Citing Old and New IR: From Positivism to Post-Colonialism

Oliver P. Richmond, J. Julian Graef[*]

Abstract: *Using citation data from Google Scholar (GS) this article reveals a picture of IR which contrasts sharply with how the discipline currently understands itself. Over a period of two years, GS citation numbers were collected from major publications across a range of IR theories. What is exposed challenges the core/periphery assumption endemic to the discipline of IR. The data suggests a realignment of discursive power in IR behind the periphery rendering the core increasingly isolated in what has become an inter-discipline. What emerges is a picture of IR which is decidedly internationalized and democratized – reaching far beyond its heretofore patrolled gates of the Anglo-American dominated academy and its associated onto-methodology. The citation data situates IR within a much larger field of scholarship which claims a significant stake and contribution to matters pertinent to understanding International Relations. All of this points to a post-colonial moment in the story of the discipline of IR which is increasingly being written far from its assumed 'core'.*

Keywords: International Relations; theory; Google Scholar; citations; interdisciplinary; Post-Colonialism; Realism; Liberalism; Constructivism

---

[*] University of St. Andrews School of International, jjg28@st-andrews.ac.uk

Introduction

We suspect that the authors' journey through IR has been similar to that of many. One author started using formal IR theory and its traditional methodologies, as he was taught and as constituted the discipline in the 1980s.[1] He was under the illusion that these were the only credible tools available. At the same time, however, the 'third debate' was developing though it was not widely taught; it appeared from his mainstream vantage point as retrogressive in its possible implications for the abandonment of the Enlightenment project, until a more nuanced perspective was introduced to him by a colleague.[2] He soon realized that these traditional IR tools were very rigid, western-centric, and disciplinarian. As a result of field experiences he had in a post-conflict zone then on the periphery of Europe, he realized how resented and inappropriate western articulations of power and norms as global or even cosmopolitan often were.[3]

This was only a small taste of what was to come from later and broader-ranging fieldwork. As this author read more, he began to engage with the more critical, normative and post-structural/ post-colonial literatures used by IR scholars.[4] He also engaged directly with the interdisciplinary scholars that were being drawn on by more critical IR scholars, and realized that the theoretical and methodological approaches of traditional, formal IR were unnecessarily constraining, serving to naturalize their epistemic capacity and to reproduce it universally rather than to develop it in the context of other debates, particularly outside of the West and formal social science.[5] He began to realize that the 'old' IR- mainly of an Anglo-American genesis - was mostly irrelevant to the contemporary issues faced by many scholars working in these areas, especially in many of the universities in developing countries where IR was just beginning to be taught (he has worked at several), and that IR was in the grip of radical shifts. Even so it seemed until recently that scholars in developing world universities were more interested in Eurocentric IR theory and methods than in developing something more contextual.[6] Furthermore, he became aware that some IR scholars working in the field areas he visited were generally very critical of mainstream IR, unless, that is, they worked for government or had been trained in the US.

The second author received his formal education in the United States where he attended a well regarded West Coast State University which was considered to have a relatively progressive and engaged liberal arts community. Coming out of the US military and into university in the post 9/11 world, he was eager to engage with international affairs. After his IR Professor declared Marxism irrelevant to the post Cold-War world and dismissed Constructivism, he was immediately confronted with a dilemma: was he a realist or was he a liberal? Upon reflection, especially in light of what the following data suggests, this was his first experience with the censorship and gatekeeping so endemic to the discipline of 'mainstream' IR. It was not until he attended post-graduate studies in Scotland that he was introduced to the third debate and began to do research outside of the library and beyond course reading lists. It was here where the messy nature of international relations as practise began to reveal itself as irreconcilable with theories rooted in reductionist, spatially contiguous, rational power maximizing unitary actors and neat problem-solving methodologies. Consequently, his interests shifted away from universal, structural macro-theories of geo-strategic power politics to the localized, particular, contingent everyday settings in which matters of international relations are most acutely experienced.

We set out with a growing suspicion that there was a significant gap between the formal discipline of IR on the one hand and the way that matters of IR are engaged on the other. This was in part brought about by the culture shock of attending ISA, where what was generally taken for granted in European IR appeared to be marginal to a more realist or liberal oriented American IR. We suspected that the relative weight, importance and influence that is assumed of the mainstream, orthodox or 'core' IR discipline is not an accurate reflection of how matters concerning international relations are debated in academia. This is partly, we suspect, because the core constituencies of northern states (and only a few of these in the Anglo- American orbit) are a global minority. North-south and south-south relations are now becoming more significant in the discipline and in praxis.[7]

Oliver P. Richmond, J. Julian Graef

What we mean by 'core' IR is International Relations as it is taught, repeated and reified across various IR and Political Science departments and journals which, incidentally, are significantly influential in delimiting the epistemological boundaries which form international policy. These represent the IR theories deploying positivist methods for realist, liberal, or Marxist-oriented approaches. We make a distinction here between 'core' IR as *the discipline* on the one hand and *matters* of international relations on the other hand. The former is concerned with its own theories and is largely occupied with an introspective engagement with IR as a discipline; the latter entails academics who have turned outward and are concerned with matters of international relations as they are practised away from the academy; it is engaged with examining matters of international relations in such diverse areas as development, conflict, human rights, security, political economy and climate change etc. The former is engaged with the nature of the discipline itself; the latter is IR in an applied sense. Inevitably a debate emerges when one is unable to reconcile matters of international relations with the core theories of IR; scholars and policy makers are often left to look toward other disciplines to make sense of what is happening on the ground (in its international and contextual sense).

We recognize the importance of theoretical and empirical approaches and the interdisciplinary demands of applied IR in a range of settings. However, an enormous breadth and depth of insights, experiences and epistemologies ranging across the disciplines of the arts and social sciences, which are very engaged with matters acutely pertinent to IR, remain relegated to the 'periphery' of the formal 'core' of the discipline (as envisaged by the core itself). Belying our motivation for this project are our own assumptions and biases which accept interdisciplinary approaches as essential to the continued relevance and utility of the discipline. Indeed, core IR theory has found it difficult to attract the attention of those working in other disciplines, though critical IR scholars have themselves drawn on, and been drawn to, other disciplines.[8] Even those, for example, working in its various sub-disciplines often turn away from IR theory; they see it as having failed to develop any useful and coherent insights for their areas. It assumes the realist inherency of violence in human nature and international relations, and the sovereignty of such views, encapsulated by the state. Axiomatically, Martin Wight once wrote that IR was subject to a poverty of 'international theory', focusing as it did on the problem of survival.[9] IR has focused on war as a natural state rather than peace and the supposed Freudian death instinct has resonated powerfully through the discipline[10] legitimating liberal notions of global (even hegemonic) governance, conditionality, and on occasion, coercion. Yet, as Fry has argued, a vast range of anthropological and ethnographic evidence shows that peace, conflict avoidance, and accommodation, are the stronger impulses of human culture.[11] However, such arguments have rarely resonated with those who place themselves at the core of the discipline. Gatekeeping of this type now seems unsustainable given the new theoretical and methodological insights that have seeped into the discipline from different cultures, histories, and indeed ontologies.

In order to investigate the gap between a widely perceived 'mainstream' and the salience and use of a broader literature we began to track citation numbers on Google Scholar (GS). We identified the main theories and sub-disciplines of IR according to a general narrative and our own estimation. The authors and publications chosen are subject to our own biases and limited by our combined range of knowledge and perceptions of the discipline of IR. Again, our intent was to look beyond the formal discipline to include some publications which we judged to be influential in matters pertinent to international relations. We wanted to situate IR within the broader web of inter-disciplines which engage with matters of international relations that have been influential to the discipline of IR; we wanted to reveal where and in what fields scholarly work is being conducted in matters pertinent to international relations. We identified the top four or five authors and their most 'influential' works according to theory. Using GS we examined these influential works according to the citation numbers displayed on the Google search page just below the citation. We entered only the author's last name and the title of the work into the search. Regardless of the result we collected the citation tallies from *only* the first and therefore highest tally (although we did track the numbers, associated websites, languages, and other anomalies for later analysis). Of course, this method is problematic in a digital world where many copies,

electronic editions, websites, databases, e-journals and other secondary sources disperse citation numbers or have not yet been digitally published. The citations counted may often come from outside of the formal discipline despite the fact that each would consider themselves as engaging with matters of international relations and in our view are no less significant for it.

To be clear, we did not approach this project as obedient Popperian 'scientists'; this study does not proceed in a statistically, rigorous, linear fashion with the aim of falsifying our hypothesis. Rather, this data, in addition to aiming to provide a glimpse of IR over a short period of time, presents a narrative of how this project itself developed – names, books, articles, sections, theories were added and deleted – our data set was not measured in regular increments, and the way in which we wanted to present the data evolved along with the data itself. Our aim was not to satisfy statisticians but to simply record the data, to attempt to allow the data to speak for itself and then offer our subjective analysis of what the data may mean.

Of course weighing the 'relative influence' of various works of various authors across various theories in what is, after all, a loosely defined 'discipline' is incredibly difficult to accurately portray. IR as a formal discipline spans a century with its philosophical antecedents stretching back to the origins of Western civilization. Key contributors to IR have been published and republished in multiple editions, articles and edited books. They have been quoted and re-quoted from different, secondary and even tertiary sources not to mention the affect the internet, ebooks, e-journals, open source databases, and freely available articles has had on the dissemination of the discipline and therefore the wide range of reference material. However, the relatively tight clustering of growth rates tends to indicate a generally consistent rate of growth across the board with some outliers. Yet, given the recent tendency of gate-keepers and/ or institutional actors to use citation numbers as a disciplinary yardstick, it is also useful to show how else they can be interpreted in showing trends which may be surprising to many. Of course, we cannot really deal with the problem of exactly what citations mean, in terms of the act of citing and the numerical outcome, other than to take them as being generally indicative. Indeed, what do the number of citations we have added in the course of this paper actually mean, beyond the fact that we are engaging in a debate about their work?

Bearing in mind the difficulty of such analyses this paper shows that the centre of the discipline is now very narrow, especially in its appeal to the broader academy, and therefore somewhat anachronistic. Despite the limitations, we found that the hierarchy or core/periphery relations of knowledge in IR, however, are rooted in an assumption not borne out by the citation numbers. While the effect of the core is obvious in world capitals and international institutions the citation numbers we have compiled suggest that it no longer occupies the gravitational centre of *discursive* power in matters of international relations as they are debated in the wider academy (nor we suspect in the many empirical 'fields' IR engages with). We hope to at least expose a bias that propagates certain theories as mainstream, and then reveal via GS citation data where the new discursive weight of IR now lies. We also offer some thoughts as to why the link between policy makers, institutions, power, sovereignty, and territoriality, and the so-called mainstream propagates discredited theories and methods as significant[12] when the most of the scientific focus and research has moved on to areas that would be of more benefit to a new generation of students, researchers, and of policy makers.

Policy driven research, in the light of the debacle of the 'liberal moment'[13] and its culmination with the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, appears to have rendered the so-called core of IR theory increasingly in tension with existing political dynamics and the intellectual role of the discipline. Rather than operating as an imperial 'compliance oriented' discipline to gather, support and confirm power, its role has in actual fact shifted to unsettling power and its tendency to mask interests as norms, institutions, rights, and practises.[14] This has extended into the remaking of conceptions of security, power, institutions, law, and agency. Instead of making power effective, it has shifted towards holding it accountable in its many currents, from the local to the global – a role far more conducive to its academic position. As the ontology of IR itself has broadened as a

Oliver P. Richmond, J. Julian Graef

result of its success in attracting global interest, the discipline has followed suit, but often in ways only recognized very slowly if at all by the more traditional gate-keepers of the discipline.

It should be made clear that there are limitations to what the methodology used and data gathered in this article can show, but even so it is at least possible to tease out a different picture in terms of interests, concepts, theory and methodology for those working in and around a broad understanding of IR, even if the core remains relatively unaffected. That said, it does raise the question of whether IR is compliance oriented in that speaking truth to power is confirmatory rather than transformatory. Is there even a truth to speak, given such diversity- especially if we are right to argue as a result of the data presented below that IR is in a post-colonial moment and now is being written far from traditional centres of power and meaning-making? What has become increasingly prominent is the fact that the acts and discourses of IR, whether fact, truth, propaganda, or question, objectively claimed or subjective, are where IR began its almost one hundred year journey as a discipline founded to develop peace.[15] In our view its culmination and imports are indicated in the sheer relative numbers of citations dealing with such matters, but less so in the mainstream self-perception of the discipline. The latter is self-announced and narrowly patrolled, while the former is increasingly representative of a diverse range of voices and issues.

Methodological Implications

This section outlines our methodological approach and its limitations. Firstly, Google Scholar citation numbers are determined through an automated method in which all 'scholarly' material available on the web is represented – this means that GS citation counts are tabulated by an automatic, continual search for any and all bibliographic references of all scholarly material from articles, databases, e-books, books for sale online and websites. The result, according to GS 'may not be comprehensive'.[16]

Secondly, a host of 'author impact' indices already exist which offer a different approach to citation numbers such as Thompson ISI Web of Science, Scopus, Scholarometer, Quadsearch, the Scholar H-Index Calculator and Publish or Perish. Each of these provides an array of specialized criteria directed at specific users for different purposes. These indices combine averages from various sub-indices such as the h-index, e-index, g-index data. While these indices may be useful to institutions and academics in measuring their 'impact' they are not very useful in assessing the state of a discipline more broadly. They are tailored to measure the combined impact of the author over their career thereby attempting to control for time and any distortions caused by one highly influential 'one-hit-wonder' publications.[17] We, on the other hand, want to isolate these distortions caused by high impact IR publications. As is the case most often in academia it is these high impact publications which tend to influence the discourse in IR rather than the 40 year arc of a career spanning many different contexts, universities, debates, discourses and paradigms.

That said, citation research suggests that the social sciences and humanities are underrepresented by these indices.[18] However, Harzing and van der Wal argue, that Google Scholar 'allows for a democratization of citation analysis as it provides every academic access to citation data regardless of their institution's financial means'.[19] Google Scholar appears to provide a broader search for citations than other tools which is useful for our focus on key publications and our attempt to assess their relative overall impact. Google Scholar's accuracy is of course hampered by a number of errors which, for example, render older publications more difficult to assess, or significantly disadvantage 'Languages Other Than English (LOTE)' in terms of citation numbers, or GS produces at times 'nonsensical results'.[20] Despite these problems they contend that GS represents the most 'comprehensive' source and therefore, 'allows for a democratization of citation analysis'.[21] We seek to further democratize and disaggregate the data from associated indices by allowing the raw citation numbers of the specific, high impact publications to speak for themselves.

We understand authors and their key texts to be representations of their contributions to the development of the discipline in an interdisciplinary setting. We draw on thinkers widely

referred to outside of the discipline such as Rawls, Foucault, Escobar and Spivak, etc. We acknowledge that the citation numbers are a composite insofar as citations relating to IR cannot be disaggregated from those which do not. As such, we claim nothing more than an indication of where interest is flowing in the broader social academy, in which IR is squarely situated. By using authors whose work either deals with matters pertinent to international relations or who, as judged by us, have been relevant to its wider debates, we acknowledge gaps in our selection.

It is important to note that citations only show the source's references, but not why, how, where, or by whom, or with what respect. They strip out all meaning from the act of citation. They do not indicate whether the source is used positively or negatively. They are not indicative of epistemic power or values, norms, institutions, or of progress. But their numbers are important in showing where in more general terms the various areas of interest in international and global issues lie. Additionally, when compared side by side, they highlight the limited relevance of key IR texts in the broader academy. Despite these problematic variables, especially given the tendency of gate-keepers and institutional actors to use statistical data gathered from GS and filtered through a number of indices we argue that the raw GS data does present a more democratic portrayal of these texts; by using the raw, unfiltered data, we will show how else they can be interpreted. Our operating assumption is that these raw citation numbers, whether the work to which they are attached are used supportively or critiqued, can paint a different picture of IR from that which the mainstream discipline itself assumes and which various indices 'control' for.

Comparing IR Theory Citations

In this section we present a range of citation data for comparative analysis. The numbers indicate the raw impact of a given publication and then sub-discipline. We also included individual rates of growth in order to show which publications are growing more quickly which also helps in plotting the range of growth distribution. Despite the acknowledged limitations of this type of study – time, language, the sometimes nonsensical, anomalous results and the very diffuse and dynamic nature of GS citations in the first place – we can only speculate (intelligently) as to why and how these numbers are behaving as they are. Our aim is simply to record the citation data and see how it compares to our suspicion about what is happening in IR.

Table 1 presents the key classical authors often regarded to have formed the basis of the discipline. These texts are widely cited in its formal historiography and are therefore fairly difficult to assess in terms of the citations they have received. Indeed, the counts for classical texts confirm that GS's inability to assess the influence of older contributions.[22] Given the obvious impact of the classical texts included in *Table 1* the numbers are fairly weak, perhaps because there are so many different editions of their texts meaning that their citations are split up amongst a wide array of versions. The citation counts are surprisingly low even though these texts should be widely referred to in other disciplines, thus increasing their citation numbers. It can only be conjecture that though these texts are part of the formal story of IR their import may tend to be assumed as basic and a priori and therefore not worth citing. This might also account for the very selective and static picture presented in the mainstream development of the theories and concepts which these authors engaged in. Clearly, realist authors and liberal authors are foundational, specifically Hobbes and Kant.[23] Yet, it is Kant that receives the highest count, probably because of his works' appeal across a range of disciplines and eras. This is also accounted for by the strength of the liberal moment[24] after the end of the Cold War. Additionally, the high growth rate of these citation numbers suggest that the relative weight of Classical IR theory will develop an ever-larger electronic footprint as these publications are now freely available in the digital public domain.

Table 1: Classical IR Citations

Theory/Author	Key Publication	Date of original Publication	Citations (Oct 2009)	Citations (April 2010)	Citations (Dec 2010)	Citations (Aug 2011)	Average citations	Numerical increase	Rate of Growth
Machiavelli	The Prince	1532	301	1,530	1,915	*1,881	1,407	1,580	84.00%
Hobbes	Leviathan	1651	3,575	4,000	4,430	5,245	4,313	1,670	31.84%
Locke	Two Treatise of Government	1689	X	2,700	2,945	3,531	3,059	831	23.53%
Kant	Critique of Practical Reason	1788	4,128	5,149	5,663	*4025	4,980	1,535	27.11%
Clausewitz	On War	1832	1,290	1,417	1,523	1,692	1,481	402	23.76%

Table 2 below illustrates the citation count for idealist authors, or those sympathetic to some form of international cooperation. It is not surprising that Keynes has received by far the most citations, given the breadth of appeal that his work had in a more recent era, and the impact it has had on a wide range of policy areas after both World Wars, including after the Credit Crisis of 2009.[25] Even so, given that idealism is part of the much maligned First Debate,[26] it is surprising that its key proponents have received so few citations, perhaps illustrative of the rather tribal and enclosed nature of formal debates in IR. Again this data might be skewed by time, the insularity of IR during that era, and by the fact that many publications are not likely to be accessible by GS. Having said this, it does indicate that in contemporary literature, apart from the work of Keynes, its salience is taken for granted (i.e. in the existence of international institutions and transnational movements) or no longer that relevant to contemporary IR. Indeed Keynes' relative rate of growth – the lowest in the category – suggests that his influence, despite the near constant invocation of his name during the financial crisis, has levelled out. This does not explain why realism receives a much stronger citation list (even though there is nothing to match Keynes' numbers), even for older forms of realism, unless one delves into the bias inflicted perhaps by 'print capitalism',[27] especially since one would expect that idealist work would be cited in conjunction with its debate with realism.[28] Yet, the comparatively rapid rates of growth in idealism, distorted no doubt by the anomalously 2nd highest growth rate in Angell[29] only behind Machiavelli, may hint at idealism finding renewed utility as the normative underpinning of the post-Cold War liberal, or even the neo-liberal project. As more editions become digitally available these citation numbers will probably only increase.

Table 2: Idealism Citations

Theory/Author	Key Publication	Date of original Publication	Citations (Oct 2009)	Citations (April 2010)	Citations (Dec 2010)	Citations (Aug 2011)	Average citations	Numerical increase	Rate of Growth
Angell, Norman	The Great Illusion	1909	144	311	319	378	288	234	61.90%
Keynes, John Maynard.	General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money	1936	10,404	11,524	12,251	14,556	12,184	4,152	28.52%
Zimmern, Alfred E.	The Greek Commonwealth	1911	118	121	142	167	137	49	29.34%
Woolf, Leonard	International Government	1916	X	75	134	160	123	59	36.88%

Table 3 below is perplexing for a number of reasons, all more or less related to the fact that given that realism is seen to be the core of the discipline even by very critical scholars who have devoted a lot of energy in contesting it. Why then are its citation numbers not very impressive? As one would expect Morganthau receives the highest numbers of citations[30] but these are not very impressive in the light of many later texts we have included. However, its high citation counts compared to idealism is mitigated by its lower growth rate, especially since one would expect that idealist work would be cited in conjunction with its debate with realism. It is possible that there

are many editions of key publications so citations may be split up and scattered, or that they have only appealed to the core of a very small discipline. Both explanations matter, especially given the length of time these publications have been available. However, the most plausible of the two is that its salience is only relevant to a limited number of scholars. These may well have had access to the corridors of power, amplifying its effects of course. This would explain the differential with post-colonial studies for example (see below), where authors received citations across humanities and social science. But this raises a broader question. Surely IR should be central to both too? So is it being ignored? Like post-colonial studies, it is relatively new, but not as new. It has ambitions to be interdisciplinary and speak to many issues and sub disciplines. In this realism has clearly failed, though like many core debates it probably dominates in the corridors of power and elite circles in the West, and so has more material purchase than its citations suggest, even if it has not been received well as a convincing intellectual product outside its protected 'core'.[31]

Table 3: Classical Realism Citations

Theory/Author	Key Publication	Date of original Publication	Citations (Oct 2009)	Citations (April 2010)	Citations (Dec 2010)	Citations (Aug 2011)	Average citations	Numerical increase	Rate of Growth
Carr, Edward H.	The Twenty Years Crisis	1939	634	779	855	1,043	828	409	39.21%
Morgenthau, Hans	Politics Among Nations	1948	3,452	4,045	4,594	4,777	4,217	1,325	27.74%
Kennan, George F.	American Diplomacy: 1900-1950	1951	327	372	461	520	420	193	37.12%
Wight, Martin	Why is there No International Theory	1960	238	258	279	347	281	109	31.41%
Niebuhr, Reinhold	Moral Man and Immoral Society a study in ethics and politics	1932	X	725	792	910	809	185	20.33%

Table 4 turns to neorealism, which with the exception of Waltz's famous 1979 text[32] also receives relatively scant citations and average growth rates given that it dominated the discipline through a period of quick expansion, including the expansion of the university system and numbers of publications being produced. Still, it clearly shows the centrality of Waltz's text to the discipline even if it is now seen from a methodological perspective more as an historical oddity of that specific strand of social science, especially compared to the broader longevity of the appeal of his more historical and normative 1959 text[33], which, however, has received less citations over a longer period of time. Significantly, Huntington's paradigmatic text receives the highest citation tallies here.[34] While his text does reify a certain epistemological engagement with matters of IR, the predominance of neo-liberal systems organisations and structures seem to point in the opposite direction; perhaps its low growth rate – one of the lowest in the study – indicates its reduced relevance vis-à-vis other post- Cold War liberal texts. The high number could also reflect its broader appeal and wider, informed reader and pop-culture audience. In any case the impact of this work, despite being something of an anomaly, is substantial and receives much higher numbers than any of the 'core' IR text from Waltz to Keohane.

Table 4:Neo-Realism Citations

Theory/Author	Key Publication	Date of original Publication	Citations (Oct 2009)	Citations (April 2010)	Citations (Dec 2010)	Citations (Aug 2011)	Average citations	Numerical increase	Rate of Growth
Kissinger, Henry	Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy	1957	X	396	492	642	510	246	38.32%
Waltz, Kenneth	A Theory of International Politics	1979	5,117	5,549	6,024	6,880	5,893	1,763	25.63%
Walt, Stephen	The Origins of Alliances	1987	1,204	1,329	1,461	1,666	1,415	462	27.73%
Mearsheimer, John	The Tragedy of Great Power Politics	2001	1,131	1,306	1,494	1,854	1,446	723	39.00%
Gilpin, Robert	War and Change in International Politics	1981	1,962	2,142	2,324	2,675	2,276	713	26.65%
Jervis, Robert	Perception and Misperception in International Politics	1976	1,863	2,017	2,200	2,518	2,150	655	26.01%
Huntington, Samuel	The Clash of Civilizations	1992	X	10,173	10,743	*5660	10,458	570	5.31%

As a counterweight to realism and neorealism, the English School receive less citations than realist and neorealist texts, but a significant number in this context. Again though, it is perplexing why, as one of the main canons of IR theory, so few citations have been received by its key texts (*Table 5*), which essentially differ little from liberal thought in IR. Perhaps this shows how citation counts are split up amongst similar theories but with significant nuance (and also illustrates the faint futility of citation counts as any more than barely indicative). As a counterweight to US realism, the English School has certainly been influential but it seems fairly minor today in the context of the constructivist and liberal-institutionalist/ neoliberal debates which have included many of their dimensions, and have received far more citations. However, its relatively high rate of average growth led by Bull and Wheeler also points to increased digital exposure as more and more material is made available on GS.

Table 5:English School Citations

Theory/Author	Key Publication	Date of original Publication	Citations (Oct 2009)	Citations (April 2010)	Citations (Dec 2010)	Citations (Aug 2011)	Average citations	Numerical increase	Rate of Growth
Bull, Hedley	The Anarchical Society	1977	1,566	1,862	2,046	2,366	1,960	800	33.81%
Dunne, Timothy	Inventing International Society: A History of the English School	1998	134	156	168	197	164	63	31.98%
Butterfield, Herbert	The Whig Interpretation of History	1965	498	502	559	664	556	166	25.00%
Wheeler, Nicholas	Saving Strangers: Humanitarian Intervention in International Society	2000	361	452	487	587	472	226	38.50%

Tables 6 and 7, which span neoliberalism and normative theory of often a liberal or cosmopolitan bent indicate a very significant counter-narrative to the variants of realism. These received healthy citations, but as the liberal peace system in both its classical and neoliberal forms which predominate in the structure of most states and the international system today – for example, democracy, free markets, and regional and international organisation – it is more remarkable that their citation numbers are not significantly higher than anachronistic realist theories. Additionally, the rate of growth is also unremarkable with a very fairly narrow spread and no significant outlier in either citation numbers or growth rates. One would expect, given their global dominance, that they would have citations in excess of those of other areas, such as post-colonial studies. Again, one can only speculate that anti-colonialism represents a far bigger constituency than the narrower valourisation of liberalism more common in northern or Eurocentric publications. Again, it might also be possible, as with realism, that disciplinary gatekeeping is to blame (perhaps foretelling the imminent transformation of 'formal' IR from a narrowly northern discipline because of growing perceptions of empirical irrelevance in the face of post-colonial shifts and emerging actors in IR).

It is interesting that the positivist work on liberal-institutionalism of Keohane is more widely cited than the philosophical work of Doyle using Kant,[35] which received fewer citations (1,004) than the work included in this study.[36] Indeed a more qualitative sampling from a European context would suggest that Doyle's 1983 work has been far more influential in modern political organisations and peace between democracies.[37]

Table 6: Neo-Liberalism Citations

Theory/Author	Key Publication	Date of original Publication	Citations (Oct 2009)	Citations (April 2010)	Citations (Dec 2010)	Citations (Aug 2011)	Average citations	Numerical increase	Rate of Growth
Keohane, Robert	After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World political economy	1984	3,430	3,790	4,294	4,849	4,091	1,419	29.26%
Nye, Joseph	Power and Interdependence	1973	2,702	3,033	3,612	4,106	3,363	1,404	34.19%
Krasner, Stephen	International Regimes	1983	1,855	2,041	2,203	2,419	2,130	564	23.32%
Doyle, Micheal W.	Liberalism and World Politics	1986	765	852	929	1,048	899	283	27.00%

Table 7 on normative theory gives a hint of the underlying inter-disciplinarity of IR over a longer period of time than has often been acknowledged. The astronomical count that Rawl's *Theory of Justice* receives (several times that of more widely recognized disciplinary core texts) reflects its salience for liberal and normative theorists across a range of disciplines.[38] Its citation count is the highest of any text used in IR which is included in this survey. It is almost impossible to disaggregate this text's connections with IR's range of theories, but it can at least be said that it has had a major impact across the full range, and the level of citations it has received indicate this.[39] One could say it is one of the most influential texts in a Eurocentric but increasingly critical/post-colonial discipline (especially as a defence of liberalism), with citations far outweighing much older and more mainstream IR texts. It is one major exception to the relative narrowness of the mainstream citations in these tables. Though the citations for liberal and normative scholars are impressive when placed in the context of other mainstream issues and scholars, they pale in comparison to the impact of Rawl's work. In terms of growth however, Rawls has a relatively low growth rate in a field of relatively modest growth rates, given the range of normative theory in IR. Again, this is across a broad range of disciplines, but the numbers of citations suggest that it is seen as broadly foundational. This has some interesting implications for the discipline, especially one where realists see themselves as foundational and liberals and critical theorists see themselves as challengers. Again this represents the power of both policy driven theory and the importance of norms and institutions.

Table 7: Normative Theory Citations

Theory/Author	Key Publication	Date of original Publication	Citations (Oct 2009)	Citations (April 2010)	Citations (Dec 2010)	Citations (Aug 2011)	Average citations	Numerical increase	Rate of Growth
Rawls, John	A Theory of Justice	1971	X	29,516	32,136	34,999	32,217	5,483	15.67%
Brown, Chris	International Relations Theory: New Normative Approaches	1992	X	258	288	331	292	73	22.05%
Frost, Mervyn	Ethics in International Relations: a Constitutive Theory	1996	X	137	146	162	148	25	15.43%
Nussbaum, Martha	Women and Human Development: The Capabilities Approach	2001	X	2,007	2,223	2,672	2,301	665	24.89%

Table 8 illustrates the weight of the relatively recent challenge of constructivism which has amassed very significant citations in a relatively short space of time, especially Wendt's key study.[40] These reflect the need to respond to new challenges and a range of events and influences, especially for positivist debates. Their citations are on a par with those of other long established approaches and a significant number of scholars have entered its discussions. Many of these are from North America or Europe but constructivism has attracted interest from across the world. Part of the reason for its success in quickly amassing citations is that it has been one of the first attempts within the discipline to create a coherent theory which both spans the more traditional core of the discipline and move significantly beyond that core. This is perhaps a lesson for theory development in the future – building bridges which represent structure, material issues, agency, identities, norms, and realities pertaining to a range of methodologies and subject settings.

Table 8: Constructivism Citations

Theory/Author	Key Publication	Date of original Publication	Citations (Oct 2009)	Citations (April 2010)	Citations (Dec 2010)	Citations (Aug 2011)	Average citations	Numerical increase	Rate of Growth
Wendt, Alexander	A Social Theory of International Politics	1999	2,142	2,351	2,654	3,045	2,382	512	19.40%
Onuf, Nicholas	World of our Making: Rules and Rule in Social Theory and International Politics	1989	469	513	582	634	521	113	19.40%
Ruggie, John	Territoriality and Beyond: Problematizing Modernity in International Relations	1993	971	1,024	1,108	1,265	1,034	137	12.40%
Kratochwil, Friedrich	Rules, Norms, and Decisions	1989	483	595	652	721	577	169	25.90%
Finnemore, Martha	National Interests in International Society	1996	1,174	1,281	1,404	1,574	1,286	230	16.40%
Waever, Ole	Securitization and Desecuritization	2007	548	609	716	743	624	168	23.50%

Table 9 on critical and post-structuralist approaches is heavily weighted towards the work of Giddens and Foucault as influential theorists both within IR and across a range of disciplines. Critical scholars working more centrally within IR also receive strong citations. Indeed, this list compares very favourably with the mainstream theories in IR, with the only exception which stands far above all citation counts, of John Rawl's contribution to normative theory (mentioned above). It is also significant that this field is exclusively occupied by European Scholars. In the case of Foucault, his influence on IR goes far beyond the work cited here as the breadth of his publications, to include his posthumous publications, exceed what many mainstream IR scholars have yet engaged with. (For comparative sake we would like to include supplementary citation tallies which we deemed to be relevant from the time this article was sent for publishing: David Campbell's *Writing Security*[41]: 1,165 citations; Cynthia Webber's Simulating Sovereignty[42]: 279 citations; and David Chandler's *Constructing Global Civil Society*[43]: 75 citations).

Table 9: Critical/Post-Structural IR Citations

Theory/Author	Key Publication	Date of original Publication	Citations (Oct 2009)	Citations (April 2010)	Citations (Dec 2010)	Citations (Aug 2011)	Average citations	Numerical increase	Rate of Growth
Giddens, Anthony	The Constitution of Society	1986	X	9,099	9,206	10,741	9,682	1,642	15.29%
Foucault, Michel	Power/Knowledge	1980	X	4,581	5,432	6,209	5,407	1,628	26.22%
Waker, R.B.J.	Inside/Outside International Relations as Political Theory	1993	789	829	938	1,070	907	281	26.26%
Ashley, Richard K.	The Poverty of Neo-Realism	1984	475	510	561	638	546	163	25.55%
Cox. Robert W.	Social Forces, States and World Orders	1981	1,168	1,175	1,338	1,580	1,315	412	26.08%
Linklater, Andrew	The Transformation of Political Community	1998	451	495	578	665	547	214	32.18%

Post-colonial theory is the biggest surprise of this assessment of citations (*Table 10*). The citations it receives are astronomical and relatively recent compared to other IR texts (with the exception of Rawls', Keynes' and Huntington's classic works mentioned above) showing an appeal across disciplines and across international academies which cannot be matched by any core IR texts (other than Samuel Huntingdon's work). Both the average growth rates and the average citation numbers for post-colonial studies lead this study.[44] Additionally, they show the lowest spread ratios in terms of growth; post-colonial studies has unparalleled citation numbers and is rapidly growing in academic influence. This raises a methodological issue of whether it is fair to compare texts with such broad appeal with those within the rather narrower discipline of IR, even if IR's narrowness is offset by its access to power. Indeed, this also raises the question of what sort of theory policymakers tend to draw on and why, and whether this is because a particularly theory appears pragmatic and representative or whether policy-makers are merely acculturated to power.

A response to this question would be that it is a fair comparison given that the very nature of international relations is supposed to include a range of issues, peoples, sources, and dynamics, not to mention post-colonial policy-makers and scholars who would no doubt consider themselves to be concerned with matters pertinent to IR. This raises a very important issue about the relevance of IR theory in its more traditional sense to the broader academy. Does its core theories' main traction come about because they speak sympathetically to power, rather than because they appeal to a wide range of scholars working in a range of different areas (and speak truth to power)? Do the huge numbers and leading growth rates in post-colonial studies vividly illustrate the hierarchy of knowledge produced by the gatekeepers of IR?

Table 10: Post-Colonialism Citations

Theory/Author	Key Publication	Date of original Publication	Citations (Oct 2009)	Citations (April 2010)	Citations (Dec 2010)	Citations (Aug 2011)	Average citations	Numerical increase	Rate of Growth
Said, Edward	Orientalism	1979	9,666	10,781	12,156	*325	10,868	2,490	20.48%
Spivak, Gayatri C.	Can the Subaltern Speak?	1988	3,475	3,848	4,362	5,398	4,271	1,923	35.62%
BhaBha, Homi	The Location of Culture	1994	8,074	9,187	10,375	12,281	9,979	4,207	34.26%
Anderson, Benedict	Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism	1983	15,558	17,541	19,472	23,207	18,945	7,649	32.96%

Oliver P. Richmond, J. Julian Graef

Table 11 representing authors working in the area of peace and conflict studies and related areas–often seen as a marginal corner of the discipline – receives similar citations to the English School. This is probably due to the fact that it covers a broader range of theories and diverse and often specialized geographies, actually qualifying as an interdisciplinary area of knowledge. Issues related to peace and conflict, which often have a more empirical base than core theoretical debates, may also attract more citations. As is clear from the competitive growth rates, Peace and Conflict Studies is well positioned as the nature of IR has shifted away from the state-centric, bipolar structure of war and peace to the dynamic, intrastate manifestations of war under the 'New Wars' paradigm, debates about the liberal peace, and beyond. (Again, we took the liberty to include relevant supplementary citations here: Mark Duffield's *Global Governance*[45]: 1,354 citations; Miall, Ramsbotham and Woodhouses' *Contemporary Conflict Resolution*[46]: 280 citations; Vivienne Jabri's *Discourses on Violence*[47]: 161 citations; and Oliver Richmond's *The Transformation of Peace*[48]: 146 citations).

Table 11: Peace and Conflict Studies Citations

Theory/Author	Key Publication	Date of original Publication	Citations (Oct 2009)	Citations (April 2010)	Citations (Dec 2010)	Citations (Aug 2011)	Average citations	Numerical increase	Rate of Growth
Mitrany, David	A Working Peace System	1943	635	733	811	942	780	307	32.59%
Burton, John	Resolving Deep-Rooted Conflict: A Handbook	1987	224	242	268	307	260	83	27.04%
Galtung, Johan	A Structural Theory of Imperialism	1971	896	959	1,031	1,163	1,012	267	22.96%
Azar, Edward	The Management of Protracted Social Conflict	1990	295	302	311	371	320	76	20.49%
Paris, Roland	At War's End: Building Peace After Civil Conflict	2004	X	435	526	664	542	229	34.49%

Table 12 provides a hint of how critical approaches in specific issue areas in IR are gaining ground in terms of citations over its former key debates. Critical IPE, development, and geography have attracted significant attention, especially when compared with mainstream IR. Indeed their citations are better than many core IR texts, illustrating a shift in the centre of gravity especially for non-US based scholars while growth rates suggest a steady, but comparatively modest assent.

Table 12: Critical IPE/Development/ Globalization/Modernity Citations

Theory/Author	Key Publication	Date of original Publication	Citations (Oct 2009)	Citations (April 2010)	Citations (Dec 2010)	Citations (Aug 2011)	Average citations	Numerical increase	Rate of Growth
Escobar, Arturo	Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World	1995	X	3,481	3,728	4,319	3,843	838	19.40%
Harvey, David	The Condition of Post-Modernity	2003	X	6,963	7,658	8,405	7,675	1,442	17.16%
Appadurai, Arjun	Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization	1996	X	6,106	6,745	7,915	6,922	1,809	22.86%
Scholte, Jan A.	Globalization: A Critical Introduction	2000	X	1,375	1,496	1,750	1,540	375	21.43%

Table 13 likewise illustrates the salience of feminist debates in the field, which again have received significant citations, on a par with most other theories, though lacking the single text that some other approaches have. Even so, it has clearly been influential, though given the emergence of critical approaches these citations are perhaps not as high as might have been expected.

Table 13: Feminism Citations

Theory/Author	Key Publication	Date of original Publication	Citations (Oct 2009)	Citations (April 2010)	Citations (Dec 2010)	Citations (Aug 2011)	Average citations	Numerical increase	Rate of Growth
Enloe, Cynthia H.	Bananas, Beaches and Bases: Making Feminist Sence of International Politics	1989	X	1,215	1,347	1,576	1,379	361	22.91%
Cohn, Carol	Sex and Death in the Rational World of Defense Intellectuals	1987	X	407	447	528	461	121	22.92%
Elshtain, Jean B.	Women and War	1987	X	421	482	536	480	115	21.46%
Tinkner, J. Anne	Gender in International Relations: Feminist Perspectives on Achieving Global Security	1992	X	193	210	246	216	53	21.54%
Sylvester, Christine	Feminist Thoery and International Relations in a Postmodern Era	1994	X	269	282	311	287	42	13.50%

Implications for the New IR

The problematic nature of GS data of course leaves any 'implications' vulnerable to methodological critique. Controlling for distortions, however, was not our main intention. Rather, we set out to see what a democratized picture of IR looks like using GS and our own sense of what the key core and emerging texts are in the discipline. The data is shown as raw citation numbers over time, however statistically anomalous and selectively biased it may be. This data tends to confirm our initial suspicions – that there is a significant gap between what is assumed to be the core of IR and where the bulk of the work is being done on matters of international relations in academia.

From this we can tentatively suggest two things: first, the citation numbers point to the comparatively large amount of work being undertaken on the critical and normative sides of the third debate. Fundamentally, the raw citation numbers very clearly indicate that the discursive weight of IR has shifted away from its ideological core; indeed, the citation numbers show that under no reasonably conceivable growth rate could the assumed core of IR match its assumed periphery in its critical, discursive, democratic, and perhaps even resistant power.[49] A reversal of disciplinary fortunes is underway as the discipline and IR in practise open up and diversifies.

Secondly, and consequently, this gap indicates a very strong shift towards liberal, more critical theories, and interdisciplinary literatures whether cited to support, extend, or rebut them.[50] In parallel there has been a move away from the narrow theoretical and conceptual heartland of modernist IR, which is dominated by American theorists and approaches to social science implicated in an institutionalized form of censorship, and a vigilant culture of gate-keeping. IR has 'internationalized' and 'transnationalized' due to the engagement of individual scholars, often from critical backgrounds or from outside of the narrow confines of the discipline itself. It is now also 'decolonising'.[51]

Clearly, and even more so than constructivism, post-colonial studies perform most impressively in both averages and consistency. This represents both an epistemological and geographical transformation. It has been the discipline's most decisive influence since the third debate lost its momentum, and perhaps is now mounting a concerted attack on Anglo-European and American political thought as IR's traditional historiographical basis.[52] IR is being re-colonized by a new wave of constructivist, critical and post-colonial scholars who debate discourses and praxes which represent difference, identity, alterity, custom, tradition, norms, and ethics. The modifications and transgressions these efforts are now being produced around the heartland of the international system, the international community and institutions, as well as the epistemologies that constructed a liberal world once thought to be derived from key western or northern interests.[53] While it is often thought that the mainstream in the south speaks with a

northern voice, what is apparently occurring is a move towards a more transnational and transversal debate where such divisions, binaries, and essentialised frameworks are losing their legitimacy and explanatory capacity. What is now emerging is a multi-polar, multi-level version of IR's historiography, which may or may not lead to a hybrid form of liberal internationalism, or liberal- post-colonialism in theoretical and methodological ways, as well as a new ontological openness. This is empowering a new post-colonial civil society, which is increasingly adept at resisting, co-opting, and transforming more traditional ontological and epistemological hegemonies, intellectually and in practise. Alternatively, there is also the possibility that a more communitarian form of IR will emerge with several geographical poles (perhaps representing the BRICS academies) compromising enclosed theoretical debates with little interaction. Speculatively, the latter seems unlikely to survive given the weight of external challenges, the collapse of muscular objectivity,[54] the waning of superpowers and markets, and their associated binaries of sovereignty, self and other, in the current era where hybridities are constantly being uncovered.

The interdisciplinary, constructivist, critical, post-structuralist, feminist, and post-colonial literatures in this survey show how a self-enclosed 'new IR' is unlikely, especially given the associated methodological, normative, and not to say ontological shifts which are emerging. It is especially notable how few female academics are represented in our survey, along with non-northern scholars (and we concede that this is partly due to the authors' own biases and training). However, this is improving according to our data as more critical and interdisciplinary theories are emerging. Instead, we would argue our data shows at a minimum that IR will continue along its trajectory of a broadening inter-discipline whereupon its traditional 'heartland' of realist, idealist, and liberal European philosophy will gradually fade and/ or be supplanted by a range of new debates which transgress the old modes of states, sovereignty, territoriality, governance, normativity, and material structures of the discipline – at least in their more conservative modes. This will coincide with new epistemic centres of thought and theorising, from alternative sites other than the usual western universities and policy centres. The development of strong academies working on IR outside of the West/ North is now underway, and though many may draw on existing mainstream theory and methodology, many are also challenging these. It is perhaps in this shift that IR will become a more relevant and cross-disciplinary nexus for international and global thought than it has ever been. It will certainly be far more complex and far more sensitized to a role of representation across space and time, material resources, political institutions, identities, environments, and experiences. As new forms of more participatory democracy take hold at the behest of developing and post-colonial states around the world,[55] as the state relinquishes its territorialism, as material resources are shared and environmental and human needs factors are encountered and built into institutions and laws across generations, the twentieth century version of IR will seem as distant and perhaps, as quaint (or dystopian), as Augustine and Hobbes.

Conclusion

The claims that realism represents the core of the discipline are not borne out by the citations of its major scholars. Liberal and constructivist approaches appear to have easily displaced them as its contemporary central core, though critical and normative areas are still being censored by an insular and postitivist IR culture of gatekeeping – a strange but familiar finding given the very scope of the discipline articulated by its own proclamation and founding purpose. Yet, when exposed to the live field of matters of international relations both realist and liberal theories have limited interdisciplinary traction or appeal. Constructivism has moved towards the core and so-called marginal theories are now far more widely cited, particularly those that are interdisciplinary and post-colonial in nature. This indicates a significant shift towards critical and post-structural, feminist, and post-colonial theories. This shift is indicative of fundamental changes in IR itself, which cannot merely be explained by increased inter-disciplinarity at work. IR is now produced

rather than merely reproduced in contexts other than its traditional Anglo-American heartlands, and has moved away from hard social science.[56]

Thus, our data represents IR as an inter-discipline, and as widely as possible. Though this may skew our citation counts, simplistic though they are, away from the formal centre, mainly located around North American debates, towards a more global, post-colonial, and interdisciplinary perspective, this is representative of the life of the discipline beyond its old-fashioned centre. This illustrates how constraining formal methods have become, and how unrepresentative of the broader field and its global, regional, and local implications it is. Furthermore, it shows how little impact formal debates have had on interdisciplinary social science, but increasingly how much engagement there is with broader issues in the context of IR. As a discipline in change – some would say revolt against formal theories – the data presented here, despite its simplicity and methodological limitations, confirms its new directions. Of course, there is also the issue of fashion in the discipline where it might be said that accumulated citations represent a theory under attack, or academics following gatekeepers and dominant discourses. In either case, citations cannot be seen as representative of the viability of a theory, but indicate its ability to prompt debate.

The alternative space in which the new IR is emerging represents the interests of scholars who generally do not accept that IR is solely produced by states, powerful or otherwise, and international actors comprising those states. Many of these scholars work in networks that span the US, UK, Europe, BRICS, and non-European settings, though they may publish in western contexts, and translate their debates for those discussions. However, they also publish in national and regional settings, in languages not widely understood in the mainstream institutional contexts. The same cannot be said for those scholars who work in more mainstream areas and who tend to be very reluctant to engage with such dynamics beyond this mainstream. The several areas in which significant citations have been amassed contrary to the realist notion of itself as the core of the discipline represent alternative spaces of debate in IR. Often these spaces have come into being using mainstream debates as their foil, but it has been less recognized that they also represent a different consensus about an interdisciplinary IR and a coalescence around an alternative discursive paradigm, often beyond the West and its interests (writ large across orthodox IR theory).

These shifts in citations and in the concurrent patterns they reflect herald IR as a more sociological, post-colonial, inter-discipline, focused on the inter-subjective place of individuals and communities in the structures of international politics in transversal, transnational, national, and international dynamics. This is contrary to the arguments of some commentators about theory formation.[57] This is a more diverse space of rights and needs, and struggles over autonomous agency at every level, normally played out in agonistic ways where violence is the exception but structural violence is common and risk constant: IR's role is to respond to such tensions rather than to maintain them. This means that the original goals of IR on its formation survive – understanding the conditions of a broadly consensual peace 58. However, its dynamics and frameworks have deepened and lengthened in terms of security, institutions, rights, and needs. If anything the lessons of IR are the failure of inequitable global narratives, whether of colonialism and empire, liberalism, or profit. As with the past revolutions of the masses which effectively reshaped the security, institutional, and normative systems of the modern European states system, new dynamics of resistance, legitimacy, and rights drive IR's constant hybridisation, as it drifts away from its roots as a narrowly oriented and even colonial discipline.

Notes

Oliver P. Richmond, J. Julian Graef

[1] A.J.R. Groom and Margot Light, *Contemporary International Relations: A Guide to Theory* (Continuum International Publishing, 1994); Oliver Daddow, *International Relations Theory* (Sage Publications Ltd, 2009).

[2] Costas M. Constantinou, *On the Way to Diplomacy* (University of Minnesota Press, 1996); R. B. J. Walker, *Inside/Outside: International Relations as Political Theory* (Cambridge University Press, 1992); R. W. Cox, "Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory," *Millennium - Journal of International Studies* 10, no. 2 (June 1981): 126–155.

[3] Oliver P. Richmond, *Mediating in Cyprus: The Cypriot Communities and the United Nations*, 1st ed. (Routledge, 1998).

[4] Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, Rev. Ed. (Verso Books, 2006); Homi K. Bhabha, *Nation and Narration*, 1st ed. (Routledge, 1990); Homi K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 2nd ed. (Routledge, 2004).

[5] Jim George, *Discourses of Global Politics: Critical (Re)Introduction to International Relations* (Palgrave Macmillan, 1994).

[6] Pinar Bilgin, "Thinking Past 'Western' IR?," *Third World Quarterly* 29, no. 1 (February 2008): 5–23; David Blaney and Naeem Inayatullah, "Knowing Encounters: Beyond Parochialism in International Relations Theory," in *The Return of Culture and Identity in IR Theory*, ed. Yosef Lapid and Friedrich Kratochwil (Lynne Rienner Publishers Inc, 1996), 65–84.

[7] Philip Nel, "Redistribution and Recognition: What Emerging Regional Powers Want," *Review of International Studies* 36, no. 04 (November 2010): 951–974.

[8] Costas M. Constantinou, Oliver P. Richmond, and Alison M. S. Watson, "International Relations and the Challenges of Global Communication," *Review of International Studies* 34, no. S1 (February 2008), http://www.journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S026021050800778X.

[9] Martin Wight, "Why Is There No International Theory?," in *Diplomatic Investigations*, ed. Herbert Butterfield and Martin Wight (Allen & U., 1966), 12–33.

[10] Sigmund Freud, *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* (General Books LLC, 2009).

[11] Douglas P. Fry, *Beyond War: The Human Potential for Peace* (OUP USA, 2007), 2 and 208.

[12] see for example Stephen M. Walt, "The Relationship Between Theory and Policy in International Relations," *Annual Review of Political Science* 8, no. 1 (June 2005): 23–48.

[13] Ian Clark, *The Post-Cold War Order: The Spoils of Peace* (OUP Oxford, 2001); G. John Ikenberry, *After Victory: Institutions, Strategic Restraint, and the Rebuilding of Order After Major Wars* (Princeton University Press, 2000).

[14] Oliver Richmond, "Critical Agency, Resistance, and a Post-Colonial Civil Society," *Cooperation and Conflict* Forthcoming (December 2011).

[15] Martin Ceadel, *Thinking About Peace and War*, New ed. (Oxford Paperbacks, 1988); Michael W Doyle, *Ways of War and Peace: Realism, Liberalism and Socialism* (W. W. Norton & Co., 1997).

[16] Google Scholar Support Team, May 10, 2010.

[17] Awk Harzing and R van der Wal, "Google Scholar as a New Source for Citation Analysis," *Ethics in Science and Environmental Politics* 8 (June 2008): pg 8.

[18] Anne-Wil Harzing, "Reflections on Norms for the H-index and Related Indices - Anne-Wil Harzing", October 2007, http://www.harzing.com/pop_norm.htm.

[19] Harzing and van der Wal, "Google Scholar as a New Source for Citation Analysis," 62.

[20] Ibid., 65.

[21] Ibid., 72.

[22] Ibid., 65.

[23] Francis Hinsley, *Power and the Pursuit of Peace.*, Reprint. (London Cambridge U.P., 1982); Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan: Or the Matter, Forme, & Power of a Common-Wealth Ecclesiasticall and Civill*, ed. Ian Shapiro (Yale University Press, 2010); Immanuel Kant, *To Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch* (Hackett Publishing Co, Inc, 2003).

[24] John R. Oneal and Bruce Russett, *Triangulating Peace: Democracy, Interdependence, and International Organizations*, 1st ed. (W. W. Norton & Company, 2001); Doyle, *Ways of War and Peace*; Nils Petter Gleditsch, "Democracy and Peace," *Journal of Peace Research* 29, no. 4 (November 1, 1992): 369–376.

[25] Krishna Guha, Sarah O'Connor, and Michael Mackenzie, "FT.com / Global Economy - IMF Says World Is Pulling Out of Recession", August 7, 2009, http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/4e8677f0-6bc2-11de-9320-00144feabdc0.html#axzz1a7xmgoUc; John Maynard Keynes, *The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money* (www.bnpublishing.com, 2008).

[26] L. M. Ashworth, "Did the Realist-Idealist Great Debate Really Happen? a Revisionist History of International Relations," *International Relations* 16, no. 1 (April 2002): 33–51.

[27] Anderson, *Imagined Communities*.

[28] Peter Wilson, "The Myth of the 'First Great Debate'," *Review of International Studies* 24, no. 5 (1998): 1–16.

[29] Norman Angell, *The Great Illusion: A Study of the Relation of Military Power to National Advantage* (BiblioBazaar, LLC, 2010).

[30] Hans Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations : the Struggle for Power and Peace*, 5. ed., 1. pr. (New York: Knopf, 1973).

[31] Roland Blieker, "Forget IR Theory," *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 22, no. 1 (January 1, 1997): 57–85.

[32] Kenneth Waltz, *Theory of International Politics* (Long Grove Ill.: Waveland Press, 2010).

[33] Kenneth Waltz, *Man, the State, and War* (New York: Columbia University press, 2001).

[34] Samuel Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order* (New York ;London: Free, 2002) Huntington was originally placed in 'security studies' section for this article. However, the section, outside of Huntington's work, did not have significant enough citation numbers to be a viable independent category. Additionally, the sub-discipline of security studies had too significant an overlap with many of the core neo-realist texts. And, as can be seen in the August 2011 sampling, GS 'nonsensical' results are revealed with a significantly truncated citation tally of 5,660. As such this sampling was not included in the work's overall growth rate.

[35] Michael W. Doyle, "Kant, Liberal Legacies, and Foreign Affairs," *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 12, no. 3 (Summer 1983): 205–235.

[36] Michael W. Doyle, "Liberalism and World Politics," *The American Political Science Review* 80, no. 4 (December 1, 1986): 1151–1169.

37 Robert Keohane, *After Hegemony* (Princeton N.J. ;;Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2005).

[38] John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice.*, Rev. ed., 2. print. (Cambridge Mass.: Belknap, 2000).

[39] Daniel Maliniak et al., *The View from the Ivory Tower: TRIP Survey of International Relations Faculty in the United States and Canada* (Williamsburg, VA: EWnedy and Emery Reves Center for Internatinal Studies and College of William and Mary, February 2009), http://web.wm.edu/irtheoryandpractice/trip/surveyreport06-07.pdf?svr=www. Indeed the TRIP survey finds that Rawls among many others (Michel Foucault, Raymond Aron, Cynthia Enloe, David Haglund, Emmanuel Adler, Immanuel Wallerstein, John Rawls, and Steven Gill) 'have had a profound impact on the thinking of researchers at Canadian schools, but who have had a relatively smaller impact on U.S. scholars' pg 6.

[40] Alexander Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics* (Cambridge UK ;;New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

[41] David Campbell, *Writing Security : United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity*, Rev. ed. (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998).

[42] Cynthia Weber, *Simulating Sovereignty Intervention, the State, and Symbolic Exchange* (Cambridge [u.a.]: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1995).

[43] David Chandler, "Constructing Global Civil Society," in *Global Civil Society: Contested Futures*, ed. Gideon Baker and David Chandler, Routledge Advances in International Relations and Global Politics (Routledge, 2006).

[44] Again with Said's work (Edward Said, *Orientalism* Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd. 1978) a GS anomaly revealed in the August 2011 data was not included in the growth rate.

44 Mark Duffield, *Global Governance And The New Wars : The Merging of Development and Security.*, 1.udg. ed. (London: Zed, 2001).

44 Oliver Ramsbotham, *Contemporary Conflict Resolution : the Prevention, Management and Transformation of Deadly Conflicts*, 3rd ed. (Cambridge UK ;;Malden MA: Polity, 2011).

44 Vivienne Jabri, *Discourses on Violence : Conflict Analysis Reconsidered*, 1. publ. (Manchester [u.a.]: Manchester Univ. Press, 1996).

44 Oliver Richmond, *The Transformation of Peace* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007).

44 Cox, "Social Forces, States and World Orders."

44 James Der Derian, *International Theory : Critical Investigations* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1995).

44 Bilgin, "Thinking Past 'Western' IR?"; Blaney and Inayatullah, "Knowing Encounters: Beyond Parochialism in International Relations Theory."

44 Dipesh Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference* (Princeton, N.J. :: Princeton University Press,, 2000).

44 Ilan Kapoor, *The Postcolonial Politics of Development* (London ;;New York: Routledge, 2008).

44 Arjun Appadurai, *Modernity Al Large : Cultural Dimensions of Globalization* (Minneapolis ;;London: University of Minnesota Press, 1996).

44 Boaventura de Sousa Santos, ", Reinventing Social Emancipation: Toward New Manifestoes," in *Democratizing Democracy: Beyond the Liberal Democratic Canon*, ed. Boaventura de Sousa Santos, Reinventing Social Emancipation (Verso, 2007).

45 Mark Duffield, *Global Governance And The New Wars : The Merging of Development and Security.*, 1.udg. ed. (London: Zed, 2001).

46 Oliver Ramsbotham, *Contemporary Conflict Resolution : the Prevention, Management and Transformation of Deadly Conflicts*, 3rd ed. (Cambridge UK ;;Malden MA: Polity, 2011).

47 Vivienne Jabri, *Discourses on Violence : Conflict Analysis Reconsidered*, 1. publ. (Manchester [u.a.]: Manchester Univ. Press, 1996).

48 Oliver Richmond, *The Transformation of Peace* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007).

49 Cox, "Social Forces, States and World Orders."

50 James Der Derian, *International Theory : Critical Investigations* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1995).

51 Bilgin, "Thinking Past 'Western' IR?"; Blaney and Inayatullah, "Knowing Encounters: Beyond Parochialism in International Relations Theory."

52 Dipesh Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference* (Princeton, N.J. :: Princeton University Press,, 2000).

53 Ilan Kapoor, *The Postcolonial Politics of Development* (London ;;New York: Routledge, 2008).

54 Arjun Appadurai, *Modernity Al Large : Cultural Dimensions of Globalization* (Minneapolis ;;London: University of Minnesota Press, 1996).

55 Boaventura de Sousa Santos, ", Reinventing Social Emancipation: Toward New Manifestoes," in *Democratizing Democracy: Beyond the Liberal Democratic Canon*, ed. Boaventura de Sousa Santos, Reinventing Social Emancipation (Verso, 2007).

56 Stanley Hoffmann, "An American Social Science: International Relations," *Daedalus* 106, no. 3 (July 1, 1977): 41–60.

57 A. Acharya and B. Buzan, "Preface: Why Is There No non-Western IR Theory: Reflections on and from Asia," *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific* 7, no. 3 (May 2007): 285–286.

58 see for example Herbert Butterfield and Martin Wight, *Diplomatic Investigations* (Allen & U., 1966).

| 78