

Idealism and Realism in International Relations: A Dichotomy of Failure

Journal of Law Journal of Law Journal of Law Journal of Law Journal of Law Journal of Law Journal of Law Journal of Law Journal of Law Journal of Law

Dr. Shadi A. Alshdaifat

Associate Professor of Public
International Law

University of Sharjah – College of Law

E-mail: salshdaifat@sharjah.ac.ae

Idealism and Realism in International Relations: A Dichotomy of Failure

Dr. Shadi A. Alshdaifat

Associate Professor of Public International Law
University of Sharjah – College of Law

Abstract

The debate between idealism and realism continues to mark the discipline of international relations. One may argue that realism of international relations is all about the struggle for power and a quest for survival, which fails and leads to permanent conflicts. However, idealism is another school of thought in international relations that suggests peaceful coexistence, prosperity, and well-being, are ideas achieved through cooperation based on values and aspirations. This paper is a try to analyze the debate between idealism and realism in international relations and whether it is a success or a mere dichotomy of failure. The argument presented here is that both idealism and realism are two thoughts that lead to the creation and maintenance of international order. There was a power for realists and there were rules for idealists, and when the two clashed, the result was the rule of power. To this end, scholars have struggled with this realist idea. The idealism theory considers the possibility to build a world of peaceful coexistence, prosperity, and well-being, achieved through cooperation based on values and aspirations shared by humans as a whole.

Keywords: Realism, Idealism, Rule of Power, Dichotomy, Failure, International Relations.

المثالية والواقعية في العلاقات الدولية: إنشطارية الفشل

د. شادي عدنان الشديفات
أستاذ مشارك
كلية القانون - جامعة الشارقة

الملخص

لا زالت حتمية الجدل قائمة بين المثالية والواقعية في تشكيل نظام العلاقات الدولية، في حين قد يجادل أحدهم - في الجانب النظري على أقل تقدير - بأن واقعية العلاقات الدولية تدور حول الجهد المبذول من أجل السلطة والبحث عن الإستمرارية والبقاء، وهو ما يؤدي بدوره إلى الفشل الذي يقود أيضاً إلى حالة من الصراعات الدائمة. ومع ذلك، تعتبر المثالية مدرسة فكرية أخرى في العلاقات الدولية تشير إلى التعايش السلمي والازدهار والرفاهية، وتعتبر الأفكار المثالية جلية التحقق من خلال التعاون الدولي القائم على القيم؛ وعليه تهدف الورقة البحثية إلى تحليل الجدل القائم بين المثالية والواقعية في العلاقات الدولية، وما إذا كان هذا الجدل موفقاً أم أنه مجرد انشطار عميق في الفشل، وسيتم طرح الحجج وتحليلها حول القيمة الجدلية بين الواقعية والمثالية، وقيمة تلك الأفكار كأداة تؤدي إلى دعم وصيانة فكرة النظام الدولي. لقد اتفق عدد من الفقهاء في العلاقات الدولية ولسنوات عديدة على أن العلاقات القائمة بين الدول لم تقدم إلا القليل في هذا العالم المتضارب، حيث وجود سلطة حقيقية للواقعيين، والتمسك بالقواعد الخلاقية بالنسبة للمثاليين، وعندما كان هنالك صدامان متعاكسان كان هنالك حكم للسلطة، ولهذا الغاية، يناضل الفقهاء مع الفكرة الواقعية المتمثلة بوجود السلطة ودمجها مع مثالية القواعد الخلاقية للوصول إلى عالم يحترم التعايش السلمي ويقوم على القيم والتطلعات المشتركة بين البشر.

“Idealism, redefined as social idealism, is, therefore, the real first-order theory opposite to realism. While realism contends that material forces primarily determine the international system, social idealism speaks of an international society that is predominantly affected by shared ideas”.¹

—Emanuel Adler.

1. Introduction

Over the course of the past century, in specific the 1930s, the gap increased between idealism² as a theory on the one hand, and international political realities³ on the other hand.

Some of these manifestations are the Japanese invasion of Manchuria in 1931,⁴ the Italian occupation of Ethiopia in 1935,⁵ and the rise of Nazism in

1. Adler, Emanuel, “Seizing the Middle Ground,” *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. III, No. 3, p. 322 (1997).

2. Idealism theories are mainly divided into two groups. Subjective idealism takes as its starting point the given fact of human consciousness seeing the existing world as a combination of sensation. Objective idealism posits the existence of an objective consciousness which exists before and, in some sense, independently of human ones. In a sociological sense, idealism emphasizes how human ideas—especially beliefs and values—shape society. Macionis, J., *Sociology*, 14th Edition. Boston: Pearson, p. 88, 2012.

3. In realities and international relations, see Harold Guetzkow, *Simulation in International Relations: Developments for Research and Teaching*. Chadwick F. Alger, Richard A. Brody, Robert C. Noel, Richard C. Snyder; *Simulation in Social Science: Readings*, Richard A. Brody, *Some Systematic Effects of the Spread of Nuclear Weapons Technology: A Study Through Simulation of a Multi-Nuclear Future*.

4. The Japanese invasion of Manchuria began on 18 September 1931, when the Kwantung Army of the Empire of Japan invaded Manchuria immediately following the Mukden Incident. Following the war, the Japanese established the puppet state of Manchukuo, and their occupation lasted until Soviet Union and Mongolia launched the Manchurian Strategic Offensive Operation in 1945. For further reading see Coogan, Anthony, *Northeast China and the Origins of the Anti-Japanese United Front*, *Modern China*, Sage Publications, Vol. 20, No. 3, pp. 282-314, 1949. Matsusaka, Yoshihisa Tak, *The Making of Japanese Manchuria, 1904-1932*, Harvard University, Asia Center, 2003. Alshdaifat, Shadi, Silverburg, Sanford, *The Second Decade of Evolution in the International Law and Weapons of Mass Destruction: UN Security Resolution 1540 At a Glance*, 2016, *British Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, Vol 16 (2), pp. 32 – 48 (2017).

5. The Italian-Ethiopian war was a colonial war from 3 October 1935 until 1939, despite the Italian claim to have defeated Ethiopia by 5 May 1936, the date of the capture of Addis Ababa. The war was fought between the armed forces of the Kingdom of Italy and those of the Ethiopian Empire (also known as Abyssinia). Ethiopia was defeated, annexed and subjected to military occupation. The Ethiopian Empire became a part of the Italian colony of Italian East Africa. Fighting continued until the Italian defeat in East Africa in 1941, during the East African Campaign of the Second World War. For further reading see Abbink, Gerrit Jan, De Bruijn, Mirjam, van Walraven, Klass, eds., *Rethinking Resistance: Revolt and Violence in African History*, *African Dynamics*. II (illus. ed.), Leiden, NL: Brill,

Germany.⁶

Theorists in the school of idealism⁷ consider the existence of mutual interests between states leads to the solidarity in the framework of mutual trust relations, to portray a perfect social unit.⁸ However, the idealism school is deeply rooted in ancient philosophy that sought to establish a virtuous life in human society, starts with the “republic” of Plato,⁹ to Bacon’s “New Atlantis”,¹⁰ modernist socialist ideas that preached economic and social exploitation by socialist thinkers like Henri de Saint-Simon, Charles Fourier, and Robert Owen.¹¹

The idea of socialism is linked to the “utopia”,¹² which expresses the desire

2003. Akyeampong, Emmanuel, Kwaku, Gates, Henry Louis, eds., *Dictionary of African Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2002.

6. Some historians have suggested that circumstances in Germany in the 1920s and 1930s made the emergence of a dictator both possible and likely. Others have argued that Adolf Hitler possessed particular traits and abilities that made his rise to power inevitable. For further reading in this regard see Bullock, Alan, *Hitler: A Study in Tyranny*, Harmondsworth, 1952. Shirer, William L., *The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich*, London, 1960.

7. Since it is impossible within the scope of this article to introduce all of the thinkers who contributed to the development of twentieth-century classical realism, E. H. Carr and Hans Morgenthau, as perhaps the most influential among them.

8. In his main work on international relations, *The Twenty Years' Crisis*, first published in July 1939, Edward Hallett Carr (1892–1982) attacks the idealist position, which he describes as “utopianism.”

9. *The Republic* of Plato is the longest of his works with the exception of the *Laws*, and is certainly the greatest of them. There are nearer approaches to modern metaphysics in the *Philebus* and in the *Sophist*; the *Politicus* or *Statesman* is more ideal; the form and institutions of the State are more clearly drawn out in the *Laws*; as works of art, the *Symposium* and the *Protagoras* are of higher excellence. *The Project Gutenberg E-Book of The Republic, by Plato, translated by B. Jowett, 2008.*

10. *New Atlantis* is an incomplete utopian novel by Sir Francis Bacon, published in 1627. In this work, Bacon portrayed a vision of the future of human discovery and knowledge, expressing his aspirations and ideals for humankind. For further reading see Weinberger, J., “Science and Rule in Bacon’s Utopia: An Introduction to the Reading of the *New Atlantis*,” *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 70, No. 3, pp. 865–866, 1976.

11. In the early 19th century, Europe saw the emergence of “utopian socialism”. Whereas in France utopian socialism is associated with thinkers such as Henri de Saint Simon, Charles Fourier and Pierre Leroux, in Great Britain it is attached to the figure of Robert Owen (1771-1858). Ophélie, Siméon, *Robert Owen: The Father of British Socialism?*, Books and Ideas, 2012.

12. A utopia is an imagined community or society that possesses highly desirable or nearly perfect qualities for its citizens. The opposite of a utopia is a dystopia. One could also say that utopia is a perfect “place” that has been designed so there are no problems. See also Giroux, Henry A., “Utopian Thinking Under the Sign of Neoliberalism: Towards a Critical Pedagogy of Educated Hope”, *Democracy & Nature*. Routledge, 9 (1), 91–105, 2003. Simandan, D., *Kinds of Environments—a Framework for Reflecting on the Possible Contours of a Better World*, *The Canadian Geographer*, 55 (3), pp. 383-386, 2011.

to establish an ideal social life free from injustice and violence. Utopia was an English term that appeared in the early 16th century and was coined by Thomas Moore in 1516,¹³ as a demonstration of the desire to reach an ideal society. More generally, these philosophic ideas have not reinvented the wheel in the political means to turn them into reality, thus, it remained in the framework of wishes.

Utopia and realism were constant and necessary elements that should coexist in an essential and permanent tension. Carr says: “Utopia and reality are the two facets of political science. A solid political thought and sound political life can only be observed where both are present.”¹⁴ The 1840s marked the height of the utopian trials. The belief that man was “naturally” good and that human institutions were perfectible had raised tremendous expectations about the possibilities of reform and renewal. These experiments ultimately disintegrated but, for a while, tried to be ideal places where a brotherhood of followers shared equally in the goods of their labor and lived in peace. It seemed that within the great American experiment, searching for utopia required only the commitment of people who found it easy to believe that nothing was impossible.¹⁵

The realism theory¹⁶ began in international relations during the 5th century BC in Greece, after the Peloponnesian War.¹⁷ To draw lessons for that era, it was suggested that the main reason for wars at the time was the power

13. In 1516 Sir Thomas More wrote the first ‘Utopia’. He coined the word ‘utopia’ from the Greek *ou-topos* meaning ‘no place’ or ‘nowhere’.

14. Carr, E. H., *The Twenty Years’ Crisis, 1919-1939: An Introduction to the Study of International Relations*, New York Harper & Row - Harper torchbooks (1964).

15. Coleman N., *Utopias and Architecture*. London: Routledge, 2005. But also see Coleman, N., “Utopian Prospect of Henri Lefebvre.” *Space and Culture* 16, no. 3, 349–63 (2013).

16. Jonathan Haslam characterizes realism as “a spectrum of ideas.” Regardless of which definition is used, the theories of realism revolve around four central propositions: 1- That states are the central actors in international politics rather than individuals or international organizations. 2- That the international political system is anarchic as there is no supranational authority that can enforce rules over the states. 3- That the actors in the international political system are rational as their actions maximize their own self-interest. 4- That all states desire power so that they can ensure their own self-preservation. See Goodin, Robert E., *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 133, 2010. Sheldon, Garrett, *The History of Political Theory: Ancient Greece to Modern America*, Peter Lang, p. 251, 2003.

17. The Peloponnesian War reshaped the ancient Greek world. On the level of international relations, Athens, the strongest city-state in Greece prior to the war’s beginning, was reduced to a state of near-complete subjection, while Sparta became established as the leading power of Greece. Kagan, Donald, *The Peloponnesian War*, New York: Viking, p. 411, 2003.

of Athena and the fear of Sparta until the idea of state came first at the Roman Catholic Empire, where a kind of civic unity was found in Europe between 1500-1800 AD. In the Renaissance, realism appeared clearly in the ideas of Machiavelli, who emphasized the principles of Theosophidus.¹⁸

By analyzing idealism and realism, Aron puts us in a position of some tension between these two ontological positions.¹⁹ However, both idealist and realist thinking are considered extreme positions. The idealists, for reasons related to the occurrence of the atrocities of the First World War and its rejection of the importance of power in international relations; and realists, precisely because of their emphasis on power in opposition and reaction to this other school of thought. It is this need of reaction that explains, according to Aron the extreme positioning of realism in relation to idealism, in his inadequate opinion.

The internationalist thought of Aron reflects numerous tensions and antinomies, among which it is worth pointing out idealism versus realism. For Aron, idealism and realism are not contradictory concepts, but complementary; this antagonism, at its core, is no more than a part of the “eternal debate” between Machiavellianism and moralism. The debate between realism and idealism can be characterized by two extreme and opposite ontological views on international relations, which results from different considerations and actions in relation to how states relate in international society. Still, they are not mutually exclusive. In the context of the international politics of states, the question that arises is whether they, in their capacity as sovereigns, have the obligation to obey moral criteria or other interests, in particular legal or rules, or on the contrary, act in a way that best serves their purposes and interests, governed solely by the objective of maximizing power. It is, of course, two different responses to the problem of order, which fall into a certain tradition of thought in the field of international relations; they can, however, overlap.²⁰

18. Among the most widely-read of the Renaissance thinkers was Niccolò Machiavelli, a Florentine politician who retired from public service to write at length on the skill required for successfully running the state. Impatient with abstract reflections on the way things “ought” to be, Machiavelli focused on the way things are, illustrating his own intensely practical convictions with frequent examples from the historical record. Machiavelli, Niccolò, *The Prince*, Italy, pp. 120–21, (1532).

19. Aron, Raymond, *Paix et guerre entre les nations*, *Revue française de sociologie* Année 4-1, pp. 68-73 (1963).

20. Vítor Ramon Fernandes, *Idealism and Realism in International Relations: An Ontological Debate*, *Universidade Autónoma de Lisboa*, Vol. 7, No. 2, pp. 14-25 (2016-2017).

As a newly created system, then, realism was also presented through the French Minister Cardinal Richelieu,²¹ who led France to the Thirty Years' War²² in order to regain Habsburg power over Europe. The war ended with the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648,²³ which was the first treaty to establish the modern state.

2. Develop Westphalia and Versailles Treaties

Numerous writings are supporting the idea of realism.²⁴ Among these writings are philosopher Thomas Hobbes,²⁵ military theorist Carl von Clausewitz,²⁶ and Hegel.²⁷

Idealism in international relations was exemplified by Wilson's idea that conflicts showed the futility of war; Fourteen Points²⁸ was a statement of

21. Cardinal Richelieu's involved two primary goals: centralization of power in France and opposition to the Habsburg dynasty (which ruled in both Austria and Spain). Levi, Anthony, *Cardinal Richelieu and the Making of France*, New York: Carroll & Graf, 2000.

22. The Thirty Years' War was a 17th-century religious conflict fought primarily in central Europe. It remains one of the longest and most brutal wars in human history, with more than 8 million casualties resulting from military battles as well as from the famine and disease caused by the conflict. The war lasted from 1618 to 1648, starting as a battle among the Catholic and Protestant states that formed the Holy Roman Empire. Wilson, Peter H., *Europe's Tragedy: A New History of the Thirty Years War*, London: Penguin, p. 787, 2010. Alshdaifat, Shadi, *A Visible Theme in the History of International Law: International or Global?* *Int. J. Public Law and Policy*, Vol. 6, No (1), 2017.

23. The treaties did not entirely end conflicts arising out of the Thirty Years' War. Fighting continued between France and Spain until the Treaty of the Pyrenees in 1659. Kissinger, Henry, *World Order: Reflections on the Character of Nations and the Course of History*, Introduction and Chpt 1, Penguin Publishing, 2015.

24. Altman, Andrew, *Legal Realism*, *Critical Legal Studies*, and Dworkin, 15 *PHIL. & PUB. AFF.* 205, 206-07 (1986). See also Dorf, Michael C., *Prediction and the Rule of Law*, 42 *UCLA L. REV.* 651, 657-59 (1995). Green, Leslie, *The Concept of Law Revisited*, 94 *MICH. L. REV.* 1687, 1694 (1996). Leiter, Brian, *Legal Realism and Legal Positivism Reconsidered*, 111 *ETHICS*, p. 278 (2001).

25. If a strong central government did not exist a state of chaos would be created by the people of the land. One of the leading philosophers of the realist school was Thomas Hobbes. He elaborated on many of the concepts of realism.

26. Clausewitz's thinking is often described as Hegelian because of his dialectical method; but, although he was probably personally acquainted with Hegel, there remains debate as to whether or not Clausewitz was in fact influenced by him. Cormier, Youri, *War As Paradox: Clausewitz & Hegel on Fighting Doctrines and Ethics*, (Montreal & Kingston: McGill Queen's University Press, 2016).

27. Hegel demonstrates that we can be self-conscious only if we are conscious of nature. This insight enables Hegel to develop genuinely transcendental proofs without invoking transcendental idealism. Hegel uses this result to defend realism about the molar objects of empirical knowledge against Pyrrhonian, Cartesian, and Human skepticism. Stern, Robert, *An Hegelian in Strange Costume?, On Peirce's Relation to Hegel*, *Philosophy Compass* 8 (1), 53-62, 2013.

28. The Fourteen Points was a statement of principles for peace that was to be used for peace negotiations

principles for peace that was to be used for peace negotiations in order to end World War I, one of the principles is national armaments will be reduced, and a general association of nations must be formed under specific covenants for the purpose of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small states alike, which the League of Nations was established then.

The Treaties of Versailles 1919²⁹ retain a prominent place within the study of international relations. The theoretical significance of Versailles for international relations can hardly be overstated. For much rests on the question of whether the post-war settlement was problematic due to its liberal nature or in spite of it. Yet, explanations as to why Versailles diplomacy was so problematic vary significantly. What were the central factors affecting policymaking at Versailles? And what does Paris Peace diplomacy tell international relations theory about modern foreign policymaking processes? Many critiques of standard international relations interpretations of Wilsonian diplomacy at Versailles, illustrating how realist and liberals' uncritical acceptance of Wilson as the quintessential 'idealist-liberal' statesman glosses over a core contradiction at the heart of Wilsonian diplomacy: the wielding of power politics to transcend power politics.³⁰

Realism also assumes that international relations are merely a struggle for power between nations seeking to promote their own interests.³¹ This confirms the pessimistic view of conflicts, wars, alliances, imperialism, and other international phenomena.

Thus, the emergence of realism emphasized the failure of idealism in international relations and in specific to achieve peace and prosperity as

in order to end World War I. The principles were outlined in a January 8, 1918 speech on war aims and peace terms to the United States Congress by President Woodrow Wilson. Europeans generally welcomed Wilson's points, but his main Allied colleagues (Georges Clemenceau of France, David Lloyd George of the United Kingdom, and Vittorio Orlando of Italy) were skeptical of the applicability of Wilsonian idealism. Unger, Irwin, *These United States: The Questions of Our Past*, Concise Ed, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Vol. 1, 4th ed, 2007.

29. The Treaty of Versailles was the most important of the peace treaties that brought World War I to an end. The Treaty ended the state of war between Germany and the Allied Powers. It was signed on 28 June 1919 in Versailles. See Davis, Robert T., ed., *U.S. Foreign Policy and National Security: Chronology and Index for the 20th Century*, Santa Barbara, California: Praeger Security International, p. 49 (2010).

30. Anievas, Alexander, *International Relations between War and Revolution: Wilsonian Diplomacy and the Making of the Treaty of Versailles*, *International Politics*, Vol. 51, pp. 619-647 (2014).

31. For further reading see Rosenberg, Justin, "What's the Matter with Realism?", *Review of International Studies*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 285-303, 1990.

realism stressed the need for the state to defend itself against any external aggression. After World War II, Hans Morgenthau established the foundations of classical realism in his book *Politics Among Nations*,³² which became later the theoretical guide to realist writings.

Morgenthau attempted to develop a scientific theory of international relations away from human nature, he also suggested that traditional realism has relied on many assumptions as basis used to understand and interpret the various complex phenomena³³ in international politics.

The first question to be taken here is, where does Hedley Bull belong within the study of international relations? The second is his unity of method and substance, to which I have already alluded; and the third is Bull's view of international society. At first sight, it appears to be obvious where Hedley Bull fits into the discipline of international relations. He seems to take up a position close to realism, the school of thought that looks at international relations as the politics of states in their external aspects, to quote from his own account to of Martin Wight's approach.³⁴ Realism starts by rejecting all forms of utopianism, as Bull himself did. His most magisterial criticism of utopianism is to be found in the anarchical society, where he disposed decisively of such concepts as a world government, new medievalism, a regional reconstruction of the world, and revolutionary schemes for change.³⁵ Even in his first book, *The Control of the Arms Race*, he had been incisively critical of proposals for world disarmament. This is the idea with which

32. Morgenthau's works belong to the tradition of realism in international relations theory, and he is usually considered, along with George F. Kennan and Reinhold Niebuhr, one of the three leading American realists of the post-World War II period. Morgenthau made landmark contributions to international relations theory and the study of international law. His *Politics Among Nations*, first published in 1948, went through five editions during his lifetime. Rice, Daniel, Reinhold Niebuhr and His Circle of Influence, University of Cambridge Press, 2013. Complete chapter on Hans Morgenthau.

33. Morgenthau asserted "I have taken a look at Woodrow Wilson's and Franklin D. Roosevelt's attitudes towards domestic dissent and I have been struck not by the similarity but by the differences between their democratic ethos and the climate of opinion prevailing today." Frei, Christoph, Morgenthau, "An Intellectual Autobiography, Political Traditions in Foreign Policy Series, LSU Press, 2001.

34. Bull, Hedley, Introduction to Martin Wight, *Systems of States*, (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1977).

35. Bull, Hedley, *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Modern World Politics*, (London: Macmillan, 1977). But see also Robert Jervis, *Perception and Misperception in International Politics*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, (1976), James N. Rosenau, Kenneth W. Thompson, Gavin Boyd (eds.), *World Politics: an Introduction*, (New York: The Free Press; London: Collier Macmillan, 1976), Dina A. Zinnes, *Contemporary Research in International Relations: a Perspective and a Critical Appraisal*, (New York: The Free Press; London: Collier Macmillan 1976).

new analyses of the problem of international relations begin. Between the late 1950s and the 1980s, American scholarship moved away from general theories towards greater specialization, and it has tended to split into two groups, the strategists and the political economists.

Bull's own work laid stress on the emergence of a universal international society, a society previously dominated by Western states and gradually extended, first to non-Western states which accepted European values and then to all the new states which emerged from decolonization after the Second World War. This expansion raised a question which Bull had only begun to address in his most recent work: can one have a universal society without a common cultural framework, with a cosmopolitan ideal that is only an ideal, indeed, one that is not even shared by all the cultural systems? Bull's final answer was yes, so long as there are still common interests.

In the absence of a central authority that monopolizes power and imposes its will, as in the case of the state, international relations is characterized by complete chaos, where morality is very limited if not nullified.

Accordingly, the basic truth in relations between states is power. Conflict is natural and inevitable in relations between nations, while mutual relations, if any, is the result of a convergence of interests, as the saying by a British politician goes³⁶ "there are no permanent friends or permanent enemies, only permanent interests". Thus, there is another sense of "neorealism," however, as suggested by Kenneth Waltz,³⁷ and Robert Tucker³⁸ is an extension of traditional realism.

3. Historical Background

In a general sense, idealism is a philosophical doctrine that encompasses a great deal of metaphysical doctrines,³⁹ a philosophical orientation that seeks

36. The original of this pragmatism is generally conceded to Lord Palmerston (John Henry Temple) of Great Britain, but most world leaders have invoked it at one time or another to justify their policies and actions.

37. Waltz was a founder of neorealism, or structural realism, in international relations theory. Waltz's theories have been extensively debated within the field of international relations. Hollander, Jason, "Prof. Kenneth N. Waltz's Political Realism Wins James Madison Lifetime Achievement Award In Political Science", Office of Communications and Public Affairs, Columbia University, 2008.

38. For further opinions see Waltz, Kenneth N. "Realist Thought and Neorealist Theory", *Journal of International Affairs*, vol. 44, no. 1, pp. 21–37, 1990.

39. For further reading in this regard see Baumgarten, Alexander, *Metaphysics: A Critical Translation with Kant's Elucidations, Selected Notes, and Related Materials*, Translated and edited by Courtney J.

the question of existence (or ontology),⁴⁰ while rationalism is a doctrinal trend that examines the origin of knowledge.⁴¹

The origin of idealism is based on reason and denies the role of senses, the knowledge of the heart, and knowledge by revelation.

In so forth, ideology is much closer to philosophy owing to the fact that it crystallizes the three major philosophical disciplines: a) right, b) goodness, and c) beauty. Idealism as a doctrine emerged in the eighteenth-century writings of the most prominent philosophers who influenced the doctrine, and had a great deal in the course of European thoughts, in general, the Irish Bishop George Barkley.⁴² His ideas were of great influence to those who came after him. Also, in this regard, Immanuel Kant,⁴³ wrote a number of books, the most significant is *The Critique of Practical Reason*.⁴⁴ He believed that there was enough moral argument to prove God's existence as a moral law.

The German philosopher Johann Fichte⁴⁵ studied theology, philosophy, Talmud and had a profound impact on the revival of Prussia after defeating it by the French leader Napoléon Bonaparte. However, Hegel⁴⁶ was one of

Fugate and John Hymers, London: Bloomsbury, 2013.

40. Ontology is the philosophical study of being. More broadly, it studies concepts that directly relate to being, in particular becoming, existence, reality, as well as the basic categories of being and their relations. Devaux, Michaël, Lamanna, Marco, *The Rise and Early History of the Term Ontology (1606–1730)*, *Quaestio Yearbook of the History of the Metaphysics*, 9, pp. 173–208 (on Leibniz pp. 197–198) 2009.

41. Rationalism has become a rarer label tout court of philosophers today; rather many different kinds of specialized rationalisms are identified. Brandom, Robert, *Articulating Reasons: An Introduction to Inferentialism*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1st ed, p. 230 (2000).

42. According to Berkeley there are only two kinds of things: spirits and ideas. Spirits are simple, active beings which produce and perceive ideas; ideas are passive beings which are produced and perceived. Bettcher T.M., Berkeley, *A Guide for the Perplexed*, Continuum Publishing, p. 14, 2008.

43. Kant is best known for his work in the philosophy of ethics and metaphysics. Rohlf, Michael, "Immanuel Kant", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Edward N. Zalta (ed.) (2018).

44. Kant informs us that while the first critique suggested that God, freedom, and immortality are unknowable, the second critique will mitigate this claim.

45. In his work *Foundations of Natural Right (1797)*, Fichte argued that self-consciousness was a social phenomenon an important step and perhaps the first clear step taken in this direction by modern philosophy. Fichte, Johann, *Foundations of Natural Right – 1797*, Cambridge Texts in the History of Philosophy, Cambridge University Press, Ed. Fredrick Neuhouser (2000).

46. Hegel's principal achievement was his development of a distinctive articulation of idealism, sometimes termed "absolute idealism". This term is actually quite rare in Hegel's writings. It does not occur anywhere in *The Science of Logic* (though he comes close in a remark on p. 124 of the [2010] di Giovanni translation, GW 21. 142).

the philosophers of various philosophies such as Existentialism,⁴⁷ Marxism,⁴⁸ and Dialectics.⁴⁹ Hegel has influenced many thinkers and writers whose own positions vary widely. Arthur Schopenhauer was greatly influenced by Plato's idealist philosophy who was influenced by Buddhism, but he did not accept the doctrine of reincarnation of spirits. Idealism as a historical doctrine suggested that the essence of truth is spiritual, and the soul cannot recognize itself except in relation to an objective physical element, as Hegel said, "spirit is the "nature" of individuals, their immediate substance, and its movement and necessity".⁵⁰

At first glance, idealism sees evil as an object of life; ideal literature always tries to reveal the beautiful nature of man. Ultimately, idealism has spread in Europe in general and in Germany in particular. In turn, realism is a theoretical school in international relations.

Beyond this general observation, realism is a collection of ideas revolving around four central proposals of collective politics, selfishness, chaos, and political power.

Realism⁵¹ or the "realistic theory" is one of the political philosophies that mean analyzing international policies or foreign policies of states, it is a reaction to idealism as well.

It has certainly emerged as one of the intellectual trends of international relations following World War I (in the League of Nations era). At a more specific level, the crystallization of the new concepts promoted by idealists

47. Existentialism is a tradition of philosophical inquiry associated mainly with certain 19th and 20th-century European philosophers who, despite profound doctrinal differences, shared the belief that philosophical thinking begins with the human subject—not merely the thinking subject, but the acting, feeling, living human individual. Macquarrie, J., *Existentialism*, Penguin Books, New York, 1972.

48. Marxism has developed into many different branches and schools of thought, though now there is no single definitive Marxist theory. Wolff, Richard D., Resnick, Stephen A., *Contending Economic Theories: Neoclassical, Keynesian, and Marxian*, The MIT Press, Cambridge: Massachusetts, p. 130 (1987).

49. Also known as the dialectical method is at base a discourse between two or more people holding different points of view about a subject but wishing to establish the truth through reasoned arguments. Dialectic resembles debate, but shorn of subjective elements such as emotional appeal and the modern pejorative sense of rhetoric. Corbett, Edward P. J., Connors, Robert J., *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student*, 4th ed., New York: Oxford University Press, p. 1, 1999.

50. *The Philosophy of Spirit (Jena Lectures 1805-6)*. (Also known as "Realphilosophie" II) Part III.

51. The first assumption of realism is that the nation-state (usually abbreviated to 'state') is the principle actor in international relations. Other bodies exist, such as individuals and organizations, but their power is limited. James, Alan, *The Realism of Realism: The State and the Study of International Relations*, *Review of International Studies*, vol. 15, No. 3, p. 215, 1989.

as criteria for the compatibility of foreign policies of states with the ideal morality and behavior.

Despite the intellectual origins of political realism, the emergence of the school of realism in international relations is relatively recent,⁵² as it dates back to the period following World War II. At this stage, attention shifted to the study of international relations from its legal framework to its realistic framework,⁵³ in particular, the contradictory interests and the balance of power.

To a significant extent, the theory of realism relied on special concepts to understand the complexities of international politics and to explain the external behavior of states, most notably (state, power, interest, rationality, international chaos, diminishing the role of international organizations, self-reliance, obsession with security and survival). The trend of realism in international relations has undergone several developments, beginning with classic realism,⁵⁴ which was later modified in the 1970s, as a result of the changes in the structure of the international environment.

And then, structural realism⁵⁵ where in the 1980s, was further developed in the framework of neo-structural realism, which in turn revealed two directions (Defensive Realism and Offensive Realism).⁵⁶

52. For further reading on the topic see Burchill, S. et. al., *Theories of International Relations*, 2nd edition, New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2001. Donnelly, J., *Realism and International Relations*, Cambridge University Press 2000. Holsti, O.R., *Theories in International Relations*, in the *Dividing Discipline: Hegemony and Diversity in International Theory*, 1985. Slaughter, A.M., *Liberal International Relations Theory and International Economic Law*, *American University International Law Review*, Vol. 10, No. 2, pp. 717-743, 1995. Slaughter, A.M., *International Relations, Principal Theories*, 2011. Walt, S., *International Relations: One World, Many Theories*, *Foreign Policy*, Washington, No. 110, pp. 29, 1998.

53. Walt, Stephen, *International Relations: One World, Many Theories*, *Foreign Policy*, Washington, No. 110, p. 35, 1998.

54. Classic realism is a theory of international relations established in the post-World War II era that seeks to explain international politics as a result of human nature. The theory is associated with thinkers such as Niccolò Machiavelli and Thomas Hobbes. Jackson, Robert, Sorensen, Georg, *Introduction to International Relations: Theories and Approaches*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 3rd ed, p 305, 2007.

55. Structural Realism is a theory of international relations that says power is the most important factor in international relations. It was first outlined by Kenneth Waltz in his 1979 book *Theory of International Politics*. Waltz, Kenneth N., *Man, the State, and War: A Theoretical Analysis*, REV, 2 ed., Columbia University Press, 2001.

56. Defensive realism is a structural theory derived from the school of neorealism in international relations theory. It finds its foundation in Kenneth Waltz's *Theory of International Politics*, in which Waltz argues that the anarchical structure of the international system encourages states to maintain

Taken together, another period was described as neo-classical realism.⁵⁷ The different classifications and theses offered acceptable explanations for what is witnessed in international relations in later years.

A. Morgenthau Supremacy and Morals of Accountability

Political realism believes that politics, like society in general, is governed by objective laws that have their roots in human nature. In order to improve society, it is first necessary to understand the laws by which society lives. The operation of these laws being impervious to our preferences, men will challenge them only at the risk of failure.

Realism, believing as it does in the objectivity of the laws of politics, must also believe in the possibility of developing a rational theory that reflects, however imperfectly and one-sidedly, these objective laws. It believes also, then, in the possibility of distinguishing in politics between truth and opinion—between what is true objectively and rationally, supported by evidence and illuminated by reason, and what is only a subjective judgment, divorced from the facts as they are and informed by prejudice and wishful thinking.⁵⁸

Morgenthau's theory of international politics is primarily concerned with the normative, and that, in contrast to revisionist accounts, the moral theory he generates is rooted in the Judeo-Christian tradition of moral thought. Morgenthau adopts an Augustinian, rather than Hobbesian-Machiavellian, moral framework, reconciling cosmopolitan principles with a recalcitrant reality by representing their relationship as a dialectical tension. This leads him to develop a practical morality that emphasizes the continued application of cosmopolitan imperatives to action, mitigated by a consequentialist orientation which demands that they be applied cautiously and always adapted to circumstances. This generates a political morality which reconciles the

moderate and reserved policies to attain security. In contrast, offensive realism assumes that states seek to maximize their power and influence to achieve security through domination and hegemony. Waltz, Kenneth N., *Theory of International Politics*, New York: McGraw Hill (1979). Mearsheimer, John J., *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, New York: W.W. Norton (2001).

57. Neo-classical realism is an approach to foreign policy analysis. Initially coined by Gideon Rose in a 1998 *World Politics Review* article (*Neoclassical Realism and Theories of Foreign Policy*), it is a combination of classical realist and neorealist—particularly defensive realist—theories. Christensen, Thomas, *Useful Adversaries: Grand Strategy, Domestic Mobilization, and Sino-American Conflict, 1947-1958*, Princeton University Press, 1996. Rose, Gideon, *Neoclassical Realism and Theories of Foreign Policy*, *World Politics*, 51, pp. 144–172, 1998.

58. Hans J. Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, 5th ed, Revised, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, pp. 4-15, (1978).

imperatives of morality and national survival by asserting that, while the national interest must be protected, it must always be subjected to strict moral limitations. It is therefore concluded that his approach ultimately culminates in a traditional, Judeo-Christian, non-perfectionist ethic.⁵⁹

4. Conceptual Analysis: Realism vs. Idealism

There are two theories interrelated to each other, idealism and realism.⁶⁰ Plato is in favor of idealism and hence known as Platonism while Aristotle is in favor of realism and so-known as Aristotlism, however, Platonism is one of the oldest form idealism and is in favor of the idealists to a long extent.⁶¹

In other words, political idealism is rooted in ideas; however, political realism is rooted deeply in observations of the material world. Political idealism looks at “what ought to be,” and political realism looks at “what is”. Considering the above said, the comparison I am making is somewhat unfair, as it suggests there is an either/or choice.

Hobbes, Machiavelli, and Morgenthau—the most prominent realist scholars—had a clear and pessimistic view of the world. In fact, classical realists viewed states—and human beings— as selfish and egoistic entities whose only goal was power and survival in an anarchical society.⁶² For instance, according to classical scholars, states lived in a status of war against each other, and every action was dictated by self-interest and struggle for power.⁶³

In the realist perspective:

- There can be no cooperation among states.
- In order to maintain peace within a state and to dominate the egoistic and brutal instincts of the citizens, the government must act as strong and merciless power.

59. Murray, AJH., *The Moral Politics of Hans Morgenthau*, *The Review of Politics*, Vol. 58, No. 1, pp. 81-107 (1996).

60. Idealism: behavior or thought based on a conception of things as they should be, or as one would wish them to be, with a tendency to be imaginary or visionary. Realism: behavior or thought based on a conception of things as they are, regardless of how one wants them to be, with a tendency to be practical and pragmatic. Further reading in this regard see Kupperman, Joel J., “Realism vs. Idealism”, *American Philosophical Quarterly*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 199–210, 1975.

61. *Comparing Idealism and Realism Philosophy Essay*. All Answers Ltd., 2013.

62. Keaney, Brian, A., *The Realism of Hans Morgenthau*, Unpublished Master Dissertation, University of South Florida, P. 17, 2006.

63. Karpowicz, Julian, *Political Realism in International Relations: The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, p. 1, 2013.

- States and human beings have the same corrupt and selfish nature.
- Just as human beings want to prevail over other human beings, states have the right to prevail over other states.
- There can be no trust among states; and
- Anarchy cannot be controlled.

Classical realism also rejects the possibility of creating international institutions where negotiations and peaceful debates can take place. Indeed, this assumption has changed over time when international institutions (both governmental and non-governmental) have begun their significant role in the international scenario.⁶⁴

The idea of idealism is, if nothing else, to have a positive perception of the world of international relations and, according to this perspective, international institutions have a pivotal role in the creation and maintenance of a peaceful international environment.

The idealism theory has its roots in Kant's belief that there is the possibility of perpetual peace among states, and according to him, human beings can learn from their past and their mistakes.

In addition, Kant suggested that an increase in trade, in the number of international organizations and in democratic states in the international system could lead to peace.⁶⁵

In other words, Kant and the idealists' perspective focused their attention on framing unity as follows:⁶⁶

- Human beings and states are not necessarily selfish, brutal, and egoistic.
- There is no need to have a strong and merciless power to maintain peace both within the state and among states.
- Some elements can increase the possibility of peaceful relations among states through:

1- The increase in trade (both bilateral and multilateral);

2- Increase the number of international institutions;

3- Increase the number of democracies in the international system –such assumptions– links back to the democratic peace theory that assumes

64. Joseph, Jonathan, *Philosophy in International Relations: A Scientific Realist Approach*, Millennium: Journal of International Studies, vol. 35, Issue. 2, pp. 345–359, 2007.

65. Frankel, Benjamin, *Roots of Realism*, Taylor and Francis, Hoboken, p. 357, 2013.

66. Morgenthau, Hans, *Politics Among Nations: Struggle for Power and Peace*, Knopf, New York, p.13, 1948.

democratic states are less likely to initiate conflicts with other states.

It is also, however, not at all consistent with my reading, at least, the main difference between the classical and the new form is the idea of structure.⁶⁷

Neoliberals think that the structure of the international system fosters the creation of international organizations that are information providers and reduce the likeliness to cheat. In this case, the structure of the system itself implies the possibility of cooperation.⁶⁸

The importance scholarly work of Wilson, Ashworth, Alfred Zimmern, Arnold Toynbee, Norman Angell, Brian Schmidt, C.G. Thies, and Andreas Osiander comes from the fact that it serves as an introduction to the main issues of international relations theory, intending to help to understand the historical moment in which we operate. Thus, their school is a good starting point to understand the issues of international relations in today's politics.

While reading the opinions of such scholars, I seem to understand two basic assumptions: the first deals with theoretical realism, an effort to cover the totality of international relations, which is considered to be the central point that sustains the philosophical school of international relations. The second being a tradition of dialogue whose richly contributed to ideas related to the study of international relations.

5. Realism in the Service of Idealism

At the very basic level, the theory of international relations in today's world is a complex phenomenon due to the authority (power),⁶⁹ as it is the

67. For further reading, see Putnam, Hilary, "'Two Dogmas' Revisited." In Hilary Putnam, *Realism and Reason: Philosophical Papers*, Vol. 3, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 87-97, 1983. Stalnaker, Robert, "Metaphysics Without Conceptual Analysis," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 62 (3), 631-636, 2001. Harman, Gilbert, "Doubts About Conceptual Analysis." In Gilbert Harman, *Reasoning, Meaning, and Mind*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 138-143, 1999. Donnellan, Keith, "Kripke and Putnam on Natural Kind Terms", In C. Ginet and S. Shoemaker (Eds.), *Knowledge and Mind*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 84-104, 1983. Ackerman, D. F., "Analysis and Its Paradoxes", In E. Ullman-Margalit (Ed.), *The Scientific Enterprise: The Israel Colloquium Studies in History, Philosophy, and Sociology of Science*, Vol. 4. Norwell, Massachusetts: Kluwer, 1992.

68. Squadrin, Giulia, *Realism VS Idealism in Foreign Policy*, 2017.

69. However, examine the various attempts to define the concept of the offensive/defensive balance of weapons among states is flawed because of the ambiguity of the concept of the offensive/defensive balance. There are multiple definitions and multiple hypotheses, but these are not interchangeable, particularly between the pre-nuclear and nuclear eras, where the concept means something fundamentally different. Hypotheses appropriate for one definition may be implausible or tautological for another. It

cornerstone of politics. But what does all this mean for the debate? An academic understanding of international relations and power shows that they are not an internal matter and an expression of the sovereignty of the nation.⁷⁰ Hence, it is true that there are multiple theoretical schools,⁷¹ such as realism school based on strength and the balance of power and interest,⁷² and idealistic school that seeks what must be a utopian world of peace, and free from wrongs. Nonetheless, theorists in international relations often prefer idealism as to “what should be”,⁷³ and theoretically succeeds in building a utopian political world such as the Ideal City of Plato.⁷⁴ From this view, I can see that realism in all democratic rational systems is the norm;⁷⁵ the reality is the practical test of governing regimes and governments.

Realism does not mean the abstraction of morality,⁷⁶ ideals or superiority over the people, but the ability of the political system to preserve the unity of

is concluded that the notion of the offensive/defensive balance is too vague and encompassing to be useful in theoretical or historical analysis, but that some of the individual variables that have been incorporated under this broader concept may themselves be useful. Much more analysis is needed, however, to demonstrate that these concepts have important theoretical consequences. Levy, Jack, *The Offensive/Defensive Balance of Military Technology: A Theoretical and Historical Analysis*, *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 28, No. 2, pp. 219-238 (1984).

70. For further reading in this matter see Adler, E., Pouliot, V., *International Practices*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011. Baldwin, DA., *Neorealism and Neoliberalism: The Contemporary Debate*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1993.

71. Lebow, RN., *Texts, Paradigms, and Political Change*, In: Williams MC (ed.), *Realism Reconsidered: The Legacy of Hans Morgenthau in International Relations*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 241–268, 2007.

72. Williams, MC., *Words, Images, Enemies: Securitization and International Politics*, *International Studies Quarterly*, 47, 511–531, 2003.

73. Kristensen, Peter, ‘Discipline Admonished: On International Relations Fragmentation and the Disciplinary politics of Stocktaking’, *European Journal of International Relations*, 22, no. 2, 243–267, 2016.

74. Plato’s ideal state was the republic. The word ‘republic’ comes from Latin and means “public affairs”, while the Greek word used in the work of Plato “politia” whose translation is constitution. But the ideas set out in ‘The Republic’ of Plato are not political, they are associated with justice. Russell, Bertrand, *A History of Western Philosophy*, Simon & Schuster, Rockefeller Center: New York, 4th Printing, 1967.

75. Morgan, Jamie, *What is Progress in Realism? An Issue Illustrated Using Norm Circles*, *Journal of Critical Realism*, 13: 2, 115-138, 2014.

76. For further reading see Machiavelli, Niccolo, *The Prince*, Trans. Jonathan Bennett, 1513, 2010. Morgenthau, Hans J., *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, Alfred A. Knopf: New York, 1948. Thucydides, *The Peloponnesian War*, Trans. Rex Warner, Penguin Books: Baltimore, 1972. Waltz, Kenneth, *Theory of International Politics*, Random House: New York, 1979. Wight, Martin, *Why is there no International Theory*, in James Der Derian, *International Theory: Critical Investigations?* New York University Press: New York, 1995.

the state and society by protecting society from external threats and ensuring cohesion and unity among the components of the society; external financing, curbing corruption, looting of public money, rule of law and returning to the people from time to time to elect its representatives to govern or participate in the government. The same is true for the opposition.

There is little doubt, however, that building a state of law and democracy reduces the frenzy sense of realism and gives it a humanistic touch, and bridge the gap between realism and idealism. In this context, we must note that the public interest as a supreme goal of governance is not achieved by slogans and ideologies, but through developmental behaviors and achievements; these are achieved in democratic regimes through gradual reforms, whether they are directed regimes or patriarchal ones.

Despite the intense theoretical debate,⁷⁷ the question remains as to how realism service idealism in international relations? Still, one reads that realism can support idealism thoughts through the following points:

1. The international relations cannot be determined by morality, as idealists believe.⁷⁸ Thus, ethical principles cannot be applied to political action in this changing world.
2. The international relations theory is derived from political practice,⁷⁹ and that has been proved through analysis and understanding of historical events.
3. Constant factors that determine international behavior. It is therefore wrong, for the reason that human nature does not directly steer public opinion.⁸⁰
4. The basis of social reality is the international community.
5. States are the most important actors in international relations.⁸¹

77. For further debates see Walker, Thomas C., Rousseau, David L., "Liberalism: A Theoretical and Empirical Assessment", in *Routledge Handbook of Security Studies*, ed. Myriam Dunn Cavelty and Thierry Balzacq, Abingdon: Routledge, 2016.

78. They believe that the spread of education and democracy—including increasing democratic control of foreign policy—will empower world public opinion, and make it a powerful force that no government can resist. Dowding, K., *Encyclopedia of power, USA*: SAGE Publications, 1st ed, pp. 332-333, 2011.

79. The study of international relations, as theory, can be traced to E. H. Carr's *The Twenty Years' Crisis*, which was published in 1939, and to Hans Morgenthau's *Politics Among Nations* published in 1948.

80. Chong, Alan, *Lessons in International Communication: Carr, Angell and Lippmann on Human Nature, Public Opinion and Leadership*, *Review of International Studies*, Cambridge University Press, Vol. 33, No. 4, pp. 615-635, 2007.

81. State is often seen as the main actor in international relations as it can declares state of war, control most of the economic influence within the region and larger states often dominant the role of

6. Peace and security factors are the most important factors in foreign policy. States will do their utmost to maintain (and strengthen) their security by various means.

It is not clear, in other words, that there is a meaningful position of some tension between idealism and realism, and if there is, both have ontological positions.

It is an illusion to think that one can avoid conflicts, particularly wars, and that lasting peace can be achieved through the only diplomacy based on normative considerations, good conduct, and principled morals. Indeed, idealism as school is so shrill that it makes me, at least, wonder if it keeps genuinely seriousness. Perhaps, idealism is seen as a deep conviction in total compliance with the rules and legal norms set in conduct among states in order to avoid conflicts.

Moreover, this belief assumes that all states are interested in maintaining the rule of law, and in the case of aggression against one of them; the others would volunteer to assist the attacked.

It is, to say the least, the debate between realism and idealism can be characterized by two extreme and opposite ontological views on international relations, which results from different considerations and actions in relation to how states relate in international society.⁸²

In the context of the international politics of states, the question that arises is whether they, in their capacity as sovereigns, have the obligation to obey moral criteria or other interests, in particular legal rules, or on the contrary, act in a way that best serves their purposes and interests, governed solely by the objective of maximizing power. It is, of course, two different responses to the problem of order, which fall into a certain tradition of thought in the field of international relations; they can, however, overlap.⁸³

international relations within the region or even in the globe. However, after the Second World War, the impacts on state influence as an actor has become less important than before.

82. Ramon, V., *Idealism and Realism in International Relations: An Ontological Debate*, E-Journal of International Relations, 7 (2), 14-25, 2016.

83. *Ibid.*

6. Toward A New Paradigm for International Relations⁸⁴

For four and a half centuries, international relations have been seen as a matter of mutual understanding among nation-states: France, China, Russia, the U.K., and preeminently over the past three decades, the U.S.

In fact, this reality sends a disturbingly mixed message, and there is indeed real direction to keep these states representing the international scenario.

Yet in a globalizing system of rising complexity, that view has grown ultimately, and it is time for a new paradigm. To be sure, the world has moved to internationalization, despite the domestic controversy of each state. On the currency level, the U.S. currency still prevails itself as a main financial factor. That puts the U.S. in the level of “indispensable nation”⁸⁵ as its international affairs push in and out due to the global changes.

Sub-national actors, to be sure, have gotten significant attention in international relations theory in the last two decades. Here, attention is paid to some classic works, Robert Keohane,⁸⁶ and Joseph Nye’s *Power and Interdependence*,⁸⁷ in the late 1970s,⁸⁸ had a great deal to say about the international relations theory.

During the Middle Ages —indeed, until the Peace of Westphalia in

84. The various “isms” in the field of international relations relates to realism, of course, but also liberalism, idealism, social constructivism and Marxism, even though hardly anybody claims to believe it anymore. These “isms” are essentially families of theory that share certain common assumptions.

85. Madeleine Albright Statement before SFRC in January 8, 1997. (If we have to use force, it is because we are America. We are the indispensable nation. We stand tall. We see further into the future). She was President Clinton’s nominee for Secretary of State and she served as a Secretary of State from 1997-2001.

86. Reciprocity has become a popular concept in the theory and practice of international relations, since it seems to provide a way to promote cooperation without centralized enforcement of rules. Yet the concept of reciprocity is ambiguous, being used differently in the literatures on international trade, international relations, game theory, and social exchange. Keohane, Robert, *Reciprocity in International Relations*, MIT Press, Vol. 40, No. 1, pp. 1-27, 1986.

87. Keohane, Robert, Nye, Joseph, *Review: Power and Interdependence*, MIT Press, Vol. 41, No. 4, pp. 725-753, 1987.

88. Calder, Kent, *Asia in Washington: Exploring the Penumbra of Transnational Power*, Brookings Institution Press, Volume 15, Issue 3 (1), pp. 571-574, 2001.

1648,⁸⁹— cities were actors in international relations.⁹⁰ Surprisingly, the concept of global relations has been a moving factor among nations.

However, global relations are changing profoundly; moving from the assistance of diplomats to telecommunications and transportation, the latter is much faster and more efficient than it has ever been before. There is a piece missing, therefore, it is the transformation of at least some of these realists or into neoconservatives—or, better said, the convergence of realism and idealism.

While international relations are more intimate and interactive, it has created increasingly semi-new nongovernmental communities that formed the new paradigm of international theory.

Almost as vital, however, the U.N. is one of the world's most significant organizations neighboring the headquarters of the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the Organization of American States, just to name a few major resident organizations. The international relations have a different shape after the emergence of vigorous NGO communities.

It is safe now to nail down the fact that realist formulations of international interactions have been under attack intermittently⁹¹ for at least half a century, however, idealism is the new realism—it is a phrase that has appeared repeatedly to date.

89. The reason that the Peace of Westphalia/Treaty of Westphalia is discussed so frequently in the studies of international relations has to do with the implications of the Treaty of Westphalia on the international system, namely with regards to the notion of state sovereignty. The reason that there is so much attention to the Peace of Westphalia was because it altered that way that political power structures existed. For example, before the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648, there was a feudal system in existence throughout much of Europe. Hassan, Daud, *The Rise of the Territorial State and the Treaty of Westphalia*, Yearbook of New Zealand Jurisprudence, Vol. 9, p. 63, 2006.

90. Calder, *supra* note 88, at 571.

91. For more detail, including citations and references see Moravcsik, Andrew, *The New Liberalism*, in Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations* (2008), "Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics", *International Organization* (Autumn 1997), *Liberal International Relations Theory: A Scientific Assessment* in Colin Elman and Miriam Fendius Elman, eds. *Progress in International Relations Theory: Appraising the Field* (Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 159-204, 2003). "Is Anybody Still a Realist?", *International Security* (Fall 1999) (with Jeffrey Legro). The focus on variation in state preferences is consistent with some or all of other scholarly writing on IR theory. See for example, David Lake and Robert Powell, eds. *Strategic Choice and International Relations* (Princeton, 1999), Chapter Two; Robert Keohane, *International Institutions and State Power: Essays in International Relations Theory* (Boulder, 1999).

An unintended and unfortunate consequence of the debate about a new paradigm⁹² suggested that it must be expressed in abstract scientific and philosophical terms, and this will –most likely– have the theory of international relations⁹³ accessible to laypersons and the discipline itself becomes a compatible one.

Whereas classical realism was a theory aimed at supporting diplomatic practice and providing a guide to be followed by those seeking to understand and deal with potential threats, today's theories,⁹⁴ concerned with various grand pictures and projects, are ill-suited to perform this task.⁹⁵

The new paradigm that has to emerge is for the renewed interest. It is not a surprise in recent years, scholars have questioned⁹⁶ the prevailing paradigm in the discipline of international relations and it is clear that the fundamental problem is that fostering political institutions.

92. The term appears in different scholarly writings: Bull, Hedley, "Theory and Practice of International Relations, 1648–1789, Introduction," in Brunello Vigezzi, *The British Committee on the Theory of International Politics (1954–1985)*, Milan: Unicopli, p. 310, 2005. For useful histories of the English School see Dunne, Timothy, *Inventing International Society: A history of the English School*, Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan, 1998. And Brunello, Vigezzi, *The British Committee on the Theory of International Politics (1954–1985): The Rediscovery of History*, Milano: Edizioni Unicopli, 2005. Wight, Martin, "Western Values in International Relations," in Herbert Butterfield and Martin Wight (eds.), *Diplomatic Investigations*: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 89–131, 1966, and Wight, Martin, (Brian Porter and Gabriele Wright, eds.), *International Theory: The Three Traditions* (Leicester: Leicester University Press/Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1991). See, i.e., Paul R. Viotti and Mark V. Kauppi, *International Relations Theory: Realism, Pluralism, Globalism* (2nd edn.) (New York: Macmillan, 1993), and James E. Dougherty and Robert L. Pfaltzgraff, Jr., *Contending Theories of International Relations: A Comprehensive Survey* (2nd edn.) Cambridge, MA: HarperRow, 1981.

93. All theories are imperfect. If one was accurate at accounting for behavior and actions in IR, there would be no need for any others. The sheer volume of different IR theories should be a warning that international relations still a young discipline that is undergoing significant formative development. Sharp, Paul, *Diplomatic Theory of International Relations*, Cambridge Studies in International Relations, p. 14, 2009.

94. Other theories of (IR) are Liberalism, Constructivism, Marxism and Feminism.

95. Korab-Karpowicz, Julian, "Political Realism in International Relations", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Summer ed., 2017.

96. Still, through the process of the Great Debates IR theory has evolved. Aspects and results of one Debate helped prompt the conditions for the emergence of the next. For further read in this regard see Kurki, M, Wight, C., *International Relations and Social Science*. In: Dunne, T., M. Kurki & S. Smith. *International relations theories: discipline and diversity*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 14-35, 2010. Lamy, S., *Contemporary Mainstream Approaches: Neo-Realism and Neo-Liberalism*. In: Baylis, J., S. Smith & P. Owens, *The globalization of world politics: an introduction to international relations*, 4th ed, Oxford: New York, N.Y.: Oxford University Press, pp. 124-141, 2008.

Thucydides, Machiavelli, Hobbes,⁹⁷ and other thinkers have become subject to re-examination⁹⁸ as a means of challenging prevailing uses of their legacies in the discipline and exploring other lineages and orientations.⁹⁹

Insofar, have any thinker undergone a similar process of reinterpretation? A number of scholars (Hartmut Behr, Muriel Cozette, Amelia Heath, and Sean Molloy);¹⁰⁰ have endorsed the importance of this thought as a source of change for the standard interpretation.¹⁰¹

It should be emphasized, that this new paradigm suggested here is that international relations must –and to the most extent– deal with the matter of the protection of human life and freedom since they constitute a ‘transcendent standard of ethics’.

Yet, every attractive foreign policy paradigm wants at least some contradictory things and is willing to risk some intellectual and policy inconsistency in pursuit of the benefits of both idealism and realism. The new paradigm —let us be absolutely clear— is over as an intellectual and moral movement.

Another avenue for the new paradigm is to keep it flexible among both schools of thought, realism, and idealism and to base the new paradigm as a center to promote universal moral values.

Nevertheless, states are power-oriented actors, at the same time, instead of engaging in fruitless theoretical debates, we would be better prepared now “for rapid power shifts and geopolitical change”.¹⁰²

We would be able to explain the causes of great wars and long periods of peace, and the creation and waning of international orders. Still another avenue is provided by the application of the new scientific discoveries to

97. Among its founding fathers, Thucydides, Machiavelli and Hobbes are the names most usually mentioned in the Twentieth-century classical realism.

98. For further examination see Forde, Steven, “International Realism and the Science of Politics: Thucydides, Machiavelli, and Neorealism”, *International Studies Quarterly*, vol. 39, no. 2, pp. 141–160, 1995.

99. Korab-Karpowicz, *supra* note 95.

100. Behr, Hartmut, Heath, Amelia, ‘Misreading in IR Theory and Ideology Critique: Morgenthau, Waltz and Neo-Realism’, *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 35, No. 2, pp. 327-49, 2009. Cozette, Muriel, ‘Reclaiming the Critical Dimension of Realism: Hans J. Morgenthau on the Ethics of Scholarship’, *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 34, Issue. 1, pp. 5-27, 2008. Molloy, Sean, *The Hidden History of Realism, A Genealogy of Power Politics*, London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

101. Korab-Karpowicz, *supra* note 95.

102. Ikenberry, G. John, Mastanduno, Michael, Wohlforth, William, *International Relations Theory and the Consequences of Unipolarity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

social sciences.¹⁰³ A new realist approach¹⁰⁴ to international politics could be based on the organic and holistic world view emerging from quantum theory, the idea of human evolution, and the growing awareness of the role of human beings in the evolutionary process.¹⁰⁵ Engaging both schools in a new paradigm is thus more than a static, a new moral theory can be accommodated solely within a positivist interpretation of international relations.

In principle, the new paradigm means policies of regional reconciliation, understanding, and cooperation instead of modern national politics of self-interest, power, and prestige. In specific, the exercise of political action now calls for reciprocal cooperation, compromise, and integration instead of the former confrontation, aggression, and revenge.

7. Mapping the Way to A Unified Theory¹⁰⁶

Developing a theory of international relations demands that, like a mapmaker, in order to do that a theorist must decide which elements are important¹⁰⁷ enough to include and which can be safely excluded without

103. The evidence for this is, for example, the recent work of Wendt, Alexander, *Quantum Mind and Social Science: Unifying Physical and Social Ontology*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2015.

104. Korab-Karpowicz, Julian, "How International Relations Theorists Can Benefit by Reading Thucydides," *The Monist*, 89 (2), 231–43, 2006.

105. Korab-Karpowicz, *supra* note 95.

106. A unified theory should not only explain and predict, but also must be capable of digesting every combination of possible inputs to produce an output that can be or will be observed in the real world. Yet no theory to date and potentially no theory ever, can achieve this level of accuracy. The problem is not the researchers who develop these theories, but the unmanageable complexity that rules our world. The characteristics and contours of this system are what make understanding it such a tricky—if not impossible—feat. Complex systems are constantly changing, highly irreversible, subject to unpredictable variation, and sensitive to their initial conditions. Tawney, Joseph, *The System is Always More than the Sum of its Parts*, *Journal of International Service*, 2018.

107. Some of the basic elements revolve around historical, geographical, economic, ideological and strategic factors that underlie and condition conflict and cooperation among actors, such as, security, justice, security dilemma, security regime, just war theory, and critical perspectives. In this regard see Hampden, Jackson, *Elements of International Relations*, *International Affairs Review Supplement* 19, no. 5, pp 268-69, (1941). Fanshawe, M., *Why Another World War: How We Missed Collective Security*, *International Affairs Review Supplement* 19, no. 5, p. 269 (1941). Clarke, F., *Cambridge History of the British Empire, Vol. II: The Growth of the New Empire, 1783-1870* by J. Holland Rose, A. P. Newton, E. A. Benians, *International Affairs Review Supplement* 19, no. 5, pp. 271-72 (1941). Cohen, C. Waley, *Who are the Americans?* by William Dwight Whitney *American Neutrality: Trial and Failure* by Charles Ghequiere Fenwick *Inside the Department of State* by Bertram D. Hulén, *United States of America: An Outline of the Country, Its People, and Institutions* by D. W. Brogan *America's Economic Strength* by C. J. Hitch, *International Affairs Review Supplement* 19, no. 5, pp. 288-90 (1941).

affecting the utility of the end product.

Mapping the way to a unified theory however, complicates such choices as it is not clear what calculus can be used to determine which elements should be included and what weight is to be afforded to them.

This problem of interdependence under international relations is similar to the problems international law jurists faced when adapting to a new event. Indeed, the term theory in international relations in particular and in social sciences in general carries multiple meanings.¹⁰⁸

In adopting a unified theory in international relations, it is worth noting that a unified theory must have the following general characteristics:

- 1- The theory must cover all aspects of holistic social relations.
- 2- The theory must be expressed by general assumptions that are clear, accurate, and possible.
- 3- Each part of the theory must be consistent and aligned with its other parts.
- 4- The theory must be placed in a framework through which it can be developed at any time and under any circumstances.
- 5- The theory must reflect international relations and is not merely a reflection of national views.
- 6- The theory must enable thinkers to predict aspects that lead to valuable judgments.

However, a unified theory of international relations is part of the social sciences discipline; the suggested unified theory in hand should not only predict and explain the phenomena of international relations but also must be capable to produce possible solutions for complexities that confront the real world. Yet no theory to date and potentially no theory ever can achieve a great level of accuracy.

The problem is not with the thinkers who develop these theories, but the unmanageable complexity that rules the world.¹⁰⁹

108. Usage of the term “international relations” by scholars in the field is not consistent. Some use “international relations” and “international politics” interchangeably, but many prefer to reserve “international politics” for relations between governments and use “international relations” as a more inclusive term. They consider international politics and subjects such as international economics, international communications, international law, international war, and international organization to be subcategories of international relations. Mitcham, Carl, *International Relations*, Encyclopedia of Science, Technology, and Ethics, Macmillan Reference USA, 2017.

109. Tawney, *supra* note, 106.

There is nothing simple about the re-making of international relations;¹¹⁰ the assumption here is that a unified theory does not mean the other theories are in a state of failure, but that they do not reach the same level of complexity.

Perhaps the construction of a truly unified theory is impossible, but the quest should not end just because it is difficult. Instead, every theory should have a place for competing ideas, and no theory can stand on its own.

So far, no theory is capable of accounting for every possible input or every bit of randomness, uncertainty, or past experiences.¹¹¹

All theories are imperfect, and if one was accurate at accounting for behavior and actions in international relations, there would be no need for any others. The sheer volume of different international relations theories should be a warning that international relations still is a young discipline that is undergoing significant formative development. Within that development sometimes a fierce set of arguments over the nature of the state, the individual, international organizations, identity, and even reality itself. The important point to remember is that theories are tools of analysis. Often, they are pertinent and insightful when applied correctly to understand an event.¹¹²

This observation is, I find, particularly hard to articulate, and it may simply serve to say that it is incoherent or not very significant theoretically whether international relations theories form substantial debate or not.

What matters whether theories keep shaping the thinking, constrain it, and reflects the exact form of the international community in contemporary relations.

8. How Did We Get Here?

The new debate between the theories in hand is no longer concerned with

110. Further reading in this aspect see Putnam, Robert D., "Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games," *International Organization*, 42, no. 3, p. 430 (1988). Kahneman, Daniel, *Thinking, Fast and Slow*, New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, p. 156, 2011. Duelfer, Charles A., Benedict, Stephen, "Chronic Misperception and International Conflict: The U.S.-Iraq Experience", *International Security*, 36, no. 1, pp. 73-100 (2011).

111. *Ibid.*

112. McGlinchey, S., *International Relations Theory*, UK: Bristol, E-International Relations Publishing, p. 13 (2017).

the questions of human ethics,¹¹³ and morality,¹¹⁴ but with the extent to which a nation-state behavior can influence the international system.

Needless to say, realism fails to perform its proper function in international relations.¹¹⁵ It stuck itself around state-centric¹¹⁶ and turned it as an ideology.¹¹⁷ It justifies aggression as a power of politics, which amounts to international chaos.¹¹⁸

Owing to the fact, it has become difficult to arrive at one recognized theory that is universally acceptable, the difficulty comes from certain concepts in the international relations as being a state, that the sovereign state(s)¹¹⁹ have absolute power over their territories, and such power is only limited by the sovereign's "own obligations towards other sovereigns and individuals".

Another issue arises around the concept of power,¹²⁰ which can be described

113. Terry Nardin, editor of *Traditions of International Ethics*, says in his introduction "we should be particularly careful to avoid defining ethics as moral philosophy." He writes that "for the sake of clarity I will use 'ethics' to refer to a wide range of considerations affecting choice and action, and 'moral' for the more limited realm of proper conduct." The institution of morality, he says, is concerned with rules, the ethical with ideas and ends, and "especially with the outcomes of action." Nardin, Terry, Mapel, David, eds., *Traditions of International Ethics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 2-4, 1992.

114 Many authors use the terms ethical and moral interchangeably, either unaware or dismissive of different connotations carried by the words. Henry Sidgwick says in his classic nineteenth-century work *Outlines of the History of Ethics*, Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, p. 11, 1988.

115 In this regard see Axelrod, Robert, *The Evolution of Cooperation*, (New York: Basic Books, 1984). Axelrod, Robert, *An Evolutionary Approach to Norms*, *American Political Science Review*, 80 (4), pp. 1095-1111, 1968. Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce, *Accomplishments and Limitations of a Game-Theoretic Approach to International Relations*, In *Evaluating Methodology in International Studies*, edited by F. Harvey and M. Brecher. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2002. Bull, Hedley, *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*, 3rd ed., New York: Columbia University Press, 2002. Checkel, Jeffrey, *The Constructivist Turn in World Politics*, *World Politics*, 50 (2), pp. 324- 348, 1998.

116. State-centered theory (or state-centred federalism) is a political theory which stresses the role of the government on civil society. Oatley, Thomas, *International Political Economy: Interests and Institutions in the Global Economy*, 5th ed., Pearson Longman, Chap 5, pp. 45-86, 2012.

117. An ideology is a collection of normative beliefs and values that an individual or group holds for other than purely epistemic reasons. Honderich, Ted, *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy*, Oxford University Press, 2ed, 2005.

118. Alshdaifat, Shadi, Silverburg, Sanford, "Strategic Chaos": *The Role of International Law*, *SJHSS*, Vol. 2, Issue.7, 2017.

119. Sovereignty is the full right and power of a governing body over itself, without any interference from outside sources or bodies. In political theory, sovereignty is a substantive term designating supreme authority over some polity. Núñez, Jorge Emilio, *About the Impossibility of Absolute State Sovereignty*, *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law*, Vol. 27, pp. 645-664, 2013.

120. Hans Morgenthau (1960) is the foremost advocate of the concept of power is theoretical core of international politics. In his view, all politics is a struggle for power. He derives this dictum from the

as the degree of resources, capabilities, and influence in international affairs. It is often divided up into the concepts of hard power,¹²¹ and soft power,¹²² hard power relating primarily to coercive power,¹²³ such as the use of force, and soft power commonly covering economics, diplomacy, and cultural influence. However, there is no clear dividing line between the two forms of power.

In this richly connected world, the international relations with all the differences, in theory, have an extensive broad purpose in the contemporary international community, where such society needs to be more concern about:

- The origins of war and the preservation of peace;¹²⁴
- The nature and exercise of power within the global system and;¹²⁵

assumption that the desire to dominate is “a constitutive element of all human association.” Holsti, K. J., *The Concept of Power in the Study of International Relations, Background*, Vol. 7, No. 4, p. 179, 1964.

121. The idea to distinguish between hard power and soft power was first introduced by Nye more than two decades ago (1990). In general, he defines power as the “ability to affect others to get the outcomes one wants”, and command or hard power as coercive power wielded through inducements or threats. Hard power is based on military intervention, coercive diplomacy and economic sanctions and relies on tangible power resources such as armed forces or economic means. Further read in this regard see Nye, J. S., *Soft Power*, *Foreign Policy*, Issue 80, pp. 153-171, 1990. Nye, J. S., *Soft Power: the means to success in world politics*, New York: Public Affairs, 2004. Nye, J. S., *Public Diplomacy and Soft Power*, *The Annals of the American Academy for Political and Social Science*, Issue No. 616, pp. 94-09, 2008. Nye, J. S., *Understanding International Conflicts: An Introduction to Theory and History*, 7th ed., New York: Pearson, 2009.

122. In contrast, co-optive or “soft power is the capacity to persuade others to do what one wants”. According to Nye, persuasive power is based on attraction and emulation and “associated with intangible power resources such as culture, ideology, and institutions”. Wilson, E. J., *Hard Power, Soft Power, Smart Power*, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*, Issue No. 616, pp. 110-124, 2008.

123. The supreme and most insidious exercise of power to prevent people, to whatever degree, from having grievances by shaping their perceptions, cognitions and preferences in such a way that they accept their role in the existing order of things, either because they can see or imagine no alternative to it, or because they see it as natural and unchangeable, or because they value it as divinely ordained and beneficial. Lukes, Steven, “From Power: A Radical View.” In *Power: A Reader*, edited by Mark Haugaard. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002.

124. In his impressive work, *On the Origins of War and the Preservation of Peace*, Donald Kagan adopts an historian’s approach to issues that have long plagued humankind how do wars come about, and how can they be prevented. Rather than looking at competing theories of war and peace, he chooses to examine specific actual cases in which war either broke out or was prevented. Kagan, Donald, *On the Origins of War and the Preservation of Peace*, New York: Doubleday, 1995.

125. The concept of power is central to international relations. Yet disciplinary discussions tend to privilege only one, albeit important, form. An actor controlling another to do what that other would not otherwise do. Barnett, Micheal, Duvall, Duval, *Power in International Politics*, International

- The changing character of state and non-state actors who participate in international decision-making.¹²⁶

Recently, progress has been made in international relations where the international community has reached a milestone in:

- Promoting successful trade policies between nations;
- Travel related to business, tourism, and immigration;
- Allowing nations to cooperate with one another;
- Discussing contemporary global issues include pandemics, terrorism, and the environment and;
- Advances human culture through cultural exchanges, diplomacy, and policy development.

To this end, I find the practice of international relations is valuable in a wide array of settings.

9. Concluding Remarks

Idealism and realism appear to have taken their places in the literature of international relations theory in direct opposition to each other. Given the above, idealism is usually described as the belief that other nations' stated good intentions can be relied on, while realism is usually defined as an approach to the study and practice of international politics. It emphasizes the role of the nation-state and makes a broad assumption that all nation-states are motivated by national interests, or, at best, national interests disguised as moral concerns.

Relying on these two oppositions in defining idealism, realism, and their relationship is unnecessary; each can be defined perfectly well in its own terms. The debate between realists and idealists has been called the "first great debate" in international relations, a debate that laid the "foundational myth" of the discipline.¹²⁷

Organization, Vol. 59, No. 1, p. 39, 2005.

126. 'The prevailing rules for who may play the game of war and who may not are self-interested rules, drawn up by national governments and in no case, I am aware of placed before the citizenry for approval. In effect they define diplomacy, including the use of military force as the ultimate diplomatic measure, as a matter solely between governments.' Coetzee, J.M., *Diary of a Bad Year*, Vintage, London, p. 21, 2008.

127. Kahler, Miles, *Inventing International Relations: International Relations Theory After 1945*. In *New Thinking in International Relations*, ed. by Michael Doyle and John Ikenberry, Boulder: Westview Press, 1997. Schmidt, Brian C., *International Relations and the First Great Debate*, New York: Routledge, 2012.

It is important to note that, one of the general aims of any science is to concern itself with the distinction between what is real and actual as opposed to what is but merely apparent. This paper has sought to show that the emergence of the theory of realism emphasized the failure of idealism in international relations and in specific to achieve peace and prosperity as realism stressed the need for the state to defend itself against any external aggression.

As I demonstrated above, both realism and idealism present problems, there are upsides and downsides to both schools, and the need for a newly unified theory is indispensable. In short, realism has nothing to do with the future as opposed to idealism. A balance of the two may be best and that can be accomplished through a unified theory without leaning too far one way or another, and as the old cliché goes, “Too much of a good thing can be a bad thing.”

While realists and idealists place themselves in different corners, I find some similarities between both beliefs. Part of that stems from the world becoming a smaller place, yet a conflicting one. Such conflict of interests caused an upset between states, for the reason of political and personal views. However, regardless of the conflicting views, I do see much more cooperation in the world, as well as a greater push for peace which I highly believe in idealism.

However, on the opposing end, idealist and realist views will always clash in theory and practice. This is due to different political views on such subjects as war, politics, technology, and weapons. Even though these political differences exist, this does not mean the world is coming to another war, it just means that realists favor force, and idealists favor peace, understanding, and reasoning. One could write many papers about the differences between realists and idealists; however, I am humbly going to shorten my ending, by leaving a quote from Abraham Lincoln who said this better than I could. “We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection. The mystic chords of memory will swell when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature.”¹²⁸

128. First Inaugural Address of Abraham Lincoln, Monday, March 4, 1861, Lillian Goldman Law Library, The Avalon Project: Documents in Law, History and Diplomacy, 2008.

Bibliography

- Abbink, Gerrit Jan, De Bruijn, Mirjam, van Walraven, Klass, eds., *Rethinking Resistance: Revolt and Violence in African History*, African Dynamics. II (illus. ed.), Leiden, NL: Brill, 2003.
- Ackerman, D. F., "Analysis and Its Paradoxes", In E. Ullman-Margalit (Ed.), *The Scientific Enterprise: The Israel Colloquium Studies in History, Philosophy, and Sociology of Science*, vol. 4. Norwell, Massachusetts: Kluwer, 1992.
- Adler, E., Pouliot, V., *International Practices*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Adler, Emanuel, "Seizing the Middle Ground," *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. III, No. 3, (1997).
- Akyeampong, Emmanuel, Kwaku, Gates, Henry Louis, eds., *Dictionary of African Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Alshdaifat, Shadi, A Visible Theme in the History of International Law: International or Global? *Int. J. Public Law and Policy*, Vol. 6, No (1), 2017.
- Alshdaifat, Shadi, Sanford, Silverburg, *The Second Decade of Evolution in the International Law and Weapons of Mass Destruction: UN Security Resolution 1540 At a Glance*, 2016, *British Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, Vol 16 (2), (2017).
- Alshdaifat, Shadi, Silverburg, Shadi, "Strategic Chaos": The Role of International Law, *SJHSS*, Vol. 2, Issue.7, 2017.
- Altman, Andrew, *Legal Realism*, *Critical Legal Studies*, and Dworkin, 15 *PHIL. & PUB. AFF.* 205, 206-07 (1986).
- Anievas, Alexander, *International relations between war and revolution: Wilsonian diplomacy and the making of the Treaty of Versailles*, Vol. 51, (2014).
- Aron, Raymond, *Paix et guerre entre les nations*, *Revue française de sociologie* Année 4-1, (1963).
- Axelrod, Robert, *An Evolutionary Approach to Norms*, *American Political Science Review*, 80 (4), 1968.
- Axelrod, Robert, *The Evolution of Cooperation*, New York: Basic Books, 1984.
- Baldwin, DA., *Neorealism and Neoliberalism: The Contemporary Debate*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1993.
- Barnett, Micheal, Duvall, Duval, *Power in International Politics*, *International Organization*, Vol. 59, No., 2005.

- Baumgarten, Alexander, *Metaphysics: A Critical Translation with Kant's Elucidations, Selected Notes, and Related Materials*, Translated and edited by Courtney J. Fugate and John Hymers, London: Bloomsbury, 2013.
- Behr, Hartmut, Heath, Amelia, 'Misreading in IR Theory and Ideology Critique: Morgenthau, Waltz and Neo-Realism', *Review of International Studies*. Vol. 35, No. 2, 2009.
- Bettcher T.M., *Berkeley, A Guide for the Perplexed*, Continuum Publishing, 2008.
- Bandom, Robert, *Articulating Reasons: An Introduction to Inferentialism*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1st ed, (2000).
- Brunello, Vigezzi, *The British Committee on the Theory of International Politics (1954–1985): The Rediscovery of History*, Milano: Edizioni Unicopli, 2005.
- Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce, *Accomplishments and Limitations of a Game-Theoretic Approach to International Relations.*, In *Evaluating Methodology in International Studies*, edited by F. Harvey and M. Brecher. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2002.
- Bull, Hedley, "Theory and Practice of International Relations, 1648–1789, Introduction," in Brunello Vigezzi, *The British Committee on the Theory of International Politics (1954–1985)*, Milan: Unicopli, 2005.
- Bull, Hedley, *Introduction to Martin Wight, Systems of States* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1977).
- Bull, Hedley, *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Modern World Politics*. Third ed. New York: Columbia University Press, 2002.
- Bullock, Alan, *Hitler: A Study in Tyranny*, Harmondsworth, 1952.
- Burchill, S. et. al., *Theories of International Relations*, 2nd edition, New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2001.
- Calder, Kent, *Asia in Washington: Exploring the Penumbra of Transnational Power*, Brookings Institution Press, Volume 15, Issue 3, 1, 2001.
- Carr, E.H., *The Twenty Years' Crisis, 1919-1939: An Introduction to the Study of International Relations*, New York Harper & Row - Harper torchbooks (1964).
- Checkel, Jeffrey, *The Constructivist Turn in World Politics*, *World Politics*, 50 (2), 1998.
- Chong, Alan, *Lessons in International Communication: Carr, Angell and Lippmann on Human Nature, Public Opinion and Leadership*, *Review of International Studies*, Cambridge University Press, Vol. 33, No. 4, 2007.
- Christensen, Thomas, *Useful Adversaries: Grand Strategy, Domestic*

- Mobilization, and Sino-American Conflict, 1947-1958, Princeton: University Press, 1996.
- Clarke, F., Cambridge History of the British Empire, Vol. II: The Growth of the New Empire, 1783-187.
 - Coetzee, J.M., Diary of a Bad Year, Vintage, London, 2008.
 - Coleman N., Utopias and Architecture. London: Routledge, 2005.
 - Coogan, Anthony, Northeast China and the Origins of the Anti-Japanese United Front, Modern China, Sage Publications, Vol. 20, No. 3, 1949.
 - Corbett, Edward P. J., Connors, Robert J., Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student, 4th ed., New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
 - Cormier, Youri, War As Paradox: Clausewitz & Hegel on Fighting Doctrines and Ethics, Montreal & Kingston: McGill Queen's University Press, 2016.
 - Cozette, Muriel, 'Reclaiming the Critical Dimension of Realism: Hans J. Morgenthau on the Ethics of Scholarship', Review of International Studies, Vol. 34, Issue. 1, 2008.
 - Devaux, Michaël, Lamanna, Marco, The Rise and Early History of the Term Ontology (1606–1730), Quaestio Yearbook of the History of the Metaphysics, 9, 2009.
 - Donnellan, Keith, "Kripke and Putnam on Natural Kind Terms", In C. Ginet and S. Shoemaker (Eds.), Knowledge and Mind, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983.
 - Donnelly, J., Realism and International Relations, Cambridge: England, Cambridge University Press 2000.
 - Dorf, Michael C., Prediction and the Rule of Law, 42 UCLA L. REV. 651, 657-59 (1995).
 - Dowding, K., Encyclopedia of power, USA: SAGE Publications, 1st ed, 2011.
 - Duelfer, Charles A., Benedict, Stephen, "Chronic Misperception and International Conflict: The U.S.-Iraq Experience", International Security, 36, no. 1, (2011).
 - Dunne, Timothy, Inventing International Society: A history of the English School, Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan, 1998.
 - Fanshawe, M. Why Another World War. How We Missed Collective Security, International Affairs Review Supplement 19, no. 5, (1941).
 - Fichte, Johann, Foundations of Natural Right – 1797, Cambridge Texts in the History of Philosophy, Ed. Fredrick Neuhouser, (2000).

- Forde, Steven, "International Realism and the Science of Politics: Thucydides, Machiavelli, and Neorealism." *International Studies Quarterly*, vol. 39, no. 2, 1995.
- Frankel, Benjamin, *Roots of Realism*, Taylor and Francis, Hoboken, 2013.
- Frei, Christoph, *Morgenthau, "An Intellectual Autobiography, Political Traditions in Foreign Policy Series*, LSU Press, 2001.
- Garrett Ward Sheldon, *The History of Political Theory: Ancient Greece to Modern America*, Peter Lang, 2003.
- Giroux, Henry A., "Utopian Thinking Under the Sign of Neoliberalism: Towards a Critical Pedagogy of Educated Hope", *Democracy & Nature*. Routledge, 9 (1), 91–105, 2003.
- Goodin, Robert E., *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Green, Leslie, *The Concept of Law Revisited*, 94 *MICH. L. REV.* 1687, 1694 (1996).
- Hampden, Jackson, *Elements of International Relations*, *International Affairs Review Supplement* 19, no. 5, (1941).
- Harman, Gilbert, "Doubts About Conceptual Analysis." In Gilbert Harman, *Reasoning, Meaning, and Mind*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Hassan, Daud, *The Rise of the Territorial State and the Treaty of Westphalia*, *Yearbook of New Zealand Jurisprudence*, Vol. 9, p. 63, 2006.
- Hollander, Jason, "Prof. Kenneth N. Waltz's Political Realism Wins James Madison Lifetime Achievement Award In Political Science". Office of Communications and Public Affairs, Columbia University, 2008.
- Holsti, K. J., *The Concept of Power in the Study of International Relations*, *Background*, Vol. 7, No. 4, 1964.
- Holsti, O.R., *Theories in International Relations, in the Dividing Discipline: Hegemony and Diversity in International Theory*, 1985.
- Honderich, Ted, *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy*, Oxford University Press, 2ed, 2005.
- Ikenberry, G. John, Mastanduno, Michael, Wohlforth, William, *International Relations Theory and the Consequences of Unipolarity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Immanuel Kant: *Metaphysics* – Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy. www.iep.utm.edu
- *International Affairs Review Supplement* 19, no. 5, (1941).
- *International Relations*, *Encyclopedia of Science, Technology, and Ethics*, www.Encyclopedia.com

-
- J. Holland Rose, A. P. Newton, E. A. Benians, *International Affairs Review Supplement* 19, no. 5, (1941).
 - Jackson, Robert, Sorensen, Georg, *Introduction to International Relations: Theories and Approaches*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 3rd ed., 2007.
 - James E. Dougherty and Robert L. Pfaltzgraff, Jr., *Contending Theories of International Relations: A Comprehensive Survey*, Cambridge, MA: HarperRow, 2nd ed, 1981.
 - James, Alan, *The Realism of Realism: The State and the Study of International Relations*, *Review of International Studies*, vol. 15, No. 3, 1989.
 - Joseph, Jonathan, *Philosophy in International Relations: A Scientific Realist Approach*, *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, Vol 35, Issue 2, 2007.
 - Kagan, Donald, *On the Origins of War and the Preservation of Peace*, New York: Doubleday, 1995.
 - Kagan, Donald, *The Peloponnesian War*, New York: Viking, p. 411, 2003.
 - Kahler, Miles, *Inventing International Relations: International Relations Theory After 1945*. In *New Thinking in International Relations*, ed. by Michael Doyle and John Ikenberry, Boulder: Westview Press, 1997.
 - Kahneman, Daniel, *Thinking, Fast and Slow*, New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2011.
 - Karpowicz, Julian, *Political Realism in International Relations: The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 2013.
 - Keaney, Brian, A., *The Realism of Hans Morgenthau*, Unpublished Master Dissertation, University of South Florida, 2006.
 - Keohane, Robert, Nye, Joseph, *Review: Power and Interdependence*, MIT Press, Vol. 41, No. 4, 1987.
 - Keohane, Robert, *Reciprocity in International Relations*, MIT Press, Vol. 40, No. 1, 1986.
 - Kissinger, Henry, *World Order: Reflections on the Character of Nations and the Course of History*, Introduction and Chpt 1, 2014.
 - Korab-Karpowicz, Julian, "How International Relations Theorists Can Benefit by Reading Thucydides," *The Monist*, 89 (2): 231–43, 2006.
 - Korab-Karpowicz, Julian, "Political Realism in International Relations", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Summer ed., 2017.
 - Kristensen, Peter, 'Discipline Admonished: On International Relations Fragmentation and the Disciplinary politics of Stocktaking', *European Journal of International Relations*, 22, No. 2, 243–267, 2016.

- Kupperman, Joel J., "Realism vs. Idealism." *American Philosophical Quarterly*, vol. 12, no., 1975.
- Kurki, M and Wight, C., *International Relations and Social Science*. In: Dunne, T., M. Kurki & S. Smith. *International relations theories: discipline and diversity*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Lamy, S., *Contemporary Mainstream Approaches: Neo-Realism and Neo-Liberalism*. In: Baylis, J., S. Smith & P. Owens. *The globalization of world politics: an introduction to international relations*, 4th ed, Oxford: New York, N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Lebow, RN., *Texts, Paradigms, and Political Change*, In: Williams MC (ed.), *Realism Reconsidered: The Legacy of Hans Morgenthau in International Relations*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 241–268, 2007.
- Leiter, Brian, *Legal Realism and Legal Positivism Reconsidered*, 111 *ETHICS* 278, 278 (2001).
- Levi, Anthony, *Cardinal Richelieu and the Making of France*, New York: Carroll & Graf, 2000.
- Levy, Jack, *The Offensive/Defensive Balance of Military Technology: A Theoretical and Historical Analysis*, *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 28, No. 2, (1984).
- Lukes, Steven, "From Power: A Radical View." In *Power: A Reader*, edited by Mark Haugaard. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002.
- Machiavelli, Niccolò, *The Prince*, Italy, (1532).
- Machiavelli, Niccolo, *The Prince*, Trans. Jonathan Bennett, 1513, 2010.
- Macionis, J., *Sociology*, 14th Edition. Boston: Pearson, p. 88, 2012.
- Macquarrie, J., *Existentialism*, Penguin Books, New York, 1972
- Matsusaka, Yoshihisa Tak, *The Making of Japanese Manchuria, 1904-1932*, Harvard University Asia Center, 2003.
- McGlinchey, S., *International Relations Theory*, UK: Bristol, E-International Relations Publishing, (2017).
- Mearsheimer, John J., *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, New York: W.W. Norton (2001).
- Molloy, Sean: *The Hidden History of Realism, A Genealogy of Power Politics*, London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.
- Moravcsik, Andrew, *The New Liberalism*, in Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations* (2008).
- Morgan, Jamie, *What is Progress in Realism? An Issue Illustrated Using*

- Norm Circles, *Journal of Critical Realism*, 13: 2, 115-138, 2014.
- Morgenthau, Hans J., *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, Alfred A. Knopf: New York, 1948.
 - Murray, A.J.H., *The Moral Politics of Hans Morgenthau*, *The Review of Politics*, Vol. 58, No. 1, (1996).
 - Nardin, Terry, Mapel, David, eds., *Traditions of International Ethics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
 - Núñez, Jorge Emilio, *About the Impossibility of Absolute State Sovereignty*, *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law*, Vol. 27, 2013.
 - Nye, J. S., *Public Diplomacy and Soft Power*, *The Annals of the American Academy for Political and Social Science*, Issue 616, 2008.
 - Nye, J. S., *Soft Power*, *Foreign Policy*, Issue 80, 1990.
 - Nye, J. S., *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*. New York: Public Affairs, 2004.
 - Nye, J. S., *Understanding International Conflicts: An Introduction to Theory and History*, 7th ed., New York: Pearson, 2009.
 - Oatley, Thomas, *International Political Economy: Interests and Institutions in the Global Economy*, 5th ed., Pearson Longman, Chap 5, 2012.
 - Ophélie, Siméon, *Robert Owen: The Father of British Socialism?*, Books and Ideas, 2012.
 - *Outlines of the History of Ethics*, Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 1988.
 - Paul R. Viotti, Mark V. Kauppi, *International Relations Theory: Realism, Pluralism, Globalism (2nd edn.)* (New York: Macmillan, 1993).
 - Popa, Andrei, *Lecture*, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA, March 15, 2015.
 - Putnam, Hilary, "Two Dogmas' Revisited." In Hilary Putnam, *Realism and Reason: Philosophical Papers*, Volume 3, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
 - Putnam, Robert D., "Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games," *International Organization*, 42, no. 3 (1988).
 - Ramon, V., *Idealism and Realism in International Relations: An Ontological Debate*, *E-Journal of International Relations*, 7 (2), 14-25, 2016.
 - Rice, Daniel, *Reinhold Niebuhr and His Circle of Influence*, University of Cambridge Press, 2013.
 - Rose, Gideon, *Neoclassical Realism and Theories of Foreign Policy*, *World Politics*, 51, 1998.
 - Rosenberg, Justin, "What's the Matter with Realism?" *Review of*

International Studies, vol. 16, no. 4, 1990.

- Russell, Bertrand, *A History of Western Philosophy*, Simon & Schuster, Rockefeller Center: New York, 4th Printing, 1967.
- Schmidt, Brian C., *International Relations and the First Great Debate*, New York: Routledge, 2012.
- Sharp, Paul, *Diplomatic Theory of International Relations*, Cambridge Studies in International Relations, 2009.
- Shirer, William L., *The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich*, London, 1960.
- Simandan, D., *Kinds of Environments—a Framework for Reflecting on the Possible Contours of a Better World*, *The Canadian Geographer*, 55 (3), 2011.
- Slaughter, A.M., *International Relations: Principal Theories*, 2011.
- Slaughter, A.M., *Liberal International Relations Theory and International Economic Law*, *American University International Law Review*, Vol. 10, No. 2, 1995.
- Stalnaker, Robert, “Metaphysics Without Conceptual Analysis,” *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 62 (3), 631-636, 2001.
- Stern, Robert, *An Hegelian in Strange Costume?, On Peirce’s Relation to Hegel*, *Philosophy Compass* 8 (1), 53-62, 2013.
- Tawney, Joseph, *The System is Always More than the Sum of its Parts*, *Journal of International Service*, [Uncategorized], 2017.
- The Project Gutenberg E-Book of *The Republic*, by Plato, translated by B. Jowett, 2008.
- Thucydides, *The Peloponnesian War.*, Trans. Rex Warner, Penguin Books: Baltimore, 1972.
- Unger, Irwin, *These United States: The Questions of Our Past*, Concise Ed, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Volume 1, 4th ed, 2007.
- Vítor Ramon Fernandes, *Idealism and Realism in International Relations: An Ontological Debate*, *Universidade Autónoma de Lisboa*, Vol. 7, No. 2 (2016-2017).
- Walker, Thomas C., Rousseau, David L., “Liberalism: a Theoretical and Empirical Assessment”, in *Routledge Handbook of Security Studies*, ed. Myriam Dunn Cavelty and Thierry Balzacq, Abingdon: Routledge, 2016.
- Walt, S., *International Relations: One World, Many Theories*, *Foreign Policy*, Washington, No. 110, 1998.
- Walt, Stephen, *International Relations: One World, Many Theories*, *Foreign Policy*, Washington, No. 110, 1998.

-
- Waltz, Kenneth N. “Realist Thought and Neorealist Theory”, *Journal of International Affairs*, vol. 44, no. 1, 1990.
 - Waltz, Kenneth N., *Man, the State, and War: A Theoretical Analysis*, Revised, 2 ed., Columbia University Press, 2001.
 - Waltz, Kenneth N., *Theory of International Politics*, New York: McGraw Hill (1979).
 - Weinberger, J., “Science and Rule in Bacon's Utopia: An Introduction to the Reading of the New Atlantis,” *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 70, No. 3, 1976.
 - Wendt, Alexander, *Quantum Mind and Social Science: Unifying Physical and Social Ontology*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2015.
 - Wight, Martin, “Western Values in International Relations,” in Herbert Butterfield and Martin Wight (eds.), *Diplomatic Investigations*: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966.
 - Wight, Martin, Brian Porter and Gabriele Wright, eds., *International Theory: The Three Traditions* (Leicester: Leicester University Press/Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1991).
 - Wight, Martin, *Why is there no International Theory*, in James Der Derian, *International Theory: Critical Investigations?* New York University Press: New York, 1995.
 - Williams, MC., *Words, Images, Enemies: Securitization and International Politics*, *International Studies Quarterly*, 47: 511–531, 2003.
 - Wilson, E. J., *Hard Power, Soft Power, Smart Power*, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*, Issue 616, 2008.
 - Wilson, Peter H., *Europe’s Tragedy: A New History of the Thirty Years War*, London: Penguin, 2010.
 - Wolff, Richard D., Resnick, Stephen A., *Contending Economic Theories: Neoclassical, Keynesian, and Marxian*, The MIT Press, Cambridge: Massachusetts (1987).