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**Introduction**

International relations is a salient discipline of theoretical and practical study. International relations are characterized by a history, theories, challenges, events, criticisms and explanations. International relations is also characterized by complicity because there are multiple theories which continuously explain issues and counter explain issues in international relations. Scholars like Brian Schmidt, Kenneth Waltz, Norman Angell, Locke Kante, Ken Boothe amongst others give their scholarly contributions to the discipline of international relations. Cognizance is given to a lot of issues through a weekly analysis. The historiography, ontology epistemology and methodology of international relation is one of the issues which shall be explored further. How International relations have metamorphosed since after World War II will also be explained.

The concept of Liberalism and how it is normatively focused prescribing how the world will be organized and how state ought to conduct their affairs for the sake of peace and prosperity will also be established. The ways on which Feminism is often connoted and seen in negative perspective in the world of politics and especially in the discipline of international relations and woman’s inclusive in politics both international and in domestic politics will also be explored. The global issue of Racism and global order in international relation theories and how it has affected African identity shall also be a topic of discourse. Constructivist’s argument that the states are not very relevant in the international system. Though non-state actors such as institutions, intergovernmental organizations and non-governmental organizations play special roles, their presence is not as strong as the states will also be explained, critiqued and assessed objectively. Therefore, this paper critically aims at exploring the concept of international relations as a discipline of study and a practice of independent states.

**WEEK ONE: INTRODUCTION**

Students of international relations always ask to know the history of the discipline. From the work of J.F. Holzgrefe (1989), the origin on international relations can be traced to the medieval era and its theory is generally a speculation about the ways by which states regulate their relations. No single author could be traced as the founder of modern international relations theory. But by late seventeenth and early eighteenth century when Pufendorf and Vattel welded in. The study of international relations has changed from the initial views of the early fathers or foundation. Now there are post-positivists that are drawing attention and creating awareness to the changing dynamics in the last century. International relations generally cover world politics, and theories have been postulated to explain happenings and realities. More theories are coming up to contend with existing ones or to explain new realities and the changing tides of the 21st century. Some of these theories are challenging the western domination of the discipline and the marginalization of the South in the discipline. One of the notable facts about international relations in the 21st century is the changes and the struggle for changes from the status quo. The UNESCO 2010 World Social Science Report points to the fact that there is severe asymmetric in a number of realms, including size, material and human resources, institutional conditions, and quality of research systems, within and between countries and regions around the globe. A glance through literatures and works in international relations shows this asymmetry as the South is highly marginalized with very few literatures, studies or ideas from them are found. Most of the work on the discipline are found from Western scholars and institutions. The Eurocentric nature of the discipline and the hegemonic domination of the United States of America has made them to be the Core international relations while others from the global South are seen as the Periphery international relations. This demarcation is a challenge that need to be surmounted so as to disabuse the notion that there is neo-imperialism in the field. Scholars from the Periphery South do not need to just ‘fit in’ to the imperial dynamics and domination of the core north but should be given a place to express themselves.

The history of international relations as a discipline and its methodological principles that have involved in research and writing are more advanced than as it was fifty years ago. International relation is an evolving discipline. As years pass, more literatures are being published that are challenging the old, conventional, Eurocentric ideas and theories of international relations. It started with theories like idealism, then realism, neo-realism, liberalism, constructivism, and other alternative approaches that are yet to be accepted. This history of international relations can be seen from two view points; that is the presentism and conceptualism views.

Great debates formed the platform for formulation of theories in the early days of the discipline. These debates though used to conceptualize and understand the discipline were quite ambiguous and did not cover for every important controversies of the discipline.

One of the challenges of international relations is lack of consensus regarding having definite theories that will explain the current theory situation in the discipline. Theories are different and so are their aims. A better theory should be one that understands the reality on ground. This is one reason why the idealist theory did not stand the test of time. A theory should not be postulated out of imagination and morality ideas alone but should be what is practicable, applicable and attainable in the real world. Theories are being proposed now more than in the past. The high level of pluralism of theories is due to the perception and experiences of members of the academia. Most of these theories are not in isolation when studied closely. There are co-relations between one and more of these theories. There is a curious twist in the politics of theoretical proliferation (Dunne et al 2013).

The presence of different types of theories in international relations clearly shows how complicated the discipline is. The continuous proposing of theories shows that the end of theorizing has not yet come. Theorizing will continue to evolve especially in the 21st century with its peculiarities and as scholars continue to try to understand happenings, theories will be needed to explain these happenings and as such there will be the proposing of more theories.

QUESTIONS:

Will international relations theory end in the 21st century?

How can the gap between the Core and Periphery, North and South be covered?

**WEEK TWO: HISTORIOGRAHY ONTOLOGY EPISTEMOLOGY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS**

For a better and clearer understanding of any subject, there is the need to have knowledge about the historiography and all that covers the subject. Before the 19th century, there was not much documented on the discipline of international relations as it went through various stages. The last stage was when it was under political science. On the history of international relations, there is more information and controversy now that there was half a century ago.

International relations have metamorphosed since after World War II. Brian Schmidt (2013) in the Handbook of International Relations addressed the various interpretations of how development in the field had been. International relations (IR), according to the widely documented story came to be an independent discipline in 1919 with the founding of a chair for the study of international politics at the University College of Wales, Aberystwyth. Before 1919, IR was a part of political science. There are still arguments that IR is still a child of Political Science and that there was no need for it to be independent. Over time, especially since after WWII, IR as a discipline has taken a modern turn to a discipline that will be universal with intellectual ideas and theories that cut across social sciences and the humanities. At the early stage, theories in IR were propounded through Great Debates. These debates helped to shape the discipline, but it has evolved into what Tim Dunne (2013) would call “a period in which theory-building has largely been replaced by the much narrower activity of hypothesis testing “.

Over time IR has taken a multiplicity nature. This shows the pluralistic nature of the discipline and it affects scholarships. The consequences of the multiplicity of IR include co-existence, differences in geographical location, interaction of different societies, combinations of local patterns of development and dialectical changes. According to Justin Rosenberg (2016), these five consequences of multiplicity tell us that the international is something much larger than a sub-field of politics – or even Political Economy.

The article, International Relations: The Story So Far by Ken Booth gave a detailed account of the birth of the academic discipline of IR. It is significant to note that this account is Eurocentric. IR has really come a long way and has been instrumental in postulating and explaining global realities. Celebrating the past sets the pace to work harder to achieve more and better in the future. This can be achieved by paying more attention to the present challenges facing the discipline and proffering contemporary solutions.

While History, Geography, Sociology and other disciplines have firm and distinct points through which they view the world, IR is still grabbling. This is portraying IR to still be in the Prison of Political Science as there are no core phenomena to explain the ontology of the discipline. The multiplicity nature of IR should be a platform to discover a new ontological entrance that would unlock the prison of Political Science that IR is in. while multiplicity is seen as a state of anarchy for the discipline, it is necessary for anarchy to exist as it could help to develop an argument for the emancipation of IR. For a better IR in the 21st century, the discipline should be universal and the international should not be limited to the North alone. There is need to create space and room for others in the South and their perspective given equal attention.

Some academics believe that IR should be classified as an academic discipline called International Studies. This could help the profession adopt a global perspective rather than the Eurocentric one it currently has.

To assure the field's future dynamics and creativity, Ursula Daxecker et al (2020) believe that IR scholars must apply 'interdisciplinary' perspectives.

This argument is important because there is no way that one would study IR in isolation without referring to other disciplines in Humanities and Social Sciences. For instance, we cannot discuss the origin of IR without looking into the History books of documented works in the past.

Theories are the one of the major ingredients that are needed for a better understanding of the discipline of IR. The formulations of theories did not end with the Great Debates. There are even more theories being propounded by scholars now based on the realities of the present time. New theories such as Feminism and Racism are being propounded with the realities of the time. The Great Debates could have died but theories are not dead. Rather, they are taking a more modern approach.

QUESTION:

1. Are there any other account of the history of IR?

**WEEK THREE: REALISM**

Realism is a theory in international relations that seeks to explain the world as it really is. It takes its stand on the assumption that the state is the principal actor in the international system and that maximum power is the quest of all states. The roots of realism can be traced to historical writings especially that of Thucydides on the Peloponnesian war from 431 – 404 BCE. The Melina dialogue gives a succinct explanation of a typical realist way of reasoning and coercion. The thought pattern and behaviors of Thucydides during the dialogue shows similarities with the modern world. Although the term ‘realism’ did not exist then until the twentieth century when renowned scholar, Hans J. Morgenthau adopted the name ‘realism’ to explain the word as it is in his work. Realism is a theory that depicts international affairs as a struggle for power among self-interested states. However is also looking at the competition and war nor conflict in international relation which is what Waltz in renowned realism is talking about.

States live in a context of anarchy – that is, in the absence of anyone being in charge internationally. Anarchy and state politics cannot be separated. . According to Alexander Wendt's article Anarchy is what nations make of it: the social construction of power politics, the condition of anarchy in the international system is expected to foster good competition and collaboration.

In his article Anarchy and the Struggle for Power, John Mearsheimer argues that major nations continue to seek more power with the objective of achieving hegemony.

Hegemony is basically the reason while states search and pursue power. The struggle of every world superpower is to attain hegemony or maintain their hegemonic place if already there.

Anarchy is a notion in the international system in which states have no central authority over them, rather than a condition of war. This state of anarchy is responsible for the high level of competitiveness among states. In the twenty-first century, anarchy is advantageous because multipolarity and international rivalry motivate governments to develop. This isn't to say that states aren't working together.

The cooperation among states makes countries to associate with each other nor allied with each other as it was agued by Stephen, M and was pointed out on Waltz’s Alliance formation and the balance of world power. States alliance is the main source where all the issues and danger is coming from, which is aligning with the state that poses the major threat. For every alliance that is created, each state has their interest, whether the dominant or the weak state. While states create alliances for survival, the safer strategy is to join alliance with dominant powers who they believe would not readily want to dominate them. Alliances are good as they form cooperation between states. Though the dominant states continue to secure their hegemonic powers. The assumption that bandwagoning with a state that is a threat as a form of appeasement could be reasonable so as not to fall prey in the hands of the superpower. The war in Ukraine can be viewed from this perspective. If Ukraine had chosen to bandwagon with Russia, this war will not have begun. Bandwagoning help smaller states to secure their sovereignty especially if they know that bandwagoning with the bigger state will keep them away from war. One would want to think that Ukraine should have bandwagon with Russia just to prevent war, there is no assurance that doing this would have ensured their sovereignty especially with the present administration in Russia. States generally prefer to balance than bandwagoning for this very reason. It is more reliable that a balance will be more favorable than bandwagoning.

Though no state can survive alone with interactions and cooperation with other states, I agree with Kant that there is no need for a world government. States should be totally autonomous and the importance of non-interventions.

This is an ideal way but how possible and feasible is that in the world today?

The world has become a global village. What affects a state sort of affect the region, continent or the world at large?

Take for instance, if ECOWAS had not interfered in the Liberia war in the 1990s, all states in the West Africa region would have been affected. They would have had to deal with refugees in the states and other complications. So, the best was to interfere and stop the war. That way, the war did not sip into neighboring states. Interventions are necessary to forestall bigger wars and consequences.

QUESTION

Would the war have been averted if Ukraine had form alliance with Russia?

**WEEK FOUR: NEOREALISM:**

Neorealism, also known as structural realism, is an international relations theory that emphasizes the significance of power polities in international relations, sees rivalry and conflict as enduring elements, and believes that cooperation has leaser possibilities.

The fundamental ideas of neorealism allow for a systematic way to examining changes in state behavior, yet few authors refer to their own theories as REALIST.

There are six basic principles.

Anarchy,

Polarity,

Structure,

Capability,

The distribution of power

Polarity and National Interest

Because there is no central authority, Neorealism thinks that conflict arises as a result of anarchy. Because there is no central authority, nations can seek power to aid themselves.

Because war is a result of the international system's anarchic nature, neorealist believe it will persist in the future. Indeed, neorealist frequently argue that the international system's organizing principle has remained essentially unchanged since Thucydides' time until the advent of nuclear weapons.

Other theorists describe the belief that long-term peace is unlikely to be reached as a largely gloomy view of international relations.

The democratic peace idea and accompanying studies, such as the book Never at War, are one of the key challenges to neorealism Neorealist respond to this problem by claiming that democratic peace theorists tend to cherry-pick definitions of democracy,

THE NEOREALISM CRITICISM: Domestic Politics Ignorance, Gains from trade and institutions' calming effects, the significance of regime type for comparable foreign policy behavior

NOTE: An international system in which another state or group of states is unable to counterbalance the might of the most powerful is similar to a political system without checks and balances, with depressing predictability when rulers establish dominance.

**WEEK FIVE: LIBRALISM**

Liberalism is normatively aspiration in focus prescribing for how the world will be organized and how state ought to conduct their affairs for the sake of peace and prosperity, and this is evident in Norman Angell’s Great Illusion {reading 3.3} penned on the eve of WW1

However the philosophical foundation of liberalism stretch back for centuries through the works of Locke, Kant and others.

The Author Kant argued that the high degree of Economic interdependence in the world would make war prohibitively costly and therefore obsolete.

Generation would seem to discredit the liberal philosophy entirely, prompting Morgenthau to pen his “relist” theory following WW11 which said that the liberal tradition of international relation theory has stepped away from its normative –prescriptive origins and refocused on explaining empirical observation in the political world

Comparison of liberal traditional and Modern liberalism according to KANT

Liberal tradition contended its own augment on how to make the world a better and habitable or prescription of how more trade can banish war and introduce peace

Why the modern Liberalism identifies way in which cooperation among state can enhance the economic slandered of the states just as describe according to Silverstone

However the comparison points are: Liberal Tradition believed that the international system is one of the reason why state experience Anarchy, although realism and liberalism can both be considered as state behavior.

Furthermore both argue that state act rationally in order to maximize their utility whether that is conceived of as military power {realism} or economic prosperity and wealth {Liberalism}

However the supporting idea is that the establishment of neoliberal institutionalism who main assumptions and contribution are described by Keenen the branch of international relation theory distinguishes from institutions their formal and informal rules that can influence and incentivize state to behave in desirable way from organization that often embody, implement and oversees these rule of the game, they by this can make state to move beyond the security dilemma for mutual gain.

In which they proposed that over an extended period of time might give other state greater confidence nor hope that the cooperation will not lead to betrayal

Second idea by modern liberal international relation theory is that, which was anticipated by Angell pacifying effect of Economic interdependence, scholars like Rosecrans have demonstrated that state that are highly interdependent on one another in trade and finance are less likely to go to war

According to the literature on the democracy peace as one of their ideas of liberal theory in which they said that war between democracies are exceedingly rare in the history of world in which they have developed two main explanation of mechanism that account for peaceful resolution between democratic state known as (democratic dyads}

My theoretically conceptual information is this.

In addition to what Locke Kant explained about the world peace and prosperity I believed that the interdependence of state would make war to be reduce among state but it may not abolished war totally as he argued, just as we know that without politics there will be no war and without war they will be no politics, also as we know according to this reading that another effect of state that can lead to such war is when a state is Economically dependent on another state which can lead to economic colonization and slavery.

E.g. Nigeria depends heavily on china for their economic survival which what they get in return is slavery and that can someday lead us to hunger war because what we get in return is not up to what we exploit out.

**QUESTION**;

How can cooperation among states determine an equal-gain as it relates to the balance of power?

Why is war between democracies highly unlikely?

Are all the states practicing the same types of democracy?

**PREDITIONS**;

The fact is that you can never be 100% sure of another states intention during cooperation among state. But observing responsible by following the rules such as international conversation well not end in betrayal

Just as Nigeria has been observing china for a period of time and they found them worthy to cooperate with them in terms of loan lending

The most important thing in this book according to Kent is that when a state become interdependent it will make them to be economical balance and less possibility of war, however war between democracies are exceeding rare because they have a regulatory body that supervise all the state.

In summary the augment of the philosophy Kant about economic interdependent theory can never be over emphasizes

Nevertheless modern Liberalism also is looking at the cooperation among state in which that will promote peace and prosperity through the practice of democratic.

**WEEK SIX: CONSTRUCTIVISM**

Theories come about to explain events and why that occur. After the Second World War, Realism and Liberalism were propounded to explain events. After them came Constructivism which is quite complex as it generally came up after the Cold War to explain the transformations taking place in the international system. While realism centered on the competition and cooperation between states, liberalism argued that the international system is controlled by identity, interests, ideas and norms. For constructivists, new knowledge is built from old experience and anarchy leads to conflict because for states to survive, they see other states as enemies.

Identity play an important role in international relations. It is what/who a state and it is what leads to their interest. Identity of a state is the representation of that state. And it comes from the interest of the state. Life experiences define the identity of a state. Often the preference and interest of a state is tied to their identity. The identity and interest of states greatly influence their actions and inactions in the international system. States act on the norms that are favorable to them.

Institutions have great impact on transformation and the state of anarchy provides a convenient ground for institutions to influence the international system. In his review article of The Constructivist Turn in International Relations Theory Jeffery Checkel argued that constructivism remains a method more than anything else.

I disagree with constructivist’s argument that the states are not very relevant in the international system. Though non-state actors such as institutions, intergovernmental organizations and non-governmental organizations play special roles, their presence is not as strong as the states. While the international system can survive without non-state actors, it cannot survive without states.

Norms could be domestic or international. Norms have been a part of politics and international affairs long before the present day understanding. Norms are defined as a standard of appropriate behavior for actors with a given identity' (Katzenstein 1996, 5). They are very important as they are significant in logical responses. With the presence of norms, states and intergovernmental organizations to inter-relate. For instance, UNESCO had been able to penetrate the world because of its norms. And the United Nations use norms in the course of their treaties and charter. In international relations, the presence and application of norms by states and non-state actors would be highly beneficial. Although norms are not always followed by powerful states when the norms are not to their advantage. Often World powers choose to not accept some international norms that are not to their advantage at any point in time. This is the case of what Russia have chosen to do by going against the UN charter and attacking Ukraine. Fennimore’s work is very timely as it answered questions about constructivism and sought to fill up many gaps lacking in the explanation of this theory. Though he disagreed that constructivism is not a theory but an approach to social inquiry. He based his argument on the assumptions that the environment influences states to take actions and the environmental setting could provide states with the understanding of what their interest would be.

Norms are created to contribute positively and make life better but there are some cases when people see some norms as being bad but as Martha Fennimore and Kathryn Skink in their article International Norm Dynamics and Political Change opine that the norms most of us would consider "bad"-norms about racial superiority, divine right, imperialism-were once powerful because some groups believed in the appropriateness (that is, the "goodness") of the norm, and others either accepted it as obvious or inevitable or had no choice but to accept it. The stages of norms norm emergence, norm cascade and norm internalization) are very important and useful. It is the ideal for norms to pass through these stages but when there are no expertise, the stages may not work.

Realists will argue that their theory is the best to explain international system and events, the Liberalists will argue their points too. And now the Constructivists. One would want to know for sure which approach give the best explanation and the most reliable.. But the fact that these debates recur so regularly offers proof that no approach can sustain claims to monopoly on truth-or even on useful in- sights”. This clearly explains that no one approach have monopoly or superiority in the field. Scholars often, discuss and critique each of the approach and arguments based on the realities of the present day.

The role played by International Organizations (IO) in the system have helped to bring some level of balance as they incorporate liberal norms into global governance. Through them, norms such as gender equality, good governance and human rights are being incorporated into global policies.

In conclusion, even constructivism, like other approached have not been able to unify the theoretical assumptions in international relations. Though the methodology used in explaining the action of states and non-state actors are very relevant in the 21st century.

QUESTION;

Why did the constructivists neglect the important of state’s roles in international system?

**WEEK SEVEN: POSTCOLONIAL CRITIQUE OF MAINSTREAM INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS THEORIES**

One of the most difficult challenges in mainstream international relations is the acceptance of post colonialism because of its unconventional nature in the academics. Rita Abrahamsen in her article Post colonialism wrote that postcolonial approaches to international relations stem in large part from its dissatisfaction with mainstream international relations, and the latter’s traditional focus on superpower politics, states and the balance of power. Identity, hybridity and authenticity are key themes in postcolonial theory that are linked to the understanding of power.

Postcolonial era came with a hybrid of individuals that have become so westernized that there is difficulty in de-westernizing our way of life. This is the same challenge with our identity and culture.

Mainstream international relations have been Eurocentric and have always only seen their side of the argument as the correct and authentic one. Such as the narration of the origin of international relations that was traced to the University of Wales in Aberystwyth.

Relations has started gaining grounds in international relations. It took such a long time to bring this narration to the fore because the Europeans even after decolonialization do still colonize our educational systems and literature. Sanjay Seth in Postcolonial Theory and the Critique of International Relations also corroborated the deceptive effect the Western narration of the history of international relations have had on students of other disciplines such as History over the years. He also queried the universality of mainstream international relations and the coercive and hierarchical attitude of the Global North. This can be seen in the way and manner they react to anything that comes/coming from the South. Even the literatures from the South are being excessively scrutinized far more than would be done from one from North.

Postcolonial theory argues that even after decolonialization, the Europeans still have great impact on our policies and knowledge. I agree with Jasmine .j article which said until the academia proffer alternative literatures and policies that are from the South, our understanding and acceptance of global politics will remain Eurocentric. There is the need for our Academia and policymakers to form a synergy and work together to reduce the impact of colonialism even in the 21st century.

Ramakrishna A.K came as a consolation to us in Africa with his article The Gaze of Orientalism: Reflections on Linking Post colonialism and International relations that brought similar challenge that Africans are facing from the Asian perspective (i.e., the Orientals). He showed that there have been famous scholars from the South such as Edward Said that are not so popular in the North because of discrimination from mainstream international relations. His critique of post colonialism is coming at a good time where many voices are raising about postcolonial theory.

In Beyond the Political: A Post-Colonial Rethinking of International Relations, Philip Darby argued that the political in contemporary Western rhetoric marginalizes non-European peoples' struggles for economic justice and racial equality.

The differences in the North and South are parallel and would continue until the North accept the South in the field of international relations. The need to redeem the universe from Euro centrism was succinctly discussed by Kamran Mating in his work, redeeming the Universe: : Post colonialism and Euro centrism’s Inner Life Post colonialism poses a challenge to mainstream international relations, and they (the Europeans) are attempting to subtly counter this by continuing to infiltrate the South with their literatures, as they do not want the South to present a world of international relations that differs from what they (the Europeans) have presented.

The struggle for acceptance of postcolonial theory, and the placement of post colonialism will not stop because the people of the South have a large population on the globe.

QUESTION:

How can the African identity be recognized globally?

What are the measures to be obtained for the African voice to be heard?

**WEEK EIGHT: POSTCOLONIAL CRITIQUE OF MAINSTREAM INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS THEORIES**

One of the most difficult challenges in mainstream international relations is the acceptance of post colonialism because of its unconventional nature in the academics. Rita Abrahamsen in her article post colonialism wrote that postcolonial approaches to international relations stem in large part from its dissatisfaction with mainstream international relations, and the latter’s traditional focus on superpower politics, states and the balance of power. Identity, hybridity and authenticity are key themes in postcolonial theory that are linked to the understanding of power.

Postcolonial era came with a hybrid of individuals that have become so westernized that there is difficulty in de-westernizing our way of life. This is the same challenge with our identity and culture.

Mainstream international relations have been Eurocentric and have always only seen their side of the argument as the correct and authentic one. Such as the narration of the origin of international relations that was traced to the University of Wales in Aberystwyth.

Relations has started gaining grounds in international relations. It took such a long time to bring this narration to the fore because the Europeans even after decolonialization do still colonize our educational systems and literature. Sanjay Seth in Postcolonial Theory and the Critique of International Relations also corroborated the deceptive effect the Western narration of the history of international relations have had on students of other disciplines such as History over the years. He also queried the universality of mainstream international relations and the coercive and hierarchical attitude of the Global North. This can be seen in the way and manner they react to anything that comes/coming from the South. Even the literatures from the South are being excessively scrutinized far more than would be done from one from North.

Postcolonial theory argues that even after decolonialization, the Europeans still have great impact on our policies and knowledge. I agree with Jasmine .j article which said until the academia proffer alternative literatures and policies that are from the South, our understanding and acceptance of global politics will remain Eurocentric. There is the need for our Academia and policymakers to form a synergy and work together to reduce the impact of colonialism even in the 21st century.

Ramakrishnan A.K came as a consolation to us in Africa with his article The Gaze of Orientalism: Reflections on Linking post colonialism and International relations that brought similar challenge that Africans are facing from the Asian perspective (i.e., the Orientals). He showed that there have been famous scholars from the South such as Edward Said that are not so popular in the North because of discrimination from mainstream international relations. His critique of post colonialism is coming at a good time where many voices are raising about postcolonial theory.

In Beyond the Political: A Post-Colonial Rethinking of International Relations, Philip Darby argued that the political in contemporary Western rhetoric marginalizes non-European peoples' struggles for economic justice and racial equality. The North and South's disputes are parallel and will continue until the North accepts the South in international relations. Kamran Mating emphasized the necessity to redeem the cosmos from Euro centrism simply in his work, redeeming the Universe.

The Inner Life of Euro centrism and Post-Colonialism Post colonialism poses a challenge to mainstream international relations, and they (the Europeans) are attempting to subtly counter this by continuing to infiltrate the South with their literatures, as they do not want the South to present a world of international relations that differs from what they (the Europeans) have presented.

The struggle for acceptance of postcolonial theory and placement of postcolonialism will not stop because the people of the South have a substantial population on the planet. Their voice and space should be acknowledged and accepted in the 'full' study of world affairs.

**QUESTION**:

How can the African identity be recognized globally?

What are the measures to be obtained for the African voice to be heard?

**WEEK NINE: FEMINISM, INTERNATION PATRIARCHY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS THEORY**

Feminism is often connoted and seen in negative perspective in the world of politics and especially in the discipline of international relations. According to Elizabeth G. Matthews and Rhonda L. Callaway in their book International Relations Theory: A Primer, feminism is interdisciplinary, obscuring the lines between the humanities and social science. Feminism is a theory as well as a movement. In our clime, if you say you are a feminist, people start to look at you as one who gives too much place and space to the female gender. Here, feminists are seen as people that advocates for equality with men, but this is a wrong notion. Feminism is both an academic discipline and a social movement. Feminism has always faced criticisms from both traditional and mainstream international relations. Feminism emerged through four waves from the 19th century but came out strongly after the Second World War and to limelight in the 1970s with scholarly work. With the percentage of women in the world, one would want to imagine that there should be more women in decision making bodies of states and even in international relations. The fourth wave which is the wave in our time has been characterized by technological advancement. Technology has made it easier to promote feminism. The advent of social media is propelling the advancement of course in the 21st century. We now have movements such as the #me movement on social media. These movements serve as a rallying point for the feminist theory to gain more exposure.

Feminist theory does not fit into the conventional international relations discipline, and this has made acceptance of feminist theory difficult even with the numerous publications and scholarly work from feminists. However the problem involved in the feminist practices in international relation is still misunderstanding because of the gender and people mind-set when the name is mentioned

From the Handbook of International Relations: Feminist Perspectives on International Relations by Laura Sjoberg and J. Ann Tickner, developing feminist theory is quite important as we continue to discuss gender issues in global politics and international relations. This can be seen with the number of women holding political positions transnational, and corporate systems as they are giving space to women who merit it. Now, we have women holding key positions in World Trade Organization, World Health Organization, United Nations, etc. There is the need for more discussions in mainstream international relations for the acceptance of feminist theory and its implementation. The African woman are making sure that their voices are equally heard in terms of academia With women calling for better working conditions, salaries and a place in a society that is masculine and In Africa, both our traditions and religions support patriarchy where a female is not to be heard or even noticed in public.

Al Chukwuma Okoli in his article exploring the Transformative Essence of Intellectual Feminism in Africa: Some Contributions of Amina Mama gives us insight to another way that feminism is promoted. This is by intellectual transformation where women in the academia help young African students to be intellectually ready and mature in the struggle for feminism. He drew insights from her background, academics and work as a female that has been in the forefront of the struggle for feminism form Africa. Mentoring of young upcoming, African international relations is one way that can bring about the acceptance of feminist theory in international relations. More scholarly work and publications will go a long way to achieve this. Amina Mama is just one of many women in the academia that are throwing their weight on feminism as a theory and a movement.

For my own contribution I strongly believed that even in the mist of crisis women are more coordinated than men. Secondly women are not only kidnapped and treated badly by the insurgents, but they also have to face survival in IDP camps and they also try to keep their families together. One good thing is women are joining forces even in their little ways to get the attention of the world. In Conclusion: International is Personal, Personal is International, Cynthia Enola shows that feminism is not for the less privileged females alone in the society/world. We see the challenges that women face in various areas of life, Women are seen lesser than men even in work environment. Simply put, a woman has to do double of what a man does to get where a man of same cadre is. The campaign for women in a society that is patriarchy is timely as more female scholars in international relations are giving their voice for the acceptance of the theory.

The world is generally patriarchal and women struggling to find a voice and place is difficult. The struggle has been on for decades and it is still on. Though progress is being made at the political and transnational levels, there is the need for mainstream international relations to listen to feminists with clear minds and reason from their point for a change.

However, it is sometimes difficult to accept if feminism will have a home in international relations research about global politics because there are still struggling for their voices to be hard.

Question:

What is the origin of the gender inequality in team of global politics involvement?

Can feminism have a home in terms of international Relation research global politics?

Is patriarchy a major reason for the noon acceptance of feminism by mainstream international relation?

**WEEK TEN: TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE IRT REFLECT AFRICAN’S GEO POLITICAL, CULTURAL, GEO ECONOMIC LOCATION, POSITION AND ITS POSITIONALITY.**

**DEFINITION OF INTERNATIONAL RELATION THEORIS:**

International Relation Theory is defined as the study of international relationship between and among state from a theoretical perspective and its help to explain constitutive effect in international relation.

The Branches 0f International Relation Theories

The branches are what we called realism, Liberalism, Constructivism and this replace Idealism and Realism dichotomy.

However this summary work is looking at the international Relation theory to Investigation Why there is none –western IRT and to provide solution to the problem.

Asia has histories, cultures, norms, and worldviews that are fundamentally different from those derived from or advanced in Europe, according to non-western international theory construction, in which this is the issues that Africans are having.

However this Theory’s led to the exclusive nature of Africa both in the geopolitical/cultural, geo-Economic location, position and its positionality because the history of our state tradition was often tied into the Middle- East and Europe.

But what global IR seeks is not discard or disavow the west, but to render our discipline more inclusive and broader, so that it reflect voices and experiences outside the west more fully.

**SOLUTION TO THE PROBLEM of NON-WESTERN INVOLVEMEN.**

African can create a voice in international Relation especially now that there are challenges in the west.

African scholars should increase their research and continue to publish in renewed journals this way our voice will be louder.

The government and transnational corporations like Denote can also help give Africa a voice in global international Relation through their sponsorships and support.

Our religions and traditional groups should also help in giving African voice by so doing the African identity will be restored.

However some slandered Marxism have sought to speak for exclusive or marginalized group such as workers, women, the third-world countries in other to promote improvement in the position of those in the periphery as listed above.

Which means if we improve in the international Relation Theory and create more impact, improving on slandered education and growing our Economic resources and promoting our cultural heritage globally the westerns will be challenged.

Explanation for the domination of the west

So much of western IRT is drown from modern western history in which the consequences of Westphalia straight societies could be from strutted in which western IRT has also been excessively concerned with rational choice view of motive in power political strategy

Global international relation and western Dominance forward or Eurocentric entrapment;

Parallel to the DE colonial project a call to globalize international Relation has been made by some strong scholars through the globe international Relation project, which led to the need to decolonize epistemology and ontology of the discipline the legalese of imperialism colonization, Racism and patriarchy in global power relations

Moreover the international Relations has rebranded itself by silencing or expropriating knowledge production at the margins of the self, by articulating and re- activating what Decennial thinkers called the coloniality of knowledge

**Conclusion:**

Conclusively, the historical background and all the scholars who has created multiple impact in international relation were comprehensively covered. The reading one and reading two emphasized mainly on the introductions and how the course international relation was amalgamated. However the reading two looks at the historiography, ontology epistemology and methodology of international relation. It also discusses how International relations have metamorphosed since after World War II. Brian Schmidt (2013) in the Handbook of International Relations addressed the various interpretations of how development in the field had been.

The reading three which is about ‘REALISM’ focuses on how International relations have metamorphosed since after World War II. Brian Schmidt (2013) in the Handbook of International Relations addressed the various interpretations of how development in the field had been. The article, International Relations: The Story So Far by Ken Booth gave a detailed account of the birth of the academic discipline of IR. It is significant to note that this account is Eurocentric. IR has really come a long way and has been instrumental in postulating and explaining global realities.

The fourth reading discusses neorealism, often known as structural or realism theories. Kenneth Waltz articulated this theory of international relations, which emphasizes the role of power polities in international relations, sees competition and conflict as enduring features, and sees limited potential for cooperation as a growth of traditional balance of power theories in international relations.

The Reading five explains more about liberalism theory. However Liberalism is normatively focused prescribing how the world will be organized and how state ought to conduct their affairs for the sake of peace and prosperity, and this is evident in Norman Angell’s Great Illusion {reading 3.3} penned in which this was agued by Locke Kant and others. Reading seven is also talking about constructivism theories which explain events and why they occur. Event such as the Second World War, Realism and Liberalism were propounded to explain events. After them came Constructivism which is quite complex as it generally came up after the Cold War to explain the transformations taking place in the international system. The reading eight talks about postcolonial critique of mainstream international relation theories such as Postcolonial era which came with a hybrid of individuals that have become so westernized that there is difficulty in de-westernizing our way of life. This is the same challenge with our identity and culture. And reading nine is taking about Racism and global order in international relation theories and how it has affected our African identity, with most histories European oversea expansion in modern period. However their expansion is what brought slave trade over the Atlantic Ocean. White supremacy have always been visible in the world and it is still visible. reading ten is talking about feminism international patriarchy and international relation theory, Feminism is often connoted and seen in negative perspective in the world of politics and especially in the discipline of international relations and woman’s inclusive in politics both international and in domestic politics. And the last reading is talking about the international relation theory and the relationship between and among state and how the African voices can be heard globally.

Therefore, the constructivist’s argument that the states are not very relevant in the international system is disagreed with. The paper concludes that though non-state actors such as institutions, intergovernmental organizations and non-governmental organizations play special roles, their presence is not as strong as the states. While the international system can survive without non-state actors, it cannot survive without states.