

ROBERT GILPIN IN REALIST PARADIGM OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS DISCIPLINE: RESEARCH PROGRAM, STATE AND INTERNATIONAL SYSTEM

ULUSLARARASI İLİŞKİLER DİSİPLİNİNİN REALİST PARADİGMASI ÇERÇEVESİNDE ROBERT GİLPİN: ARAŞTIRMA PROGRAMI, DEVLET VE ULUSLARARASI SİSTEM

Dr. Ali Ercan Su
Ministry of Labour and Social Security
Directorate General of International Labour Force
aliercan.su@csgb.gov.tr
ORCID: 0009-0006-7053-3728

Gönderim 25 Nisan 2024 – Kabul 14 Mayıs 2024
Received 25 April 2024 – Accepted 14 May 2024

Abstract: *The international relations discipline has been continuously progressing especially since the beginning of 1980s. On the basis of these developments in the discipline, concepts such as state and international system continue to be the major issues of research and debates. After 1980s, research programme also play the major role in debates of the discipline. The aim of the article is to discuss the views of realist academicians particularly views of Gilpin on research programme, state and international system and is to assert that real purpose of the realist scholars in international relations discipline is to produce policies for the USA. In this regard, the views of Robert Gilpin, on research programme, state and international system are discussed in this article. It is seen that Gilpin is well aware in their writings that there are divergent approaches in social sciences in terms of research programmes. Although he accepts the existence of different research programmes on social sciences, he only applies the positivist research program when it comes to scholarship. “The state” is on the other hand has never been elucidated by realist scholars and acknowledged a priori as an entity. Gilpin makes an effort to clarify the state and in some parts, he admits society’s influence over the state. However, then, Gilpin approaches state as a solid structure in Waltzian meaning. International system in Gilpin’s works, is analysed through “change” concept. He explains that there is a room for change in international system in early 1980s. On the other hand, after the disintegration of the Soviet Bloc, he just indicates that liberal and capitalist bloc triumph over socialism, international system is just capitalist world, with some divisions within it such as the USA, Japan, Germany. The article aims to postulate that even though Gilpin knows the deficiencies of the positivist research programme, he, in the international relations discipline deliberately remains in the realm of the realist paradigm by explicating their views on state and system. Gilpin’s basic aim is to find out to the paths for the continuation of American dominance in the sense of realist paradigm. It demonstrates that Robert Cox’s argument “theory is always for someone and for some purpose” is valid.*

Keywords: *Robert Gilpin, international relations, research programme, realist theory, state, international system.*

Öz: Uluslararası ilişkiler disiplini özellikle 1980'lerin başından itibaren sürekli bir biçimde ilerleme göstermektedir. Disiplindeki bu gelişmelere temelinde, devlet ve uluslararası sistem gibi kavramlar, başlıca araştırma ve tartışma konusu olmaya devam etmektedir. 1980'lerden sonra, araştırma programı da disiplinindeki tartışmalar içerisinde önemli bir rol oynamaktadır. Makalenin amacı realist paradigma kapsamındaki akademisyenlerin özellikle Gilpin'in araştırma programı, devlet ve uluslararası sistem konusundaki görüşlerini tartışmak ve realist akademisyenlerin uluslararası ilişkiler disiplininde temel amaçlarının ABD'nin geleceğine yönelik politika üretme olduğunu ileri sürmektir. Bu kapsamda, bu makalede, Robert Gilpin'in araştırma programı, devlet ve uluslararası sisteme ilişkin görüşleri tartışılmaktadır. Gilpin'in yazılarından anlaşıldığı üzere, araştırma programları bağlamında sosyal bilimlerdeki farklı yaklaşımları bildiği görülmektedir. Her ne kadar sosyal bilimlerdeki farklı araştırma programlarını bilse de, akademik çalışmaların da Gilpin'in sadece pozitivist araştırma programını uyguladığı görülmektedir. Diğer yandan, "devlet" realist akademisyenler tarafından asla detaylı bir şekilde açıklanmamış ve a priori bir varlık olarak kabul edilmiştir. Gilpin, bu noktada devleti açıklamak için bir çabanın içinde bulunmakta ve bazı yazılarında toplumun devlet üzerindeki etkisini kabul etmektedir. Bununla birlikte, sonrasında, Gilpin, Waltz'un bakış açısına yakın bir şekilde devlet katı bir yapı olarak yaklaştığı görülmektedir. Gilpin'in çalışmalarında uluslararası sistem ise "değişim" kavramı çerçevesinde analiz edilmektedir.. 1980'lerin başında uluslararası sistemde değişim için imkân bulunduğu açıklanmaktadır. Diğer yandan, Sovyet Birliği'nin dağılmasının ardından, Gilpin, sosyalizme karşı liberal ve kapitalizmin zaferini anlatmakta ve uluslararası sistemin sadece kapitalist dünyayı işaret ettiğini göstermektedir. Bu kapitalist dünyada ise ABD, Japonya ve Almanya gibi sistem içi farklı uygulamaların olduğunu söylemektedir. Bu makale, Gilpin'in uluslararası ilişkiler disiplininde pozitivist araştırma programının eksikliklerinin farkında olmasına karşın, özellikle devlet ve sistem konularındaki görüşleri ile realist paradigmanın içerisinde bilerek kaldığını göstermeyi amaçlamaktadır. Gilpin'in temel amacı, realist paradigma bağlamında Amerikan üstünlüğünü koruma yollarını araştırmaktır. Robert Cox'un "kuram her zaman birileri ve bir amaç içindir" argümanının geçerliliğini ortaya koymaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Robert Gilpin, uluslararası ilişkiler, araştırma programı, realist kuram, devlet, uluslararası sistem.

INTRODUCTION

The International Relations (IR) discipline has been diversifying its theoretical discussions in the last four decades. Particularly since 1980's, IR has demonstrated change and improvement in interpreting the international politics by applying different theoretical and methodological approaches as well as research programmes. Leading IR scholars such as Scott Burchill and Andrew Linklater welcome the diversifying efforts within the discipline (Burchill and Linklater, 2005: 24). It is possible to say that the approach towards the knowledge in IR discipline through the cooperation with a wide range of disciplines has contributed to this progress in IR discipline. Thus, IR discipline is not confined within its state-centric limits and not suffocated in its strict rules based on these limits. On the contrary, it has taken its step forward by acknowledging the importance of other disciplines such as sociology, psychology, political science, economics, history, and philosophy as well as critical and interpretivist research programmes.

This paper in this context aims to demonstrate the views of prominent theoretician of the realist paradigm of the IR,⁹ namely, Robert Gilpin, on state and international system as well as scientific approaches that he applies in IR. It should also be stated that the interest of the researcher on the theories of state as well as theories of international relations helps in writing this article.

⁹ IR will be used as an abbreviation of International Relations discipline.

Research methodology of the article is based on mainly the works of Gilpin especially War and Change in World Politics, The Political Economy of International Relations and Global Political Economy as well as Gilpin's own articles. In addition, the article uses Kenneth Waltz's seminal work of Theory of International Politics. Apart from the books, the articles written on international relations theory or on Gilpin are applied.

Research programme is decisive for the scholars as to how they consider and define the world in general and in specific, the knowledge. The research programme that the scholars adhere themselves reflects their values, beliefs, ideologies and the main reason of the research. In this article, it should be stated that the views of the Gilpin, will be analysed through the perspectives of the critical research programme with neo-Gramscian credentials.

For some scholars, the dominant research programme in IR discipline has been positivism since beginning of 1950s and more heavily in 1960s (Smith, 2008: 11). This latter endeavour for the period reflects scientific efforts for the IR discipline. In fact, early scholars of the discipline were more normative and searched more how to sustain peace at world in general. Steve Smith considers that this positivist dominance has been questioned by the Critical Theories¹⁰ and has led to diversification in international relations theory in the 1980s.

General characteristics of positivism are in general well applied to the IR discipline. Encapsulating the time and space as well as adapting general characteristics methods of natural sciences into the social sciences are two important features of the IR discipline.

Another important feature, closely linked with ahistoricist view, is the search for regularities in attitudes of the states and making predictions on the basis of regularities in international politics (Yalvaç, 2010: 170-175, 178). Martin Wight, in his article "Why there is no international theory?" (Wight, 1960: 43) asserts that "international politics is a realm of recurrence and repetition". Through finding out regularities, theory and even laws of international politics may be well-established for the realist scholars. It is apparent that those adhere realist paradigm in IR heavily follow positivist research programme.

Critical theory not only in IR but also in social sciences has made important contributions to the debates in academia. In this regard, critical theory has enormously impacted in IR discipline against the positivism's programme in the last 3-4 decades (Yalvaç, 2010: 177). Then, it is also seen that the progress in IR has been widely used in different disciplines of social sciences ranging from economics and sociology to political science.

First of all, critical theory objects to ahistorical approach of positivist IR. Ahistorical view clearly dismisses people's power to change. Secondly, for critical theory, there is a reciprocal relation between idea and material world even though material world is given priority. In fact, this issue is an area of contention. In general it can be ascertained that ideas and institutions produce each other. Therefore people

¹⁰ For Smith, there are basically three theories under Critical Theory namely Frankfurt School, feminist theory and post structuralism. Steve Smith, "Positivism and Beyond".

change the society-complex in a continuous and reciprocal way on the basis of the critical theory.

It also does challenge positivism's concept of "neutrality" in social sciences. Being "objective" in social sciences as well as in IR for critical theorists is scientifically impossible. Robert Cox, the leading scholar applying critical theory in IR believes that "theory is always for someone and for some purpose". Thus, the critical theory advocates rightly assert that research itself is value-laden as it is totally dependent on the values, ideology of the researcher. In other words, it is possible to claim that if the values are extracted from the researcher, the research would be meaningless, or in a metaphorical way "cake without sugar".

Third issue is that critical research programme aims to emancipation not only in social sciences but also the world. It also ponders and challenges the "social purpose" of the research (Linklater, 1990: 9-10). Intertwined with emancipation, scientist also envisages "action". Therefore, the purpose of the scientist is to understand and to change the world.

Furthermore, the author believes that critical theory covers two other research programmes namely, positivism and hermeneutics as explaining, understanding and criticising of international relations. Critical theory as a research programme on the other hand broadens the international relations perspective by arguing the nature of social relations and its impacts on state-society. Linklater also mentions in an indirect way the importance of positivism since "critical theory regards the analysis of social regularities as useful for understanding the constraints upon the political change" (Linklater, 2008: 283).

For the author it is also important that positivism provides the explanation of the framework for the periods of the "stability". In this regard, stability here corresponds to the periods that most of the conditions in domestic or international conjuncture remains almost the same. For example, the period between the years of 1945-1970 are seen as "Golden Age of Capitalism" while the period of 1970-1980 can be classified as capitalism crisis period. Therefore, applying positivist methods in analysing of these periods with a different research programme can provide a suitable framework. It should be noted that any of three research programmes can be applied in any work using the specific methods since they facilitate the production of the knowledge. However, positivism's contribution is exceeded by critical theory since it also provides the analysis for the change of the "social systems". Linklater, therefore considers that critical theory has superior characteristics over positivism (Linklater, 1990: 4, 10).

In the last decades, it has also been seen that eclecticism has also taken the ground on the social sciences. Applying multiple theories to "criticise" as well as to "explain" or to "understand" the international politics is used within the academia.¹¹ Economic theories, sociological theories as well as IR's own theories are reflected among the leading scholars such as Cox, Gilpin and Waltz. The use of these theories is clearly demonstrating the impress of the critical theory as well as eclectic approach in IR.

¹¹ Gilpin's "War and Change" and Waltz's "Theory of International Politics" are very good examples of eclectic approach in international relations.

The competing research programmes thus in IR are in conflict on the concepts “state” and “international system”. It is clear that in IR discipline, the state is the fundamental actor as well as the fundamental question. Not only in the realist paradigm but also in the other theories of IR such as critical theory of international relations (CTIR), the state is the basic entity that there requires to understand. However, it is also explicit that in CTIR, the society and system are derived from the production process which is also considered as one of the fundamental tenets of the international relations too. In addition, it also underpins that there is a continuous relationship among society, the state, and international system in which these relations shape reciprocally each other (Cox, 1981: 137-139).

Having said that there is a major difference between theories of realist paradigm and CTIR. Realist theories never deeply focus on the state itself. As said earlier, even some of the theories in this paradigm do not define the state. It acknowledges the state as *a priori* entity in international relations. On the other hand critical theory simply considers that the state is the result of the social system which is mainly constituted by the production system along the lines of ideas, institutions and material capabilities (Cox, 1981: 136-137). Secondly, for the realist theories, the state is discussed as ahistorical while critical theory posits that the state is a historical entity and totally dependent on the change of society and state as well as in world orders defined by social relations of production. It is possible to assert for CTIR that the state can take any other form or even can be eliminated from the world politics on the basis of developments within the social-state complex. Thus, there is a huge discrepancy in handling “the state question” between these theories.

The issue of international system in international relations of realist paradigm is considered as mainly the result of the interaction of actors. It is simply states’ behaviours and relations among themselves that constitute the international system. It has fallen into the agenda of the discipline by Kenneth Waltz’s book, *Theory of International Politics* (1979). Waltz’s main purpose was to make international relations more scientific discipline through establishing a theory missing in the discipline (Waltz, 1979: 1). He posits that behaviouralists’ efforts in applying merely statistics do not produce the theory that international relations require as a discipline (Waltz, 1979: 3). International system for Waltz is not just the interaction of the states. The international system on the other hand defines the behaviour of the states (Waltz, 1979: 73-74).

Waltz’s importance is not limited to his views on theory in the discipline. Waltz’s approach not only has opened the way for the structural approaches but also thinking for new research programmes other than positivism in international relations. Even though it is clear that Waltz applies positivism in his studies, he interestingly acknowledges the importance of other research programmes in the discipline (Waltz, 1979: 19-37).

The realist theories discuss the state as a “sine qua non” entity in the discipline. For example, Hans Morgenthau’s *Politics among Nations* mainly focuses on the state as defining on the basis of “nations”. In his view, “nations” are equated with the states and those entities are just looking for the means to increase their powers (Morgenthau, 1948: 9). Additionally, the state by Waltz is considered as the entities

having identical features and function similarly in the international system (Waltz, 1979: 78).

As there is no a deeper analysis of the state in international relations discipline in the realist paradigm, it also means that there is no or not in-depth analysis of society and social relations of production.

It is also necessary to emphasise that liberal or idealist theories of the realist paradigm differentiate themselves from classical realism on the state. They are eager to see the establishment of world peace through focusing on domestic politics. Simply, they think that liberal democracies will not wage war at the international level (Brown, 2005: 20-21). However, comprehensive analysis of state by including social complex is not reflected in those studies.

Interestingly, realist theoreticians write about the international system without any special detailed study on the international system. However, by Waltz's introduction of international system, it becomes notably important for the realist scholars during the 1980s especially in the works of Gilpin.

1. GILPIN AND THE RESEARCH PROGRAM

Robert Gilpin is one of the prominent scholars of the international relations discipline. Some scholars argue that he makes the study of international relations more comprehensive than Waltz's famous work by referring the relation between economics and politics (Wohlforth, 2011: 502).

It is generally acknowledged that Gilpin is classified as a realist scholar. He, on the other hand, does not consider himself as a realist scholar in his article written for *Neorealism and Its Critics* and admits that he is greatly influenced by the classical realist scholars (Gilpin, 1986: 304) He also admits that he is also impressed by the liberal and Marxist views by identifying himself as "a liberal in a realist world and frequently even in a world of Marxist class struggle" in the 1980s (Gilpin, 1986: 304).

Regarding the research programme, Gilpin is well aware of the competing approaches of knowledge in the social sciences. In his *War and Change in World Politics*, he explains succinctly what issues are at stake in international relations discipline. Gilpin conceives the difficulty in the social sciences with the concepts such as establishing theories or laws, non-repetition of history in the discipline. He also acknowledges value laden scientist that hinders "objectivity". Gilpin however gives contradictory views on how he considers the research programme of the international relations for himself.

First of all, Gilpin asserts that he does not intend to develop "a general theory of international relations". Secondly, he also says that he did not find out "the laws" in the discipline. Thirdly, he claims that he does not look for being "predictive" as he continues by saying prediction is impossible for all social sciences (Gilpin, 1981: 3).

Gilpin also uses history in explaining the international relations as a major source. His position on history is clear by admitting "uniqueness and complexity of the historical events". It is seen that he also implicitly adopts non-positivist attitude in his research by agreeing to non-repetition of the history.

According to Gilpin, “ideology and emotion” also make search of laws impossible in social sciences (Gilpin, 1981: 5-6). This view is clearly opposed to positivist approach. Gilpin also admits that theories in IR are “descriptive” and aiming “to explain a type of phenomenon”. This opinion of descriptive IR theories endorses what Cox considers as problem-solving theory since these theories only “takes the world as it finds it” (Cox, 1981: 136-137).

In addition, Gilpin focuses on the “change” in international system. Since the main criticism against positivism is that it does not have explanatory power for change, he aims at positivist research programme has also capability to explain the change in international politics in his book of *War and Change in World Politics*.

Gilpin gives the impression that his position in scientific study is prone to interpretive research program since what he openly expresses for social sciences in particular for international politics excluding the positivism’s basic tenets. However, in the same study of *War and Change in World Politics*, Gilpin then starts interestingly to use positivism as his main scientific inquiry (Gilpin, 1981: 7):

“...(T)he fundamental nature of international relations has not changed over the millennia. International relations continue to be recurring struggle for wealth and power among independent actors in a state of anarchy. The classic history of Thucydides is a meaningful a guide to the behaviour of states today as when it was written in the fifth century B.C....Nevertheless, we contend that the fundamentals have not altered.”

It is seen that Gilpin is in a position to support positivist view of repetition of history as basics of international relations. However, Gilpin contradicts himself since previously acknowledging uniqueness of the history. After this paradoxical view, he accepts that there have been changes in relations between states through economic, political and technological developments (Gilpin, 1981: 7). By this statement, Gilpin gets somehow closer to accepting the importance of social relations of production.

After his book on *War and Change in World Politics* in 1981, he specifically developed “Theory of Hegemonic War” since in his early years he focused on war and change through the basic concepts of realist paradigm such as the state and international system. However, his usage of international system is also a clear sign of Waltz’s impact (Gilpin, 1981: xii). His theory of hegemonic war accepts the very basic principles of Waltzian system in international politics although it is clear that there are also strong differences. He asserts that the changes in international system are the “basic determinants of such wars” (Gilpin, 1988: 592). This will be discussed in Gilpin’s view on state and international system part in detail.

Gilpin after Waltz’s efforts for making the discipline more scientific wants to broaden the scope of IR too. He borrows concepts and theories from disciplines of sociology and economics in *War and Change in World Politics*. It is clear there is Waltz’s impact in his application of the disciplines of sociology and economics into explaining the IR theory. In this book, Gilpin, apart from the war, he questions the change using mainly these two disciplines’ theories. For Gilpin, “rational choice theory” provides solution for all the theoretical questions of the international politics. This theory provides a good basis for Gilpin, in explaining the social change as well as political change as individual’s behaviour is basically determining the outcome, or

change in another word (Gilpin, 1981: xiii). Afterwards, Gilpin constitutes a framework for change in international system.

Gilpin's deal with the change is important since realist paradigm is in essence a positivist research programme which cannot properly explain the change since the theories developed within this paradigm always claim that they find the regularities in the international politics. His quest for explaining change gives room for the human action. Gilpin indeed accepts the human dimension in "change" and says that change is restrained by "ideology and emotion".

On the other hand, he also claims that academia looks for the stability by saying "most academic social scientists have a preference for stability or at least preference for orderly change. The idea of radical changes that threaten accepted values and interests is not an appealing one" (Gilpin, 1981: 6). It is also clear that Gilpin's view on academia's preference for stability by the social scientists is worrisome since the academia dismisses the arguments of the competing research programmes such as emancipation and understanding. Therefore academia explicitly or implicitly burdens social scientist a duty; to look for stability. This view also reflects main credentials of positivist research programme as it purports no change of the system as well as repetitive historical cycles within the system. It is also in conflict with "change" concept which he also searches in his *War and Change in World Politics*.

Regarding the social scientist's duty, the change for Gilpin is a change within the established system. It implies that the system is to be preserved. For that aim, social scientist has to find out alternative paths for the preservation of the system. Indeed, "stability" or "orderly change" is in fact, directly related to the debates of 1980s regarding the decline of the "hegemon" within the realist perspective. In fact, in his book of *US Power and Multinational Corporations* (1975) Gilpin expounds his views on the USA's shift in world politics (Gilpin, 1975:). Then, he confesses his position in his *Political Economy of the International Relations* (1987) by saying that "... I expressed a deep concern with the problem of American decline" (Gilpin, 1987: xiii).

What Gilpin addresses is apparently the USA's decline and searches alternative choices within the international system. For Gilpin, the USA will have a new role corresponding to the needs of the international system. However, in his writings, it is also clear that the USA will continue to play important role in world politics accepting the erosion of its power for lead. It will continue to be an important actor within the international system especially after the end of the Cold War even though the impact of the Cold War has lessened the military-political ties in the capitalist world.

Regarding the international relations theory, Gilpin accepts basic tenets of realism, such as search for power, security, and "conflictual nature of international affairs". Apart from politics, he thinks that the economy related issues are missing in the writings of classical realists. However, Gilpin's view for inclusion of economy into the world politics do not change his support of the realist paradigm as he considers world politics is driven by power whether it is political, military or economic. However, it is seen that he refers to Marxism and liberalism for the importance of economy in international relations.

The impact of the Marxism is visible in Gilpin's *The Political Economy of the International Relations* (1987). He states that that work "also takes seriously the Marxist critique of a world market or capitalist economy". In particular, Gilpin acknowledges the dependence theory's impulse for explaining "the diffusion of sources of power, the undermining of the hegemonic state, and eventual creation of a new hegemonic system" (Gilpin, 1987: xiii).

His views on the influence of Marxism on international relations seem to have changed after the end of the Cold War in his *Global Political Economy*:

"My discussion of economic development in the 1987 book has become totally outdated; scholarship at that time gave serious attention to quasi-Marxist dependency theory and the deep division between the less developed and the developed world. Today, the debate over economic development centers on the appropriate role for state and market in the development process" (Gilpin, 2001: 4).

As seen, Gilpin, after the end of the Cold War, explicitly considers that the leftist argument and its intellectual influence over the international relations and political economy have simply ceased. It has been replaced by the views on triumph of the liberalism. Furthermore, he also refers to some scholars that "a profound shift is taking place from a state-dominated to a market-dominated international economy" (Gilpin, 2001: 8).

2. GILPIN'S VIEWS ON THE STATE

First of all, it should be stated that the division between state and international system in Gilpin's works is not an easy task. Gilpin explains state and international system in an interlinked manner since for him both are interlinked.

Gilpin clearly advocates state-centric approach in international relations even though he acknowledges the importance of political groups, political movements or multinational corporations (Gilpin, 1987: vi; Gilpin, 2001: 4). Separating himself from other realist scholars, however, in his *War and Change in World Politics*, he attempts to define the state. He refers to Douglass North and Robert P. Thomas 1973's work (*The Rise of the Western World: A New Economic History*) and defines the state in a liberal context as "an organization that provides protection and [welfare] . . . in return for revenue" (Gilpin, 1981: 40-41). He then gives more importance on the property rights in relation to state function. Secondly, he also asserts that state and society are "distinguishable" but "mutually influence each other". Moreover, he considers that state is a "coalition of coalitions" of "larger society and political elite". Thereby society's importance in an indirect way is emphasised within the framework of state which is not a general character of a realist scholar in IR.

As said previously, the state is considered as *a priori* entity in realist paradigm. However, it is possible to induce factors of a state. The state for him, as an entity is the prerequisite of international relations. Gilpin, even within years of his intellectual development, believes that the state remains as the most important actor. The objectives of states contribute to the changes in international politics.

On the objectives of the state, he applies economic theory's assumptions especially "indifference curve" since it can easily reflect different objectives of states and societies in an international context. In this regard, states and ruling elites' objectives differ in terms of the aspirations whether it is ideological, political or economic. Secondly, internal and external changes have an impact on the state as well as international system. Thirdly, indifference curve is also related to "wealth and power of society". Therefore, it is seen that Gilpin uses two important issues here. First, in an eclectic framework, economic theory is used in IR discipline. Secondly, state-society complex is referenced in realist paradigm. Gilpin's this explanation on the state in 1981 totally diverges from rest of the period's realist scholars. From this perspective, Gilpin identifies three objectives for states; "to control of territory"; "to increase influence of the state over other states"; "to control or at least exercise control over world economy" (Gilpin, 1981: 22-24).

In this framework, the order in the world politics as well as the progress in the international economy requires a strong state, a hegemon, namely the USA (Pax Americana) (Gilpin, 1987: xii). This hegemon provides "the leadership over the other states" (Gilpin, 1981: 6). This dominant power provide hierarchical structure in international politics even though he accepts Waltz's self-help and anarchy because he believes no state has the absolute power to gain what it aims to over any other states. Nonetheless his formulation of anarchy in international politics differs through the idea of control of the system. This control mechanism is provided by the dominant state implying the hierarchical characteristics of the international system. Through this hierarchical structure, Gilpin means the prestige that the dominant power or powers have the capacity to influence the decisions over the other states (Gilpin, 1981: 186). This hierarchy of world politics is in stable unless there are changes in the objectives of states or growth in power of a state (Gilpin, 1981: 14). Gilpin on the other hand stresses after 1970s and 1980s, American power is declining as power has diffused. For this reason, there are many states emerging as dominant powers in international politics. Since the hierarchy in the international system has been scattered, Gilpin tends to search for new order after the USA supremacy or hegemony in international politics declines. However, it is also clear that Gilpin makes efforts for the international order to be in line with the USA's objectives implying the continuation of well-functioning of the capitalist system.

It is also seen in Gilpin's later works that other than the state, there are also entities that are important to understand the international relations. Even though Gilpin refers in this point the importance of economy particularly markets' role in international politics, he believes that there is a need to a state for proper function of the economy and markets. According to him, "the nation-state remains the dominant actor in both domestic and international economic affairs" (Gilpin, 2001: 4). He repeats continuously this opinion in his books of 1987 and 2001 with different emphasis.

On the other hand he can be regarded as the most successful scholar in the realist paradigm in accepting the influence of different factors and groups within the state. In fact, this view on admitting different factors and groups within state is directly the result of the 1970s and 1980s intellectual environment of Marxism since he accepts in his writings during that period. In 2000, however, he simply disregards the impact

of Marxist discussions over him since the liberalism and capitalism triumphed over communism after the dissolution of the Soviet Union.

Nevertheless his focus shifts to the business activities rather than the international relations. For Gilpin, Keohane and Nye's *Transnational Relations and World Politics* work (1971) requires new thinking since the state is no longer only actor. "Multinational corporations" and "political movements" had become new important actors in international politics. He also emphasises increasing markets' role even though the economy has always had a very effective and determining place in international politics (Gilpin, 2001: 3). Thus, Gilpin claims that markets and states combine international politics and international economics into international political economy (Gilpin, 2001: 3-4, 8).

3. GILPIN'S VIEW ON INTERNATIONAL SYSTEM

In fact, Gilpin's in his early works on international system are very similar to Waltz's ideas. He asserts that states simply reflect "international social, political, and economic arrangements". Therefore these arrangements lead to at the end the creation of international system. In fact, he refers to interaction among the states in the creation of international system. However, he further points out that there is reciprocal relationship between states and international system. Both influence and shape each other. In this conjuncture, international system brings opportunities and threats for states in which states aim to ensure best of its interests (Gilpin, 2001: 3).

He further deliberates his opinion on international system by adapting definition of Robert Mundell and Alexander Swoboda, as an "aggregation of diverse entities united by regular interaction according to a form of control". From this definition, Gilpin asserts that international system has 3 factors: Firstly, there are diverse processes, structures, and actors in international system. In this situation, he asserts that distribution of power establishes dominant states the possibility "to establish and to enforce the basic rules" in international context. Secondly, there is "regular interaction" between actors. The governance of the system is ensured through regular interaction and governance demonstrates the hierarchy of prestige. Prestige, here is simply reflection of authority in domestic politics. Gilpin here explains that this prestige concept differentiated from the power since prestige has a moral basis while power signs coercion. However, at the end of the day, it is economic power and military power provides the basis for hierarchy of prestige in international system. Thirdly, there is a "form of control" which ensures a general compromise on the attitudes of the actors. Nonetheless, he admits that the control over the international system is not an easy task. Rights and rules of the states that have to obey are determined among the states themselves. For any interaction, there is a need for mutually agreed rules. He calls it "relative control" since no state has ever controlled the international system (Gilpin, 1981: 25-28). In fact, this is an overt acceptance of anarchic structure of the international system taken from Waltz. He further explains the control over the system is ensured through the distribution of power among the states. However, by this, he differentiates himself from Waltz since this distribution of power gives some states the possibility to organize international system. In this hierarchal structure of international politics, prestige plays "the role of authority in domestic politics". For Gilpin, prestige is more important than the power. The reason

is that prestige in international politics ensures what the dominant states aims to achieve without using force and also maintains the stability. Prestige or prestige perceived by the other states allows the establishment of hierarchy among the states (Gilpin, 1981: 31-33).

Apart from this view, Gilpin mainly defines international system by the concept of change in international politics and focuses on three concepts, “interaction”, “system change” and “systemic change” (Gilpin, 1981: 10-11-42). Interaction clearly means the relations among the states. This interaction of states provides the establishment of the international system through agreed set of rules as said. The set of rules on the other hand for Gilpin is mostly reflection of the values and interests of dominant states. International law and multilateral treaty are good examples of the rules agreed among the states (Gilpin: 1981, 36-37). System change refers to the actors in the international politics. Its examples are empires, city-states and nation-states. Particularly since 1970s, there are various and new actors emerged in the international politics such as transnational corporations and international organizations. In fact, he demonstrates that new types of social, political or economic organizations will emerge and affect the international politics. Third concept is the systemic change which is for Gilpin, “a change in the hierarchy or control of international political system” (Gilpin, 1988: 596). For Gilpin, hierarchical power among the states ensures the order of the international system. Any systemic change is seen a change “within the system rather than the system itself” (Gilpin, 1980: 42). He just considers that this systemic change is the replacement of a dominant state by a new dominant state in the same international conjuncture. In doing so, Gilpin tries to establish a framework for change in international system. However, again, he focuses on the states since the states have the necessary attributes to change the international settings:

1. An international system is stable (in a state of equilibrium) if no state believes it profitable to change the system.
2. A state will attempt to change the international system if the expected benefits exceed the expected costs.
3. A state will seek to change the international system through territorial, political and economic expansion until the marginal costs of further change are equal to or greater than the expected benefits.
4. Once equilibrium between the costs and benefits of further change and expansion is reached, the tendency is for the economic costs of maintaining the status quo to rise faster than the economic capacity to sustain the status quo.
5. If the disequilibrium in the international system is not resolved, then the system will be changed, and a new equilibrium reflecting the redistribution of power will be established.

In this classification of international system of change, it is apparent that there is a visible impact of Waltz's views on international system. The difference of what Gilpin brings is that the states are more important in the change of international system rather than the structure itself. In other words, state is more decisive rather than the system. The changes in domestic politics through technological, economic, political or other means has the capacity to change state objectives and then the stability in the international system.

On the other hand, Gilpin, after the end of 1980s, he focuses on international economic system. Especially in his *Global Political Economy* in 2001 he admits not working on the details of international economic system, especially giving little importance to “domestic economic developments” (Gilpin, 2001: 3). In 2001, Gilpin nevertheless retains his opinion that state is “the dominant actor in both domestic and international economic affairs” (Gilpin, 2001: 4). In this book, he first defines global political economy as “interaction of the markets and powerful actors as states, multinational firms and international organizations” (Gilpin, 2001: 17-18). Later on, Gilpin calls himself as “state-centric realist” and explains the divergent points from Waltzian international system. By state centric realism, firstly he is clearly adamant in his position to stick to realist credentials that states are in self-help position in international politics but cooperation is still possible in the current politics. Secondly he is aware of the role of the international organizations, non-governmental organizations, and multinational firms. Thirdly, for him, state policies are determined by the “powerful social groups”. Lastly but more importantly, values and morals are important in the external actions of the state as well as identity of the society. This last two points makes Gilpin separates from Waltz. It is apparent that Waltz never goes in any analysis of the society since even though societies are different, the function of the state remains the same in international politics (Gilpin, 2001: 17-19).

After 1990s, Gilpin declares that there is a clear change in his intellectual orientation even in his 1987 work, this is very visible while the Soviet Union was on the verge of collapse. For him, from 1990s, the capitalism triumphed over socialism. This new international conjuncture makes in his writings, that international system has been in an undefined position rather than bipolar or multipolar. However, it is clear that international system is now mainly liberal capitalist world. In this point, Gilpin intensified his works on international political economy within the divisions of liberal capitalist world, namely the USA, Germany and Japan. For Gilpin, there are three kinds of capitalist world: While the USA represents liberal market capitalism, Germany is equated with social market capitalism and Japan is named as developmental capitalism. After all, for Gilpin, current international system simply reflects interactions of the states of the capitalist world.

CONCLUSION

Gilpin is clearly an outstanding scholar not only in the realist paradigm but also in a wider IR scholarship. His notable academic credentials make IR discipline more eclectic as well as more interdisciplinary. He combines politics and economics discipline into IR and contributes to development of international political economy even within the realist paradigm. His knowledge on research programmes, trying to understand “change” in IR and inclusion of society into IR discipline are also other salient features of Gilpin for the contribution to IR.

Apart from his considerable contributions to IR discipline, Gilpin cannot leave the realist paradigm, prefers to stay within the limits of realism. Even though he knows the deficiencies of positivist research programme, he believes that IR has an ahistorical character. Regarding his ideas on state demonstrates some divergent approaches in realist paradigm especially the society’s impact on the state. It should be also added that especially the change in state through economic, technological and

political means are important for a realist scholar. However, Gilpin then continues to assert state is the only actor in international relations with a differentiated Waltzian view of state.

International system on the basis of Gilpin's intellectual development is to be divided into two periods; first period mostly inspired by Waltz's thoughts but introduces new insights such as hierarchy, prestige and state's importance in the international system. In his late years, for him, there is only one international system remained which is capitalist world system. He admits that there are different approaches to capitalism within this international system. However, he does foresee big challenge from these divergent approaches in capitalist world since different types of capitalism represents the different interests of dominant states. By contrast, it is important to recall that Gilpin acknowledges the possibility of change in international system through the developments not only at the external level but also developments within the internal affairs of a state implying society's power to lead a change even though change in the international system is related to dominant states.

REFERENCES

- Brown, Chris, (2005), *Understanding International Relations* (Third Edition), Palgrave: Houndmills.
- Burchill, Scott and Linklater, Andrew (2005), "Introduction" Scott Burchill and Andrew Linklater (eds.), *Theories of International Relations* (Third Edition), Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke.
- Cox, Robert W., (1981), "Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory", *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 10(2), 126-155.
- Gilpin, Robert, (1986), "The Richness of Tradition of Political Realism", Robert O. Keohane (ed.), *Neo-realism and its Critics*, Columbia University Press, New York, 301-320.
- Gilpin, Robert, (1988), "The Theory of Hegemonic Wars", *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 18(4), 591-613.
- Gilpin, Robert, (1975), *US Power and Multinational Corporations*, Basic Books, New York, 1975.
- Gilpin, Robert, (1987), *The Political Economy of the International Relations*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Gilpin, Robert, (2001), *Global Political Economy: Understanding the International Economic Order*, Princeton University Press, Princeton and Oxford.
- Linklater, Andrew, (1990), *Beyond Realism and Marxism: Critical Theory and International Relations*, St. Martin's Press, New York.
- Linklater, Andrew, (2008), "The Achievements of Critical Theory", (in) *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond* (eds., S Smith, K. Booth and M. Zalewski) (Tenth Edition), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 279-298.
- Morgenthau, Hans, (1948), *Politics among Nations*, Alfred A. Knopf: New York.
- Smith, Steve, Booth, Ken, Zalewski, Marysia, (eds.), (2008), *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond* (Tenth Edition), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Waltz, Kenneth N., (1979), *Theory of International Politics*, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Reading, Massachusetts.
- Wight, Martin, (1960), "Why There is No International Theory?", *International Relations*, 2(1), 35-48.
- Wohlforth, William C. (2011), "Gilpinian Realism and International Relations", *International Relations*, 25(4), 499-511.