Epistemological Freedom and the Globalization of IR: Challenges and Opportunities for Core-Periphery Dialogue

Mürsel DOĞRUL*

National Defence University

Abstract

This article examines core-periphery dynamics within Global international relations (IR), focusing on how intellectual history informs the ongoing dialogue between the core, primarily the United Kingdom and the United States, and the 'periphery', representing the rest of the world. The study critically engages with Turton's conceptualisations of cores and explores how the concept of the periphery can be rethought to promote a more inclusive global IR framework. The article uses qualitative methods, including content analysis of key reference texts and historical sources, to examine the evolution of the core-periphery divide. The concept of epistemological freedom is discussed, prompting the question of whether a convergence of epistemologies or the pursuit of independent epistemic freedom is a more attainable objective for the expansion and diversification of the intellectual foundation of Global IR. The importance of dialogue in reshaping the discipline is emphasized, and the potential of civilizational discourse to advance Global IR is considered. However, the article critically assesses whether such a discourse may inadvertently promote exceptionalism and essentialism. Ultimately, the article argues for a more balanced and pluralistic approach to global knowledge production that integrates perspectives from historically marginalized regions to challenge the traditional centre/periphery binary and promote intellectual diversity in the discipline. Drawing on the insights of scholars such as Shahi, Moshirzadeh and Kuru as well, the article explores the complexities of establishing genuine dialogue and inclusivity within IR, considering alternative approaches such as Shahi's 'dialogic approach' and Kuru's emphasis on global intellectual history.

Keywords
Epistemological Freedom, Global IR, Global South, Intellectual History, Knowledge Production

*   Assist. Prof. Dr. Turkish National Defence University, Joint War College, mursel.dogrul@msu. edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-0637-843X

Epistemolojik Özgürlük ve Uluslararası İlişkilerin Küreselleşmesi: Merkez-Çevre Diyaloğu için Zorluklar ve Fırsatlar

Öz

Bu makale, Küresel Uluslararası İlişkilerde (Uİ) merkez-çevre dinamiklerini incelemekte ve entelektüel tarihin, başta İngiltere ve ABD olmak üzere "merkez" ile dünyanın geri kalanını temsil eden "çevre" arasında süregelen diyaloğu nasıl bilgilendirdiğine odaklanmaktadır. Çalışma, Turton'un merkez kavramsallaştırmasına eleştirel bir yaklaşım getirerek, çevre kavramının daha kapsayıcı bir küresel Uluslararası İlişkiler çerçevesini desteklemek için nasıl yeniden düşünülebileceğini araştırmaktadır. Makale, merkez-çevre ayrımının evrimini araştırmak için önemli referans metinlerinin ve tarihsel kaynakların içerik analizi de dahil olmak üzere nitel yöntemler kullanmaktadır. Epistemolojik özgürlük kavramı incelenerek, epistemolojilerin yakınsamasının mı yoksa bağımsız epistemik özgürlük arayışının mı küresel Uİ'nin entelektüel temelinin genişlemesi ve çeşitlenmesi için daha ulaşılabilir bir hedef olduğu sorusu ortaya atılmıştır. Disiplinin yeniden şekillendirilmesinde diyaloğun önemi vurgulanmakta ve medeniyet söyleminin Küresel Uluslararası İlişkiler'i ilerletme potansiyeli değerlendirilmektedir. Ancak makale, böyle bir söylemin istemeden de olsa istisnacılığı ve özcülüğü teşvik edip etmeyeceğini eleştirel bir şekilde değerlendirmektedir. Sonuç olarak makale, geleneksel merkez/çevre ikiliğine yenilikçi ve disiplinde entelektüel çeşitliliği teşvik etmek için tarihsel olarak ötekileştirilmiş bölgelerden perspektifleri entegre eden küresel bilgi üretimine daha dengeli ve çoğulcu bir yaklaşımı savunmaktadır. Shahi, Moshirzadeh ve Kuru gibi akademisyenlerin de görüşlerinden yararlanan makale, Shahi'nin 'diyalojik yaklaşımı' ve Kuru'nun küresel entelektüel tarihe yaptığı vurgu gibi alternatif yaklaşımları göz önünde bulundurarak Uluslararası İlişkiler içerisinde gerçek bir diyalog ve kapsayıcılık oluşturmanın karmaşıklıklarını araştırmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler
Epistemolojik Özgürlük, Küresel Uluslararası İlişkiler, Küresel Güney,
Entelektüel Tarih, Bilgi Üretimi

Introduction

The concept of core-periphery dynamics is a fundamental tenet in the study of power imbalances and intellectual dominance within the field of IR. This framework is particularly useful for analysing the hierarchical structure that differentiates Western nations from non-Western nations, as well as the privileges often associated with Western academic perspectives (Klink, 1990; Tickner, 2013). In the context of global IR, scholars are increasingly advocating for a shift away from the traditionally Western-centric perspective, emphasising the importance of inclusivity and a diverse array of viewpoints contributed by non-Western thinkers (Acharya, 2011; Eun, 2018; Anderl & Witt, 2020). This shift represents a deliberate effort to create a discipline that more accurately reflects the theoretical, historical, and cultural diversity of the field. The inclusion of these diverse perspectives is essential for promoting a balanced discourse and underscores the significance of open dialogue as a means of connecting the core (often Western) and the periphery (non-Western) perspectives within the field.

Nevertheless, the existing literature underscores the necessity for these dialogues to refrain from cultural essentialism or the promotion of exceptionalism, as such approaches may impede the constructive potential of cross-cultural exchanges (Goodhart, 2003; Zhou & Pilcher, 2018; R'boul, 2022). In contrast, there is a focus on the concept of epistemological freedom, which has been elucidated by scholars such as Kwesi Kwaa Prah from Africa (Prah, 1998). Epistemological freedom can be defined as the capacity of scholars from non-Western backgrounds to establish their intellectual autonomy and to liberate their research from excessive reliance on Western frameworks of knowledge (Bailón & Lissovoy, 2018; Sharma, 2021). This independence is crucial for fostering an inclusive and diverse IR discipline, where various intellectual traditions are valued equally.

Moreover, although the concept of 'civilizational dialogue' is regarded as a potentially fruitful avenue for fostering mutual understanding between disparate cultural and academic traditions, scholars tend to adopt a circumspect stance in its regard (Köchler, 2011; Bettiza, 2014). There is a risk that civilizational dialogue, if not carefully managed, could inadvertently reinforce binary thinking or othering, which would undermine the goal of genuine, transformative exchange. Collectively, these ideas call for a reassessment of traditional power structures in IR, advocating for a discipline that prioritises equity,

inclusivity, and the dismantling of the entrenched hierarchies that have long shaped the field. In this sense, the substantial contributions of scholars to the field of international relations (IR) are shown by an intellectual history approach to the study of core-periphery dynamics in IR (Acharya, 2014; Buzan, 2016; Hellmann & Valbjørn, 2017; Gelardi, 2019). These academics challenge the traditional Western-centric narrative of international relations by putting forth alternative viewpoints that highlight a variety of theoretical, historical, and cultural contexts (Bilgin, 2007). Their criticisms point out the shortcomings of the ontological and epistemological presumptions of IR, which forces the field to broaden its focus beyond experiences of Euro-Americans. IR can benefit from the addition of indigenous frameworks, as demonstrated by the works of non-Western intellectuals like Ibn Khaldun (1332-1406), who studied cyclical civilisational change (Spengler, 1964), and Kautilya (Indian Machiavelli) (375-283), who developed the mandala system (Gray, 2013). The integration of cultural and economic aspects, which are frequently discussed independently in Western discourse, enhances our comprehension of the complex character of globalization. Furthermore, IR has the opportunity to create a discourse that is more inclusive and globalized with the introduction of new linguistic and conceptual frameworks. In order to achieve their full potential, non-Western contributions must overcome the barriers that exist within the core, where they are often ignored or undervalued. The promotion of communication and mutual learning between Western and non-Western views has the potential to achieve more than just the sharing of knowledge.

This article addresses pivotal questions at the core of advancing Global IR by engaging with foundational concepts such as Turton's conceptualisations of cores. The study first considers the extent to which Turton's framework is useful for understanding the power dynamics between the core and periphery. It then explores how the concept of the periphery can be rethought in novel ways to better reflect the diverse realities of the global South. Furthermore, the research considers the question of epistemological freedom in Global IR, exploring whether scholars should seek a synthesis of diverse epistemologies or prioritise the pursuit of independent epistemic freedom across regions. Which of these approaches is more feasible and beneficial for the discipline's global inclusivity? A further key area of investigation is the part played by dialogue in determining the direction of Global IR. The study then considers whether dialogue is a necessary component of Global IR and, if so, how it can be effectively established to foster a more balanced exchange between core and peripheral voices. Finally, it critically examines the idea of civilizational dialogue as a tool for advancing Global IR, while considering whether such discourse risks entrenching exceptionalism and essentialism. These questions form the foundation for the article's exploration of how intellectual history and diverse perspectives can reshape Global IR to be more inclusive and pluralistic in following titles Core and Periphery, Multifaceted Conceptualisations of the 'Core', and Calls for Dialogue.

Core and Periphery in the IR

The field of IR remains dominated by Western perspectives, which have resulted in the marginalisation of the contributions of non-Western thinkers (Moshirzadeh, 2020; Kayaoglu, 2010; Eun & Pieczara, 2013; Acharya & Buzan, 2017; Bilgin, 2016). This dominance can be attributed to the persistence of centre-periphery dynamics, which privilege Western perspectives and constrain the diversity of intellectual input within IR (Turton, 2020). To foster a more balanced and inclusive field, it is imperative to restructure these dynamics and incorporate a greater representation of non-Western scholars.

The hierarchical structure of the IR field has historically served to reinforce Western dominance, particularly by affording privileged status to the perspectives of white males. The gatekeeping roles in journals and conferences are predominantly occupied by this group, which results in a cyclical process whereby research that is aligned with their experiences is given priority (Donnelly, 2006; Bayly, 2022). This results in the perpetuation of a narrow set of intuitions and theories, which in turn limits the scope of ideas that shape the discipline. Moreover, the hierarchy determines which issues are deemed "important" in IR, frequently prioritising traditional security concerns over those related to human security. Professional incentives encourage scholars from underrepresented groups to conform to mainstream perspectives, thereby reducing diversity in scholarship. Implicit biases in the selection of "essential" readings reinforce these dynamics, signalling to students that white male voices are the most valued (Lake, 2016). These insights underscore the core-periphery dynamics central to the article, highlighting the need for more inclusive dialogues that challenge intellectual hierarchies and embrace diverse perspectives in Global IR.

The concepts of "core" and "periphery" IR serve to illustrate the global power imbalances and intellectual dominance, particularly of Western nations. Turton (2020) presents a challenge to this rigid distinction, arguing that it oversimplifies the complex relationships within these groups. The role of language is pivotal, with English-speaking countries exerting a dominant influence over scholarly output, frequently marginalising non-English work. Furthermore, the West's role in determining which perspectives are given prominence serves to reinforce this hierarchy, with non-Western perspectives being marginalised (Aydinli & Biltekin, 2017). The institutional core, while still led by the United States and United Kingdom, is expanding, reflecting the fluidity of these dynamics as periphery regions adopt core practices, especially in East Asia. These insights underscore the need for a more nuanced core-periphery dialogue, as discussed in the article, in order to foster a more inclusive global IR.

The core-periphery distinction in IR reflects a complex and evolving global structure. A range of factors, including linguistic, intellectual and institutional,

contribute to the reinforcement of the dominance of certain regions while marginalising others. However, the internal stratification observed within both the core and the periphery demonstrates the limitations of this binary model, suggesting the potential for a more nuanced and inclusive understanding of power in IR. The concept of core-periphery dynamics is a fundamental concept in the field of IR. It highlights the hierarchical relationship between dominant and marginalised voices within the discipline (Acharya, 2011). Insights derived from Latin American intellectual history, particularly as elucidated by Schenoni and Escudé (2016), provide a comprehensive framework for analysing the structure of global IR and for acknowledging the intellectual contributions of peripheral states.

The theory of Peripheral Realism, which originated in Latin America, challenges the traditional frameworks of IR. It draws attention to the distinctive constraints faced by peripheral states. Rooted in the Raul-Prebisch centre-periphery paradigm and dependency theory (Baer, 1962), it critiques mainstream IR theories for failing to acknowledge the structural limitations on these states. The theory focuses on unequal global power relations and the strategies states employ based on their position within this hierarchy. The incorporation of Peripheral Realism into discourses on core-periphery dynamics in IR enhances our comprehension of the strategic positioning and intellectual history of peripheral states (Tickner, 2013). This perspective elucidates the function of non-Western scholars and perspectives within IR, demonstrating how these diverse voices contribute to and transform the ongoing dialogue between core and peripheral actors within the international system.

Turton's (2020) analysis offers a critical re-evaluation of the core-periphery dynamics concept, providing further insight into the nuances of this theoretical framework. Turton's critique reflects a broader dissatisfaction with the static use of the terms "core" and "periphery" in IR, particularly when applied to the Western and non-Western divides. She posits that even the core itself is stratified, challenging the simplistic binary and suggesting that the boundaries between core and periphery are fluid. Turton (2020) posits that core-periphery distinctions are multifaceted, encompassing linguistic, intellectual, and institutional or pedagogical cores. This layered approach provides readers with a more nuanced understanding of how these dynamics operate within IR, illustrating that core-periphery relationships are not static but evolve depending on the lens through which they are examined. Turton's contribution is thus valuable for readers, offering a critical perspective that enhances their engagement with other scholarship on core-periphery dynamics and encourages a deeper, more reflective approach to interpreting Western and non-Western paradigms in IR.

It is of significant importance to consider the linguistic core, which is essentially linked to the status of English as a global language. Turton (2020) posits that English is encouraged by the 'core' to be adopted in the periphery

358

through its domination. This situation gives rise to the formation of distinct clusters within the periphery, characterised by a growing divergence between scholars who publish in English and those who do not. Nevertheless, it seems plausible to suggest that the linguistic domination may serve to exacerbate the existing fissure in the periphery. For example, there are already disagreements as to how to challenge the domination of the core and make their voice heard in the discipline. This linguistic issue may appear to be an inevitable challenge for scholars in the periphery as they strive to globalise IR. However, this is not the end of the matter. As Turton (2020) posits, the existence of English-speaking hubs (such as campuses of certain universities) in the periphery gives rise to a stratification within the periphery. These hubs become the cores of the periphery, thereby establishing a local hierarchy within the wider global hierarchy. Consequently, the challenge of challenging hierarchies may necessitate a more comprehensive effort, otherwise it may result in the diversion of attention from the genuine aim of globalising the discipline or the consumption of time and energy.

The intellectual core represents an additional dimension of the core. The term is used to describe the volume of knowledge and intellectual production that has originated from specific Western countries, such as the United States and the United Kingdom. Western scholars have established certain standards, and from that perspective, they do not consider theorising efforts in the periphery to be genuine IR theory. In other words, as Aydinli and Biltekin (2017) point and quoted from Turton (2020, p. 189) "When a scholar from a peripheral field nevertheless attempts to 'do theory', their work is likely to be dismissed as not 'being theory'". A certain benchmark is set by Western scholars when evaluating a scholarly study. For instance, an IR theoretical work must demonstrate a commitment to Western epistemology in order to be regarded as legitimate knowledge. This is a crucial point, as any scholarly work that aspires to be recognised must first demonstrate that it is legitimate knowledge. This signifies a demonstration of power by the authority that allows its usage. A substantial corpus of literature exists which attempts to explain why there is no non-Western IR theory, despite the existence of efforts to develop one. This phenomenon can be attributed to the benchmark set by the intellectual core, which serves to legitimise and delegitimise knowledge production efforts. Consequently, this situation gives rise to a hierarchy of knowledge within the IR discipline, whereby certain forms of knowledge production are excluded. This, gives rise to a kind of false consciousness, as observed in Marxian terms (Lukács, 1971), whereby peripheral scholars may perceive their own work as lacking in theoretical rigour, due to their internalisation of the norms or critique associated with the aforementioned Western hierarchical views.

The establishment of hierarchies within the sphere of knowledge production is a crucial aspect to be considered. This perpetuates the 'epistemic

dependence' of scholars situated at the periphery on Western epistemologies. Epistemic dependence refers to a situation in which one's understanding and knowledge are shaped by the dominant epistemological framework of a particular group. This dependence perpetuates existing hierarchies, as the very structure of the hierarchy is constituted by this specific epistemology and epistemic dependence. It is crucial to address the epistemological issue if the Global IR initiative, which advocates for diversity within the discipline, is to succeed. As Shahi (2020), Turton (2020), and Moshirzadeh (2020) posit, the West - nonWest binary is constructed through this specific mode of knowledge production. The assumption that Western epistemology is the only valid mode of production serves to reinforce the dichotomy between the West and the non-West, which represents a significant obstacle to the advancement of Global IR, as Shahi (2020) has observed. An African scholar, Kwesi Kwaa Prah, attempted to provide a name for the struggle against epistemic domination, which he termed 'epistemic freedom' (Gutsheni, 2020). This concept of intellectual autonomy concerns the effort to break free from the limitations of epistemological frameworks that reinforce hierarchies. In order to gain a full understanding of the processes of knowledge production and constraints within the core, it is essential to explore the diverse and layered conceptualisations of the core in greater detail.

Multifaceted Conceptualizations of the "Core"
Turton's investigation (2020) of core-periphery dynamics in IR elucidates the intricacies and stratification that underpin the production and dissemination of knowledge within the discipline. His principal assertion is that conceptualisations of the "core" in IR are multifaceted, resulting in disparate boundaries and distinct dynamics between core and periphery. Each conceptualisation informs the contours of IR scholarship, influencing which countries and regions are accorded intellectual authority and which remain on the margins.

At the most general level, Turton defines the core as the "West," which encompasses not only Western Europe and the United States but also countries such as Australia, Canada, Israel, Japan, and New Zealand. This expansive view groups together countries historically linked to Western political, economic, and cultural dominance. However, it also simplifies the reality of a far more stratified core, where influence and power are unevenly distributed. The periphery, in this broad understanding, includes all countries outside the West, effectively defining a "non-West" that serves as a counterpoint to the Western-dominated core (Turton, 2020, p. 180).

The limitation of this comprehensive conceptualisation is that it fails to acknowledge the internal stratification that exists within the core itself. Turton offers a critique of this view by introducing a narrower conceptualisation: the "Anglosphere" or "Anglophone" core (p. 180). This group, which is unified by the shared use of the English language, encompasses Australia, parts of

Canada, Ireland, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and the United States. In this context, Turton highlights (p. 181) the significance of language in perpetuating intellectual hierarchies within the field of the IR. English has emerged as the dominant language of the discipline, conferring a privileged position on countries within the Anglosphere, particularly with regard to the production and dissemination of scholarly work. This dominance has the effect of marginalising non-English-speaking countries and restricting their capacity to influence global debates in IR.

Furthermore, Turton draws attention to the internal stratification of the Anglosphere. The United States occupies a dominant position at the pinnacle of this hierarchy, exerting considerable influence through its universities, research institutions, and extensive network of IR scholars, who collectively play a pivotal role in shaping the production of theory and research in the discipline. The United Kingdom is positioned as a close second, although in a somewhat subordinate role. The countries of Australia, Canada, Ireland and New Zealand are categorised as part of the 'post-imperial world', which situates them at the lowest level of the Anglosphere's hierarchy but still within the core. This stratification is essential to understanding the power dynamics at play within IR; even those countries within the core experience varying degrees of influence, with the United States exerting the most dominance (p. 181).

Western Europe occupies a semi-peripheral position in this framework, neither fully excluded from the core nor as central as the Anglosphere. Turton highlights that this exclusion is primarily linguistic in nature. A significant proportion of the IR scholarship produced in Western Europe is not written in English, which limits its global reach and influence. Nevertheless, the theoretical and empirical contributions of scholars from Western Europe are acknowledged, even if they are not accorded the same weight as those produced in the Anglophone world. The semi-peripheral status of Western Europe underscores the broader linguistic and cultural barriers that shape the global distribution of knowledge in IR, where English serves as a gatekeeper, determining which countries' scholarship is most visible and impactful (p. 181).

One of Turton's more critical points is his discussion of the narrower conceptualisation of the core as consisting solely of the United States and the United Kingdom. This perspective posits that the United States and the United Kingdom exert considerable influence within the field of IR, not merely through the quantity of scholarly output they generate, but also through the institutional presence they command. The majority of major IR journals, conferences, and academic networks are based in the United States and the United Kingdom, which serves to reinforce their respective dominant positions. Turton posits that the United States is the more dominant of the two, largely due to its larger academic infrastructure and financial resources (p. 182). The United Kingdom, while still central, plays a secondary role but is nonetheless an essential part of the Anglophone core.

An essential aspect of Turton's analysis is his recognition of potential obstacles to the continued dominance of the United States and the United Kingdom. He observes that "European IR," particularly in Continental Europe, has the potential to emerge as a significant challenger to the hegemony of the United States-United Kingdom axis. European IR, which encompasses intellectual traditions from countries such as France and Germany, presents an alternative to the Anglophone dominance. As an increasing number of European scholars publish in English and engage with global debates, they may potentially shift the balance of power within the discipline, thereby transforming the core-periphery dynamics. However, Turton is cautious in his optimism, acknowledging that the dominance of English as the lingua franca of IR represents a significant obstacle to a more pluralistic discipline (p. 183).

At the most fundamental level, Turton puts forth the proposition that the concept of the core can be reduced to the United States. This perspective highlights the pervasive influence of American institutions, scholars, and theoretical contributions. IR is characterised as an "American-dominated discipline", with the United States universities and journals exerting a significant influence over the global research agenda (p. 183). This perspective serves to reinforce a highly hierarchical organisation of the periphery, with the United Kingdom positioned as the least peripheral country due to its close alignment with the United States IR traditions. Subsequently, other Anglophone countries are situated in the next tier, followed by Western Europe, Israel, and Japan. The remaining countries, including China, Eastern Europe, Latin America, South Asia, and Southeast Asia, are positioned at a lower level within this hierarchy. This stratification reflects the broader inequalities in the global academic system, where countries outside the core face significant challenges in having their research recognised or in influencing the discipline's trajectory.

Turton's analysis (p.192). demonstrates that core-periphery dynamics in IR are not static; rather, they are fluid and subject to change based on a range of factors, including language, institutional resources, and geopolitical shifts. His argument challenges the simplistic binary of core and periphery by illustrating the internal hierarchies within the core itself and highlighting the different levels of marginalisation experienced by countries in the periphery. Furthermore, Turton prompts reflection on the future of IR as a discipline. As non-Western scholars contribute increasingly to the field and as European IR gains greater visibility, there is potential for a more pluralistic and globally representative discipline. However, this shift will necessitate substantial changes to the current structures that privilege Anglophone scholarship and marginalise non-English-speaking voices.

Turton's (2020) critique of the core-periphery binary represents a call for scholars engaged in the field of IR to adopt a more nuanced and complex approach to understanding and addressing global inequalities. While the

core-periphery framework has proven useful for identifying patterns of dominance and marginalisation, it is ultimately limited in its ability to capture the full diversity of experiences and power relations within the global academic system. Turton's recommendations for extending the analytical scope beyond nation-states, conducting a critical examination of the dynamics within the core, and adopting a more inclusive lexicon are pivotal steps towards the creation of a more equitable and representative discipline. By destabilising the core-periphery binary, scholars can gain a deeper understanding of the complex and multifaceted ways in which power operates in IR, and work towards a future where knowledge production is truly global and inclusive.

Calls for Dialogue
Turton (2020) the core-periphery framework for oversimplifying diversity and ignoring internal exclusions in the periphery, emphasizing the linguistic, intellectual, and institutional dominance of the 'West'. It makes a case for looking beyond this simple contrast to analyze power dynamics within IR communities in a critical manner. It is probable that Turton would be cautious in approaching 'calls for dialogue' examining their intentions, conditions, and potential outcomes. She could question if these requests are truly aiming to promote a more diverse and fair discussion, or if they are actually maintaining current power structures. In addition, she would probably emphasize the significance of making sure that these conversations result in tangible progress instead of just being superficial acts.

An examination of the core-periphery dynamics within the field of IR reveals the difficulties inherent in establishing genuine dialogue and inclusivity within the discipline. Scholars from around the globe have put forth a multitude of potential solutions, with the promotion of dialogue emerging as a particularly popular avenue for addressing the dominance of Western perspectives. However, the terms and structure of such a dialogue remain a point of contention. Moshirzadeh (2020, p. 213) posits that "if it can be seen as a part of civilizational dialogue, we may have a better, more clarified understanding of it, since the key philosophical assumption behind the idea of dialogue of civilizations represents a challenge to the Western-centric matrix of contemporary practices and thinking in IR." Nevertheless, basing dialogue on civilizational identities is problematic, as it risks reinforcing binaries, such as West vs. non-West, "us vs. them" a danger that Shahi (2020) has warned against. Such framing can entrench divisions rather than fostering mutual understanding.

Furthermore, Moshirzadeh's (2020) use of the term "civilization" is also ambiguous in that he employs it interchangeably with "culture." This ambiguity carries the risk of essentialising cultures as fixed and unchanging, which may unintentionally foster perceptions of superiority and inferiority. Such an approach carries the risk of reinforcing "exceptionalism" (e.g. Turkish or American exceptionalism), which can result in hierarchical rather than inclusive

363

dialogues. As Kuru (2020, p. 235) argues, essentialising cultures may serve as "further mechanisms of parochialism", limiting the scope of dialogue in IR by imposing narrow, exclusionary perspectives.

Moshirzadeh's (2020) conceptualisation of civilisation as a "collective identity" or "intentionality" introduces further complexities. Despite his acknowledgement of the diversity within civilisations, questions remain regarding the dominance of certain ideas within this diversity within the discourse. It is therefore pertinent to inquire as to whether certain voices will prevail over others, and if so, whose perspectives will be the most influential. Shahi (2020, p. 172) offers a critique of this uneven playing field, arguing that the West has assumed a position of privilege in the production of knowledge within the field of IR and other social sciences. This, he suggests, has manifested in the West's role as a conventional knowledge-producer in these fields. This historical legacy has positioned the West as the primary producer of legitimate knowledge, thereby marginalising non-Western contributions. The use of civilizational lenses in framing dialogue may serve to perpetuate these dynamics, as the recognition of "civilizations" can often become a tool for delineation rather than genuine exchange. The use of civilizational lenses in dialogue raises questions of authenticity and representation. For example, the concept of a 'real West' or a 'true Iranian civilization' invites the question of who is entitled to determine these definitions. This approach relies on the assumption that civilizations possess an immutable 'realness', which can inhibit open dialogue and foster a fragile and superficial exchange that may collapse under the weight of inherent biases and power imbalances.

The concept of civilisation is inherently linked to the discipline of history. Kuru (2020) presents a number of valuable insights pertaining to the value of global intellectual history and historical sociology. Although Shahi (2020) appears to encourage a greater focus on philosophy than history, Kuru (2020, p. 238) proposes a more active engagement with global intellectual history. Kuru proposes that this will serve as a means of presenting tools that will enrich the quest of Global IR, which is to broaden our understanding of world politics, with a special contribution to be made by our past. As Kuru (2020, p. 239) posits, Global Intellectual History entails transcending the constraints of 'scholarly parochialism' and methodological nationalism. As Turton (2020) also outlines, this parochialism and methodological nationalism present a significant challenge for Global IR. Such engagement may prove a more fruitful avenue for Globalising IR than establishing dialogue based on civilisation, given the risk of its culturalist connotations. The objective of global intellectual history and historical sociology is to demonstrate global patterns, which is also aligned with the argument put forth by Shahi (2020, p. 169) regarding covariance. This concept suggests that ideas that are intrinsically related can be generated in historically and culturally distant spaces. This approach can assist in avoiding the "chronological battle" that Shahi (2020, p. 169)

identifies as a potential issue. This battle concerns the question of which individual or group came first in the development of a particular idea, concept, method, or theory.

The call for the globalisation of the discipline of IR has been articulated in a variety of ways, reflecting different perspectives on the incorporation of diverse voices and structures into the field (Buzan, 2016; Tickner & Blaney, 2012; Blaney & Tickner, 2017). Kuru (2020), for instance, underscores the necessity of linking ideas with their institutional and structural dimensions by integrating insights from global and international historical sociology, global intellectual history, and Global IR. This approach, which is more theoretical in nature than practice-oriented works like Moshirzadeh's (2020), provides a framework for understanding the intersection of ideas and institutional power in IR.

In their respective works, Shahi (2020), Turton (2020), and Moshirzadeh (2020) address the core-periphery dialogue from distinct perspectives, offering insights on enhancing inclusivity. Shahi proposes a "dialogic approach," which emphasises a two-way, non-binary exchange with the objective of dismantling hierarchies and fostering deeper understanding across cultural divides. This approach is valuable for its commitment to non-hierarchical communication, which suggests that genuine dialogue requires overcoming the structural binaries that have historically shaped the field.

Turton (2020) builds on this discussion by examining the concept of the "institutional core," with a particular focus on the ways in which the United Kingdom and the United States exert dominance within the discipline through their concentration of leading scholars, institutions, and journals. This analysis broadens our understanding of the fluid and stratified nature of core-periphery dynamics in IR, highlighting how influence within the core itself is structured and maintained. However, Turton's (2020) approach does not propose new concepts to address the nuances of power and influence observed within the discipline. Instead, it urges further investigation into stratification within the periphery itself, which has significant implications for understanding global power dynamics within IR.

Moshirzadeh (2020) introduces a civilizational perspective to dialogue, which risks essentialism and exceptionalism by implying fixed cultural identities. While his approach emphasises the value of civilizational identities, it inadvertently reinforces binary oppositions and risks reducing complex identities to simplistic categories. Such essentialising can hinder rather than promote meaningful dialogue, as it potentially reinforces hierarchical perceptions among civilisations.

As Kuru (2020) posits, a truly globalised IR discipline can benefit from engaging with other globalised or globalising disciplines. The application of methodologies and insights from fields such as global sociology and intellectual

history can enrich IR by offering new frameworks for cross-cultural analysis. By fostering dialogue and collaboration across these subfields, IR scholars can create a more comprehensive and inclusive approach, addressing the limitations of current theories and better accommodating diverse perspectives.

The globalisation of IR remains a complex issue, with a multitude of scholars offering a similarly diverse array of approaches. Moshirzadeh (2020) proposes civilizational dialogue as a means of challenging Western dominance. However, this approach may inadvertently reinforce cultural essentialism and exclusion. In response, Shahi (2020) puts forward an alternative approach: a non-hierarchical, dialogic approach that challenges the dominance of binary oppositions. Kuru (2020) also offers a critique of the current state of IR, emphasising the value of integrating global intellectual history and sociology. Kuru presents a framework for a more inclusive approach to the discipline of international relations, with a particular focus on the interplay between ideas and institutional power. This approach promises a more effective interpretation for understanding global politics, while avoiding the limitations of civilizational reductionism.

Conclusion

This article has examined the pivotal issues pertaining to core-periphery theories in IR from an intellectual history standpoint, underscoring the necessity for a more comprehensive and global approach to the field. By examining the works of scholars such as Turton, Kuru, Moshirzadeh, and Shahi, this paper engaged with fundamental inquiries regarding power relations, the freedom of knowledge production, and the importance of dialogue in the advancement of global IR. Turton's conceptualisation of core-periphery structures provided a better framework for understanding the continued dominance of Western perspectives and the marginalisation of non-Western viewpoints. Furthermore, it encouraged a re-evaluation of the periphery in a manner that reflects the distinctive experiences of the Global South.

The question of epistemological freedom remains a central issue. Should Global IR strive for a synthesis of diverse epistemologies, or would independent epistemic freedom across regions better serve the goal of inclusivity? This inquiry is closely tied to the role of dialogue, which, as this study argues, is essential for fostering meaningful exchanges between core and peripheral perspectives. However, dialogue must avoid reinforcing binaries or entrenching essentialist and exceptionalist views, particularly when framed in terms of civilizational identities, which may risk solidifying a West versus non-West dichotomy.

In addressing these questions, this study emphasised the necessity for a nuanced comprehension of core-periphery relationships that transcends simplistic dualities and acknowledges the evolving, dynamic nature of Global

IR. Acknowledging the influence of local contexts, intellectual traditions, and geopolitical histories on the evolution of IR scholarship paves the way for more nuanced discourses that authentically reflect the diversity of global experiences.

In conclusion, the realisation of a genuinely pluralistic and inclusive IR depends on the dismantling of barriers to participation, the overcoming of epistemological biases and a shift away from the current centre-periphery dynamics. The contributions of non-Western intellectuals are vital to this transformation, offering the potential for IR to more accurately represent the complexity of global politics and foster a discipline that is genuinely reflective of diverse perspectives.

References

Acharya, A. (2011). Dialogue and Discovery: In Search of International Relations Theories Beyond the West. *Millennium Journal of International Studies, 39*(3), 619–637. https://doi.org/10.1177/0305829811406574

Acharya, A. (2014). Global international relations (IR) and regional worlds. *International Studies Quarterly: A Publication of the International Studies Association, 58*(4), 647–659. DOI:10.1111/isqu.12171

Acharya, A. and Buzan, B. (2017). Why is There non Non-Western IR Theory? Ten Years On. *International Relations of the Asia Pacific, 17*(3). 341–370.

Anderl, F., & Witt, A. (2020). Problematising the Global in Global IR. *Millennium Journal of International Studies, 49*(1), 32–57. https://doi.org/10.1177/0305829820971708

Aydinli, E., & Biltekin, G. (December 2017). "Peripheral perspectives: The theorizing potential of Global South IR". *All Azimuth: A Journal of Foreign Policy and Peace, 7*(1), 45 - 68.

Bailón, R. O. F., & De Lissovoy, N. (2018). Against coloniality: Toward an epistemically insurgent curriculum. *Policy Futures in Education, 17*(3), 355–369. https://doi.org/10.1177/1478210318819206

Bayly, M. J. (2022). Global intellectual history in International Relations: Hierarchy, empire, and the case of late colonial Indian international thought. *Review of International Studies, 49*(3), 428–447. https://doi.org/10.1017/s026021052200041

Baer, W. (1962). The Economics of Prebisch and ECLA. *Economic Development and Cultural Change, 10*(2), 169–182. http://www.jstor.org/stable/1151909

Bettiza, G. (2014). Civilizational Analysis in International Relations: Mapping the Field and Advancing a "Civilizational Politics" Line of Research. *International Studies Review, 16*(1), 1–28. https://doi.org/10.1111/misr.12100

Bilgin, P. (2007). Thinking past 'Western' IR?, *Third World Quarterly, 29*(1), 5–23. https://doi.org/10.1080/01436590701726392

Bilgin, P. (2016). Contrapuntal Reading as a Method, an Ethos, and a Metaphor for Global IR, *International Studies Review, 18*(1). 134–46.

Blaney, D. L., & Tickner, A. B. (2017). Worlding, Ontological Politics and the Possibility of a Decolonial IR. *Millennium, 45*(3), 293-311. DOI: 10.1177/0305829817702446

Buzan, B. (2016). Could IR Be Different?. *International Studies Review, 18*(1), 155–157. doi:10.1093/isr/viv025

Donnelly, J. (2006). Sovereign Inequalities and Hierarchy in Anarchy: American Power and International Society. *European Journal of International Relations, 12*(2), 139–170.

Eun, Y. & Pieczara, K. (2013). Getting Asia Right and Advancing the Field of IR, *Political Studies Review, 11*(3). 369–77.

Eun, Y. S. (2018). Beyond 'the West/non-West Divide' in IR: How to Ensure Dialogue as Mutual Learning. *The Chinese Journal of International Politics, 11*(4), 435–449. https://doi.org/10.1093/cjip/poy014

Gelardi, M. (2019). "Moving global IR forward—A road map". *International Studies Review, 22*(4), 830–852. doi:10.1093/isr/viz049

Goodhart, M. (2003). Origins and Universality in the Human Rights Debates: Cultural Essentialism and the Challenge of Globalization. *Human Rights Quarterly, 25*(4), 935–964. https://doi.org/10.1353/hrq.2003.0043

Gray, S. (2013). Reexamining Kautilya and Machiavelli. *Political Theory, 42*(6), 635–657. https://doi.org/10.1177/0090591713505094

Hellmann, G., & Valbjørn, M. (2017). Problematizing global challenges: Recalibrating the "inter" in IR-Theory Inter Alia: On global orders, practices, and Theory. The inter as liminal spaces: Prudence, transience, and Affection Dialoguing about dialogues: On the purpose, procedure and product of dialogues in inter-national relations Theory Interpreting international Relations The narrative of academic dominance: How to overcome performing the "core-periphery" divide. *International Studies Review, 19*(2), 279–309. DOI:10.1093/isr/vix009

Kayaoğlu, T. (2010). Westphalian Eurocentrism in International Relations Theory," *International Studies Review, 12*(2). 193–217.

Klink, F. F. (1990). Rationalizing Core-Periphery Relations: The Analytical Foundations of Structural Inequality in World Politics. *International Studies Quarterly, 34*(2), 183–183. https://doi.org/10.2307/2600708

Köchler, H. (2011). The Philosophy and Politics of Dialogue. Culture and Dialogue, 1(2), 5–19. https://doi.org/10.1163/24683949-00102002

Kuru, D. (2020). Dialogue of the "Globals": Connecting Global IR to Global Intellectual History. *All Azimuth: A Journal of Foreign Policy and Peace, 9*(2), 229-248.

Lake, D. A. (2016). White Man's IR: An Intellectual Confession. *Perspectives on Politics, 14*(4), 1112–1122. doi:10.1017/S153759271600308X

Lukács, György. (1971). Hi*story and class consciousness: studies in Marxist dialectics 1885-1971.* Cambridge, Mass. MIT Press.

Moshirzadeh, H. (2020). The Idea of Dialogue of Civilizations and Core-Periphery Dialogue in International Relations. *All Azimuth: A Journal of Foreign Policy & Peace, 9*(2). 211-227

Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S. J. (2020). The cognitive empire, politics of knowledge and African intellectual productions: reflections on struggles for epistemic freedom and resurgence of decolonisation in the twenty-first century. *Third World Quarterly*, 1-20.

Prah, K. K. (1998). *Beyond The Colorline. Trenton*, NJ: Africa Research & Publications.

R'boul, H. (2022). Epistemological plurality in intercultural communication knowledge. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses, 17*(2), 173–188. https://doi.org/10.1080/17447143.2022.2069784

Schenoni, L., & Escudé, C. (2016). Peripheral realism revisited. *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional*, *59*(1). DOI:10.1590/0034-7329201600102

Shahi, D. (2020). Foregrounding the Complexities of a Dialogic Approach to Global International Relations. *All Azimuth: A Journal of Foreign Policy & Peace, 9(2).* 163-176.

Sharma, A. (2021). Decolonizing International Relations: Confronting Erasures through Indigenous Knowledge Systems. *International Studies, 58*(1), 25–40. https://doi.org/10.1177/0020881720981209

Spengler, J. J. (1964). Economic Thought of Islam: Ibn Khaldūn. *Comparative Studies in Society and History, 6*(3), 268–306. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0010417500002164

Tickner, A. B. (2013). Core, periphery and (neo)imperialist International Relations. *European Journal of International Relations, 19*(3), 627–646. https://doi.org/10.1177/1354066113494323

Tickner, A., & Blaney, D.L. (Eds.). (2012). *Thinking International Relations Differently (1st ed.).* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203129920

Turton, H. L. (2020). Locating a multifaceted and stratified disciplinary 'core'. *All Azimuth: A Journal of Foreign Policy and Peace, 9(2).* 177-209.

Zhou, V. X., & Pilcher, N. (2018). Tapping the thirdness in the intercultural space of dialogue. *Language and Intercultural Communication, 19*(1), 23–37. https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2018.1545025