, and dealt with as a law-and-order problem, there are now indications that localised crime syndicates are increasingly also functioning across borders (Coker, 2002:47). This trend has given rise to the concept of transnational criminal organisations or TCOs (Williams, 1994:315).

The permeability of national boundaries, increased interdependence, international travel and communications and the globalisation of financial infrastructures have facilitated the emergence of what is, in effect, a single global market for both licit and illicit commodities (Williams, 1994:316). The scale of these illicit global markets is astronomical – it is estimated that the narcotics trade alone represents 10% of the world’s money in circulation at any one time (Coker, 2002:48).

TCOs flourish in “failed states” where their power often rivals that of the state itself. Political uncertainty and a breakdown in authority structures provide a congenial environment for criminal activity (Williams, 1994:332). Criminal networks thrive in this “well organised chaos” (Kolossoff & O’

Loughlin, 1999:2) which is becoming an unavoidable part of the post-modern political landscape. The existence of these areas, linked to the growing influence of criminal networks, again underscores the strain being brought to bear on traditional notions of sovereignty.

One example in this regard is Myanmar, which lacks an effective, legitimate government, is the world's main producer of heroin, and is internationally isolated yet is penetrated trans-nationally (Williams, 1994:332). In the case of Myanmar, criminal organisations have a vested interest in the continuation of weak government which allow them to export heroin from Myanmar unhindered.

Willetts (2001:367) identifies four ways in which TCOs evade detection and actions against them, thus circumventing the sovereignty of nation-states. In this regard he firstly mentions that criminal financial flows are massive, complex and unpredictable. Tracking this money is further complicated by intricate money-laundering schemes.

Criminal trade has secondly been extensively diversified through operating via third countries (so-called "triangulation"), to the extent that no government can confidently claim that its country is not a transit route for illegal activities. In the arms trade, triangulation with false end-user certificates is a regular practice (Willetts, 2001:367).

Thirdly, using the law against TCOs produces an effect similar to movements by companies in the mainstream global economy. This entails that, if conditions in one nation-state are no longer conducive to its

operations, the TCO's operations are merely relocated to a state where less stringent measures are in place. Willetts (2001:367) mentions that this trend is noticeable in the shifting patterns of drug production in Latin America.

Fourthly, and due to the extra-territoriality of much of the activities of TCOs, jurisdiction over criminal behaviour is often not clear and this detracts from speedy and effective steps being taken against these criminal networks. Coker (2002:49) notes that many regional and sub-regional initiatives to counter criminal networks are yet to be fully implemented or suffer from a lack of financial support.

Wiener (1999:181-182) comes to the conclusion that the Westphalian system of nation-states (which implies compartmentalised legal jurisdictions) is simply not up to the task and that the only way to address global crime is to reassess the territorial approach to dealing with it.

5.3.1.5 **The question of taxation**

Moving on to a next critical issue, Rifkin (2000:228) contends that nowhere is the encroachment on the sovereignty of the nation-state more at issue than pertaining to the question of taxation – an issue Pierson (1996:33) describes as “a touchstone of the politics of the modern state”. With a growing amount of personal and commercial business being conducted in cyberspace, it becomes more and more difficult to assess and collect taxes. In the Internet-environment, where many products and services are the result of small, value-added contributions made by many players scattered around the globe, the question arises of how a particular government makes the determination

about exactly how much value added is assignable to taxation within its geographical borders?

Citing a practical example, Rosenau (1990:251) refers to a computer-chip manufacturer called European Silicon Structures (or ES2) which was deliberately formed as a company without a country, in order to attract customers throughout Europe. It is incorporated in Luxembourg; its central offices are in Germany; its factory is in southern France; its research facilities are in England; and the eight members of its board come from seven different countries.

5.3.1.6 **The onset of a worldwide “organisational explosion”**

The world of international relations has witnessed an “organizational explosion” (Rosenau, 2003:56) within nation-states and this trend dilutes nation-states’ claim to sovereignty. Not only have Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) multiplied exponentially, but the level of influence they wield has also increased.

Whereas, twenty years ago, Indonesia had only a single independent environmental organisation, there are now more than 2000 linked to an environmental network based in Jakarta. In Russia, where almost no NGOs existed before the fall of communism, there are now at least 65 000 (Rosenau, 2003:57).

Hirata (2002:165) gives a comprehensive overview of the growing role of NGOs in Japan’s Official Development Assistance (ODA) policy-making

process, challenging bureaucratic dominance and reshaping state-civil society relations. Rosenau (2003:58) concludes that a major reason for the organisational explosion is the declining competence of states and the greater opportunities therefore opened up for those who organise in other spheres of society to press their demands.

5.3.1.7 **Links between sub-national authorities**

Finally, reference could be made to the growth of direct trans-border links between substate authorities, which have consequently taken control of a substantial number of policy initiatives that bypass central governments (Scholte, 2001:24). Scholte (2001:24) continues to argue that, for example, various provinces of Canada and China, as well as most of the United States' federal states, now have their own "diplomatic" missions abroad that operate relatively independently from their respective national embassies (also see Matthews, 1997:61-62).

At a municipal level too, considerable transborder cooperation has developed between local authorities on matters such as pollution control, crime prevention and development cooperation. In light of the structural dominance of the nation-state in the international system having been reduced, subnational units of government are increasingly empowered to act in their own best interests (Mingus, 2003:6).

The phenomenon of regional governments becoming global actors is referred to in the literature as "paradiplomacy" and represents "a manifestation of globalization, namely the complexification of world politics

through the multiplication and differentiation of actors” (Lecours, 2002:1). In other words, Lecours explains, by acquiring a greater sense of agency and by developing relations across borders, regions become part of globalisation rather than simply being acted upon by its processes. Lachapelle and Paquin (2003:7) link the increase in paradiplomacy directly to globalisation and to the crisis of the Westphalian paradigm.

One prime example is the region of Wallonia in Belgium that has the most extensive paradiplomacy of any European region. It has developed bilateral relations with states in the whole of Europe, Latin America, the North American continent, the Maghreb region, the Middle East and Asia. It is involved in European Union institutions, and has developed relationships with neighbouring regions. It also participates in multilateral forums such as La Francophonie and United Nations agencies (Lecours, 2002:9-10).

Another example of a region engaging in extensive paradiplomacy is the state of Quebec in Canada. Quebec has international representation in more than twenty-five countries, posting more than 250 officials abroad (Lecours, 2002:12). In its paradiplomacy, Quebec engages other political entities on a spectrum of issues ranging from foreign investment promotion to human rights. Lachapelle and Paquin (2003:2) assert that Quebecers understand the importance of acting not only locally but also globally.

Quebec’s paradiplomacy, however, differs from that of Wallonia in an important sense. In the case of Quebec, one of its explicit aims is to use paradiplomacy to illustrate its identity as separate from that of the Canadian federation. Lecours (2002:12) believes that it represents a way to affirm the

distinctiveness of this identity vis-à-vis the Canadian identity and to frame it as a national identity.

Lecours contends that the development by Quebec of an autonomous foreign policy is meant to carry the message that the province is in fact a nation distinct from Canada. He concludes that Quebec presents an example of state-like units projecting themselves onto the global scene without the help, and sometimes against the will, of the central state (Lecours, 2002:14).

Paradiplomacy is yet another example of the way in which the sovereignty of the nation-state has been “perforated” (Duchacek, 1990:20) and in which sovereignty seeps away from the nation-state. This process is perhaps not as spectacular as ethnic or civil wars, but its consequences are equally far-reaching (Lecours, 2002:2).

The widespread presence of failed-, quasi- and pseudo-states, the nation-state’s inability to deal with local criminal organisations which “have gone global”, increasing complexities with regard to tax collection, the growing influence of NGOs within nation-states and expanding links between authorities at the sub-national level, all point to the principle of nation-state sovereignty being diluted internally. But what are the forces at play externally and is their impact as far-reaching?

5.3.2 Questions surrounding the sovereignty of the nation-state: the external dimension

Externally, the most important factor disempowering the nation-state has

arguably been the growth and reach of global economic and financial infrastructure. The global economy, especially globalised production and worldwide financial markets, has become more and more evasive of individual states' control (Pierson, 1996:179; also see Holton, 1998:50-51) and new information technologies and increased capital mobility have contributed to this trend. This aspect therefore demands closer scrutiny.

5.3.2.1 **The presence of global economic and financial architecture**

The integration of the world's financial markets through information technology allows virtually instantaneous transactions across political boundaries on a vast and unprecedented scale. Holton (1998:52) points out that, in the late 1990s, trading in foreign exchange alone already exceeded one thousand billion dollars a day (also see Rifkin, 2000:36).

Commerce increasingly occurs in cyberspace, an electronic medium far removed from the geographically bounded (and more controllable) marketplace. "Electronic networks, by their very nature, break down boundaries and walls." (Rifkin, 2000:18.) All of these developments underline the extent to which traditional notions of sovereignty, with the nation-state firmly in control of the movement of goods, products and services, has been weakened.

Jameson asserts that:

the nation-state itself has ceased to play a central functional and formal role in a process that has in a new quantum leap of capital prodigiously expanded

beyond them, leaving them behind as ruined and archaic remains in the development of this mode of production (Jameson, 1991:412).

Kennedy, making a similar point, refers to “the challenge of losing national financial sovereignty”, and to “a certain surrender of the sovereign authority’s control over its own currency, its fiscal policies ... and its fixing of interest rates” (Kennedy, 1991:14-15; also see Mathews, 1991:3). Willetts (2001:363) remarks that two of the most fundamental attributes of sovereignty, control over the currency and control over foreign trade, have been substantially diminished. The two factors combined imply that governments have largely lost control of financial flows.

5.3.2.2 **The influence of Transnational Corporations (TNCs)**

Thompson (2000:103) differentiates between Transnational Corporations or TNCs and Multinational Corporations or MNCs by stating that the former are “disembodied” from any national base while MNCs could still be identified with a specific country base. Robinson (2005:324) argues that the giant conglomerates of the Fortune 500 ceased to be “U.S.” companies in the latter part of the twentieth century and increasingly represent transnational capitalist groups. With regard to TNCs, “the image here is one of footloose capital searching the globe for competitive advantage” (Thompson, 2000:103).

TNCs have been one of the main corrosive agents detracting from the credibility of a state-centred view of international relations (Evans & Newnham, 1998:332). The top 200 TNCs have total annual sales greater

than the annual output of the US economy. Of the 100 largest economies in the world, 51 are TNCs; only 49 are countries.

In reality a third of all global trade is taking place between different subsidiaries or divisions of TNCs and not among nations (du Toit, 2003:375). Murphy (1996:107) contends that these corporations are often able to escape state regulation by carefully assigning facets of their enterprises to the different states in which they operate.

These companies' control over access to capital investment and new technology give them considerable leverage over even the most powerful governments anxious to attract employment- and taxation-generating investment (Holton, 1998:51; also see Rifkin, 2000:227). Their centrality within the global economy is evident in the scale of their operations, measured both by value and in terms of their geographical reach.

While some observers, such as Krasner (2001:9) dispute the influence TNCs wield in relation to nation-states, Howard (2000:98) asserts that "(t)he capacity of multinational corporations ...may have been much exaggerated, but not even the most powerful economies are immune from their pressures".

Charles Handy goes as far as stating that the nation-state has relinquished so much authority to TNCs that one could truly now speak of "corporate sovereignty" (Handy, 1998:74; also see Bhalla & Lapeyre, 1999:168). The rise and influence of Transnational Corporations thus provide a further example of how the content of sovereignty, as traditionally defined, has been

altered.

Nowhere is the influence of these organisations more pervasive than in the media and information technology (IT) sectors. Large media and IT conglomerates are not only economic players, but influence society in a much wider sense as well.

5.3.2.2.1 **The role of Transnational Corporations (TNCs) in the media sector**

Specifically noticeable in the global economy has been the meteoric rise of TNCs in the information sector. These typically link together production and service provision in a network of interconnected activities. Information technology has thus not only created new and powerful TNCs such as Microsoft, Sun Microsystems, Dell, and Apple, but has also enhanced the capacity of other similar companies to operate across geographical and political boundaries (Holton, 1998:55).

Rifkin (2000:11) states that the global electronic networks are controlled by a few powerful transnational media companies who own the pipelines over which people communicate with one another and who control much of the cultural content that makes up the paid-for experiences of a postmodern world. There is no precedent in history for this kind of overarching control of human communications and it invariably erodes nation-states' sovereignty (also see Rifkin, 2000:223-224).

These giant media conglomerates and their content providers become the

“gatekeepers” (Rifkin, 2000:177) who determine the conditions and terms upon which hundreds of millions of human beings will secure access to one another in the coming era. Power in the coming era, Rifkin believes, “belongs to the gatekeepers who control both access to the popular culture and the geographic and cyberspace networks that expropriate, repackage, and commodify culture” (Rifkin, 2000:177).

The power of these companies has been enhanced by a string of mergers in a range of fields. Laxer (1998:63-64) contends that one consequence of such immense and growing concentration of corporate power is that leading corporations are able to dictate the economic and social agenda to nation-states in a way that was unimaginable in the past.

5.3.2.3 **The influence of cutting-edge technology**

The rise of the global economy and the increasing power of corporations have both been facilitated by the development of cutting edge technology. Technology erodes sovereignty as it transfers power from the state to the individual. Already in 1989, during the Tiananmen Square uprising in the People’s Republic of China, e-mail and fax communication became potent tools in the hands of Chinese activists (Conklin, 2003:3).

Individuals involved in the protest action used these means to communicate with each other, but, simultaneously, with others around the globe. Especially after an attempted media blackout by the Chinese government, private computers and fax machines inside the PRC were flooded with information on the unfolding events. This was sent by Chinese living abroad,

but also by Western media agencies covering the events, and upset by the media blackout (see Mathews, 1991:4; Rosenau & Durfee, 1995:47).

The personal computer or PC empowers individuals and citizens' groups who choose to play a role to do so – even in so-called “high politics” (Mathews, 1991:4). “The communicative actions of human rights groups have created new transnational communities that do not respect traditional boundaries between the domestic and the international.” (Biersteker & Weber, 1996:10.) Technology's contribution to the ease and frequency of travel has also, indirectly, eroded sovereignty. Disease travels more swiftly than ever. Quarantines, the historical protection, are no longer effective or acceptable – again, national borders no longer provide protection (Mathews, 1991:5).

5.3.2.4 **The role of supranational political and economic organisations**

It was previously unthinkable that the state's policies with regard to its own citizens could be questioned from “outside” - as this would amount to interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign nation-state. However, the growing influence of supranational political and economic institutions has removed the validity of this claim to sovereignty.

This phenomenon can be traced back to the end of the Second World War, with the establishment of the UN system in the political and of the Bretton Woods institutions in the economic sphere. The cumulative result of these has been subtle changes in the direction of a more conditional form of

national sovereignty. Rosenau conceives of these in terms of a normative shift from multilateral action taking place “at-the-convenience-of-states” to the more muted principle whereby “states-are-sometimes-obliged-to-go-along” (Rosenau, 1996:237).

One example of this trend is the widespread appeal for the UN to monitor elections or to become involved in resolving conflicts (Holton, 1998:120). Ottaway and Lacina (2003) point out that where the UN had originally intervened in the case of inter-state conflicts, the post-1989 world witnessed increasing intervention in cases of intra-state conflict. UN peacekeeping, peace enforcement and good offices missions pertaining to domestic situations have risen from only two a year in the 1980s to an average of between ten and twelve a year during the 1990s (Blechman, 1998:294; also see Ottaway & Lacina, 2003). In this arena, as in many others, there seems to be an acknowledgement of the impact of globalisation – of the “intermeshing and densification of local lives and global processes” (Booth, 1998a:339).

In similar vein, the report produced in 2005 by the UN Secretary-General’s high-level panel on threats, challenges and change, entitled “A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility” (UN, 2004c), endorses the emerging norm of a responsibility to protect civilians from large-scale violence. In terms of the report, and when a state fails to protect its civilians, the international community has a responsibility to act, through humanitarian operations, monitoring missions and diplomatic pressure – and with force if necessary, though only as a last resort.

Similar to supranational political institutions, the corrosive effect which global economic institutions have had on sovereignty, is also significant. The effect of this has especially been felt in the developing world where global economic institutions have come under consistent criticism for their perceived bias towards Western interests and towards liberal market-oriented economic policies. The conditionality of IMF and World Bank support for developing countries has been seen as both economically destabilising and quasi-colonialist in its overriding of national political priorities.

Meeting IMF conditions has provoked domestic political conflict and undermined social cohesion (Holton, 1998:71-72). Rifkin (2000:228) contends that officials from bodies such as the World Trade Organisation are unaccountable to any specific government, yet they have the power to impose sanctions on countries which violate trade agreements and norms.

Despite the merits or demerits of these institutions, or the way in which their policies have been implemented, the fact remains that they have diluted the national economic sovereignty of nation-states to a significant extent. The influence of these bodies has been further buttressed by an expanding set of declarations, conventions, and international legal instruments to which governments have become signatories, in the economic sphere and in many other areas of public policy and law (Holton, 1998:80).

It is difficult to dispute the role which the global economy and global political and economic institutions have played in the corrosion of the sovereignty of nation-states. Holton (1998:2), however, points out that the growth of more encompassing normative frameworks based on, for example,

human rights, have also contributed substantially to this process.

5.3.2.5 **The emergence of encompassing normative frameworks**

Overy (2003:2) traces this development back to the Nuremberg war trials where it was affirmed that, under certain circumstances, the rights and obligations of individuals take precedence over those of the nation-states of which they are members. By doing this, the tribunal took a step of major historical significance. It laid the groundwork for the creation of a transnational legal and political system in which nation-states were no longer to have an exclusive *de jure* monopoly of sovereignty within international law.

Human rights connect the individual with humanity by asserting that each individual is an instance of humanity. The development of the international human rights regime since 1945 thus saw a steady undermining of the sovereignty doctrine, although actual intervention on human rights grounds was scarcely a regular practice.

Further explaining this trend, Ken Booth argues that in the past a number of “human wrongs” were given a safe haven within the parameters of Westphalian conceptions of sovereignty (Booth, 1995:103). It was, after all, a sovereign state exercising Westphalian jurisdiction that led to Auschwitz, Booth (1998c:32) asserts. Encroaching on the “internal affairs” of Nazi Germany was, in terms of the tenets of sovereignty as it prevailed at the time, beyond the imaginable.

Apart from the failure of the world to react to the Nazi policies of persecution, the 20th century had witnessed genocides in Cambodia where the Khmer Rouge regime killed two million people, in Rwanda where eight hundred thousand people were killed in 100 days and in Bosnia-Herzegovina where Serbians systematically murdered more than 200 000 Muslims between 1992 and 1995 (Gordin, 2005:9). In many instances the nation-state itself continued to be one of the primary sources of insecurity (Walker, 1993:182) and there was a conviction that this had to stop.

In contemporary international relations, intervention on humanitarian grounds has become an almost commonplace occurrence (Lawson, 2002b:15). The principle of sovereignty is no longer a barrier to external intervention in situations where large-scale violations of human rights occur. There is a firm belief that excesses such as those outlined above have to be countered. These events have inspired critics to postulate capabilities for overriding deference to territorial supremacy and sovereignty.

Proposals to establish genocide-prevention forces under UN authority are therefore one contemporary direction of assault upon hard-core Westphalian ideas of sovereignty. Another direction includes procedures (such as the war crimes tribunal in Rwanda) that have been put in place for imposing accountability on leaders of sovereign states that commit crimes against their own peoples (Falk, 2002:159). Also given the pressures exerted by global public opinion and the media, it is safe to assume that the threshold for intervention, not just militarily but also politically, has been substantially lowered.

Bianchi explains that the two opposite poles of the spectrum are evident:

(o)n the one hand, there stands the principle of sovereignty with its many corollaries ... on the other, the notion that fundamental human rights should be respected While the first principle is the most obvious expression and ultimate guarantee of a horizontally-organized community of equal and independent states, the second view represents the emergence of values and interests ... which deeply cut across traditional precepts of state sovereignty and non-interference in the internal affairs of other states (Bianchi, 1999:260).

Touching on an issue which will be revisited in Chapter Eight, mention must finally be made of the role of the United States as the sole remaining superpower. This is necessary because the way in which the United States, especially the current Bush administration, conducts its foreign policy, opens up serious questions pertaining to established notions of sovereignty.

5.3.2.6 **The global role of the United States**

The United States National Security Strategy, unveiled on 17 September 2002, first elaborated the doctrine of pre-emptive intervention (NSC, 2002). This doctrine posits that the United States has the right to intervene unilaterally in order to eliminate threats to its security, such as harbouring terrorists or proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

This right, as expounded by the Bush administration, is not limited to the elimination of the threat itself, but extends to the engineering of regime change – the replacement of an unfriendly, intrinsically threatening regime.

Afghanistan and Iraq constituted the first forays down this path (Ottaway & Lacina, 2003).

Lake (2003:319) argues that with the war against Iraq in 2003, the United States was claiming a right of unilateral intervention, in breach of the principle of sovereignty, while at the same time it was resisting similar assertions of authority by Russia against Georgia and by India and Pakistan vis-à-vis each other. In essence, the United States was demanding an authority over Iraq and, potentially, the rest of the world, that it was denying others in their relations with each other and certainly in their relations with the United States.

Other countries did not so much disagree that Iraq was in violation of numerous United Nations resolutions as they agreed that the claim to new authority by the United States to forcibly change the regime of a potentially threatening state was a dangerous precedent – and one they could not countenance (also see Agathangelou & Ling, 2004b:520).

The section thus far has aimed to illustrate that, as is the case in the theoretical domain, numerous anomalies have surfaced with regard to the implementation of sovereignty in practice and in the face of the disappearance of Inside/Outside distinctions in international relations. Held (1989:229-237) asserts that writers who stress sovereignty's irrelevance to the day-to-day workings of the state make the most developed critique of sovereignty. Put another way, critics expose the gaps between the claims of supremacy and the ability of states to exercise control over their territory in an effective manner.

Sovereignty has been compromised in fundamental areas such as security, capital regulation, migration, ecology, health, culture and language (March & Olsen, 1998). Cynthia Weber contends that, at the root of this problem, lies the fact that the concept of sovereignty takes a historically and spatially specific example as its empirical referent (the nation-state as it developed in Europe) and then simply proceeds to universalise this idea (Weber, 1995:2-3).

Erroneously, the time and purpose-bound nature of sovereignty therefore do not form part of the calculation. What the nation-state can do, what its competencies are, and what the limits to its powers are with respect to society and humanity, are not factored into the equation. Under these conditions, Weber (1995:129) concludes, nation-states are only “simulating sovereignty” in contemporary international relations, based on the extent to which the concept (in its original form) has become devoid of meaning.

It may therefore be reasoned that sovereignty has become outmoded because, although states may possess *de jure* rights, *de facto* they are unable to use them meaningfully (Williams, 1996:113 – italics in original). The gap between the possession of sovereignty (formal sovereignty) and the capacity to exercise those rights (effective sovereignty) has become so wide that it no longer makes sense to say that states possess supreme authority; under these conditions traditional notions of the concept of sovereignty are highly questionable.

Where the history of the nation-state has been a history of territorial division and of clear-cut links to geographically bounded spaces, these links have

become frayed. Deterritorialisation has become a prime consequence of the boundary-spanning flows elaborated in Chapter One. To sum up in the words of Roxanne Doty: “When the criteria for differentiating the inside of states from the outside become blurred and ambiguous, the foundational premise of state sovereignty becomes shaky.” (Doty, 1996:122.)

In Chapter Four it was argued that, in the paradigm shift in international relations, security now manifests as “mutual vulnerability”. But how is sovereignty manifesting in a dynamic milieu where the nation-state is increasingly losing its grip on the monopoly of power within the politics of globalisation?

5.4 **Sovereignty as a dimension of the paradigm shift in international relations**

As is clear from the preceding sections of this chapter, the map of the globe increasingly seems unable “to hold the organizational dimensions of time and space through which sovereignty once confidently promised to deliver” (Vale, 2003:54). The perceived omnipotence of the nation-state is being questioned and the frontiers of nation-states are exposed as mere “relative discontinuities” in human relations as Karl Deutch (1953:25) describes them.

Zygmunt Bauman asserts that the concept “time/space compression” encapsulates the ongoing multi-faceted transformation of the parameters of the human condition (Bauman, 1998:2). In this period of fundamental change, the uses of time and space are, however, sharply differentiated as

well as differentiating. “Globalisation divides as much as it unites; it divides as it unites – the causes of division being identical with those which promote the uniformity of the globe.” (Bauman, 1998:2.) We live in a world of “uneven globalisation” with the process varying in terms of cross-national intensity, geographical scope and national and local depth (Holm & Sorensen, 1995:2). But what do these statements imply?

Bauman explains that, alongside the “globalising” planetary dimensions of business, finance, trade and information flow, a ‘localising’ space-fixing process is set in motion. Between them, the two closely interconnected processes sharply differentiate the existential conditions of whole populations and of various segments of each one of these populations (Bauman, 1998:2).

What appears as globalisation for some means localisation for others; signalling a new freedom for some, upon many others it descends as an uninvited and cruel fate. These processes “rebound in the redistribution of privileges and deprivations, of wealth and poverty, of resources and impotence, of power and powerlessness, of freedom and constraint” (Bauman, 1998:70).

Bauman elaborates and remarks that:

rather than homogenizing the human condition, the technological annulment of temporal/spatial distances tends to polarize it. It emancipates certain humans from territorial constraints and renders certain community-generating meanings extraterritorial – while denuding the territory, to which other people go on being

confined, of its meaning and its identity-endowing capacity. For some people it augurs an unprecedented freedom from physical obstacles and unheard-of ability to move and act from a distance. For others, it portends the impossibility of appropriating and domesticating the locality from which they have little chance of cutting themselves free in order to move elsewhere (Bauman, 1998:18 – italics in original).

In a borderless world, a world where “Inside” and “Outside” is the same place, mobility now climbs to the rank of most coveted value – and the freedom to move, perpetually a scarce and unequally distributed commodity, fast becomes the main stratifying factor of our late-modern or postmodern times. It can therefore be argued that sovereignty manifests as spatial “re-stratification” (Bauman, 1998:70) - endowing one cross-section of humanity with new freedoms but curtailing the freedoms of another cross-section of humanity in new ways.

Divisions between people are, therefore, no longer determined by the geographical borders of nation-states, but by a new set of criteria which operate on a global scale. “We witness today the process of a worldwide *restratification*, in the course of which a new socio-cultural hierarchy, a worldwide scale, is put together.” (Bauman, 1998:70 – italics in original). Horizontal territorialities seem to be evolving into hierarchical levels (Walker, 1993:159).

In this spatially restratified world, the inhabitants of Denial World (as will be posited in Chapter Seven) often find “blocked pathways of upward mobility that leave large numbers of people trapped” (Adato *et al.*, 2004:i) while this is not the case for the citizens of Access World. A “mobile elite

and an enclosed mass” (Arditi, 2003:2) – Access World and Denial World – now exist side by side.

5.5 **Conclusion**

Today the Westphalian or state-centric-paradigm conveys “a sense of characters, conflicts and concepts that no longer has the same resonance on the world stage unless one stages the world around the non(sense) of this script” (Luke, 1994:9). This is especially true for sovereignty; the nation-state appears to be unable to fulfil the sovereign functions traditionally assigned to it. A serious question mark hangs over the notion of sovereignty as an “illimitable, indivisible, and exclusive form of public power” (Held *et al.*, 1999:81).

The year 1989 fully exposed the fragility of the nation-state in the face of complex forces within and outside it. In combination these forces have exposed the weaknesses of sovereignty as a Westphalian concept. The notion of a “border”, Rosenau (2003:37) asserts, is “increasingly shorn of content and becomes merely a historical marker, an artifact of an age in which the sovereignty of states was fully in place”. There is thus a marked decline in the nation-state’s ability to claim the final word at home or to speak exclusively for the country abroad.

Chapter Five concluded that the deconstruction of the concept of sovereignty, against the larger canvas of globalisation, is giving rise to a process of spatial restratification. This process is taking place at all levels of society. As a result of this, a new bifurcated configuration of international

relations is emerging.

The focus now moves to the final of the trilogy of concepts which, it is argued, have been closely associated with the Westphalian paradigm and with the nation-state. Chapter Six will investigate how the concept of “identity” was given meaning within the context of Westphalia and how, in the context of “Westflailia”, this knowledge has been critically probed and found lacking.

CHAPTER SIX

DIMENSIONS OF “WESTFLAILIA”: THE CONCEPT OF IDENTITY

6.1 Introduction

At a recent conference, a speaker introduced himself as being a thirty-year old heterosexual male, born in the former Deutsche Demokratische Republik (DDR) or East Germany (a nation-state which no longer exists), now being a citizen of Germany, but spending the bulk of his time in either North Africa where he works or in Spain where he owns a house. Apart from this he loves art films from Latin America and prefers to listen to music from young and upcoming Estonian pop groups. He then poses the vexing question to the audience: Who am I? What, in a globalised world, is my identity?

By asking this question, the speaker affirms that, in contemporary international relations, identity has emerged as a prominent yet problematic issue – identity matters. It matters, Gilroy (1997:301) contends, both as a theoretical concept and as a contested fact of contemporary political life. Indeed, globalisation has pushed identity to the fore as one of the focal points of the analysis of emergent patterns of social organisation (Langman & Morris, 2003). The paradigm shift in international relations is thus marked by a pervasive preoccupation with issues of identity, with a restless need for affiliation provoked by transformative dynamics that pose troubling questions about who one is and where one fits in.

Chapter Six sets out to prove that traditional notions of the concept of “identity”, similar to notions about “security” and “sovereignty”, have been bereft of content. In terms of demands to give meaning to the concept of identity in a changed and changing world, the nation-state, as the centrepiece of the Westphalian paradigm, has been exposed as an institution under strain.

In the context of Walker’s notions of “Inside” and “Outside”, “the secure frontiers of an unproblematic identity” no longer exist (Walker, 1993:x). In line with the ongoing paradigm shift in international relations, identity is characterised by shifting allegiances or by a restructuring of loyalties, as will be argued in the final section of this chapter.

Similar to the two previous chapters, attention will initially centre on theoretical anomalies which have surfaced. Within the wider context of critical theory, specific attention will be given to criticism of the concept of “identity” from a constructivist point of view.

6.2 The concept of identity: theoretical anomalies

Identity is a psychological concept employed by many branches of social science (Anon., 2000). It refers to a narrative of self that tells a story of who one is, where one comes from and what makes one distinct from others. McSweeney (1999:117) contends that individuals acquire identities – defined as “relatively stable, role-specific understandings and expectations about self” – by participating in collective meanings.

Identity is therefore created through membership in communities of meaning as a mechanism of orienting to the world and relating to others. In the process, identity becomes an inherent part of selfhood – described by Giddens (1991:11) as “self-identity”. Identity is thus inherently relational. It is also not fixed and can change over time – “... it is a process rather than a state, ‘becoming’ rather than ‘being’ ” (Anon., 2000).

Expanding on these views, McSweeney (1999:165) asserts that identity is a social act as well as a structure of meaning. As act, it refers to the capacity of individuals to sustain a story about the self or the collective self. As structure, it relates to the story or narrative sustained, from which individuals draw to enact identity. Identity thus becomes a social practice where the latter refers to habitual or regularised types of action which link, or mediate between, structure and agency.

Explaining this somewhat differently, Woodward (2000a:1) posits that identity necessarily involves an interrelationship between the personal and the social which can also be expressed as a tension between structure and agency. Identity therefore provides a link between individuals and the world in which they live and are formed through the interaction between people. Woodward (2000b:6-7) argues that when trying to answer the question: “Who am I?” identity might appear to be about personality.

Identity, however, differs from personality in important respects:

- Sharing an identity suggests some active engagement on the part of the individual. We choose to identify with a particular identity or

group. The extent to which this choice can be exercised is determined by structures, the forces beyond our control which shape our identities, and by agency, or the degree of control which we ourselves can exert over who we are.

- Marking oneself as having the same identity as one group of people (or taking up a collective identity) implies that the identity is different from that of other groups of people. Members of groups sharing an identity experience themselves as being the same or as having aspects in common. “Identity is marked by similarity, that is of the people like us, and by difference, of those who are not.” (Woodward, 2000b:7.)
- Identifying symbols and representations are important in marking the ways in which we share identities with some people and distinguish ourselves as different from others.

Similar to security and sovereignty, and despite attempts at clarification, identity remains a difficult concept to pin down. Horowitz (2002:1) ascribes this to the fact that “identity is the subtext of almost any argument in international relations”.

Despite its ubiquitous nature, Mercer (1994:259) interestingly observes that identity only becomes an issue when it is in crisis. The veracity of this statement was borne out by developments in the 1980s and especially after 1989, when identities increasingly appeared to be fragmented and uncertain. But how did humanity arrive at this juncture?

Before 1989, and in the context of the Westphalian paradigm, the nation-state played a crucial role in constructing identity. Although individuals had other identities as well, these were subordinate to the individual's identity as a member of a specific nation-state. Being a member of a specific, geographically fixed state conferred a single identity on the individual, which was of overriding importance in terms of the paradigm.

Identity and geography were fused together (Evans & Newnham, 1998:197; also see Kuah, 2003:24). State borders acquired a very specific meaning as well as they were now “a function of a state's ... ability ... to impose fixed and stable meanings about who belongs and who does not belong to the nation” (Doty, 1996:122).

This worldview was reflected in mainstream International Relations theories. Identity was primarily linked to the nation-state, the discipline's “principal referent object” (Buzan, 1991a:22) or unit of analysis. International Relations was constructed on the basis of “the ontological primacy of the nation-state” (Biswas, 2002:177).

The concept of “national identity” came to occupy a prominent and, indeed, dominant, place in International Relations discourse. In the framework of the Westphalian paradigm, the “fact” that identity referred to “national identity” was treated as self-evident and non-problematic (Doty, 1996:121). It was accepted that individuals “can be assumed to follow the lead of their states” (Rosenau, 2003:24).

Based on this ontology, the concepts of authority, territory, population and

recognition also acquired a specific (constructed) meaning as was explained in Chapter Five. Following Kuhn, paradigms (in this case the Westphalian paradigm) have an important semantic function in fixing the meaning of terms (Kuhn, 2000a:29).

The “reality” of national identity was explained in terms of the nation-state being the most prominent of territorially based forms of social collectivities. It was also an exceptionally well-marketed form of collective solidarity - its perceived strength and resilience was viewed as necessary conditions for a “strong” state and a “firm” foreign policy (Anon., 2000).

Apart from geography, identity came to be closely associated with being a “national” or a “citizen” of a specific nation-state. Nationality was defined as “the status of belonging to a particular state” (Evans & Newnham, 1998:349) while the meaning of citizenship centred on membership in a specific type of political community.

Brubaker (1998:21) argues that the modern state is more than a territorial organisation, it is also a “membership organisation”. Closing the circle, Caporaso explains that, in the Westphalian context, citizenship was based on membership of (or of belonging to) a very specific type of political community, namely the nation-state (Caporaso, 2000:11).

After 1989 the situation changed dramatically. In the face of globalisation and a reconfigured global political architecture, the nation-state increasingly had to compete for people’s loyalty with newly emerged groupings. The latter included “sovereignty-free actors” - as Rosenau and Durfee (1995:40)

describe them - such as transnational corporations or TNCs, ethnic minorities, sub-national governments and bureaucracies, professional societies and social movements and issue groups. “New social movements have produced a new focus for the politics of collective identities, with their concerns with gender, sexuality, and race, in some instances making ‘the personal political’.” (Woodward, 2000c:157.)

Identity was now not only influenced, but often determined, by structures which were not territorially or geographically bounded. As the apparent omnipotence of the nation-state waned, the importance of citizenship similarly decreased as the most important link between the individual and the world. Traditional ideas of citizenship were being reconsidered against the background of globalisation. The search for identity, Axtmann (1995:922) asserts, is an integral part of globalisation.

It was clear that identity politics – inviting and maintaining people’s affiliation with collectivities of shared values and interests – had now become the stuff of political action. Du Plessis (2001b:13) suggests that the emergence of identity as an issue of academic concern has been the response to the birth of a profoundly globalised post-Cold War era, as well as to the diverse challenges brought on by the transition to, and very nature of, this new era.

The rise of identity as a focus area does, however, not mean that awareness of the concept was absent before. According to du Plessis (2001b:13) the difference was that the concept was suppressed, masked or incorporated by other concerns, such as ideology and power politics, for example, or by more

salient forms of social, political or ideological identification such as communism and liberalism. In all instances identity was closely linked to the nation-state and to its objectives and ideals. The end of the Cold War, however, produced a climate that “precipitated the re-emergence of identity as a multi-faceted phenomenon” (du Plessis, 2001b:13).

Once a paradigm shift is underway, one cannot “quite describe the new in the vocabulary of the old or vice versa” as Kuhn (2000a:15) has mentioned before. This was also the case pertaining to the content of the concept of identity and efforts to rectify the situation inevitably followed. However, and despite attempts to revisit the concept of identity (similar to exercises involving the reconceptualisation of “security” and “sovereignty”), du Plessis contends that it still “suffers from ambiguity and a lack of clarity” (du Plessis, 2001b:14).

Groom (1999:45) concludes that the notion of identity remains a very under-researched one. In the field of International Relations, studies of nationalism, for example, reach back into the nineteenth century, but other aspects of identity, such as gender, have only recently come to the International Relations agenda.

Groom furthermore contends that:

(w)hile nation, gender, race and ethnicity all have their idiosyncratic aspects, they do also have sufficient in common that they can be conceptualised together. This is a conceptualisation that has not yet adequately begun (Groom, 1999:45).

What can, however, be tentatively concluded is that, through a fundamental restructuring of international relations into world politics via spatial compression and temporal acceleration, globalisation renders our identity hitherto grounded in the territorial nation-state highly problematic (Kuah, 2003:25). Kuah expands on these views and asserts that:

these identities which were grounded in the sovereignty of the nation-state and intrinsically territorial in its logic are losing ground to a politics of identity articulated in terms of ethnicity, gender, ecology and even virtual spaces (Kuah, 2003:24).

The “constructed face of national identity” Vale (2003:93), was fully exposed. It became increasingly evident that identity is not a “fact” of society; it is a process of negotiation among people and groups.

Anton du Plessis (2001b:17) argues that critical theories of International Relations have generally been more successful than others when explaining this turbulent era in international relations, also as far as the issue of identity is concerned. The following section of the chapter endeavours to further substantiate this position, specifically from a constructivist perspective.

6.2.1 **Constructivist criticism of the concept of identity**

Within the reflectivist theoretical tradition, identity is extended beyond the realm of the state and the nation - and territory and interests as its logical correlates. A critical approach seeks to address the dilemma inherent in traditional understandings of the concept of identity, where the latter is

unable to speak to emerging dimensions of the concept.

Critical theories of identity maintain that substance rather than form is important. Identity should be viewed as an open-ended departure and not necessarily as an arrival at a pre-determined end-state (du Plessis, 2001b:14). In grappling with the concept of identity, its diversity, dynamism, plurality, and dependence on social and cultural qualities should be recognised.

As summarised by Lapid (1996:8) a critical approach entails that there is a move from bounded or fixed objects in the natural world – namely that identity (singular) is essential, fundamental, unitary and unchanging – to the idea that identities (plural) are constructed and reconstructed through socio-historical action. Hence identities are emergent and constructed – not fixed and natural; contested and polymorphic – not unitary and single; and interactive and process-like – not static and essence-like.

The intuitive notion that identity is “natural” is thus misleading, and even dangerous. Halliday (2002:48) supports this view and argues that historical identity is not a given, like blocks of colour on a map. It is defined and redefined by each generation, in response to current concerns, and it is sometimes defined by some at the expense of others.

Saurette (2000) similarly notes that the precise contours of any particular identity are never natural or necessary. Rather, the substantive content of any identity is always a limited, historical entity. Campbell (1992:8) maintains that any identity is not only historical and particular, but always constructed – created and constantly reproduced by certain forces and acts.

Campbell furthermore suggests that any particular identity, then, has “no ontological status apart from the various acts which constitute its reality” (Campbell, 1992:9). The creation of identity, moreover, relies on certain crucial practices of identity/difference as identity is always “achieved through the inscription of boundaries which serve to demarcate an ‘inside’ from an ‘outside’, a ‘self’ from an ‘other’, a ‘domestic’ from a ‘foreign’” (Campbell, 1992:9).

Linking this line of argumentation to the issue of globalisation, one could argue that globalisation has led to the concept of identity being progressively freed from territorial constraints, thus “the most significant effect of globalisation has been the de-territorialisation of identity as ethnic and national groups, amongst others, display interactions that transcend territorial boundaries and also engage other non-state identities” (du Plessis, 2001b:20). Constructivists also believe that globalisation “suggests possible openings for new means and contexts of identity formation ... in which people are forced constantly to remake their identities” (Steans, 2002:60).

Moving from this premise, a number of theoretical schools now draw attention to the exclusively narrow theoretical foundations, conceptual tools and issue areas of the traditional International Relations that developed in Western Europe and North America in the 20th century. Most notably, postcolonial criticism de-constructs the Euro-centric cultural bias, and feminism the gendered character of the discipline (see Steans, 2002:54-65).

In both instances, ‘traditional’ International Relations is shown to construct a Euro-centric and gendered worldview marginalising and silencing the

‘Other’ – respectively the developing world and women, allowing them at best to be the object of agency in world politics (Anon., 2000).

Claude Ake (1992:12) believes that the views of “the North” towards the developing world, even in the post-Cold War period, display a number of characteristics. These include a preoccupation with the security of certain favoured sub-systems; rather than with the security of the entire world system. It entails a vision of the world not as consisting of equal actors; but as consisting of subjects and objects – the bearers respectively of relevant and irrelevant interests.

Ake maintains that it finally involves a worldview which dichotomises the world without being conscious of the saliency of this dichotomy. Underlying these ideas are notions of “Inside” and “Outside”, of having an identity which makes the individual one of “us” or one of “them”.

Peterson (1997:38) argues that gender is pre-eminent among the obscured aspects of power relations that shape, and are shaped by, the state and capitalism. To remedy this, she asserts, gender is not only a variable that must be added to conventional accounts of international relations, but an analytical category with profound consequences for who we are, what we have, how we act and how we ‘know’ the world (Peterson, 1997:38).

These new critical approaches suggest that International Relations should change its disciplinary “identity politics” and evolve to re-construct its collective self-image on a more inclusive basis, admitting difference and the subjectivity (agency) of the ‘Other’.

The “House of IR”, Agathangelou and Ling (2004a:43) suggest, should promote critical engagement across borders, categories and generations allowing agents from multiple worlds – whether marked by tradition, race, class, gender or sexuality – to build communities together. In this way, the concept of “identity” does not subvert the discipline of International Relations, but extends its possibilities (Anon., 2000).

In the frame of globalisation, and to a certain extent, “we are who we choose to be” according to McSweeney (1999:76). Collective identity is not “out there”, waiting to be discovered. “What is ‘out there’ is identity discourse on the part of political leaders, intellectuals and countless others, who engage in the process of constructing, negotiating, manipulating or affirming a response to the demand – at times urgent, mostly absent – for a collective image.” (McSweeney, 1999:77-78.) What these statements entail in practice, will be fleshed out further in Chapter Eight, when the interaction between Access World and Denial World will be more closely scrutinised.

In terms of identity, humanity seems to differentiate less and less between the “Self” and the “Other” based on historic parameters set by the constructed borders of nation-states. In a global context, the invisible thread that tied the fate of the individual to that of the nation-state seems to have been severed. It will be argued in Chapter Seven that, against the backdrop of globalisation, the criteria for judging identity are changing. Identity is no longer “an accident of birth” (Gumbel, 2005:44), but becomes a matter of personal choice (Access World) or an unwanted burden (Denial World) from which there is often no escape.

Kuhn encourages this type of understanding when he posits that “revolutions should be described not in terms of group experience but in terms of the varied experiences of individual group members” (Kuhn, 1993:xiii). Determining the practical ways in which the separation of individual and nation-state identities are taking place, will be the focus of the next section of this chapter.

6.3 **The concept of identity: practical anomalies**

Within the Westphalian paradigm, identity was a concept which appeared to be unalterable, indeed immutable. In addition, the individual’s identity was firmly linked to that of the nation-state. Since 1945, the nation-state’s positioning within the larger East-West standoff further circumscribed the individual’s identity (see comments by du Plessis, 2001b:13).

The end of the Cold War, however, finally exposed identity as a social construction (du Plessis, 2001b:13) similar to those of security and sovereignty. With the declining ability of the nation-state to provide security to its citizens, and with its claim to sovereignty challenged, the concept of “identity” is similarly being contested, and its content is inevitably changing.

Governments’ appeal to citizens’ sense of identity in terms of the “public interest”, “national duty” or “patriotism” now often rings hollow and only elicits a lacklustre response (see Waters, 1995:5). Howard (2000:100) maintains that the kind of patriotism that enabled the peoples of Europe to endure two world wars now appear as archaic as the feudal loyalties that it had displaced. Patterns of ritual, pageantry and symbolism that gave

collective expression to the nation-state, are receding in importance. Doty (1996:121) asserts that we are witnessing the “instability of national identities”.

Another manifestation of this weakening of “national identity” is widespread resistance in many countries to risking the lives of their young men and women in war. This might also help to explain why the United States is prepared to invest billions of dollars in programmes aimed at developing robot soldiers (a subject which will be touched upon again in Chapter Eight). Living in a “post-heroic age” Howard (2000:102) notes, death is no longer seen “as being part of the social contract” (Howard, 2000:100).

The appeal of the nation-state, as a social construction, was contained in its perceived ability to provide answers to the questions of international relations, within the wider context of the Westphalian paradigm. This ability is, however, now being critically challenged. In the face of the perceived failure of the nation-state “to deliver”, a relocation of authority is identifiable, occurring in several directions.

This relocation depends in part on the extent to which alternative collectivities are perceived as being more receptive to human concerns and of being capable of realising or furthering specific human interests. These multiple directions in which authority is being relocated and towards which identity is migrating, highlight the question mark that hangs over the concept of “national identity” in contemporary international relations.

In this way, identity has migrated both “downward” as well as “upward”

(Rosenau & Durfee, 1995:39). There are thus both sub-national as well as supra-national challenges to conventional ideas of “national” identity. Explaining this, Luke (1994:29) contends that areas of operation below and above the nation-state now frame the critical zones of individual, corporate and social performativity. It is to challenges from these new “critical zones of performativity” – both “below” and “above” the nation-state – that attention will now turn.

6.3.1 **Sub-national challenges to identity**

The major challenge to national identity from below remains that of proliferating ethnic identities, which have reasserted themselves in the post-Cold War world.

6.3.1.1 **The challenge of ethnicity**

Ethnic identity has reasserted itself in the contemporary era of international relations and has occasionally exploded in many areas (du Plessis, 2001b:18; see also Gray 2003:59). In these cases identity is asserted based on “blood, race, language, locality, religion or tradition” (Biswas, 2002:175). In conflicts such as that following the break-up of the former Yugoslavia, a complex confluence of these factors led to large-scale violence. These conflicts amount to a situation where “there is a disarticulation between the state as a spatial unit (with fixed territory) with the spatial claims of the nation(s) in whose name(s) it speaks” (Biswas, 2002:184).

The search for identity has thus, in many ways, become a divisive, instead of

a binding factor in international relations. Another example is the conflict between Hutus and Tutsis in Rwanda in 1994 that claimed hundreds of thousands of lives (see Lake & Rothchild, 1998:24). Evans & Newnham (1998:153) add that these types of conflicts differ from the anti-colonial, secessionist and separatist movements of the past which were chiefly conducted within the juridical framework of the persistence of a system of sovereign territorial states.

It is, however, important to note that the resurgence of ethnic identity and related ethnic movements are not only limited to the so-called developing world, but have emerged in other environments as well (du Plessis, 2001b:18-19; also see Doty, 1996:122). Examples of these include the case of Quebec in Canada (discussed in Chapter Five) and that of the Catalonian region in Spain (Keating, 1998:35).

Issues of identity also remain unresolved in other, well-established and seemingly stable nation-states. Using the example of the United Kingdom, Guibernau and Goldblatt (2000:120) posit that citizens' identification with Britishness and indeed the content of what it means to be British appear increasingly fragile and uncertain.

The rise of a more robust and entrenched Scottish national identity has been paralleled by a deepening sense of Welsh national identity. In Northern Ireland, a significant proportion of the population have always seen themselves as Irish rather than British (Guibernau & Goldblatt, 2000:120).

The demand for labour generated by the economic growth of the 1950s and

1960s saw a great wave of migration to the UK from Britain's former colonies in the Caribbean and the Indian subcontinent. For some, the growth and influence of these communities have unsettled the meaning of Britishness (Guibernau & Goldblatt, 2000:121).

What does it, for example, mean to be "British" in a city like Leicester which, in 2011, is set to become the first city in Europe with a minority white population? (McAllister, 2005: 39). As will be argued in later chapters, Western nation-states (or traditionally Access World societies) will increasingly have to come to terms with a situation where "the field of 'otherness' [has] moved from the 'outside' to the 'inside'" (Laidi, 1998:104).

Axtmann (1995:920) maintains that, in a globalised world, and confronted with the demise of state sovereignty, a stronger emphasis on ethno-cultural identity was to be expected. This trend towards "decentralising subgroupism" (du Plessis, 2001b:19) is further strengthened by a global authority crisis (manifesting in distrust of politicians and low turnout in general elections) and by "a deepening lack of faith ... in the core organizational features of the international" (Vale, 2003:8).

Arguing from a perspective where ethnicity has strongly come to the fore in different environments, it is possible that the early-21st century resurgence of ethnicity is less an eruption of age-old primordial ethnic sentiments, than a symptom of the failure of globalisation. Globalisation has failed to address uncertainty and to provide binding forms of cultural identity grounded in the history and experience of people.

Ethnicity offers higher levels of security against threat than do many other sources of identity, because it offers members of a group symbolic as well as material forms of gratification and security (Holton, 1998:150). Lake and Rothchild maintain that contemporary ethnic conflict is most commonly caused by collective fears of the future (Lake & Rothchild, 1998:4).

Ethnic identification therefore appears to be a worldwide reaction of people to the forces of de-nationalisation and economic and cultural deprivation. According to Holton (1998:7) the fusion of national concerns with ethnicity to produce what has been called “ethno-nationalism” (Connor, 1994:1) may be seen, in part at least, as a reaction against homogenising tendencies and inequalities of power at work in globalisation.

Ethnic identification offers individuals and groups considerable certainty in an uncertain and changing world – in a world, as was explained in Chapter One, in which the nation-state as an anchor appears less and less secure. Richards (1996:119) remarks that when the territorial dimension is added to ethnicity they can together constitute one of the deepest dimensions of human experience – the sense of identity, place and belonging. The ethnic-territorial appeal is basic and challenges complex society over fundamental issues such as the direction and speed of change as well as over the nature of a sense of identity.

Walker makes the important observation that, in terms of ethnicity linked to either nationalism, territory or religion, the persistence of these movements offer “an alternative account of the plurality of peoples” in contrast with the earlier “restricted pluralism of state sovereignty” (Walker, 1993:77).

Walker furthermore suggests that it was conventional to equate state, nation and autonomy, and then to reify all three as the fundamental reality of international life. However, it now seems more useful to ask what states, nations, particularist identities and struggles for autonomy can be under new historical conditions (Walker, 1993:77).

6.3.1.2 **The challenge of “consumer sovereignty”**

In terms of sub-national challenges to identity, the issue of “consumer sovereignty” (Waters, 1995:139-140) must be addressed, as ideas developed here will be taken up in Chapters Seven and Eight again. This phenomenon manifests especially within the frame of postmodernity, and is identifiable within elite sectors of society around the globe. Waters (1995:140) points out that consumer sovereignty refers to more than mere consumption.

In the context of a consumer culture, consumption becomes the main form of self-expression and the chief source of identity. Issues such as ‘taste’, ‘fashion’ and ‘lifestyle’ become key sources of social differentiation, displacing political affiliations such as being a member of a specific nation-state.

Waters (1995:140) declares that consumer sovereignty “invalidates the social and political structures of modernity including states”. Brand loyalty now surpasses national loyalty in importance. In contemporary international relations, much of the resistance against globalisation is aimed specifically at this attempt to create a dominant culture based upon consumerist values (Steans, 2002:56).

Challenges to “national identity” from “below” have now been reviewed. The idea of “national identity” is, however, also challenged from “above”. Looking beyond, and not inside the nation-state, a plethora of new forms of identity are emerging at the supranational level, and the most important of these need to be highlighted. These further underscore the changing nature of the concept of identity within the context of globalisation.

6.3.2 **Supranational challenges to identity**

New identities at the supra-national level – or at the level where one witnesses “the social relations of an ongoing globalisation” (Williams, 2001) - challenge the perceived immutability of national identity. In the case of identities that transcend national boundaries, a collectivity of political actors (political elites in particular) construct a supranational community by developing a common social identity that transcends the legal borders of the state (du Plessis, 2001b:19). Perhaps the best example of this type of identity can be found in the experience of the European Union (EU).

6.3.2.1 **The rise of the European Union (EU)**

From its modest beginnings in the European Coal and Steel Community, the European ‘project’ has drawn an ever-wider circle of nations into a political framework which has seen an increase in decisions taken at the Community level. The EU has its own parliament, its own executive and bureaucracy (built around the Commission), its own framework of community legislation and courts of law.

In principle, “the sovereignty of nation-states is ‘pooled’ in the collective determinations of EU institutions” (Pierson, 1996:197; also see Hehir, 1992:8). Falk (2002:176) refers to “an emergent European polity operating within a constitutional framework, engendering loyalty and political identity” (also see Holton, 1998:79). The EU project involves the active promotion of an identity of “Europeanness” (Biswas, 2002:176; also see Krasner, 2000:15-16).

Jackson and Sorensen (2003:283) remark that EU states are not merely liberal democracies that share common moral values; there is an integrated polity that exists beyond the sovereignty of member states. There is not merely economic interdependence; there is rather an integrated economic space no longer based on purely national economies.

However, developments in the European Union in 2005, such as the rejection by France and the Netherlands of the proposed EU constitution, underline that even these emerging identities are constructed, dynamic, susceptible to change and vulnerable in the face of new sub-national (sometimes xenophobic) identities which are congealing. Keating (1998:35) conveys a similar idea and points out that, although new identities appear to be distinctive, affiliation with these in fact remain “malleable, contextual, and instrumental, used in order to advance specific claims or to resist others”.

At a deeper level, Lahav (2004:6) contends, these events mirror the tension between neo-functional theories of a supranational European Union and realist (state-centric) inter-governmental views. In essence this is still a

debate on how to deal with identity-related questions of “Us versus Them” (Lahav, 2004:1).

A second form of supranational identity that is emerging is related to the Internet, to the World Wide Web (WWW) and to “cyberspace”. This aspect will now be investigated.

6.3.2.2 **The creation of the Internet and of the World Wide Web (WWW)**

In cyberspace non-territorial forms of identity are becoming efficient foci of new loyalties. The notion of an “Internet Citizen” (or “Netizen” as it has been called) negates the traditional association between geography and identity. The Internet, Langman and Morris (2003) contend, provides the conditions for the “massive implosion of boundaries”.

Timothy Luke maintains that this trend presents the most far-reaching challenge yet to the strength and persistence of national identity. Luke (1996) states that a netcentric-world is a nation-decentred world in which intensely felt community ties can, and will, form around interests articulated at web sites rather than at geographical locations.

“Webcrawling” in cyberspace now begins to displace nationalistic expression as a means of self-understanding. Many people actually find more gratification and fulfilment in their virtual selves and in virtual groups than in their “real” life conditions. In a postmodernist framing, the “virtual” often overtakes the “real” (Mills, 2002:69).

Rifkin (2000:131) states that, in the new world of cyberspace, increasing numbers of people spend more and more of their time embedded in relationships that have no geographic frame of reference whatsoever. Millions of people now conduct business and carry on active social lives independent of spatial referencing.

Virtual addresses are fast replacing geographic addresses for people around the world. The ease with which people have been willing to suspend geographic referencing altogether in their commercial and social undertakings is remarkable and bears further testimony to the waning significance of territoriality and of the nation-state in people's lives.

Guéhenno makes the point that:

in the age of networks, the relationship of the citizens to the body politic is in competition with the infinity of connections they establish outside it. ... politics, far from being the organizing principle of life in society, appears as a secondary activity, if not an artificial construct poorly suited to the resolution of the practical problems of the modern world (Guéhenno, (1995:19).

Linked to the Internet, the rise of movements, such as the anti-globalisation campaign, challenges traditional ideas of identity. The next section will explore these movements - their structure and aims – in greater detail.

6.3.2.3 **The proliferation of social movements**

Movements, which should be viewed separately from International

Governmental Organisations (IGOs) or from Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), are less organisationally coherent but are nevertheless politically influential.

Mackenzie observes that:

(t)hese social movements prioritise grassroots mobilisation and the personal and ethical struggles located within the sphere of ‘everyday politics’. The focus on personal, everyday, and cultural politics minimises the involvement of incumbent political and economic structures and effectively [as Hartmann (1998:348) remarks] “de-centres the state as the predominant site of political struggle (Mackenzie, 2004:50).

They act therefore as inchoate structures that cut across associational, class, and geographical boundaries and siphon-off support from established nation-state anchored identities. The focus of these movements are varied and include issues as diverse as hardwood imports, Shell Oil, arms sales, animal rights, quarrying and genetic engineering (Plows, 2000:1). As more and more of these issues rise to urgent status on the global agenda, they will galvanise global movements, which, in turn, may intensify organisation at all levels of society.

Langman and Morris state that:

(i)n the face of the globalization of capital, with the grinding poverty of the majorities, environmental despoliation and human rights abuses, growing numbers seek engagement in organizations that would challenge the new forms of alienation, power and exploitation (Langman & Morris, 2003)

Plows (2000:2) argues that action is the key to understanding these type of movements' collective identity. Their identities are embodied in their action-based philosophy – this is identity through action. Plows (2000:6) also asserts that these movements could be viewed as constructing shared meanings and worldviews, based on the action taken collectively: this in turn comprises its collective identity. Langman and Morris (2003) see this identity coalescing around a commitment to “global justice”.

The reasons for mobilisation are highly, pragmatically, political – a hard-headed assessment of the non-sustainability of present political and economic practices (Plows, 2000:13). Environmental, economic and social issues are thus inextricably linked in the activist worldview. Many of them are aware that globalisation is generating many unusually destructive ecological effects at the local, regional, and global levels.

Finally, the World Wide Web and the Internet have empowered these movements. According to Langman and Morris (2003) they do not depend on leaders and ideologues as much as networkers and “cheerleaders”. They depend on shared values, rich communication flows, and access to information and communication.

The many-to-many flow of information on the Internet enables activists to use dense communications flows to renegotiate, circulate and share power. Langman and Morris (2003) conclude that between the global justice movement and some recent theory constructions, new global justice identities are emerging that increasingly depend on the Internet as a medium of communication.

But what are the implications of these sub-national and supranational challenges to national identity? If human beings are increasingly able to detach their identity from that of the nation-state (sometimes being forced to do so) what are the consequences?

6.4 **Identity as a dimension of the paradigm shift in international relations**

Thomas Kuhn did not focus on the issue of “identity” as a key area of interest. Yet, a close reading of his work nevertheless reveals useful information concerning the scientific community as a grouping with a specific identity.

A scientific community, Kuhn remarks, consists of “the practitioners of a scientific speciality” (Kuhn, 1996:177) and, as a grouping, is “an immensely efficient instrument for solving the problems or puzzles that its paradigm defines” (Kuhn, 1996:166). Working within a paradigm, the members of the scientific community are both the “producers and validators of scientific knowledge” (Kuhn, 1996:178). Addressing very specific questions within periods of “normal science” – an activity which Kuhn describes as “mopping-up operations” (Kuhn, 1996, 24) - is what most scientists do for the larger part of their careers (Kuhn, 1996:24).

As argued in Chapter Three, the discipline of International Relations represents a similar type of “scientific community”, committed to and guided by the parameters provided by the Westphalian paradigm. The knowledge which was produced and validated, explicitly or implicitly,

reflected “Inside/Outside” and “us” versus “them” ideas.

As with Kuhn’s scientific community, the discipline of International Relations appeared to be able to solve the puzzles of international relations comprehensively and eloquently. Like their academic counterparts, politicians, policymakers and bureaucrats were involved in daily “mopping-up operations” to reinforce the specific meanings of the concepts of sovereignty, security and identity and to enhance their image of permanence and inviolability. All of this, however, changed in 1989.

Given the changes that took place with regard to the traditional conceptions of “security” and “sovereignty”, it should have been expected that the content of the concept of “identity” too was bound to be questioned. Bereft of the “common language” (Kuhn, 1977:xxii) that gave meaning to the concept of identity within the Westphalian paradigm, humanity is no longer looking to the nation-state for an understanding of the concept.

Albrow (1996:160) affirms that “(i)t is ... a question of recognizing that identity extends beyond national definition and ... [of recognising that] personal fates are linked to global conditions”. Rather, as will be argued in Chapter Seven, the dynamic exchange between Access World and Denial World is leading to:

the negotiation of new identities that are filling the social and psychological spaces vacated by weakening states and fragmenting societies, spaces that may have the capacity to siphon off the commitments and orientations that states are no longer able to serve (Rosenau, 2002:30).

Identity in contemporary international relations is characterised by shifting allegiances or by the “restructuring of loyalties” (Rosenau & Durfee, 1995:50).

Referring to the characteristics of identity which Woodward identified in the first section of this chapter, shifting allegiances entail that there is still an engagement, but now with new identities. James Rosenau (2003:127) concurs that there is a reshaping of long-standing commitments and loyalties that have previously been directed towards the state-centred world. Humanity yields to globalising pressures that generate orientations toward one or another new world.

The issues that people regard as important, as salient to their lives, operate as the basis for these shifting allegiances (Rosenau, 2003:177). In the case of Access World, this new identity primarily results from an increased sense of agency. In the case of Denial World, this choice is primarily determined by the structuring of global society.

Secondly, Woodward suggests that identity is always marked by difference and sameness. In the paradigm shift in international relations, the sense of difference or sameness is less and less determined by geographical borders and by a shared nationality. As we shall see, sameness or difference is increasingly determined by the individual’s perception of “access” or “lack of access” in a globalised world. This critically determines the way in which the individual’s loyalties are restructured.

Thirdly Woodward points out the importance of signifiers of national

identity such as flags and national anthems. In the paradigm shift in international relations, these signifiers of identity now function at a global level. It will be argued in the next chapter that global signifiers such as wealth, mobility, connectivity and agency now determine an individual's loyalty or allegiance. Humanity is ontologically reorienting itself, based on these criteria. On the basis of these processes, a clearer conception of being a citizen of either Access World or of Denial World is simultaneously emerging.

In the paradigm shift in international relations, the concept of identity, as traditionally conceived, is challenged. It is clear that the nation-state's capacity to sustain broad consensus around shared goals has been diminished and that the nation-state's ability to convert the energies of citizens in support of policies reduced. Allegiances are shifting and loyalties are being restructured - new identities are materialising in the "space of flows" which is now international relations.

6.5 Conclusion

"Certain elements of the Periodic Table go together in such frequent and stable fashion that the compounds themselves are treated as "real things" – they have an existence of their own." (Caporaso, 2000:6.) Security, sovereignty and identity functioned in much the same way, constituting key elements of the Westphalian paradigm.

Furthermore these concepts gave meaning and direction to the paradigm, but at the same time each derived their own individual meaning from it, and

specific meanings in relation to each other. Kuah (2003:ii), for example, asserts that “the politics of identity and the politics of sovereignty are a mutually constitutive, intersubjective discourse”. Similarly, Peter Vale (2003:14) asserts that security and sovereignty are twin concepts.

In the language of Kuhn then, these concepts formed “a pattern of similarities” (Kuhn, 2000a:30) durably clustered around the Westphalian paradigm. The concepts functioned together “as a coherent ensemble, as part of the overall concept of the Westphalian order” (Caporaso, 2000:8).

However, in 1989, these concepts largely lost their meaning in the face of “postmodern challenges, sub-national and transnational political identifications, and local-national-global linkages” (Peterson, 1996:11). The breakdown in the meaning of the components of the paradigm inevitably led to the paradigm itself becoming meaningless – international relations were exposed as being ill-equipped to deal with new “political issues, actors, places and spaces” (Williams, 2001).

“Transcendence of the sovereign states-system as the basic framing arrangement of international relations means the end of the Westphalian monopoly of the framing discourse of politics.” (Williams, 2001.) A larger ontological crisis was triggered – “the end of the Westphalian monopoly of the framing discourse of politics” translates as a breakdown of the Westphalian vision of the world. What followed was the commencement of a fundamental shift - a shift from which the system of international relations is yet to emerge.

The puzzling (and often apparently conflicting) developments in international relations that get beamed around the world every day - tendencies intimately related to issues of security, sovereignty and identity - are indicative of this ongoing paradigm shift. We are witnessing the convulsions of a “decaying social order” (Vale, 2003:6). Further explaining these phenomena, Rosenau (1990:34) maintains that, in a paradigm shift, conceptual clarity is inevitably undermined.

In the process, security, sovereignty and identity have been exposed as being not stable “elements”, but volatile ones. These are socially constructed concepts subject to renegotiation and refutation, and, like all issues in social science, are “vulnerable to changing objective conditions that affect the aspirations and capacities of collectives and individuals” (Vale, 2003:173).

It is on these “changing objective conditions” that Chapter Seven will focus. In terms of contemporary international relations, which is “a transformation, and not a culmination” (Albrow, 1996:100), Chapter Seven asks the critical question: How does humanity respond to mutual vulnerability, spatial re-stratification and shifting allegiances in the context of an ongoing paradigm shift in international relations?

CHAPTER SEVEN

SECURITY, SOVEREIGNTY, AND IDENTITY REVISITED: ACCESS WORLD AND DENIAL WORLD

7.1 Introduction

Voiced by someone who has been described as “an apostle of geopolitics” (Soros, 1998:215), it is insightful and slightly ironic to read Henry Kissinger’s remarks in 1975 when he states that:

(t)he traditional agenda of international affairs – the balance among major powers, the security of nations – no longer defines our perils or our possibilities ... Now we are entering a new era. Old international patterns are crumbling; old slogans are uninformative; old solutions are unavailing. The world has become interdependent in economics, in communications, in human aspirations.

He continues and states that:

progress in dealing with the traditional agenda is no longer enough. A new and unprecedented kind of issue has emerged. The problems of energy, resources, environment, population, the uses of space and the seas now rank with questions of military security, and ideological and territorial rivalry which have traditionally made up the diplomatic agenda (Kissinger, 1975:1).

In 1975, Kissinger was already acutely aware of the “essential tension” (Kuhn, 1996:79) in international relations. “Westflailia”, however, only became truly visible in 1989 when, almost overnight, the global political

architecture was dramatically and irrevocably altered. Until that point, and as is characteristic of a dominant paradigm, the Westphalian paradigm could time and again reinvent itself, elaborating explanations when challenged and when anomalies arose. The paradigm could maintain its “language of justification” (Biersteker & Weber, 1996:5).

In 1989, however, the paradigm came under pressure on a number of fronts simultaneously and was unable to respond. A pervasive sense of “malfunction” (Kuhn, 1996:92) became discernible and international relations witnessed a quickening flow of anomalies. A noticeable shift had taken place; anomalies had become more pervasive than recurrent patterns and discontinuities more prominent than continuities as the central tendencies in international relations (Rosenau, 1990:5).

The nation-state’s ability to ensure security, its claim to sovereignty, and its capacity to offer identity, were all being eroded simultaneously. It was very clear, as the Berlin Wall was being broken down brick by brick, that a paradigm shift in international relations was underway. The demolition of the Berlin Wall not only signalled an opening across territorial space, but it equally signalled an awareness of temporal velocities and incongruities (Walker, 1993:3). In terms of the extent to which both space and time were being compressed by the process (soon to be called) globalisation, it was clear that accepted Inside/Outside distinctions in international relations had become outdated.

Hand-in-hand with these developments, the language of International Relations, which had served many so well during the past, became less and less relevant, unable to explain new trends and developments. In a Kuhnian sense, not only knowledge of the world of international

relations, but also the language encapsulating that knowledge, was proving inadequate. Powerful forces were released which were “revising the axioms of international politics” (Nolan *et al.*, 1994:19).

As humanity enters the third millennium, the many conceptual and ideological structures that were taken for granted and gave a grasp of “reality” have crumbled. With the disarticulation of the terms of reference of international relations, the conceptual foundations that gave meaning to the Westphalian paradigm have become unsteady. Much of the “assumptive scaffolding” (Nef, 1999:4) that emerged in the context of this paradigm has lost consistency. A situation has arisen which has altered “the historical perspective of the community that experiences it” as Kuhn (1996:xi) described it in Chapter Three.

The future of the nation-state, the traditional cornerstone of the system of international relations, is no longer certain. Albrow (1996:45) suggests that forces that cross the boundaries of nation-state society will decisively influence the nation-state’s future trajectory. Attali (1991:118) adds to this that the most pressing future problem will be the struggle to learn how to manage problems that are, for the first time, global in nature.

Emerging from this paradigm shift is (what has been called) the “Access World/Denial World” configuration of international relations – a re-articulation of political, economic and social space refracted through the lens offered by globalisation. The use of the term “world” here is specifically intended to suggest a predominant perspective on life – an ontology or worldview – through which people:

arrange their priorities among the opportunities available to them, the

threats they perceive as serious, the values they hold dear, the goals to which they aspire, and the horizons they view as salient (Rosenau, 2003:41).

It will be maintained that the dynamic interaction between security, sovereignty, and identity will continue in international relations discourse, but that the meanings that attach to these concepts, and the way they are perceived by humanity, will change. This is because humanity's understanding of security, sovereignty and identity is increasingly shaped within the context of globalisation. In terms of their worldview, human beings perceive themselves either benefiting from, or being disadvantaged by, the process of globalisation. This gives rise to a situation where planet earth increasingly represents "not 'one world' but 'two worlds' " (Speth, 1997:166-167).

Today, the inhabitants of the globe seem to be living in two parallel dimensions; those in the one dimension have a radically different view of a world in the throes of globalisation from those in the other. These two worlds are interlinked but are not "necessarily socially integrated" (De Santis, 1996:146). The discourse between the two progressively resembles a Kuhnian sense of "incommensurability". This development has potentially dire consequences because it negates the fact that, in a globalised world, humanity shares a common destiny. The implications of this bifurcation will be explored in this chapter.

The Westphalian paradigm of international relations, especially as it evolved during the Cold War period, imprinted a rigid division on the world. Notions of "Inside/Outside" and "us" versus "them" were embodied in ideas such as "East" versus "West" and these, in turn,

generated an extensive Cold War vocabulary, still in use today. The intention with the development of the Access World/Denial World idea is not however to superimpose a new binary on the world or to (again) “stuff” global politics “into two pigeonholes” (Huntington, 1993:187).

The Access World/Denial World metaphor does not merely recast a statist structure of conflict as a global one. There is, indeed, an acknowledgement that very complex configurations exist (and combine) in the world of contemporary international relations. The “present-day polarization has many dimensions”, Bauman (1998:3) asserts. The thesis, however, posits that the foregrounding of the Access World/Denial World configuration facilitates the explanation of (often) contradictory developments and this appears to underscore its conceptual utility.

Instead of replacing an old division with a new one, the binary technique represents an effort to critically engage the subject matter of contemporary international relations, given the fact that “(t)he power of binaries lies in their facility to draw, define, and contrast extremes; this is often helpful in holding options to the light” (Vale, 2003:139). Access World and Denial World is therefore not another addition to the “carnival of the grand generalization” (Halliday, 2002:37) but an attempt to critically and fundamentally “rethink the constructed nature of boundaries and political spaces” (Steans, 2002:65) in a way which could lead to change for the better.

Shaw (2000a) argues that the global is the largest and most inclusive spatial framework of social relations. It is therefore not accidental that global categories - such as Access World and Denial World in this case - have emerged as main forms of the new theoretical discourse in the social

sciences. The ‘global’, according to Chandler (2001:11), is the key political space in which the solution to state-based politics can be found. The illustrative power of these types of global comparisons is thus significant, and useful conclusions can result from juxtaposing these expressions of global political space.

Very importantly, too, the binary is utilised in this study to carry the idea that the interaction between Access World and Denial would appear to be taking on a confrontational character; it seems to be evolving into a schism similar to the Cold War standoff. The binary concept allows a view of the “obverse side of globalisation: the discontents to which it gives rise and ... the strategies of the discontented” (Coker, 2002:7).

The juxtaposition reveals that some representatives of both Access World and Denial World are involved in attempts to (in a sense) recreate the rigid Cold War divisions of security/insecurity, Inside/Outside and Self/Other - albeit on a global scale. Using a “binary” allows for isolating and critically engaging this tendency. At the same time it provides space for discussing possible pro-active steps aimed at ameliorating the (apparent) tension between these two worlds.

In the process of developing the concepts of Access World and Denial World, unavoidable use has been made of quotations by authors who utilise concepts inherited from the Westphalian paradigm. “East” and “West”, “First World” and “Third” World, “North” and “South”, “Developing” and “Developed” – all these concepts are still widely used in international relations. The chapter will however, conclude that, in a world where the “Inside/Outside” distinction is fast disappearing, these, predominantly geographically-bounded terms are increasingly of little

value. These concepts, Agathangelou and Ling (2004b:518) observe, ideally have to be disassembled to promote an understanding of the forces that shape international relations.

Chapter Seven will proceed to develop the concepts of Access World and Denial World, to investigate dimensions of the Access World/Denial World construct, and to explore how these two spheres interact in theory. The relevance of the concepts of security, sovereignty and identity (within the Access World/Denial World framework) will be constantly highlighted.

7.2 The concepts “Access World” and “Denial World”

In the novel *Don Quixote*, Sancho Panza, Quixote’s faithful squire, claims that “(t)here are only two families in the world ... the have-somethings and the have-nothings” (De Cervantes Saavedra, 2004:721). In a globalised world, these two families - the “have-somethings” and the “have-nothings” - or the haves and the have-nots as they have become known colloquially - have evolved into intricate forms: but are still very much with us, however. The concepts “Access World” and “Denial World” have been developed to give content and structure to these.

The concept Access World is an adaptation of the title of the book “The Age of Access: how the Shift from Ownership to Access is transforming Modern Life” by Jeremy Rifkin. According to Rifkin, the word “access” has become synonymous with advancement and personal fulfilment and is as powerful as the democratic vision was to earlier generations (Rifkin, 2000:15). It is a highly charged word, full of political significance. Access is, at its core, about distinctions and divisions; about who is to be

included and who is to be excluded. Rifkin (2000:15) contends that “(a)ccess is becoming a potent conceptual tool for rethinking our worldview ... making it the single most powerful metaphor of the coming age”.

The concept of “Denial World” is offered as a counterweight or opposite pole to Access World. Rifkin (2000:13) notes that while one fifth of the world population’s lives are based on access relationships, the rest of humanity is still caught up in a world of physical scarcity. For the majority of the inhabitants of Denial World, life remains a daily struggle for survival. Their world is far removed from fibre-optic cables, satellite uplinks, cellular phones, computer screens and cyberspace networks. Whereas access conjures up images of whole new worlds of possibilities and opportunities, denial signifies the exact opposite.

The stark distinction between these two worlds, global awareness of this distinction, and the respective worldviews flowing from this, form the basis for the key argument advanced in this chapter. This central argument posits that the interaction between Access World and Denial World will represent the nucleus of political struggle in the coming decades.

As Booth (1998a:346) affirms, the main question facing international relations might therefore not be: “What will the twenty-first century be *like?*”, but “Who will the twenty-first century be *for?*” (Booth, 1998a:346 – italics in original). But what exactly are the criteria that set Access World apart from Denial World? What does the one have? And what is the other being denied?

7.3 **Characteristics of Access World and Denial World**

Four criteria distinguish the citizens of Access World from those of Denial World.

7.3.1 **The question of “affluence”**

The division between Access World and Denial World is firstly a division of affluence. Referring to the novel “Don Quixote”, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Kofi Annan, asserts that, when referring to the haves and the have-nots, De Cervantes could have been speaking and writing about our own era, when some people enjoy fabulous wealth, while nearly half of the world’s population live on less than US\$ 2 a day (UN, 2002).

While many rejoiced in 1989, for countless millions across the globe the end of the Cold War only served to expose an older bifurcation, that between the world’s haves and the have-nots (Booth, 1998b:17-18). There has been an explosive widening of the gap between the rich and the poor since 1945 compared with previous history, and more particularly in the 1990s (Adams, 1993:vii; also see Rogers, 2000:81-82). The Access World/Denial World dichotomy could thus be described as a Rich World/Poor World division (Moore, 2005) although this is but one aspect of the emerging Access World/Denial World configuration, as we shall see.

7.3.2 **The question of “mobility”**

Secondly, the division is one of mobility. The citizens of Access World

are mobile; space between Access World and Denial World is traversed in both its real and ‘virtual’ renditions. The citizens of Denial World are tied down, and when they are on the move, movement takes the form of (often illegal) immigration or asylum-seeking. One observer remarks that “their isolation is extreme, their alienation profound and their future uncertain” (Smith, 2003:3).

Based on their mobility, the inhabitants of Access World become “fully and truly ‘global’” (Bauman, 1998:2). They lead a “digital lifestyle”, as espoused by Bill Gates, the chairman of Microsoft, seamlessly traversing a universe of digital communication, music, film and television (Anon., 2005f:18). On the other hand, the inhabitants of Denial World are increasingly fixed in their ‘locality’ – a predicament neither pleasurable nor enduring in the world in which the ‘globals’ set the tone and compose the rules of the life-game (Bauman, 1998:2). The inhabitants of Denial World are increasingly “territorially tied” as Mary Kaldor (1999:70) describes it.

7.3.3 **The question of “connectivity”**

The Access World/Denial World division, thirdly, is one of connectivity. There is a clear distinction between those living inside the electronic gates of cyberspace and those living outside it. Inhabitants of Access World will be quick to point out that around 100 million people in the world regularly use the World Wide Web. They, however, do not draw attention to the less well-known statistic that one-half of the world’s inhabitants or three billion people have never made a telephone call (Holsti, 1998:5). The gulf between the “information rich” - with access to a range of information devices and sources - and the “information poor” -

who lack electricity, communication technologies and access to information – grows on a daily basis (Mackay, 2000:57).

Rifkin (2000:14) remarks that the new global digital communications networks, because they are so encompassing and comprehensive, have the effect of creating a new and totalising social space, a second earthly sphere above the terra mater, suspended in the ether of cyberspace. The migration of human activity to the realm of cyberspace isolates one part of the human population from the rest in ways never before imaginable. In the mid-1990s, the Clinton administration coined a name for this phenomenon – the “digital divide” (Warschauer, 2003:1).

This “digital divide” has far-reaching consequences. Rifkin (2000:14) points out that when one segment of humanity is no longer able to communicate with the other in time and space, the question of access takes on a political import of historical proportions. In the years to come, this divide between those whose lives are increasingly taken up in cyberspace and those who will never have access to this powerful new realm of human existence, will be one of the key aspects dividing Access World and Denial World (see Pinkett, 2001).

7.3.4 **The question of “agency”**

Finally, a differentiation can be made between Access World and Denial based on their sense of agency. Agency refers to “active self-constitution, striving for realization and fulfilment” (Langman & Morris, 2003) or to actors having “the freedom to create, change and influence events” (Bilton *et al.*, 2002:539). The citizens of Access World have freedom, in the sense of being free to move, to trade, to invest capital, to work

wherever they please. They have the ultimate freedom to act and to determine their own future. The citizens of Denial World often find themselves in situations where these freedoms are severely curtailed and their upward mobility constrained in many ways.

The inhabitants of Access World have opportunities, the latter based on the skills they possess. The inhabitant of Denial World, often, has nothing to offer except his or her physical labour, but increasingly even this is snubbed and does not translate into access. Intellectual capital is the driving force in a globalised world. Concepts, ideas and images are increasingly the items of real value (Rifkin, 2000:5; also see Garrett, 2004:84). The skilled are privileged at the expense of the unskilled (Higgott, 2002:98).

Access World is, however, not completely averse to exploiting the labour of Denial World. Invariably designer garments bought in the United States will be produced in Guatemala or in the Dominican Republic; a garment bought in the United Kingdom in Romania or Turkey. The caveat in this regard is that these activities must be “contained” to Denial World and must be obtainable at much lower rates than would have been otherwise possible. Apart from this, workers in these factories are often subjected to inhumane working conditions that would generally be viewed as unacceptable (see Rogers, 2000:84-85).

Laxer (1998:15-16) gives a detailed account of the way in which Nike, the sports shoe manufacturer, was exposed in 1997 as employing young women aged between 15 and 28 in plants in Vietnam under appalling conditions. This included corporal punishment and rigidly controlled work schedules. The women working in the plant were paid only US\$ 1.6

a day. Cyber-capitalism is markedly inegalitarian in its impact (Laxer, 1998:26).

In sum, Access World has power and Denial World has little to none. The inhabitants of Denial World have no access, they have no means of “plugging into the available political, social and economic resources” (van Zyl Slabbert, 2005:26). But, as will be argued in subsequent sections of this and the next chapter, concepts such as “powerful” and “powerless” have become extremely deceptive. This the events of 11 September 2001 graphically illustrated (see Agathangelou & Ling, 2004b:517). “Power”, Keohane (2002:82) remarks, “comes not simply out of the barrel of a gun, but from asymmetries in vulnerability interdependence”.

In exploring the meaning of the concepts “Access World” and “Denial World”, we have also expanded on the criteria that distinguish the two. But what does the Access World/Denial World configuration look like? An elaboration of this construct’s architecture is essential.

7.4 The architecture of the Access World/Denial World configuration

A reference by the former Czech President, Vaclav Havel, to the “complex and multileveled ways in which our planetary society is organized” (Havel, 1999), is very useful when visualising the global Access World/Denial World configuration. James Rosenau believes that only multilevel theory is capable of coping with the puzzles posed by the turbulence presently confronting the actors and structures of international relations (Rosenau, 1990:24-25; also see Mittelman, 2002b:6; Walker, 1993:159).

Using multilevel theory as a point of departure, Access World and Denial World represent the upper and lower levels respectively of the turbulence paradigm in international relations. As noted in Chapter Three, the turbulence paradigm encompasses dynamics that foster intense conflicts, unexpected developments, pervasive uncertainties and swift changes in the realm of international relations (Rosenau & Durfee, 1995:33).

Access World, or the upper level of this turbulence paradigm, is home to the cross-section of humanity that benefits from the process of globalisation (defined as the erosion of the distinction between internal and external) and who can retrieve the fruits of globalisation. Denial World, or the lower level of the turbulence paradigm, is home to the cross-section of humanity that does not benefit from the process of globalisation; who is refused access to the fruits of globalisation.

Globalisation therefore has the innate capacity to be either a personally and privately enabling or a constraining process (Holton, 1998:199). Underscoring the importance of this, Holton (1998:156) states that “(g)lobalization as a process of (both perceived and very real) change, taking place across political and cultural borders, is perhaps as overtly challenging as war”.

Access World and Denial World (each home to a distinct cross-section of humanity) are emerging as “new spheres of authority” - as Rosenau (2002:22) calls them - in embryonic form. They may be the first traces of “emerging terminal entities” (Rosenau, 2002:23) that can capture the loyalties and refocus the orientations of humanity in new ways. The question can thus be posed: If, as constructivists contend, the nation-state is an “imagined political community” in which individuals will never

know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them (Anderson, 1991:6), what prevents Access World and Denial World from developing as new imagined communities over a period, albeit now on a global scale?

Holton reminds us that that “there may be one planet earth but ... there is more than one human world living on it” (Holton, 1998:12). Access World and Denial World indeed signify two different spheres of existence. Their inhabitants do not “share a common reality” as Laxer (1998:53) puts it. This lack of a shared experience lies at the heart of the Access World/Denial World *problematique* as will be argued.

Interestingly, Francis Fukuyama gives a similar account of the emerging (but divided) global structure and also refers to the incommensurability between the two. He believes that “(f)or the foreseeable future, the world will be divided between a post-historical part, and a part that is still stuck in history” (Fukuyama, 1992:276). He concedes that the dividing line between the historical and post-historical world can sometimes be difficult to draw, but believes that these two worlds “will maintain parallel but separate existences, with relatively little interaction between them” (Fukuyama, 1992:277).

Viewed individually, and using Fukuyama’s idea of parallel existences, the Access World level exists parallel to, but slightly elevated above that of Denial World. By doing this, the prevailing sense of spatial “re-stratification” (as was explored in Chapter Five) is better explained. Explicating the Access World/Denial World architecture in this way also illustrates that although the inhabitants of the two levels are separated, they are in full view of each other. The reason for this is that, in a

globalised world, we are living in a “communicative environment ever more structured by televisual media and by the importance of images” (Williams, 2003:525).

Barnet and Cavanagh write that:

(f)antasies of affluence, freedom and power flash across the earth as movie and TV images, offering the poor of the world a window into a fairy-tale world of money, thrills and ease, but no door (Barnet & Cavanagh, 1995:419)

Moving “down” from Access World to Denial World is easy; despite Access World being visible, moving “up” from Denial World to Access World is cumbersome and arduous – almost impossible. “Globalization raises ... expectations that often cannot be fulfilled, and the end result is alienation, frustration, relative deprivation and, potentially, crime and social strife.” (Ger & Belk, 1996:283.)

The Access World/Denial World partitioning furthermore represents a clear division in terms of demographics. Denial World is generally much more populous than Access World with a much younger population. The inhabitants of Access World and of Denial World all live in the “global village” (McLuhan, 1964:93) but are divided on a basis of roughly one to five.

Transferring this demographic information to the Access World/Denial World configuration highlights a situation where the surface of the upper, elevated level of the configuration is clearly limited while that of the lower level is vast. Paul Kennedy (1993:331) identifies “a growing

mismatch between where the world's riches, technology, good health, and other benefits are to be found and where the world's fast-growing new generations, possessing few if any of those benefits, live" (also see Steinbruner, 2000:8-9).

One projection envisions that the "Western" nations' share of world population, which was 22% in 1950 and 15% in 1985, would be a miniscule 5% in 2085 (Wattenberg, 1987:81). In 2005, the United Nations estimated that the world's population will increase by 40 percent to 9.1 billion in 2050, but virtually all the growth will be in the developing world, especially in the 50 poorest countries (see Lederer, 2005). More than 60% percent of Africa's population is made up of young people under 25 (Anon., 2004:9).

The demographic argument expounded above, linked to these statistics, suggests that the majority of Denial World live in what has traditionally been called "the developing world", and more specifically in Africa. Flagging an idea which will be touched upon again in Chapter Eight, Steinbruner (2000:10) comments that it is difficult to imagine that social coherence could be preserved decade after decade with economic growth occurring at the top of the prosperity pyramid and population growth at the bottom.

Thus far, elements of the Access World/Denial World configuration have been discussed individually. When viewed in combination, the Access World/Denial World configuration represents a dynamic new "global social structure" (Williams, 1996:118). It represents a reordering – a dynamic new articulation - of time and space, in which the territoriality of conventional international relations has been ruptured. This structure

embodies “new patterns of power and inequality in the global order” and plots the “complex pattern of winners and losers emerging in the global economic system” (Held, 2000a:174).

We are not witnessing a “Clash of Civilizations” (Huntington, 1996:13), but a “Clash of Globalizations” (Hoffmann, 2003:106) with Access World and Denial World reaping benefit-, and being excluded from, the fruits of globalisation respectively. The emerging situation does not represent the “End of History” (Fukuyama, 1992:ix), but the divergence of history, with the inhabitants of Access World and Denial World living on the same planet, but on different ontological planes.

As part of this paradigm shift, the “institutions, structures, and processes that sustain economic, political and social life today are undergoing extensive transformations that are rendering the international-domestic dichotomy obsolete” (Rosenau, 2002:22; also see Holton, 1998:113; Devetak, 2002:169). These processes lead to a situation where, although apart, the Access World and Denial World levels are linked in an organic holistic sense (Groom, 1999:29).

This is an area of “indeterminate and shifting boundaries” (Rosenau, 2002:24); the area where Access World and Denial World connect - where they are organically linked - and where these two cross-sections of humanity engage each other. In this sense it disagrees with Fukuyama’s contention that there will be “relatively little interaction” between the two worlds. In fact, exactly the opposite is the case. James Rosenau describes this area of interaction as:

a new frontier where politics unfolds, a frontier that is marked by an

endless flow of new technologies, by an endless proliferation of new organizations and by an endless movement of people across borders, not to mention the endless flow of polluted air and water, crime, drugs and diseases (Rosenau, 2002:22)

Along this line of engagement, the “tensions and contradictions generated by the clash of globalizing and localizing dynamics” (Rosenau, 2002:27) emerge.

The importance of this frontier area cannot be underestimated. Gaddis (1992:24) declares that probably the most important post-Cold War division is the one that separates integrative from disintegrative forces in international relations (also see Williams, 1996:119). Waters (1995:139-140), in similar vein, refers to a “complex interweave of homogenizing with differentiating trends”. The dynamics along the Access World/Denial World frontier also prove – as we have noted - that globalisation is a “decidedly unfinished narrative that could go forward in different directions” (Falk, 2002:162).

To confine this inquiry only to globalising dynamics or to localising forms, is to risk overlooking what makes events unfold. In order to facilitate a continual focus on this interactive perspective, Rosenau (2002:28) coins the phrase “framegration”, a concept that juxtaposes the “processes of fragmentation and integration occurring within and amongst organizations, communities, countries, regions and transnational systems” (also see also Holton, 1998:5).

In a later work, Rosenau (2003:11) more specifically describes these processes as “localizing, decentralizing, or fragmenting dynamics that are

interactively and causally linked to globalizing, centralizing, and integrating dynamics”. Dissecting the interactivity and causal linkages between these various “fragnegrative processes” (Rosenau, 2002:28) lie beyond the scope of this study. The study merely notes the positioning of these within the evolving global architecture, that is, in the fluid frontier area linking Access World and Denial World.

In the face of these processes, traditional, mostly nation-state- and geographically linked Westphalian concepts now appear obsolete and often make little sense. Despite this, and keeping in mind Kuhn’s contention that dominant paradigms do not yield to new pressures overnight, the processes of fragmentation and integration, the re-ordering of humanity, still seem to be the most easily discernible or noticeable between existing nation-states.

7.4.1 Access World, Denial World and existing nation-states

Buzan (1991b:432) asks what does ‘West’ mean when it includes Japan and Australia, or ‘North’ when it includes Albania, Romania and the Soviet Union, or ‘South’ when it includes Korea but excludes Australia? He adds that it is commonplace to observe that the term ‘Third World’ has lost nearly all its content. In the absence of a Second World, how can there be a Third? What now unites countries as diverse as South Korea, India, Malawi and Bahrain that they should be referred to as a distinct ‘world’?

In trying to find answers to these questions in the Access World/Denial World idiom, Buzan (1991b:432) provides a possible answer. He contends that recasting Westphalia into a new mould could best be done

by using the centre-periphery approach which was elaborated in dependency theories developed by scholars such as Frank (1969) and Cardoso (1978). Nef (1999:22) gives further structure to this idea and contends that the two central polarities in international relations – between North and South and between East and West – have been replaced by a single core-periphery axis (also see Nef, 2001:47).

In terms of this interpretation, the Western core (or so-called First World) remains as it was: an interdependent and stratified bloc of dominant trading partners. The development of a transnational economy, discussed in Chapter Five, further strengthens the linkages between three core Access World areas: the USA, Western Europe, and Japan (Holton, 1998:53).

The so-called Second and Third Worlds have collapsed into one heterogeneous conglomerate including “newly industrializing”, “developing”, and “poor societies”, along with the “transitional societies” of the former socialist camp (Nef, 1999:22; also see Kuah, 2003:29-30). The languages in which the warning to prospective asylum-seekers at Heathrow International Airport in London is printed, give some indication of the “conglomerate” of nation-states to which the citizens of Denial World belong - Somali, French (the Maghreb region), Arabic, Albanian, Farsi and Kurdish.

The pattern of division between core and periphery nation-states is replicated within nation-states (see Venter, 2001:121; also see Rosenau, 2003:386). Laidi (1998:98) suggests that the crisis of the links between nation-states resembles the crisis of the social links within each nation-state. What emerges (in both core and periphery nation-states) is an

increasing concentration of force and wealth in the hands of a global ruling class, in which economic and organisational commonalities are stronger than any traditional definition of national interest, at the expense of the rest of humanity (see Rogers, 2000:86). Thomas (2002:72) argues that for many, the term Third World status now applies irrespective of geographic location. For Denial World, Third World status has effectively been globalised; even inside countries such as the United States.

In the United States, the unquestioned leader of Access World, the gap between rich and poor has widened into “an even deeper gulf in which the richest one percent of Americans or 2.8 million people, had more after-tax money in 2000 than did the bottom 40%, or 110 million Americans (Browning, 2003:5). The poverty level in the United States rose to 12.7% in 2004 (a fourth consecutive annual increase) with 37 million people living in poverty (Leonhardt, 2005:A9).

Rorty (1999:231) states that social critics are warning that the United States:

is in danger of what they call ‘Brazilianization’ – that is, the emergence of an ‘overclass’ consisting of the top 20 percent of the population, and the steady immiseration of everybody else. By now there is little difference between the favelas of Rio and the ghettos of Chicago, and little difference in lifestyle between the Chicago suburbs and that in the affluent sections of Rio (Rorty, 1999:231).

A similar trend is noticeable in the United Kingdom, another country traditionally viewed as belonging exclusively to Access World. Mackintosh and Mooney (2000:93) point out that in 1994 more than half (53%) of the financial wealth in the UK was owned by five percent of the

population. Canada provides yet another example. According to Laxer (1998:3) thirty percent of the children in Toronto – the city picked by the United Nations as the best place in the world to live – live below the poverty line.

In an article written in 1973, the Chilean economist Osvaldo Sunkel already foresaw a situation where there develops a divide between transnationally integrated, affluent elites, along with their respective clienteles, and a large fragmented mass of subordinate sectors at the margins of the modern, integrated global society (Sunkel, 1973:140-150). Nef argues that transnational integration and territorial decentralisation have gone hand in hand, as in the case of the globalisation of production, trade, and accumulation (Nef, 1999:74).

Moore (2005) gives an excellent account of how globalisation allows periphery elites, often representing oil-exporting countries, to integrate themselves fully into Access World (also see similar comments by Huntington, 2004:267-268). For Pasha (2003:115), this trend amounts to the globalisation of the liberal-modernist project. Pasha furthermore asserts that (putting down a marker which will be followed up later in this chapter) the hold of this project on the imagination is most pervasive “not only in the *cultural* West, but *outside*, in the minds of state elites and managers in the Islamic and other non-Western cultural zones” (Pasha, 2003:115-116 – italics in original).

Transnational networks operate as mechanisms for elite integration and reinforcement, facilitated by transnational corporations, international organisations, professional associations and NGOs. The process is therefore given further momentum by the transnational integration of

business elites into extended circuits of trade, capital, information, and power, often bypassing national interests and regulatory structures (Nef, 1999:10).

The middle class, so central to theories of social development, is increasingly becoming less relevant as a unit for social analysis. In this context, Garrett's reference to "globalization's missing middle" (Garrett, 2004:84) takes on added importance when he contends that globalisation "has squeezed the middle class, both within societies and in the international system" (Garrett, 2004:84).

In the global economy and in a world of "downsizing" and "outsourcing", the middle class or what Laxer (1998:5) calls "wage and salary earners" have more chance of being relegated to Denial World than of remaining within, or progressing to join, the ranks of Access World (also see Cable, 1997:27-28). Access World economies "are producing and consolidating a perpetual underclass" (Horsman & Marshall, 1995:227) – an idea which will be further explored presently.

An analysis of the pattern of division between and within nation-states reveals a global bipolar configuration of elites and non-elites (Nef, 1999:70; also see Coker, 2002:21). "The current globalized social order reproduces on a planetary scale some of the most profound contradictions present in both developed and underdeveloped societies." (Nef, 1999:71.) There are now, as Castells (1998:165) asserts, "multiple black holes of social exclusion throughout the planet". This phenomenon, Castells argues, is present in literally every country, and every city, and represents a new global geography of social exclusion.

The end result is a double optic representing the complete Access World/Denial World configuration; this embodies an “intensification and reconfiguration of pre-existing inequalities of an economic, political and social nature” (Thomas, 2002:71). The lines dividing humanity now transcend the borders of nation-states. In terms of scope, the impact of this is global, and, in terms of social penetration, makes its impact felt right down to the community level.

Social polarisation now exists both among and within countries (Cox, 1996c:26). Lawson remarks that there is now a First World within the Third World and a Third World within the First (Lawson, 2002b:14). Every part of the world becomes a microcosm of the larger whole. Access World and Denial World exist “both beyond and within states” (Stoett, 1999:121). The Access World/Denial World configuration thus provides a glimpse of what post-Westphalian international relations could possibly look like.

In what is described as “a new type of functional bipolarity” (Nef, 2001:41) a clear distinction can be drawn:

between a seemingly secure world, which provides access to the benefits of modernity and globalization, regardless of latitude, and the ‘other’, peripheral world. The latter consists of the bulk of populations in Africa, Asia, the Middle East and Latin America, and an increasing majority of people in the former socialist world and even in the United States and Western Europe that have been excluded from the benefits of modernity and must live with its dysfunctional effects (Nef, 2001:41-42).

The Access World/Denial World concept is, however, not equivalent to the idea of “zones of peace” and “zones of conflict” which was developed

by Singer and Wildavsky (1993). The latter implies that the two zones are separate in a geographical sense and furthermore implies that it is possible to maintain “zones of peace” on a sustainable basis despite the presence of “zones of conflict” – a view which is disputed in this thesis.

Robert Cox (1996c:28) notes that the process of decomposition and recomposition of society in all parts of the world does not follow a uniform pattern. Access World and Denial World exist rather side-by-side and their impact on each other is unavoidable and can be felt on a daily basis. Denial World impacts on “zones of peace” in the form of ‘leaking misery’ (refugees), ‘entrepreneurial misery’ (crime) and political discontent (terrorism), using a frame offered by Coker (2002:25).

The Access World/Denial World metaphor is also unlike James Rosenau’s idea of “two worlds of world politics” (Rosenau, 1990:5). He explains this as a condition in which the state-centric system now coexists with an equally powerful, though more decentralised, multi-centric system (Rosenau, 1990:11). The idea of “sovereignty-free actors” developed by Rosenau (1990:36) is very useful as explained in Chapter Five. However, using this idea as one of the cornerstones of a theory of “two worlds of world politics”, in which nation-states or “sovereignty-bound actors” (Rosenau, 1990:36) coexist and have overlapping membership with new structures or “sovereignty-free actors”, is questioned.

The reason for this questioning is the fact that Rosenau’s conception of the “sovereignty-free actors” - the total of which he puts at “hundreds of thousands” (Rosenau, 1990:250) - is too limited in scope. His theory gives no recognition to the silent billions who represent the bulk of

Denial World. The Access World/Denial World construct endeavours to give greater cognisance to Denial World as a grouping, a formation whose voice will increasingly be heard in international relations.

Thus far this chapter has conceptualised Access World and Denial World and has focused on the resulting architecture of the global Access World/Denial World configuration. But a key question remains: Who are the inhabitants of these emerging spheres of existence?

7.5 The inhabitants of Access World and Denial World – Davos Man and Porto Alegre Woman

Inhabitants of Access World across the globe now often have more in common with fellow Access World citizens than with individuals who would, historically, have been their “countrymen”. The American, Colombian, Belgian or Singaporean who can be placed in the Access World category will travel frequently, will often hold more than one passport, will wear the same brands of shoes and clothing, listens to so-called “world music”, connects to the Internet frequently and usually maintains properties and bank accounts in a number of world cities.

The inhabitant of Access World, who Handy (1998:52) calls “Davos Man” (referring to the annual meeting of the World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland) shares the same security concerns, occupies the same “sovereign” space and increasingly shares an identity with others like him. The thread binding them together is, however, no longer attachment to the nation-state (from which Davos Man is increasingly seceding), but attachment to a larger and evolving social grouping that shares a common worldview or ontology.

Class fractions are drawn from different countries and regions and are being fused in a global supranational elite (see Coward, 1999:7; Thomas, 2002:80). Huntington (2004:268) contends that these individuals have “little need for national loyalty, view national boundaries as obstacles that thankfully are vanishing, and see national governments as residues from the past whose only useful function is to facilitate the elite’s global operations”. Davos Man’s credo could well be, as Hannerz (1996:88) asserts: “What can your nation do for you that a good credit card cannot do?”

Huntington (2004:267) states that, collectively, these globalising elites inhabit a “socio-cultural bubble” apart from the cultures of individual nations. “They constitute a world within a world, linked to each other by myriad global networks but insulated from the more hidebound members of their own societies.” (Micklethwait & Woolridge, 2003:237.) Davos Men and Women increasingly act as members of an “emerging global superclass” (Huntington, 2004:268).

Similarly the inhabitants of Denial World increasingly share the same interests, concerns, fears, grief and hates. These ties seem to be strengthening while inhabitants of Denial World often identify very little with the Access World citizens within the borders of the nation-state they, theoretically, share. Amartya Sen (2002:32) maintains that poverty can be a great source of solidarity across other boundaries. Acceptance of this new form of identity might also develop fairly quickly in Denial World in line with Ogata’s comments that especially “(t)hose who feel marginalized, deprived or angered by what they perceive as injustices caused by poverty and inequity, find new ways of grouping themselves together” (Ogata, 2002:2).

Perhaps the best example of Denial World solidarity can be found in the alternative-globalisation movement and in the World Social Forum which crystallised from this. Although still representing the movement as an amorphous network, the thousands gathering in Porto Alegre (where the World Social Forum was established in 2001), Mumbai and other venues, and speaking for millions more, are representatives of Denial World and not the envoys of individual nation-states. Metaphorically, what I call “Porto Alegre Woman” is emerging as a counterforce to “Davos Man”, buttressed by humanity’s “enlarged capacity to know when and how to participate in collective action” (Rosenau & Durfee, 1995:36).

Dupuy remarks that:

(o)n the heels of Seattle, the anti-, then alternative- globalization watchword seemed to coalesce militant forces that up to then had been scattered in a virtually unlimited geographic and sociological diversity. Fundamentally different human realities ... found a common language (Dupuy, 2004).

The slogan of the World Social Forum “Another World is Possible” is resonating across borders and around the world (see Anon., 2005g).

The alternative globalisation movement puts its main stress on failures to distribute the gains of economic growth among the peoples of the world on an equitable basis and in greater accord with human needs. Distributive justice across the globe is therefore a key concern. The movement is also directed at the failure to provide democratic oversight with respect to the operation of global market forces, as well as its tendency to bypass environmental concerns (Falk, 2002:171).

The movement displays a commitment to the enhancement of human well-being, and as such is people-oriented rather than market-driven (Falk, 2002:161). Porto Alegre Woman has found a strong voice in authors such as George Monbiot who asserts that the task is not to overthrow globalisation, but to capture it, and to use it as a vehicle for humanity's first global democratic revolution (Monbiot, 2004:23).

Denial World's collective identity is increasingly defined by its actions – therefore, identity through action as we noted in Chapter Six. As with other contemporary social movements, the outlines of Denial World increasingly become clear as its citizens construct shared meanings and worldviews, based on the action taken collectively, which in turn constructs a collective identity. Whereas individuals in Denial World may lack a sense of agency, this no longer translates as powerlessness. Through its collectively actions, Denial World's power grows and, at the same time, its collective identity becomes increasingly entrenched.

Langman and Morris contend that:

(p)owerlessness, as the denial of agency, is generally an extremely potent motive for individuals and groups. To be powerless is often humiliating and shame can be a powerful motive that fosters attempts to gain empowerment and to overcome domination (Langman & Morris, (2003).

Despite the fact that the outlines of Access World and Denial World are becoming increasingly clear, and their respective identities more defined, neither yet speaks with one voice. An appraisal of the spectrum of views that find a home in each is therefore essential.

7.5.1 The spectrum of views in Access World and Denial World

As noted, the citizens of both Access World and of Denial World represent a spectrum of views. Groups such as Al Qaeda, which is involved in a violent confrontation with Access World, can be positioned at the radical edge of the Denial World spectrum. Positioned close to Al Qaeda on this spectrum are violently disposed anarchists (the so-called ‘black blocs’) and anti-technologists (often identified as Luddites or neo-Luddites) in the alternative globalisation movement (Falk, 2002:170). Herd and Weber (2001) refer to “violent anti-globalist movements which appeared as the radical cutting edge of a transnational undercurrent of unease at the perceived destructiveness of globalisation”.

Because of the news value of their actions, these are the citizens of Denial World who mesmerise the world with their terror attacks or who are shown on television smashing windows, hurling projectiles and engaging in street violence during anti-globalisation campaigns. The majority of Denial World, however, does not (yet) espouse violent change.

Arditi (2003:9-13) explains that they use non-violent means to push for initiatives to modify North-South inequality, to expand the public sphere, to seek greater accountability and public scrutiny of multilateral organisations, and to work towards a cosmopolitan democracy.

Access World reflects a similar spectrum. It includes elements for whom the woes of Denial World appear to be of little concern but also actors and institutions propagating Denial World-friendly policies such as the write-off of the debt of so-called HIPC or Highly Indebted Poor Countries. The Access World spectrum thus ranges from “Social-Safety-

Netters” to “Let-Them-Eat-Cakers”, utilising terms developed by Friedman (2000:438). Rosenau (2003:139) explains that while the “Social-Safety-Netters” also want to protect the losers in the globalisation process, the “Let-Them-Eat-Cakers” believe that the winners in the process should keep the spoils of globalisation only for themselves.

As noted before, to many the United States is the foremost representative of Access World. Unfortunately, to many in Denial World especially, it is also viewed as indifferent and hypocritical - as the foremost representative of the “Let-Them-Eat-Cakers” - who remains untouched by the plight of the inhabitants of Denial World. We return to this issue.

The chapter thus far has argued that the possessed and the dispossessed, the globals and the locals, the connected and the disconnected, the advancing and the stagnant all find an echo in the image of a layered paradigm housing Access World, the new “global overclass” (Rorty, 1999:233; also see Miyoshi, 1993:726) and Denial World, the new global underclass, respectively. In a post-Westphalian context, the Access World/Denial World construct is slowly crystallising out of the paradigm shift in international relations and is making its impact felt at all levels of society.

An important point, made earlier, needs reiteration. This refers to Richard Falk’s observation that globalisation is a “decidedly unfinished narrative that could go forward in different directions” (Falk, 2002:162) – this now linked to the elaboration of a range of views present within both Access World and Denial World. The emergence of the Access World/Denial World configuration is not, necessarily, synonymous with the emergence of a new fault line or schism in international relations.

Rather, the type of relationship developing between Access World and Denial World, and the perceptions of- and choices exercised by- the inhabitants of each are crucial. At the present moment, the way in which this relationship is unfolding gives rise to concern. At the same time, however, the relationship is not immutable and space for a change of direction exists.

In his celebrated article “Anarchy is what states make of it: the social construction of power politics” Alexander Wendt essentially posits that we are what we are by how we interact rather than being what we are regardless of how we interact (Wendt, 1992:391-395). The focus now shifts to analysing the interaction between the two levels of the Access World/Denial World construct, firstly from a theoretical and, in the next chapter, from a practical point of view.

As elaborated above, a case will eventually be made that it is ultimately in the nature of this exchange, and not in the Access World/Denial World structure or in its respective agents, that “incommensurability” is embedded; it is also here that incommensurability could, and should, be addressed.

7.6 **The interaction between Access World and Denial World in theory**

Human beings engage each other, either individually or in the context of some social grouping, on a daily basis and have been doing so for centuries. As we have noted throughout, this engagement takes place within a paradigmatic framework. Integral to the paradigm are certain ontological assumptions or a worldview.

In this context, Ray contends that there exists an:

overarching mind set that people of all walks of life have in each historical period, whether they are in science or not. Just as Kuhn says that a particular paradigm or set of fundamental assumptions are what make a science, so too we live in this world with a set of fundamental beliefs that are so ingrained in our society that we hardly know they exist, much less examine them (Ray, 1995).

In international relations, this mindset or ontology, since 1648, has been represented by the Westphalian or state-centric paradigm. This has been a central theme throughout this work.

Humanity, Ray continues, has the capacity to recognise periods in the history of the world in which far-reaching changes occur (also see Albrow, 1996:2). For instance in his book “The Passion of the Western Mind: Understanding the Ideas that have shaped our World View”, Tarnas (1993) organises his overview of Western thought into four stages. These are the classical (dominated by the Greek philosophers), medieval (dominated by Christianity), modern (dominated by scientific thought, largely the paradigm we are living in today), and the postmodern (the transformation of the modern mind that is the discontinuity happening at the beginning of the 21st century in ourselves, our organisations and our world).

In much the same way, the events of 1989, linked to globalisation, irrevocably changed the terms whereby humanity would henceforth engage one another. Where globalisation was described in Chapter One as a solvent, eroding the distinction between internal and external, Waters’ definition might provide further insight when he defines globalisation as

“a social process in which the constraints of geography ... recede and in which people become increasingly aware that they are receding” (Waters, 1995:3).

In the present circumstances, national borders are increasingly partial and relative; hence Lawson’s reference to the “porousness” of national borders as noted in Chapter Five (Lawson, 2002b:10). The nation-state is continuously being relativised and the links between people can no longer be squeezed into a national-international straitjacket, even if this is still very much one of the dimensions which define them. According to Shaw (2000a) this is “as true of social relations ‘within’ nation-states as it is of those ‘across’ their borders”.

As noted in Chapter One, globalisation is not merely a concept or an abstraction – it is a powerful force which affects and changes the daily lived experience of humanity and which shapes their perceptions. Kuah states that “it is a process that people are aware of and engaged in” (Kuah, 2003:13). It represents processes and sequences that unfold in both mind and behaviour (Rosenau, 1997:80).

Different people, in different sets of circumstances, perceive this transformation as affecting their lives in different ways. There thus exist “many different views of the world as a single place” (Holton, 1998:38). The fact, however, remains that “(t)he ontologies that people work with derive from their historical experience and in turn become embedded in the world they construct” (Cox, 1996a:145).

Humanity’s perception that the “constraints of geography are receding” goes hand-in-hand with a growing awareness that we share a common

world history (Booth, 1991c:542). Human beings' sense of political belonging is increasingly being less conditioned by their affiliation to a geographically-fixed nation-state.

According to Albrow (1996:20) the nation-state is exposed as just another form of the organisation of power in human affairs (also see Shaw, 1995; Venter, 2001:62-63). Individuals are increasingly more competent in assessing where they fit in with regard to international relations and how their behaviour can be aggregated into significant collective outcomes (Rosenau, 1990:xiv).

We are witnessing what Giddens calls “the disembedding of social systems ... and the *reflexive ordering and reordering* of social relations in the light of continual inputs of knowledge affecting the actions of individuals and groups” (Giddens, 1990:17 – italics in original). New solidarities are being created that do not coincide with nation-state boundaries (March & Olsen, 1998). There is a trend towards the “relocation of political sovereignty” (De Santis, 1996:178).

The nature of the social bond within, and between, political communities is being transformed by the “intensification of consciousness of the world as a whole” (Albrow, 1990:8; also see Robertson, 1992:8). “It is not the attitudes towards politics that are transforming world politics, but the ability to employ, articulate, direct, and implement whatever these attitudes may be.” (Rosenau, 1990:334.)

Jorge Nef (1999:10) suggests that this social and political restructuring has affected the very definition of citizenship. It has reduced the state's capacity to shape the nation, and it has encouraged the rise of non-

national frameworks of collective identity: a new global consciousness. We are witnessing the fragmentation of identity, especially national identity, under the impact of globalisation (Coker, 2002:13). Increasingly, and on a global scale, humanity will have a form of citizenship beyond the nation-state (Luke, 1996).

Identity becomes a choice made by people, not a property of society which transcends their agency. Globalisation is “freeing (even forcing) people to shoulder greater autonomy and to evolve new identities and shifting allegiances” (Rosenau, 2003:25). Globalisation therefore revolutionises the certainties of the past and inserts entire populations into a more open, changing and diverse world, often enhancing the array of options of how and where to live their lives. In summing up, it is clear that globalisation (and more specifically perceptions of globalisation) shapes choices.

We are witnessing increasing manifestations of “non-sovereignty (or non-state) bound identity” (du Plessis, 2001b:24). Jan Aart Scholte (2001:22) supports this view when he contends that globalisation has prised loose some important cultural and psychological underpinnings of sovereignty. Humanity has new loyalties that may supplement and in some instances outweigh national ones. Laidi (1998:104-107) suggests that since the nation-state has lost the monopoly of giving meaning and providing identity, humanity has lost the “natural reference space” (Laidi, 1998:105) that constitutes identity; thus “identity is constantly being renegotiated” (Laidi, 1998:126; also see Hess, 1997).

Based on these two factors - (a) the diminished role of the geographically-bounded nation-state, linked to an increased political

awareness of the global, and (b) the changing nature of citizenship and identity - humanity tends to 'defect' and finds new ways of pursuing their ends outside, whether it is above, through, or below state processes and institutions. This search for a new frame of reference increasingly involves "the resort to different forms of exit from the system" (Van Nieuwkerk, 2001:16).

In the contemporary paradigm shift in international relations, humanity is in the process of "defecting" or of "exiting" from the present system and is being subsumed into new structures. New identities "siphon-off" the commitments and orientations that states are no longer able to serve (Rosenau, 2002:30).

This argument finds an echo in Steinbruner's notion of "a new pattern of interaction" (Steinbruner, 2000:5) amongst human societies. "Globalization has encouraged the development of solidarities that cut across national borders and unite the citizens of different political communities." (Linklater, 2001:626.)

Referring to a post-Cold War identity crisis, Bar-On (2003) states that, at the end of the Cold War, "the reason for a collective, monolithic identity vanished and many people both in the East and the West suddenly had to restructure their collective identities anew, a process that was both energy-consuming and frightening". This process was often accompanied by a sense of powerlessness and a lack of agency, contributing to frustration and (sometimes) rage (see Coker, 2002:21).

Importantly we must therefore note that these processes of "defecting" or of "exiting" do not always refer to pro-active actions. As we witness "the

retreat of the nation-state” (Luttwak, 1999:36) and as the individual loses hold of the “political anchor that helped him make sense of his world” (Horsman & Marshall, 1995:xv), billions of individuals are forced into a new and changed situation – for them it is not a question of choice. These individuals are often “forcefully localized” (Bauman, 1998:99) and their mobility curtailed.

Here the concepts of “Access World” and “Denial World” come back into play again; they provide a useful way of understanding the way in which humanity is interacting in the contemporary paradigm shift in international relations. When exiting or defecting from the Westphalian paradigm, voluntarily or being forced to do so by circumstances, a cross-section of humanity increasingly perceive in their engagement with others a sense of being “in”, or of being a citizen of Access World. The perception of the other cross-section of humanity, however, amounts to a sense of being “out”, or of being a citizen of Denial World. This sense of either belonging, or of being ostracised, creates new poles of commonality.

Hugh De Santis comments that:

the future is an interpretation of reality. It is what we imagine it to be in the context of our awareness of the possibilities and limitations of the objective world and our awareness of ourselves participating in the world (De Santis, 1996:xiii).

The key idea that this section wants to convey is that society’s future is in some part bound up with “the recognition of its self-creative nature in the activities of each and every human being” (Albrow, 1996:154).

Ultimately, the shape of a future international relations paradigm will depend on decisions and actions humanity takes. The future will be “what we make it” (De Santis, 1996:xv).

7.7 Conclusion

To conclude this, mostly theoretical chapter, a review of the main argument thus far is in order. The paradigm shift in international relations resembles James Rosenau’s “turbulence paradigm”. It is described as consisting of two levels, separate, yet at the same time intimately linked.

In this period of revolutionary change, humanity’s perception of security, sovereignty and identity is being refracted through the lens of globalisation. Ontologically, human beings perceive themselves benefiting from, or being disadvantaged by, the world they see through this “framegrative” lens.

The shape of a future paradigm will be determined by the dynamic interaction between the political, social and economic forces operating in the frontier region between Access World and Denial World – the region where centralising and decentralising-, and converging and diverging forces meet constantly.

It is in this region that Access World and Denial World engage each other, develop perceptions of each other based on this engagement, and take decisions and actions based on these perceptions, in an effort to improve their relative sense of well-being. At this nexus between the two worlds the tensions between continuity and change within and among cross-sections of humanity will eventually either erupt or be ameliorated.

Hocking & Smith (1995:3) maintain that the value of a meaningful social science lie in the juxtaposition of ideas with reality. Chapter Eight will apply ideas concerning security, sovereignty and identity, developed here and in previous chapters, and the notion of interaction between Access World and Denial World, in a practical context.

Chapter Eight will secondly be utilised to reconnect strongly with Thomas Kuhn's theory; specifically with his ideas concerning "incommensurability". This should allow for the resolution of the final outstanding question: Why does a Kuhnian sense of incommensurability increasingly seem to define the Access World/Denial World relationship? What are the implications of this for international relations? Can this troublesome trend be reversed?

CHAPTER EIGHT

WORLDS IN COLLISION? ACCESS WORLD, DENIAL WORLD AND THE QUESTION OF INCOMMENSURABILITY

8.1 Introduction

Robert Cox reaffirms an idea which has been developed throughout the previous seven chapters when he remarks that:

(o)ut of the crisis of the postwar order, a new global political structure is emerging. The old Westphalian concept of a system of sovereign states is no longer an adequate way of conceptualizing world politics (Cox, 1996d: 305-306)

It has similarly been contested that, in the ensuing transformation, a number of new contenders have appeared and each of these “competing narratives” (Vale, 2003:68) is vying for supremacy. Each “proto-paradigm” (Mittelman, 2002a:24) represents a specific worldview or ontology and in this sense international relations is witnessing a “shift of ontologies” (Cox, 1996a:147).

Kegley Jnr. describes a situation where:

a diversity of theoretical perspectives are struggling for paradigmatic dominance ... in a race among scholars to capture disciples, each believing that a favored approach best explicates and prognosticates the major trajectories of international relations and the factors that propel them (Kegley Jnr., 2002:62).

This study has consequently argued that the Access World/Denial World configuration could contribute meaningfully towards an interpretation of international relations and change at this juncture. It aims to contextualise this turbulent period of “crossing-over” in which the Westphalian paradigm, with units consisting of nation-states as the “principal aggregations of political power” (Cox, 1996b:85), has become defunct, but where we can still only glimpse the contours of a new paradigm.

When Friedman (2000a) sings the praises of globalisation in his book “The Lexus and the Olive Tree”, when Kaplan (2001) warns of globalisation’s dark underside in his book “The Coming Anarchy” and when Rosenau (1997) talks about the tumult “Along the Domestic-Foreign Frontier” in his book with the same name, they are all highlighting dimensions of what is described in the thesis as the Access World/Denial World configuration.

Whereas Chapter Seven aimed at developing a theoretical and conceptual basis for the Access World/Denial World idea, the focus in Chapter Eight will shift to “the real social world” (Cox, 1996b:85). Theory will now be put into practice, in the context of positions outlined before, and focusing on the action and discourse of the inhabitants of Access World and Denial World respectively. Referring to Cox’s idea of a “shift of ontologies”, this chapter will focus on the use of these new ontologies as they become “the heuristic for strategies of action in the emerging world order” (Cox, 1996a:147).

This chapter asks various critical questions: Are Access World and Denial World the representatives of a global emerging class structure? How should the actions of the Bush administration and of Al Qaeda (as

the two most visible and vocal proponents of Access World and Denial World respectively) be interpreted within this framework?

Finally, and to borrow a phrase from Booth and Dunne (2002b:1), the chapter seeks an answer to the question: Are Access World and Denial World “worlds in collision”? Within the context of Kuhn’s theory, the chapter thus aims to establish whether the apparent incommensurability between Access World and Denial World is truly inescapable or whether it could be bridged.

8.2 **The interaction between Access World and Denial World in practice**

Paradigm shifts are tumultuous, uncertain periods when fundamental beliefs are shaken and deep-held convictions proven to be without foundation. In Kuhnian terminology, and as we learnt in Chapter Three, there is a “persistent failure of the puzzles of normal science to come out as they should” (Kuhn, 1996:68). International relations is currently in the midst of such a turbulent paradigm shift in which the “fragmegrative processes” James Rosenau (2002:28) refers to, seem to have taken on a life of their own.

Waters (1995:2) contends that many of these globalising forces are impersonal and beyond the control and intentions of any individual or group of individuals. Emerging from this process is Access World and Denial World – new global spheres of human existence. We now proceed to investigate the engagement, at a practical level, between them and to highlight the (often troubling) findings that emerge from this investigation.

In a world where the Inside/Outside distinction is increasingly becoming irrelevant, and in which the concepts of security, sovereignty and identity manifest in new ways, possibilities open up for the creative re-conceptualisation of these concepts. Access World and Denial World have the opportunity to embrace their common destiny. But, instead, both seem to be progressively stereotyping each other as the main obstacle to their own sense of wellbeing. Access World and Denial World increasingly have a threat perception of each other.

Christopher Coker contends that “(t)o the globalised the other seems marginal; to the marginal, the globalised appear uncaring and exploitative. This difference is likely to be a growing source of conflict in the near future” (Coker, 2002:21). Mary Kaldor refers to a “growing dissonance” between those who participate in globalisation and those who are excluded from it (Kaldor, 1999:69) while Mills warns against “global estrangement” (Mills, 2000:14). The perception of international relations remains that of the politics of inequality, inherently a politics of mutual suspicion and of struggle.

This process of stereotyping is creating a situation similar to the East-West stand-off when “(t)he rhetoric of Winston Churchill and Harry Truman, not to mention Stalin’s . . . , constructed the semantic foundations of this binary worldview” (Nef, 1999:7). Terms such as “Cold War”, “Iron Curtain” and “Free World” conveyed an inescapable inference – social alignment as either friend or foe. The corollary or consequence of this was a rigid ideological bipolarism between two incompatible camps, referred to by their respective propagandists as the free world and popular democracies respectively (Nef, 1999:7).

Booth (1998b:3) states that the behaviour and attitudes of both the East and the West constituted a mirror image. He adds that both reshaped the political structures of the territories they occupied according to their own interest; both regarded their own actions as completely justified; both thought it proper to exclude the other from its own sphere; both blamed the other for the situation; and both adopted double standards. This surrender to the logic of conflict and pessimism offers powerful lessons to human relations at all levels; also in the present (Booth, 1998b:4).

A failure in communication between Access World and Denial World goes hand-in-hand with this process of stereotyping. Bauman (1998:3) remarks that “(a) particular cause for worry is the progressive breakdown in communication between the increasingly global and extraterritorial elites and the ever more ‘localized’ rest”. Negative perceptions of each other are increasingly emblazoned on the collective psyche of Access World and Denial World respectively. These negative perceptions underlie Access World and Denial World’s ontological perspectives; to each of these we now turn.

8.2.1 **The Denial World perspective**

Denial World perceives Access World, by commission and omission, as threatening in a number of ways that can be relayed back to security, sovereignty and identity.

8.2.1.1 **Perspectives with regard to security**

Denial World believes that Access World is loath to accept the reality of “diffuse forms of harm transmitted across frontiers by the forces of global

capitalism” (Coker, 2002:16) – a direct threat to Denial World’s security. Denial World, for example, interprets the problems that beset ongoing rounds of trade talks as indicative of this attitude.

In this context, they share the view that “globalization remains a flawed game whose rules have been fixed by rich nations” (Anon., 2003b:6). Elliott (2002:112) remarks that since the end of the Cold War, there has been little beyond a declaratory commitment to important cross-sectoral issues of financial and technology transfer, debt, unequal trading relationships and poverty alleviation.

The resources of international society have not been devoted towards resolving outstanding “global concerns” (Chandler, 2003:338). Booth (1998a:342) adds that the peripheries of the global capitalist system do not presently have much to lose, given their position in the global economy, the unhelpful rules of trade under the World Trade Organisation and the structural adjustment programmes of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. To this list can be added limited development help and punitive debt repayment burdens.

There is a perception in Denial World that the regulation of the global monetary and trading environment has been skewed towards the welfare of powerful economic interests rather than being aimed at achieving social justice or the protection of the interests of the poor and the defenceless (Holton, 1998:74). Inhabitants of Denial World will agree with De Soto when he argues that “capitalist globalization” has opened the door only for small and globalised elites, leaving out most of humanity (De Soto, 2003:227).

Williams (2002:58) contends that every transaction in the developed economies of the West can be interpreted as an act of aggression against the economic losers in the worldwide game. He goes on to say that:

(h)owever much we protest that this is a caricature, this is how it is experienced. And we have to begin to understand how such a perception is part of the price we pay for the benefits of globalisation (Williams, 2002:58).

Williams adds that:

we have to see that we have a life in other people's imagination, quite beyond our control. Globalisation means that we are involved in dramas we never thought of, cast in roles we never chose. As we protest at how the West is hated, how we never meant to oppress or diminish other cultures, how we never intended to undermine Islamic integrity and so on, we must try not to avoid the pain of grasping that we are not believed (Williams, 2002:59).

Affluence, rather than poverty, also remains the primary cause of global environmental decline (Elliott, 2002:112) and of subsequent environmental insecurity in Denial World. While the visible consequences of environmental degradation such as deforestation, desertification and air pollution, for example, are concentrated more in developing countries, the invisible causes are embedded in the ecological shadow cast by Access World. The root causes of environmental decline are lodged in the pursuit of economic growth, unsustainable patterns of production and consumption, and extensive and excessive exploitation of living and non-living resources.

Consider these statistics: in 1998 the industrialised world comprised about 20% of the world's population but consumed 58% of total energy and emitted 53% of the world's carbon dioxide emissions (UNDP, 1998) - the latter which is believed to contribute to the phenomenon of global warming. In 2005, the United States alone accounted for 25 percent of global carbon dioxide emissions (Walter, 2005). There is a deep and persistent bitterness at the entrenched attitudes of Northern states towards the problems of the global environment, Rogers (2000:99) asserts, especially with regard to the North's reluctance to accept responsibility for this or to take remedial actions.

Much of Denial World's insecurity thus stems from Access World's inaction - the latter resulting from Access World's (perceived) ability to insulate itself from Denial World's security concerns - and from Access World's reluctance to deal with these issues. The inhabitants of Access World are seen as the indolent and self-satisfied citizens of what John Saul describes as "the unconscious civilization" who have "set about building a wall between themselves and reality by creating an artificial sense of well-being on the inside" (Saul, 1997:9). Theirs is the "Culture of Contentment" (Galbraith, 1992:15).

Saul (1997:9) continues to argue that "the very size and prosperity of the elite permits it to interiorise an artificial vision of civilization as a whole". While Denial World is acutely aware of Access World, the world's elite travels the world in a perpetual mirage, constantly protected and made comfortable, happily unaware of the real world (Rogers, 2000:2). They "filter out the sufferings of the world" as Sunter (1992:147) puts it. The citizens of Access World believe they have the freedom to withdraw into a private world of fee-paying schooling, private transport and health care,

and sports and social clubs.

Access World sees the suffering in Beslan, or in Darfur, in Baghdad, or in Aceh Province in Indonesia, but these are media-images – sterile, clinical and distant – and soon overtaken by other snippets of “breaking news”. Living in a world of “seven-second sound bites” (Rifkin, 2000:187), Access World often dismisses as trivial what others perceive as grave threats to their survival. Inequitable responses to threats further fuel division (UN, 2004c:12; also see Sparks, 2003:xii).

At the same time, there is increasing awareness in Denial World of the “structural violence which lies hidden in many aspects of global society” (Groom, 1999:36) to the extent that some are willing to change these structures in a violent manner. Dunn contends that:

(t)he problem here is ‘systemic’, in the sense that the structure of the international system locks the poorer states into dependence; they may be legally or nominally independent states but in practice they are hardly free and sovereign (Dunn, 1996:33).

Du Toit (2003:369) poses a pertinent question: May present-day market systems, with their all-encompassing reach and influence, not be viewed by some as a form of structural and systemic terrorism? In terms of these negative perceptions of Access World, Cohen (2003:7) observes that “US leaders say the world changed on September 11. In fact, the world didn’t change a bit; the United States simply received a sudden, tragic wake-up call about the way the world really is”.

Evans posits that, especially in the Arab world, poverty and joblessness is

creating a large class of young people, insecure to the point of hopelessness about their own futures. They therefore become that much more vulnerable to recruitment by those who play upon that insecurity, fire up the sense of political grievance endemic throughout the Arab-Islamic world, and, critically, offer a religious justification for jihad, making holy war (Evans, 2004b).

This phenomenon is also perceptible in Africa. The lethal combination of corrupt or destructive leaders, porous and unmonitored borders and rootless or hopeless youths has made some regions in Africa incubators of international terrorism (Anon., 2005h:8). In many of these places, poverty and unemployment and the desperation they spawn leave youths vulnerable to the lure of terrorist organisations. These organisations, beyond offering two meals a day, also provide a target for the youth's anger at rich societies, which they are led to believe view them with condescension and treat them with contempt (Anon., 2005h:8; also see McIntyre, 2004:12). Mittelman (2002b:22) asserts that global terrorism feeds on marginalisation.

Those in Denial World will agree with Ayoob's views on the common grand design that underpins the North Atlantic "Concert", the major industrialised democracies of Western Europe and North America. He argues that:

the major objective of this Concert is to retain its member states' privileged position in economic and security arenas by concentrating wealth in the global North, controlling access to strategic resources, and retaining a decisive global military advantage. The Concert controls the international economic regime through its preponderance in multilateral financial institutions, such as the IMF and the World Bank, and through

the G-7 – the apex body that in many ways governs the international economic system (Ayoob, 2005:6).

The negative views Denial World has of Access World insofar as its security (or insecurity) is concerned, is reflected in other areas. Denial World also perceives itself being discriminated against in terms of sovereignty, the latter now manifesting as spatial re-stratification.

8.2.1.2 **Perspectives with regard to sovereignty**

As far as sovereignty - manifesting as spatial re-stratification - is concerned, citizens of Denial World incrementally experience their freedom of movement being curtailed or complicated. Gray (2003:70) points out that the inhabitants of Denial World will often “find their exit blocked” and will come up against “barriers to flows of people”. While advocates of globalisation (in its ideological free-market sense) in Access World stress the need for the free mobility of capital, few ever speak of the free mobility of labour (Ayoob, 2005:6). The freedom of the market, say Zincone & Agnew (2000:12), entails a schizophrenic logic – positive for capital, and negative for labour.

The citizens of Denial World are the individuals who are refused access to the wealth of the postmodern zones of prosperity, denied transit rights at their borders, and condemned to dangerous refugee camps or political persecution when frontiers are closed (Dalby, 1996:30; see also Frelick, 1993:170).

First-time visa applicants in a country such as Algeria can only apply for visas to visit the United States in neighbouring Tunisia. This arrangement

makes travel very difficult - near impossible - both from a logistical and financial point of view. This kind of discrimination has been described by Richmond (1995:46) as “global apartheid” whereby national barriers act to segregate the relatively wealthy and powerful from the relatively poor and powerless.

In newspapers in predominantly Denial World countries, the decision by the United States to start fingerprinting and photographing visitors to the United States from certain countries was reported in a very specific way. It reflected the fact that only certain categories of individuals from certain countries would be subjected to these procedures.

The online edition of the China Post, for example, stated that “(f)oreigners entering US airports and seaports – except those from Europe and a handful of other countries – will soon have their fingerprints scanned and their photographs snapped as part of a new programme to enhance border security” (Anon., 2003c). Turned away at border crossings or subjected to rigorous entry procedures; to many in Denial World “Access Denied” is a way of living.

In a world in the throes of globalisation, Denial World has witnessed its security compromised and its mobility curtailed. Exactly the same perceptions exist with regard to identity, as will subsequently be explained.

8.2.1.3 **Perspectives with regard to identity**

Denial World perceives itself as being acutely discriminated against in terms of maintaining its identity in a globalising world. Many in the

Islamic world (the majority of which belong to Denial World) view the implementation of a decision to ban the wearing of Islamic headscarfs in French state schools as an attack on Islam. Despite the validity or not of the reasons professed for the decision, actions such as these could have far-reaching implications for Access World in the political sphere (see Little, 2003).

These developments take place against the background of perceptions of an increasingly anti-Arab sentiment in France, a country home to the largest Muslim community in Western Europe (Bennhold, 2005:1). In the Arabic world there is talk of rising “Islamophobia” throughout Europe. This perception will most likely increase in the aftermath of more frequent terrorist attacks in traditionally Access World countries.

Many in Denial World reject the global export of Access World’s cultural products and identity - the so-called “McDonaldization” of society (Ritzer, 2000:1) – which is regarded as being decadent and immoral. They reject the “spiritual emptiness” (Gray, 2003:23) of modern societies and the “hedonism and individualism” (Gray, 2003:78) it encourages. More than a surrogate politics, Islam now becomes a “moral critique of the anomie of secular modernity ... and a demand for a revival of essential religious principles as a basis of individual morality and social organization” (Hutchinson, 1994:65). Bauman (1998:4) refers to the “bifurcation and polarization of human experience, with shared cultural tokens serving two sharply distinct interpretations”.

Against the background of these perspectives, Waldman (2001:A6) asserts that most Arabs/Muslims agree with Osama Bin Laden’s allegations of Western cultural annihilation due to neo-liberal

globalisation's legacy in the Middle East. Although everybody in Denial World may not approve of Osama Bin Laden's methods, there is apparently tacit agreement with his assertion that the West has embarked on a global campaign of "cultural imperialism" as Goldsmith (1994:183) describes it.

In this context Hershberg and Moore (2002:3) make the important comment that September 11 brought home with renewed force the importance of the United States as a symbol of much of what is being rejected by Denial World. The World Trade Center and the Pentagon represented more than American economic and military dominance. They also symbolised the global economic, military, and cultural ascendancy of the West (of Access World), and the comparative marginalisation of much of the rest of the world (also see Cohen, 2005:2).

The worldview of the attackers on 11 September 2001 appears to have been shaped by a "profound sense of powerlessness and resentment" and their actions cannot be "disentangled from the broader configurations of international power" (Hershberg & Moore, 2002:4). Beck (2002:114) concludes that, on September 11th, "it was globalisation itself that was attacked". On this date, we can say, Denial World forcefully lashed out at Access World with devastating consequences.

8.2.2 The Access World perspective

In a mirror image of the others' worldview, Access World has a similar threat perception of Denial World. It experiences these threats as actively impinging on its security, sovereignty and identity.

8.2.2.1 Perspectives with regard to security

In nation-states which can be classified as traditionally belonging to Access World (the “West” or the “Developed World”), the events of 11 September 2001 reinforced a view that existed even before that date. In terms thereof, states perceived as belonging to Denial World - in Africa, the Balkans, the Caribbean, Central Asia, Latin America and the Middle East - are increasingly viewed with suspicion and are seen as a breeding ground for crises and terrorism.

These regions are viewed as conflict-prone zones suffering from epidemics, violence, desertification, over-population and corruption. Access World has unified its vision of these diverse nations by compressing them into a category called ‘risk’ (see Rogers, 2000:95). It turns away in exasperation from these regions with their apparently endless wars and self-destructive misrule. With regard to the African continent, a sense of “Afro-pessimism” (Hopwood, 1998:247) can be detected. When considering the correct policy on how to interact with these regions, Cooper (1997:323) advises that “ (o)n the basis of a rational calculation of interest, the answer should be: as little as possible”.

In terms of existing nation-states, as noted, the United States has consolidated its place as the undisputed leader of Access World. Laxer (1998:214) asserts that “(w)e are living in an American global empire. Its ethos extends almost everywhere on the planet”. It dominates the world economically, militarily and in terms of political clout. The United States, however, ironically provides the best example of a contemporary security deficit and of “mutual vulnerability” (see Nef, 2001:58).

After September 11 fear and a sense of being at risk seem to have permeated every aspect of American society. Even with regard to the fashion industry it is noted that “the pervasive climate of free-floating fear is leaving its mark on fashion. Two years after New York’s terrorist attacks, the clothes ... suggest a human body under high protection” (Menkes, 2003:15).

Other cultural aspects, such as architecture, also reflect this sense of trepidation. Ouroussof (2005:1) describes the new structure, which will be built on the site of the destroyed Twin Towers building in New York, as “a tower shaped by fear”. It is a monument, he claims, “to a society that has turned its back on any notion of cultural openness” (Ouroussof, 2005:1).

In other traditionally Access World countries like Sweden, events such as the assassination of the Foreign Minister, Anna Lindh, is “sharpening the dilemmas of Scandinavian nations ... seeking to balance their traditional openness against the newer dictates of security” (Hoge, 2003:1). Hoge continues to argue that Europe’s “political and social strains have produced new threats of violence in an ever more volatile era” (Hoge, 2003:1).

Similar trends are noticeable in countries such as France (see Lambroschini, 2004:8). In France a sense of *insécurité*, a French code word for the combination of vandalism, delinquency and hate crimes stemming from immigrant enclaves, is widespread (Leiken, 2005). The developments surrounding the murder of the controversial Dutch filmmaker, Theo van Gogh, in November 2004, is another example of Access World’s prevailing sense of being in danger (see Rippert, 2004).

Van Gogh's murder by a Dutch Muslim of Moroccan descent, born and socialised in Europe, has acted as a catalyst, spurring a sharp rise in the number of Dutch citizens who now plan to emigrate to countries such as Canada, New Zealand and Australia (Simons, 2005:1). In most of these instances, the search for a greater sense of security has been a motivating factor. These would-be immigrants point to the fact that immigrant youths now make up half of the Dutch prison population (Simons, 2005:1). A similar situation prevails in France, with Muslims representing 10% of the population, but the majority of prison inmates (Anon., 2005i:25). In the Netherlands, the prevalent public mood is described as being "deeply fearful of religious extremism and terrorism" (Anon., 2005j:22).

Access World's insecurity permeates right down to community level. For many in Access World, moving from secure workplaces to fenced communities and leisure facilities with 24-hour protection has become a fact of everyday life. For the richest sectors of society in regions such as Latin America, security extends to armed bodyguards and stringent anti-kidnapping precautions, with a host of special companies offering these services.

Williams (2002:61) notes that the "existence of wealthy residential developments surrounded by all the technological refinements of security in many of our cities tells us that the spiral of wealth is also a spiral of threat". In her book "Behind the Gates: Life, Security and the Pursuit of Happiness in Fortress America" Low (2003:11) notes that in the past twenty years thousands of Americans have retreated into so-called "gated communities". Twelve percent of Americans currently live in these type of gated neighbourhoods (Rifkin, 2000:115).

Drawing these ideas closer to home, Wines (2004:2) observes that, in the last decade, fences and gates have been erected blocking off 1 245 ostensibly public streets in Johannesburg from the outside world (also see Rogers, 2000:2-3). Staying with South Africa, Van Zyl Slabbert (2005:26) notices a withdrawal into “urban enclaves” where services are privatised and where there is less and less dependence on the state to provide the latter.

According to Waters (1995:48) surveillance by different means has been a key characteristic of the nation-state as a construct of modernity. This is, however, taken to ever-greater lengths as Access World’s threat perception increases. In its elusive search for security, actions by Access World are turning these countries into “Hobbesian surveillance states” (Gray, 2003:84).

Beck (2002:117) argues that “(s)urveillance states threaten to use the new power of cooperation to build themselves into fortress states, in which security and military concerns will loom large and freedom and democracy will shrink”. There is also a tacit acceptance of a larger private sector role in this regard. “No longer exerting a controlling power over their own territories, sovereign states accept the private sector’s commercialisation of security for sale to both public and private buyers.” (Luke, 1994:33.)

Zygmunt Bauman comments that:

(t)he walls built once around the city now criss-cross the city itself, and in a multitude of directions. Watched neighbourhoods, closely surveilled public spaces with selective admission, heavily armed guards at the gate

and electronically operated doors – are all now aimed against the unwanted co-citizens, rather than foreign armies or highway robbers... (Bauman, 1998:48).

In Britain, one camera has been installed for every 14 residents (Hooper-Box, 2005:16). A type of “democratic authoritarianism” (Beck, 2002:117) may be emerging where maintaining flexibility towards the world market would be premised on increasing domestic rigidity. The future of Access World could well witness “liberal economics” but “authoritarian politics” (Bacon, 1999:292).

Access World’s feeling of insecurity is exacerbated by the fact that there has been a remarkable democratisation of access to effective means of coercion. Today small determined groups who think they have nothing to lose, and are therefore willing to risk everything, can have an impact, sometimes literally out of all proportion, to their numerical importance (Groom, 1999:35).

Again, the attacks of 11 September 2001 come to mind. “The attack and its targets demonstrated with horrendous efficiency that neither global wealth (World Trade Center) nor military might (the Pentagon) could defend against low-tech, human sacrifices when mobilized.” (Agathangelou & Ling, 2004b: 517.) In an attempt to secure itself from these new threats, Access World has embarked on an active campaign to “contain” Denial World as we will come to argue.

8.2.2.2 **Perspectives with regard to sovereignty**

In terms of maintaining sovereignty, Access World is turning to advanced

technologies and to multilateral forums in an effort to contain Denial World. It has embarked on a range of initiatives to ensure that the new configuration of spatial re-stratification is not breached.

In 2004, EU member states debated signing up to an agreement to finance and manage immigration transit camps in the North African countries of Tunisia, Morocco, Algeria, Mauritania and Libya. The initiative was prompted by events such as the arrival of more than 1000 illegal immigrants, within 24 hours, on the Italian island of Lampedusa south of Sicily and by the EU's "political frustration about the lack of progress on curbing clandestine immigration" (Minder, 2004).

Especially the Spanish Government is concerned by a spate of recent attempts by African asylum-seekers to enter the European Union via the Spanish enclaves of Melilla and Ceuta on Morocco's northern coast. Spanish police have logged 12 000 attempts to enter Melilla since the beginning of 2005 (Anon., 2005k). Many of these individuals travel from countries in sub-Saharan Africa, such as the Democratic Republic of Congo, with the hope of entering the European Union.

In September 2005, the would-be immigrants started using a new tactic – hundreds of individuals stormed the barbed wire fences surrounding these territories with makeshift ladders and tried to enter the territory *en masse*. Around 200 succeeded in crossing in these mass assaults on 28 September 2005 while more than 100 made it across the previous day (Anon., 2005k). In the London Times the incidents were described as "laying siege to fortress Europe" (Sage, 2005).

Another initiative, which has already been dubbed "Migrant Air", will see

the UK, France, Germany, Italy and Spain organising joint charter flights which will pick up illegal immigrants in each country before flying them home (Travis, 2005:1). Industrialised economies have increased subsidies to immigration and other policing institutions to “secure” economic, political and cultural borders even while transnationalising them (Agathangelou & Ling, 2004b:532). Despite these initiatives, efforts by Access World to stop movement across the global poverty barriers of the Rio Grande, the Mediterranean, and the Pacific Rim are likely to have little success (Sparks, 2003:x; also see Ohmae, 1995:8).

In traditionally Access World countries, an emotional debate about immigration is raging. There exists a general perception that immigration depresses wages and takes jobs from local inhabitants (McAllister, 2005:34). In 1995, 65% of British citizens surveyed wanted to reduce the number of immigrants; by 2003 that number had increased to 74% (McAllister, 2005:34). Gray (2003:69) contends that the flow of people from regions devastated by war, failed states or ecological collapse will increasingly generate political controversy in many of the world’s rich states.

Britain’s Conservative Party vowed early in 2005 to cap numbers of asylum seekers and immigrants, hoisting the issue of migration to the top of the political agenda ahead of a General Election (Baldwin, 2005:6; also see McAllister, 2005:35). In an overhaul of the existing British immigration policy, less-skilled workers are specifically targeted. These individuals will now no longer be able to work their way towards citizenship – a nod towards a German-style guest-worker policy, which Britain had strenuously avoided (Anon., 2005l:31).

Rising unemployment in traditionally Access World countries such as Germany contribute to the threat perception generated by immigration. German unemployment rose in January 2005 to its highest level since World War II, with more than five million people, or 12.1 percent of the work force, now considered jobless (Dougherty, 2005:11). Across the border in France, unemployment reached its highest level in five years in January 2005, breaking through the psychologically important ten percent level (Arnold & Atkins, 2005).

Linking the issue of migration to security, Williams (2003:526) contends that the rise of migration on the security agenda in Europe must be viewed in the context of how migration is “experienced” by relevant publics. McAllister contends that these debates rest on perceptions - the crucial one being that people believe that immigrants are flooding in (McAllister, 2005:35).

This experience is partially constructed by the images (and discussions based around them) of televisual media. These include nightly images of shadowy figures attempting to jump on trains through the Channel Tunnel between France and the UK, for example, or of lines of “asylum seekers” waiting to be picked up for a day’s illicit labour. All of these have an impact that must be assessed in their own terms, constituting as they do a key element of the experience of many people on the issue of immigration and its status as a “threat” (Williams, 2003:526).

We have seen how the core-periphery division between existing nation-states is replicated within nation-states. Right down to community level, the First World now exists within the Third World, and the Third World within the First. Several European countries find themselves with large

immigrant ghettos for the first time. In Sweden, for example, about 15% of the country's nine million people are immigrants, many of them concentrated in mainly Muslim areas inhabited by Kurds, Iranians, Iraqis and Somalis (Walt, 2005:31). A similar situation prevails in the United Kingdom, in France and in Belgium. Given these trends the issue of identity (or the lack thereof) emerges as a key Access World concern.

8.2.2.3 **Perspectives with regard to identity**

The explosive growth of Denial World populations living in Access World leads to a threat perception vis-à-vis the identity of people who historically view themselves as citizens of Access World countries. This sense of insecurity fuels xenophobia and an “anti-foreigner” sentiment (Stoett, 1999:76). Such anti-immigrant sentiments have been further fuelled by what is perceived to be the “frightening nexus of immigration and Islamic terrorism” (Walt, 2005:30).

In the Access World/Denial World context, and in a plea that harkens back to a previous era, conservative forces demand that immigrants give up their distinct cultures and traditions. Political parties in Germany such as the Christian Democratic Union (CDU) has called for “more patriotism” in all areas of society (Rippert, 2004). These parties argue that foreigners have to do more to integrate and that the German people must not lose its identity. In the Netherlands, the Immigration Minister Rita Verdonk announced in February 2005 that immigrants would be compelled to pass an examination on Dutch language and culture, and attend 350 hours of classes before becoming permanent residents (Walt, 2005:31).

The anti-multiculturalist notion of the “Clash of Civilizations” and its incompatibility of “different” cultures are being “imported” into the domestic sphere through new immigration policies (Pautz, 2004:1,3). According to this mindset, Pautz (2004:5) asserts, immigration from “hostile” civilisations (such as the Islamic civilisation) imports the international clash into the domestic realm. As these cultures are portrayed as “almost totally alien to ours” (Pautz, 2004:10), there is a perception, actually an assumption, that immigrants do not want to integrate.

Rippert (2004) however comments that financial cuts, restrictive asylum laws and bureaucratic harassment have created conditions making social integration virtually impossible. Immigrants maintain that mainstream society does not really want them to assimilate or participate. In traditionally liberal Access World societies, such as Germany, the “social cement” that has so far held society together is in danger of breaking up (Rippert, 2004).

In a view that finds resonance in the Access World/Denial World imagery, McAllister refers to a common pattern across Europe: barriers of culture, education, wealth and prejudice prevent newcomers and their offspring from integrating – and young people, in particular, feel they will never be allowed to assimilate (McAllister, 2005:36). James Rosenau (2003:199) describes a situation where the flow of immigrants and refugees leads to pervasive resentments, tensions, and outright prejudices in which immigrants are treated – if not legally, then socially – as second-class citizens. These individuals are stereotyped as being incapable of conforming to the community’s prevailing norms and as being responsible for its polarisation.

This disconsolate, (very often) Muslim, offspring are the citizens of European nation-states in name, but not culturally or socially (Leiken, 2005). This gives rise to a condition, Leiken (2005) affirms, where, disenfranchised and disillusioned by the failure of integration, some European Muslims have taken up jihad against the West. From the point of view of state authorities, and against the background of the attacks in London in July 2005, these individuals are feared because they can move across Europe and to the United States without complying with any visa requirements. Theo van Gogh's assailant was born and raised in the Netherlands; the attackers of the London transport system were all Britons – these events put a serious question mark over traditional ideas concerning identity (understood as “us” and “them”) in contemporary international relations.

Linked to growing suspicion towards immigrant communities, and playing on xenophobic fears, Gray (2003:15-16) contends that the Far Right in traditionally Access World countries has moved from the margins of politics to the centre. They have been able to do this by grasping that globalisation has losers, even in the richest countries, and by linking their political fortunes with immigration and the remoteness of European institutions.

Research into xenophobia conducted by the European Commission illustrated the point that the more respondents identified with the right of the political spectrum, the more importance they attached to the “problem” of immigration and vice versa (Lahav, 2004:16). Access World's insecurity also comes into play. Lahav (2004:189) contends that “(s)ecurity is conducive to tolerance. Conversely, insecurity promotes xenophobia”.

On a European continent where immigration is increasingly becoming politicised, parties of the Far Right are in national government in a number of European countries, such as in Austria and in Italy. In others, such as Denmark and Holland, they are “shaping the agenda of politics” (Gray, 2003:16; see also Hershberg & Moore, 2002:11). In Belgium, the controversial Vlaams Belang party has attracted the support of an estimated 24% of Belgians (Walt, 2005:32).

The fact, however, remains that around five percent of people alive today are estimated to be living in a country other than the one where they were born (Tharoor, 1999:7). For Kotkin (1993:4), diaspora groups such as the Chinese, Jews and Indians have come to present “global tribes”, combining geographical dispersal with cultural networks and economic adaptiveness to new and changing conditions. Criticising Huntington’s “Clash of Civilizations” theory, Falk (2002:156) contends that migration patterns of intermingled civilisations make spatial mapping of inter-civilisational relations impossible.

As argued, even the middle class in what has traditionally been Access World countries feel that their identity is being eroded and they perceive themselves being slowly relegated to the realm of Denial World (Venter, 2001:123). The French “no” vote on the European Union constitution in 2005 was interpreted by many observers as a type of Access World/Denial World standoff. Leicester (2005) maintains that “the result suggests a stunning disconnect between ordinary people and France’s political, business and media establishment, where support for the treaty was strong”. In the face of a subsequent “no” vote in the Netherlands, Bernstein (2005:1) suggests that this reflected disaffection, even perhaps an insurrection, against the governing political elites.

The debate in Germany around the issue of capitalism, and especially what has been called “predatory capitalism”, offers further evidence of this trend (see Landler, 2005:8). This debate was sparked by remarks by Franz Müntefering, chairman of Germany’s Social Democratic Party (SPD) that certain financial investors are akin to swarms of locusts that fall on companies, stripping them bare before moving on (see Anon., 2005m:14). The flames were fanned by an announcement by Deutsche Bank, shortly after paying large bonuses to Deutsche Bank executives, that it intended cutting 6 400 jobs at the same time that the bank’s profits had increased.

Similar outcries have been heard in countries which have usually been trumpeted as economic success stories. In South Korea lay-offs have also been increasing, usually in the aftermath of take-overs by large multinational corporations. Sang-Hun (2005:18) asserts that the view that foreign investors are preying on the local economy is one that is held by many people in South Korea today.

As far afield as Australia, a comparable trend is discernible. An announcement by the National Australia Bank that it would cut its workforce by 10.5% (despite having posted a seventeen percent increase in net profits in the six months ending on 31 March 2005) led to widespread protests (Arnold, 2005:18). Whether in France, the Netherlands, Germany, South Korea or Australia, salary earners perceive themselves as becoming victims of the corporate greed of the citizens of Access World.

The preceding section has explored the interaction between Access World and Denial World (as elements of a global configuration) in practice, and

specifically in terms of perceptions related to security, sovereignty and identity. What must, however, still be highlighted are the repercussions of this interaction.

8.3 **The implications of the interaction between Access World and Denial World**

Based on their interaction, both Access World and Denial World are exercising certain choices and taking various actions. These must be highlighted. Firstly, in an effort to make sense of the flux in international relations, and to try to regain a measure of control over it, Access World seems to have reverted to referring to the global situation in a simplistic frame – as a struggle between the civilised and the uncivilised world.

8.3.1 **The choices and actions of Access World**

In a curious development, a hybrid of Fukuyama and Huntington – “the good civilization paradigm” – has been conceived within the context of globalisation (Herd & Weber, 2001). The “End of History” and the “Clash of Civilizations” now “blend into a neofunctionalist synthesis” (Nef, 1999:9). This conception recreates a bipolar worldview in which tensions within globalising modernity and between conflicting modernisation projects become cloaked in the rhetoric of “civilisations”.

According to this, the world is to be divided between civilisation, underpinned by global justice and a new moral order, and its antithesis: violence, terror and evil (Herd & Weber, 2001). Shedding some light on this phenomenon, Laxer (1998:148) points out that ruling classes do best when they legitimise their rule by presenting it in a universalist guise,

justifying their dominance as the only way to achieve some lofty and worthy purpose. The elevation of the issue of “civilisations” has a clear echo in Westphalia and in policies adopted during the Cold War era.

The purpose of the Westphalian paradigm was to institute a zone of “amity” and “civilized behaviour” in Europe even in times of war (Arrighi, 1997). The realm beyond Europe, in contrast, was regarded as a residual zone of alternative behaviours, to which no standards of civilisation applied (Arrighi, 1997). Grenz traces these ideas back to the birth of the modern age and to some of the founding ideas of Western philosophical thought. The latter included the belief that it was possible to construct a universal human nature (Grenz, 1996:79).

It was believed that, based on Western knowledge, generalised yet authoritative pronouncements could be made on human nature and morality. This would also allow an assessment of the conduct and practices of societies around the globe, determining which were “civilised” and which were “barbaric” (Grenz, 1996:80).

Finally, and very importantly when reviewing contemporary international relations, the faith in the validity of this knowledge provided “the authority and even the duty to instruct those whom they concluded were ‘savages’ for the sake of the advancement of true civilization” (Grenz, 1996:80). Goldsmith (1994:56) argues that the West still believes that its destiny is to guide or coerce diverse human cultures into a single global civilisation.

In similar fashion, Cold War foreign policies constructed an independently existing hostile world to which it was a reaction. In a study

of US foreign policy from President Truman to Reagan, Campbell finds a frequent refrain of national values, God-given rights, the principles of European civilisation, the fear of cultural and spiritual loss and the duties entrusted to America. All of these, according to Campbell (1992:33) clearly pointed to the “scripting of a particular American identity”.

Campbell’s account, according to McSweeney (1999:121), is however not intended to explain a unique case. America is the same as many other like-minded states but only more so. It is the “imagined community *par excellence*”(Campbell, 1992:251 – italics in original). In the paradigm shift in international relations, new threats are being created and new identities being scripted in the same way and around the same issues Campbell had identified years ago. The politics of “Inside/Outside” and “us versus them”, it appears, is being reconstructed.

Within this framework, the tendency is towards exclusion rather than inclusion, towards confrontation rather than accommodation, towards domination rather than towards engagement. In the words of President George W. Bush, “either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists” (Bush, 2001a:B4). Outside, the “Enemy”, the “Other” is now no longer the Evil Empire, personified by the USSR, but anyone or anything that threatens “civilisation” or “our way of life” as defined by those who wield power in Access World.

There is an unshaded division of the world into good and evil, terrorist and anti-terrorist, friend and enemy. Tuathail (2000:174) refers to an “atavistic impulse to pour formless global threats into old territorial bottles”. Despite its assertion that it represents civilisation, and its seemingly progressive rhetoric of democratisation, the support for

individual freedom, the open society, and the rule of law, Nef (1999:9) asserts that this new worldview is every bit as Manichean and dogmatic as that of the old Cold War national security discourse it replaced.

Recalling Kuhn's views elaborated in the introductory chapters of this thesis, a paradigm provides not only answers but also questions – it delineates the “problem-field” (Kuhn, 1996:103). It follows logically from this that if the answer identified by Access World is grounded in the Westphalian paradigm (a military solution) then the question will likewise be sought within this paradigm (an evil “Other” – now not in the form of Communism but in that of “Global Terror”).

Influenced by their sense of vulnerability and of being at risk, Access World seems to be “relapsing into the rituals of identity and non-identity, affirmation and denial, the great battle between the righteous and the barbarian that is so deeply inscribed in the constitutive discourses of modern politics” (Walker, 1993:182). Outmoded vocabularies of sovereignty, security and identity are being resurrected.

Reconstructing Westphalian concepts creates room for the assertion and is predicated on the assumption that one “knows what the world is like” as Kuhn (1996:5) put it in Chapter Three. From this logically follows a “willingness to defend that assumption, if necessary at considerable cost” (Kuhn, 1996:5), as the current United States administration has amply illustrated.

Access World still seems to be mesmerised by “the war/peace and military/diplomatic dimensions of international relations” as Evans and Newnham described it. In 2005, the United States unveiled plans to

introduce robot soldiers to fight future wars. In terms of this the US will be spending tens of billions of dollars developing automated armed forces over the next ten years (Weiner, 2005:1). Booth (1998b:8) therefore seems justified in referring to the continuing grip of Cold War thinking and habits evident in the current US military posture, economic arrangements, and ways of thinking about the world. The new doctrine entails “keeping the violent peace” in the uncertain world that has replaced the Cold War era (Rogers, 2000:8).

There does not seem to be a realisation that the security of Access World is “inseparably linked to the real or perceived insecurities of other regions of the world” (Arora, 2002). There similarly seems to be scant recognition of what Cerny calls the “New Security Dilemma” (Cerny, 2000:623) – a situation where fragmentation, radicalisation and their associated insecurities are not bounded by old frames of reference but rather by socio-economic conditions, questions of identity and autonomy, alienation and the struggle for social power.

For the most part, little attention is paid to the fundamental causes of insecurity, the economic processes that continue to ensure the marginalisation of the majority of the world’s people and the failure to address core problems of the global environment. “Machiavellian ethics, the Clausewitzian philosophy of war, and the Westphalian state system” (Booth, 1998c:31) still seem to be the core components of Access World’s ontology.

On the contrary, Booth (1998c:41) argues that many in the West are primed for new definitions of ‘us’ and ‘them’, with the simplifications and gratifications of a Cold War. Access World, it seems, remains

“caught within discursive horizons that express the spatiotemporal configurations of another era” (Walker, 1993:x). We are witnessing “old thinking in a changing world” (Booth, 1991d:16; also see Holsti, 1998:2).

Processes of “rebordering” (Agnew, 2003:5) and of “neo-monolithic reconstruction” (Bar-On, 2003) seem to be underway at all levels of society. New “Berlin Walls” are going up within and between nation-states – now “to block entry, as opposed to deterring escape” (Frelick, 1993:164; also see Booth, 1998a:346). Beck (2002:117) contends that attempts to construct a western citadel against the numinous Other has already sprung up in every country and will only increase in the years to come.

Access World is acting as a “para-keeper” (Mittelman, 2002a:2) as it was described in Chapter Three, loyal to the end to the discredited paradigm. It seems to be committed to saving the Westphalian paradigm and to resuscitating its concepts. By clinging to a particular identity which was scripted a long time ago (as Campbell explained) the United States as the leader of Access World may well be the “last Westphalian” (Cox, 1997:xxvi) in an era of globalisation.

This section has expanded in detail on the choices which Access World has exercised. But how is Denial World responding to these (apparently) exclusionary initiatives and what are the implications? To this we now turn.

8.3.2 The choices and actions of Denial World

In reaction to Access World’s attempts at “rebordering”, and in terms of

Denial World's choices, mention should firstly be made again of the increasing ability of the weak to take up arms against the strong in a globalised world. Significant changes have made industrial societies more susceptible to disruption (Groom, 1999:36) and the proliferation of military technologies is providing so-called force equalisers.

This refers to weapons that are within the reach of intermediate states and paramilitary groups and that can be used in "asymmetric warfare" (Gray, 2003:82) to counter much more advanced military power. In contemporary international relations, non-state actors can wield power and inflict damage on a scale that was formerly the sole province of states (Hershberg and Moore, 2002:2).

Overall, these trends suggest that seemingly invulnerable states, however powerful and wealthy they may be, have innate weaknesses that can be readily exploited (Rogers, 2000:112). Groom (1999:36) contends that "(w)estern societies are rich and developed because they are open and complex. They are, therefore, extremely vulnerable". Venter (2001:59-60) notes that every day "the world's poor becomes less weak, less silent and less unorganised. The politics of our time are the politics of declining acquiescence". Denial World is starting to flex its political muscle and is grasping its sense of agency.

In exercising their choice, unfulfilled expectations in Denial World have:

elicited violent reactions from peoples who have chosen either to inflict retribution on the advanced industrialized world for its perceived indifference to their conditions or to seize by force what they believe is rightfully theirs (De Santis, 1996:139).

Maninger (1997) affirms that political antagonism and migration patterns suggest that Western countries are increasingly targeted by those who are convinced that they are owed something, a notable difference from the perceptions of citizens of these countries. The same author asserts that this culture of entitlement is inclined to evolve along the peripheral rim of development and tends to move towards the core, aiming at the fulfilment of expectations. Proponents of such a culture have shown a willingness to advance this objective with all the means at their disposal, often culminating in violence and even the destruction of the core (Maninger, 1997).

Expanding on the idea of “new wars” mentioned in Chapter Four, Mary Kaldor (2002:26) contends that we live in a globalised world, and the frustrations in repressive societies cannot any longer be confined to particular territories. Those frustrations will not be expressed as democratic demands, as was the case in the Cold War period. “They will be expressed in the language of extremes and in the acts of nihilism that characterize the new wars.”(Kaldor, 2002:26.) This could escalate to a “new war” on a global scale – a sort of global Israel/Palestine conflict with no equivalent.

In similar vein Gray (2003:1) makes a strong argument that global terrorism is not a throwback to medieval times but is a truly modern phenomenon. He contends that it is a “by-product of globalisation” (Gray, 2003:1) as has been noted in Chapter Four. Al Qaeda proves that technology is a force driving globalisation (in its ideological sense) but that it equally “begets de-globalisation” (Gray, 2003:112; also see Bauman, 1998:3).

Those in Denial World often do not reject the means of globalisation; only its message (Coker, 2002:17). Terrorist groups such as Al Qaeda, for example, use English, the Internet and satellite phones – all authentic results of a globalised world – even if they serve a movement that is fundamentally in conflict with it (Coker, 2002:39). Gray (2003:26) maintains that “Al Qaeda sees itself as an alternative to the modern world, but the ideas on which it draws are quintessentially modern”.

The attack on the Twin Towers also demonstrates that Al Qaeda understands that twenty-first century wars are spectacular encounters in which the dissemination of media images is a core strategy. Its use of satellite television to mobilise support in Muslim countries is also part of this strategy (Gray, 2003:76).

It is not only in the use of communication technologies and the media that Al Qaeda is modern. The same is true of its organisation. Al Qaeda resembles less the centralised command structures of twentieth-century revolutionary parties than the cellular structures of drug cartels and the flattened networks of virtual business corporations (Gray, 2003:76; also see Hershberg and Moore, 2002:9-10). Without fixed abode and with active members from practically every part of the world, Al Qaeda is a multinational organisation with global reach (Gunaratna, 2003:1).

What should thus be expected, in reaction to actions by Access World, is that new social movements will develop that are essentially anti-elite in nature and will draw their support from individuals on the margins. In different contexts and circumstances they may have their roots in political ideologies, religious beliefs, ethnic, nationalist, or cultural identities, or a complex combination of several of these. They may be focused on

individuals or groups but the most common feature is an opposition to existing centres of power (Rogers, 2000:98).

Gumbel (2005:44) contends that “(a)mong people who aren’t Davos Men and Women – that is, the overwhelming majority of the world’s population – a backlash against the global elite can already be seen” (also see Kuah, 2003:28). Groom (1999:36) asks the crucial question: “If the poor and the dispirited finally lose hope in the existing system, what reason do they have for not disrupting it in a most devastating manner?” The citizens of Denial World are united by their general anger at being excluded.

Laxer believes that:

(a)nger ... is becoming more intense and widespread, no longer the outrage of specific groups against specific wrongs. We are seeing the first signs of a general repudiation of a whole system and its values (Laxer, 1998:248).

Rogers likewise maintains that, by studying present trends, anti-elite action will be a core feature of the next thirty years (Rogers, 2000:98). What is clear is that “populist efforts to penetrate the Westphalia edifice in its globalisation phase” (Falk, 2002:174) will not dissipate, but will continue its erosional effect and will grow in intensity (also see comments by Miall *et al.*:1999:224).

A further implication of the interaction between Access World and Denial World has been that possible future paradigms are becoming discernible. Especially because these are cause for alarm, attention has to be drawn to these.

8.3.3 Access World/Denial World interaction: possible futures

The French political commentator Jacques Attali draws a disturbing picture of a future world that has embraced a common ideology of consumerism, but is bitterly divided between rich and poor, and threatened by a warming and polluted atmosphere. The consumer-citizens of the world's privileged regions will become "rich nomads" (Attali, 1991:5) but wherever they go they will be confronted by roving masses of "poor nomads" (Attali, 1991:5) – boat people on a planetary scale – searching for sustenance and shelter, their desires inflamed by the seductive images of consumerism they will see on satellite TV broadcasts from Paris, Los Angeles, or Tokyo.

In similar vein Friedman states that:

(t)he single most underestimated force in international affairs today is what happens – thanks to globalisation – when we all increasingly know how everyone else lives. People everywhere start to demand the same things, and when they can't get them, they get frustrated (Friedman, 2000b:A31).

Sunter paints a similar picture of a situation in which Access World has turned its back on Denial World and has retreated into a "gilded cage" (Sunter, 1992:147). However, the "rich old millions" (Sunter, 1992:147) cannot escape from the fact that the "gilded cage" is encircled by the "poor young billions" (Sunter, 1992:147) – the citizens of Denial World.

"Outside the gilded cage, billions of poverty-stricken people struggle to survive as the globe deteriorates into a crazy quilt of clans." (Sunter,

1992:147.) Only the elite from the developing world are welcomed through the bars of the cage, thus stripping the developing world of the very people they need. Access World Embassies in regions outside the cage become “impenetrable forts” (Sunter, 1992:147; also see Cohen, 2005:2).

The question posed at the conclusion of Chapter Six was: How does humanity deal with mutual vulnerability, spatial re-stratification and shifting allegiances in the context of globalisation? Mushrooming security estates in South Africa, xenophobia in the Netherlands, the residual resentment against the United States in much of the developing world, the rise of Al Qaeda – all of these seemingly unconnected dots, when seen as a whole, could be interpreted as indicative of how this is taking place. These are the contours of a future paradigm of international relations.

What is therefore cause for concern is the picture emerging; the way in which the concepts of security, sovereignty and identity are being reconstructed. This points to a future paradigm of which the key dynamic will be conflict rather than consensus – it points to a confrontation between Access World and Denial World. The divisions between the two worlds – divisions of wealth, mobility, connectivity and agency – are apparently strengthening opposing worldviews or ontologies. These ideas will be revisited in the latter part of this chapter.

Although not intentionally, the issue of class has kept reappearing throughout this chapter. This leads to the intriguing question: Is a global class configuration emerging from the interaction between Access World and Denial World?

8.3.4. The Access World/Denial World configuration – a global emerging class structure?

While it is too early for final pronouncements on new worlds or their inhabitants, there is, nevertheless, an intuitive sharing of Rosenau's view that the concept of "class" may still be relevant and that new social classes may be emerging (Rosenau, 2003:133).

Albrow shares this view and contends that:

(c)ontrary to many of the interpretations of globalization, the declining significance of nation-state societies in the organization of social life does not mean the end of stratification or the phenomenon of class, only that they cannot be equated with the social structure of a national entity (Albrow, 1996:160).

Cox (1996b:111) argues that, hitherto, social classes have been found to exist within nationally defined social formations. Now, as a consequence of international production, it becomes increasingly pertinent to think in terms of a global class structure alongside or superimposed upon national class structures. Robinson (2005:317-318) also believes that the system of nation-states as discrete interacting units – the inter-state system – is no longer the primary institutional framework that shapes social and class forces and political dynamics.

Against the background of the cross-pollination between globalisation and postmodernity (explained in Chapter One) Grenz remarks that postmodernity questions the "radical individualism" to which modernity gave birth (Grenz, 1996:168). This may go some way towards explaining

why, in an era of globalisation, new human collectivities (in the form of social classes) appear to be congealing on a global scale.

It is thus argued in the thesis that Access World and Denial World increasingly represent a new global overclass and underclass (as was hinted in Chapter Seven) or a dominant and a dominated class. Here class refers to “a large grouping of people who share common economic interests, experiences and lifestyles” (Woodward, 2000b:21). The inhabitants of Access World and Denial World’s “life circumstances” (Rosenau, 2003:173) therefore differ completely.

Robinson & Harris (2000:11-54) discuss the formation of this new global class structure at length and concur that the world is witnessing the emergence of a global ruling class - what I call Access World. This class comprises of fractions of nation-state societies from both the North and the South and emerges from processes – economic, social, political and cultural – that supersede nation-states. They conclude that this global over-class finds its alter ego in an expanding transnational proletariat - what I call Denial World.

Wendt (1992:398) observes that “identities are the basis of interests”. Proceeding from this statement it is argued in the thesis that the identity of humanity has been delinked from the nation-state and that its interests are now determined on the basis of whether or not it has access to the fruits of globalisation.

The World Economic Forum (or WEF), which inspired the image of Davos Man, acquires a very specific meaning in this context. Goodman (2001) describes it as having taken on “an unprecedented role as a

rallying point for global elites, and as a vehicle for class power”. He asserts furthermore that the WEF “is a class grouping, fully embedded in social relations, that self-consciously takes on the role of planning for collective class interests” (Goodman, 2001). Giving further credence to this analysis is the contention that the anti-globalisation movement, the counterfoil to the WEF embodied in the World Social Forum, signals a new era of class discontent (Agathangelou & Ling, 2004b:531).

Faivre (2003) argues that, while there has been a “return” to class analysis, the basis of this analysis is no longer relations of production as elaborated in classic Marxist thought. The traditional ideological categories of leftist political discourse are thus being eschewed. Mackenzie (2004:50) posits that the classic Left, insofar as it regards the state and its structural appendages as the locus of politics – and class-status as the determining factor of political agency – is unable to account for “the rationale and role of identity/lifestyle politics” (Ingalsbee, 1996:272) in contemporary international relations.

Huntington (1996:21) observes that “(i)n the post-Cold War, the most important distinctions among peoples are not ideological, political or economic. They are cultural”. The thesis shares Huntington’s assertion that it is in the domain of culture that the answers to the nature of new global divisions should be sought. The thesis, however, differs insofar as Huntington sees these divisions as being between civilisations. It rather sees these divisions as being between lifestyles; the latter determined by whether or not one is able to benefit from globalisation.

In line with Woodward’s earlier definition, and in the frame of postmodernity, Faivre contends that class-as-lifestyle has become the

dominant theory of class (Faivre, 2003). The key question then arising is whether or not you are able to satisfy your desire for this lifestyle, or worded differently, whether you have access to the fruits of globalisation or not? This is a crucial question, as Huntington himself acknowledges in his 1994 work “Who are We? The Challenges to America’s National Identity”. Are you, therefore, a citizen of Access World or of Denial World?

As a close reading of this chapter reveals, no actors within Access World and Denial World are currently more visible and seem to be more representative of these groupings than the US administration of President George W. Bush (in power since 2001) and the Al Qaeda network, led by Osama Bin Laden. Contributing to this, the events of 11 September 2001 had the unfortunate effect of bringing to the fore the durable yet unfortunate “ontological persistence of Islam as the generalised Other of Western modernity” (Pasha, 2003:113).

The critical influence these players exercise on international relations thus have to be assessed as a final dimension of the interaction between Access World and Denial World. Once this has been done, an analysis could be made of whether or not the Access World/Denial World relationship is typified by incommensurability.

8.3.5 The role of the Bush administration and of Al Qaeda within the Access World/Denial World framework

The United States and Al Qaeda, as the two opposite, symbolic and most visible faces of Access World and Denial World, should both carry blame for the confrontational nature of the Access World/Denial World

relationship in contemporary international relations. Both also contribute to a prevailing sense of incommensurability.

Indeed, Agathangelou and Ling (2004b:517) assert that America's "war on terror" and Al Qaeda's "jihad" reflect mirror strategies. As explained before, the United States, as the leader of Access World, has apparently embarked on a global "civilising mission" (El-Amine, 2002; also see Agathangelou & Ling, 2004b:520). In this context, the United States seem to be determined to export "America's seminal seeds of democracy, capitalism, and freedom" (Agathangelou & Ling, 2004b:525). There is, a "civilizational justification" for the 'War on Terror', Agathangelou and Ling (2004b:525) assert.

Where the "cosy identity" (Soros, 1998:217) which the United States had during the Cold War has been shattered, the Bush administration has found a clear view of its role in the world – a new ontology - in the global "War on Terror". Howard (2000:97) sees a parallel to this in nineteenth century campaigns led by European powers to bring "barbaric regions within the pale of Western civilization". Booth and Dunne (2002b:19) affirm that at the end of the Cold War the United States lost the Soviet Empire but did not find a role. It did when the post-Cold War collided with the future on 11 September 2001 and became the "War on Terror". "Extremism and fear have given the US society a framework of meaning that was never possible from the 24/7 transactions of globalization." (Booth & Dunne, 2002b:19.)

Lipschutz explains this need for the "Other", for an "Enemy":

The loss of an Enemy can be seen ... as something of a catastrophe for

an identity based on that Enemy, and it opens up a search for a new Other that can function as the new Enemy. While the myths underlying American identity are many, during the Cold War the strongest one had to do with not-being, and not-becoming, Communist, both individually and collectively (Lipschutz, 1995:219).

In rhetoric reminiscent of the Cold War period, “civilisation’s” struggle is increasingly depicted as being waged against a new ideology of the 21st century – as reprehensible as Communism – but now global in scope. The terrorists murder “in the name of a totalitarian ideology that hates freedom, rejects tolerance and despises all dissent” President Bush asserted following the London bombings in July 2005 (Bush, 2005a).

At the extreme opposite end of the spectrum, groups such as Al Qaeda support an equally fundamentalist worldview of one global Islamic state (Ghosh, 2005:34) or of a “supranational Islamic caliphate” as Cowell (2005:3) describes it. Al Qaeda’s worldview is as narrow and exclusionary as that of the Bush administration.

Contrary to the “Clash of Civilizations” thesis, Al Qaeda distinguishes between “us” and “them” even within the Islamic world. Countries viewed as having sided with the United States (or with “them”) include Muslim countries such as the Arab Republic of Egypt and the People’s Democratic Republic of Algeria. The kidnapping and subsequent slaying of both the Egyptian and Algerian Ambassadors to Iraq in July 2005 have been attributed by the grouping “Al Qaeda in Iraq” to the fact that these countries have sided with the “crusaders” who have invaded Islam’s holy lands.

Putting in a broader context the idea that the Bush administration and Al Qaeda ascribe to mirror strategies, Blond & Pabst argue that:

(w)hat unites both liberals and conservatives is their mutual insistence on the exclusivity and absoluteness of their vision. In this both sides are composed of fundamentalists who mistake their subjective beliefs for the only objective truth. For each their own assessment of the “facts” and of “reality” is beyond questioning (Blond & Pabst, 2005:10)

The Bush administration and Al Qaeda both transnationalise their respective military forces. This is done not only to gather more allies by crossing borders but also to propagate a global rhetoric that distracts attention from each camp’s exploitation of the masses economically, politically, religiously, and physically (Agathangelou & Ling, 2004b:520).

While the United States has assembled a global coalition in its war on terrorism, it faces, in Al- Qaeda, “an equally transnational antagonist” (Hershberg & Moore, 2002:9). Both transgress national and physical boundaries to reinforce their borders of the mind: that is, a “Global War on Terror” on the one side; “Global Jihad” on the other.

Each demand that the world choose between “civilisation” or “barbarity” or between being grouped with “the faithful” or with “the infidels” (Agathangelou & Ling, 2004b:523). Both want to resurrect the idea of “national security” conventionally defined as sovereign, stable boundaries and identities (Agathangelou & Ling, 2004b:525). In both cases, the same authors argue, violence is exploited to affix collective identities, forge a common political project, and subsume dissent. In this way, they deny

opportunities for transformation in exchange for more violence (Agathangelou & Ling, 2004b:521). “The old dichotomy of civilized / barbarian returns, now dressed in fresh attire.” (Pasha, 2003:120.)

Increasingly these two proponents of Access World and Denial World are asserting their respective identities on a global scale, as can be witnessed in world events. So-called “global jihadists” from all over the world have volunteered to join the struggles in Chechnya, Bosnia, Afghanistan and Kashmir (Roy, 2005:5). In what has been called the “Iraq effect” (Leiken, 2005), it is similarly estimated that (since 2003) less than ten percent of more than 500 suicide attacks in Iraq have been carried out by Iraqis (Quinn & Shrader, 2005). Notably, these volunteers from other countries are increasingly not only from the Middle East, but from African countries such as Morocco, Libya, Tunisia and Algeria.

Osama Bin Laden now provides encouragement and strategic orientation to scores of relatively autonomous European jihadist networks (Leiken, 2005). The footsoldiers of Denial World’s radical fringe are increasingly operating across old borders and boundaries. Osama Bin Laden asserts a new kind of religious sovereignty and claims to personify the identity of the “true” Islamic nation. On a global scale, he revitalises Westphalian ideas to rationalise his hegemonic politics (Agathangelou & Ling, 2004b:520).

At the opposite end of the spectrum, and drawing new boundaries, President Bush declared on 08 November 2001 that “(w)e wage war to save civilization itself” (Bush, 2001b). In his Presidential radio address on 09 July 2005, President Bush described the attacks on the London transport system as “barbaric” (Bush, 2005b). In his speech on 11 July

2005, President Bush again asserted that “(t)he attack in London was an attack on the civilized world” (Bush, 2005a). Referring to a barbaric assault on the civilised world has become a constant refrain in White House statements following terrorist attacks.

Political reality, as the United States and Al Qaeda see it, “remains wrapped in Westphalian words, tying their sense of the present back to actions and thoughts grounded in a previous era’s representations of a political realism suitable only for a world gone by” (Luke, 1994:1-2). In a Kuhnian sense, both emerge as adherents to the paradigm-in-crisis. Both actively try to resurrect the Westphalian paradigm and its ability of fixing identities, fabricating sovereign space (Luke, 1994:30) and, to this list could be added, feigning security. Smith (2001) warns that the world may be witnessing the blossoming of a war between alternative forms of terror, a war that is nonetheless anxiously poured into familiar if dubious moulds.

Attempting to resuscitate Westphalian notions of Inside/Outside by replacing “nation-state” with “civilisation” may eventually prove to be wholly counter-productive. Al Qaeda’s appeal has historically been to the oppressed, the disillusioned and to those who view globalisation as a “constraining” rather than as an “enabling” process (as these were described in Chapter Seven) in what has traditionally been viewed as Denial World countries. The bombings in London in July 2005, perpetrated by British citizens, however prove that Al Qaeda is now succeeding in tapping into these sentiments in the Denial World component within traditionally Access World countries as well (see Sciolino, 2005:3).

The question now arises: Could the Bush administration's rigid division of the world into "civilised" and "uncivilised" not contribute to a situation where Al Qaeda's appeal starts extending to those for whom (as has been mentioned before) the phrase "Access Denied" is a way of life, irrespective of their religious orientation? Giving further credence to this, Roy (2005:5) argues that although the worldview of the present generation of Al Qaeda fighters consists of a vision of a virtual, universal "ummah" or worldwide community of believers, at a deeper level they turn to the fundamentalist cause because they "felt excluded from Western society" (Roy, 2005:5). In these cases "profound alienation" is often the main motivating factor for joining Al Qaeda (Waldman, 2005:3). These individuals do not have access, to the extent that access is synonymous with "advancement and personal fulfilment" as Rifkin (2000:15) described it earlier.

Roy contends that:

(t)he Western-based Islamic terrorists are not the militant vanguard of the Muslim community; they are a lost generation, unmoored from traditional societies and cultures, frustrated by a Western society that does not meet their expectations. And their vision of a global ummah is both a mirror of and a form of revenge against the globalization that has made them what they are (Roy, 2005:5).

Booth and Dunne (2002b:18) posit that September 11 was the deadly symptom of a hot-house global order in which rage germinates, and out of which ruthless leaders are able to pick suicidal accomplices. Martyrdom, Gellner (1994:25) observes, is more rousing stuff than jurisprudence and theology. The attraction of fundamentalist Islam may thus not only be its religious aspect alone but, similar to the ideology of

the nation-state, its ability to project a vehicle for the hopes and aspirations of its followers, to which they owe their allegiance. Fundamentalist Islam offers specific assurances as a model of social organisation (Horsman & Marshall, 1995:xvi).

Fundamentalist Islam comes to represent:

a broader backlash to the pressures being exerted by a faceless globalizing postmodernism in which the homogenizing and consumerist impacts of the market negate every particular identity, and highlight the unbridgeable distance between winners and losers in the world to come (Falk, 1995: 33).

Cultivating appeal across a broader spectrum may well be one of Bin Laden's strategic objectives. By referring to the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in a taped message on 07 October 2001, Bin Laden made the subtle inference that American hegemony also threatens non-Muslims and non-Arabs (Bin Laden, 2001; also see Agathangelou & Ling, 2004b:522). Coker (2002:44) asserts that frustration with- and resentment at being excluded lead to a situation where individuals "find in extremist causes and extreme groups some meaning for their lives that they cannot find in the world at large".

With the middle class increasingly being unable to maintain its standard of living, gradually being absorbed by Denial World, extremism from this quarter cannot be ruled out. Explaining this phenomenon, Nef (1999:84) states that with pronounced declines in living standards affecting the once secure bastions of the middle-class and blue-collar sectors in the First World and former Second World, socio-political conditions similar to

those of post-World War I Europe have been created. The unemployed, alienated youth, and an economically threatened middle class constitute a propitious culture for “extremism from the centre” (Nef, 1999:84).

Should Osama Bin Laden be able to capitalise on these trends, it will greatly strengthen his hand as the global “custodian” of terror and affirm his status as the architect of an absolutist and exclusionary future paradigm of international relations.

When using the Bush administration and Al Qaeda as a benchmark, the Access World and Denial World positions inexorably seem to be “fundamentally asymmetric” (Solovyov, 2002). Confrontation indeed seems to be the hallmark of this relationship. One therefore cannot but ask the question first formulated in Chapter One: Why have the past sixteen years proven to be divisive and dangerous in ways never imagined when the Berlin Wall fell? These two questions follow: Are Access World and Denial World incommensurable worlds? What is the prognosis for humanity if these worlds are truly incommensurable?

8.4 **Access World and Denial World: a case of Kuhnian incommensurability?**

The concept of incommensurability was discussed in detail in Chapter Three. It was argued that there had been a substantial transformation in Kuhn’s own views on incommensurability since “The Structure of Scientific Revolutions” was first published in 1962.

It was furthermore pointed out that a distinction could be made between “strong” and weak” forms of incommensurability and that, in the case of

the latter, translating the vocabularies of contending paradigms into language that was mutually understandable was possible. The next section will attempt to, based on these understandings, shed some light on the pertinent questions posed above.

8.4.1 **“Strong incommensurability”, “weak incommensurability” and international relations: an assessment**

From a review of the individual trends prevalent in the ongoing paradigm shift in international relations, it is clear that humanity’s ontology or worldview is shaped by an evolving sense of identity (belonging to either Access World or Denial World); an evolving perception of sovereignty (being positioned in either Access World or Denial World); and by an evolving sense of security (perceiving insecurity emanating from either Access World or Denial World).

Access World and Denial World become two new nuclei in international relations, decentring state-sovereign authority and dividing old ties of belongingness. These new nuclei split cultures, economies and societies between “the demands of nominal nationality in old in-stated spaces and actual transnationality in new un-stated spaces” (Luke, 1994:25).

Responding to this, Access World (with the United States leading the way) is attempting to construct a new social template that it wants to imprint on the world. This template will replace the “classificatory grid of nation-states” (Kaplan, 2001:43). Attempts are underway to, through high-technology processes and multilateral declarations, erect new barriers and draw fresh borders. The certainties of Westphalia must be revived; a world where “Inside” and “Outside” were clearly delineated.

Denial World reacts forcefully to initiatives aimed at denying it access by either illegally scaling or breaking down Access World's "walls" and attempts at "rebordering". Attali (1991:76) remarks that this section of humanity will "attempt to leave behind the misery of the periphery" or alternatively they will "redefine hope in fundamentalist terms". If the perception takes root in Denial World that "leaving the misery of the periphery behind" is truly and utterly unattainable, "redefining hope in fundamentalist terms" might well translate into widespread support for organisations such as Al Qaeda or other groupings with a nihilistic agenda.

On a broad reading, it would therefore seem as if the chances of Access World and Denial World, working together towards a common future paradigm, are slim. In Access World, "the siege mentality/garrison state perspective" (Stoett, 1999:90) seems to be gaining ground. Access World is progressively withdrawing into a fortress – the latter constructed both physically and semantically.

As far as Denial World is concerned, and "amidst an atmosphere of general dismay and fear" (Chomsky, 1998:187) there are already signs of resistance. Bauman (1998:22) states that the "fortifications built by the elite and the self-defence-through-aggression practised by those left outside the walls have a mutually reinforcing effect".

This vicious cycle plays into the hands of those, like Osama Bin Laden, who wants to recreate the world in their own image. Interaction between Access World and Denial World increasingly seem to be characterised by what divides people, rather than what unites them; by what brings about difference and discrimination rather than what leads to commonality and

coalescence. Incommensurability seems inevitable.

Al Qaeda, indeed, seems to revel in incommensurability. The attacks by this organisation on the British transport network on 07 July 2005 could be viewed as an act of sabotage, designed specifically to derail a *rapprochement* of any kind or a bridging of the divide between Access World and Denial World. This assertion seems to be supported by the fact that, at the time of the bombings, the Gleneagles Summit was underway in Scotland. The Gleneagles Summit focused specifically on ways in which to assist Africa, a continent where the majority of Denial World's inhabitants live, but also a continent being carefully cultivated by Al Qaeda as a fertile recruitment ground.

What must, however, be understood, is that at the heart of this struggle is not a "Clash of Civilisations" but a "Clash of Globalisations" as was mentioned in Chapter Seven. The paradigm shift in international relations resembles a duel of globalisations or a battle for the soul of globalisation. From both sides Access World and Denial World (and its various proponents) are locked into an ontological struggle "to reimpose meaning on the world" as De Santis (1996:147) puts it. This is a new fight for people's "loyalties and interests, ideologies and beliefs" (Kohn, 2005:15).

The danger in contemporary international relations is that it becomes generally accepted that the views of the Bush administration or of Al-Qaeda, which both lean towards "strong incommensurability", will inevitably set the tone for the debate on global change. Similar to die-hard adherents to a paradigm which has proven to be fatally flawed, both display "resistance" to paradigm change and the positions of both have become singularly "rigid" (Kuhn, 1996:64).

In addition, and in both these instances, the idea of incommensurability has apparently been turned into “the doctrine of incommensurability” (Waters, 2001:144). “Difference itself is elevated to a permanent ontological principle.” (Walker, 1993:118.) The narrowly defined ontologies of the Bush administration and of Al Qaeda strengthen the perception that dialogue between Access World and Denial World is impossible.

Lindsay Waters (2001:163) explains this type of “strong incommensurability” when she warns of the virulent nature thereof. She asserts that “(i)ncommensurability legitimates our giving up on the effort to seek out what makes us similar with others” (Waters, 2001:163). The danger lies in the possibility that, to avoid the rigours of undergoing revolutionary change or the difficulty of understanding how it might happen, of truly imagining a new world beyond the present, both Access World and Denial World may increasingly promote the virtues of residing inside an incommensurable community. From here they then mercilessly attack the possibility of translation.

Waters’ description of the situation in the 1960s in the United States, when the push for integration started to be violently opposed, bears an uncanny resemblance to this type of “strong incommensurability”. She mentions that:

(w)hen the sixties turned ugly, the possibilities for the idea of incommensurability increased considerably. ... Incommensurability came to mean not just that people living within one spatial horizon could be free from those living in others; it came to mean that people living in the same time could consider themselves to be utterly different and free from their contemporaries, as long as they could define themselves as

occupying different paradigms. ... Walls went up between peoples, and ready to hand was a fancy justification for constructing those walls (Waters, 2001:144).

Based on the elaboration thus far in this section, the general outlook appears to be gloomy. Linking back to theoretical ideas developed in Chapter Seven the battle lines seem to have been clearly drawn – “(t)wo worlds, two perceptions of the world, two strategies” (Bauman, 1998:100). There are signs, Bauman (1998:101) warns, of “an almost complete communications breakdown between the ... elites and the *populus*”.

Fatalism and a sense of despair, however, need not prevail. Tapping into the idealistic element of Kuhn’s theory, it is possible to ensure that these discourses which are “imprisoning imagination” (Falk, 1995:35) are not allowed to drown out other voices. But what reasons can be put forward to support Falk’s sense of optimism?

Firstly, and as pointed out in the previous chapter, Access World and Denial World represent a spectrum of views. A homogenous political culture (both within Access World and Denial World) is still in its formative stages. Neither Access World nor Denial World yet speaks with one voice. It is thus a fallacy to assume that all the inhabitants of Denial World support actions by Al Qaeda or that the majority of Denial World has chosen fundamentalist Islam as a vehicle for their own grievances.

Similarly, Access World represents views which are more sympathetic toward Denial World and include individuals who grasp the seriousness of the prevailing situation. The inhabitants of Access World are not all

“Let-them-eat-Cakers” (Friedman, 2000:438). Goodman (2001) points out that key Access World proponents, such as Hungarian-born financier George Soros and American media magnate Ted Turner, have added their voices to the chorus of those concerned with the social cost and wider ramifications of global exclusion.

Turok (2001:165) argues that there are now many serious critics who are deeply concerned about the current forms of globalisation and its associated ideology of neo-liberalism. These individuals seem to grasp that “(t)he widely noted, increasingly worrying polarization of the world and its population is not an external, alien, disturbing, ‘spoke in the wheel’ interference with the process of globalization; it is its effect (Bauman, 1998:93).

These contradictions within Access World as a “transnational bourgeoisie” (Robinson, 2005:320) and the tensions they generate “open up new opportunities for emancipatory projects” (Robinson & Harris, 2000:11). There seems to be a growing realisation in Access World that “(i)f it will not find constructive ways of delegating power, groups like Al Qaeda will just be a prelude for other forces that will drive the West to deliver power in very destructive ways” (Bar-On, 2003).

Secondly the cross-paradigm conversation between Davos Man and Porto Alegre Woman is possible, based on a shared humanity, and, ultimately, because the continued existence of both ourselves and of the planet will depend on it. Similar to Waters, the thesis rejects “the idea of the incommensurability of peoples” (Waters, 2001:164). Strands of cooperation, Steinbruner (2000:2) remarks, are deeply implanted in both history and human nature.

There is therefore an opportunity to take advantage of what Kuhn calls “a family resemblance” (Kuhn, 1996:14) between these two paradigms. Humanity must be convinced that Osama Bin Laden’s (never-articulated) vision of an Islamic “Paradise” attainable through “Jihad” is as unattainable as the idea of “Homeland Security” that cannot be breached.

What Sankey (1991:422) calls “the principle of charity” (or what could be described as seeing-the-world-through-the-eyes-of-another) could similarly ease the Access World/Denial World conversation. Sankey contends that:

(i)f we charitably attribute to speakers of [another] language beliefs which we would ourselves hold in the circumstances in which they find themselves, then we can use such beliefs to fix the meaning of their words (Sankey, 1991:422).

Based on these assertions, the thesis contests that the incommensurability between Access World and Denial World, at this point in time, and looking beyond the interaction between the Bush administration and Al Qaeda, does not yet represent an example of “strong incommensurability”. It cannot be compared to the incommensurable views of adherents to a, for example, geocentric or a heliocentric view of the world. The broader relationship between Access World and Denial World should rather be seen as one of “weak incommensurability” and it is in this assertion that the possibility for positive change is contained.

Following from this, and pursuing ideas which have been developed throughout, it is argued that incommensurability is embedded neither in the Access World/Denial World structure nor in the agents representing

Access World and Denial World. Incommensurability rather resides in the contemporary interaction between Access World and Denial World. Reflecting on worrying contemporary trends, Sparks (2003:xii) asserts that “(i)t is the relationship between the First and Third Worlds that is the primary cancer threatening to metastacize as this century progresses”.

We can agree with Alexander Wendt’s constructivist approach when he observes that the focus of analysis should be the agent/structure interrelationship and practices, processes and the social creation of meaning rather than material facts and eternal imperatives (also see Rosenau, 1990:60). The key to unlocking the potential for change is changing Access World and Denial World’s inter-subjective understandings of international relations or their worldview. Agency and structure are two sides of the same ontological coin (McSweeney, 1999:143). Once these change, alternative imaginings of human life become possible.

De Santis (1996:141) posits that what is required is a new conceptual framework – indeed, a new way of living that will provide meaning to the objective flow of events that people everywhere are simultaneously encountering in the context of shared experience. As will be argued in Chapter Nine, and as “translators”, the practitioners of International Relations will be required to play a leading role in building these “consensual bridges” (Kegley Jnr., 2002:65) between Access World and Denial World. Likewise, practitioners of international relations will be required to implement these new understandings in imaginative ways.

Positioning incommensurability in the relationship between Access World and Denial World and asserting that, in a general sense, this can be

typified as “weak incommensurability”, thus opens up the space for human agency. This does not necessarily have to be the “Age of Incommensurability” (Waters, 2001:133). McSweeney (1999:101) asserts that “there is choice ... and that neither a fixed human nature nor an independent structure determines the direction ... is a fundamental conclusion”.

It is thus argued that Access World and Denial World as global social classes are not locked into an inescapable dialectic of conflict as Marxist theory predicted. While current developments would seem to point to a confrontation between Access World and Denial World, humanity has the power to change the course of events – to imagine a new world of international relations. Humanity lives in “worlds of our making” (Onuf, 2002:119) and our sense of agency, as far as world-making is concerned, should never be underestimated (Onuf, 2002:119-121). Appadurai (1996:7) states that the imagination is today a staging ground for action, and not only for escape.

Kuhn posited that the “essential tension” (Kuhn, 1977:225) present in all paradigms eventually lead to their destruction. But Kuhn simultaneously views change as a dynamic process of “destructive-constructive paradigm changes” (Kuhn, 1996:66). The essential tension which lead to the demise of the Westphalian paradigm is thus also a creative tension. Humanity today has the opportunity to capitalise on this opportunity to construct a new international relations.

The arguments elaborated here underline the ontological priority of social action. What lies beyond the Westphalian paradigm “will be shaped by the structures of thought, conceived and reconceived, and made material,

by individuals and the political units they constitute and reconstitute” (Booth, 1998b:2). Access World and Denial World do not have to be “worlds in collision”.

8.5 Conclusion

Chapter Eight has shown that the outcome of the paradigm shift in international relations will be determined as much by Denial World as by Access World. Albrow (1996:82) underlines this point when he states that the shape of a future paradigm is as much determined by the anti-global as by the global. It is indeed the tension between Access World and Denial World that will define international relations’ future character.

Stressing the importance of this, Rosenau (2002:28) observes that this tension – the “framegratory processes” - are so pervasive and generic that the emergent epoch seems likely to acquire a label reflective of them. In a globalised world, and as a result of the dynamics of these processes, “our individual destinies are merging into a single destiny” (Havel, 1999; also see Devetak, 2002:169). In an era in which the fate of Access World and Denial World have become intertwined, and for the first time, decisions taken by either might not only impact on individuals or on nation-states, but on the survival of humanity as a whole.

Referring to human interests, Dunn remarks that:

modern history has duly created nation-states to defend them [human interests] in some fashion. But for those more final interests which stretch across all boundaries and on which the very survival of the human species (and vast numbers of other species along with it) arguably

now depends, modern history has not so far been thoughtful enough to supply agencies with the least capability of defending them (Dunn, 1993:81).

As both Attali and Sunter warn, it is naïve to believe that the human species can survive in good shape in a world dominated by the politics of exclusiveness and the economics of exploitation. There has to be an understanding of humanity which defines the individual as “a cohabitant of a fragile planet and a member of a global community of fate” (Axtmann, 1995:922). The exclusion of Denial World from the globalisation project will ultimately be to the detriment of Access World as well.

Ironically, therefore, and to reinforce a theme which has run throughout this study, the wider the divides between Access World and Denial World, the smaller the distance between the two actually becomes and the less independently of each other they can truly act. Access World and Denial World will therefore be forced to exist together, trying to find common ground concerning a range of contentious and emotional issues.

It is with these issues that the inhabitants of planet Earth, academics studying International Relations, as well as policymakers, will have to grapple. Making sense of this world, re-imagining it - and ultimately remaking it - is the challenge of the new international relations as will be asserted in the closing chapter of the thesis.

CHAPTER NINE

BEYOND WESTPHALIA - RE-IMAGINING INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

“Creating a new world out of new words ...” (Alker *et al.*, 2001).

9.1 Introduction

The theory developed by the historian and philosopher of science, Thomas Kuhn, offers a powerful instrument in the search for answers to questions related to contemporary international relations and global change. Kuhn developed the revolutionary idea that science advances not gradually but in jolts, through a series of raw and jagged paradigm shifts. The result of this process is far-reaching, to the extent that it changes the worldview of those affected by it.

Arguing from a Kuhnian perspective, this study has posited the view that the Westphalian or state-centric paradigm of international relations has become obsolete. The shared and well-known margins of this paradigm - its very foundations - have disappeared. As in science, the repercussions of this paradigm shift in international relations have been profound. Whereas previously there had been the luxury of arguing over and debating esoteric aspects of the state-centric paradigm, this comfort zone no longer exists. Debates now focus on the substructure, and, indeed, on the reconstruction of the paradigm's cornerstones.

By applying views and concepts developed by Kuhn, the preceding chapters have concluded that:

- More than 16 years after the fall of the Berlin Wall, there is an intense and ongoing ontological debate regarding the changed nature of international relations. This can be ascribed to the fact that international relations are in the midst of a Kuhnian paradigm shift in both a real and a theoretical sense. Humanity has witnessed the breaking of the Westphalian frame and is now living in a post-Westphalian dawn. A “new, postinternational paradigm” (Rosenau & Durfee, 1995:31) of international relations still has to be forged.
- The extensive body of accumulated Westphalian knowledge is increasingly found to be anomalous. This can be explained by Kuhn’s view that knowledge is paradigm-bound. In the current paradigm shift, international relations’ knowledge, and the conceptual vocabulary constructed within this framework, are therefore inadequate. The content of concepts such as sovereignty, security and identity have become vague and without paradigmatic context. Finding a resonance in postmodern and constructivist theories, the notion of a paradigm shift ultimately opens up the possibility of a world characterised by ever-changing sets of knowledge; and that
- Proponents of various positions in these ongoing ontological debates are “talking past each other”; not reaching an understanding and apparently having irreconcilable worldviews. This can be explained in terms of Kuhn’s concept of incommensurability. In a theoretical

sense, this explains the ongoing contest in International Relations between (often diametrically opposed) meta-theoretical explanations of contemporary developments. In a practical sense, it has given rise to the (what I call) Access World/Denial World configuration in international relations. The rigid Cold War divisions of security/insecurity, Inside/Outside and Self/Other are being re-created, albeit now on a global scale, and to the detriment of humanity as a whole. It has been argued that - in the interest of humanity - this trend has to be countered.

Walker (1993:163) remarks that “the powerful sense of change apparent all around us is not matched by an equally clear sense of how evidence of change is to be interpreted”. To move beyond this impasse, new understandings of both the geographical and conceptual space of international relations are required. There is a dire need for a new ontology of international relations; for new ways of seeing the world. We need to realise that “the Outside is now also the Inside”, to quote Derrida (1976:44). Only if a new ontology is established will the rift between Access World and Denial World be healed and will the discipline of International Relations remain viable and its language relevant.

Where previous chapters endeavoured to answer specific international relations-related questions, in the context of Kuhn’s theory, this closing chapter deals with a crucial, remaining issue. This larger question that has to be answered involves interpreting the meaning of Thomas Kuhn for international relations and global change. Worded differently, how can Kuhn’s views assist in the search for a new international relations? The

implications of this for both the theory and the practice of international relations are far-reaching and have to be highlighted.

9.2 **Thomas Kuhn and the search for a new international relations**

From 1987 onwards, calls to tear down the Berlin Wall were increasingly heard, but often lampooned. Proponents of a unified Germany were viewed as utopian dreamers, out of touch with the world of *realpolitik*. On the night of 09 November 1989 the Berlin Wall fell. In 1990 the country that was known as East Germany had disappeared from the map. The dreamers and those with absurd views were exposed as being those individuals who could not imagine that the world might change.

President Mikhail Gorbachev had a stake in these changes, Malzahn (2005) argues, but it was the East Germans themselves who played the larger role (also see Booth, 1998b:4). Although many could not imagine that there might be an alternative to a divided Germany, the people of East Germany imagined a new world. They asked the question: Why not here?

“Why not here?” Brooks (2005:9) contends, is a Kuhnian question, perhaps the most powerful question in the world today. Wherever it is asked, people seem to feel that the rules have changed and that new possibilities are opening up. Society is rethinking the kind of bonds and boundaries that will define human relations in the coming decades.

Humanity realises that we all have some space and some sense of agency, however little, to “change and challenge” (Booth, 1998b:7). More and more

people agree with Murphy that it would be dubious to assume that we are “indefinitely imprisoned within the current political-territorial order” (Murphy, 1996:110).

The thesis argues the point that the question “Why not here?” truly represents Thomas Kuhn’s gift to twenty-first century international relations. Expressing a very Kuhnian idea, Booth posits that “it remains for us to *invent* the future, not *discover* it through simply amassing knowledge (Booth, 1998a:352 – italics in original). With his concepts of “paradigm” and “paradigm shift”, Thomas Kuhn gives international relations the language to understand “world-making”, but also not to rule out the possibility of “world-breaking” (Babich, 2003:105). As the question: “Why not here?” was asked in East Germany, it is now reverberating around the world (see Falk, 1995:36-39).

The fall of the Berlin Wall opened up larger vistas. Humanity, having been conditioned to accept a world where security, sovereignty and identity were constructed on the basis of Inside/Outside principles, suddenly viewed the world through new eyes and asked: Why not here? This awareness makes it imperative, perhaps inevitable, to re-imagine international relations.

Kuhn’s theory frees up space to think beyond the present and to imagine “different sets of possible worlds” (Kuhn, 2000f:86). He suggests “a new and promising way for us to think about the relation among various large areas of human activity” (Rorty, 1999:175). This, in turn, facilitates, “courageous, creative leaps into the unknown by individuals, groups of individuals, and eventually society as a whole, who take the stream of the

past places it has not gone” (De Santis, 1996:49). But what are the implications of this for, firstly, the discipline of International Relations, and, secondly, for practitioners of international relations?

9.3 **Re-imagining international relations: theoretical implications**

The main task of International Relations scholars may well in future be that of “translators”, translating the language of Access World into language understandable to Denial World and vice versa. For academics, the core challenge will thus be to use “sociological imagination” (Wright Mills, 2000:5) to find common language that can bridge the incommensurable discourse emanating from Access World and Denial World respectively. Interpreted somewhat differently, “translation” will involve a re-conceptualisation of concepts such as sovereignty, identity and security to make these applicable in a globalised world.

If “(o)ur work is our words, but our words do not work any more”, to again quote Booth (1991a:313), the challenge now is “(c)reating a new world out of new words ...” (Alker *et al.*, 2001). The world outlined in Chapters Seven and Eight opens up a rich seam, which can be mined by practitioners of International Relations. One practical example: What are the implications of a situation where Access World and Denial World seem to be on a collision course, for waging war, or for the practice of diplomacy? Can global or cosmopolitan democracy be entrenched in this context?

Academics will also need to assist practitioners of international relations to “deal with social change by [encouraging them to] ... see beyond the

immediacy of what *is* at any particular moment to conceptualize something of what could be” (Calhoun, 2000:511 – italics in original). New thinking is needed if real alternatives to prevailing power structures are to be found. Kuhn’s reference to a “decisive transformation in the image of science” (Kuhn, 1996:1) is crucial here. The difference, however, is that what is required in this case is a decisive transformation in the image of the world.

New and relevant content must be given to the concepts of the discipline of International Relations. International Relations scholars thus have a critical role to play as far as “retooling” (Kuhn, 1996:76) the discipline and supplying it with “a revised vocabulary of appropriately global concepts” (Spence, 2004:7) are concerned. The role of International Relations scholars in “shifting the paradigm” (Rogers, 2000:119) is indispensable.

Finally crossing this “true divide” – suggested by Peter Drucker in Chapter One - will, however, not be easy. Johnston (2004) reminds us that revolutionary science is tortuous and painful for it shakes all of the confidence that science has in its present theories and underlying paradigms (also see Walker, 1993:x). Our knowledge is embedded in culture and context and we have trouble imagining a world beyond these confines. Saunders (1999) argues that forming a consensus on a new paradigm is an intensely political process, with actors pursuing their own goals by advancing different interpretations of the political environment.

The hold of the Westphalian paradigm will have to be broken – for the moment International Relations often still “gets said” in the language of textbook statism (Booth, 1998a:344; also see Vale, 2003:14). But only if this

is done, if, through their words, academics craft new theories acceptable to both Access World and Denial World, will both be able to reach the point where they are convinced that converting to a new paradigm of international relations is truly in their interest (see Cox, 1996b:87).

Booth sums up the gravity of the choices facing International Relations when he remarks that the discipline “will become the site for considering all the most interesting and fundamental questions in the social sciences in global perspective, or it will become a diplomatic history backwater” (Booth, 1996:338). A new vision for International Relations has to be distilled from the various apparently incommensurable academic theories currently in vogue. In this context, and by focussing on the Access World/Denial World idea, new - previously unnoticed - yet exciting projects may present themselves.

Apart from challenges, the paradigm shift in international relations also presents opportunities. In a critical framing, International Relations scholars can contribute greatly to realising the “utopian” aim of recasting the core ideas of International Relations as an emancipatory project. This project will be rooted in a conception of global community that makes those humans most in need its primary referents, rather than states and their makers.

In a sense, this will allow International Relations to go back to its roots. Burchill (1996:6) notes that “in the discipline’s formative stages there was an explicit connection between theory and practice and between means and ends. The very purpose of intellectual endeavour was to change the world for the better”. Embarking on this project will allow International Relations

to make a key contribution to change aimed at making the world a better place. International Relations is afforded an opportunity to lead the “extraordinary investigations” (Kuhn, 1996:6) that ultimately leads to the acceptance of a new paradigm.

Staying with critical theory, one of the key points of criticism levelled against this approach can simultaneously be addressed – the notion that critical theory is unable to say much about the “real world” (du Plessis, 2001a:139) of international relations. Robert Cox rejects this charge and maintains that critical theory is as concerned about the problems of the real world as is problem-solving theory.

The difference is that critical theory allows for a normative choice in favour of a different social and political order; a dimension which is absent within the context of problem-solving theory (Cox, 1996b:90). Having said this, International Relations must (and should be) the carrier of the message that “(a) world divided, under conditions of globalisation, would be uniquely insecure and deeply inhumane” (Booth, 1998a:346).

9.4 **Re-imagining international relations: practical implications**

It has been argued that, in future, the discipline of International Relations will have the responsibility of translating and of making the languages of Access World and Denial World mutually understandable. The future demand on practitioners of international relations may well be to mediate between- and to craft policies which will bring about greater congruence between Access World and Denial World (representing the two levels of an

emerging global configuration). Sustained imaginative engagement with political and economic realities is required.

For practitioners of “lifeworld politics” (Falk, 2002:158), the challenge will therefore be to draft policies through which Access World and Denial World’s construction of social reality can be aligned and to create forums for ontological mediation between these two worlds. The “mediation of estrangement” (Der Derian, 1987:42) will become a prime responsibility. Security, sovereignty and identity must not only be reconceptualised, but have to be practically devised in new ways.

Whereas the task at the theoretical level will be to formulate a theory of translation, the task at the practical level will be to implement “a theory of translation that maximizes agreement” (Davidson, 1984:101). The responsibility will fall to the world’s decision-makers to facilitate the conversation - or rather an “exhaustive political engagement” (Sparks, 2003:xii) - between Access World and Denial World in their search for middle ground. The ontological horizons of Access World and Denial World have to be aligned.

The political space which the paradigm shift in international relations opens up will allow policymakers to become involved in “(t)he search for alternative forms of community, of rediscovering the past, of making the new” (Vale, 2003:6, see also Dalby, 1996:33). These communities – still to be imagined – lie “beyond the discourses of state power, beyond the present multilateral techniques ... and beyond the holding power of borders with their rituals of exclusion” (Vale, 2003:155).

Such future forms will ideally represent societies distinguished not by its time zones or levels of development, but by a truer sense of belonging to a common whole. Coker believes that it could be a world “in which there will be one global conversation, with limited participation open to all, but probably full participation open to none (Coker, 2002:32; also see De Santis, 1996:xv; Devetak, 2002:172).

As in the theoretical sense, bringing about these changes in the day-to-day conduct of international relations will be similarly arduous. It is obstructed by the historic power of today’s ruling ideas about politics and economics, as they have become “normalised, naturalised and enshrined as common sense” (Booth, 1998a:352; also see Mittelman, 2002b:15-16).

Rosenau (2003:391-392) adds that present generations, having matured in a world of states and fixed boundaries, may lack the experience – and possibly the political will – to cope with the many tensions, ambiguities, and contradictions to which fluid boundaries and diverse opposing forces give rise. To paraphrase Booth (1998b:7) the “Berlin Walls in our heads” first have to be torn down.

The task will be difficult because the type of global solidarity required does not simply mean offering something superfluous; it means dealing with vested interests, with lifestyles, with modes of consumption, and with entrenched power structures (see Rogers, 2000:130-131). This will require resources commensurate with the scale of the challenges ahead and commitments that are long-term and sustained. It will demand visionary leadership from within both Access World and Denial World.

Although the Access World/Denial World configuration currently seem to be developing into a global paradigm of confrontation, and despite the challenges outlined above, the frontier region between Access World and Denial World need not be a “border of violence” (Shaw, 1999:195). The way in which the “unbounding of the globe” (Lawson, 2002b:4) is taking place, can also lead to greater harmony and cooperation. The forces locked up in globalisation can be reconfigured to contribute to “the ripening goal of envisioning and realising humane global governance as a practical and indispensable political project” (Falk, 2002:163).

Humanity will have to be convinced that bringing about greater congruence between the planes of Access World and Denial World – addressing “the lack of continuity or overlap between ontologies” as Ronen (1998) put it in Chapter Three - will ultimately be to the benefit of all. This, in essence, is the “conversion” that policy-makers will have to bring about.

A global system has to be devised which credibly and equally balances the interests, concerns and aspirations of Access World and Denial World. What is needed may be nothing less than “a new consensus ... among peoples mired in mistrust across an apparently widening abyss” (UN, 2004b:12).

Believing that Denial World will catch up with Access World, or that the majority of the inhabitants of the former will eventually graduate to the latter, is naïve. However, ensuring that Access World and Denial World accommodate each other might, ultimately, be what is required if we believe, as Buzan (1991b:432) does, that survival is the bottom line of security. Moving from Booth’s premise of “utopian realism”(Booth, 1991c:537) as

mentioned in Chapter Two, the objective should however be the realisation of “process utopias” rather than of an “end-point utopia”.

Booth describes process utopias as “benign and reformist steps calculated to make a better world somewhat more profitable for future generations” (Booth, 1991c:536). “Trying to reduce the risk of war each year, improving human rights and spreading economic justice are examples of such policies.” (Booth, 1991c:537.) Indeed Kuhn (2000e:104) reminds us that “(s)mall changes ... can have large-scale effects”.

These initiatives must, however, be rooted in dialogue and not in the “utopian bellicosity” (Klein, 2005:6) which is increasingly the hallmark of sections of Access World and Denial World’s words and actions. The quality of this dialogue will eventually determine the nature of a future paradigm of international relations.

The debate between Davos Man and Porto Alegre Woman has to be facilitated and the drift towards global estrangement arrested. Seeing the world through new eyes, imagining a new international relations, is crucial if we are to arrive at some sort of cosmopolitan political arrangement which is appropriate for the world in the 21st century.

9.5 **Conclusion**

The study has deliberately refrained from advocating an alternative candidate for paradigm or from validating some kind of “post-Westphalia designation” (Falk, 2002:153). In the tradition of critical theory, as much

room as possible is left for discussion and for debate. The study merely goes as far as stating that, inherent in the dynamics of the paradigm shift, is its capacity to open up an aperture through which humanity could view, perhaps, a common destiny.

This aperture - or window of opportunity - creates room for intellectual risk-taking at the theoretical, and for bold initiatives at the policy level. Nef (1999:108) asserts that this window of opportunity creates the space to bring new voices and perspectives into the debate on international relations and change. It provides “a fresh way of looking at the world” (Nef, 1999:108).

Both academics and policymakers should be concerned with not only understanding the new international relations, but also with remaking the world because, ultimately, the future of humanity is at stake. Booth (1998a:348) succinctly puts it that the task at hand is that of infusing globalisation with a reinvented humanity, including its global political expression. In the language of critical theory, an emancipatory approach to globalisation is required (Agathangelou & Ling, 2004b:534). This is imperative as humanity may not have had the same past, but will most likely have the same future. “The era of separate destinies has run its course.” (Hamidou Kane as quoted by Jackson, 1994:1.)

Making these adjustments, and dealing with the challenges facing humanity and our common planet, is possible, and may not be as chimerical as some would have us believe. We may rightly ask the question: Why not here? The present is, as Laxer (1998:254) asserts, “a time for thinking in large, even utopian, terms”.

De Santis sums up this reasoning when he remarks that:

(f)or all the material and cultural differences that divide the world into its discrete parts, peoples everywhere face a common existential challenge of learning how to get along in order to go along. Given the interdependence of the world's peoples and the finiteness of its resources, it is hard to ignore the reality that our fate, for good or ill, lies as much in the hands of others as it does in ourselves. Human achievements accordingly need to be fashioned to human needs in new ways. Assuming that our commitment to life is greater than our fantasies of immortality, we may be on the verge of creating a post-materialistic order in which the excesses of economic inequality, technological insensibility, and ecological ignorance are providing the creative stimulus to rewrite history's evolving story. Slowly, reluctantly, intuitively, we may be erecting the foundations of a new international system, albeit an imperfect one. It is not that humanity is undergoing some religious conversion. We have not suddenly become angels. The demonic side of our nature has not been miraculously expunged. We simply have no better alternative (De Santis, 1996:221).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ADAMS, N.A. 1993. *Worlds apart: the North-South divide and the international system*. London : Zed Books.

ADATO, M., CARTER, M. & MAY, J. 2004. Sense in sociability? Social exclusion and persistent poverty in South Africa. (Joint report by the International Food Policy Research Institute, the University of Wisconsin and the University of KwaZulu-Natal.) Durban. 35 p. [Web:] <http://www.basis.wisc.edu/live/persistent%20poverty/sense%20in%20sociabilityDec2004.pdf> [Date of access: 06 March 2005].

AGATHANGELOU, A.M. & LING, L.H.M. 2004a. The house of IR: from family power politics to the *poisies* of Worldism. *International studies review*, 6(4):21-49, Dec.

AGATHANGELOU, A.M. & LING, L.H.M. 2004b. Power, borders, security, wealth: lessons of violence and desire from September 11. *International studies quarterly*, 48(3):517-538, Sep.

AGNEW, J. 1998. *Geopolitics: re-visioning world politics*. London : Routledge.

AGNEW, J. 2003. Sovereignty over time and space. (Paper delivered to the conference on globalization, territoriality, and conflict held at the University of California on 17-18 January 2003.) San Diego, CA. 7 p.

AKE, C. 1992. *The new world order: a view from the South*. Port Harcourt, Nigeria : Malthouse Press.

ALBROW, M. 1990. Introduction. (*In Albrow, M. & King, E., eds. Globalization, knowledge and society: readings from international sociology*. London : Sage. p. 3-13.)

ALBROW, M. 1996. *The global age*. Cambridge : Polity Press.

ALKER, H.R., AMIN, T. BIERSTEKER, T.J. & INOBUCHI, T. 2001. Twelve world order debates which have made our days. (Paper presented at the first meeting of the Russian International Studies Association held at MGIMO University on 20-21 April 2002.) Moscow. [Web:] <http://www.isanet.org/archive/worldorder.html> [Date of access: 27 November 2003].

ALLOTT, P. 1997. Kant or won't: theory and moral responsibility (The BISA Lecture, December 1995). *Review of international studies*, 23(3):339-357, Jul.

ALMOND, G.A. 1988. Separate tables: schools and sects in political science. *PS: political science and politics*, 21(4):828-842, Fall.

ANDERSON, B. 1991. *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. Revised edition. London : Verso Press.

ANNAN, K. 2003. Defining a new role for the United Nations. *International Herald Tribune*:8 , Dec. 04.

ANON. 1999. Overview of critical theory. [Web:] <http://www.perfectfit.org/CT/ct1.html> [Date of access: 20 August 2005].

ANON. 2000. Identity and International Relations. (Background paper prepared for the project “Teaching International Relations Online” organised by the Institute for East European Studies at the Free University Berlin.) Berlin, Germany. [Web:] http://www.ir-online.org/abstract_id.shtml [Date of access: 24 November 2004].

ANON. 2003a. The future ain't what it used to be. [Web:] <http://billmon.org/archives/000021.html> [Date of access: 22 July 2005].

ANON. 2003b. Showdown in Cancun. *International Herald Tribune*:6 , Sep. 12.

ANON. 2003c. US airports to start fingerprinting visitors. *The China Post*, Dec. 24. [Web:] <http://www.chinapost.com.tw/detail.asp?ID=44364&GRP=A> [Date of access: 24 December 2003].

ANON. 2004. E-schools at forefront of NEPAD's focus on Africa's young people. *Nepad dialogue*, 10:8-9, Oct./Nov.

ANON. 2005a. Postmodernity. [Web:]
<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Postmodernity> [Date of access: 22 July 2005].

ANON. 2005b. Postmodernism. [Web:]
<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Postmodernism> [Date of access: 22 July 2005].

ANON. 2005c. Twenty-first century masters: Thomas Kuhn. [Web:]
http://www.21stcentury.co.uk/masters/thomas_kuhn.asp [Date of access: 23 September 2005].

ANON. 2005d. Baby boomer. [Web:]
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Baby_boomer [Date of access: 03 August 2005].

ANON. 2005e. George Sarton. [Web:]
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/George_Sarton [Date of access: 28 August 2005].

ANON. 2005f. Digitale leefstyl is hier, sê Gates. *Beeld*:18 , Jan. 10.

ANON. 2005g. World Social Forum. [Web:]
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/World_Social_Forum [Date of access: 22 July 2005].

ANON. 2005h. Thousands died in Africa yesterday. *International Herald Tribune*:8 , Feb. 28.

ANON. 2005i. The French lesson: Europe and terrorism. *The Economist*, 376(8439):25-26, Apr. 02.

ANON. 2005j. Living with Islam: the new Dutch model? *The Economist*, 375(8420):22-24, Aug. 13.

ANON. 2005k. New storming of Spanish enclave. *BBC News – world edition*, Sept. 28. [Web:] <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/4289818.stm> [Date of access: 28 September 2005].

ANON. 2005l. Rolling up the welcome mat. *The Economist*, 374(8413):31, Feb. 12.

ANON. 2005m. German capitalism: bogus backlash. *The Economist*, 375(8425):14-15, May. 07.

APPADURAI, A. 1996. *Modernity at large: cultural dimensions of globalization*. Minneapolis, MN : University of Minnesota Press.

ARDITI, B. 2003. From globalism to globalisation: politics, citizenship and resistance. (Paper delivered during the 53rd annual conference of the Political Studies Association, University of Leicester, 15-17 April 2003.) Leicester, Leicestershire, UK. p. 1-20. [Web:] <http://www.psa.ac.uk/cps/2003/Benjamin%20Arditi202.pdf> [Date of access: 22 June 2005].

ARNOLD, M. & ATKINS, P. 2005. Unemployment hits five-year high of 10% in France. *Financial Times*, Feb. 26. [Web:]
<http://news.ft.com/cms/s/174e892c-87a0-11d9-ab48-00000e2511c8.html>
[Date of access: 26 Feb. 2005].

ARNOLD, W. 2005. A profitable National Australia Bank faces protests over job cuts. *International Herald Tribune*:18 , May. 12.

ARORA, C. 2002. Gaining perspective on the 11th of September. (Paper prepared for the American Institute for Contemporary German Studies.) Washington, D.C. [Web:]
<http://www.aicgs.org/research/911/911arora.shtml> [Date of access: 13 December 2004].

ARRIGHI, G. 1997. Globalization, state sovereignty, and the 'endless' accumulation of capital. (Paper prepared for the Fernand Braudel Center for the study of economics, historical systems, and civilizations. Binghamton University, State University of New York.) New York, NY. [Web:]
<http://fbc.binghamton.edu/gairvn97.htm> [Date of access: 10 September 2005].

ART, R.J. 2001. Security. (*In* Krieger, J., *ed.* The Oxford companion to politics of the world. 2nd ed. Oxford : Oxford University Press. p. 757-759.)

ATTALI, J. 1991. Millennium : winners and losers in the coming world order. Translated from the French by Leila Connors and Nathan Gardels. New York, NY : Times Books.

AXTMANN, R. 1995. Globalization and the democratic nation-state: twelve theses. (Paper delivered during the 45th annual conference of the Political Studies Association (PSA), University of York.) Heslington, York, UK. p. 917-923. [Web:] <http://www.psa.ac.uk/cps/1995%5Caxtm.pdf> [Date of access: 22 June 2005].

AXWORTHY, L. 1999. The protection of children in armed conflict. (Conference notes for an address delivered by the Canadian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lloyd Axworthy, at Columbia University on 12 February 1999 – Document no. 99/9.) Released by the Canadian Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade. 7 p.

AYOOB, M. 2005. US and Europe Inc: What trans-Atlantic crisis? *International Herald Tribune*:6 , Feb. 24.

BABICH, B.E. 2003. Kuhn's paradigm as a parable for the Cold War: incommensurability and its discontents from Fuller's tale of Harvard to Fleck's unsung Lvov. *Social epistemology*, 17(2-3):99-109, Apr.-Sept.

BACON, P. 1999. The end of history and the first man of the twenty-first century. (In Chan, S. & Wiener, J., eds. Twentieth century international history. London : I.B.Tauris Publishers. p. 271-294.)

BAIER, B., McCALEB, I. & PERSKY, A. 2004. Bin Laden claims responsibility for 9/11. *Fox News – US and World*, Oct. 30. [Web:] <http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,137095,00.html> [Date of access: 31 August 2005].

BAKER, R. 2004. Challenges to traditional concepts of sovereignty. (Paper prepared for the School of Public and Environmental Affairs at Indiana University.) Bloomington, IN. [Web:] http://www.spea.indiana.edu/bakerr/challenges_to_sovereignty.htm [Date of access: 01 September 2005].

BALDWIN, K. 2005. Immigration tops Tory agenda for election. *Business Day*:6 , Jan. 25.

BARNET, R.J. & CAVANAGH, J. 1995. Global dreams: imperial corporations and the new world order. Reprint edition. New York, NY : Touchstone.

BARNETT, S.M. 2000. Essay review - scientific revolutions, paradoxes and paradigms. *Contemporary physics*, 41(3):167-169, May-Jun..

BAR-ON, D. 2003. Terrorism and the post-Cold War identity crisis. (Introductory statement made during online panel discussion: “Kollektive Traumatisierung durch terroristische Gewalt” on 5 May 2003. Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung.) Bonn, Germany. [Web:] http://www.bpb.de/themen/SS3VX9,0,0,Terrorism_and_the_Post_Cold_War_Identity_Crisis.html [Date of access: 22 July 2005].

BAUMAN, Z. 1998. *Globalization: the human consequences*. Cambridge : Polity Press.

BAYLIS, J. 2001. International and global security in the post-cold war era. (In Baylis, J. & Smith, S., eds. *The globalization of world politics: an introduction to international relations*. 2nd ed. Oxford : Oxford University Press. p. 253-276.)

BAYLIS, J. & SMITH, S. 2001. Introduction. (In Baylis, J. & Smith, S., eds. *The globalization of world politics: an introduction to International Relations*. 2nd ed. Oxford : Oxford University Press. p. 1-12.)

BECK, U. 2002. Terror and solidarity. (In Leonard, M., ed. *Re-ordering the world*. London : The Foreign Policy Centre. p. 112-118.)

BELL, D. 1988. Previewing planet earth in 2013. *The Washington Post*: B3 , Jan. 3.

BENNHOLD, K. 2005. Racist incidents jarring the French. *International Herald Tribune*:1 , Feb. 24.

BERGER, P.L. & LUCKMANN, T. 1967. *The social construction of reality*. London : Allen Lane.

BERNSTEIN, R. 2005. A 'revolt against the establishment'. *International Herald Tribune*:1 , Jun. 02.

BHALLA, A.S. & LAPEYRE, F. 1999. Poverty and exclusion in a global world. London : Macmillan.

BIANCHI, A. 1999. Immunity versus human rights: the Pinochet case. *European journal of international law*, 10(2):237-277, Jun.

BIERSTEKER, T.J. & WEBER, C. 1996. The social construction of state sovereignty. (In Biersteker, T.J. & Weber, C., eds. State sovereignty as social construct. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. p.1-21.)

BILTON, T., BONNETT, K., JONES, P., LAWSON, T., SKINNER, D., STANWORTH, M. & WEBSTER, A. , eds. 2002. Introductory Sociology. 4th ed. London : Palgrave MacMillan.

BIN LADEN, O. 2001. Text of videotape broadcast by Al-Jazeera television channel on 10 October 2001. [Web:] http://users.skynet.be/terrorism/html/laden_statement.htm [Date of access: 21 July 2005].

BIRD, A.J. 2002. Kuhn's wrong turning. *Studies in history and philosophy of science*, 33(3):443-463, Sep.

BIRD, A.J. 2003. Three conservative Kuhns. *Social epistemology*, 17(2-3):125-131, Apr-Sep.

BIRD, A.J. 2004. Thomas Kuhn. (In Zalta, E.N., ed. The Stanford encyclopaedia of philosophy. Spring 2005 edition.) [Web:] <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2005/entries/thomas-kuhn/> [Date of access: 10 June 2005].

BISWAS, S. 2002. W(h)ither the nation-state? National and state identity in the face of fragmentation and globalisation. *Global society*, 16(2):175-198, Apr.

BLACK, J. 2001. War in the new century. London : Continuum Books.

BLANEY, D.L. & INAYATULLAH, N. 2000. The Westphalian deferral. *International studies review*, 2(2):29-64, Summer.

BLECHMAN, B.M. 1998. International peace and security in the twenty-first century. (In Booth, K., ed. Statecraft and security: the Cold War and beyond. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. p. 289-307.)

BLOND, P. & PABST, A. 2005. Why the West gets religion wrong. *International Herald Tribune*:10 , Jul. 08.

BOHMAN, J. 1996. Critical theory and democracy. (In Rasmussen, D., ed. The handbook of critical theory. Oxford : Blackwell. p. 190-215.)

BOOTH, K. 1991a. Security and emancipation. *Review of international studies*, 17(4):313-326, Oct.

BOOTH, K. 1991b. Preface. (*In Booth, K., ed. New thinking about strategy and international security. London : HarperCollins. p. ix-xvi.*)

BOOTH, K. 1991c. Security in anarchy: utopian realism in theory and practice. *International affairs*, 67(3):527-545, Jul.

BOOTH, K. 1991d. Introduction - the interregnum: world politics in transition. (*In Booth, K., ed. New thinking about strategy and international security. London : HarperCollins. p. 1-28.*)

BOOTH, K. 1995. Human wrongs and international relations. *International affairs*, 71(1):103-126, Jan.

BOOTH, K. 1996. 75 years on: rewriting the subject's past – reinventing its future. (*In Smith, S., Booth, K. & Zalewski, M., eds. International theory: positivism and beyond. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. p. 328-339.*)

BOOTH, K. 1998a. Conclusion: security within global transformation? (*In Booth, K., ed. Statecraft and security: the Cold War and beyond. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. p. 338-355.*)

BOOTH, K. 1998b. Introduction. (*In Booth, K., ed. Statecraft and security: the Cold War and beyond. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. p. 1-26.*)

BOOTH, K. 1998c. Cold Wars of the mind. (*In Booth, K., ed. Statecraft and security: the Cold War and beyond. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. p. 29-55.*)

BOOTH, K. 1999. Three tyrannies. (*In Dunne, T. & Wheeler, N.J., eds. Human rights in global politics. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. p. 31-70.*)

BOOTH, K. & DUNNE, T. 2002a. Preface. (*In Booth, K. & Dunne, T., eds. Worlds in collision: terror and the future of global order. New York, NY : Palgrave MacMillan. p. ix-x.*)

BOOTH, K. & DUNNE, T. 2002b. Worlds in collision. (*In Booth, K. & Dunne, T., eds. Worlds in collision: terror and the future of global order. New York, NY : Palgrave MacMillan. p. 1-23.*)

BOYSEN, A. 2002. Theory paper on Kuhn's concept of paradigms. (Paper prepared as part of the Futures Studies Masters Programme at the University of Houston – Clear Lake. Paper no.2.) Houston, TX. 4 p. [Web:] <http://www.cl.uh.edu/futureweb/best/essay.pdf> [Date of access: 22 June 2004].

BRAND, L.A. 2004. Scholarship in the shadow of empire. (Presidential address delivered to the Middle East Studies Association, School of International Relations - University of Southern California.) Tucson, AZ. [Web:] <http://fp.arizona.edu/mesassoc/Bulletin/Pres%20Adresses/Brand.htm> [Date of access: 22 July 2005].

BRAUDEL, F. 1995. A history of civilizations. Translated from the French by Richard Maine. Reprint edition. New York, NY : Penguin.

BRONOWSKI, J. 1990. Science and human values. Revised edition. New York, NY : Perennial Publishers.

BROOKS, D. 2005. Why not here? *International Herald Tribune*:9 , Mar. 1.

BROWN, C. 1992. International relations theory: new normative approaches. New York, NY : Harvester Wheatsheaf.

BROWNING, L. 2003. U.S rich get richer, and poor poorer, study shows. *International Herald Tribune*:5 , Sep. 25.

BRUBAKER, R. 1998. Citizenship and nationhood in France and Germany. Cambridge, MA : Harvard University Press.

BURCH, K. 2000. Changing the rules: reconceiving change in the Westphalian system. *International studies review – Special Issue*, 2(2):181-210, Summer.

BURCHILL, S. 1996. Introduction. (In Burchill, S. & Linklater, A., eds. Theories of international relations. New York, NY : St. Martin's Press. p. 1-27.)

BUSH, G.W. 2001a. Bush's speech to Congress. *New York Times*:B4 ,
Sep. 21.

BUSH, G.W. 2001b. President discusses war on terrorism. World Congress
Center, Atlanta, GA - 08 November 2001. [Web:]

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/11/20011108-13.html>

[Date of access: 12 July 2005].

BUSH, G.W. 2005a. President discusses war on terror at FBI academy.
FBI academy, Quantico, VA – 11 July 2005. [Web:]

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2005/07/print/20050711-1.html>

[Date of access: 12 July 2005].

BUSH, G.W. 2005b. President's radio address - 09 July 2005. [Web:]

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2005/07/20050709.html>

[Date of access: 12 July 2005].

BUZAN, B. 1991a. People, states and fear: an agenda for international
security studies in the post-Cold War era. 2nd ed. New York, NY :
Harvester Wheatsheaf.

BUZAN, B. 1991b. New patterns of global security in the twenty-first
century. *International affairs*, 67(3):431-451, Jul.

CABLE, V. 1997. Identity politics. (*In* Mulgan, G., *ed.* Life after politics:
new thinking for the twenty-first century. London : Fontana Press. p. 13-
31.)

CALHOUN, C. 2000. Social theory and the public sphere. (*In* Turner, B.S., *ed.* The Blackwell companion to social theory. Oxford : Blackwell. p. 505-544.)

CAMILLERI, J.A & FALK, J. 1992. The end of sovereignty? The politics of a shrinking and fragmenting world. Aldershot : Edward Elgar.

CAMPBELL, D. 1992. Writing security: United States foreign policy and the politics of identity. Minneapolis, MN : University of Minnesota Press.

CAPORASO, J.A. 2000. Changes in the Westphalian order: territory, public authority, and sovereignty. *International studies review – Special Issue*, 2(2):1-28, Summer.

CARDOSO, F.H. 1978. Dependency and development in Latin America. Los Angeles, CA : University of California Press.

CARR, A. 2000. Critical theory and the management of change in organizations. *Journal of organizational change management*, 13(3):208-220, May.

CASTELLS, M. 1998. The Information Age: economy, society and culture at the end of the millennium. Volume III. Oxford : Blackwell.

CERNY, P.G. 2000. The new security dilemma: divisibility, deflection and disorder in the global era. *Review of international studies*, 26(4):623-646, Oct.

CHANDLER, D. 2001. Universal ethics and elite politics: the limits of normative human rights theory. *International journal of human rights*, 5(4): 1-14, Winter. [Web:] <http://imm-live.wmin.ac.uk/ssh/pdf/IJHR-Universal%20Ethics%20Elite%20Politics.pdf> [Date of access: 04 Apr. 2005].

CHANDLER, D. 2003. New rights for old? Cosmopolitan citizenship and the critique of state sovereignty. *Political studies*, 51(2):332-349, Jun.

CHOMSKY, N. 1998. World orders, old and new. New Delhi : Oxford University Press.

COCCONI, S.J. 2002. Social and IT paradigms ... from past to future. (Course notes for course ISM 410 in the Information Systems Management Department at the University of San Francisco.) San Francisco, CA [Web:] <http://www.usfca.edu/fac-staff/cocconi/ISM410/> - 13k [Date of access: 17 August 2005].

COCHRANE, A. & PAIN, K. 2000. A globalizing society? (*In* Held, D., ed. *A globalizing world: culture, economics, politics*. London : Routledge. p. 5-45.)

COHEN, C. 2003. America has changed – for the worse. *International Herald Tribune*:7 , Sep. 12.

COHEN, E.A. 1996. A revolution in warfare. *Foreign affairs*, 57(2):37-54, Mar./Apr.

COHEN, R. 2005. Paying a deadly price for U.S. global hubris.
International Herald Tribune:2 , May. 04.

COKER, C. 2002. Globalisation and insecurity in the twenty-first century:
NATO and the management of risk. Oxford : Oxford University Press.
103p. (The International Institute for Strategic Studies. Adelphi Paper 345.)

CONANT, J. & HAUGELAND, J. 2000. Editors' introduction. (*In*
Conant, J. & Haugeland, J., eds. The road since Structure: Thomas S. Kuhn
– philosophical essays, 1970-1993, with an autobiographical interview.
Chicago, IL : The University of Chicago Press. p. 1-9.)

CONKLIN, D.B. 2003. The Internet, e-mail and political activism – the
case of Tiananmen Square. (Paper prepared for presentation at the European
Consortium for Political Research – Workshop no. 20: Changing media and
civil society on 30 March 2003.) Edinburgh, Scotland, UK. 14 p. [Web:]
<http://www.essex.ac.uk/ecpr/events/jointsessions/paperarchive/edinburgh/ws20/David%20Conklin.pdf>
[Date of access: 01 September 2005].

CONNOLLY, W.E. 1995. The ethos of pluralization. Minneapolis, MN :
University of Minnesota Press.

CONNOR, W. 1994. Ethno-nationalism: the quest for understanding.
Princeton, NJ : Princeton University Press.

COOPER, R. 1997. Is there a new world order? (*In* Mulgan, G., *ed.* *Life after politics: new thinking for the twenty-first century.* London : Fontana Press. p. 312-324.)

COOPER, R. 2002. Order, force and law in a new era. *Crimes of war project*, Sept. [Web:]
<http://www.crimesofwar.org/sept-mag/sept-cooper.html> [Date of access: 27 June 2004].

COWARD, M. 1999. Loyalty and the post-national state: reflections on the ontopolitics of modern subjectivity. (Paper prepared for the graduate workshop “Loyalty and the post-national state” organised by the Keele European Research Centre at Keele University on 9 August 1999.) Keele, Staffordshire, UK. 48 p. [Web:]
<http://www.sussex.ac.uk/Users/mpc20/pubs/loyalty.rtf> [Date of access: 27 August 2005].

COWELL, A. 2005. One terror replaces another in Britain. *International Herald Tribune*:3 , Aug. 1.

COX, R.W. 1996a. Towards a posthegemonic conceptualization of world order: reflections on the relevancy of Ibn Khaldun. (*In* Cox, R.W. & Sinclair, T.J., *eds.* *Approaches to world order.* Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. p. 144-173.)

COX, R.W. 1996b. Social forces, states and world orders: beyond international relations theory. (*In Cox, R.W. & Sinclair, T.J., eds. Approaches to world order. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. p. 85-123.*)

COX, R.W. 1996c. A perspective on globalization. (*In Mittelman, J.H., ed. Globalization: critical reflections. Boulder, CO : Lynne Rienner. p. 21-30.*)

COX, R.W. 1996d. Global *perestroika*. (*In Cox, R.W. & Sinclair, T.J., eds. Approaches to world order. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. p. 296-313.*)

COX, R.W. 1997. Introduction. (*In Cox, R.W., ed. The new realism: perspectives on multilateralism and world order. London : MacMillan Press. p. xv-xxx.*)

DALBY, S. 1996. Crossing disciplinary boundaries: Political Geography and International Relations after the Cold War. (*In Kofman, E. & Youngs, G., eds. Globalization: theory and practice. London : Pinter. p. 29-42.*)

DAMARELL, R. 2005. Harvard referencing guide. (Notes prepared by the Sturt Library at Flinders University.) Adelaide, Australia. 23 p. [Web:] <http://www.lib.flinders.edu.au/services/infolit/nureference.pdf> [Date of access: 21 August 2005].

DAVIDSON, D. 1984. On saying that. (*In Davidson, D., ed. Inquiries into truth and interpretation. Oxford : Clarendon Press. p. 93-108.*)

DE CERVANTES SAAVEDRA, M. 2004. Don Quixote. Translated from the Spanish by Tobias Smollett. New York, NY : The Modern Library.

DEIBERT, R.J. 1997. "Exorcismus Theoriae": pragmatism, metaphors and the return of the medieval in IR theory. *European journal of international relations*, 3(2):167-192, Jun.

DER DERIAN, J. 1987. On diplomacy: a genealogy of Western estrangement. Oxford : Blackwell.

DER DERIAN, J. 1995. The value of security: Hobbes, Marx, Nietzsche, and Baudrillard. (In Lipschutz, R.D., ed. On security. New York, NY : Columbia University Press. p. 24-45.)

DERRIDA, J. 1976. Of grammatology. Baltimore, MD : Johns Hopkins University Press.

DE SANTIS, H. 1996. Beyond progress - an interpretive odyssey to the future. Chicago, IL : The University of Chicago Press.

DE SOTO, H. 2003. The mystery of capital: why capitalism triumphs in the West and fails everywhere else. Reprint edition. New York, NY : Basic Books.

DEUTSCH, K.W. Nationalism and social communication: an inquiry into the foundations of nationality. Cambridge, MA : The MIT Press.

DEVETAK, R. 1996. Critical theory. (In Burchill, S., Linklater, A., Devetak, R., Paterson, M. & True, J., eds. Theories of international relations. London : MacMillan. p. 145-178.)

DEVETAK, R. 2002. Signs of a new Enlightenment? Concepts of community and humanity after the Cold War. (In Lawson, S., ed. The new agenda for International Relations. Cambridge : Polity Press. p. 164-183.)

DOHMEN, T. 2003. Kuhn's incommensurability thesis. Utrecht : Department of Philosophy, University of Utrecht. (Draft of M. Phil thesis.) August. 57 p. [Web:]
http://www.phil.uu.nl/preprints/ckiscripties/SCRIPTIES/027_dohmen.pdf
[Date of access: 17 September 2005].

DOTY, R.L. 1996. Sovereignty and the nation: constructing the boundaries of national identity. (In Biersteker, T.J. & Weber, C., eds. State sovereignty as a social construct. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. p. 121-147.)

DOUGHERTY, C. 2005. 5 million jobless in Germany. *International Herald Tribune*:11, Feb. 3.

DOYLE, M.W. & IKENBERRY, G.J. 1997. Introduction: the end of the Cold War, the classical tradition, and international change. (In Doyle, M.W. & Ikenberry, G.J., eds. New thinking in international relations theory. Boulder, CO : Westview Press. p. 1-19.)

DRAPER, T. 1997. Is the CIA necessary? *New York review of books*, 44 (13), Aug. 14. [Web:] <http://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/draper.htm> [Date of access: 12 Dec. 2004].

DRUCKER, P.F. 1990. *The new realities*. London : Mandarin.

DUCHACEK, I.D. 1990. Perforated sovereignties: towards a typology of new actors in International Relations. (In Michelmann, H.J. & Soldatos, P., eds. *Federalism and International Relations: the role of subnational units*. Oxford : Clarendon Press. p. 20-38.)

DUNN, D. 1996. The nature of conflict and cooperation. (In Carey, R. & Salmon, T.C., eds. *International security in the modern world*. London : MacMillan. p. 20-38.)

DUNN, J. 1993. *Western political theory in the face of the future*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

DUNNE, T. & SCHMIDT, B.C. 2001. Realism. (In Baylis, J. & Smith, S., eds. *The globalization of world politics : an introduction to International Relations*. 2nd ed. Oxford : Oxford University Press. p.141-161.)

DU PLESSIS, A. 2001a. International relations theory and the discourse on terrorism: preliminary reflections on context and limits. *Strategic review for Southern Africa*, 23(2):134-151, Nov.

DU PLESSIS, A. 2001b. Exploring the concept of identity in world politics. (In Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung. Politics of identity and exclusion in Africa: from violent confrontation to peaceful cooperation. Papers read at seminar on 25-26 July 2001 at the Senate Hall, University of Pretoria. p. 13-25.)

DUPUY, G. 2004. Two worlds. Translated from the French by Leslie Thatcher. *Libération*, Jan. 21. [Web:]
http://www.truthout.org/docs_04/printer_012204H.shtml [Date of access: 22 Jan. 2004].

DU TOIT, C. 2003. Rethinking globalism after September 11: paradoxes in the evolution of globalisation. *Scriptura*, 84(3):368-380.

EISENHOWER, D.D. 1961. Military-industrial complex speech, Dwight D. Eisenhower. Public papers of the Presidents: Dwight D. Eisenhower, 1960. [Web:]
<http://coursesa.matrix.msu.edu/~hst306/documents/indust.html> [Date of access: 01 September 2005].

EL-AMINE, B. 2002. A war of terror. *Leftturn: notes from the global intifada*, 6, Jul./Aug. [Web:]
<http://www.leftturn.org/Articles/Viewer.aspx?id=361&type=M> [Date of access: 23 Jul. 2005].

ELLIOTT, L. 2002. The global politics of the environment. (*In* Lawson, S., *ed.* The new agenda for International Relations. Cambridge : Polity Press. p.109-127.)

ENG, L. 2001. The accidental rebel: Thomas Kuhn and “The Structure of Scientific Revolutions”. *Concepts in science and technology studies*:1-19, Fall. [Web:] <http://www.rpi.edu/~engl/kuhn.pdf> [Date of access: 26 Aug. 2005].

ERICKSON, F. 1985. Qualitative methods in research on teaching. East Lansing, MI : Michigan State University. (The Institute for Research on Teaching. Occasional Paper No. 81.) 144 p. [Web:] <http://ed-web2.educ.msu.edu/irtlarchive/OP081.pdf> [Date of access: 14 September 2005].

EVANS, G. 2001. International Crisis Group (ICG) publication - The quest for security and social justice. [Web:] <http://www.crisisweb.org/projects/showreport.cfm?reportid=767> [Date of access: 01 October 2002].

EVANS, G. 2004a. Shifting security parameters in the 21st century. (Paper delivered to the Emirates Center for Strategic Studies and Research’s (ECSSR) 9th annual conference – The Gulf: challenges of the future on 12 January 2004.) Abu Dhabi, UAE [Web:] <http://www.crisisweb.org/home/index.cfm?id=2470&1=1> [Date of access: 08 July 2004].

EVANS, G. 2004b. Where are we in the war on terrorism? (Address to Chicago and the World Forum 2004. Hosted by the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations as part of the Winter/Spring series - 30 March 2004.) Chicago, IL. [Web:]
<http://www.crisisweb.org/home/index.cfm?id=2556&1=1> [Date of access: 08 July 2004].

EVANS, G. & NEWNHAM, J. 1998. The Penguin dictionary of International Relations. London : Penguin.

FAIVRE, R. 2003. Intoxicating freedom: drinking the class divide. *The red critique*, 8, Spring. [Web:]
<http://www.redcritique.org/Spring2003/intoxicatingfreedom.htm> [Date of access: 23 Jul. 2005].

FALK, R. 1995. The challenge of politics: overcoming realist myopia, implementing rooted utopianism. (In Race, A. & Williamson, R., eds. True to this earth: global challenges and transforming faith. Oxford : Oneworld Publications. p. 28-40.)

FALK, R. 2001. Sovereignty. (In Krieger, J., ed. The Oxford companion to politics of the world. 2nd ed. Oxford : Oxford University Press. p. 789-791.)

FALK, R. 2002. The post-Westphalia enigma. (In Hettne, B. & Odén, B., eds. Global governance in the 21st century: alternative perspectives on world order. Stockholm : Almqvist & Wiksell. p.147-183.)

FARR, J. 1990. Francis Lieber and the interpretation of American Political Science. *Journal of politics*, 52(4):1027-1049, Nov.

FIERKE, K.M. 2002. Meaning, method and practice: assessing the changing security agenda. (In Lawson, S., ed. *The new agenda for International Relations*. Cambridge : Polity Press. p. 128-144.)

FINDLEY, C.V. & ROTHNEY, J.A.M. 1986. *Twentieth-century world*. Boston, MA : Houghton Mifflin.

FRANK, A.G. 1969. *Capitalism and underdevelopment in Latin America: historical studies of Chile and Brazil*. New York, NY : Monthly Review Press.

FRANKLIN, J. 2000. Thomas Kuhn's irrationalism. *The new criterion online*, 18(10), Jun. [Web:]
<http://www.newcriterion.com/archive/18/jun00/kuhn.htm> [Date of access: 01 Jun. 2005].

FRELICK, B. 1993. Closing ranks: the North locks arms against new refugees. (In Bennis, P. & Moushabeck, M., eds. *Altered states: a reader in the new world order*. New York, NY : Olive Branch. p.162-171.)

FRIEDMAN, T.L. 2000a. *The lexus and the olive tree: understanding globalization*. New York, NY : First Anchor Books.

FRIEDMAN, T.L. 2000b. Three movies and a funeral. *New York Times*: A31 , Jun. 16.

FUKUYAMA, F. 1992. The end of history and the last man. London : Penguin.

FULLER, S. 2002. Prolegomena to a sociology of philosophy in the twentieth-century English-speaking world. *Philosophy of the social sciences*, 32(2):151-177, June.

GADDIS, J.L. 1992. Fault lines, forecasting, and the post-Cold War world: an experiment in geopolitical tectonics. (Paper read during Session 2 of the deliberations of the International Working Group meeting, held on 7-8 April 1992, and hosted by the Council on Foreign Relations. Pew Foundation project on America's task in a changed world.) New York, NY. 25 p.

GALBRAITH, J.K. 1992. The culture of contentment. London : Penguin.

GARCIA-SEGOVIA DE MADERO, M.T. 2003. Securing the parameters of North America: a NAFTA challenge in a context of US unilateralism. *Policy options*, 24(5):29-31, May. [Web:] <http://www.irpp.org/po/archive/may03/madero.pdf> [Date of access: 23 Mar. 2004].

GARRETT, G. 2004. Globalization's missing middle. *Foreign affairs*, 83(6):84-96, Nov.-Dec.

GELLER, D.S. & VASQUEZ, J.A. 2004. The construction and cumulation of knowledge in international relations: introduction. *International studies review*, 6(4):1-6, Dec.

GELLNER, E. 1994. *Conditions of liberty: civil society and its rivals*. London : Penguin.

GEORGE, J. 1994. *Discourses of global politics: a critical (re)introduction to International Relations*. Boulder, CO : Lynne Rienner.

GEORGE, S. 1992. *The debt boomerang: how Third World debt harms us all*. Boulder, CO : Pluto Press.

GER, G. & BELK, R.W. 1996. I'd like to buy the world a Coke: consumptionscapes of the "less affluent world". *Journal of consumer policy*, 19(3):271-304, Sep.

GHOSH, A. 2005. Inside the mind of an Iraqi suicide bomber. *Time*, Special Issue: 29-35, Jul. 04-11.

GIDDENS, A. 1990. *The consequences of modernity*. Stanford, CA : Stanford University Press.

GIDDENS, A. 1991. *Modernity and self-identity: self and society in the late modern age*. Stanford, CA : Stanford University Press.

- GILROY, P. 1997. Diaspora and the detours of identity. (*In* Woodward, K., *ed.* Identity and difference. London : Sage Publications. p. 299-346.)
- GOLDBLATT, D. & WOODWARD, K. 2000. Series preface. (*In* Held, D., *ed.* A globalizing world: culture, economics, politics. London : Routledge. p. vii-viii.)
- GOLDSMITH, J. 1994. The trap. London : Macmillan.
- GOODMAN, J. 2001. World Economic Forum: capitalism's International. *Leftturn: notes from the global intifada*, 1, Jun. [Web:] <http://www.leftturn.org/Articles/Viewer.aspx?id=274&type=w#top> [Date of access: 23 Jul. 2005].
- GORDIN, J. 2005. Dark shadow of the human condition. *The Sunday Independent* (SA edition):9 , Jan. 23.
- GRAY, J. 2003. Al Qaeda and what it means to be modern. London : Faber and Faber.
- GRENZ, S.J. 1996. A primer on postmodernism. Grand Rapids, MI : William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- GROOM, A.J.R. 1999. International relations after the Cold War: from world politics to global politics. (*In* Chan, S. & Wiener, J., *eds.* Twentieth century international history. London : I.B. Tauris Publishers. p. 25-46.)

GUÉHENNO, J-M. 1995. The end of the nation-state. Translated from the French by Victoria Elliott. Minneapolis, MN : University of Minnesota Press.

GUIBERNAU, M. & GOLDBLATT, D. 2000. Identity and nation. (*In* Woodward, K., *ed.* Questioning identity: gender, class, nation. London : Routledge. p.115-158.)

GUMBEL, P. 2005. In search of Davos Man. *Time*, 165(5):41-47, Jan.

GUNARATNA, R. 2003. Inside Al Qaeda: global network of terror. New York, NY : The Berkley Publishing Group.

HACKING, I. 2002. Inaugural lecture: chair of Philosophy and History of scientific concepts at the Collège de France, 16 January 2001. *Economy and society*, 31(1):1-14, Feb.

HALLIDAY, F. 1996. The future of international relations: fears and hopes. (*In* Smith, S., Booth, K. & Zalewski, M., *eds.* International theory: positivism and beyond. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. p. 318-327.)

HALLIDAY, F. 2002. Transnational paranoia and International Relations: the case of the 'West versus Islam'. (*In* Lawson, S., *ed.* The new agenda for International Relations. Cambridge : Polity Press. p. 37-53.)

- HANDY, C. 1998. *The hungry spirit: beyond capitalism – a quest for purpose in the modern world.* London : Arrow Books.
- HANNERZ, U. 1996. *Transnational connections: culture, people, places.* London : Routledge.
- HARBUTT, F.J. 2002. Hazy historiographical perspectives and September 11th. *The journal of the historical society*, 2(3-4):397-408, Summer/Fall.
- HARMAN, W. 1998. *Global mind change: the promise of the 21st century.* San Francisco, CA : Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- HARPER, D. 2000. Science. [Web:] <http://www.etymonline.com/columns/science.htm> [Date of access: 16 June 2003].
- HARRIS, R.A. 2004. Keywords for rhetoric of science. (Pre-conference proposal for the 2004 American Association for the Rhetoric of Science and Technology (AARST) conference held at the University of Waterloo.) Waterloo, ON., Canada. 5 p. [Web:] <http://www.aarst.jmccw.org/harris.pdf> [Date of access: 27 July 2004].
- HARTMANN, F. 1998. Towards a social ecological politics of sustainability. (In Keil, R., Bell, D.V.J., Penz, P & Fawcett, L., eds. *Political ecology: global and local.* London : Routledge. p. 336-352.)

HAVEL, V. 1999. Kosovo and the end of the nation-state. Translated from the Czech by Paul Wilson. *The New York review of books*, 46(10): Jun. [Web:] <http://www.nybooks.com/articles/455> [Date of access: 7 Sep. 2005].

HAY, C. 1997. Political time and the temporality of crisis – on institutional change as ‘punctuated evolution’. (Paper delivered during the annual Political Studies Association (PSA) conference held at the University of Ulster.) Jordanstown, Newtonabbey, UK. p. 1092-1102. [Web:] <http://www.psa.ac.uk/cps/1997/hay2.pdf> [Date of access: 26 August 2005].

HEAD, I. 1991. On a hinge of history: the mutual vulnerability of South and North. Toronto : University of Toronto Press.

HEALY, T. 1996. Thomas Kuhn. (Course notes prepared in the Department of Electrical Engineering at Santa Clara University.) Santa Clara, CA. [Web:] <http://www.ee.scu.edu/eefac/healy/kuhn.html> [Date of access: 26 April 2004].

HEHIR, J.B. 1992. Reviewing and revising Westphalia: notes on sovereignty, politics and the role of religion. (Paper read during the deliberations of the International Working Group meeting, held on 7-8 April 1992, and hosted by the Council on Foreign Relations. Pew Foundation project on America’s task in a changed world.) New York, NY. 18 p.

HEILBRONER, R. 1995. Visions of the future: the distant past, yesterday, today and tomorrow. New York, NY : Oxford University Press.

HELD, D. 1989. *Political theory and the modern state*. Cambridge : Polity Press.

HELD, D. 1993. *Democracy and the new international order*. London : Institute of Public Policy Research.

HELD, D. 2000a. Afterword. (*In Held, D., ed. A globalizing world: culture, economics, politics*. London : Routledge. p. 169-177.)

HELD, D. 2000b. Introduction. (*In Held, D., ed. A globalizing world: culture, economics, politics*. London : Routledge. p. 1-4.)

HELD, D. 2002. Violence, law, and justice in a global age. (*In Leonard, M., ed. Re-ordering the world*. London : The Foreign Policy Centre. p. 56-72.)

HELD, D., MCGREW, A., GOLDBLATT, D. & PERRATON, J. 1999. *Global transformations: politics, economics and culture*. Stanford, CA : Stanford University Press.

HERD, G.P. & WEBER, M. 2001. Forging world order paradigms: 'Good Civilization' vs. 'Global Terror'. *Security dialogue*, 32 (4):504-506, Dec. [Web:]

<http://www.prio.no/publications/publication.asp?PublicationID=3709> [Date of access: 27 Jun. 2003].

HERMANN, M.G. 1998. One field, many perspectives: building the foundations for dialogue (1998 ISA presidential address). *International studies quarterly*, 42(4):605-624, Dec.

HERSHBERG, E. & MOORE, K.W. 2002. Introduction: Place, perspective, and power – interpreting September 11. (In Hershberg, E. & Moore, K.W., eds. *Critical views of September 11: analyses from around the world*. New York, NY : The New Press. p. 1-19.)

HESS, J. 1997. Transnational documentaries: a manifesto. [Web:] <http://www.experimentalvcenter.org/history/people/ptext.php3?id=39&page=2> [Date of access: 16 April 2005].

HETERICK Jnr, R.C. 1990. Less is more. *Cause/Effect*, 13(3):Fall. [Web:] <http://www.educause.edu/ir/library/text/CEM9030.txt> [Date of access: 12 Apr. 2004].

HIGGINS, N.P. 2004. Understanding the Chiapas rebellion: modernist visions and the invisible Indian. (Excerpt from “Understanding the Chiapas rebellion: modernist visions and the invisible Indian”. Austin, TX : University of Texas Press.) [Web:] <http://www.utexas.edu/utpress/excerpts/exhigund.html> [Date of access: 17 September 2005].

HIGGOTT, R. 2002. Taming economics, emboldening international relations: the theory and practice of international political economy in an era of globalization. (In Lawson, S., ed. *The new agenda for International Relations*. Cambridge : Polity Press. p. 91-108.)

HIRATA, K. 2002. Whither the developmental state? The growing role of NGOs in Japanese aid policy making. *Journal of comparative policy analysis*, 4(3):165-188, Jun.

HIRST, P. 2001. War and power in the 21st century: the state, military conflict and the international system. Cambridge : Polity Press.

HOCHSCHILD, A. 2004. A pseudostate is born. (Paper prepared for the Global Policy Forum.) New York, NY. [Web:]
<http://www.globalpolicy.org/nations/future/2004/0627pseudostate.htm>
[Date of access: 07 November 2004].

HOCKING, B. & SMITH, M. 1995. World politics: an introduction to International Relations. 2nd ed. Hemel Hempstead : Prentice-Hall/Harvester Wheatsheaf.

HOFFMANN, S. 2003. Clash of globalisations. (In Held, D. & McGrew, A., eds. *The global transformations reader*. 3rd ed. Cambridge : Polity Press. p.106-111.)

HOGUE, W. 2003. Minister dies after stabbing in Sweden. *International Herald Tribune*:1 , Sep. 12.

HOLM, H-H & SORENSEN, G. 1995. Introduction: what has changed? (In Holm, H-H. & Sorensen, G., eds. *Whose world order? uneven globalisation and the end of the Cold War*. Boulder, CO : Westview Press. p. 1-18.)

HOLSTI, K.J. 1987. *The dividing discipline: hegemony and diversity in International Relations*. Boston, MA : Allen Unwin.

HOLSTI, K.J. 1998. *The problem of change in International Relations Theory*. (Working paper no. 26. published in December 1998 by the Institute of International Relations, University of British Columbia.) Vancouver. 21 p. [Web:] <http://www.iir.ubc.ca/pdffiles/webwp26.pdf> [Date of access: 19 August 2005].

HOLSTI, O.R. 1995. *Theories of international relations*. Website of the Political Science Department, Duke University, Durham, NC. 62 p. [Web:] <http://www.duke.edu/~pfeaver/holsti.pdf> [Date of access: 10 August 2005].

HOLTON, R.J. 1998. *Globalization and the nation-state*. New York, NY : St. Martin's Press.

HOOVER-BOX, C. 2005. You are not alone: Big Brother is watching you more closely than ever before. *The Sunday Independent* (SA edition):16 , Jan. 23.

HOPMANN, T. 2003. Adapting international relations theory to the end of the Cold War. *Journal of Cold War studies*, 5(3):96-101, Summer.

HOPWOOD, I.G. 1998. Africa: crisis and challenge. (*In Booth, K., ed. Statecraft and security: the Cold War and beyond. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. p. 247-269.*)

HORGAN, J. 1991. Profile of a reluctant revolutionary: Thomas S. Kuhn unleashed “paradigm” on the world. *Scientific American*, 264(5):14-15, May.

HOROWITZ, M. 2002. Research report on the use of identity concepts in International Relations. (Report prepared as part of the Harvard Identity Project, Weatherhead Center for International Affairs, July 2002.)

Cambridge, MA. 16 p. [Web:]

<http://www.wcfia.harvard.edu/misc/initiative/identity/publications/horowitz1.pdf> [Date of access: 03 September 2005].

HORSMAN, M. & MARSHALL, A. 1995. After the nation-state: citizens, tribalism and the new world order. London : HarperCollins.

HOWARD, M. 2000. The invention of peace: reflections on war and international order. London : Profile Books.

HOYNINGEN-HUENE, P. 1993. Reconstructing scientific revolutions: Thomas S. Kuhn’s philosophy of science. Translated from the German by A.T. Levine. Chicago, IL : The University of Chicago Press.

HUNG, E.H.C. 2001. Kuhnian paradigms as representational spaces: new perspectives on the problems of incommensurability, scientific explanation, and physical necessity. *International studies in the philosophy of science*, 15(3):275-292, Oct.

HUNTINGTON, S.P. 1993. If not civilizations, what? Samuel Huntington responds to his critics. *Foreign affairs*, 72(5):186-194, Nov./Dec.

HUNTINGTON, S.P. 1996. *The clash of civilizations and the remaking of world order*. New York, NY : Simon & Schuster.

HUNTINGTON, S.P. 2004. *Who are we? The challenges to America's national identity*. New York, NY : Simon & Schuster.

HUTCHINSON, J. 1994. *Modern nationalism*. London : Fontana Press.

HUTTON, W. 2001. Anthony Giddens and Will Hutton in conversation. (*In* Hutton, W. & Giddens, A., eds. *Global capitalism*. New York, NY : The New Press. p. 1-51.)

IGNATIEFF, M. 1993. *Blood and belonging: journeys into the new nationalism*. London : Vintage.

IMPARATO, N. & HARARI, O. 1994. *Jumping the curve : innovation and strategic choice in an age of transition*. San Francisco, CA : Jossey-Bass.

INGALSBEE, T. 1996. Earth first! activism: ecological postmodern praxis in radical environmentalist identities. *Sociological perspectives*, 39(2):263-276, Summer.

JACKSON, B. 1994. Poverty and the planet: a question of survival. New edition. London : Penguin.

JACKSON, R.H. 1993. Quasi-states: sovereignty, international relations and the Third World. Reprint edition. New York, NY : Cambridge University Press.

JACKSON, R.H. 2001. The evolution of international society. (*In* Baylis, J. & Smith, S., eds. *The globalization of world politics : an introduction to International Relations*. 2nd ed. Oxford : Oxford University Press. p. 35-50.)

JACKSON, R.H. & SORENSEN, G. 2003. Introduction to international relations: theories and approaches. Oxford : Oxford University Press.

JACOBS, S. 2002. Polanyi's presagement of the incommensurability concept. *Studies in history and philosophy of science*, 33A(1):105-118, Mar.

JAMESON, F. 1991. Postmodernism, or the cultural logic of late capitalism. Durham, NC : Duke University Press.

JARVIS, A.P. & PAOLINI, A.J. 1995. Locating the state (*In* Camilleri, J.A., Jarvis, A.P & Paolini, A.J., *eds.* The state in transition: reimagining political space. Boulder, CO : Lynne Rienner. p. 3-19.)

JAVAID, I. 1997. Thomas Kuhn: paradigms die hard. *Harvard science review*:1-6, Winter. [Web:]
https://www.harvardsciencereview.org/Issues/99_hsr_webpage/hsr/winter97/kuhn.pdf
[Date of access: 18 Aug. 2005].

JAYASURIYA, K. 2004. Breaking the ‘Westphalian’ frame: regulatory state, fragmentation, and diplomacy. Clingendael : Netherlands Institute of International Relations. 21 p. (Netherlands Institute of International Relations ‘Clingendael’. Discussion papers in diplomacy no. 90.)

JOHNSTON, A. 2004. Kuhn’s “paradigm” and “normal science”. (Paper prepared in the Department of Physics, Weber State University.) Ogden, UT. [Web:]
<http://departments.weber.edu/physics/johnston/mundane/kuhn.htm> [Date of access: 22 June 2004].

KALDOR, M. 1999. New and old wars: organized violence in the global era. Stanford, CA : Stanford University Press.

KALDOR, M. 2002. The power of terror. (*In* Leonard, M., *ed.* Re-ordering the world. London : The Foreign Policy Centre. p. 21-28.)

KANT, I. 1996. The metaphysics of morals. 2nd revised edition.
Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

KAPLAN, R.D. 2001. The coming anarchy: shattering the dreams of the post Cold War. New York, NY: Vintage Books.

KEATING, M. 1998. Minority nationalism or tribal sentiments? The case of Scotland, Quebec and Catalonia. (*In* Christie, K., *ed.* Ethnic conflict, tribal politics: a global perspective. Surrey : Curzon Press. p. 35-59.)

KEGLEY JNR., C.W. 2002. Bridge-building in the study of International Relations: how “Kuhn” we do better? (*In* Puchala, D.J., *ed.* Visions of International Relations: assessing an academic field. Columbia, SC : University of South Carolina Press. p. 62-80.)

KENNEDY, P. 1991. Towards a broader definition of national and international “security”. (Paper presented during the deliberations of the International Task Force on Global Security, held on 30-31 October 1991, and hosted by the Council on Foreign Relations. Pew Project on Global Security.) New York, NY. 28 p.

KENNEDY, P. 1993. Preparing for the twenty-first century. New York, NY : Vintage Books.

KEOHANE, R.O. 1995. Hobbes's dilemma and institutional change in world politics: sovereignty in international society. (*In* Holm, H-H. & Sorensen, G., *eds.* Whose world order? uneven globalisation and the end of the Cold War. Boulder, CO : Westview Press. p. 165-186.)

KEOHANE, R.O. 2002. The globalization of informal violence, theories of world politics, and the "liberalism of fear". (*In* Calhoun, C., Price, P. & Timmer, A., *eds.* Understanding September 11. New York, NY : The New Press. p. 77-91.)

KISSINGER, H. 1975. A new national partnership. (Speech delivered by Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger in Los Angeles, CA. on 24 January 1975.) News release by Department of State - Bureau of Public Affairs, Office of Media Services.

KISSINGER, H. 2002. Preemption and the end of Westphalia. *New perspectives quarterly*, 19(4):31-36, Fall.

KLARE, M.T. 2002. Resource wars: the new landscape of global conflict. New York, NY : Owl Books.

KLEIN, B.S. 1992. Discourse analysis: teaching world politics through international relations. (*In* Gonick, L.S. & Weisband, E., *eds.* Teaching world politics: contending pedagogies for a new world order. Boulder, CO : Westview Press. p. 153-169.)

KLEIN, J. 2005. Playing with fire. *Time*, 165(5):6, Jan. 31.

KLÍMA, I. 1999. *Between security and insecurity*. Translated from the Czech by Gerry Turner. London : Thames & Hudson.

KOHN, R. 2005. Can the US war president who will admit no error finish what he has started? *The Sunday Independent* (SA edition:15 , Jan. 23.

KOLOSSOV, V. & O' LOUGHLIN, J. 1999. Pseudo-states as harbingers of a new geopolitics: the example of the Trans-Dniester Moldovan Republic (TMR) (Paper delivered as part of the Program on Political and Economic Change. Institute of Behavioral Science, University of Colorado.) Boulder, CO. 40 p. [Web:]

<http://www.colorado.edu/IBS/PEC/johno/pub/pseudo-states.pdf> [Date of access: 15 September 2005].

KOTKIN, J. 1993. *Tribes: how race, religion, and identity determine success in the new global economy*. New York, NY : Random House.

KRASNER, S.D. 1999. *Sovereignty: organized hypocrisy*. Princeton, NJ : Princeton University Press.

KRASNER, S.D. 2000. *Abiding sovereignty*. (Paper presented at the workshop on *El estado del debate contemporáneo en Relaciones Internacionales*, Universidad Torcuato Di Tella held from 27-28 July 2000. Working paper nr 4.) Buenos Aires. 24 p. [Web:]

http://www.utdt.edu/cei/papers/papers_estado_nacion/krasner-paper.pdf [Date of access: 17 July 2005].

KRASNER, S.D. 2001. Globalization, power and authority. (Paper presented at the American Political Science Association (APSA) annual meeting held from 29 August – 02 September 2001.) San Francisco, CA. 32 p. [Web:] <http://www.reformwatch.net/fitxers/66.pdf> [Date of access: 17 July 2005].

KRAUSE, J. 1994. Political theory, international politics and the ‘problem’ of gender. (*In* Political Studies Association. Paper delivered during the annual conference of the Political Studies Association (PSA) held at the University of Wales Swansea.) Swansea, Wales, UK. p. 610-620. [Web:] <http://www.psa.ac.uk/cps/1994/krau.pdf> [Date of access: 02 June 2005].

KUAH, A. 2003. Sovereignty and the politics of identity in international relations. Singapore : Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies. 37 p. (IDSS Working Paper Series. Working paper no. 48. August 2003)

KUHN, T.S. 1970a. Reflections on my critics. (*In* Lakatos, I. & Musgrave, A., eds. Criticism and the growth of knowledge. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. p. 231-278.)

KUHN, T.S. 1970b. Logic of discovery or psychology of research? (*In* Lakatos, I. & Musgrave, A., eds. Criticism and the growth of knowledge. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. p. 1-23.)

KUHN, T.S. 1977. The essential tension: selected studies in scientific tradition and change. Chicago, IL : The University of Chicago Press.

KUHN, T.S. 1993. Foreword. (*In* Hoyningen-Huene, P. *Reconstructing scientific revolutions: Thomas S. Kuhn's philosophy of science*. Translated from the German by A.T. Levine. Chicago, IL : The University of Chicago Press. p. xi-xiii.)

KUHN, T.S. 1996. *The structure of scientific revolutions*. 3rd ed. Chicago, IL : The University of Chicago Press.

KUHN, T.S. 2000a. What are scientific revolutions? (*In* Conant, J. & Haugeland, J., *eds*. *The road since Structure: Thomas S. Kuhn – philosophical essays, 1970-1993, with an autobiographical interview*. Chicago, IL : University of Chicago Press. p. 13-32.)

KUHN, T.S. 2000b. A discussion with Thomas Kuhn. (*In* Conant, J. & Haugeland, J., *eds*. *The road since Structure: Thomas S. Kuhn – philosophical essays, 1970-1993, with an autobiographical interview*. Chicago, IL : University of Chicago Press. p. 255-323.)

KUHN, T.S. 2000c. Commensurability, comparability, communicability. (*In* Conant, J. & Haugeland, J., *eds*. *The road since Structure: Thomas S. Kuhn – philosophical essays, 1970-1993, with an autobiographical interview*. Chicago, IL : University of Chicago Press. p. 33-57.)

KUHN, T.S. 2000d. The natural and the human sciences. (*In* Conant, J. & Haugeland, J., *eds*. *The road since Structure: Thomas S. Kuhn – philosophical essays, 1970-1993, with an autobiographical interview*. Chicago, IL : University of Chicago Press. p. 216-223.)

KUHN, T.S. 2000e. The road since *Structure*. (In Conant, J. & Haugeland, J., eds. The road since Structure: Thomas S. Kuhn – philosophical essays, 1970-1993, with an autobiographical interview. Chicago, IL : University of Chicago Press. p. 90-104.)

KUHN, T.S. 2000f. Possible worlds in history of science. (In Conant, J. & Haugeland, J., eds. The road since Structure: Thomas S. Kuhn – philosophical essays, 1970-1993, with an autobiographical interview. Chicago, IL : University of Chicago Press. p. 58-89.)

LACHAPELLE, G. & PAQUIN, S. 2003. Quebec's international strategies: mastering globalization and new possibilities of governance. (Paper presented at the conference "Quebec and Canada in the new century: new dynamics, new opportunities" hosted by Queen's University, School of Policy Studies on 31 October 2003.) Kingston, Ontario. 17 p. [Web:] <http://www.iigr.ca/site/iigr/files/papers/PrsPaper.40323484be2a6.pdf> [Date of access: 26 July 2005].

LAHAV, G. 2004. Immigration and politics in the New Europe: reinventing borders. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

LAIDI, Z. 1998. A world without meaning: the crisis of meaning in international politics. London : Routledge.

LAKATOS, I. 1970. Falsification and the methodology of scientific research programmes. (*In Lakatos, I. & Musgrave, A., eds. Criticism and the growth of knowledge. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. p. 91-196.*)

LAKE, D.A. 2003. The new sovereignty in international relations. *International studies review*, 5(3):303-323, Fall.

LAKE, D.A. & ROTHCHILD, D. 1998. Spreading fear: the genesis of transnational ethnic conflict. (*In Lake, D.A. & Rothchild, D., eds. The international spread of ethnic conflict: fear, diffusion and escalation. Princeton, NJ : Princeton University Press. p. 3-32.*)

LAMBROSCHINI, C. 2004. An immigrant's son stalks the Elysée. *International Herald Tribune*:8 , Jun. 17.

LANDLER, M. 2005. Clouds linger over German banker. *International Herald Tribune*:1 and 8 , May. 20.

LANGMAN, L. & MORRIS, D. 2003. Globalization, alienation and identity: a critical approach. (Paper presented during the 2003 annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, August 2003.) Atlanta, GA. p.1. (24 p.) [In SocINDEX with full text. Reference number: 15921826. Full display : <http://0-search.epnet.com.echea.ru.ac.za:80/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&an=15921826> [Date of access: 3 September 2005].

LAPID, Y. 1989. The third debate: on the prospects of international theory in a post-positivist era. *International studies quarterly*, 33(3):235-254, Sep.

LAPID, Y. 1996. Culture's ship: returns and departures in International Relations Theory. (In Lapid, Y. & Kratochwil, F.V., eds. *The return of culture and identity in International Relations*. London : Lynne Rienner. p. 3-20.)

LAWSON, S. 2002a. Preface. (In Lawson, S., ed. *The new agenda for International Relations*. Cambridge : Polity Press. p. xi-xiii.)

LAWSON, S. 2002b. Introduction: a new agenda for International Relations? (In Lawson, S., ed. *The new agenda for International Relations*. Cambridge : Polity Press. p. 3-18.)

LAWSON, S. 2002c. After the fall – international theory and the state. (In Lawson, S., ed. *The new agenda for International Relations*. Cambridge : Polity Press. p. 204-222.)

LAXER, J. 1998. *The undeclared war: class conflict in the age of cyber-capitalism*. Toronto, Ontario : Penguin.

LECOURS, A. 2002. When regions go abroad: globalization, nationalism and federalism. (Paper prepared for the conference “Globalization, Multilevel Governance and Democracy: continental, comparative and global perspectives” hosted by Queens University on 03 May 2002.) Kingston, ON. 16 p. [Web:] <http://www.iigr.ca/conferences/archive/pdfs1/lecours.pdf> [Date of access: 26 July 2005].

LEDERER, E.M. 2005. U.N. : World population to hit 9B in 2050. *Seattle Post-Intelligencer*, Feb. 26. [Web:]

http://seattlepi.nwsource.com/national/apasia_story.asp?category=1104&slug=UN%20World%20Population

[Date of access: 26 Feb. 2005].

LEICESTER, J. 2005. French vent spleen on EU charter vote. *The Washington Post*, May. 29. [Web:]

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/05/29/AR2005052900480.html>

[Date of access: 01 Jun. 2005].

LEIKEN, R.S. 2005. Europe's angry Muslims. *Foreign affairs*, 84(4):120 (16 p.) Jul/Aug. [In EBSCOHost : Academic Search Premier. Reference number: 17327838. Full display :

<http://0-search.epnet.com.echea.ru.ac.za:80/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&an=17327838>

[Date of access: 10 September 2005].

LEONHARDT, D. 2005. Poverty in US grew in 2004, while income failed to rise for 5th straight year. *The New York Times*:A9 , Aug. 31.

LINKLATER, A. 1998. The transformation of political community: ethical foundations of the post-Westphalian era. Columbia, SC : University of South Carolina Press.

LINKLATER, A. 2001. Globalization and the transformation of political community. (In Baylis, J. & Smith, S., eds. The globalization of world politics : an introduction to International Relations. 2nd ed. Oxford : Oxford University Press. p. 617-633.)

LIPPMANN, W. 1943. US foreign policy: shield of the republic. Boston, MA : Little Brown & Company.

LIPSCHUTZ, R.D. 1995. Negotiating the boundaries of difference and security at millennium's end. (In Lipschutz, R.D., ed. On security. New York, NY : Columbia University Press. p. 212-228.)

LITTLE, A. 2003. Protest over French headscarf ban. *BBC News - world edition*, Dec. 21. [Web:] <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/3338955.stm> [Date of access: 21 December 2003].

LOMBARDI, M.O. 1996. Third-world problem-solving and the 'religion' of sovereignty: trends and prospects. (In Denham, M.E. & Lombardi, M.O., eds. Perspectives on Third World sovereignty: the postmodern paradox. London : MacMillan. p. 152-163.)

LORIAUX, M. 2004. European Union: myth and deconstruction of the Rhineland frontier. (Working draft of document being prepared in the Political Science Department, Northwestern University.) Evanston, IL. [Web:] <http://pubweb.northwestern.edu/~mlo697/myth.html> [Date of access: 12 September 2005].

LOW, S. 2003. Behind the gates: life, security and the pursuit of happiness in fortress America. New York, NY : Routledge.

LUKE, T.W. 1991. Touring hyperreality: critical theory confronts informational society. (In Wexler, P., ed. Critical theory now. London : The Falmer Press. p. 1-26.)

LUKE, T.W. 1994. Fixing identity, fabricating space: sovereignty and territoriality after the Cold War. (Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of American Geographers (AAG) held from 27 March – 02 April 1994.) San Francisco, CA. 54p. [Web:] <http://www.cddc.vt.edu/tim/tims/Tim382.PDF> [Date of access: 12 September 2005].

LUKE, T.W. 1996. Nationality and sovereignty in the new world order. *Antepodium*, 3, Mar. [Web:] http://www.vuw.ac.nz/atp/articles/Luke_9608.html [Date of access: 28 Jun. 2002].

LUKE, T.W. 2000. The discipline as disciplinary normalization: networks of research. (In Sil, R. & Doherty, E., eds. Beyond boundaries: disciplines, paradigms, and theoretical integration in International Studies. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press. p. 207-230.)

LUTTWAK, E. 1999. Turbo capitalism: winners and losers in the global economy. New York, NY : HarperCollins.

LYOTARD, J-F. 1984. The postmodern condition: a report on knowledge. Manchester : Manchester University Press.

MACKAY, H. 2000. The globalization of culture? (*In* Held, D., *ed.* A globalizing world: culture, economics, politics. London : Routledge. p. 47-84.)

MACKENZIE, J. 2004. The continuing avalanche of historical mutations: the new “new social movements”. *Social alternatives*, 23(1):50-55, First Quarter.

MACKINTOSH, M. & MOONEY, G. 2000. Identity, inequality and social class. (*In* Woodward, K., *ed.* Questioning identity: gender, class, nation. London : Routledge. p. 79-114.)

MACLAURIN, J. 2005. Kuhn II: Review of Kuhn’s view of science. (Course notes prepared for the course Philosophy 208 in the Department of Philosophy at Otago University.) Otago, New Zealand. 7 p. [Web:] <http://www.otago.ac.nz/philosophy/208/Docs/Kuhn2.Lecture14.pdf> [Date of access: 27 July 2005].

MACLEAN, J.S. 1981. Political theory, international theory, and problems of ideology. *Millennium*, 10(2):102-125, Summer.

MALZAHN, C.C. 2005. Could George W. Bush be right? *Spiegel online*, Feb. 23. [Web:] <http://www.spiegel.de/international/0,1518,343378,00.html> [Date of access: 04 Feb. 2005].

MANINGER, S. 1997. The West, the rest, and the will to project power. *African security review*, 6(6), Dec. [Web:] <http://www.iss.co.za/Pubs/ASR/6No6/Maninger.html> [Date of access: 10 Feb. 2005].

MANNING, B. 1977. The Congress, the executive and intermestic affairs: three proposals. *Foreign affairs*, 55(2):306-324, Jan.

MARCH J.G & J.P. OLSEN. 1998. The institutional dynamics of international political orders. Oslo : University of Oslo, Faculty of Social Sciences. (Center for European studies (ARENA). ARENA Working Paper WP 98/5.) [Web:] http://www.arena.uio.no/publications/wp98_5.htm [Date of access: 10 February 2005].

MARTIN, M.T. 1999. "Fortress Europe" and Third World immigration in the post-Cold War global context. *Third World quarterly*, 20 (4):821-838, Aug.

MASTERMAN, M. 1970. The nature of a paradigm. (In Lakatos, I. & Musgrave, A., eds. *Criticism and the growth of knowledge*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. p. 59-89.)

MATHEWS, J.T. 1991. Thinking about international security. (Paper presented during the deliberations of the International Task Force on Global Security, held on 30-31 October 1991, and hosted by the Council on Foreign Relations. Pew Project on Global Security.) New York, NY. 13 p.

MATHEWS, J.T. 1997. Power shift. *Foreign affairs*, 76(1):50-66, Jan./Feb.

McALLISTER, J.F.O. 2005. A secret success. *Time*, 165(9):34-39, Jan.

McCARTHY, T. 1991. Ideals and illusions: on reconstruction and deconstruction in contemporary critical theory. Cambridge, MA : The MIT Press.

MccGWIRE, M. 2001. The paradigm that lost its way. *International affairs*, 77(4):777-803, Oct.

McGREW, A. 2000. Power shift: from national government to global governance? (*In Held, D., ed. A globalizing world: culture, economics, politics. London : Routledge. p. 127-167.*)

McINTYRE, A. 2004. Outside war zones: youth in organized armed violence. *Focus on arms in Africa*, 3(2):12, Aug.

McLUHAN, M. 1964. Understanding media. London : Routledge.

McSWEENEY, B. 1999. Security, identity and interests: a sociology of international relations. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

MENKES, S. 2003. Positively medieval: fashionable armor for a jittery world. *International Herald Tribune*:15 , Sep. 9.

MERCER, D. 1998. Future revolutions : a comprehensive guide to life and work in the next millennium. London : Orion Business Books.

MERCER, K. 1994. Welcome to the jungle: new positions in black cultural studies. New York, NY : Routledge.

MIALL, H., RAMSBOTHAM, O. & WOODHOUSE, T. 1999. Contemporary conflict resolution: the prevention, management and transformation of deadly conflicts. Cambridge : Polity Press.

MICKLETHWAIT, J. & WOOLRIDGE, A. 2003. A future perfect: the challenge and promise of globalization. New York, NY : Random House.

MIDGLEY, M. 1995. The challenge of science: limited knowledge or new high priesthood? (*In* Race, A. & Williamson, R., *eds*. True to this earth: global challenges and transforming faith. Oxford : Oneworld. p. 75-84.)

MILLS, G. 2000. The wired model: South Africa, foreign policy and globalisation. Cape Town : Tafelberg.

MILLS, K. 2002. Cybernations: identity, self-determination, democracy and the “Internet effect” in the emerging information order. *Global society*, 16(1):69-87, Jan.

MINDER, R. 2004. EU aims to turn back would-be migrants. *Financial Times*, Oct. 2. [Web:]
<http://news.ft.com/cms/s/980c0914-140e-11d9-aa94-00000e2511c8.html>
[Date of access: 03 Oct. 2004].

MINGUS, M.S. 2003. Transnationalism and subnational paradiplomacy: Is this perforated sovereignty or are democracy and civil society just reaching across borders? (Paper presented to the 16th annual conference of the Public Administration theory network on 20 June 2003.) Anchorage, AK. 25 p.
[Web:]
<http://www.patnet2003.alaska.edu/pdf/papers/Mingus%20full%20paper.pdf>
[Date of access: 26 July 2005].

MITTELMAN, J.H. 2002a. Globalization: an ascendant paradigm? (Paper presented at the conference “Responding to globalization: societies, groups, and individuals” held at the University of Colorado from 4-7 April 2002.) Boulder, CO. 30 p. [Web:]
<http://www.colorado.edu/IBS/PEC/gadconf/papers/mittelman.pdf> [Date of access: 28 August 2005].

MITTELMAN, J.H. 2002b. Making globalization work for the have-nots. *International journal on world peace*, 19(2):3-25, Jun.

MIYOSHI, M. 1993. A borderless world? From colonialism to transnationalism and the decline of the nation-state. *Critical inquiry*, 19(4):726-751, Summer.

MONBIOT, G. 2004. *The age of consent: a manifesto for a new world order*. London : Harper Perennial.

MOORE, M. 2005. Rich world, poor world - Book review of Francis Fukuyama's book "State building: governance and world order in the 21st century". *Boston review*, 29, Dec. 2004/Jan. 2005. [Web:] <http://www.bostonreview.net/BR29.6/moore.html> [Date of access: 03 Mar. 2005].

MURPHY, A.B. 1996. The sovereign state system as political-territorial ideal: historical and contemporary considerations. (*In* Biersteker, T.J. & Weber, C., *eds*. *State sovereignty as a social construct*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. p. 81-120.)

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL. 2002. *The national security strategy of the United States of America*, Washington, D.C. September. [Web:] <http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss.html> [Date of access: 24 July 2005].

NEF, J. 1999. *Human security and mutual vulnerability: the global political economy of development and underdevelopment*. 2nd ed. Ottawa, ON : International Development Research Centre.

NEF, J. 2001. Human security and mutual vulnerability. (*In* Goucha, M. & Aravena, F.R., *eds*. *Human security, conflict prevention and peace in Latin America and the Caribbean*. Paris : UNESCO. p. 29-60.)

NEL, P. 1999. Theories of International Relations. (*In Nel, P. & McGowan, P.J., eds. Power, wealth and global order: an International Relations textbook for Africa. Rondebosch : University of Cape Town Press. p. 47-70.*)

NICHOLSON, M. 1992. Imaginary paradigms – a sceptical view of the inter-paradigm debate in International Relations. Canterbury, Kent, UK : University of Kent. (*The Kent papers in politics and international relations. Series 2.*) [Web:]

<http://www.kent.ac.uk/politics/research/kentpapers/nicholson.html>

[Date of access: 02 April 2004].

NOLAN, J.E., STEINBRUNER, J.D., FLAMM, K., MILLER, S.E., MUSSINGTON, D., PERRY, W.J. & CARTER, A.B. 1994. The imperatives for cooperation. (*In Nolan, J.E., ed. Global engagement: co-operation and security in the 21st century. Washington, D.C. : Brookings Institution Press. p. 19-64.*)

NORDGREN, T. 1996. Science as consensus - comments on “The structure of scientific revolutions”. [Web:]

<http://www.thingsrevealed.net/structure.htm> [Date of access: 26 April 2004].

NOSSAL, K.R. 1998. The patterns of world politics. Scarborough, ON : Prentice Hall Canada.

NSC see NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL.

NYE, J.S. 1997. Understanding international conflicts: an introduction to theory and history. New York, NY : Longman.

O'BRIEN, R. 2004. Does geography matter? (Closing address to ESF exploratory workshop "Economic geography and European finance" held from 16-19 September 2004 at Jesus College.) Oxford, UK. 6 p. [Web:] http://www.geog.ox.ac.uk/research/eco/esf_papers/obrien.pdf [Date of access: 19 August 2005].

OGATA, S. 2002. From state security to human security. (Ogden Lecture delivered at Brown University on 26 May 2002.) Providence, RI. 6 p. [Web:] http://www.humansecurity-chs.org/activities/outreach/ogata_ogden.pdf [Date of access: 09 September 2005].

OHMAE, K. 1990. The borderless world: power and strategy in the global marketplace. London : HarperCollins.

OHMAE, K. 1995. The end of the nation-state: the rise of regional economies. London : HarperCollins.

OLSEN, M.E., LODWICK, D.G. & DUNLAP, R.E. 1992. Viewing the world ecologically. (Excerpt from Chapter Two: Theoretical framework.) Boulder, CO : Westview Press. [Web:] <http://www2.pfeiffer.edu/~lridener/courses/worldview.htm> [Date of access: 17 September 2005].

ONU, N.G. 2002. Worlds of our making: the strange career of constructivism in International Relations. (In Puchala, D.J., ed. *Visions of International Relations: assessing an academic field*. Columbia, SC : University of South Carolina Press. p. 119-141.)

OTTAWAY, M. & LACINA, B. 2003. International interventions and imperialism: lessons from the 1990s. *SAIS review*, 23(2): Summer/Fall. [Web:] http://www.press.jhu.edu/journals/sais_review/sample.html [Date of access: 24 Jul. 2005].

OTTO, T. 1997. Social practice and the ethnographic circle: rethinking the “ethnographers’ magic” in a late modern world. (Paper prepared in the Department of Ethnography and Social Anthropology at Aarhus University. Working paper no.1) Aarhus, Denmark. 52p.

OUROUSSOF, N. 2005. A tower shaped by fear: N.Y design hints at a changed America. *International Herald Tribune*:1 , Jun. 30.

OVERY, R. 2003. The Nuremberg trials: international law in the making. (In Sands, P., ed. *From Nuremberg to The Hague: the future of international criminal justice*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. p. 1-29.)

PACKER, M. 2004. What is interpretive research? (Course notes prepared in the Psychology Department at Duquesne University.) Pittsburgh, PA. [Web:] <http://www.mathcs.duq.edu/~parker/IR/Irmain.html> [Date of access: 12 April 2004].

PAJARES, F. 2003. The structure of scientific revolutions: outline and study guide. (Course notes prepared in the Department of Education at Emory University.) Atlanta, GA. [Web:] <https://www.des.emory.edu/mfp/Kuhn.html> [Date of access: 26 August 2005].

PASHA, M.K. 2003. Fractured worlds: Islam, identity, and international relations. *Global society*, 17(2):111-120, Apr.

PAUTZ, H. 2004. Continuities in German identity politics: the *Leitkultur*-debate. (Paper delivered during the 54th annual conference of the Political Studies Association (PSA) held at Lincoln University.) Brayford Pool, Lincoln, UK p. 1-20. [Web:] <http://www.psa.ac.uk/cps/2004/Pautz.pdf> [Date of access: 22 June 2005].

PETERSON, V.S. 1996. Shifting ground(s): epistemological and territorial remapping in the context of globalization(s). (In Kofman, E. & Youngs, G., eds. *Globalization: theory and practice*. London : Pinter. p.11-28.)

PETERSON, V.S. 1997. Seeking world order beyond the gendered order of global hierarchies. (In Cox, R.W., ed. *The new realism: perspectives on multilateralism and world order*. London : MacMillan. p. 38-56.)

PIERSON, C. 1996. *The modern state*. London : Routledge.

PINKETT, R.D. 2001. Redefining the digital divide. *Teaching to change LA*, 1(2): Spring. [Web:] <http://www.tcla.gseis.ucla.edu/divide/politics/pinkett.html> [Date of access: 16 Apr. 2005].

PLOWS, A.J. 2000. Collective identity through collective action – environmental direct action in Britain. (Paper delivered during the annual proceedings of the Political Studies Association (PSA) conference held at the University of London.) London, UK. p. 1-25.) [Web:] <http://www.psa.ac.uk/cps/2000/plows.%20Alexanda.pdf> [Date of access: 22 June 2005].

POPPER, K.R. 1970. Normal science and its dangers. (*In* Lakatos, I. & Musgrave, A., *eds*. *Criticism and the growth of knowledge*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. p. 51-58.)

PRINS, G. 1994. Notes towards the definition of global security. (Paper prepared for a seminar jointly organised by the Southern African Friends of Cambridge University and the South African Institute of International Relations at Jan Smuts House, University of the Witwatersrand.) Johannesburg. 14 p.

PUTNAM, H. 1990. *Realism with a human face*. Cambridge, MA : Harvard University Press.

PYE, L. 1975. The confrontation between discipline and area studies. (*In* Pye, L., *ed.* *Political Science and Area Studies: rivals or partners?*. Bloomington, IN : Indiana University Press. p. 5-13).

QUINN, P. & SHRADER, K. 2005. Most Iraq suicide bombs by foreigners. *Guardian Unlimited*, Jun. 30. [Web:] <http://www.guardian.co.uk/worldlatest/story/0,1280,-5109609,00.html> [Date of access: 17 Jul. 2005].

RAY, M. 1995. Community building as a metaphor for a worldwide paradigm shift. [Web:] <http://www.vision-nest.com/cbw/Metaphor.html> [Date of access: 27 June 2004].

REAGAN, M.D. 1967. Basic and applied research: a meaningful distinction? *Science*, 155(768):1383-1386, Mar.

REICH, S. 1998. What is globalization? Four possible answers. (Paper prepared for the Kellogg Institute, University of Notre Dame. Working paper no. 261 - December.) Notre Dame, IN. [Web:] <http://www.nd.edu/~kellogg/WPS/261.pdf> [Date of access: 01 September 2005].

REUS-SMIT, C. 2001. The strange death of liberal international theory. *The European journal of international law*, 12(3):573-593. [Web:] <http://www.ejil.org/journal/Vol12/No3/120573.pdf> [Date of access: 15 Aug. 2005].

RICHARDS, J. 1996. ‘ “Them and Us”: the assertion of ethnic and national identity in the New Europe’. (Paper delivered during the 46th annual conference of the Political Studies Association (PSA) held at the University of Glasgow.) Glasgow, Scotland, UK. p. 114-123. [Web:] <http://www.psa.ac.uk/cps/1996/richj.pdf> [Date of access: 22 June 2005].

RICHMOND, A.H. 1995. Global apartheid: refugees, racism and the new world order. Toronto, Ontario : Oxford University Press.

RIFKIN, J. 2000. The age of access: how the shift from ownership to access is transforming modern life. London : Penguin.

RIPPERT, U. 2004. Germany: right-wing trajectory of conservative parties in wake of Bush re-election. World Socialist Website. [Web:] <http://www.wsws.org./articles/2004/nov2004/csu-n29.shtml> [Date of access: 06 December 2004].

RITZER, G. 2000. The McDonaldization of society. 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA : Pine Forge Press.

ROBERTSON, R. 1992. Globalization: social theory and global culture. London : Sage.

ROBINSON, W.I. 2005. Global capitalism: the new transnationalism and the folly of conventional thinking. *Science and society*, 69(3):316-328, Jul.

ROBINSON, W.I. & HARRIS, J. 2000. Towards a global ruling class? Globalization and the transnational capitalist class. *Science and society*, 64(1):11-54, Spring.

ROGERS, P. 2000. Losing control: global security in the twenty-first century. London : Pluto Press.

RONEN, R. 1998. Incommensurability and representation. *Applied semiotics*, 5, Jul. [Web:] <http://www.tau.ac.il/~rronen/online.html> [Date of access: 22 Jun. 2004].

RORTY, R. 1999. Philosophy and social hope. London : Penguin.

ROSENAU, J.N. 1990. Turbulence in world politics: a theory of change and continuity. Princeton, NJ : Princeton University Press.

ROSENAU, J.N. 1996. The adaptation of the United Nations to a turbulent world. (*In* Thukur, R., *ed.* The United Nations at fifty: retrospect and prospect. Dunedin : University of Otago Press. p. 229-240.)

ROSENAU, J.N. 1997. Along the domestic-foreign frontier: exploring governance in a turbulent world. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

ROSENAU, J.N. 2002. Ageing agendas and ambiguous anomalies: tensions and contradictions of an emergent epoch. (*In* Lawson, S., *ed.* The new agenda for International Relations. Cambridge : Polity Press. p. 19-34.)

ROSENAU, J.N. 2003. Distant proximities: dynamics beyond globalization. Princeton, NJ : Princeton University Press.

ROSENAU, J.N. & DURFEE, M. 1995. Thinking theory thoroughly: coherent approaches to an incoherent world. Boulder, CO : Westview Press.

ROY, O. 2005. Global jihad: the ideology of terror. *International Herald Tribune*:5 , Jul. 23-24.

RUGGIE, J.G. 1993. Territoriality and beyond: problematizing modernity in international relations. *International organization*, 47(1):139-174, Winter.

SAGE, A. 2005. Laying siege to fortress Europe. *Timesonline*, Sep. 29. [Web:] <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,13509-1802316,00.html> [Date of access: 29 Sep. 2005].

SALMON, T.C. 1996. The nature of international security. (In Carey, R. & Salmon, T.C., eds. *International security in the modern world*. London : MacMillan. p. 1-19.)

SANG-HUN, C. 2005. Seoul grows wary of foreign investors. *International Herald Tribune*:18 , May. 12.

SANKEY, H. 1991. Incommensurability, translation and understanding. *The philosophical quarterly*, 41(165):414-426, Oct.

SANKEY, H. 1993. Kuhn's changing concept of incommensurability. *The British journal for the philosophy of science*, 44(4):759-774, Dec.

SARTON, G. 1927. Introduction to the history of science. Volume 1. Cambridge, MA : Harvard University Press.

SAUL, J.R. 1997. The unconscious civilization. Victoria : Penguin.

SAUNDERS, P.C. 1999. Foreign policy and international transitions: the case for foreign policy paradigms. (Draft of paper presented during the 40th annual convention of the International Studies Association held from 16-20 February 1999.) Washington, D.C. [Web:] <http://www.ciaonet.org/isa/sap01/index.html> [Date of access: 18 June 2003].

SAURETTE, P. 2000. International relations – image of thought: collective identity, desire and Deleuzian ethology. *The international journal of peace studies*, 5(1): Jan. [Web:] http://www.gmu.edu/academic/ijps/vol5_1/saurette.htm [Date of access: 07 Nov. 2004].

SCHMIDT, B.C. 2002. On the history and historiography of International Relations. (In Carlsnaes, W., Risse, T., & Simmons, B.A., eds. Handbook of International Relations. London : Sage Publications. p. 3-22.)

SCHOLTE, J.A. 1996. Beyond the buzzword: towards a critical theory of globalization. (In Kofman, E. & Youngs, G., eds. Globalization: theory and practice. London : Pinter. p. 43-57.)

SCHOLTE, J.A. 2001. The globalization of world politics. (In Baylis, J. & Smith, S., eds. The globalization of world politics: an introduction to international relations. 2nd ed. Oxford : Oxford University Press. p. 13-34.)

SCHRAM, S. 2003. Return to politics : perestroika and postparadigmatic Political Science. *Political theory*, 31(6):835-851, Dec.

SCIOLINO, E. 2005. The changing face of terror in Europe. *International Herald Tribune*:3 , Aug. 2.

SEN, A. 2002. Identity and freedom. (In Leonard, M., ed. Re-ordering the world. London : The Foreign Policy Centre. p. 30-38.)

SHAPIRO, M.J. & ALKER, H.R. , eds. 1995. Challenging boundaries: global flows, territorial identities. Minneapolis, MN : University of Minnesota Press.

SHAW, K. 2004. Knowledge, foundations, politics. *International studies review*, 6(4):7-20, Dec.

SHAW, M. 1995. The development of ‘common risk society’: a theoretical overview. (Paper delivered at the seminar on “Common Risk Society” hosted by the George C. Marshall European Center for Security Studies.) Garmisch-Partenkirchen, Germany. [Web:] <http://www.sussex.ac.uk/Users/hafa3/criskoocs.htm> [Date of access: 28 January 2003].

SHAW, M. 1999. The global revolution and the twenty-first century: from international relations to global politics. (In Chan, S. & Wiener, J., eds. Twentieth century international history. London : I.B. Tauris Publishers. p. 191-210.)

SHAW, M. 2000a. Intimations of globality: *Hamlet* without the prince. (Draft of Chapter Three of “Theory of the global state: globality as unfinished revolution”.) [Web:] <http://www.sussex.ac.uk/Users/hafa3/theory3.htm> [Date of access: 10 February 2005].

SHAW, M. 2000b. Democracy and peace in the global revolution. (Draft chapter prepared for inclusion in the publication “Making global spaces” edited by Tarak Barkawi and Mark Laffey as part of the Lynne Rienner Critical Security Studies series.) Boulder, CO. [Web:] <http://www.sussex.ac.uk/Users/hafa3/democracy.htm> [Date of access: 13 July 2005].

SIEGEL, L. 1996. All politics is cosmic. *The Atlantic online*, 277(6): Jun. [Web:] <http://www.theatlantic.com/issues/96jun/lerner.htm> [Date of access: 20 Mar. 2004].

SIMONS, M. 2005. Tensions drive out Dutch: white middle class leads emigration trend. *International Herald Tribune*:1 , Feb. 28.

SINCLAIR, T.J. 1996. Beyond international relations theory: Robert W. Cox and approaches to world order. (*In Cox, R.W. & Sinclair, T.J., eds. Approaches to world order. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. p. 3-18.*)

SINGER, M. & WILDAVSKY, A. 1993. The real world order: zones of peace/zones of turmoil. Chatham, NJ : Chatham House Publishers.

SKINNER, Q. 1999. Rhetoric and conceptual change. (*In Haikala, S., ed. Finnish yearbook of political thought. Volume 3. Jyväskylä : SoPhi Academic Press. p. 60-74.*)

SMITH, C.S. 2003. In a French village, anger over racism is spoken in Arabic. *International Herald Tribune*:3 , Dec. 27-28.

SMITH, N. 2001. Global executioner: scales of terror. (Essay prepared for the series “New World Order” arranged by the Social Science Research Council.) New York, NY. [Web:] <http://www.ssrc.org/sept11/essays/nsmith.htm> [Date of access: 17 September 2005].

SMITH, S. 1996. Positivism and beyond. (*In* Smith, S., Zalewski, M. & Booth, K., *eds.* International theory: positivism and beyond. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. p. 11-46.)

SMITH, S. 2001. Reflectivist and constructivist approaches to international theory. (*In* Baylis, J. & Smith, S., *eds.* The globalization of world politics: an introduction to international relations. 2nd ed. Oxford : Oxford University Press. p. 224-249.)

SOLOVYOV, E. 2002. Tolerance as a factor of global stability in the changing world. (Paper prepared for the Institute of World Economy and International Relations, Russian Academy of Sciences - IMEMO.) Moscow. [Web:] <http://www.iip.at/publications/ps/0702solovyov.htm> [Date of access: 29 June 2004].

SOROS, G. 1998. The crisis of global capitalism: open society endangered. London : Little, Brown and Company.

SPARKS, A. 2003. Beyond the miracle: inside the new South Africa. Johannesburg : Jonathan Ball Publishers.

SPENCE, K. 2004. World risk society and war against terror. (Paper delivered during the 54th annual conference of the Political Studies Association (PSA) held at Lincoln University.) Brayford Pool, Lincoln, UK p. 1-35. [Web:] <http://www.psa.ac.uk/cps/2004/Spence.pdf> [Date of access: 22 June 2005].

SPETH, J.G. 1997. Global inequality: 358 billionaires versus 2.3 billion people. (In Gardels, N., ed. The changing global order: world leaders reflect. Malden, MA : Blackwell. p. 166-168.)

STEANS, J. 2002. Globalization and the discourse of women's human rights: transgressing boundaries in a post-Cold War world. (In Lawson, S., ed. The new agenda for International Relations. Cambridge : Polity Press. p. 54-70.)

STEINBRUNER, J.D. 2000. Principles of global security. Washington, DC : Brookings Institution Press.

STENGER, V.J. 2000. Buddy can you paradigm? *Sceptical inquirer*, 10(3), Sep. [Web:] <http://www.scicop.org/sb/2000-09/reality-check.html> [Date of access: 16 Apr. 2004].

STOETT, P. 1999. Human and global security: an exploration of terms. Toronto, Ontario : University of Toronto Press.

STORY, B.H. 1996. Plato's absolutes vs. Thomas Kuhn's turbulent world of paradigmatic shifts. (Paper prepared for the Core Course presented by the University of Richmond.) Richmond, VA. 8 p. [Web:] <http://core.richmond.edu/resources/paradigm.pdf> [Date of access: 26 August 2005].

STRANGE, S. 1996. The retreat of the state: the diffusion of power in the world economy. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

STREMLAU, J. 1999. The Commonwealth: contributing to civility on the eve of the citizen century. (In Mills, G. & Stremlau, J., eds. *The Commonwealth in the twentieth century*. Johannesburg : SAIIA. p. 63-77.)

SUNKEL, O. 1973. Transnational capitalism and national disintegration in Latin America. *Social and economic studies*, 22(1):132-171, Mar.

SUNTER, C. 1992. *The new century: quest for the high road*. Cape Town : Human & Rousseau.

TARNAS, R. 1993. *The passion of the Western mind: understanding the ideas that have shaped our worldview*. Reprint edition. New York, NY : Ballantine Books.

TARRY, S. 1999. 'Deepening' and 'Widening': an analysis of security definitions in the 1990s. *Journal of military and strategic studies*, 2(1), Fall. [Web:] <http://www.jmss.org/1999/article3.html> [Date of access: 23 Mar. 2004].

TAYLOR, C. 1989. Cross-purposes: the liberal-communitarian debate. (In Rosenblum, N.L., ed. *Liberalism and the moral life*. Cambridge, MA : Harvard University Press. p. 159-182.)

TAYLOR, P.J. 1999. Places, spaces and *Macy's*: place-space tensions in the political geography of modernities. *Progress in human geography*, 23(1):7-26, Mar.

THAGARD, P. & ZHU, J. 2001. Acupuncture, incommensurability, and conceptual change. (Paper prepared in the Philosophy Department of the University of Waterloo.) Waterloo, Ontario. 30 p. [Web:] cogsci.uwaterloo.ca/Articles/Pages/acupuncture.pdf [Date of access: 15 July 2005].

THAROOR, S. 1999. The future of civil conflict. *World policy journal*, 16(1):1-11, Spring.

THOMAS, C. 1993. Beyond UNCED: an introduction. *Environmental politics*, 2(4):1-27, Winter.

THOMAS, C. 2000. Global governance, development and human security: the challenge of poverty and inequality. London : Pluto Press.

THOMAS, C. 2002. Developing inequality: a global fault-line. (*In* Lawson, S., *ed.* The new agenda for International Relations. Cambridge : Polity Press. p.71-90.)

THOMAS, S.M. 2001. Perspectives, paradigms, and traditions of international thought. (Course notes prepared for the course “A history of international relations theory” in the Department of economics and international development at the University of Bath.) Bath, UK. [Web:] <http://staff.bath.ac.uk/hssmt/ecoi0040.html> [Date of access: 30 August 2005].

THOMPSON, G. 2000. Economic globalization? (In Held, D., ed. A globalizing world: culture, economics, politics. London : Routledge. p. 85-126.)

TICKNER, J.A. 1995. Re-visioning Security. (In Booth, K. & Smith, S., eds. International relations theory today. Cambridge : Polity Press. p. 175-197.)

TIMMERMANN, C. 2003. A Kuhnian revolution - Thomas Kuhn and *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. (Course notes prepared for Course hs3112 presented by the Centre for the history of science, technology and medicine at the University of Manchester.) Manchester, UK. 6 p. [Web:] <http://www.chstm.man.ac.uk/teaching/2002-2003/hs3112/lecture-4.pdf>. [Date of access: 23 September 2005].

TRAVIS, A. 2005. 'Migrant air' to speed up deportations. *The Guardian*: 1, Jul. 06.

TRESCH, J. 2001. On going native: Thomas Kuhn and anthropological method. *Philosophy of the social sciences*, 31(3):302-322, Sep.

TUATHAIL, G.O. 2000. The postmodern geopolitical condition: states, statecraft, and security at the millennium. *Annals of the association of American Geographers*, 90(1):166-178, Mar.

TUROK, B. 2001. Looming conflict between two worlds. *New agenda*, 3:165-168, Autumn.

UN see UNITED NATIONS.

UNDP see UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME.

UNITED NATIONS. 2002. 'Quest for development has reached a turning point', Secretary-General tells audience in Alcalá, Spain. (Press release SG/SM/8192. [Web:] <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2002/SGSM8192.doc.htm> [Date of access: 10 February 2005].

UNITED NATIONS. 2004a. Executive summary of the report of the Secretary-General's high-level panel on threats, challenges and change entitled "A more secure world: our shared responsibility". (Report A/59/565.) p.1-6. [Web:] <http://www.un.org/secureworld/brochure.pdf> [Date of access: 26 February 2005].

UNITED NATIONS. 2004b. Transmittal letter dated 1 December 2004 from the chair of the high-level panel on threats, challenges and change entitled "A more secure world: our shared responsibility" addressed to the Secretary-General on the United Nations. (Report A/59/565.) p. 6-7. [Web:] <http://www.un.org/secureworld/report.pdf> [Date of access: 26 February 2005].

UNITED NATIONS. 2004c. Report of the Secretary-General's high-level panel on threats, challenges and change entitled "A more secure world: our shared responsibility". (Report A/59/565.) p. 8-99. [Web:] <http://www.un.org/secureworld/report.pdf> [Date of access: 26 February 2005].

UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME. 1998. Human development report 1998. New York, NY : Oxford University Press. [Web:] <http://hdr.undp.org/reports/global/1998/en/> [Date of access: 10 September 2005].

VALE, P. 2003. Security and politics in South Africa: the regional dimension. Cape Town : University of Cape Town Press.

VALE, P. 2004. International relations in post-apartheid South Africa – some anniversary questions. *Politikon*, 31(2):239-249, Nov.

VAN CREFELD, M. 1999. The rise and decline of the state. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

VAN GELDER, L. 1996. Thomas Kuhn, 73; devised science paradigm (Obituary). *The New York Times*:B7, Jun. 19. [Web:] <http://www.sal.wisc.edu/~sobolpg/kuhn.htm> [Date of access: 20 Mar. 2004].

VAN NIEUWKERK, A. 2001. Regionalism into globalism? War into peace? SADC and ECOWAS compared. *African security review*, 10(2):7-18, Jun.

VAN ZYL SLABBERT, F. 2005. Striking a balance. *Leadership*:20-26, June.

VASQUEZ, J.A. 1983. *The power of power politics: a critique*. New Brunswick, NJ : Rutgers University Press.

VENTER, L. 2001. *In the shadow of the rainbow*. Johannesburg : Heinemann.

VON CLAUSEWITZ, C. 1976. *On war*. Edited and translated from the German by Michael Howard and Peter Paret. Princeton, NJ : Princeton University Press.

WALDMAN, P. 2001. The question in the rubble: Why us? *Wall Street Journal*:A6, Sep. 14.

WALDMAN, P. 2005. Profound alienation nurtured bomber's zeal. *International Herald Tribune*:3 , Aug. 1.

WALKER, R.B.J. 1993. *Inside/outside: international relations as political theory*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

WALT, S.M. 1998. International relations: one world, many theories. *Foreign policy*, 110:29-46, Spring.

WALT, V. 2005. Life on the front lines. *Time*, 165(9):28-33, Jan.

WALTER, J. 2005. World faces massive increase in CO2 emissions as population grows. *Alexander's gas and oil connections*, 10(15): Aug. [Web:] <http://www.gasandoil.com/goc/features/fex53365.htm> [Date of access: 23 Sep. 2005].

WALTZ, K.N. 1979. *Theory of international politics*. Reading, MA : Addison-Wesley.

WAPNER, P. 2002. The sovereignty of nature? Environmental protection in a postmodern age. *International studies quarterly*, 46(2):167-187, Jun.

WARSCHAUER, M. 2003. *Technology and social inclusion: rethinking the digital divide*. Cambridge, MA : The MIT Press.

WATERS, L. 2001. The age of incommensurability. *Boundary 2*, 28(2):133-172, Summer.

WATERS, M. 1995. *Globalization*. London : Routledge.

WATKINS, J. 1970. Against 'normal science'. (In Lakatos, I. & Musgrave, A., eds. *Criticism and the growth of knowledge*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. p. 25-37.)

WATTENBERG, B.J. 1987. *The birth dearth*. New York, NY : Pharos Books.

WEBER, C. 1995. *Simulating sovereignty: intervention, the state and symbolic exchange*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

WEBER, M. 1978. *Economy and society: an outline of interpretive sociology*. Translated from the German by Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich. Los Angeles, CA : University of California Press.

WEINBERG, S. 1998. Steven Weinberg on scientific revolutions. *New York review of books*, 45(15), Oct. 8. [Web:] <http://cs.utexas.edu/users/vl/notes/weinberg.html> [Date of access: 22 Jun. 2004].

WEINER, T. 2005. 'GI, Robot' rolls toward the battlefield. *International Herald Tribune*:1 , Feb. 17.

WEISS, T.G. & HAYES HOLGATE, L.S. 1993. Opportunities and obstacles for collective security after the Cold War. (In Dewitt, D., Haglund, D. & Kirton, J., eds. *Building a new global order: emerging trends in international security*. Toronto, Ontario : Oxford. p. 258-283.)

WENDT, A.E. 1992. Anarchy is what states make of it: the social construction of power politics. *International organization*, 46(2):391-425, Spring.

WHEELER, N.J. 1996. Guardian angel or global gangster: the ethical claims of international society revisited. *Political studies*, 44(1):123-135, Mar.

WIENER, J. 1999. Technology, business and crime: the globalisation of finance and electronic payments systems. (*In Chan, S. & Wiener, J., eds. Twentieth century international history. London : I.B. Tauris Publishers. p. 160-182.*)

WILLETTS, P. 2001. Transnational actors and international organizations in world politics. (*In Baylis, J. & Smith, S., eds. The globalization of world politics: an introduction to international relations. 2nd ed. Oxford : Oxford University Press. p. 356-383.*)

WILLIAMS, J.C. 2001. New spaces, new places: solidarism, pluralism and territoriality. (Paper presented to the British International Studies Association (BISA) annual conference in December 2001.) Edinburgh, Scotland. [Web:] <http://www.isanet.org/noarchive/williams1.html> [Date of access: 28 June 2005].

WILLIAMS, M. 1996. Rethinking sovereignty. (*In Kofman, E. & Youngs, G., eds. Globalization: theory and practice. London : Pinter. p.109-122.*)

WILLIAMS, M.C. 2003. Words, images, enemies: securitization and international politics, *International studies quarterly*, 47(4):511-531, Dec.

WILLIAMS, P. 1994. Transnational criminal organisations and international security. *Survival*, 36(1):315-337, Spring.

WILLIAMS, R. 2002. Writing in the dust: reflections on 11th September and its aftermath. London : Hodder & Stoughton.

WILSON, T.M. & DONNAN, H. 1998. Nation, state and identity at international borders. (In Wilson, T.M & Donnan, H., eds. *Border identities: nation and state at international frontiers*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. p. 1-30.)

WINES, M. 2004. For South Africans, fencing in or fencing out? *International Herald Tribune*:2 , Oct. 04.

WOODWARD, K. 2000a. Introduction. (In Woodward, K., ed. *Questioning identity: gender, class, nation*. London : Routledge. p. 1-4.)

WOODWARD, K. 2000b. Questions of identity. (In Woodward, K., ed. *Questioning identity: gender, class, nation*. London : Routledge. p. 5-41.)

WOODWARD, K. 2000c. Afterword. (In Woodward, K., ed. *Questioning identity: gender, class, nation*. London : Routledge. p. 155-158.)

WRIGHT MILLS, C. 2000. The sociological imagination. 40th anniversary edition. Oxford : Oxford University Press.

ZACARIAS, A. 1999. Security and the state in southern Africa. London : I.B.Tauris & Company.

ZINCONE, G. & AGNEW, J. 2000. The second great transformation: the politics of globalisation in the global North. *Space and Polity*, 4(1):5-21, May.

ZOGLAUER, T. 2002. The incommensurability of values. (Abstract of paper presented at the conference “Incommensurability (and related matters)” hosted by the University of Hannover from 13-16 June 1999.) Hannover, Germany. [Web:] <http://sun1.rrzn.uni-hannover.de/zeww/inc.conf.volumeofabstracts.html> [Date of access: 28 August 2005].