Copyright is owned by the Author of this thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. This thesis is not to be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

Introducing heterarchy: a relational-contextual framework within the study of International Relations.

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

In

Politics

At Massey University, Manawatu,

New Zealand

Brenton Beach

2017

Abstract

This thesis posits that for too long International Relations (IR) has been overly rigid and insular, discouraging cross-disciplinary cooperation within the social sciences and becoming increasingly irrelevant to policy-makers. IR academia tend to stick rigidly to their theoretical paradigms in interpreting the real world, straight-jacketing their thinking into theories that limit analysis. However, humans think relationally and contextually so why not apply this form of thinking to IR? Heterarchy, the theoretical framework presented here, seeks to overcome this silo effect, to expand IR's relevance, and encompass previously barred academic areas to the sub-discipline.

This thesis presents a new relational-contextual framework within which empirical variables can be situated to provide a different understanding of actors' actions and speech acts within the IR field.[1] Heterarchy sits in part within both foundationalist and anti-foundationalist ontologies, challenging both positivist and post-positive schools by relating the world through relational-contextual rationales. Heterarchy suggests that IR (referring to the practice of international affairs) can best be understood from a sub-systemic viewpoint where the behavior of actors can only be observed by knowing the differing contexts between 'self' and 'other', and where relations continuously form and shape each actor; hence its relational-contextual nature. These relational-contexts are initiated through certain identifiable catalysts which stimulate similarly identifiable variables to expose actor relationships to the observer. While this does have constructivist and relativist underpinnings, heterarchy differentiates itself from both in terms of its approach and methodology. Having laid out this conceptual framework, the thesis then investigates how heterarchy might work empirically by exploring the Japanese-South Korean relationship which defies conventional understandings.

[1] This capital letter acronym will refer to the academic discipline throughout the thesis.

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge and thank Dr Bethan Greener for her support, advice and guidance in the conception, writing and presentation of this thesis. I especially appreciate the many various iterations of this thesis that she had to wade through for this document to see the light of day. Her comments, thoughts and knowledge on the IR subject have been invaluable to channeling and focusing my thinking in creating the outlines of heterarchy.

Secondly, I would like to acknowledge the contribution of Professor Will Fish, who asked me one simple question that provided the final piece in conceptualizing how heterarchy would function within an empirical setting.

Thirdly, I am indebted to my parents Bruce and Alice who allowed me the freedom to explore and gave me the desire for knowledge as a child, even if our ontological worlds were far apart.

Lastly, I would like to acknowledge the contribution of Dr James Ogilvy who introduced me to the idea of heterarchy through his articles at Stratfor. I hope that the conception that I present here is in keeping with his ideas, even if approaching them from a different angle, to produce 'the legs to carry heterarchy forward' as a new framework within IR.

Table of Contents

Abstract…… i

Acknowledgements……iii

List of figures……viii

Introduction……1

- **A brief introduction to the ontology and epistemology of heterarchy**……4

  i *Heterarchy and Ontology*……4

  ii *Heterarchy and Epistemology*……5

  iii *Heterarchy, Constructivism and Relationalism*……6

- **Methodology and thesis outline**……9

Chapter One: Relational-contexts within heterarchy……14

- **The origins of heterarchy**……14
- **Heterarchy: An IR literature review**……15
- **How does heterarchy apply to IR?**……19
- **Relationalism**……21
- **Context**……23

  i *What is context?*……23

  ii *How is context formed?*……25

- **How can context be applied to IR theory?**……27

  i *Contextual-Variables*……27

- **The heterarchical cycle: Practical application to empirical study**……30

Chapter Two: Strusturalism and heterarchical criticisms……35

- **Structuralist anarchy**……..……36

  i *Structuralist anarchy: A positivist-substantualist approach*.....……..……...36

  ii *Imposing order upon anarchy*..…….……..…….……37

  iii *Twin dilemmas: Measurement and diffuse variables*……39

  vi *Non-differentiation*……41

  v *Substantivism*……..…..…….……42

  vi *Rationality*……..44

- **Heterarchical anarchy: The relational-contextual argument**……..46

  i *Context as anarchy at a sub-systemic level*……..……...……..48

  ii *Context as rationality under the conditions of anarchy*……53

  iii *Relationalism and patterns*……55

  iv *Achieving differentiation*……57

  v *Resolving the twin dilemmas: Measurement and contextual-variables*…….59

  vi *The heterarchical substructure*……62

- **Conclusion**.....65

Chapter Three: Relational-context in the Japanese-South Korean relationship…….……..68

- **History and IR**.....69

- **Why choose the Japanese-South Korean relationship to demonstrate heterarchy?**.71

- **Structuralist explanations for the Japanese South Korean relationship and their critique**……..73

  i *Convergences between Japan and South Korea*……73

  ii *Structuralist epistemologies and their interpretation of the relationship*.....……....76

  iii *Relations in practice*……77

- **Conclusion on conventional IR epistemologies in the case of Japan-South Korea**…83
- **Using history as relational-contexts to explain Japanese-South Korean relations**…85
  - *i Japan and South Korea: Early background*…….85
  - *ii Japanese colonization of Korea*…….86
  - *iii Korean nationalism and identity*……87
  - *vi Japanese 'normalization'*……..88
- **Answers to the above posited questions**..……94
- **Conclusion: Heterarchy and history**…….96

Chapter Four: A study of a quasi-crisis in Japanese-South Korean relations…….100

- **How the study will proceed**……100
- **Quasi-crises**……101
- **The Yasukuni Shrine: Multiple symbolic meanings**……102
- **The Ahn Museum at Harbin: Confirming and creating contexts**……....103
- **The leaders and their motives**……..…104
- **Findings from a heterarchical point of view**……106
- **Reflection and Reflexivity**……..108
- **Conclusion**.....109

Conclusion: Is heterarchy a viable framework for IR?.....112

References……116

Appendix A: Glossary of terms……A-1

Appendix B: Policy Regimes as overarching contextual paradigms……..B-1

- *i Description of a policy regime*……B-1
- *ii Hierarchies conceptualized as policy regimes*……B-3

iii External policy regimes……..……B-7

iv Policy regime differences/conflicts……..B-8

v Policy regime thinking and expansion….……..…….B-9

- **Conclusion to Appendix B**….…….…….B-12

Appendix C: Timeline in Japanese-South Korean relations…..……...……C-1

List of figures

Figure 1.1: Pictorial positionality of heterarchy compared to other paradigms…….……9

Figure 2.1: McCulloch's Dromes' of Diallels…..…….……...16

Figure 2.2: Relations between interests, materiality and ideation…….22

Figure 2.3: Relations between interests, materiality and ideation through contexts……..…..23

Figure 2.4: Contextual-variable categories…….……..…….28

Figure 2.5: Heterarchical cycle framework.....…….……31

Figure 3.1: Diagram of Waltz's concept of interaction between the state and the IR system…...41

Figure 3.2: Foreign Relations anarchy/relations matrix – International…….……..….50

Figure 3.3: Sub-actor anarchy/relations matrix – Domestic.…….……..……..52

Figure 3.4: Differentiation in contrast to Waltz's concept in Figure 3.1…….……..57

Figure 3.5: Relational-contextual reduction of IR Actor policy formation…….……..……64

Figure 4.1: Japan-South Korean trade data……..…..75

Figure A1.1: Paradigmatic Feedback Loop model…….…….A-4

Figure B1.1: Indian Kashmiri policy regime……...B-6

Figure B1.2: Contextual filters of action and observation……...……B-9

Figure B1.3: India's Sino-Kashmiri policy regime……B-11

Figure B1.4: Core and pragmatic policy regimes……..B-12