



Revista Asia América Latina

ISSN 2524-9347

Grupo de Estudios sobre Asia y América Latina
Instituto de Estudios de América Latina y el Caribe
Universidad de Buenos Aires



TEORÍA DE LAS RELACIONES INTERNACIONALES ESTADOCÉNTRICAS Y LA PARADOJA DE LA SEGURIDAD PARA EL SUR GLOBAL (ASIA Y AMÉRICA LATINA)

Asia
América
Latina

41

VALORACIÓN CRÍTICA POR LOS REALISTAS
SUBALTERNO-PERIFÉRICOS MOHAMMED AYOOB Y
CARLOS ESCUDÉ

STATE-CENTRIC INTERNATIONAL
RELATIONS THEORY AND PARADOX OF
SECURITY FOR GLOBAL SOUTH (ASIA AND
LATIN AMERICA)

CRITICAL APPRAISAL BY SUBALTERN-PERIPHERAL
REALISTS (MOHAMMED AYOOB & CARLOS ESCUDÉ)

Ravi Kumar

Assistant Professor at Center for Foreign Languages and International Studies at
Mahatma Gandhi International Hindi University, Wardha, Maharashtra, India.

jnu.ravi@gmail.com

Rafida Nawaz

Assistant Professor of International Relations at Bahauddin Zakariya University
Multan, Pakistan

rafidanawaz@gmail.com

RESUMEN: Este artículo apunta a revisar las presunciones a priori del paradigma estadocéntrico, alternativamente resignificadas como *realpolitik*, realismo o el sistema de equilibrio de poder. Aunque este abordaje provee las normas del comportamiento de los estados desde la creación del sistema estatal moderno, está sujeto a un criticismo severo por parte de sus teóricos clásicos, como E. H. Carr, Hans

J. Morgenthau, entre otros, así como por parte de las relaciones internacionales críticas que se desarrollan en el norte global, que ven el dilema de seguridad como amenaza a la paz internacional. No obstante, las críticas de estos críticos del Norte son incapaces de proveer una alternativa a las políticas de poder. En la atmósfera del debate pospositivista, emergieron ambas teorías, a saber, el realismo subalterno, y el periférico, como voces de disenso radicado en experiencias del Sur global que proveen una revisión para basar las presunciones del abordaje realista. Los teóricos Mohammed Ayooob y Carlos Escudé extendieron las presunciones paradigmáticas de los estudios subalternos del Sudeste Asiático y de la escuela latinoamericana del ECLA y Raúl Prebisch -de la dependencia- en el dominio de las relaciones internacionales. Este artículo provee un resumen del dilema de la seguridad experimentado por los Estados del Sur global, basado en la valoración crítica de las dos teorías, al mismo tiempo que contextualiza el realismo periférico-subalterno dentro de los principales abordajes realistas sobre el realismo estructural defensivo u ofensivo.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Realismo; Realismo subalterno-periférico; Sur global

ABSTRACT: The paper aims to revisit the priori assumptions of state centric paradigm alternatively signified as *realpolitik*, Realism or balance of power system. Though the approach is providing for the norms of state behavior since inception of modern state system, it is subjected to severe criticism by the classical theorists of the approach like E.H. Carr, Hans J. Morgenthau etc., as well as from critical IR developing in global north; for causing security dilemma as threat to international peace. Despite the critique these northern critics are unable to provide an alternative to power politics. In atmosphere of post-positivist debate the two theories emerged i.e., Subaltern Realism and RP (*Realismo Periférico*) as voices of dissent; rooted in experiences of global south providing a revision to base assumption of Realist approach. The two theorists, i.e., Mohammed Ayooob and Carlos Escudé extended the paradigmatic assumptions of South Asian Subaltern Studies and Latin American ECLA-Prebisch school (*dependencia*) in domain of International Relation. The paper will provide an overview of security dilemma experienced by the states of global south based on the critical appraisal of two theories at the same time contextualizing the Peripheral-Subaltern Realism within main stream Realist approaches of Defensive and Offensive Structural Realism.

KEYWORDS: Realism, Subaltern-Peripheral Realism, Global South.

I. Introduction

Since 1939 with E.H. Carr's seminal work "Twenty Years of Crisis"; Realism is serving as guide to state craft and foreign policy making. With the other metanarrative Liberalism is the theory that explains human behavior in their collectivity; and assumes central position in academic International Relations. It is considered to be the problem solving theory that takes the world as given and provides solution to greatest human ailment, i.e., war. (Burchill, 1996, p. 19) Like other theoretical enterprises it serves as a bridge between the factual world and cognitive realm and assigns meaning to facts. In recent years the theory building practices underwent severe critiques by the theorists themselves. The critical approaches to theory by the name of critical theory believe that theory masks certain interest. Here comes the famous notion by the Cox that "theory is always for someone and for some purpose". (Burchill, 1996, p. 19) In a world where binaries of power are present and the world is divided between core and periphery, powerful and subalterns; each binary is further segmented in hierarchies determining not only status and rank but also the behaviors; the realm of fact can be translated in many languages and interpreted and understood variously. Hence the claims to universality remain contested. Broadly speaking IR theories can be divided in two main camps i.e. problem solving and emancipatory. Both types produce theories with an objective.

The problem-solving camp of constitutive IR metanarratives i.e., Realism and Liberalism is criticized by the opponents as statu quo theories that want to legitimize and preserve the hegemonic order in favor of powerful. The future according to these theories is unfolding and hence deterministic in nature. The purpose of theory is to minimize loss. The emancipatory vision drives its raw material from the lived experience of the weak, and conceives alternative possible about future. These critical approaches with the dream of emancipation challenge the status quo and serves as catalyst for action politics and movements bubbling up on the bottom, like movements to alter modernity by the indigenous people (Acharya, 2000).

The paper provides an overview of the Realist paradigm from a critical perspective, with special reference to versions of Realism that developed in the periphery. The two strands of Realism i.e., Realismo Periférico and Subaltern Realism are concerns of this study. The paper is divided in three main segments.

- Timeless Wisdom of Realism Questioned?
- Subaltern Realism and Problem of Internal Anarchy for Post Imperial State

- Peripheral Realism as Strategy of Alignment

II. Timeless Wisdom of Realism Questioned?

During the post-cold war era, Realist theory went through decay. The age of Globalization was considered to be the triumph of Liberalism over its age old adversary Realism. Further challenges were posed by the critical doctrines that were challenging the inside/outside dichotomy and in a way echoing the liberal claims the age of nation-state is over. (Walker, 1995) Furthermore, approaches like Critical security studies, post-positivist theories and Green movements set on the path of broadening the horizon of theory beyond war. But as the first decade of the 21st century ended, the emergence of non-state militancy, revival of religion, and absolutism in name of populism brought the state centrism back. The challenges according to Ken Booth (Booth, 2011) caused the redux of Realism and continued relevance of state centrism is acknowledged once again. The challenges to Realist theorizing were not only from outside but there were internal voices of dissent as well that enhanced the problem-solving capacity of Realist paradigm.

II.1 Critical Theory and Realism

This segment of our study is dedicated to the 4th debate critique¹ on Realist notions of state and security. Although the critical approaches highlight the multifaceted reality and weakness of explanatory powers of Realist

1. Discipline of International Relations developed in a series of discipline defining debates. The first debate took place in 1939 between Liberal Internationalists, the believers of Woodrow Wilson and Norman Angell doctrines of collective security and interdependence and the group of theorists who proclaimed themselves as "Realists", and suggested that human nature is not mutable and essential self-centric. In atmosphere of anarchy, the armament and self-help is the only means to ensure the security of states, that cannot be left to utopian claims of collective security and survival. The second debate dealt the methodological concerns of International Relations and theorists ended in consensus of "unity of all science at least on the level of methodology". The objective of International Relations theory is to identify the patterns and finally predict 3rd discipline-defining debate in the decade of 70's took place between the protagonists of Realist, Liberal and Structuralist (Radical) doctrines. The three approaches reflected on three dimensions of IR. Realist focused on anarchy and survival strategies in case of war, Liberals highlighted the interdependence in field of trade and finance, while the Structuralist being the inheritors of Marxist tradition highlighted the exploitative nature of International Relations and essentially an arena of powerful actor both in time of peace as well as war. The fourth debate known as Post-Positivist debate is actually an orchestra of multiple strands previously remained in status of exile. (Jim George and David Campbell, Vol 34, No 3, Sep 1990) (Nawaz, Vol II, No 1, (Jan-June) 2016)

paradigm from different perspectives, based on their ontological assumptions, the underlying thread that unites critical approaches is that present world and its structures are constructed according to logic of power. State-centrism is a flawed and exclusionary paradigm that divides humanity, and acts as an agent of power and domination on different levels. The three currents of critical emancipatory theory i.e. Critical Theory, Feminism and Postmodernism all envision a possible future free from domination and propose an ethical world order to replace power politics.

II.1.1 Critical Theory

Critical Theory remained in exile in initial years of development of discipline of International Relations due to its Marxist connotations. Theory according to critical theorists is meant to attain some purpose. Critical theory considers itself to be an emancipatory theory with the purpose to improve human existence by abolishing injustice, with a commitment to extend rational, just and democratic organization of political life, beyond the level of state to whole humanity. The understanding is manifest in Booth definition of emancipation, i.e., “freeing people from those constraints that stop them from carrying out what freely they would choose to do”. According to Andrew Linklater, “to be free means to be self-determining or to have the capacity to initiate action”. Linklater believes that source of inequality and domination is the form of political community organized in state that is essentially an exclusionary institution. (Linklater, 1996) Critical theorists envision a possible cosmopolitan future above and beyond any form of communitarianism. The latest example of such thinking is Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri’s Commonwealth, declared by them as an ethical project for political organization of a common world, a democracy of multitude, where the air, the water, the fruits of the soil, and all nature’s bounty-is claimed to be the inheritance of humanity and shared together. Furthermore, it will not be based on the principle of humans as exploiters of the nature, but its custodian. Common also include the social production, such as knowledge, languages, codes, information, effects and so forth. The project has an ambivalent relation with modernity and capitalism (Negri, 2009, p. viii).

II.1.2 Feminist Theory and Reconstruction of International Relations from the Perspective of Gender

Feminist critical theory is concerned about the implications of state-sanctioned violence, and makes the case for broadening the definition of security to allocate more resources of the marginalized strata of society.

Feminists criticize the concept of violence implied in state-centric security approaches and advocates for more people-centered approaches. Feminists are of the view that people in general and women in particular are not only vulnerable to direct violence but also the victims of direct structural violence that occurs in form of economic insecurities. As state allocates more and more resources for the self-help mechanism to meet the challenges of omnipresent external threats, economic wellbeing of citizens and other human securities like food and health are compromised. The victim of human insecurities resultant from structural violence is poor people irrespective of gender, but the female tend to suffer most. Security dilemma for feminism is multifold, affecting the weak states of anarchic international order, that complicit their behavior in accord to international norms, further unfolding in form of less allocation of resources for poor regions and certain groups of citizen body, making women on the lowest rung of social hierarchy of poor strata the worst victim of barrack community of state (Steans, 2006, pp. 68-69).

II.1.3 Postmodern Questions on Violence, Boundary, Identity and Statecraft

The postmodernist International Relations theory employ the methods of deconstruction and double reading to understand and disentangle the paradoxes of state system. Richard Ashley revisits the problem of Anarchy in International system as absence of an overarching authority over a multiplicity of states having their interests, capabilities resources and territory; none of which can lay down the laws on “other”. According to Ashley state sovereignty is the trait that is valorized and anarchy is considered to be a problem. The two concepts are antithesis to each other. If the problem of anarchy has to be addressed in International realm, the states have to surrender their sovereignty. He further adds, that system allows the norm of self-determination and creation of new boundaries as a result of political struggle at the same time giving authority to sovereign states to use violence as means to “expunge any traces of anarchy within them”, leading to abuse of rights and structural violence. Four basic concepts of International politics questioned by postmodern thinkers are; violence, boundary, identity and statecraft (Devetak, 1996, p. 190).

State has the monopoly on the legitimate use of force. Violence is both a poison and cure. There exist a paradoxical relationship between violence, state security and political order. States rely on violence to constitute themselves as states and in process construct binaries of self and other. Paradox appears when these binaries appear as cracks on the consensus of national cohesion inside the nation-state. Concentration camps, refugees,

and authoritarian regimes like Nazism as well as forces like NATO (who present people as victims and act on impulse of humanitarianism) all blur the boundaries of internal / external. Act of boundary making implies power and sovereign state emerge as territorial container of power. Rob Walker in his seminal work *Inside/Outside*, discuss how political identities are imposed by spatial practices and act results in distancing of humankind. Walker considers it an ineffective response to challenges confronted by humanity that is beyond the domain of power of territorial states like natural disasters and other environmental concerns. According to Walker modern political life is too complex to be caught in exclusionary dichotomies of inside/outside, self/other and identity need not be exclusionary. Postmodernism proposes a detached de-territorialised ethics transcending the limits of sovereignty and rigid boundaries (Walker, 1995, pp. 1-6).

All this ethical content and emancipatory dogmas recorded their voices of protest first from the position of exile, then from the margins of discipline and then taking a central position after the end of cold war. Despite their utopian stances and ethical considerations, critical theorists have a consensus with Realist position that problems faced by the world are the result of inside/outside dichotomies and anarchy is the root cause of all problems. The differences between the critical and problem-solving approach is a choice between bottom-up and top-down solutions. The critical approaches believe that the solution comes from the margins, while Realist wants to maintain the statu quo of power and provides solution in form of order under a hegemonic power. Still the foreign and domestic policies of states are written in syntax of state, power, and violence. Realism too cannot be considered a coherent paradigm with a multitude of solutions from Radical Realism, Defensive Realism and Offensive Realism (Chris Brown & Kristen Ainley, 2005, p. 45).

II.2 Voices of Dissent in Realism

Realism as problem solving doctrine championed all the discipline defining debates, despite its inherent flaws, and internal dissent. As a problem solving doctrine it analyzed the ills of the international system and claimed to be a universal doctrine. But crisis of mid-twentieth century forced the classical theorists of Realism like E.H.Carr, Hans J. Morgenthau, John J. Herz to take a radical shift and revisit the priori assumptions of realist thought. E.H.Carr declared nation state dysfunctional and provided a more inclusionary solution by expansion of community bounds, centralized economic planning and a worldwide coordination facilitated through international organization. Similar ideas were expressed by Hans J. Morgenthau who himself

moved beyond “Politics Among Nations”, and declared nation state as obsolete and proposed a world government to save humanity from the menace of nuclear warfare. John J. Herz constructed the scenario of future in terms of environmental threats and demographic changes as a result of migration. Ken Booth calls these shifts as Utopian Realism (Booth, 2011, p. 8), a charge that was leveled to Liberal Internationalism by these fathers of classical realism. But this utopian turn made it manifest that statist dogma and claims of timeless wisdom about state craft and *realpolitik* is under question.

Along with these voices of dissent, there is an ongoing debate between two strands of structural Realism, i.e. defensive realism led by Kenneth Waltz and offensive Realist school of thought led by John Mearshimer. In an anarchic world Kenneth Waltz believe that peace comes from deterrence achieved through balance of power. Waltz believes in peace enhancing property of nuclear proliferation, and owes the relative peace of cold war a direct corollary of nuclear armament. Waltz takes state as rational actors minimizing the cost especially the cost of armed conflict. John Mearshimer on the other hand negates the premise of rationality, on the pretext that if all states acted rationally there would not be any hegemonic wars (Chris Brown & Kristen Ainley, 2005).

State opts for highly aggressive policies and attempts to gain preponderant position in world affairs to lay down their rules in political as well as economic realm. So the aim of a state in hegemonic position is to contain the potential hegemon and misguided adversaries. John Mearshimer advocates the preemptive strike against the aggressive designs of a potential contender. According to him such states learn their lessons only through power and submit to dictates of power. His analysis is based on his reading of history, and he draws inference that if there would have been a preemptive strike on Germany in 1936, the world would not have gone through the tragedy of Second World War. He believes that it was the power that bounded Japan and Germany to align them with great power and adopt the strategy of bandwagon. (Mearsheimer, 2011) Mearshimer view are resonated by Carlos Escudé, who declares that strategy of bandwagoning adopted by Germany, Japan and even the victorious powers like Great Britain and France was the result of lessons learnt after Second world war. During Cold War these powers defined their national interests in terms of economic development and reconstruction of their industrial potential (Escudé L. S., 2016).

III. Subaltern Realism and Experiences of Third World State

Mohammed Ayoob’s Realist version, i.e. Subaltern Realism is part of ontological and epistemological debates of post-positivism as it essentially

believes in standpoint reality and claims to speak on behalf of inferior in rank, i.e., from the standpoint of postcolonial state. Inferior/superior dichotomy implicitly hints towards hierarchical nature of international politics. But unlike the other post-positivist critical stances, Ayoob is not a believer of individualism. His analysis is not citizen centric at all but state-centric by all standards. Like Machiavelli of Renaissance Europe he is an advocate of coercion and use of force for sake of regime and state security (Ayoob, 1998). Ayoob another similarity with Machiavelli and Hobbes; the philosophers of Realist tradition, is problem of internal chaos and anarchy within state. He finds the Post-Imperial states on same stage of historical development that was the case of Europe in sixteenth and seventeenth century, characterized by internal warfare; the context of philosophies of power politics (Ayoob, 1995). Ayoob is of the view that inside/outside dichotomy of Realist paradigm of Twentieth century with a priori assumption that threat essentially emanates from the outside due to state of anarchy at international level is based on a misreading of history.

Ayoob negates the Waltzian claim that Cold War was a period of relative peace because of absence of armed conflict between First world states and defensive balance of power between two super powers deterring each other. Both Ayoob (Ayoob, Vol 4, No 3, Autumn 2002) and Acharya (Acharya, 1997) are of the view that war is missing from the text books of international history during the period (1945-) as there were fewer border wars and more anti-regime wars or wars of national cohesion. The space of these border as well as wars of national (in)cohesion were Third World. Both Amitav Acharya and Ayoob find the concept of nation introduced by colonial powers as problematic. To Acharya the elite political class employed the discursivity of nation to fulfill their political aspirations against the territorial, ethnic, religious geographic and historic and cultural traditions and postcolonial states emerged. The habitual identification with the crafted identities and allegiance to new state apparatus brought to surface the innate tension between state and different groups (Acharya, 39(3) 2011).

Ayoob is of the view that national identity in case of Third world state is mutable and subject to redefinition. Hence the principle of self-determination and norm of recognition of secessionist states by the powerful actors of international politics makes nationalism an unfinished business. He criticizes the norm of Emancipation as a “malleable idea”, and denounces the Booth preposition as a fallen realist that “security is freeing of people as individual and group from physical and human constraints, which stop them from carrying out what they freely choose to do”. Ayoob declares that making emancipation a synonym of security and panacea for the ill of Third World state is height of naïvité”, and emancipation interpreted as the right of every group can be a recipe of grave disorder”. (Ayoob, 1997, p. 126) Ayoob

asks the crucial question – What comes first, being secure or being free?, and whether the groups struggling for their long term aspiration for freedom will be secure when they will secure freedom. Whether living under an oppressive regime with only assurance of right to live is better than living a life in an anarchic state of continued warfare of all against all? Furthermore he believes that breakup of third world state will not be the end of crisis as at present there is no space in the world that can be signified as pure ethnic homeland, and what will be the status of minorities in these mini states, as that particular ethnic group will be in position to define identity of state and national interest.

To Ayoob identity in itself is not a problem, but legitimacy of state becomes contested and challenged with the demands of economic redistribution and political participation, that is beyond the capacity of state and creates overload on political system. (Ayoob, 1997, p. 128) The word state in third world comes with an imagery of effective, responsive, representative exemplar state present in industrialized first world and citizen demand effective statehood (Ayoob, 1997, p. 126). Discussing the security dilemma of Third world state Ayoob believes that nascent state at initial level of structural and institutional development performs three main functions. Policing and maintaining order in the territory; the extraction of resources from territory and population essential for war making and policing activities; the expansion and consolidation of political authority, including the imposition of order on contested territorial and demographic spaces. Ayoob sees the last two functions of state as sources of insecurity, internal as well as external for the post-colonial state. Extraction of resources and differential rate of development of regions provides facts that certain region serve as internal colony, providing material for resistance movements. The problem according to Ayoob become more acute when Third world state institutions are monopolized by certain ethnic configuration and state deliberately opt for mono-ethnicity and try to curb identities in name of national integration (Ayoob, 1995). The root cause of third world external problematic of security lies in the same phenomenon as neighboring states contest each other to consolidate their control over a given territory or population, leading to irredentist intervention in name of nationalism in contested areas. Examples Ayoob quote are India-Pakistan, Vietnam and Cambodia, Ethiopia and Somalia, Serbia and Croatia, Armenia and Azerbaijan. State building activities in these states gave rise to the perception that their neighbor is source of threat (Ayoob, 1997, p. 133).

Ayoob also negates the preposition that democracies are less prone to interstate conflict than non-democratic states. He believes that both stable democracies and autocracies are least likely to behave irrationally. As it takes years to become mature democracies, mass politics with authoritarian elite is the trait followed during transition to democracies. These transitional

democracies act aggressively and prone to invoke international conflict. Ayoob believes that without the provision of political order by state, every other form of security is an elusive or at best an ephemeral idea. The state cannot replace society, but it is charged with greater responsibility to protect society. Ayoob even goes a step further from the classical Realists and believes that in case of third world regime security is also vital to ensure order and protection from internal anarchy.

As a firm believer of self-help mechanism Ayoob believes that both foreign economic aid with the package of conditionalities as well as humanitarian intervention in name of protection of citizen rights are practices with a neo-colonial bias. Ayoob is against any redefinition of security to make it a more inclusionary concept. He is of the view that debt burden, rainforest decimation, or even famine cannot be a part of security calculus of third world. Security problematic for third world includes only the survival of state territorial borders, state institutions and legitimacy of its governance elite. A regime that ensures order internally and overcomes the situation of internal anarchy in case of third world is assurance of international order as well.

IV. Realismo Periférico and the Argentine Experience

Carlos Escudé believes that all international relations theories are normative in content and rooted in specific experience. To him International relations theory can be either philosophy or ideology conceding a sordid interest. The Realismo Periférico outlined in his book *El Realismo de los Estados Débiles* (1995) and its English language version *Foreign Policy Theory in Menem's Argentina*, is rooted in particular experience of exercising state's will and sovereignty that Argentine went through as state since 1889 leading to Falkland adventure (1982), its hostile posture towards neighborhood states like Chile and Brazil, and opting for policy of arms escalation and nuclear race with Brazil. The Escudé is of the view that Argentine had to pay the price of this offensive mode of realism because since 1942 and particularly after the Cold war the incentive for Latin American countries have been given on condition of bandwagoning with USA. Argentina was not the only country in the region that was opting for the mode of offense by checking the power of other regional power contenders; Brazil was the game contender of chicken game of nuclear brinkmanship. The difference between Argentine's and Brazil's foreign policy according to Escudé was the latter's alignment with the Western block.

Unlike Brazil, Argentina was clearly on hostile side with USA and Great Britain. Ever since First Pan American Conference (1889), it opted for diplomatic hostility against North America led by USA and by 1990 Argentina was

amongst those states who casted anti US votes in UN General Assembly; it opted for neutrality during two great Wars; joined non-aligned movement as champion of third position, opted for hostile relations with Chile and Brazil despite no survival threat in 1978 and 1979 respectively ending in nuclear arms race with Brazil; Attacked Falkland/Malvinas island which had been under the suzerainty of Great Britain since 1833, refused to ratify Tlatelolco treaty for prohibition of nuclear weapons in Latin America as well as Non-Proliferation treaty and devoted its scarce resources to enrich Uranium, and joined hands with Saddam Hussain for development of intermediate range guided missiles Cóndor II (Escudé C. , 2009). Argentina was the power that repudiated Morgenthau and Waltz preposition that weaker states have no real foreign policy; though its policy was in accord to Realists like Stephen Krasner and John Mearsheimer, who believe that Third World States seek not only wealth but also political-military power. Escudé provided a bottom up analysis of the system, and established that middle rung states in hierarchy of states with certain domestic characteristics opt to pay high costs for the implementation of an active policy. Escudé refutes Waltzian notion that all states are alike and pay attention to premise of rationality, and opt only for defensive equilibrium of power for sake of deterrence. Escudé makes an in-depth analysis of domestic traits of states. Domestic traits that Escudé traced out from the history of Argentina was that:

- It was a developed economy during the period 1880-1940 with expectation to attain a power status in world political hierarchy, ignoring the fact that its economy was closely tied to Great Britain during the period.
- Isolated geography augmented the inflated ideas of its development and power
- Contents of its educational system encouraged perception of country's past splendor and future possibilities².

2. According to Klaus Dodds, since independence from Spanish Empire in 1810, patriotic education was considered to be an essential element of state survival. Educational reforms helped Argentina not only to extend its sovereignty over more extensive geographical territory, and assimilated the waves of immigrants from Spain and Italy and inculcate a national consciousness in immigrant perception. Due to Patriotic education Argentine is considered to be a success story as nation state in comparison to states of Latin America like Peru and Bolivia. The same patriotic education imparted a lesson in minds of young that Argentine is an incomplete country, without "lost little sisters", i.e., the East and West Falkland. The schools ensured that every school child can draw an outline of two islands. (Dodds, 2000, pp. 87-88)

- Quest for Regional power status and definition of National interest in terms of prestige and power. (Escudé L. S., 2016)

But Argentina had to bear the costs of this policy of aggrandizement. Escudé analysis was not entirely based on normative hunches but rooted in archival records of United Kingdom and USA that revealed that price of neutrality was the silent embargo by these powers that produced devastating consequences for economy; and 1982 misadventure led to jeopardizing the economic ties with European Economic Community, and alienation of investment as country risk index was raised. Argentine took a paradigm shift during Menem's period as a result of deliberation of two institutions Instituto Torcuato Di Tella and Flacso Buenos Aires. The first step was reestablishment of ties with Great Britain, followed by a policy of alignment with the West and abandonment of Non Aligned posture. Further concrete steps was ratification of Tlatelolco Treaty for prohibition of nuclear weapons; scrapping the Cóndor II Missile project, and cooperating with US led United Nations peacekeeping operations ad missions like Gulf War and Haiti. Furthermore, it started rapprochement policy with Chile and Brazil. As a result the military budget was reduced, military draft was eliminated, and state owned Arms industry was dismantled (Escudé C. , 2009).

The paradigm shift took place as a result of policy suggestion of the two think tank mentioned above, who proposed that “in a liberal democracy, the principal function of the foreign policy of a peripheral state that does not face credible security threats from the outside should be to serve its citizens by facilitating the socio-economic development”. Hence, the socio-economic development is the prime national interest. The approach unlike any other version of Realism was not state centric, power oriented. Rather it was seemingly repudiation from the norms of Neo-Realism adopting a citizen centric approach and defining national interest in terms of economic development. Unlike other state centric stances of Realism it was not hesitant to compromise sovereignty for sake of security and economic development; hence it preferred butter over guns.

Escudé does not consider the system of states as anarchical but takes it as a proto hierarchy of Rule Makers, Rule Takers and Rebel/Rogue states (defying the rules defined by the powerful state actors), correcting another fallacy of Realist paradigm that all states are equal, “none is entitled to command, none is required to obey”. Power determines the role of state in world system. Hence there are states, powerful enough to contribute to formal and informal rule making; those that not being powerful enough to be rule makers abide by the rules; and those that although not powerful enough to be rule makers rebel against the rules, i.e. the rogue/pariah states (Escudé C. , 2005).

He, like Mearsheimer, is of the view that potential of contenders must be checked through power, as Imperial Germany, Nazi Germany, Imperial Japan was checked during great Wars, and they finally submitted to hegemony and its dictates. The peripheral Realism in Escudé view was the policy opted by both East and West Germany during Cold War, Japan and even great powers like United Kingdom who preferred economic development on military might. Though, these states in Mearsheimer view learnt their lesson through the tragedy of errors. Argentina too learnt its lessons through the lessons of Falklands War when its faulty perception of power led it to fight a war with an opponent that outnumbered not only in terms of military might but economic as well.

Escudé is of the view that peripheral realist abdication is the other side of the coin of empire, rather the first step in building of a world Leviathan. He believes that when Argentina partially surrendered its sovereignty, deactivated its ballistic missile project, and signed NPT, the policy of defensive realism isolated Brazil that in turn acquiesced to US pressure and also signed Non Proliferation treaty. Escudé resonates John Mearsheimer Offensive Realist doctrine of containment of potential hegemonies and misguided adversaries with possible objective of annihilating it (Mearsheimer, 2011, p. 134); when he advocates the freedom to launch preemptive just wars to hegemonic power with a liberal secular cultural matrix on cultures that do not believe in equality of all³. He goes against defensive balance of power equation suggested as strategy for peace and deterrence by Kenneth Waltz and a firm believer of concentration of power. He provides a rationale for Empire not for the sake of interest of United States of America but is of the view that world needs a global leviathan to overcome the problem of anarchy and USA just happens to be the only candidate for the job. His recipe for the panacea of ills of world is a preemptive strike by USA to root out weapons of mass destruction from the state that rebel and defy the rules made by the powerful actors of the system (Escudé C. , 2005).

V. Conclusion

Discourse in this paper started with the debate on the nature of international relations theory divided by Scott Burchill in two contending camps, i.e. the problem solving and Critical. (Burchill, 1996) Theorists belonging to both camps, situated in their particular perception about reality either

3. To Escudé all cultures are not morally equal and cultures that normatively acknowledge that all men are created equal are ethically superior to those who award some men more rights. (Escudé C. , Reflections on Cultural Superiority and Just War: A Neo Modern Imperative, 2005)

want to legitimize the present or reconstruct the given and have a view of possible future (deterministic or alternative). Both camps of International Relations have the consensus that there is something wrong with the ideas, the discursive formations that underlie the structure of present. Ken Booth is of the view that present world political, economic and social norms i.e., patriarchy, proselytizing religions, triumph of capitalism, statism, nationalism, racism and consumer democracy are the result of interplay of history of ideas and structures produced by these ideas, and we are paying the costs of ideas that made us. Booth adds that these structures are threats for humankind and if “living globally is not radically reinvented, decades of disorder and violence will follow with a multilayered world conflict”. Booth seeks refuge again in timeless wisdom of Realist paradigm and heralds the redux of Realism. (Booth, 2011) During the post-cold war years before 9/11 when realist wisdom was under question, Booth was confused between state security and self and was championing the cause of freedom and emancipation for self and groups at the cost of state security. (Booth, 1997) During the period he declared himself to be a fallen realist. The base of his claims was the revisionist views of fathers of Realism i.e. E.H. Carr, Hans J. Morgenthau, and John J. Herz whom he declared Radical or “Utopian Realists”, already discussed in above lines (Booth, 1997). During the period two thinkers rooted in the experience of life on margins, Mohammed Ayoob and Carlos Escudé revisited the basic premise of Realism, and tried to free Realism from its ethnocentric Central biases to make it a more inclusionary (Acharya, 2000).

The Subaltern Realism is constituted by the percepts and facts of inferior in ranks, i.e. the post imperial states; and questions the norm of self-determination and recognition that makes secessionist nationalism an unfinished business. Ayoob does not equate freedom and emancipation with security; and being a staunch statist even goes to the extent of absolutism in name of regime security in third world; therefore he prefers absolutism on chaos and disorder. The Peripheral Realism of Carlos Escudé is rooted in Argentine experiment with the theory building during Menem’s period (Escudé, 1997); when there was a paradigm shift in Argentine foreign policy as a result of research in two think tanks Instituto Torcuato Di Tella and Flacso Buenos Aires; and as a result Argentine abandoned its policy of non-alignment with western block, tried to diffuse its disputes with Latin American neighbors like Chile and Brazil, abandoned its nuclear program, disarmed itself from Missile technology, adopted the strategy of bandwagoning to attain balance of power with Brazil and accepted the hegemony of United States of America.

Both Subaltern and peripheral Realism were presented in the last decade of Twentieth Century and were rooted in tragedy of 20th Century, and in a way perceived the unfolding of present in form of chaotic world with conflict on micro to macro levels. Hence both theories are problem solving in nature

and prefers the tyrannies of present in form of absolute state in Third World and International hegemon; believing that status quo is better than the utopian future that brings chaos; and absolutism on state and system level is inevitable to bring order, a far superior value than unchecked freedom resulting in anarchy.

The root cause of problem for both Ayoob and Escudé is anarchy but their level of analysis is different. Ayoob builds a case against emancipation and freedom of groups vis a vis state and believes that the notions of self-determination, liberty, human rights are cause of conflict in postcolonial state as state is equipped with lesser resources to fulfill the demands of all citizens, regions and groups. If these notions and action politics motivated by these discursivities come at odds with the stability of state, it must be curbed with coercive means employed by state. Hence Ayoob is a believer of statism, and survival, and as he aims to address the problem of internal threats, national in-cohesion and civil wars against regimes in postcolonial state, he is essentially a believer of self-help and considers the interventionism in name of irredentism by neighboring states as well as aid coming with the package of conditionality against the basic norms of state system. But instead of Utopian solutions like formation of a world community, world government, he surrenders to the given, i.e., proto-hierarchy of world made of rule makers, rule takers, and rebel states, As he is against the alternative possible futures to be brought into actualization by the efforts of weak and inferior in rank, he solves the problem by preferring butter over guns, defining national interest in terms of economic development and is against the policy of offense, going beyond the means of state for sake of maintaining a hostile stance against hegemonic states like United States of America. Escudé prefers hegemonic stability to chaos and goes to the extent of constructing an empire in suzerainty of USA after a just war to implement the norms of liberal-secular west in form of universal human rights. Escudé is of the view that US at present is charged with the responsibility in neo-modern world to construct empire and check the potential threats to humanity (Escudé C. , 2005). These corrected versions of Realism considers anarchy on state and system level as root cause of problem and are believers of aggression to protect order on both levels. The theories are reminiscent of Hobbes' Leviathan, considered to be the father of Realist tradition in International Relations, who faced similar type of security dilemma in form of English Civil War.

VI. Bibliography

- ACHARYA, A. (1997). Periphery as Core. In K. K. Williams, *Critical Security Studies* (pp. 229-327). London: University College London.
- ACHARYA, A. (2000). Ethnocentrism and Emancipatory IR Theory. In S. A. Beier, (Dis) *Placing Security: Critical Evaluation of Boundaries of Security* (pp. 1-18). York: York University Press.
- ACHARYA, A. (39(3) 2011). Dialogue and Discovery: In Search of International Relations Theory Beyond the West. Millenium: *Journal of International Studies*, 619-637.
- AYOUB, M. (1995). Third World Security Predicament. Boulder London: Lynne Rienner Publisher.
- AYOUB, M. (1997). Defining Security: A Subaltern Realist Perspective. In K. K. Williams, *Critical Security Studies* (pp. 121-148). London: UCL Publishers.
- AYOUB, M. (1998). Subaltern Realism: International Relations Theory meets the Third World. In S. G. (ed), *International Relations Theory and the Third World* (pp. 31- 54). St. Martin Press.
- AYOUB, M. (Vol 4, No 3, Autumn 2002). Inequality and Theorizing in International Relations: The Case of Subaltern Realism. *International Studies Review*, 27-48.
- BARNETT, M. (2002). Radical Chic? Subaltern Realism A Rejoinder. *International Studies Review*.
- BARAVEBOY-WAGNER, J. A. & SNARR, M. T., (2003). Accessing Current Conceptual and Empirical Approaches. In J. A. Braveboy-Wagner, *Foreign Policies of Global South, Rethinking Conceptual Frameworks*. Colorado, London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, pp. 13-30.
- BEER, F. A. & HARIMAN, R., (1996). *Post Realism: The Rhetorical Turn in International Relations*. MSU Press.
- BOOTH, K. (1997). Security and the Self: Reflections of a Fallen Realist. In K. K. Williams, *Critical Security Studies* (pp. 83-120). London: UCL Press.
- BOOTH, K. (2011). *International Politics: The Inconvenient Truth*. In K. B. (Ed), *Realism and World Politics* (pp. 325-342). London, New York: Routledge.
- BOOTH, K. (2011). Realism Redux: Contexts, Concepts, Contests. In K. B. (ed), *Realism and World Politics* (pp. 1-14). London, New York: Routledge.
- BROWN, C. & AINLEY, K., (2005). *Understanding International Relations*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- BURCHILL, S. (1996). *Introduction*. In R. D. Scott Burchill, *Theories of International Relations* (pp. 1-28). New York: Palgrave.
- BUZAN, B. (1983). *People State and Fear The National Security Problem in International Relations*. Warwick: University of Warwick Press.
- BUZAN, B. (1997). Timeless Wisdom of Realism. In K. B. Steve Smith, *International Relations Theory Positivism and Beyond*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- DEVETAK, R. (1996). Postmodernism. In S. B. (ed), *Theories of International Relations* (pp. 181-208). New York: Palgrave.
- DODDS, K. (2000). *Geopolitics*. London: palgrave.
- ESCODÉ, C. (1997). *Foreign policy Theory in Menem's Argentina*. Florida: University press of Florida.
- (2005). Reflections on Cultural Superiority and Just War: A Neo Modern Imperative. *Politics and Culture*.
- (2009). Peripheral Realism: An Argentine Theory Building Experience. In J. F. (ed), *Concepts, Histories and Theories of International Relations, Regional and National Approaches*. Brasilia: IBRI.
- ESCODÉ, L. S. (2016). Peripheral Realism Revisited. *Rev. Bras Polit Int*, 59 (1) :e002.
- GEORGE, J. (1994). *Discourses of Global Politics: A Critical (Re)Introduction*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publisher.
- GEORGE, J. & CAMPBELL, D., (1990), *Patterns of Dissent and the Celebration of Difference: Critical Social Theory and International Relations*. *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol 34, No 3, pp. 269-293.
- LINKLATER, A. (1996). Marxism. In S. B. (ed), *Theories of International Relations* (pp. 129- 155). New York: Palgrave.
- MEARSHEIMER, J. J. (2011). Reckless States and Realism. In K. B. (ed), *Realism and World Politics* (pp. 124-140). London, New York: Routledge.
- NAWAZ, R., (2016), Reflections on State-Centrism (The Realist Paradigm) in International Relations from Peripheral Realist Standpoint. *Journal of Historical Studies*, Vol II, No 1, pp. 40-60.
- NEGRI, M. H. (2009). *Common Wealth*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- PUGLIERIN, C. H. (2007). John H. Herz: Balancing Utopia and Reality. *International Relations*, Vol. 21, pp.367-382.
- SHEEHAN, M. (2010). *International Security: An Analytical Survey*. New Delhi: Viva Books.
- STEANS, J. (2006). *Gender and International Relations*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- WALKER, R. B. (1995). *INSIDE/OUTSIDE : International Relations as Political Theory*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- WOHLFORTH, W. C. (2010). Realism and Security Studies. In M. D. Mauer, *The Routledge Handbook of Security Studies*. London, New York: Routledge, pp. 9-20.



Grupo de Estudios sobre Asia y América Latina
Instituto de Estudios de América Latina y el Caribe
Universidad de Buenos Aires