

# Non-Western International Relations as Historical Rejuvenation and Theoretical Framework

Sachin Karmacharya 

sachinkarmacharya777@gmail.com

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3126/japfsc.v9i1.94386>

---

## Article History:

Received: 29 November 2025

Revised: 23 April 2026

Accepted: 27 April 2026

---

## Keywords:

Non-Western IR, rejuvenation, theoretical framework, intellectual tradition, inclusive

## To cite this article:

Karmacharya, S. (2026). Non-Western international relations as historical rejuvenation and theoretical framework. *Journal of APF Command and Staff College*, 9(1), 133-149. <https://doi.org/10.3126/japfsc.v9i1.94386>

---

## Corresponding Editor

Ramesh Raj Kunwar

[kunwar.sangla2@gmail.com](mailto:kunwar.sangla2@gmail.com)

## Abstract

*Non-Western International Relations represent as a historical rejuvenation and theoretical framework. Amidst the longstanding of Western scholarhip, the paper investgites how non-Western perspectives reconstruct global political analysis by drawing upon diverse cultural, philosphical and historical ontologies. The Western frameworks like Realism and Liberalism are limited to adequately address global complexities due to their parochial origins. The non-Western theories offer normative alternatives emphasizing harmony, communalism, and ethical statecraft. The analysis reveals that integrating these traditions challenges the Westphalian status quo and enriches global governance models. The objective is to evaluate the capacity of these rejuvenated traditions to reshape the disciplinary architecture of International Relations and reconfigure understandings of global power dynamics. Employing a qualitative methodology centered on comparative analysis and critical literature review, the study interrogates whether contemporary non-Western theories represent novel paradigmatic shifts or the revitalization of indigenous wisdom. This paper finds*

*that non-Western International Relations functions as a distinct theoretical framework wherein historical rejuvenation informs contemporary application, blending ancient statecraft with modern geopolitical realities. This dual constitution challenges Western narratives, advocating for an epistemically pluralistic discipline that integrates reclaimed historical insights into the core of International Relations theory. The integration of non-Western IR theories advances a more inclusive and globally grounded conceptualization of international dynamics.*

## **Introduction**

International Relations (IR) is an interdisciplinary field that constitutes a scholarly discipline dedicated to interrogating the complex constellations of power and association among states, nations, intergovernmental organizations, non-state actors, and multinational corporations within the global polity (Baylis et al., 2017). While historically centered on high politics such as war, peace and diplomatic statecraft, the discipline of IR has evolved to interrogate a broader spectrum of transnational challenges including climate change, global health security, mass migration, cyber warfare and cultural identity formation (Buzan, 2007; Jackson & Sørensen, 2019). The discipline focuses on understanding the dynamics of power, cooperation, and conflict that drive these relationships, as well as examining how such interactions shape and are shaped by international institutions, norms, and legal frameworks (Keohane, 1984).

According to Dunne et al. (2010), IR theory offers interpretive tools for analyzing the complex interplay between material capabilities, ideational structures, and normative commitments in world politics. IR must incorporate diverse epistemological perspectives and historical experiences. This approach challenges the field to move beyond state-centric and promoting a more pluralistic understanding of global political life (Acharya, 2014; Tickner, 2003).

The term 'non-Western' is often used to denote cultures and societies. However, it is important to recognize that this categorization is problematic, as it oversimplifies the diversity of these cultures (Spivak, 1988). For instance, instead of using non-Western terms, it might use terms like global south and Postcolonial (Edward, 1978).

Rejuvenation is the process of revitalizing something to bring it back to its original, youthful state. It may allude to emotional, mental, or physical rejuvenation (Oxford, n.d.). Rejuvenation comprises a wide range of approaches to revitalization, from beauty items promising youthful skin to spiritual activities aimed at inner calm.

A theoretical framework is the structured set of concepts, assumptions and established theories designed to explain, predict and analyze a research phenomenon (Gerring, 2017; Ravitch & Riggan, 2017). It serves as the theoretical background that justifies the study's rationale by linking the research problem with existing theories (Swanson, 2013).

The discipline of IR traces its intellectual ancestry to ancient philosophical reflections on war, peace, and order among autonomous political communities, as evidenced in the strategic statecraft of Kautilya's Arthashastra, the ethical-political synthesis of Confucian thought, and the realist-pragmatic insights of Thucydides and Machiavelli (Boesche, 2002). The peace of Westphalia, 1648 is regarded as the foundational moment of modern IR, establishing the structural framework of state sovereignty, territorial integrity, and diplomatic protocol that continues to define the international system (Krasner, 1993; Oslander, 2001). In this reference, IR between states afterward expanded the scope of subject in complex yet simpler manner, independence yet inter-dependence, separateness yet closeness, nationalism yet internationalism (Baylis et al., 2017).

However, IR emerged as a formal academic field in the aftermath of the First World War, driven by the urgent imperative to systematically understand the causes of war and establish conditions for lasting peace (Schmidt, 1998). In the United Kingdom, the discipline's early development was significantly shaped by Liberal Idealism, drawing upon Woodrow Wilson's normative vision of collective security and institutional cooperation (Acharya & Buzan, 2019). The post-Second World War era marked a decisive scientific turn, wherein behavioralism, systems theory, game theory, and structural realism sought to rationalize international politics through positivist methodologies and parsimonious theoretical models, epitomized by Kenneth Waltz's neorealist framework (Waltz, 1979; Kaplan, 1957).

The 1980s marked a critical turning point as scholars challenged the "neo-neo" consensus, reintegrating history to expose the shortcomings of ahistorical scientific approaches (Cox, 1981; Walker, 1993; Leira & de Carvalho, 2016). This intellectual opening allowed historical analysis to flourish within both mainstream and critical traditions, including constructivism and historical sociology (Ruggie, 1986; Kratochwil, 1986). The post-1989 geopolitical landscape characterized by the breakdown of bipolarity and the emergence of Global South powers necessitated a return to historical consciousness to understand an increasingly multipolar and uncertain world order (Bertelson, 2020). Consequently, history has regained prominence as essential for constructing inclusive, globally representative theories of IR.

IR is a Western field of study (Acharya & Buzan, 2007). Since the issues raised and potential remedies are thought to be Western-oriented, Western academics and institutions are predominantly responsible for producing academic work. Theories of realism and liberalism, which originated with the writings of Western philosophers like Hobbes and Kant, have evolved into the accepted methods of IR. However, this conventional wisdom has come under scrutiny. Revisionists claim that the history of Westphalia is a historical myth that serves as a historical foundation for specific realist or conventional social theories (Jackson & Sørensen, 2019). The conventional perspective generalizes the fundamental rules that all states must abide by while exalting Western values (Hobson, 2004). Western centrism creates parochialism because it cannot address the issues of the entire world, especially the non-Western world.

Likewise, it is anticipated that scholars will analyze their problems using Western theories. The Teaching, Research, and International Politics Project (TRIP) survey offers the most comprehensive database of data on the field of IR, revealing research and teaching methodologies as well as perspectives on foreign policy concerns among IR scholars. According to Eun (2019), 66.98% of IR researchers from 32 Western and 13 non-Western countries who participated in the 2014 TRIP poll agreed or strongly agreed that IR is a discipline developed by the West and North America. The Western IR scholars are recognized as the most significant researchers in the discipline. According to Tickner (2001) and Eun (2019), non-Western scholars are for theory testing, whereas Western scholars are thought to be knowledge producers. Tickner (2003) argued that the conventional IR theories are insufficient for understanding world politics, suggesting developing non-Western International Relations theories and incorporating local history, culture, or dynamics.

This paper explored non-Western IR traditions, thereby enriching the theoretical landscape and fostering a more pluralistic understanding of global dynamics. It posits that the discipline has long been dominated by Eurocentric frameworks, neglecting the rich and diverse intellectual traditions of other cultures. Ultimately, this work seeks to revitalize the field of IR by incorporating a broader range of epistemological and ontological assumptions.

## **Review of Literature**

According to Said (1978), the idea of the Orient is a Western invention that acts as a counterpoint to clarify and strengthen Western identity. This Orientalism has been crucial in defending colonial dominance and is present in a number of academic fields, including politics, literature, and history. On the other hand, berates the Orient and downplays the diversity and intricacies found inside Eastern nations. Nevertheless, Orientalism

is nevertheless a major component of postcolonial studies and has a lasting impact on discussions concerning representation, power, and knowledge (Chen, 2011).

Spivak (1988) explains the ability of intellectuals, especially those from wealthy backgrounds, to represent the experiences of marginalized groups, specifically women in the Global South. The author highlights the structural barriers preventing these voices from being heard. Nevertheless, Tickner (2001) has also come under fire for being overly negative and for possibly silencing the people it aims to represent. However, continues to be a vital starting point for conversations about power, representation, and the creation of knowledge.

Rangarajan (1992) explores the Contemporary IR theories remains entrenched in an epistemic hegemony that marginalizes non-Western ontologies as derivative regional cases, often misinterpreting Kautilyan statecraft. This reductionism obscures critical theoretical divergences: where Western Realism accepts anarchy, Matsyanyaya posits order as a moral imperative; where Western alliance theory is static, Rajamandala offers dynamic relationality; and where Western thought dichotomizes power and ethics, Dharmic Realism integrates them internally. Additionally, Saptanga theory challenges the Western domestic-international divide by linking internal stability to external power. Ultimately, integrating these non-Western concepts is not merely an exercise in historical recovery but a necessary methodological intervention to decolonize IR, offering holistic frameworks for understanding state construction, ethical power, and relational geopolitics that Western paradigms fail to capture.

Chatterjee (1993) highlights the consideration of colonialism's lasting effects on India and, by extension, the broader non-Western world. The author also delves in to the notion that traditional civilization evolved linearly into contemporary ones, contending that colonialism produced a hybrid that still influences postcolonial experiences. The basis for comprehending the ways in which colonial power structures have impacted the evolution and the challenges of navigating a world order.

Tickner (2003) demonstrates how Latin American scholar has been systematically marginalized in mainstream IR. The author argues that incorporating these voices reveals blind spots in Western theories regarding inequality, imperialism, and peripheral agency. It provides empirical evidence that Western IR is incomplete without non-Western input. Use this to argue that concepts from the Global South offer explanatory power for issues like global inequality that Western Liberalism often overlooks.

Jordan et al. (2009) analyzed that Teaching, Research and International Policy (TRIP) Project survey of IR faculty across ten countries provides critical empirical evidence challenging the assumption of a monolithic, American-dominated discipline. The study reveals significant epistemological divergence: while 65% of U.S. scholars identify as positivists, majorities in the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa describe their work as non- or post-positivist, suggesting a deep methodological fault line within the field contrary to claims of Western theoretical hegemony, the survey finds that realism, liberalism, and constructivism are represented albeit in varying proportions across all national contexts, with no single paradigm achieving global dominance. These findings are particularly relevant for non-Western IR research, as they empirically substantiate calls for epistemic pluralism: the discipline is already more diverse than often portrayed, yet structural biases in publication, citation, and curriculum may still marginalize non-Western ontologies.

Shilliam (2015) explores a profound critique of the territorial and state-centric assumptions underpinning mainstream Western IR. By centering Black and Indigenous political thought from the Pacific region, Shilliam illuminates relational, oceanic, and diasporic ontologies that fundamentally disrupt Westphalian categories such as fixed borders, sovereign territory, and the nation-state. This scholarship demonstrates that non-Western theories are not merely additive but possess the capacity to reconstruct IR's core conceptual architecture. Consequently, integrating Shilliam's insights reveals the limitations of Eurocentric frameworks, arguing that a truly global discipline must accommodate these alternative spatial and political imaginaries to accurately understand transnational solidarity and post-colonial security dynamics.

Acharya and Buzan (2019) explain a comprehensive re-examination of the predominance of Western centric IR theories. By tracing the evolution of IR from its colonial origins to the contemporary period, they highlight the marginalization of non-Western perspectives. The authors illustrate how the Confucian values of harmony, hierarchy, and human-centered administration have influenced regional order by looking at the East Asian region. The study challenges the Westphalian assumptions that underlie most of the subject and offers an alternative normative framework, which makes a substantial contribution to the increasing body of research on non-Western IR.

Hall (2020) examines the development and status of China-focused IR research. In order to obtain a more thorough knowledge of China's involvement in international politics, he calls for a paradigm change that takes into account both its own intellectual traditions and geopolitical strategies. This assessment emphasises how crucial it is to

incorporate many points of view in order to fully understand China's expanding influence and the consequences it will have for IR.

Demirer (2020) analyzes of Qing China and the Ottoman Empire reframes the perceived silence of non-Western IR theory not as an epistemic absence, but as a strategic camouflage born from the trauma of imperial decline and colonial subjugation. This intervention challenges the disciplinary tendency to equate theoretical invisibility with theoretical non-existence, arguing instead that marginalized societies often encode their strategic thought within historical, literary, or diplomatic practices that Western IR fails to recognize as theory. By centering the experiences of two pivotal non-Western empires, Demirer contributes to the decolonial critique advanced by scholars like Acharya and Bilgin, demonstrating that recovering these silenced voices is essential for understanding how power, resistance, and order are conceptualized beyond the Westphalian canon.

Buzan and Acharya (2021) analyze traditional Western-centric IR theories. The authors also argue for a more inclusive strategy that takes non-Western viewpoints into account. They investigate the ways in which incorporating varied local perspectives, particularly those from China, India, and the Islamic world can deepen and broaden our comprehension of world politics. The book makes the case for reimagining the IR framework in order to provide a more thorough and nuanced understanding of IR by recognizing and incorporating the philosophical, historical, and cultural contributions of non-Western traditions.

According to K.C. (2024), there is a growing interest in non-Western (IR) studies, which is often presented as a cutting-edge academic endeavor. This viewpoint undervalues non-Western intellectuals' significant historical and theoretical contributions to the study of diplomacy, power, and international order. The non-Western IR is by no means a new phenomenon; rather, it is, in many respects, the discipline's founding heritage. As historical evidence demonstrates, centuries prior to the Western disciplinary canon coalescing, scholars such as Sun Tzu, Kautilya, and Ibn Khaldun had already established complex theories of warfare, diplomacy, and governance. The intricate problems of power, balance, and alliance building, which laid the foundation for many of the ideas that are now considered fundamental to IR.

Safi et al. (2025), provides a crucial empirical intervention in non-Western IR scholarship by centering Afghan historical experiences, tribal governance structures, and regional geopolitical logics often marginalized in mainstream analyses. Their work challenges the application of universalized Western frameworks such as liberal state-

building or democratic peace theory to complex post-colonial contexts, demonstrating how local ontologies of power, legitimacy, and conflict resolution offer more nuanced explanatory power. By foregrounding Afghan agency and indigenous political thought, the authors contribute to the broader decolonial project in IR, illustrating that non-Western perspectives are not merely cases to be theorized but essential sources of theory themselves, capable of reshaping core disciplinary assumptions about sovereignty, intervention, and order in fragile states.

### **Research Methodology**

Methodology is concerned with the logic of scientific inquiry, in particular with investigating the potentialities and limitations of particular techniques or procedures. Research methods are the techniques or procedures used to collate and analyze data. It further discusses the data collection tools and finally provides the method of analysis adopted in the thesis. The nature of this research is descriptive and analytical, as the information originates from various sources that have been synchronized and analyzed properly.

This study employs a qualitative methodology that integrates critical discourse analysis. This work critically examines prevailing Western IR theories. The methodology involves a document analysis of scholarly literature, historical texts to highlight the limitation of mainstream IR theories. This research aims to critique the predominance of Western perspectives in IR, identify the limitations of applying Western theories to non-Western contexts.

The secondary data sources are used for the justification of the study that provides a discussion on the research approach, methods and process adopted in the study. The analysis part is an important part of study under which the data is presented and analyzed in useful format. Under this part the data is analyzed to achieve the desired objective of the paper.

### **Findings and Discussion**

The theoretical architecture of non-Western IR has been constructed through the cumulative interventions of scholars across regions. Foundational figures like Acharya and Buzan (2010) established the critique of epistemic hegemony, while regional specialists Chen (2011) in Asia, Grovogui (2006) in Africa, and Escudé (1995) in Latin America articulated context-specific alternatives. Therefore, scholars demonstrate that non-Western IR is not a monolithic project but a pluralistic endeavor encompassing relational ontologies (Qin, 2018), decolonial methodologies (Bilgin, 2016), and indigenous cosmologies (Murithi, 2006).

The discipline of IR has historically been structured in distinct ontological and epistemological assumptions about global politics. Realism, grounded in the works of Morgenthau (1948) and Waltz (1979), posits an anarchic international system where sovereign states act as unitary, rational agents prioritizing survival and power accumulation, thereby normalizing conflict as an inevitable condition of statehood. In contrast, Liberalism emphasizes the mitigating potential of international institutions and economic interdependence (Keohane, 1984), alongside democratic governance structures (Russett, 1993), to foster cooperation amidst anarchy. Later, Constructivism challenged these materialist foundations by arguing that international structures are socially constructed through intersubjective ideas, norms, and identities rather than fixed material forces (Wendt, 1992). Consequently, understanding these dominant frameworks is essential not only for grasping the discipline's status quo but also for identifying the epistemic gaps that non-Western theories seek to address through pluralistic rejuvenation.

The emergence of non-Western IR theories invites a constructive re-evaluation of established Western narratives, offering complementary perspectives grounded in diverse historical and cultural contexts. The rise of non-Western nations like China, India, and Brazil has also made a substantial contribution and posed a challenge to the global order that is dominated by the West. Non-Western IR theories also introduce alternative concepts (K.C., 2024). The Ubuntu concept of Africa emphasizes interconnectedness and communalism. In contrast to the Western emphasis on legalistic and adversarial ways to resolve, Ubuntu promotes restorative justice and community-oriented initiatives (Said, 1978). By focusing on justice, the well-being of the ummah (community), and Shariya (Islamic law), Islamic IR theories challenge Western liberal principles. They are based on Sharia law and Islamic ethical teachings (Buzan & Acharya, 2021).

Buzan and Acharya (2021) highlight the strategic thought of Kautilya's Arthashastra approach to statecraft, which emphasizes realpolitik, diplomacy and intelligence, compared with the more significant power centric theories dominant in Western IR. The concept of Dharma is also pivotal in Indian thought, integrating ethical challenges into governance and IR through prioritizing power and competition over morality. Another part of the Chinese concept of Tianxia envisions a hierarchical and moral world order, which contrasts with the Westphalian notion of sovereign equality. The authors also explore the Sun Tzu's superior strategies such as indirect approaches, psychological strategies and the importance of adaptability into Western military engagement.

The increasing prominence of non-Western IR theories encourages a more inclusive understanding of historical narratives, enriching Western frameworks. Said (1978)

illustrates how Western scholarship has historically marginalized and misrepresented non-Western societies. So far, the critique of Western epistemology highlights how knowledge production has often excluded or distorted non-Western perspectives (Spivak, 1988). The concept of the subaltern underscores the need to recognize and incorporate the voices and experiences of marginalized groups into the discourse of IR.

The non-Western IR theories critically interrogate the foundational assumptions of Western IR, particularly the state-centric and power-orientated perspectives predominant in Realism and Liberalism. Realist theories, as articulated by scholars like Mearsheimer (2001), emphasize power politics and state competition, assuming that states are primarily motivated by national interests and power accumulation. In contrast, Chinese IR theory, influenced by Confucian thought, challenges this paradigm by prioritizing moral leadership, harmony, and ethical governance (Chen, 2011). The Western IR theories are not fully integrated with the variety of global political experiences without broader engagement of non-Western perspectives.

The critical arguments presented by non-Western IR theories have significant implications for contemporary IR. It argues that the rise of non-Western perspectives contributes to the formation of a more multi-polar world order, where diverse cultural and philosophical traditions influence global governance (Buzan & Acharya, 2021). This shift challenges the Western-centric model of global politics and promotes a more balanced and inclusive approach to IR (K.C., 2024). Moreover, the incorporation of non-Western perspectives into IR theory has practically been applied. The emphasis on communalism and restorative justice in Ubuntu philosophy can inform approaches to post-conflict reconciliation and peace building, offering alternatives to Western-dominated frameworks that often focus on punitive measures and state-centric solutions (Chatterjee, 1993). Similarly, Islamic IR theories provide alternative approaches to economic development and international law, which can lead to more diverse and equitable global policies (Said, 1978).

The non-Western IR theories rejuvenate historical ideas to address today's global issues by reinterpreting traditional concepts through contemporary lenses. This rejuvenation process is critical as it not only challenges the Western-centric theories but also integrates diverse historical and philosophical traditions into global discourse. The non-Western IR theories engage in a process of reinterpretation where historical ideas are revived and adapted to address contemporary global issues. The non-Western theories rejuvenate historical concepts by integrating them with modern issues, such as global governance and security (K.C., 2024). The Indian IR theory, which draws on classical texts

like the Arthashastra, reinvigorates ancient strategic ideas to address contemporary security dilemmas, challenging the Western realist focus on power politics opposing Western ideals of secular and individualistic ways, and reimagining the Islamic philosophy of government through the concepts of justice and communal solidarity (Buzan and Acharya, 2021).

The non-Western IR theories also rejuvenate historical ideas by integrating cultural and philosophical traditions into contemporary analyses. Chen's work on Chinese IR theory illustrates how Confucian principles, such as the emphasis on harmony and moral leadership, are revived to address modern global issues (Chen, 2011). Hobson (2012) advocates for recognizing the contributions of the integration of eastern philosophical ideas, such as the Chinese concept of harmony and relations in non-Western societies, to global political thought. The Asian intellectuals, including figures like Jamal al-Din al-Afghani and Liang Qichao, resisted Western imperialism and sought to integrate their own cultural and philosophical traditions into the global discourse (Mishra, 2012). The rejuvenation of historical ideas is also evident in the revival of non-Western epistemologies, which offer alternative ways of understanding and analyzing IR. The re-evaluation of historical knowledge, production, and highlighting of non-Western epistemology can offer valuable insight into global issues that are often overlooked by Western theory (K.C., 2024). Hall (2020) argues that this overlooks the profound influence of historical Chinese thought, particularly Confucianism and Taoism, on its foreign policy. The origins of realism and other dominant IR theories in a specific historical and cultural context post World War II Western academia, thereby revealing the limitations of these theories in addressing global issues from a non-Western perspective (Guilhot, 2011).

The non-Western IR theories' revitalization of antiquated concepts has important ramifications for international governance and policy. An alternate strategy for resolving disputes and promoting peace is provided by the Ubuntu concept, which places an emphasis on communalism and interconnection (Chatterjee, 1993). Furthermore, based on Islamic values of justice and equity, Islamic IR theories provide substitute frameworks for IR and economic development (Said, 1978). Western IR theories, including constructivism, liberalism, and realism, have their roots in particular cultural contexts, mainly in Western Europe and North America. The implications of the growing influence of non-Western states like China and India on the international scene (Said, 1978). The emerging trends in non-Western IR theories reflect a dynamic shift towards integrating diverse cultural, historical, and philosophical perspectives into the analysis of global politics. This trend is characterized by a critical engagement with Western-centric frameworks, the revival of historical concepts, and the introduction of alternative epistemologies that challenge established norms.

The non-Western IR theories, such as those rooted in Confucianism, Hinduism, and Islamic thought, offer alternative frameworks that challenge Western assumptions about power, governance, and international order (Acharya, 2014). The Confucian principles of harmony and moral leadership are applied in Western IR theory (Chen, 2011). The inclusion of non-Western perspectives can lead to more inclusive and effective global governance structures in Western IR theory (Andrew, 2012). The integration of diverse perspectives in IR is not just a theoretical exercise but a practical necessity for understanding and addressing the complexities of the contemporary global landscape. Embracing a multiplicity of worldviews and acknowledging that there is no single, universally applicable theory of IR (Buzan & Acharya, 2021). The concept of balance of power, a central tenet of realist theory, can be re-examined through the lens of non-Western histories, where different forms of balancing and power dynamics have played out (K.C., 2024). The critical engagement involves questioning and rethinking Western-centric assumptions about IR. The non-Western theories offer valuable critiques of Western paradigms, highlighting their limitations and proposing alternative approaches (Dunne & Kurki, 2010). Western IR theories have historically marginalized non-Western contributions, perpetuating a skewed understanding of global dynamics (Hobson, 2012).

## **Discussion**

The advent of non-Western intercultural relations (IR) theories has fundamentally altered the academic terrain by upending conventional Western paradigms, revitalising ancient epistemologies, and bringing out fresh trends. Because they were primarily created in a Eurocentric framework, Western IR theories frequently ignore or marginalise non-Western viewpoints and experiences (K.C., 2024). The knowledge of world politics has historically been restricted by Western theories to a limited, Western-centric perspective, thereby ignoring the important contributions and insights from non-Western traditions (Hobson, 2012). There is a need for a more inclusive approach that acknowledges the different contributions of non-Western researchers because the lack of non-Western ideas in IR has resulted in a skewed depiction of global dynamics (Chen, 2011). The non-Western IR theories' revitalization of historical concepts provides a thorough reevaluation of conventional wisdom in modern settings. Alternative viewpoints on strategy, diplomacy, and government that challenge Western-centric approaches are offered by the resurgence of strategic insights from books like Sun Tzu's *The Art of War* and Kautilya's *Arthashastra* (Hall, 2020). The historical experiences and epistemologies of non-Western countries shed light on how historical settings influence current international dynamics, thus advancing our

understanding of global politics (Mishra, 2012). The revitalization of historical conceptions allows non-Western IR to tackle contemporary problems with viewpoints based on a variety of intellectual traditions, adding depth and diversity to the discipline.

A rising emphasis on integrating multiple viewpoints and questioning established paradigms is seen in the emerging tendencies in non-Western IR theories. The revision of IR theory to challenge the predominance of Western theory and take non-Western perspectives into account (Said, 1978). Traditional ideas are incorporated into non-Western philosophies to meet modern problems like fostering harmony and maintaining power balance (Buzan & Acharya, 2021). As evidenced by Hobson's criticism of Eurocentric theories and Chen's demand for a more inclusive strategy, this tendency also involves a critical engagement with Western paradigms (Hobson, 2012; Chen, 2011). The non-Western IR theories pose a challenge to Western narratives by acknowledging the shortcomings and prejudices of conventional frameworks, revitalizing historical concepts to offer alternative viewpoints on global issues, and reflecting new trends that incorporate varied perspectives and challenge established paradigms. It adds to a more complex and comprehensive understanding of IR by embracing ideas from eminent academics and historical documents.

## **Conclusion**

International Relations has been historically influenced by Western epistemological frameworks, which have often positioned non-Western intellectual traditions at the periphery of mainstream discourse. This study interrogates the structural biases within IR theory, positing that the emergence of non-Western perspectives signifies not merely a contemporary trend but a substantive rejuvenation of historical ontologies. Employing a qualitative methodology based on critical discourse analysis of scholarly literature and historical texts, the study indicates that while the foundational frameworks such as Realism, Liberalism and Constructivism offer foundational analytical tools for understanding interstate dynamics, their derivation from Western historical experiences may limit their applicability to diverse global complexities. Specifically, the paper advocates for a decolonized IR discipline where non-Western histories are recognized as foundational rather than peripheral. By revitalizing indigenous epistemologies, the study contributes to the construction of Global IR, fostering epistemic pluralism and enhancing the discipline's capacity to explain contemporary multipolar dynamics.

The non-Western IR theories offer insightful perspectives that improve the study and application of global politics. These theories serve two main purposes: revive historical ideas and provide modern theoretical frameworks. This dual role is significant because it shows

that these theories do not just introduce new concepts; they also update ancient wisdom to address contemporary challenges. In this way, Non-Western IR theories contribute to a more inclusive understanding of International Relations.

### Disclosure Statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author

### Author Introduction

**Sachin Karmacharya** is a Deputy Superintendent of Armed Police Force, Nepal. He is also MPhil-PhD scholar at Central Department of International Relations and Diplomacy, Tribhuvan University. <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-6211-8199>

### References

- Acharya, A. (2016). Advancing global IR: Challenges, contentions, and contributions. *International Studies Review*, 18(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1093/isr/viv016>
- Acharya, A. & Buzan, B. (2007). Why is there no non-Western international relations theory? An introduction. *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific*, 7(3), 287-312. <https://doi.org/10.1093/irap/lcm015>
- Acharya, A., & Buzan, B. (Eds.). (2010). *Non-Western International Relations theory: Perspectives on and beyond Asia*. Routledge.
- Acharya, A., & Buzan, B. (2019). *The making of global international relations*. Cambridge University Press.
- Bartelson, J. (2021). War and the turn to history in international relations. In E. Denemark, H. Leira, & B. de Carvalho (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of historical international relations* (pp. 120–130). Routledge.
- Baylis, J., Smith, S., & Owens, P. (Eds.). (2017). *The globalization of world politics: An introduction to international relations*. Oxford University Press.
- Bilgin, P. (2016). Contrapuntal reading of security in the Global South. *International Relations*, 30(1), 115–134. <https://doi.org/10.1093/isr/viv018>
- Buzan, B. (2007). *People, states and fear: An agenda for international security studies in the post-cold war era* (2nd ed.). ECPR Press.
- Buzan, B., & Acharya, A. (2021). *Re-imagining international relations*. Cambridge University Press.
- Carr, E. H. (1939). *The twenty years' crisis, 1919–1939: An introduction to the study of international relations*. Macmillan.
- Chatterjee, P. (1993). *Colonialism and its legacies: India and the modern world*. University of California Press.

- Chen, C.C. (2011). The absence of non-western IR theory in Asia reconsidered. *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific*, 11 (1), 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.1093/irap/lcq014>
- Cox, R. W. (1981). Social forces, states and world orders: Beyond international relations theory. *Millennium*, 10(2), 126–155. <https://www.doi.org/10.1177/03058298810100020501>
- Demirer, H. A. (2020). The silence of non-Western international relations theory as a camouflage strategy: The trauma of Qing China and the late Ottoman Empire. *All Azimuth: A Journal of Foreign Policy and Peace*, 10(1), 99–118. <https://doi.org/10.20991/allazimuth.663742>
- Dunne, T., Kurki, M., & Smith, S. (Eds.) (2010). *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity* (2nd ed.) Oxford University Press.
- Escudé, C. (1995). *El realismo de los estados periféricos* [Peripheral realism of states]. Grupo Editor Latinoamericano.
- Eun, Y.S. (2019). Opening up the debate over non-western. *International Relations. Politics*, 39 (1), 4-17. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263395718805401>
- Grovogui, S. N. (2006). *Beyond Eurocentrism and anarchy: Memories of international order and institutions*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Guilhot, N. (2011). *The invention of international relations theory: Realism, the rockefeller foundation, and the 1954 conference on theory*. Columbia University Press.
- Hall, T. (2020). I'll tell you something about China: Thoughts on the specialist study of the international relations of the People's Republic of China. *St Antony's International Review* 16 (1), 184-190. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/e27027784>
- Hobson, J. M. (2012). The euro centric conception of world politics. *Western international theory, 1760-2010*. Cambridge University Press.
- Jackson, R., & Sørensen, G. (2019). *Introduction to International Relations: Theories and Approaches* (7th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Jordan, R., Maliniak, D., Oakes, A., Peterson, S., & Tierney, M. J. (2009). One discipline or many? Survey of international relations faculty in ten countries. College of William and Mary.
- Kaplan, M. A. (1957). *System and process in international politics*. Wiley.
- Keohane, R. O. (1984). *After hegemony: Cooperation and discord in the world political economy*. Princeton University Press.
- K.C., Khadka. (2024). Does the World need 'Non-Western International Relations'? [Powerpoint Slides].

- Krasner, S. D. (1993). Westphalia and all that. In J. Goldstein & R. O. Keohane (Eds.), *Ideas and foreign policy* (pp. 235–264). Cornell University Press.
- Kratochwil, F. (1986). Of systems, boundaries, and territoriality: An inquiry into the formation of the state. *World Politics*, 39(1), 27–52. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2010297>
- Leira, H., & de Carvalho, B. (2016). *History and theory in international relations*. Oxford Research Encyclopedia of International Studies.
- Mearsheimer, J. J. (2001). *The tragedy of great power politics*. W.W. Norton & Company.
- Mishra, P. (2012). *From the ruins of empire: the revolt against the west and the remaking of Asia*. Penguin Books.
- Morgenthau, H. J. (1948). *Politics among nations: The struggle for power and peace*. Alfred A. Knopf.
- Murithi, T. (2006). *The African Union: Pan-Africanism, peacebuilding and development*. Ashgate.
- Oxford (n.d.). *Definition of rejuvenation*. In *Oxford Learner's Dictionary*. <https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/rejuvenation>
- Qin, Y. (2018). *A relational theory of world politics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Rangarajan, L. N. (1992). *Kautilya: The Arthashastra*. Penguin Classics.
- Ravitch, S.M., & Riggan, M. (2017). *Reason & rigor: How conceptual framework guide research* (2nd ed.). SAGE.
- Ruggie, J. G. (1986). Continuity and transformation in the world polity: Toward a neorealist synthesis. *International Organization*, 40(2), 259–282. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2010273>
- Russett, B. (1993). *Grasping the democratic peace: Principles for a post-Cold War world*. Princeton University Press.
- Safi et al. (2025). Examining non-western perspectives in international relations: A case study and analysis of Afghanistan. *Journal of Social Political Science*, 8(1), 148-164. <https://doi.org/10.31014/aior.1991.08.01.552>
- Said, E. W. (1978). *Orientalism*. Pantheon Books.
- Schmidt, B. C. (1998). *The political discourse of anarchy: A disciplinary history of international relations*. SUNY Press.

- Shilliam, R. (Ed.). (2015). *The black pacific: Anti-colonial struggles and oceanic connections*. Bloomsbury.
- Spivak, G. C. (1988). *Can the subaltern speak?* University of Illinois Press.
- Swanson, K.M. (2013). Empirical development of a middle range theory of nursing. In: Smith, M.C., Turkel, M.C. and Wolf, Z.R. (Eds.), *Caring in nursing classics. An essential resource* (pp. 211-221). Springer.
- Tickner, J. A. (2001). *Gender in international relations: Feminist perspectives on global politics*. Routledge.
- Tickner, A. B. (2003). Hearing Latin American voices in IR. *International Studies Perspectives*, 4(4), 325-350. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1528-3577.404010>
- Tickner, R. (2009). *The Unthinkable in western thought: Ethical and political foundations of Euro-centrism*. University of Chicago Press.
- Walker, R. B. J. (1993). *Inside/outside: International relations as political theory*. Cambridge University Press.
- Waltz, K. N. (1979). *Theory of international politics*. McGraw-Hill.
- Wendt, A. (1992). Anarchy is what states make of it: The social construction of power politics. *International Organization*, 46(2), 391–425. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818300027764>
- Winter, R., & Albani, A. (2013). Restructuring the design science research knowledge base. *Journal of Political Science*, 2(7), 121-139. [https://ideas.repec.org/h/spr/lnichp/978-3-642-33371-2\\_4.html](https://ideas.repec.org/h/spr/lnichp/978-3-642-33371-2_4.html)