

Full Length Research Paper

The concept of change and James N. Rosenau: Still international relations?

Murat Gül

E-mail: mgul@metu.edu.tr.

Accepted 8 May, 2009.

This article aims to study issue of ‘change and continuity’ in the field of international relations and the capability of mainstream approaches of international relations and history to cover the issue of change from perspective of James N. Rosenau. The dynamics of change and statics of continuity, at micro and macro levels and interaction between two levels will be analyzed, with the aim of designing a theoretical framework for the issue of ‘change and continuity’. Methodologically, conceptual framework Rosenau uses to explain dynamics of change will be given priority and primacy he attaches to improvement in micro phenomena will be explained. It is argued in this article that even it is far from clear whether global turbulence is a temporary or a permanent condition, change is in progress and is altering the parameters of world politics. Thus, the mainstream conceptual framework and history understanding is incapable to approach the issue of change and there is the need of a jail-breaking process that is to consider new concepts, new actors and new types of relationships.

Key words: Postinternational politics, turbulent change, micro and macro phenomena, parametric transformation, multi-centric world.

INTRODUCTION

The discipline of international relations entails the development of conceptual frameworks and theories to facilitate the understanding and explanation of events and phenomena in world politics, as well as the analysis and informing of associated policies and practices. Regarding the inter-disciplinary character of social sciences and as complementary in the study of international relations, history can be defined as a discipline that gives us knowledge about the conditions of the lives of the past communities, their traditions, the politics and states of the governors. The most beneficial part of history is reflected as its ability to set models for the worldly and religious events and let the people make use of these models and knowledge, to enable them understand and explain the ongoing events in world politics. This comprehensive interaction between international relations and history is well defined by Barry Buzan and Richard Little. Buzan and Little insist on three themes to characterize the conceptions in the field of international relations, in analyzing the international system: It is argued that although the concept is central to the discipline, there is no standard definition of it and no agreed chronology for the emergence of a global international system. Second, for them, conceptions of international system are over-

whelmingly biased by the European experience. Third, they think that international relations theory and history need each other; a comprehensive understanding of history is necessary for a well-constructed theory, whereas history cannot be written without some organizing principles (Buzan and Little, 1994).

Buzan and Little correctly point out the necessity of a strong correlation between the disciplines of international relations and history, with which I agree. It is also an inevitable fact that some organizing principles become prerequisites for study areas to become disciplines and pave the way for academic studies within the field. However, the problem is what are the organizing principles characterizing international relations and the principles history uses for perceiving international relations. The positivist methodology in these disciplines that seems to be biased by the Westphalian states system, and thus the European experience, leaving very small room, or even no room, for the actors other than the nation states, for the issues other than the high-security questions and for the role of domestic politics and technological developments shaping the nature of world politics, is likely to be questioned more than ever. In other words, the process of change finds little place in the organizing principles of

mainstream approaches within the disciplines of international relations and history. As a critique of this mainstream tendency, Holsti's *The Dividing Discipline* announces that international theory is in a state of disarray. It is argued that the long-established consensus about the objectives and methodology, grounding the study of international relations, is under challenge from many directions (Holsti, 1987). Holsti's claim points out an inconsistency with the mainstream academic studies in the discipline based on the fact that these studies disregard the prominence of change that comes with the process of globalization and its challenging influence on international relations and international system.

Although the process of globalization had/has been in play already before, especially, since the end of the Cold War, the structures and processes of world politics have been undergoing transformation, which in turn created more interdependence. The greater interdependence in world politics involves greater complexity and dynamism as more and more actors form more and more elaborate relationships with each other. The expansion of these relational networks increases the probability that any new development in one relationship will have ever more extensive and intensive rippling effects across the network of relationships. Within this new structure, it is an undeniable fact that the mainstream approaches of international relations and the classical history understanding and concepts do not provide a sufficient framework, by themselves, to deal with transformation and complex web of relational networks within the international system. As a matter of fact, today the scope and complexities of world politics demand an understanding of a much wider range of issues. Moreover, new conceptual frameworks and theories are required to improve the understanding of the dynamics, parameters and the functioning of the world politics and the interdependent world system. To this end, this article aims to analyze the concept of change from the perspective of James N. Rosenau (who is one of the forerunners of theory of change) and how Rosenau contextualizes the process of change in relation to the structures, interactions and even to the definition of international relations and international system. Within this framework, the dynamics of change and statics of continuity, at the micro and macro levels and the interaction between these two levels will be analyzed, with the aim of designing a theoretical framework for the issue of 'change and continuity'. Methodologically, the conceptual framework he uses to explain the dynamics of change will be given priority and the primacy he attaches to the improvement in micro phenomena will be explained. Moving forward from this point, the article starts with a focus on the increasing interdependence in world politics, changing agenda of world politics with new issues and how the new framework has improved the skills of individuals (micro phenomena) from rote and habitual behavior to adaptive learning. This improvement in micro phenomena that is fostered by the process of globalization creates an

interaction between the micro-macro phenomena. In contrast to realists and Marxists (who focus on macro structures) and ethnomethodologists (who focus on micro phenomena), Rosenau argues that a meaningful analysis of change and continuity necessitates a study of both and the interaction between the two. Thus, this part of the article deals with this interaction, the sources of change, how the improvement in micro phenomena influences macro structure and how the latter responds, in short the 'ominous tension' between the dynamics of change and statics of continuity. Within this framework, the following part of the article deals with how the interactions between the micro-macro phenomena shape the actors in world politics and their environments. It is argued here that according to Rosenau enough collectivities have been experiencing change to produce a global system which is turbulent, and within such a system to continue referring to the field as "international politics" is obsolete since interactions that sustain world politics unfold without the direct involvement of states. The way Rosenau contextualizes postinternational politics and actors and collectivities in the new structure is explained in this section. The claim that the interactions go beyond the confines of nation states should not mean that the presence and centrality of states in world politics are downgraded or dismissed. On the contrary, states hold a central and influential position in world politics, especially in the state-centric world. Thus, Rosenau sets forth state-centric and multi-centric worlds those embrace the same actors, but with distinctive structures and processes. Since these two worlds are interactive and overlapping, but each nevertheless retains its identity as a separate sphere of activity, this section deals with the coexistence of these two worlds. From all these, the following part of the chapter sets forth that change (that comes with globalization and improvement in micro phenomena) and continuity (with habits and resistance of macro collectivities) exist synchronically, there is a tension between the two tendencies and this synchronism provides coexistence between the multi- and state-centric worlds. The article ends with concluding remarks.

Increasing interdependence, changing agenda and habdaptive individuals

Unable to forego the need for access to each others' markets and for avoiding nuclear resolutions of their conflicts, and incapable of eluding the rippling effects of currency crises, environmental pollution, terrorism and drug trade, the world seems destined to converge around new norms appropriate to the new issues of a greatly intensified interdependence. Global culture, the realm of norms which are shared on a worldwide scale, (Rosenau and Hylke 1989) may be neither fixed nor stagnant. As technology shrinks the world and as value systems within the subcultures are exposed to the dynamics of life in a postindustrial order, global culture seems likely to under-

go transformation, to encompass broadened conceptions of self-interests pursued by other people. Thus, the rapid advances in communications, transportation and computer technologies have greatly intensified the extent of global interdependence, but how the collectivities and publics assess and cope with these changes is far from certain and is still very much in flux. In other words, and more concretely, as a result of the microelectronic revolution and satellites bringing televised accounts of distant events into homes, people are becoming analytically more skillful and emotionally more engaged with respect to the course of events. The enlarged competence of citizens around the world is presumed to underlie not only the expansion of a generalized sensitivity to the objective interdependence of global politics, but also the particular reactions to the nature of proof, legitimacy and patriotism, which in turn affects traditional authority relations.

Where the issues of earlier times were (or were considered to be) either domestic or foreign in scope and thus accepted as falling under the jurisdiction of two different policy-making processes, many of today's problems span the domestic-foreign boundary, thus making national officials responsible for coping with challenges that require international cooperation to manage. As a result, the new issues of interdependence have become intractable, as such, they contribute to public scepticism about the performances of political leaders. The shift from traditional criteria of legitimacy can be grounded on, at least, two major dynamics: One involves the advent of new types of issues resulting from increased global interdependence which are characterized by occupying a central place on national agendas, meanwhile being beyond the authority of national governments to resolve. The other is the consequence of the growing capacity of publics to observe directly, through global television, internet and other microelectronic breakthroughs, the political leaders in action. Thus, with regard to the issue of authority and legitimacy, there is the process of a shifting balance between rote behavior and adaptive learning that forms the conditions of postinternational politics. This shift expresses the synthesis of habitual and adaptive responses of individuals. Rosenau conceptualizes individuals as hadaptive actors and argues that turbulence has engulfed world politics largely because citizens and officials have moved away from the habit end of the learning continuum and toward the adaptive end. This has become one of the major reasons for the transformation of the state-centric system into a bifurcated one (Rosenau, 1990).

Globalization: Interactive micro-macro phenomena

Michael Mann analyzes global capitalism, environmental danger, identity politics and post-nuclear geopolitics as four supposed 'threats' to nation states, while using a model to distinguish local, national, international, transnational and global interaction networks. For Mann, all four issues have different impacts and tendencies on nation

states, containing both state-weakening and strengthening affects and increasing the significance of both international and transnational networks (Mann, 1997). In this regard, Mann approaches change through its weakening and strengthening affects upon the state and the extension of relational networks accordingly (either between the states or transnational actors).

Here, a broad conception of change is opted for within which globalizing dynamics are conceived to be any processes that underlie the expansion of human activities beyond national boundaries on a scale that has the potential of becoming global in scope. The numerous processes that contribute to this expansion consist of political, economic, social, cultural, and communication activities that result in flows of people, ideas, goods, money, pollution, norms, authority, and several practices across borders (Rosenau et al., 2005). As John Meisel mentioned: "The merger of, among others, computers, microcomputers, telephony, cable, fiber optics, videotape and communication satellites are creating a new world. The ways in which citizens perceive and respond to events, and therefore the interactions between them and their governments, are bound to alter substantially. The structures and organization of private enterprises and governments will likewise undergo major changes. Furthermore, the very process of acquiring facts and values and the means through which people act will substantially alter in both the private and public spheres. The ubiquitous tension between centers and peripheries may assume entirely new forms; class distinctions will be related to the use people make of the new technologies; new technocratic elites will emerge; the size and nature of communities within which individuals and groups identify themselves will reflect the capabilities of informatics or of telematics. All these and other developments are certain to make for a different political process from that known so far, both within and between states" (Meisel, 1986).

Thus, the evidence of rapid and pervasive transformations seems to expand, to every level of politics and community life, as neoliberal economic policies, vast movements of people around the world, electronic and transportation technologies and a host of other dynamics have led to what has been described as 'the relative death of time and distance' (Rosenau et al., 2005). People are seen as being induced by globalizing dynamics to attach loyalties to other collectivities besides the nation-state. The growth of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) is only one example.

Within this framework, different from Mann, James N. Rosenau's analysis focuses on the underlying and enduring dynamics out of which daily events occur. He mentions that every generation thinks it has more problems than its predecessors, but a case can readily be made that the present era is far messier than any other that today's insecurities are more pervasive, its uncertainties more elusive, its ambiguities more perplexing and its complexities more extensive (Rosenau, 2002). In other

words, the central differentiation between the present epoch and previous ones involves the acceleration of personal, community, national and international life. Both the people and societies have become more interdependent as a result of innovative electronic technologies, of jet aircraft that move hundreds of thousands of people every year from one part of the world to another and of the resulting shrinkage of time and distance. From this point, when the system's boundaries no longer contain the fluctuations of the variables, anomalies arise and irregularities set in as structures waver, new processes evolve, outcomes become transitory, and the system enters a period of prolonged disequilibrium. According to Rosenau, this is a turbulent form of change and turbulent situations tend to be marked by quick responses, insistent demands, temporary coalitions, and policy reversals, unlike conventional diplomatic or organizational situations (Rosenau, 1990). Some of the dynamics of turbulent change are located at micro levels where individuals learn and groups cohere; others originate at macro levels where new technologies are operative and collectivities conflict; and others derive from clashes between opposing forces at the two levels, between continuity and change, between the pulls of the past and the lures of the future, and between centralizing and decentralizing tendencies within and among nations.

For the identification and analysis of turbulent change, there becomes the necessity to differentiate the profound kind of transformations (that are likely to be occurring in the global era) from familiar and commonplace changes and parametric change (that is one attribute of political turbulence). How do we recognize change when we encounter it? How do we distinguish changes from continuities? Core changes from peripheral ones? Evolutionary and slow changes from revolutionary and rapid changes? Parametric from variable changes? In response to these questions, it is fair to argue that turbulence is considered to have set in only when the basic parameters of world politics (those boundary constraints that shape and confine the fluctuations of its variables and make possible the continuities of political life) are engulfed by high complexity and high dynamism. But what are the basic parameters of world politics? Three dimensions of world politics are conceptualized as its basic parameters: The micro level is referred to as the orientational or skill parameter within which the orientations and skills of citizens of states and members of nonstate organizations are linked to the macro world of global politics. The macro level is conceptualized as the structural parameter and refers to the constraints embedded in the distribution of power among and within the collectivities of the global system. The mixed parameter is called as the relational one, through which the authority relations between individuals at the micro level and collectivities at the macro level are studied (Rosenau, 1990).

Through the technological developments, and in a larger context through the process of globalization, and by

virtue of newly acquired skills, people have become more able and ready to question authority that, in turn, has facilitated new authority relations and development of new and more decentralized global structures. Thus, the enlarged analytic skills of individuals increased to a point to make them play a different and significant role in world politics, a role which has intensified both the processes of structural bifurcation and the breakdown of authority relations. While claiming the structural bifurcation, it is argued that the state-centric system now coexists with a more decentralized multi-centric system. With regard to the relational parameter, the long-standing pattern whereby compliance with authority tended to be unquestioned and automatic, is conceived to have been replaced by a more elaborate set of norms that make the exercise of authority much more problematic and amounts to a series of authority crises.

Rosenau, mainly, identifies five forces that drive the above-mentioned parametric transformations in the basic parameters of world politics: The first one involves the shift from an industrial to a postindustrial order and deals with the dynamics of technology, associated with the process of globalization and microelectronic revolution that have made political, economic and social distances shorter and the movement of ideas faster, which in turn increases interdependence. The second dynamic of change is the introduction of new issues into global agenda, which are distinguished from traditional political issues by virtue of being transnational (rather than being local or national in scope). These issues such as terrorism, drug trade, AIDS and environmental pollution, are the products of new technologies or the world's greater interdependence. A third dynamic can be defined as the reduced capabilities of national authorities to provide satisfactory solutions to the new issues, partly because these issues are transnational and not wholly within their jurisdiction, and partly because the compliance of their citizenries can no longer be taken for granted. As a result of the third dynamic, namely the weakening of whole systems, tendencies toward decentralization have increased. This tendency towards decentralization is conceptualized by Rosenau as subgroupism, and subsystems have acquired a greater coherence and effectiveness that can be defined as the fourth dynamic. The consequences of all the foregoing that influence the skills and orientations of the world's adults who comprise states, groups and other collectivities, is the fifth dynamic (Rosenau, 1990). It is important in the sense that today's persons in the street are no longer easily manipulable and uninvolved with respect to world affairs. From these dynamics, the shift in the micro capabilities and orientations seems to be more powerful than the others and is likely to be a primary condition to the expansion and intension of the other dynamics. Thus, it can be argued that the enlargement of the capacities of citizens is the primary prerequisite for global turbulence. The prerequisite, or at least a prominent dynamic, for the enlargement of capacities of individuals

is the technological development that has expanded the capacity to generate and manipulate information and knowledge, and has so greatly diminished geographic and social distances.

Although the shift in the micro capabilities and orientations seems to be more powerful than the others and is likely to be a prerequisite to the expansion and intensification of the other dynamics, an attempt to theorize the underpinnings of emergent global structures and processes comprehensively, requires sensitivity to the interaction of micro and macro phenomena. If the magnitude of change is as great as appears to be the case, presumably it is occurring both at the level of individuals and that of collectivities such as states and international organizations. For realists and Marxists, changes at the micro level are not causal and are only responses to the conditions imposed by macro structures. On the contrary, ethnomethodologists argue that causation is located exclusively at the micro level, that the notion of macro collectivities and structures is essentially a metaphoric conception. For Rosenau, both of these approaches are misguided that a more accurate view is one in which micro and macro phenomena are posited as interactive, and that there can be no meaningful change unless developments at both levels operate to condition the other (Rosenau, 1990). Within the above-mentioned framework, while approaching the concept of change, the importance Rosenau attaches to the process of globalization and the expansion of analytic skills of individuals, has already been mentioned. On the other hand, the resistances of the macro collectivities to the ongoing change and their attempts to keep traditional authority, legitimacy, patriotic, and loyalty relations, have to be reflected as well. In short, there is an 'ominous tension in a globalizing world' (Rosenau, 2002) among the dynamics of change and statics of continuity. In addition, it should be taken into consideration that individuals who are deeply involved in the political, economic and social transformations have not simply absorbed the changes into their traditional behavior. Rather, all peoples are bound to have had their lives, outlooks, practices and relationships altered by globalizing processes and the backlashes against globalization. Ironically, it is the anti-globalization movement that perhaps best exemplifies the willingness of people to place a transnational agenda (Rosenau et al., 2005). Besides these, simply assuming that somehow the meaning of change and the distinctions between it and non-change are self-evident is not the case. Much depends on the observer: the arrival of a first-born child is a profound change for a family, but it is merely another instance of the birth rate for a demographer. Appreciating this dependence of the concept of change, in the way it is used, can serve as a powerful incentive to be precise in delineating what is meant by change, how its variants are distinguished from each other, and how actors shape, and in turn influenced by, the process of change. The following part will deal with how the international system and actors within are

shaped by turbulent change and how the interaction between macro and micro phenomena is contextualized by James N. Rosenau.

Actors, environments and postinternational politics

Among the several views on change, three main are the most challenging: The first one involves the globalization era as a historical breakpoint. The second view concerns a bifurcation of macro global structures into what is called "the two worlds of world politics". The third view focuses on the micro level and the hypothesis that the analytic and emotional skills of adults in everywhere are increasing (Rosenau, 1990). The common point within these three views is that with the impact of modern technologies and other dynamics rendering the world ever more interdependent, the bifurcated structures and the enlarged skills of individuals are conceived to have fostered such a transformation within which the lessons of history may no longer be helpful. This is a claim to argue that the changes are so effective as to render the obsolete rules and procedures by which politics are conducted, and there are no paradigms or theories that adequately explain the course of events. Thus, as mentioned above, theorizing must begin anew and present premises and understanding of history's dynamics must be treated as conceptual jails to be escaped.

The new structure and new forms of interactions are shaped by a process of change that is turbulent. Turbulence both accounts for the dynamism of actors and is in itself dynamic. As systems and actors become much more specialized, they must rely on others for support in those areas that lie outside their specializations. Hence, they become increasingly interdependent and their relations become increasingly complex. Meanwhile, the greater degrees of specialization render the new technologies more effective and the interactions more dynamic. Thus, a turbulent environment can be defined as the one within which complexity and dynamism are high. Environments, in which complexity and dynamism are both low, are called as the placid-randomized environment or in which one is high and the other low are called, respectively, the placid-clustered and disturbed reactive environments. A fifth type of environment is hyperturbulence in which there are such high degrees of complexity and dynamism as to utterly exceed the adaptive capacities of collectivities (Rosenau, 1990). From this view, it is characteristic of a turbulent environment in which actors are more numerous and interdependent, with the result that it becomes less stable and predictable and developments can in turn lead to changes in the environment's structures and processes. Turbulence is a product of interactions among micro and macro actors and comes into being when numerous micro actions culminate in macro outcomes that lie outside the system's normal functioning. Thus, turbulence in world politics is to be found not in individuals or groups, but in their interactions: in other words, when the

high dynamism of the former interacts with the high complexity of the latter, turbulence comes out.

According to Rosenau, several collectivities in every corner of the world are becoming increasingly complex and dynamic as they enter the postindustrial era. Some of the collectivities that have not undergone much Industrialization and are thus only partially affected by postindustrial conditions may still be marked by simple and static structures. However, enough collectivities have been experiencing internal change and turmoil to produce a global system that is turbulent. Global turbulence is both a source and consequence of the change in the sense that: as the global system becomes increasingly turbulent, this condition adds further to the complexity and dynamism of the collectivities that constitute it and of the individuals that constitute the collectivities.

Since enough collectivities have been experiencing change to produce a global system that is turbulent, it would be difficult to appraise the bifurcation of global life from the perspective of international politics. Due to the fact that much of the politics or interactions extend across national boundaries and do not refer to state-to-state relations, the term "international" does not contain every level of global politics. In other words, according to Rosenau, to continue referring to the field as "international politics" is awkward and the notion of "international relations" seems obsolete in the face of an apparent trend in which more and more of the interactions that sustain world politics unfold without the direct involvement of nations or states. Thus, he thinks that the term "postinternational" politics would be a suitable label to explain the very nature of new structures and processes. The new concept clearly suggests the decline of long-standing patterns in world politics and at the same time indicates a process where the change is leading. It suggests flux and transition even as it implies the presence and functioning of stable structures, it allows for chaos even as it hints at coherence and it mentions that "international" matters may no longer be the dominant dimension of global life or at least that other dimensions have emerged to challenge or offset the interactions of nation-states (Rosenau, 1990). Moving forward from this point, Rosenau avoids using the term 'nonstate actor' in his studies, because this term creates a residual category for all collectivities other than states and gives subordinate status to the former. Rosenau argues that such may be the case in the state-centric world, but it does not apply to the structure of the multi-centric world. In order to reflect the essential difference between the two types of actors and the non-hierarchical structure of the multi-centric world, he defines states as sovereignty-bound actors whereas other types of collectivities are called as sovereignty-free actors (Rosenau, 1990).

For Rosenau, the above-mentioned situation within which the interactions go beyond the confines of nation states should not mean that the presence and centrality of states in world politics are downgraded or dismissed.

However, the analysis would be obscure if its conceptualization prevents recognition of any decline in their competence relative to other types of collectivities. Within this framework, rather than a neglect of each world (multi- or state-centric), Rosenau points out the coexistence of the two worlds and increasing gravity of the latter with globalization.

Coexistence: State- and multi-centric worlds

As one observer has set forth: "Humans have lived on earth for possibly 800 lifetimes...the last two lifetimes have seen more scientific and technological achievement than the first 798 put together" (Schlesinger, 1986). However, this is not simply saying that the current scene is exclusively one of profound change and this is not to undermine that there is an existing and continuous tension with a wide array of static forces that press for continuity. Rosenau identifies four patterns to set forth and distinguish the salient outcomes of the dynamics of change that are at work in world politics: The universe of global politics had come to consist of two interactive worlds with overlapping memberships: a multi-centric world of diverse, relatively equal actors, and a state-centric world in which national actors are still primary.

The norms governing the conduct of politics in the multi-centric world have evolved so as to diminish the utility of force, compelling most of its actors to confine the threat of actual use of force to those situations that arise in the state-centric world of international politics.

An autonomy dilemma serves as the driving force of the multi-centric world and a security dilemma constitutes a dominant concern in the state-centric world; at the same time, in the latter case, acquiring or preserving what is held to be a proper share of the world market has come to rival the acquisition or preservation of territory as a preoccupation of states.

Changes at the level of macro structures and processes have served as both sources and products of corresponding micro-level shifts wherein individuals are becoming more analytically skillful and cathetically competent, thus fostering the replacement of traditional criteria of legitimacy and authority with performance criteria that, in turn, serve to intensify both the centralizing and the decentralizing tendencies at work within and among macro collectivities (Rosenau, 1990).

It is important, here, to mention that although these two worlds embrace the same actors, they have distinctive structures and processes. Also, these two worlds are interactive and overlapping, but each nevertheless retains its identity as a separate sphere of activity because of the different structures and processes through which its actors relate to each other. According to Rosenau, for realists, the actions that matter in world politics have been those undertaken by states, the entities which act according to their national interests, and thus they have left no room for the effects of actions by citizens. Micro pheno-

mena have been viewed essentially irrelevant to the course of events due to the fact that the states have been considered to be able to mobilize people to provide the support necessary to carry out their policies. As long as nation-states centralize authority and exercise it through macro collectivities, behavior at the micro level is considered insufficient to overcome the authority and conditioning of states and thus has no significant macro consequences (Rosenau, 1993). Therefore, it is irrelevant for realists to search for micro phenomena as a source of global transformation. However, for Rosenau, this is an overlooking perspective. He mentions that without denying the existence of the state and the state system, one ought not to be content with them as sufficient explanations of change. International systems and their collectivities do have boundaries and parameters that limit the range of variation within which structural, institutional and process variables stimulate demands, constrain action and encourage resistance. In addition to this, a collectivity's actions and reactions may be shaped by the individuals of whom it is comprised and it is this possibility that makes him wary of metatheoretical premises that locate causation exclusively in either micro or macro sources. Thus, Rosenau stresses that postinternational politics is sustained by both macro and micro dynamics. It consists not of one or the other but both and of the interaction between them. Whatever the nature and direction of this interaction, Rosenau posits it as being capable of altering the parameters and extending the fluctuations of the variables through which the global life unfolds from day to day. In other words; alterations in macro structures, processes and collectivities affect the ways in which micro actors comply with the directives of macro institutions, and in turn, these changes in the modes of compliance lead to further alterations in the macro phenomena (Rosenau, 1990).

Change and continuity: Synchronic

The concept of international system is generally characterized as a shorthand way of reference to the nexus of actors and their interactions that constitute the whole. Hence, Bull and Watson formulate it as: "A group of independent political communities...form a system, in the sense that the behavior of each is a necessary factor in the calculations of others" (Bull and Watson, 1984). Waltz mentions that the international system comprises units (states), their interactions and the structure (Waltz, 1979). For this conventional logic, the historical record sets forth four types of interaction those are significant for any broadly conceived understanding of international relations: military, political, economic and cultural (Buzan and Little, 1994). Herbert Simon defines a complex system as: "One made up of a large number of parts that interact in a nonsimple way. In such systems, the whole is more than the sum of the parts, not in an ultimate, metaphysical sense, but in the important pragmatic sense that,

given the properties of the parts and the laws of their interaction, it is not a trivial matter to infer the properties of the whole" (Simon, 1965). On the other hand, organizational theorists identify three dimensions that characterize complexity: One is the number of actors with the assumption that the greater the number, the greater is the likelihood that the interactions among them will become complicated. The second dimension is about the extent of dissimilarity or variety among the actors, with greater variety resulting in more elaborate interactions. The third dimension explains the interdependencies among the actors through underlying that the higher the degree of interdependence, the more likely it is that an action of one will have consequences for others and thus the greater will be the intricacies of their interactions (Rosenau, 1990).

To mention that the political world is too complex and too dynamic to lend itself to, whole, effective control and a meaningful reduction of its interconnectedness and variability, does not mean that change is 'automatic'. This is to say that actors do not respond to conditions in the same way: some collectivities have a greater capacity for adaptation, some may even manage to prosper under conditions of high complexity and dynamism, while others may founder and undergo transformation. In addition to this, all the changes at work in world politics do not indicate global turbulence because there can be big changes that may alter the course of history and small changes that are merely momentary deviations from central tendencies. Through simply presuming that nothing remains constant and thus overlooking how the tensions between the past and present can result in stalemate as well as in transformation, a reliable conceptualization of change cannot be made. Rather than having nostalgia over the past and myopia with respect to the present, a third conception that allows for both change and continuity simultaneously through a systemic perspective, is necessary. First of all, the interpretation of continuity and change depends on the systemic and time perspective from which they are assessed. The observation of change and continuity requires conceptual formulation rather than the empirical data and it should be underlined that micro changes can cumulate to macro consistencies as well as to macro changes, depending on the interests of the observers and on the perspective from which change is being judged. Second, the longer the time span takes and the more encompassing the system becomes, it is more likely that the statics of continuity will prevail over the dynamics of change. Most of the crises or fluctuations may be the subjects of daily news reports, but within a global context, they are minor fluctuations. The global system is too diverse and cumbersome to undergo enduring changes within a limited time span. If this is the case, the answer for the question of how global system can undergo enduring and fundamental change is: it lies in a distinction drawn between the parameters and the variables of the system, the former viewed as setting limits within

which the latter vary. The parameters are those enduring human circumstances of the system's form (like its hierarchical structure, cultural norms and authority orientations) that are systemwide in scope and set the context for interaction among collectivities and individuals. On the other hand, the variables consist of both nonhuman dynamics (like, technology) and the human structures and processes (like, composition and objectives of nation-states) through which the collectivities interact (Rosenau, 1990).

The distinction between the parameters and variables is, then, crucial to identify and understand the tension between continuity and change. Parameters are the basic rules and organizing principles of a system that prescribe the goals, means and resources of the system's actors, and including the mechanism of enforcement. Different parameters limit different activities in the system, while different systems have different parameters. On the other hand, variables of a system are the wellsprings of change. As the individuals and institutions respond to the course of events, the values of variables fluctuate and may enter on a collision course with the parameters, while pushing the range of their variation against the parametric constraints. If the pace (at which these values change) is slow, the change becomes evolutionary and the system becomes more likely to retain its stability, in as much as it has time to adjust to the new values. However, if it is abrupt, it becomes a breakpoint change and is likely to be followed by instability. When the parameters undergo a transformation, the members of the system and their relationships become more complex, and if this is followed by deepening structural complexities and more widely fluctuating activities of member, the hallmarks of turbulence begin to appear.

The emphasis begins to focus on how authority and hierarchy within and among collectivities are sustained. When the authority relations of collectivities undergo crisis, the advent of parametric turbulence is seen to occur. As a result of the comparable tendencies at the micro level, decentralizing dynamics in the structural parameter, and the fast-changing technologies of the present order, the relational parameter is conceived by Rosenau, to have been caught up in turbulent change. As examples; none of the conventional paradigms adequately account for the impact of global television and internet usage (Rosenau, 2002) and for the appearance on the global agenda of issues (such as currency crises, terrorism, AIDS, drug trade, environmental pollution) growing out of the world, those are increasing interdependence.

CONCLUSION

The very first years of the twentyfirst century, as well as the last decades of the twentieth century, have witnessed a gradual increase in the abilities of individuals to connect to world politics and cope with its complexity, while their sense of control over this complexity and the ongoing events has decreased. There have been shifts in the

skills and orientations of individuals. The shift in skills involves moving away from habitual modes of learning toward adaptive modes, away from rudimentary toward developed analytic talents, away from simplistic toward complex understandings, away from dormant and crude toward active and refined cathectic capacities. The main orientational changes involve moving away from unthinking toward questioning compliance with authority, away from traditional toward performance criteria of legitimacy, and away from loyalties focused on nation-states toward variable foci. Currency crises, environmental pollution, terrorist attacks, ozone depletion and a host of other problems that transcend national boundaries have begun to reflect the limits of effective action available to national governments. These have given citizens additional reasons to question the nature and scope of political authority. Thus, the ordinary citizens have become likely to find it increasingly difficult to close their eyes to the implications of distant events and the course of world affairs. Put more specifically, relations between those who exercise authority and those who respond to it are undergoing transformation at every level, sometimes resulting in stalemate but generally creating circumstances in which compliance can no longer be taken for granted.

Especially in the recent decades, technological developments have come so swiftly that they have overwhelmed long-established institutions designed to manage the pace of change. Under conditions in which it took hours to send messages and money abroad and weeks to move people and goods from one part of the world to another, the national and local systems were able to absorb and channel the complexity and dynamism and the parameter values of the global system could contain the subsystemic fluctuations within acceptable limits. However, when the time required to transmit ideas and pictures was reduced to seconds, and the transportation of people and goods to hours, interdependence became increasingly unmanageable, national governments increasingly ineffective, national boundaries increasingly permeable, and the durability of the global parameters of the past increasingly questionable (Rosenau, 1990). On the other hand, Rosenau mentions that although governments are increasingly circumscribed by domestic and foreign constraints, they continue to be key actors on the global stage. For Rosenau, many still enjoy considerable authority and legitimacy and their foreign policies are still conspicuous components of postinternational politics. They still have command of many mechanisms for bargaining, synthesizing and playing demands off against each other and maintaining their identities as collectivities. Although less effectively than in the past, they still exercise control, obtain compliance and meet challenges, he argues (Rosenau, 1990). In an inquiry, when asked to the respondents, over 90 percent of them replied that they regard one country as "home". When asked in another question, over 65 of the respondents replied that patriotism is of continuing major importance. Also, when the

respondents were asked that if a vital choice involving your company or organization could not be avoided, would you put its interests ahead of those of your country, over 60 percent replied as no and those who said yes were approximately 10 percent. When the respondents were asked that how would you rank the role actors can play in world affairs, over 80 percent checked the US as very important (Rosenau et al, 2005).

On the one hand, there is the existence of relations going beyond the confines of nation states within a multi-centric world. On the other hand, there is the existence of the centrality and control of states (on many issues) within a state-centric world. Approaching the framework as such, Rosenau stresses the coexistence of the state-centric and multi-centric worlds and enduring of this structure appears to be the most likely of these scenarios, projected for world politics (Rosenau, 1990).

In one of his recent articles Rosenau mentions "One major consequence of the accelerated pace of life in our time is the breakdown of long standing boundaries that differentiate public from private, domestic from foreign, political from economic, to mention only a few of the distinctions that had become commonplace and that are today so obscure as to be the source of widespread insecurities, uncertainties, ambiguities and complexities that prevail throughout the world. The 9/11 attacks did not initiate the insecurities, uncertainties, ambiguities and complexities; rather, the attacks aggravated dynamics that were already deeply rooted in the social, political, and economic life of people, communities and societies. Until now I have always been an optimist about the probabilities of globalization fostering long-term processes of reconciliation among these groups caught up in seemingly intractable tensions. But my optimism is under severe challenge today. The repercussions of the Middle Eastern and India-Pakistan crises as well as the war on terrorism strike me as being on an order of magnitude far beyond any that have been experienced since the end of the Cold War. Indeed, the Cold War was at least marked by a form of stability, but today instability, even chaos, seems to mark the prevailing order. And it does so in such a way as to cast doubt on whether the liberating dimensions of globalization are sufficient to reverse the descent toward worldwide chaos and thereby achieve a modicum of security for both peoples and collectivities" (Rosenau, 2002).

It is far from clear whether global turbulence is a temporary or a permanent condition and even murkier is the likely evolution of the bifurcated structures if in fact the present conditions are only a transitional phase to a more enduring set of arrangements. Will the global structures fostered by ozone depletion, currency crises and other transnational issues become increasingly manifest and dominant, thereby moving the world beyond turbulence to some kind of unitary order? Or will historical and cultural

diversities prove so powerful as to absorb such issues and give added appeal to the principles of international anarchy, thereby leading to a renewed predominance of the state-system? Alternatively, will pluralistic dynamics prevail and fragment the transnational issues into questions of immediate self-interest, thereby resulting in a subordination of the state-system to its multi-centric counterpart? The answers of these questions are far from clear. However, what is obvious is that the change is in progress and is altering the fundamental structures, processes and the parameters of the world politics. To conclude, in order to answer the question asked at the beginning and to understand the issue of change and continuity, Rosenau argues that theorizing must begin anew and the researcher must escape himself from the present premises and understandings of history. So, for him, the existing conceptual framework and history understanding is incapable to cover the issue of change. Thus, there is the need of a jail-breaking process through developing new concepts and taking into account the existence of new actors, with new types of relationships.

REFERENCES

- Bull H, Watson A. (eds.) (1984). *The Expansion of Int. Society*, Oxford: Oxford University Press p.1
- Buzan B, Little R, (1994). "The Idea of "International System", *Int. Pol. Sci. Review*, 15(3): 231-255.
- Holsti KJ, (1987). *The Dividing Discipline*, Boston, MA: Allen and Unwin,
- Mann M, (1997). 'Has Globalization Ended the Rise and Rise of the Nation-State?'. *Rev. Int. Pol. Econ.* 4(3): 472 – 496.
- Meisel J (1986). "Communications in the Space Age: Some Canadian and International Implications", *Int. Pol. Sci. Rev.* 7: 300.
- Rosenau JN (1989). *Tromp, Hylke (editors and contributors), Interdependence and Conflict in World Politics*, Aldershot, UK: Gower Publications.
- Rosenau JN (1990). *Turbulence in World Politics: A Theory of Change and Continuity*, Princeton: Princeton University Press. pp. 5 – 13, 36, 59-60, 61-63 79-80, 97-98, 111-112, 145-149, 150-151, 402, 445.
- Rosenau JN (1993). (editor and contributor), *Global Voices: Dialogues in International Relations*, Boulder: Westview Press pp. 2 - 4.
- Rosenau JN (2002). "Generational Change and Internet Literacy," a paper prepared for presentation at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Boston.
- Rosenau JN (2002). "Ominous Tensions in a Globalizing World," a paper presented at the 10th International Summer Seminar on The New International Crisis: Implications for International Politics, Hydra Greece, and again at the Conference on International Relations, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey. pp. 1 - 3
- Rosenau JN, Earnest DC, Ferguson YH, Holsti OR, (2005). *On the Cutting Edge of Globalization: An Inquiry into American Elites*, Lanham, MD Rowman & Littlefield. pp. 11-29.
- Schlesinger Jr. AM (1986). "The Challenge of Change", *New York Times Magazine*. pp. 20-21.
- Simon HA (1965). "The Architecture of Complexity", *General Systems Yearbook*, Ann Arbor, Mich.: Soc. Gen. Syst. Res. 10: 63-64
- Waltz KN (1979). *Theory of International Politics*, Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley p.79.