JANUS.NET
e-journal of International Relations

EPISTEMOLOGICAL CHALLENGES OF GLOBALIZATION TO THE WESTPHALIAN THINKING WITHIN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Borjana Alexandrova

borjana_alexandrova@hotmail.com

PhD (University of Münster). Senior Assistant-Professor in International Relations, Sofia University "St. Kliment Ohridski" (Bulgaria). Current research interests: historical transformations of state and international structures, globalization, transnationalization, theories of international relations, international conflicts. Teaching: university course "Globalization and International Relations"; seminars on Theory of International Relations, Theory of Foreign Policy, Theory of International Negotiations; introductory seminar on International Relations for students of law.

Abstract

From the critical perspective of the concept of "human emancipation" globalization represents an important historical challenge to realism, liberalism and Marxism. Nevertheless, they are not to be ignored in any theoretical debate about globalization in IR. Without neglecting the nuances in each of the three schools of thought we can say that they tend to view the globalizing world through the lenses of the Westphalian order. To the contrary, we are witnessing the (re)emergence of a spatial, power and functional heterogeneity beyond, between and within nation-states today.

We can particularly attribute the epistemological gaps of the three IR subdivisions in terms of globalization to their handling of five main issues: *territory, actors, interrelation between public and private sphere, predictability, interdisciplinarity.* In this sense, a critical globalization debate cannot and should not be restricted to issues conceptualized explicitly under the banner of "national democracy", "national security" or "national welfare" but must be urgently engaged with the different spatial manifestations as well as state and non-state, public and private instruments for the proliferation of transnational interconnectedness and "unpredictability". It is on this basis that eventual fruitful synergies between the three conventional theories, and between them and the reflectivist and constructivist streams of the 1980s and 1990s are to be sought.

JANUS.NET, e-journal of International Relations
e-ISSN: 1647-7251
Vol. 9, Nº. 1 (May-October 2018), pp. 1-14
Epistemological challenges of globalization to the Westphalian thinking within international relations
Borjana Alexandrova

EPISTEMOLOGICAL CHALLENGES OF GLOBALIZATION TO THE WESTPHALIAN THINKING WITHIN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Borjana Alexandrova

Introduction

For the last 35 years globalization has been occupying a solid place within International Relations (IR) (e.g. Bigo, 2006; Buzan & Hansen, 2010; Cohen & Rai, 2000; Czempiel, 2002; Etzioni, 2002; Hardt & Negri, 2000; Held, 2004; Held et al., 1999; Held & McGrew, 2008; Scholte, 2001; Shaw, 2000; Varwick, 2000). In this framework, it represents a serious historical challenge to realism, liberalism and Marxism. Simultaneously, these three conventional schools of thought bare the potential to stimulate self-reflection on our understanding of global orders through their longtime theoretical systematizations of international affairs.

Without neglecting the nuances in each of them it is to say that for the most part they tend to view the world through the lenses of the Westphalian paradigm while avoiding "a big picture of the changing contours of the international and/or global realm" (Roach cit. in Roach, 2008: xvii). Be it through the "hard and 'scientific' look at power politics" (Friedman, Oskanian and Pardo, 2013: 1) of realism, the examination of the peaceful settlement of disputes among capitals in the realm of liberalism (Dunne, 2001: 164) or the perception of a "totality within which the states forming the centre dominate the periphery" (Bidet, 2007: 16) of Marxism the international system appears predominantly as a multiplicity of compact nation-states being in charge of a single territory. Thus, an ahistorical dichotomy between the domestic and the international has been reasserted within IR for many years.

To the contrary, in the last four decades we are witnessing the (re)emergence of a spatial, power and functional heterogeneity beyond, between and within nation-states (Acuto & Curtis, 2014; Castells, 2004; Eisenstadt, 2012; Rosenau, 2003; Sassen, 2006). Both their external and internal milieus have been transforming in the course of intensifying migration flows, climate change, transnationally grounded political convergence or divergence, emergence of global public opinion, a burgeoning perception of insecurity among broader populations, etc. A global society (Shaw, 2000) has been in formation between and within states' spaces due to a complex interweaving of various social forces. Impediments and chances for equal and fulfilling, individual and community realization nowadays remain therefore underresearched or undervalued by the three IR theories.

Against this background, the current exposé proposes a critical evaluation of the discourse of the nation-state in IR. It is the view of the author that we cannot delineate

JANUS.NET, e-journal of International Relations
e-ISSN: 1647-7251
Vol. 9, Nº. 1 (May-October 2018), pp. 1-14
Epistemological challenges of globalization to the Westphalian thinking within international relations
Borjana Alexandrova

globalization in all its complexity and asymmetry without addressing this particular discourse. The concept of "human emancipation" serves as a leading normative baseline for this undertaking. Following Ken Booth, it signifies "the freeing of people (as individuals and groups) from those physical and human constraints which stop them carrying out what they would freely choose to do" (Booth cit. in Buzan and Hansen, 2010: 206). In light of globalization it is meant to imply three things. First, individual self-realization is deeply related to the peaceful and sustainable global cohabitation (Albrow, 2007; Friedman, 2006). Second, human emancipation presupposes historically evolving (political) communities that have innovated, reinvented or even replaced the states (Booth and McSweeney cit. in Buzan and Hansen, 2010: 206-207). Third, the coexistence of human communities is to be rooted in equal and fulfilling, structural and institutional conditions in the world (Booth, 1995; Linklater, 1999). So, how do global orders fit into the Westphalian tradition of the three theoretical branches of IR in respect of human emancipation?

The article represents first and foremost a theoretical undertaking. An inductive approach is being applied to the topic starting with depicting appearances of globalization – unlike used deductive ones which project exiting theoretical frameworks over globalizing realities. Commensurately, general deficits as well as inputs of realism, liberalism and Marxism with regard to the global realm are elucidated together with five concrete epistemological points of critique. The thesis is being presented that the social and space heterogeneity of globalizing life necessarily leads us beyond the Westphalian assumptions in IR without making them redundant. Elements from sociology (Albrow, 2007; Bauman, 1998; Beck, 2013; Castells, 2004; Sassen, 2006; 2011) and human geography (Agnew, 2015; Bialasiewicz, 2011; Strandsbjerg, 2013) are being included with regard to comprehending globalization.

The text consists of three parts. At the outset, a definition and a brief outline of the chief characteristics of globalization will be given based on academic literature and own observations. Then the fundamental Westphalian features of each of the three IR subdivisions will be summarized in light of globalization. Third, five specific epistemological challenges to the three IR schools will be synthesized as a way to substantiate future discussions on the subject and provoke further empirical research.

Globalization and Its Characteristics

Leaning on Ulrich Menzel (2001: 226) and Jan Aart Scholte (2001: 14-15), globalization equals an aggregation of multifaceted processes of deepening, intensification and spatial enlargement of transborder interconnections in different spheres of human existence (politics, economy, culture, ecology, military affairs, etc.) which transform the function and meaning of nation-state's borders and domains (Aleksandrova 2016: 47). In this interpretation, globalization does not mean that all people in the world encounter the same experiences simultaneously (Scholte, 2001: 17). It results in that many events or influences nowadays occur unlinked, although not irrespective of politico-territorial distances. In this fashion, international relations make their way into all other groups of relations much more intensively than before and vice versa (Stefanov, 2004: 228).

This is how the ongoing situation enables us to (re)discover practically and conceptually the inherent globality (Albrow, 2007: 12-13) of local, regional and international life. In the words of Jeremy Waldron:

JANUS.NET, e-journal of International Relations
e-ISSN: 1647-7251
Vol. 9, Nº. 1 (May-October 2018), pp. 1-14
Epistemological challenges of globalization to the Westphalian thinking within international relations
Borjana Alexandrova

> *"… to organize analysis around national phenomena is to give voice to 'the same old myth – that the default position has been independent societies following their own course on their own respective territories... historically the default position has been more or less exactly the contrary: intense interaction, and the existence of traditions, cultures and institutions of interaction, among all societies whenever interaction is a possibility. Societies that can interact do* (cit. *in Rosenau, 2003: 84-85)'".*

Put into such analytical perspective, states' spaces and structures are currently (re)confirming their place in the global climate, investment, taxation, migration, information, cultural and political flows – to use the phraseology of Manuel Castells (2004). However, the effects produced thereof for the Westphalian thinking within IR from the point of view of human emancipation cannot be stipulated one-sidedly. That is why an overview of the main characteristics of globalization is needed.

They can be subsumed under four key headings – *interconnectedness, deterritorialization, unevenness and ambiguity*. The interconnectedness and deterritorialization indicate two major trends. On the one hand, bonds between various societies have been thickening, so that "all politics is now glocal" (Lamy, 2001: 193). Accordingly, the broader social world, including the individual, has become intrinsically interconnected with the world of states. To quote James N. Rosenau:

> *"As the density of the global stage has increased…, the structures of world politics have undergone a profound and pronounced bifurcation in which a multi-centric macro world composed of a wide variety of nongovernmental, transnational, and sub-national actors … has evolved to cooperate, compete, or otherwise interact with a state-centric world that consists of collectivities increasingly active on local stages* (2003: 62)".

In economy this kind of state and non-state convergence plays role in the process of designing or opposing cross-border regimes for trade, investment and financial operations. In ecology it comes into sight as mixed political reactions to the dissemination of environmental risks and the occurrence of global ecological knowledge. In media it materializes through the transcontinental spread of information and social claims. In the field of culture perceptions for hybrid identities and/or cosmopolitism are emerging, in politics – for elements of global governance. Correspondingly, national societies experience the circulation of global elites of mobility (Bauman, 1998: 19) as well as low-paid migrants and conflict and climate refugees.

On the other hand, a plurality of problems has been dispersed on a transborder scale. Dietrich Thränhardt (2000: 131-132) and Ulrich Beck (2013: 56; 77; 310) ascribe this tendency to a large extent to the character of modern industrial development, established international political and economic relations and patterns of global consumption.

JANUS.NET, e-journal of International Relations
e-ISSN: 1647-7251
Vol. 9, Nº. 1 (May-October 2018), pp. 1-14
Epistemological challenges of globalization to the Westphalian thinking within international relations
Borjana Alexandrova

Examples thereof are the corollaries ensuing from the stockpiling of nuclear weapons, chemical and biotechnical accidents, the climate change, the violation of biodiversity, the disproportionate access of world populations to some industrial achievements, the global value chains, the unsustainable energy consumption and handling of waste and resources (water, farmland, manufacture resources) and the transport pollution. A significant part of these complications cannot be reduced to a particular area, and neither can they be rehabilitated on a particularistic basis.

The unevenness, on its part, means that the impact of globalization cannot be determined one-dimensionally for all regions as well as social strata and groups, even single individuals, on our planet (Bauman, 1998: 103-127; Sassen, 2011: 340-439; Steans, 2008). Respectively, the unevenness also has multiple expressions. Thus, competing taxation policies (tax heavens) and corporativization of international trade are producing discrepancies in the global economic development. The labor relations worldwide, in turn, are characterized by a rising demand for highly qualified, specialized and well paid professionals in the context of transnational restructuring of production, trade and banking (business managers, IT specialists, financial and legal consultants, experts in insurance and marketing, scientists in the same areas of research, etc.) and a precariat in the informal sector and personal services (Taran & Geronimi, 2013). Other spheres of glocal living are undergoing similar disparities via corporativization of media landscapes, transnationalization of border and security industries, activation of power ambitions by trans-spatial terrorist structures, maintaining elite education and information networks, etc.

Against the backdrop of the three features of globalization elaborated hitherto, its ambiguity stands out even more. In this sense, globalization speaks for selective intergovernmental coordination on global issues but augmented cross-border non-governmental cooperation, for certain economic and technological ties but surfacing social destabilizations and divergence, for specific cultural exchange or universalization but reinforcement of essentialist national and sub-national identities, for ecological connectivity but unilateral treatment of natural resources by state and non-state actors, for free movement of capital and services but militarization of borders and ethno-cultural and financial thresholds for granting citizenship. In times when Myspace registers more than 110 million active users per month and Facebook 60 million already in 2008 (Siwal, 2008) we are confronted with a lack of a fruitful official political communication in respect of overcoming global fragmentation and marginalizion.

Returning to the topic of the present article, where do the three conventional theories of IR stand in all this from the critical perspective of human emancipation? In other words, how is their Westphalian orientation to be assessed in reference to the manifold, state and non-state, material and virtual bounds of inclusion and exclusion drawn in the course of globalization?

Westphalian contours of realism, liberalism and Marxism in light of globalization

Before going into their general incompleteness as well as relevance in terms of globalization, the basic Westphalian prerequisites of realism, liberalism and Marxism will be sketched out. The theory of realism (Dunne & Schmidt, 2001; Grieco, 1997; Kissinger, 1994; Morgenthau, 1993) considers the state as the leading actor and pretender for

JANUS.NET, e-journal of International Relations
e-ISSN: 1647-7251
Vol. 9, Nº. 1 (May-October 2018), pp. 1-14
Epistemological challenges of globalization to the Westphalian thinking within international relations
Borjana Alexandrova

legitimate power on the global scene. States are described as homogenous social entities exercising control over an impermeable physical territory by forceful means which, in turn, is articulated as a basis for the geopolitical divisions in the world. The international relations are greatly reduced to a regular struggle for survival, power and access to resources in the name of and between the unitary states (Caverley, 2013: 147-149).

Liberalism supports the idea of a coordinated interplay of states on the global geopolitical map (Cerny, 2013; Dunne, 2001; Mingst, 1999: 90-92). Special importance is ascribed to fostering of international legal and institutional mechanisms for a peaceful interstate cooperation, economic exchange and deterrence of the use of force (Axelrod & Keohane, 1993; Burley, 1993; Ikenberry, 2013). Although single subdivisions of liberalism, e.g. the (neo)liberal institutionalism (Moravcsik, 1991; Lamy, 2001) pay attention to additional factors on the world scene like the transnational corporations, NGOs, political elites, political parties, trade unions, lobby groups, ideologies, etc., they still consider as key determinants for the international communication "those relations that are maintained with the help of or in respect of the public authority" (Stefanov, 2006: 14).

Marxism interprets the structure of the global politics as a stratification between highly industrialized capitalist states and brought in dependence, low industrialized countries – as a reflection of the socioeconomic formations in both of them (Bidet, 2007; Mingst, 1999: 102-104; Hobden & Jones, 2001). Thus, the ruling international geopolitical order is subordinated to the fragmentation of the planetary geography in territorially demarcated sovereign states competing on the world market (Teschke, 1999: 29; Jessop, 1982).

> *"The form of the state may have changed, and it may have been subject to a 'tendential hollowing-out' as many of its previous functions and responsibilities have been displaced upwards, downwards and outwards, but its distinctively national character remains* (Hay, 1999: 172)."

From the critical standpoint of human emancipation globalization raises serious common questions for the Westphalian orientation of the three theoretical directions. Parallel to this, their conceptual foundations are not to be utterly ignored in any theoretical debate about globalizing realities.

In detail, we can say that the realist interpretation of world developments belittles the multidimensional, qualitative and quantitative, changes in and across societies of the last 30 to 40 years. Consequently, their asymmetrical effects are ignored – in reference to men and women, citizens and non-citizens, shareholders and work force, political and financial elites and populations, highly educated and non-educated, trained and non-trained in high technologies, bureaucrats and non-bureaucrats, consultants and non-consultants, brokers at the stock exchange and non-brokers, etc. In sight of the growing glocality in the world identification with realism also strengthens states' practical inability to reconsider their reductionist nation-centric ideological foundations. Moreover, seen through the Westphalian perspective the interconnectedness and deterritorialization are often being articulated as a manifestation of "unpredictability". The rigid realist notions of "state", "foreign" and "domestic policy" seem more and more incommensurate with

JANUS.NET, e-journal of International Relations
e-ISSN: 1647-7251
Vol. 9, Nº. 1 (May-October 2018), pp. 1-14
Epistemological challenges of globalization to the Westphalian thinking within international relations
Borjana Alexandrova

broad-based concepts, such as "global society", "global justice" and "global governance" or differentiated ones like "global elite", "human security" and "alter-globalization".

At the same time, realism helps us comprehend that globalization cannot be decoded if looked mainly through the paradigmatic lenses of a boundless universalism. On that account, relationships between global, national and local matter. The role of states must hence be studied carefully – their own economic, financial, trade, social, security and military policies, selective categorizing of world populations, prioritizing of one type of (inter)national legal regimes while refraining from others. In that regard, human emancipation is innately linked up with present states. What realism seems to be unaware of is the modification of states' administrative, political, legal and social structures which has decisively influenced their behavior on the global stage. Globalization has been profoundly enhanced due to cross-cutting coordination of single regulatory agencies within states' bureaucracies with corresponding governmental and nongovernmental counterparts – international financial institutions, consulting groups, stock exchanges, UN, etc. (Jayasuriya, 1999: 426); likewise, the structural significance of changing national populations and mutually reinforcing, state and non-state levels of destructive force.

The liberal theorists, on their part, successfully bring to the fore the global meaning of the spread of liberalization processes of various sorts all over the world in the last decades. Respectively, a strong potential has been demonstrated to conceptualize the international relations as intersocietal (Czempiel, 2003: 7) and not merely interstate. Nevertheless, in order to overcome its penchant for the top-down Westphalian thinking it would be necessary for liberalism to unravel the two-way connections between transnational tendencies and discourses and domestic realities in a much more penetrating way. In the same vein, the formation of attitudes, norms, institutions and policies in and between societies today needs to be elucidated through existing glocal structural disharmonies as well. Otherwise a liberal understanding of globalization would continue to inspire distrust among individuals and communities on both sides of state borders.

Another valuable contribution of liberalism to the globalization debate within IR is its focus on the issue of cooperation. A fully-fledged global society enabling bottom-up human emancipation is hardly to be accomplished without an adequate trans- and international coordination bearing in mind the depleting environmental resources, growing world population, transborder financial fluidity and aggravating social injustices. This particularly applies to the construct of "global governance", the reform or abolishment of certain international institutions, hierarchies and rules. Here liberalism still has not proposed a widely accepted stance.

The dialectical approach of Marxism, on the other hand, lays open a space for the analytical investigation of global capitalist fragmentation. For example, pursuant to some Marxist authors we are currently witnessing a "separation of the state from the production process" and the "operation of capitalist enterprises internationally with much greater autonomy from state control" (Justin Rosenberg cit. in Hobden & Jones, 2001: 218-219). Insufficiently recognized by the followers of this intellectual tradition remain asymmetries of non-economic nature and their ramifications for disparate social groups and individuals in nation-states. The plurality of alternatives to dominant political, social, cultural, economic and ecological patterns in and beyond states that have occurred in different parts of the world on a local and transnational level are accordingly left underrated.

JANUS.NET, e-journal of International Relations
e-ISSN: 1647-7251
Vol. 9, Nº. 1 (May-October 2018), pp. 1-14
Epistemological challenges of globalization to the Westphalian thinking within international relations
Borjana Alexandrova

Furthermore, the fundamental question about the economic organization of human existence posed by globalization has still not found its ultimate answer within this theoretical subdivision – provided that human economy has been rooted in complex chains of exchange for thousands of years "We need to question not if but how to deal with large-scale management of global resources in an egalitarian, peaceful and sustainable manner – beyond relying entirely on local solutions; human history is one of great cities that brought different cultures together through trade; human civilization is a history of large concentration of people (Asimakopoulos, 2014: 41)."

Epistemological points for discussion

We can particularly attribute the gaps of realism, liberalism and Marxism with regard to human emancipation in a globalizing world to their handling of five key epistemological points: *territory, actors, interrelation between public and private sphere, predictability, interdisciplinarity.* Showing inclination to render these issues a Westphalian interpretation the three theories of IR are squeezing altering social realities and chances for human development into the monolithic categories of the nation-state.

Globalization creates conditions for weakening of the top-down understanding of "territory" as a homogeneous attribute for legitimizing state power. In fact, new challenges and possibilities come up across and within states for the unfolding of human power. Among them are: the rising transborder information exchange, the mounting volatility of capital flows, the corporativization of a significant part of the world trade (Varwick, 2000: 142), the advent of alternative projects for sustainable development, trade or barter on a transnational and local scale, the global warming, the formation of transnational political, administrative and media networks, the evolution of the international law, transnationally organized campaigns against impeding of the movement of certain categories of people, etc.

Leaning on John Agnew (2015), Luiza Bialasiewicz (2011) and Jeppe Strandsbjerg (2013) a possible way out of the Westphalian "territorial trap" (Agnew, 2015: 43-46) and an eventual way in to the "geography of globality" can be the replacement of the notion of "territory" by the term "space". Spaces are depicted by these authors as multidimensional environments where human life is intertwined with a number of global, transnational and local influences and/or forms of exercising state sovereignty. Their social, economic, political and socio-cultural parameters endure constant transformations due to historical events, imposing or turning down of hierarchies and clash of manifold interests and discourses. Seen in this light, emancipative fulfillment of glocal human existence will depend more and more on the complex operationalization of concepts, such as "citizenship", "state sovereignty", "security", "borders", "geopolitics", "foreign policy mechanism", "global governance/self-governance", "legitimacy", "global trade", etc.

In addition to evoking circumstantial conceptions of space, globalization reasserts the necessity for expanding the definition of the actors and factors of international relations. Nowadays institutions like the UN, WB or IMF are being consolidated, together with a "multiplication of nonformalized or only partly formalized political dynamics, actors and hierarchies" (Sassen, 2006: 147). In the meantime, "NGOs, first-nation peoples, immigrants and refugees, including climate refugees, who become subjects of adjudication in human rights decisions are increasingly emerging as subjects of international law and actors in international (and national) relations" (Ibid., 340).

JANUS.NET, e-journal of International Relations
e-ISSN: 1647-7251
Vol. 9, Nº. 1 (May-October 2018), pp. 1-14
Epistemological challenges of globalization to the Westphalian thinking within international relations
Borjana Alexandrova

Multinational corporations are in position to guide (inter)governmental and supranational programs through lobby groups, platforms, such as the World Economic Forum, or presence on the sidelines of international negotiations. The tone in the global social and media space is being conspicuously set by reactions of financial capital and credit rating agencies like Standard&Poor's, Moody's and Fitch to election outcomes or other domestic affairs. Transnational social movements like Fair trade, Via Campesina or the International Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty have turned into an irrevocable form of organized political participation outside the state-system. Since the beginning of XXI century the global flows of information, technology, social interaction and finances have been instrumentalized by terrorist groups as well. Overall, the accumulation of normative agendas and institutionalizations on the world scene thrives on multiple overlappings of local, national and global dynamics. This fact makes the question of "democratic accountability, legitimacy and subsidiarity" (Held & McGrew, 2008: 10) all the more important.

A similar dilemma arises for realism, liberalism and Marxism in the context of ongoing reconfigurations between public and private components in glocal life – especially in but not limited to economy and finances. In the last 35 to 40 years the international politics has been taking shape under the conditions of shrinking public and expanding private elements between and within states. The networks of corporate production, trade, banking and insurance, of stock exchanges and centers for technical and legal services, of drug, arms and human trafficking, of global media images and others rest upon a conflation of public prerogatives and private interests and regulatory regimes (Sassen, 2006: 184-203). The emergence of the "global city" (Sassen, 2011) as a distinctive spatial node with a range of public and private commanding capacities for global economic (dis)integration is another example. A variety of private actors show eminent presence in the security landscape today – think thanks, mercenaries, logistics companies and private contractors like Blackwater, Kellog, Brown&Root, Eyrinus and DynCorp hiring their military personnel in different countries. Rita Abrahamsen and Michael C. Williams summarize this development as follows:

> *"To be sure, there has been an increasing fragmentation of the security field, in that a multiplicity of different actors – public and private, global and local – are involved in the provision of security. But rather than an erosion of state power, the result is the emergence of new networks of security in which the authority of the state and private actors is re-articulated through new technologies of governance, coercion and control. This has numerous political implications, in terms of how security is provided, for whom, and by whom, and also theoretically for how we think about the state and global security"* (2005: 5).

An increasing amount of development work has been conducted through corporate involvement since the 1980s as well.

Another epistemological problem of the three mainstream IR subdivisions with regard to detecting chances for human fulfillment in global times is their view of the issue of predictability. Generally speaking, each of them confines predictability to a certain

JANUS.NET, e-journal of International Relations
e-ISSN: 1647-7251
Vol. 9, Nº. 1 (May-October 2018), pp. 1-14
Epistemological challenges of globalization to the Westphalian thinking within international relations
Borjana Alexandrova

configuration of (inter)dependency among states. Realism anchors interdependency in the anarchic structure of the world affairs. The anarchy which by definition urges states to rely on their self-help is thought to induce a pursuit of non-alignment and strengthening of the own means of survival and control. Liberalism sees interdependency as emanating from the common interests of states, the expanding capitalist production, the crystallization of global norms and legal culture, the liberalization of trade, the ecology. Here states are seen as actors that can work together. Marxism stresses the meaning of dependency between the mighty capitalist states in the center and the dominated ones in the periphery and semi-periphery. Within the constraints of the capitalist system states in the periphery and semi-periphery are expected to strive to get closer to the production and market standards of the center.

However, these approaches to predictability neglect (in)congruencies possibly overshadowing the establishment of an emancipative global society embedded beyond and beneath state politics. This often results in an inability to capture critically the ambiguous conduct of governments with respect to global challenges – the hardening of their national reflex as to some spheres of politics and social groups and the propensity to adapt in others. Nowadays much political activism is generated beyond electoral attendance both on the Left and on the Right (e.g. citizens' action committees, lobby groups, global social movements, neighborhood vigilante patrols etc.) (Eisenstadt, 2012). Analogously, the rising global inequality cannot be measured exclusively by classical economic categories, such as the GNP or GDP. For example, while $134 billion flow into Africa each year, predominantly in loans, foreign investment and aid, $192 billion is taken out – in profits made by foreign companies, tax evasion and costs of adapting to climate change (Jubilee, 2014: 1). In Nepal and Liberia, another example, the diaspora's remittances account for more than 30 percent of their current GDP (DAAD-Alumniportal, 2017).

In order to tackle the issues of territory/space, actors, correlation of public and private elements on the global scene and predictability in a critical manner, interdisciplinary investigation methods should be reaffirmed in the field of IR even further. The research results of disciplines, such as anthropology, political economy, sociology, geography, development studies and regional studies can provide a valuable contribution for the multi-layer account of the place of globalization in (inter)national life from the perspective of both individual and collective well-being and equality.

Conclusion

In conclusion, a critical analysis of global economic, social, cultural, political and ecological transformations in IR from the point of human emancipation presupposes breaking, in one way or another, with the ahistorical Westphalian "standards" of realism, liberalism and Marxism. As shown above, such globalization debate, including the important inputs of these three schools of thought, cannot and should not be restricted to issues conceptualized explicitly under the banner of "national democracy", "national security" or "national welfare". Instead, it must be urgently engaged with the different spatial manifestations as well as state and non-state, public and private instruments for the proliferation of transnational interconnectedness and "unpredictability". Globalization and its fragmentations are not to be inquired as something outside of the state apparatuses and the wholesale domestic life. The practical formation of egalitarian

JANUS.NET, e-journal of International Relations
e-ISSN: 1647-7251
Vol. 9, Nº. 1 (May-October 2018), pp. 1-14
Epistemological challenges of globalization to the Westphalian thinking within international relations
Borjana Alexandrova

emancipative communities in a globalizing world will thus depend on modifications within, between and across states' structures.

Against this backdrop, it would be necessary for the so called reflectivist and constructivist theories that came into IR in the 1980s and 1990s to find a stronger place in the discipline. Due to their willingness to examine the broader social reality in a refined manner social constructivism, feminism, critical theory, historical sociology, normative theory and post-modernism seem to be in a better position to reconstruct globalization with its four characteristics outlined in this article. Here, the permanent search for changing social configurations beyond and within states will bring us closer to a complex reconstruction of glocal hierarchies and dynamics as well as the ethical and structural conditions for the fulfillment of an emancipative global society. On this basis, eventual fruitful synergies with the three conventional IR theories could be sought. In order to build such bridges, even more empirical researches will be needed which draw on interdisciplinary methodologies.

References

Abrahamsen, R., & Williams, M. C. (2005). "The Globalization of Private Security". Chatham House ISP/NSC Briefing Paper 05/02., 5-7.

Acuto, M., & Curtis, S. (2014). *Reassembling International Theory: Assemblage Thinking and International Relations*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Agnew, J. (2015). "Revisiting the Territorial Trap". *Nordia Geographical Publications*, 44 (4), 43–48.

Albrow, M. (2007). *Das globale Zeitalter.* Fr/M: Suhrkamp.

Aleksandrova, B. (2016). *Globalization and International Relatio*ns. Sofia: Sofia University Press.

Asimakopoulos, J. (2014). *Social Structures of Direct Democracy: On the Political Economy of Equality*. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill nv.

Axelrod, R. & Keohane, R. O. (1993). "Achieving Cooperation under Anarchy: Strategies and Institutions", in David A. Baldwin (ed.) *Neorealism and Neoliberalism: The Contemporary Debate*. NY: Colombia Univ. Press.

Bauman, Z. (1998). *Globalization: The Human Consequences.* Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Beck, U. (2013). *Risikogesellschaft. Auf dem Weg in eine andere Moderne.* [Bulgarian Translation]. Sofia: K&H.

Bialasiewicz, L. (2011). "Introduction: Europe in the World?", in Luiza Bialasiewicz (ed.) *Europe in the World: EU Geopolitics and the Making of European Space.* Farnham: Ashgate.

Bidet, J. (2007). "A Key to the Critical Companion to Contemporary Marxism", in Jacques Bidet & Stathis Kouvelakis (eds.) *Critical Companion to Contemporary Marxism*. Brill Online Books.

Bigo, D. (2006). "Globalized (in)Security: the Field and the Ban-optikon". Conference paper [14.08.2017]. Available at http://www.people.fas.harvard.edu/~ces/conferences/muslims/muslim_papers.html.

JANUS.NET, e-journal of International Relations
e-ISSN: 1647-7251
Vol. 9, Nº. 1 (May-October 2018), pp. 1-14
Epistemological challenges of globalization to the Westphalian thinking within international relations
Borjana Alexandrova

Booth, K. (1995). *Cosmopolitan Democracy: An Agenda for A New World Order*, by Daniele Archibugi & David Held. Reviewed in: *The Political Quaterly*, 66 (4), 345-348.

Burley, A-M. S. (1993). "International Law and International Relations Theory: a Dual Agenda". *American Journal of International Law*, 87 (2), 205-239.

Buzan, B., & Hansen, L. (2010). *The Evolution of International Security Studies*. NY: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Castells, M. (2004). *The Rise of the Network Society. The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture.* vol. 1. Bulgarian Translation. Sofia: LIK.

Caverley, J. D. (2013). "Neoconservatism, Neoclassical Realism, and the Narcissism of Small Differences", in Rebekka Friedman, Kevork Oskanian and Ramon Pacheco Pardo (eds.) *After Liberalism? The Future of Liberalism in International Relations*, 189-215. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Cerny, P. G. (2013). "The Paradox of Liberalism in a Globalising World", in Rebekka Friedman, Kevork Oskanian and Ramon Pacheco Pardo (eds.) *After Liberalism? The Future of Liberalism in International Relations*, 145-166. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Cohen, R., & Rai, S. M. (2000). "Global Social Movements: Towards a Cosmopolitan Politics", in Robin Cohen and Shirin M. Rai (eds.) *Global Social Movements*, 1–17. London: The Athlone Press.

Czempiel, E-O. (2003). *Weltpolitik im Umbruch*. München: Beck.

DAAD-Alumniportal. (2017). "Infographics: Remittances – When migrants send money home". [18.08.2017] Available at https://www.alumniportal-deutschland.org/en/global-goals/sdg-10-inequalities/infographics-remittances-money-transfers/.

Dunne, T. (2001). "Liberalism", in John Baylis and Steve Smith (eds.) *The Globalization of World Politics. An Introduction to International Relations*, 162-181. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.

Dunne, T., & Schmidt, B. C. (2001). "Realism", in John Baylis and Steve Smith (eds.) *The Globalization of World Politics. An Introduction to International Relations*, 141-161. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.

Eisenstadt, S. (2012). "The Contemporary Globalization, Hegemonies and Transformations of the National States." *The Culture Magazine,* 23 (2685), 10-11.

Etzioni, A. (2002). "Can there be a Global Society?" *Perspectives* 25(1), 1, 2, 6. [18.08.2017] Available at http://www.csun.edu/~egodard/asatheory/newsletters/Perspectives-2002-Jan.pdf.

Friedman, T. (2006). *The The World Is Flat: A Brief History of the Twenty-first Century.* Bulgarian Translation. Sofia: Obsidian.

Friedman, R., Oskanian, K., & Pardo, R. P. (2013). "Introduction", in Rebekka Friedman, Kevork Oskanian and Ramon Pacheco Pardo (eds.) *After Liberalism? The Future of Liberalism in International Relations*, 1-14. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Grieco, J. (1997). "Realist International Theory and the Study of World Politics", in Michael W. Doyle and G. John Ikenberry (eds.) *New Thinking in International Relations Theory*, 163-201. Boulder, Co: Westview Press.

Hardt, M., & Negri, A. (2000). *Empire.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard Univ. Press.

Hay, C. (1999). "Marxism and the State", in Andrew Gamble, David Marsh and Tony Tant (eds.) *Marxism and Social Science*, 152-174. Urbana and Chicago: Univ. of Illinois Press.

Held, D. (2004). *Democracy and the Global Order: From the Modern State to Cosmopolitan Governance.* Bulgarian Translation. Sofia: K&H.

Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D., & Perraton, J. (1999) *Global Transformations*: *Politics, Economics and Culture.* Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press.

Held, D., & McGrew, A. (2008). "Introduction", in David Held and Anthony McGrew (eds.) *Governing Globalization: Power, Authority and Global Governance*, 1-21. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Hobden, S., & Jones, R. W. (2001). "Marxist Theories of International Relations", in John Baylis and Steve Smith (eds.) *The Globalization of World Politics. An Introduction to International Relations*, 200-223. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.

Ikenberry, J. G. (2013). "The Liberal International Order and Its Discontents", in Rebekka Friedman, Kevork Oskanian and Ramon Pacheco Pardo (eds.) *After Liberalism? The Future of Liberalism in International Relations*, 91-102. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Jayasuriya, K. (1999). "Globalization, Law, and the Transformation of Sovereignty: The Emergence of Global Regulatory Governance". *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies*, 6 (2), 425–455.

Jessop, B. (1982). *The Capitalist State: Marxist Theories and Methods.* Oxford: Martin Robertson.

Jubilee Debt Campaign. (2014). "Honest Accounts? The True Story of Africa's Billion Dollar Losses". Briefing. [18.08.2017]. Available at http://jubileedebt.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/Honest-accounts_Briefing.pdf.

Kissinger, H. (1994). *Diplomacy.* NY: Simon&Schuster.

Lamy, S. L. (2001). "Contemporary Mainstream Approeches: Neo-Realism and Neo-Liberalism", in John Baylis and Steve Smith (eds.) *The Globalization of World Politics. An Introduction to International Relations*, 182-199. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.

Linklater, A. (1999). "The Evolving Spheres of International Justice". *International Affairs*, 75 (3): 473-482.

Menzel, U. (2001). *Zwischen Idealismus und Realismus: Die Lehre von den Internationalen Beziehungen*. 5. ed. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Mingst, K. (1999). *Essentials of International Relations*. NY: W. W. Norton&Co.

Moravcsik, A. (1991). "Negotiating the Single European Act: National Interests and Conventional Statecraft in the European Community". *International Organization*, 45 (1), 19-56.

Morgenthau, H. J. (1993). *Politics Among Nations. The Struggle for Power and Peace.* Brief and Revised Ed. by Kenneth W. Thompson. Caledonia: McGraw-Hill.

Roach, S. C. (Ed.) (2008). Critical Theory and International Relations: a Reader. NY and Abingdon: Routledge.

JANUS.NET, e-journal of International Relations
e-ISSN: 1647-7251
Vol. 9, Nº. 1 (May-October 2018), pp. 1-14
Epistemological challenges of globalization to the Westphalian thinking within international relations
Borjana Alexandrova

Rosenau, J. N. (2003). *Distant Proximities: Dynamics beyond Globalization.* Princeton&Oxford: Princeton Univ. Press.

Sassen, S. (2006). *Territory, Authority, Rights: From Medieval to Global Assemblages.* Princeton&Oxford: Princeton Univ. Press.

Sassen, S. (2011). *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo.* Bulgarian Translation. Sofia: K&H.

Scholte, J. (2001). "The Globalization of World Politics", in John Baylis and Steve Smith (eds.) *The Globalization of World Politics. An Introduction to International Relations*, 1-32. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.

Siwal. (2008). "Facebook, Myspace Statistics". *TechRadar Blog,* [17.07.2017]. Available at http://techradar1.wordpress.com/2008/ 01/11/facebookmyspace-statistics.

Shaw, M. (2000). *Global Society and International Relations* (online edition)*.* http://users.sussex.ac.uk/~hafa3/global.htm.

Steans, J. (2008). "Global Governance: a Feminist Perspective", in David Held and Anthony McGrew (eds.) *Governing Globalization: Power, Authority and Global Governance*, 87-108. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Stefanov, G. (2004). *Theory of International Relations*. Sofia: Ciela.

Strandsbjerg, J. (2013). "Cartography and Territory in International Relations". [18.08.2017] Available at http://www.e-ir.info/2013/10/02/cartography-and-territory-in-international-relations/.

Taran, P. A., & Geronimi. E. (2013). "Globalization, Labour and Migration: Protection is Paramount". Paper issued for ILO. [18.08.2017]. Available at http://www.ilo.org/global/topics/labour-migration/publications/WCMS_232365/lang--en/index.htm.

Teschke, B. (2003). *The Myth of 1648. Class, Geopolitics, and the Making of Modern International Relations.* London and NY: Verso.

Thränhardt, D. (2000). "Globale Probleme und Weltöffentlichkeit", in Wichard Woyke (ed.) *Handwörterbuch Internationale Politik*. 8th ed., 131–136. Opladen: Leske+Budrich.

Varwick, J. (2000). "Globalisierung", in Wichard Woyke (ed.) *Handwörterbuch Internationale Politik*. 8th ed., 136–147. Opladen: Leske+Budrich.