

Realist theory argument



There are 196 states existed in the world. All are connected to each other and with certain interest. Here, international relations are the one that connect them. International relations can best be defined as the relationship between states or between states and the organizations. There will be a great danger if world without international relations because the harmonious between states and all international organizations in the world cannot be achieved. But somehow, wars and disputes happened nowadays were due to certain reasons.

Here come the applications of the theories of international relations where not all states in the world are in a good relationship since there also wars happened against each other. This will be discussed later in this report. There are 3 main theories of international relations which are Realists, Idealists and Socialists. For realists' theory, it is where the political approach that emphasized the conflictual nature of global politics, the priority of national security, a pessimistic assessment of human nature and the consequentiality moral perspective.

In short, the realist is a theory where states that practiced this would do anything in order to achieve whatever their goals are. Second one is the idealists' theory which the approach to politics assumes that law is an institution as the main contribution to the development of peace. It is also an optimistic perspective towards world politics. States with idealist theory would probably seen wars as a great violence since it is against morality of human nature. Lastly, socialists theory where in this theory it assume that human nature should be treated as equal.

The equality is a must in human life. It centralizes the power of marginalization and imperialism and government as main economy conductor. This can be seen clearly in the communist country where all citizens treated as equally to each other. All production of profit are belongs to government itself. Hence, there is no such thing as high class, middle class and low class citizen. Questions arise today on why there are states with disputes and why there are still wars happening in the world even though we are entering 21st century?

All these are going to be answer later in this report where it shows examples of current world situations with theories related to it. 2. 0 Realism and Neo-Realism Whereas the first generation of realists in international relations relied on philosophical insight and historical experience to address particular foreign policy problems an approach now called " classical realism" the second generation embraced the methods of social science to explain state behaviour in general.

In the 1980s, this effort led to the ascendancy of Kenneth Waltz's " neorealism," in which ignores the particular characteristics of states as example their ideologies, economic systems, ties of friendship, and the personalities of leaders in order to explain their behaviour solely from the constraint exercised by the " anarchic structure. " This structure consists of the absence of central authority among states, and of the distribution of capabilities of the power across them.

Neorealism predicts that states balance each other's power either by their own efforts or in alliance with others, and that balances of power form recurrently in the international system. Since the mid-1990s, the

(intentional) inability of neorealism to account for variations in the behaviour of states caused by their characteristics has prompted the rise of "neoclassical realism. Its proponents insert the particular characteristics of a state especially its perception of other states and its incentives arising from domestic politics as a secondary cause, placing it between its structural position in the distribution of capabilities (the primary cause) and its foreign policy (the effect). It is hoped that this approach will yield a synthesis between the empirical richness of the case-study method and the analytical rigor of waltz's structuralism

Theoretical schools and trends represent more than abstract, free-floating ideas. They are socially moored, and need to be seen in relation to other intellectual and social trends. "realism" has been present in philosophical thought at least since Aristotle, but the return of realism in recent years can be best understood as a reaction against the dominance of "postmodernism" in the academy, especially in the humanities and humanistic social sciences.

What we have now come to call postmodernism (even when some of its adherents disavow the label) is a theoretical position that relies on a definable epistemic stance what the philosopher Bernard Williams has called the stance of the "denier." At the most general level, what is being denied is the value of such intellectual (and social) ideals as truth and objectivity. The current version of realism in literary and cultural disciplines emerged as a response to postmodernism as an epistemological position.

Drawing on sources in realist philosophy of science in example of The Work Of Putnam And Boyd; See Antony (1993) For A Good Exposition, and in solidarity with the progressive goals of postmodernist thinkers, recent

versions of realist theory, identified as “critical realism” or “postpositivist realism,” attempt to go beyond both idealism and positivism without relying on the relativist and sceptical stance that characterizes postmodernist thought of various stripes.

In the social sciences, where postmodernism has had at best marginal influence, some critics of positivism invoke postmodernist theses about the social and discursive construction of social phenomena to move beyond narrow empiricism, but other theorists of social science, suspicious of postmodernism, are more robustly realist. To one version or another of the social construction idea, but much depends on how that idea is specified and developed.

Key postmodernist figures such as Jacques Derrida saw themselves as deconstructing the idealist substructure of “western thought,” the idealism that sometimes permeates even some self-avowed materialist approaches. Contemporary realists share the anti-idealist perspective of deconstruction and other strands of postmodernism but also develop a non-positivist account of the very concepts postmodernists wanted to deny: concepts such as truth and objectivity most centrally, but also reference (Boyd 1988; S.

Mohanty 2004), causation (Miller 1987; Also See Somers 1998, A Sociologist Who Draws On An Alternative Tradition Of Realism), identity, and experience (Alcoff 2000; S. Mohanty 1993; Moya And Hames-Garcia 2000; Siebers 2004). A serious debate between the postmodernist position and the contemporary realist one has barely begun, and narrowly partisan rhetoric, mistaking intellectual disagreement for political hostility, has prevented a genuine engagement.

But the implications of the questions that being scrutinized are large and these questions could, for the first time in recent years, gather practitioners of the humanities and the social sciences together on common intellectual ground.