Journal of Social and Political Sciences

The Asian Institute of Research *Social and Political Sciences* is a peer-reviewed International Journal. The journal covers scholarly articles in the fields of Social and Political Sciences, which include, but are not limited to, Anthropology, Government Studies, Political Sciences, Sociology, International Relations, Public Administration, History, Philosophy, Arts, Education, Linguistics, and Cultural Studies. As the journal is Open Access, it ensures high visibility and the increase of citations for all research articles published. The *Journal of Social and Political Sciences* aims to facilitate scholarly work on recent theoretical and practical aspects of Social and Political Sciences.

ASIAN INSTITUTE OF RESEARCH
Connecting Scholars Worldwide

Examining Non-Western Perspectives in International Relations: A Case Study and Analysis of Afghanistan

Maiwand Safi[1], Khair Mohammad Momand[2], Wolas Safi[3]

[1] PhD Scholar, South Asian University
[2] Chancellor Tabesh University, Nangarhar, Afghanistan
[3] Lecturer, Tabesh University, Nangarhar, Afghanistan

Correspondence: Maiwand Safi. Email: Maiwandsafi74@yahoo.com

Abstract

This paper explores the dynamics of international relations beyond the Western paradigm, emphasizing a global perspective. It contends that the Western world has exerted significant influence over the field of international relations. It is frequently referred to as 'An American Social Science.' Nevertheless, scholarships, voices, discourse, and narratives are arising from the non-Western World (Global South) in opposition to the dominance and hegemony of the West within the discipline. This paper underscores the persistent neglect within IR scholarship to center non-Western thought, experiences, and contributions, resulting in the sidelining and marginalization of scholarship from the global south. Similarly, this paper illuminates the constraints and limitations of predominant international relations theories in the context of the non-Western world and Afghanistan. Afghanistan serves as a notable illustration of the prevalence of Western theories in international relations, resulting in the application of frameworks that engage with Afghanistan through a geopolitical lens while sidelining indigenous knowledge(s) and perspectives. Afghanistan stands as one of the most ancient civilizations endowed with the potential to enhance international relations theory (IRT). Therefore, within this framework, this scholarship argues that the 'Loya Jirga'—a time-honored method for resolving disputes among traditional communities—can significantly contribute to the advancement of an inclusive international relations theory, aiming not to supplant the existing paradigms but to enhance them. This paper emphasizes that for international relations to evolve into a truly universal and inclusive discipline, it must accommodate non-Western perspectives, particularly those originating from Afghanistan. It further offers recommendations to Afghan scholars and the IRT community on enhancing the prominence of Afghan knowledge(s) within the realm of IRT.

Keywords: International Relations Theory, Non-Western International Relations, Global International Relations, African IR, Asian IR, Afghanistan IR. Loya Jirga

1. Introduction

"Decolonizing knowledge should not put us in the position of only producing knowledge as a reaction to Western knowledge. Our existence should not become one in which everything we produce is to justify our intellectual existence vis-à-vis the West. It means to produce what we see as important, fit, and nurturing to our communities, countries, and cultures in separation from the West and its colonial and imperial agenda. This way, we will ensure

that we do not waste our energy simply reacting to the West to justify the value of our contribution to knowledge." (Yako, 2021). The West has established hegemony and dominance over the production, propagation, and absorption of knowledge. In the field of international relations, among many others, the Western nations have established their dominance (Acharya, 2016). International relations have been described as an 'American social science,' a 'colonial household,' and a 'disjunctive empire' (Hoffman, 1977; Yew, 2003; Agathangelou & Ling, 2004). The dissemination of knowledge in the discipline of International Relations is predominantly unidirectional, with non-Western perspectives often overlooked, dismissed, and marginalized. A cluster of scholars has emerged to challenge Western dominance in the discipline and to question the applicability of existing international relations theory to the non-Western world. These scholars and practitioners operate within the frameworks of 'critical,' 'Global,' and 'non-Western' International Relations.

The primary objective of non-Western international relations is to democratize the discipline by integrating the theories, concepts, ideas, experiences, narratives, and norms from the non-Western world. Additionally, non-Western international relations advocates for the IR community to transcend American and Western hegemony in the field and to diversify the disciplinary sources. This paper aims to illustrate the objective of non-Western international relations: to establish a global, universal, and inclusive discipline in the field of international relations. The same dominance of Western International Relations is evident in Afghanistan. The Afghan perspectives, knowledge, narratives, and discourse are frequently overlooked and marginalized. The Western theories, including mainstream International Relations theories such as Liberalism, Realism, and Constructivism, as well as state-centric geopolitical theories, are applied to Afghanistan, thereby marginalizing local Afghan knowledge.

This paper addresses non-Western international relations debates and case studies, representing a novel contribution in the context of Afghanistan. This paper's initial section addresses critiques of Western and American hegemony within the discipline and introduces non-Western International Relations. The next part of the paper examines various non-Western works, with a primary emphasis on African, Asian, and Latin American International Relations. The following portion provides an analysis of Afghanistan. This paper introduces the Afghani concept of 'Loya Jirga' and asserts that, if appropriately developed and articulated, it has the potential to enhance international relations theory. The concluding section provides insights into the potential contributions of Afghan scholars to the field of International Relations and its theoretical frameworks.

This study employs a qualitative methodology that integrates comparative analysis, case study examination, and critical discourse analysis. This work critically examines prevailing Western International Relations Theories (IRTs) and juxtaposes them with non-Western viewpoints, utilizing Afghanistan as a primary case study. The methodology involves a documentary analysis of scholarly literature, historical texts, and policy documents to highlight the limitations of mainstream International Relations theories—specifically Realism, Liberalism, and Constructivism—when applied to non-Western contexts. This inquiry is guided by the following research questions: To what extent has Western hegemony influenced International Relations Theory and marginalized non-Western perspectives? What are the limitations of mainstream International Relations theories in explaining Afghanistan's geopolitical and socio-political landscape? What is the role of the Loya Jirga in the context of International Relations, and how might it augment current IR theories? What strategies can be utilized to incorporate Afghan and Global South perspectives into mainstream International Relations theory?

This research aims to critique the predominance of Western perspectives in International Relations (IR), identify the limitations of applying Western theories to non-Western contexts such as Afghanistan, propose the Loya Jirga as a valuable framework for IR, and advocate for a decolonized and pluralistic discipline that incorporates diverse global viewpoints. This study focuses on Afghanistan while also referencing perspectives from the Global South, including Asia, Africa, and Latin America. It contrasts mainstream Western International Relations theories with non-Western alternatives, analyzes both historical and contemporary applications of these theories, and addresses the decolonization of knowledge, indigenous governance models, and the marginalization of Global South epistemologies. This study aims to expand the scope of International Relations theory to create a more inclusive, global, and interdisciplinary academic field.

2. International Relations as a hegemonic discipline

The global significance of international relations has been questioned and extensively scrutinized, with critiques highlighting its lack of genuine "international" scope (Tickner, 2003; Waever, 1998). Hoffmann (1977) and Smith (2002) characterize International Relations (IR) as an "American Social Science" and a "hegemonic discipline" predominantly influenced by Western ideologies. Critical researchers in International Relations question the applicability of mainstream theories, such as liberalism and realism, in non-Western contexts. The marginalization and exclusion of non-Western scholars from mainstream International Relations is apparent, even though Western International Relations does not publicly discriminate against them. Acharya claims that exclusion and marginalization arise from the production of International Relations (IR) and the concentration of journals, publishing houses, and academic institutions in the United States and other Western countries.

Moreover, the suppression of non-Western stories, thinking, experiences, and values happens all the time in mainstream IR. It may take in the form of language that the non-western scholarship's English is poor or does not adhere to the standard established methodology (Acharya, 2016, p. 7). Most publishing channels lack space for non-Western viewpoints. Peter Katzenstein inquires about the quantity of articles from postcolonial, feminist, or critical perspectives present in prominent journals and publications. Furthermore, non-American scholars are excluded from major international relations conventions and conferences, limiting their ability to contribute to international relations theory from a non-Western perspective (Katzenstein, 2010).

Moreover, the perspectives and experiences of non-Western societies remain ignored, mainly within the realm of international relations. Peter Vale argues that conventional international relations consistently overlook the perspectives, narratives, and concepts emerging from the global south (Acharya, 2016, p.8). An enduring characteristic of international relations studies is the marginalization of non-Western perspectives, which manifests in various ways, including the exclusion of these viewpoints from prominent publications and academic curricula in the field. Furthermore, realism, liberalism, and constructivism—the three predominant theories within Western international relations—have profoundly failed to understand and accurately reflect the complexities of the non-Western world. In Asia and Africa, numerous assumptions and forecasts derived from these theories fail to correspond with the actual circumstances. Within this framework, the pragmatic prediction regarding Asia's future proved to be erroneous (Kang, 2003). The discipline of international relations has been overwhelmingly dominated by scholars from Western and American academic circles (Acharya, 2014; 2016). For instance, numerous individuals, such as John Mearsheimer, contend that the ascent of non-American scholars in this field can be attributed to their capacity to expand upon the contributions of American academics. This exemplifies the extensive reach of its dominance. Furthermore, the TRIP report indicates a prevailing influence of Western methodologies, epistemologies, and scholarly outputs (Jordan et al., 2009), which consequently leads to the marginalization of non-Western viewpoints.

Numerous leading researchers in International Relations (IR) contest the notion that IR is exclusively a Western social science and express a reluctance to alter its established practices despite the evident and significant influence of Western thought within the discipline (Acharya, 2016). Mearsheimer is a prominent figure in international relations, and his publications are widely studied globally. He denies the claim that the international relations scholarly community is excessively American-centric. He asserts that American supremacy is "benign," indicating that the discipline does not require a "broadening of its horizons." (Acharya, 2016, p. 6). The Teaching, Research, and International Policy (TRIP) report asserts that self-interest drives Western domination. Opposition to non-Western international relations initiatives will likely come from scholars benefiting from Western dominance. Additionally, when inquired about Western dominance in the IRT, seventy-five percent of respondents concurred that international relations is a Western-dominated discipline, indicating that American preeminence in this field is not benign. Simultaneously, 62% of participants acknowledged the importance of countering hegemony (Acharya, 2016).

Many non-Western scholars view international relations as neither universal nor inclusive. As a result, numerous initiatives are emerging to move International Relations from its parochial focus to a more global and inclusive discipline. The purpose of these projects is to encourage the International Relations community to move beyond

Western dominance in the discipline and to acknowledge diversity by recognizing the roles and contributions of non-Western peoples and societies. Non-Western scholarship endeavors to incorporate its insights, narratives, experiences, values, and norms into international relations theory, potentially leading to the establishment of Global and non-Western IR (Acharya, 2014).

The issue of Western hegemony is central to the discourse and discussion surrounding non-Western and global international relations. Global and non-Western international relations argue that the field must broaden its scope by incorporating ideas, theories, and narratives from diverse nations and cultures to challenge Western supremacy (Acharya, 2016). Each state and its society exhibit distinct characteristics, indicating that the world is not homogeneous. Consequently, evaluating and interpreting all aspects of the world through the singular lens of prevailing International Relations theories—Realism, Liberalism, and Constructivism—proves inadequate for producing practical answers, predictions, and solutions (Acharya, 2014; 2016; 2017). Place and position are significant in international relations (IR); each position provides distinct characteristics, narratives, and experiences that can contribute to the development of IR theory. The objective of global and non-Western International Relations is to enhance the diversity of IR sources and facilitate the inclusion of perspectives from various regions. Anyidoho observes that 'locations are, however, mobile because each person inhabits multiple locations within and across time. He suggests that 'what you stand for should be as important as where you stand' (Anyidoho, 1985).

The emergence of non-Western International Relations can be attributed to a rising discontent with the applicability of conventional IR theories to the Asian context. Its main aim is to promote inquiry into alternative foundations of IR theory. Indigenous histories, classical philosophy, the perspectives of national leaders, academic writing, and religious traditions have the potential to enhance IRT (Acharya, 2017). It is essential to recognize that global and non-Western international relations do not constitute a singular theory or methodology; instead, they seek to enhance and incorporate existing international relations theories by introducing a diverse array of concepts and frameworks. The objective of non-Western international relations is to transform the field into a genuinely inclusive and universal discipline rather than merely replacing one form of centrism with another. Acharya posits that non-Western international relations scholarship faces criticism for its critiques of Western concepts, which are deemed lacking in comprehensiveness (Acharya, 2014; 2016; 2017).

Odoom and Andrews (2017) assert that non-Western international relations broaden the scope of the discipline, suggesting that the inclusion of perspectives from non-Western nations allows the field to achieve a truly global and universal character. The foremost intellectual contributions and scholarly work must extend beyond North America and Europe for International Relations to evolve into a genuinely inclusive discipline; it is essential to incorporate the perspectives of scholars from Asia and Africa (Odoom & Andrews, 2017). Moreover, by shifting the discipline beyond the limiting confines of conventional international relations, the inclusion of non-Western perspectives and global frameworks disrupts the prevailing order. The contributions of non-Western scholars in the field have illuminated the predominance of Western perspectives in International Relations theory. Incorporating non-Western viewpoints will shift the discipline of international relations from a singular notion of universality towards a more diverse understanding known as "pluri-versality" (Mignolo, 2009). Ultimately, by exploring perspectives beyond the Western paradigm for an alternative understanding of international relations, the field engage with a field that transcends racial constructs through the decolonization of the subject and the careful management of concepts and methodologies. Engaging with the expanding body of ideas from diverse locations, rather than dismissing them, constitutes a crucial concern for IRT.

The objective of non-Western international relations is to gradually move the discipline away from Western hegemony towards a framework that is more inclusive and universally applicable. In non-Western international relations, understanding and knowledge are rooted and derived in non-Western practices and interactions alongside distinct epistemological concepts. The objective of global and non-western IR is to put forward an alternative perspective. A multitude of recognized publications, including Huntington's "Clash of Civilizations," conform to the traditional methodologies of International Relations. Instead of portraying Islam as fearful of the West, Huntington illustrates the West's apprehension towards Islam (see Huntington, 1993). As noted by Acharya (2016), an essential component of global international relations is the examination of regions or regional worlds.

A crucial expression of the agency of non-Western actors that Western international relations have overlooked is regionalism. The worldwide relevance of the EU is subject to debate within non-Western international relations. For the pursuit of a truly universal framework in international relations, global IR must engage with non-Western traditions and research methodologies. The development of non-Western and global international relations is profoundly shaped by distinct national schools of thought in the field.

Amitav Acharya offers a paradigm for evaluating theoretical breakthroughs or literature that has the potential to advance theory. A theoretical breakthrough should be evaluated based on two criteria, regardless of whether it originates in Asia or, more broadly, any other part of the world. The first role is to refute popular theories, particularly those that assert universality. Any non-Western IR and global endeavor should be able to question the applicability and relevance of the current ideas. This entails moving past the ethnocentrism of discussions across paradigms. In this regard, much effort has been made. For example, David Kang and Amitav Acharya use the realist/neorealist assumptions and forecasts for Asia and China. They outline the discrepancy between the region's reality and the presumptions and forecasts of the three fundamental IR theories—constructivism, liberalism, and realism. The second purpose of any theoretical innovation in international relations is to offer fresh or different ideas that enhance comprehension and elucidation of global phenomena and development. However, the idea should be universal and applicable outside of its original context. For example, Asian IR has produced numerous theoretical works, such as Yaging Qin's "Relational Theory of World Politics," that question the conventional theories that are now in use.

3. Exploring Perspectives Beyond Western International Relations and Progressing Towards Non-Western Approaches

This part of the paper critically and rigorously engages with the scholarship coming from Asia, Africa, and Latin America using the 'framework of judging' expounded by Amitav Acharya and the application of Western IR theories and simultaneously offers its critiques over and challenges the dominance IR theories and in turn uses it and applies in the case of Afghanistan.

Odoom and Andrews (2017), in their high-volume paper "What/who is still missing in International Relations scholarship? Situating Africa as an Agent of IR Theorizing," reveal the limitations of Western theories and concepts. It is posited that case studies, experiential insights, and a substantial corpus of work from African societies can significantly enrich the field of International Relations. Theorization in international relations often lacks substantial insight into Africa, and Africa's cultural, political, and economic knowledge must be integrated into the framework of international relations theory. Isaac and Andrews contend that IRT is afflicted by a representational deficiency, indicating that, aside from the perspectives of the West and America, the experiences, values, and norms of the non-Western world have been largely overlooked. If the field of international relations aspires to be truly global and inclusive, its leading scholars must extend beyond the confines of American and European representation. Moreover, it has been argued (2017) that narratives originating from Africa will illuminate facets of global politics that prevailing theories and perspectives overlook. African insights, narratives, and experiences possess a distinctiveness that sets them apart from those of the West. The authors argue that revealing alternative narratives within the dominant international relations scholarship poses difficulties but is still achievable (Smith, 2009).

The concept of the state has consistently held a position of prominence within the field of International Relations (Agnew, 1994; Odoom and Andrews, 2017). The understanding of the state during the 20th century was predominantly centered around European perspectives (Malaquias, 2001). International relations is a discipline that centers around the state, with sovereign political entities serving as the primary actors in this arena. The state-centric model of international relations proved to be highly effective for Europeans (Malaquias, 2001, p. 12), facilitating peace and stability and fostering consensus and cooperation, as evidenced by the Westphalia Accord. Nevertheless, the application of the Westphalian state system to African nations has resulted in warfare and discord rather than fostering peace, unity, and collaboration. The primary issue with prevailing theories of International Relations lies in their historical emphasis on the state, particularly the actions of dominant and great powers.

Consequently, this focus has led to the marginalization of sub-state levels and actors, as well as the intricate dynamics of human and cultural geography (Agnew, 1994; Odoom & Andrews, 2017, p. 48; Chaturvedi, 2017).

Thus, an important lesson can be obtained from African narratives, experiences, and academic contributions regarding the diverse array of participants that must be considered in cultivating a comprehension of international relations that transcends traditional state-centric frameworks. Malaquias suggests that African reinterpretations of international relations narratives must engage with the dominant state-centric paradigm and supplant it with more inclusive frameworks (Malaquias, 2001, p. 15). Furthermore, should we transcend the traditional state-centric framework of International Relations Theory. In the perspective articulated by John Agnew, if we liberate ourselves from the constraints of the 'Territorial Trap' and explore alternative units of analysis, we may uncover answers to the often-neglected yet crucial questions in international relations, which could address numerous challenges faced by African nations and the Global South.

For instance, to comprehend the tension in Southern Sudan and Northern Uganda, it is essential to focus on sub-state actors rather than solely examining the roles of the Sudanese and Ugandan states. This involves evaluating the history, background, and motivations of the rebel groups (Smith, 2009). This will enhance understanding of the situation in Africa and lead to a plausible and feasible solution to the issues at hand. Analyzing sub-state levels and actors offers the international relations community innovative analytical tools to elucidate the behavior of African states (p. 278). The imposition of the Westphalian state model has led to conflict, as the state is not inherently essential to political life, both in Africa and in Afghanistan and other South Asian nations. Other actors in Africa have appropriated state functions. Thus, the implementation of the Western state has significantly failed in Africa.

Moreover, liberalism is of significant importance and occupies an essential explanatory space in international relations (Odoom and Andrews, 2017, p. 50). Nkiwane asserts that the liberal tradition does not acknowledge the contributions of African society (Nkiwane, 2001). Fukuyama's concept of democracy includes several African nations, which, in reality, do not qualify as such. He defines democratic regimes as those that empower their citizens to choose their government via periodic secret ballots and multiparty elections grounded on universal adult suffrage (Fukuyama, 1989). The liberal proposition that the advancement of liberal democracy and human rights would resolve issues of political repression and economic stagnation has proved to be elusive in several regions of Africa (Saul, 1997). Liberal democracy in African societies has shown significant illiberal tendencies. The preservation of democratic rights cannot be confined just to election matters. Consequently, Western democracy is ineffective in the African environment. Suppose any Western philosophy, such as democracy, seeks to function inside a community without a liberal heritage. In that case, it should be integrated with the local customs rather than just imposing the Western notion. Boele van Hensbroek asserts that liberal democracy may be enhanced by integrating African ideals and institutional structures via the incorporation of local traditions (Boele van Hensbroek, 1999).

In this context, Africa presents a distinctive view of democracy, exemplified by Ujamaa, which, if articulated and developed thoughtfully, has the potential to enhance theories of international relations. "Ujamaa" represents an African interpretation of democracy that emphasizes communalism, engaging in deliberation, consensus building, and reconciling differing perspectives, thereby presenting a challenge to Western liberal democracy (Smith, 2009). Odoom and Andrews assert that the integration of African concepts such as "Ujamaa" into International Relations theory would enhance the discipline's inclusivity and overall quality. Ultimately, the prevailing theories within mainstream international relations are predominantly centered on an individualistic perspective rather than a collective understanding. A significant number of African nations demonstrate numerous characteristics indicative of collectivist cultures. Consequently, mainstream IR theories struggle to encapsulate the collective cultural essence of African societies when viewed through an individualistic perspective. The social, economic, and political realities of Africa provide significant perspectives on the subject matter and theories of international relations.

In addition, David C. Kang, in his paper "Getting Asia Wrong: The Need for New Analytical Framework" (2003), argues that "the mainstream International Relations theories do not have the best application into the Asian

countries because the European-derived realist theories, in particular, have difficulty explaining the international relations of Asian countries." (Kang, 2003, p.1). When looking at these theories, one must bear in mind that they were initially designed to resolve the wars and conflicts that would materialize in Europe. This does not mean that the IR theories are, per se, not applicable because they are Euro-centric, but only that they merely cannot apply in the Asian states as functional as it does in Europe because of the differences between these diverse regions of the world. Kang defends this view by holding similar reasoning. He holds that if scholars of the past had to research the Asian side of the world, it would only be to "study subjects considered peripheral such as third-world security or the behavior of small states." However, from there, these Asian countries have altered – India and China in particular - significantly; their economies have surged immensely, and their militaries have grown powerful, all of which combined can outdo Europe with much ease. The differences among these regions should, at no cost, be compromised. It is for the same reason that the IR theory is a hollow scholarship. Consequently, it is imperative for the scholars of contemporary times to either amend or, at worst, not look at Asian international relations from an identical spectacle as issues of the European states.

Moreover, the IR theories of the past do not fit their application to the issues of Asian countries because, throughout history, the IR theories have failed in their predictions about post-Cold War Asia. As the Cold War ended in 1991, scholars in the West, through exerting the realist theory of the IR, thought that states in Asia would plunge into rivalry with one another. According to them, it was unlikely that the Asian countries would reach a peaceful consensus and thus deal with each other cordially. To support their predictions, Western scholars brought up the differences between "political systems, historical animosities, and lack of international institutions" in the region. Therefore, scholars predicted that a return of "power politics" and "arms racing" awaited the Asian states. Also, many scholars predicted that a war over the status of Taiwan and "terrorist attacks from rogue North Korea against South Korea, Japan, or even the United States." would take place. However, three decades later, we see that none of the predictions have taken a concrete form. The Western scholars, in lieu of acknowledging the shortcomings in their scholarship about Asia, evade criticisms and claim that the predictions they made will materialize in the future.

In short, as argued throughout this paper, the predominant traditional IR theories do not apply perfectly in the context of Asian relations. They might apply in European countries, but in Asia, taking into account the differences between the regions, the application of the IR theories has been wrong. This is because, initially, the theories were based on solving the conflicts and other issues in Europe. Along with that, the theories of IR also fail to apply in Asia because historically, the predictions made by the scholars using IR theories have been wrongful, of which the predictions on North and South Korea, power politics, and arms racing are a few examples. Accordingly, when observing Asian subjects, scholars should not use the current IR theories as their primary scholarship (See David C. Kang, 2003).

Amitav Acharya (2004) presents an argument for employing various theoretical tools to comprehend and assess Asia and its security issues. He has remarked that the pessimists are mistaken regarding the future of Asia being "ripe for rivalry" (Kang, 2003). He believes that Asia differs from the West and contends that theories and empirical records ought to be derived from the Asian experience (Acharya, 2004). Incorporating local knowledge and narratives is essential for developing theories related to Asian society. Asians ought to offer insights into the theory of international relations from their unique perspective. Additionally, Acharya asserts that Asian IR has posed a challenge to Western regional institutions by presenting an alternative model of regional institutions in Asia. Theoretical work on Asian IR has also questioned constructivism's 'up-down' narrative regarding the dissemination of ideas. Additionally, the study of Asian International Relations encounters the liberal viewpoint that rising powers globally can be integrated into the American-established global framework. The actions of China and India illustrate a contrasting perspective (Acharya, 2004).

A body of work from Latin America is emerging to critique and enhance Western International Relations Theory. Melisa Deciancio's work "Latin America in Global International Relations" (2021) offers valuable insights into the role of Latin American international relations studies. The author contends that Latin American International Relations has been marginalized within American and Western International Relations frameworks. Additionally, Latin America is regarded as a theory adopter rather than a theory exporter. Deciancio asserts that Latin America

possesses a broader foundation for the study of international relations than other regions outside of Europe. The individuals in the region, including both scholars and practitioners, can be regarded as pioneers in the theory and practice of regionalism. Latin American contributions to International Relations theory are often overlooked. Scholars from Latin America use regionalism to participate in theoretical discussions, contest dominant international relations theories, and formulate alternative frameworks (Acharya, Deciancio & Tussie, 2021).

Non-Western and global IR scholars have contributed to challenging the prevailing mainstream theories in the field. Criticism regarding the limitations of Western International Relations theory is emerging from non-Western regions globally, highlighting discrepancies between the predictions and assumptions of realism, liberalism, and constructivism and the realities of these regions. Despite presenting new and alternative concepts and theories, non-Western International Relations has not yet made significant contributions. This does not imply a lack of scholarly activity; numerous scholars from Asian International Relations and other non-Western regions have developed theories. For example, Yaqing Qin's 'relational theory of world politics' and Andrew Phillips's emphasis on the Indian Ocean are noteworthy contributions.

Yaqing Qin stands as a foundational figure in the Chinese School of International Relations, recognized for his pioneering contributions to the study of international relations within China (Qin, 2007; 2016). Qin's relational theory posits the fundamental importance of social context and actions (Qin, 2016; Acharya, 2017). He posits that "international relations scholars should look beyond rationality and embrace 'relationality' in explaining foreign policy and international behavior and outcomes in a more universal context" (Acharya, 2017, p. 823). Furthermore, he argues that the predominance of rationality in mainstream international relations theories has led to neglect or oversight of the relational aspect. The actors in international relations indeed exhibit relational behaviors. Moreover, he claims that rationality and relationality are not opposing forces but rather serve to enhance one another. State and non-state actors likewise ground their actions in relationships, and it is these relationships that drive the dynamics of the world. Therefore, for theories of international relations to expand their scope and achieve universality moving forward, it is essential to transcend mere rationality and adopt a relational perspective to clarify international behavior, foreign policy, and global outcomes. Qin's relational theory in global politics has originated within the Chinese framework, yet its implications extend far beyond both national and regional boundaries. He asserts that his theory is applicable in the Western context as well. Qin's endeavor seeks not to eliminate the rational dimension but to incorporate his theoretical framework within international relations, thereby enhancing it (Qin, 2016; Acharya, 2017).

A further breakthrough from non-Western international relations that interrogates and contests the overarching metanarratives of the West, presenting a novel analytical framework with broader significance (Buzan, 2007). Andrew Phillips critically examines Western International Relations theories and presents an alternative perspective on the universalization of Westphalian sovereignty, emphasizing the significance of the Indian Ocean (Buzan, 2007; Acharya, 2016). He challenges the idea that Western institutions and norms were disseminated in other parts of the world solely due to the West's superior military capabilities. He characterizes this as a simple exaggeration, contending instead that the Western Powers were compelled to engage in negotiations and adapt to local realities in order to solidify their role and empire. The dynamics of Western imperialism were significantly shaped by the strategic alliances formed by Europeans with indigenous partners, often driven by mutual convenience.

Furthermore, Western powers were compelled to engage in negotiations with local populations to perpetuate their imperial expansion, a process that Phillips referred to as "customization" in terms of negotiation and alliance formation. He asserts that the empire's reliance on indigenous alliances endured throughout the colonial period. Consequently, his analysis thoughtfully reexamines traditional narratives concerning the universalization of the sovereign state system while also presenting the innovative idea of 'customization,' which possesses an analytical value that extends beyond that particular region (Acharya, 2016, p. 4).

In her prolific paper "Heart and Soul for World Politics: Advaita Monism and Daoist Trialectics in IR," L.H.M. Ling discusses the concept of 'epistemic compassion' (Ling, 2018). She contends that five centuries of colonialism and imperialism have eradicated knowledge not only in the 'global south' but also in the 'global north' (p. 2). Ling

asserts that three epistemic limitations hinder International Relations. Firstly, it neglects to consider the extent to which individuals beyond the Westphalian framework grasp the complexities of power and politics. Furthermore, it is unable to draw upon the wisdom of ancient perspectives, including the foundational ideas and principles that have historically propelled those societies forward. Ultimately, it remains unaware of its nature, particularly the complicity of the disciplines with hegemony and the arrogance that accompanies it (Ling, 2017).

As a result, Ling advocates for the community to liberate International Relations through analytical, political, ethical, and spiritual means by embracing epistemic compassion to overcome the Westphalian impasse (Ling, 2018, p. 20). Epistemic compassion encourages us to embrace an open mind and heart when engaging with the diverse perspectives of others. Therefore, this paper, employing Ling's concept, contends that the field of international relations theory and its scholarly community must embrace a form of epistemic compassion when engaging with non-Western perspectives and Global IR. Rather than dismissing the burgeoning intellectual contributions, ideas, and frameworks from non-western areas, immerse yourself in them and integrate their insights. Everyone ought to engage in their manner and according to their own conditions.

4. Afghanistan and IR Theories

In this part of the paper, the flaws of Western International Relations (IR) theories like realism, liberalism, and constructivism are carefully examined by looking at how they apply to Afghanistan. These theories, which are firmly rooted in Western historical settings, frequently overlook Afghanistan's unique sociopolitical realities, which are shaped by tribal frameworks, cultural practices, and informal government institutions (Acharya, 2004; Kang, 2003; Barfield, 2012; Ling, 2018). This part uses studies of non-Western and global international relations to point out the problems with current theories and make the case for a broader and more culturally aware way of understanding world politics.

Realists assert that the state constitutes the primary actor within the structure of foreign and international relations (Morgenthau, 1973; Mearsheimer, 2003; Waltz, 1993; 2018; Heywood, 2014, pp. 53-83; Baylis, Smith, & Owens, Eds., 2020). This concept, originating from the Westphalian model, is incompatible with Afghanistan's decentralized governance structure. In Afghanistan, sub-state entities such as tribal councils, regional leaders, and informal networks wield significant power (Malaquias, 2001; Odoom and Andrews, 2017). As Odoom and Andrews (2017) argue that the effects of the Westphalian state system in Afghanistan mirror those observed in Africa. This model is said to have weakened government and exacerbated divisions among local communities in both places. Traditional methods for resolving disputes in Afghanistan, such as the Loya Jirga, overseen by tribal leaders and influential figures, remain significant (Barfield, 2012). Consequently, realism's emphasis on state autonomy neglects these factors, rendering it an insufficient framework for analyzing Afghan politics.

Furthermore, realism's emphasis on material power, such as military strength and economic resources, overlooks the significant influence of non-material factors in shaping Afghanistan's political climate (Qin, 2016; Acharya, 2017). The resistance of Afghan society to foreign invasions is rooted in its religious beliefs, social norms, and cultural traditions (Barfield, 2010). Yaqing Qin's relational theory emphasizes the significance of connections and social contexts in influencing political outcomes. The interactions among tribal elders, religious leaders, and local communities significantly influence political decisions in Afghanistan. This illustrates the necessity of transcending state-centric and materialist perspectives to comprehend the complexities of Afghan politics (Qin, 2007).

Liberalism is a prominent theory in international relations; however, it encounters similar challenges in elucidating the structural dynamics in Afghanistan (Heywood, 2014, pp. 53-83; Baylis, Smith, & Owens, Eds., 2020). Fukuyama (1989) asserts that liberalism endorses democracy, human rights, and free markets as fundamental principles that should gain universal consensus. Despite this, their use in Afghanistan has frequently resulted in negative consequences. Fukuyama's concept of democracy, emphasizing fair elections and individual rights, is incompatible with Afghanistan's collectivist society and political traditions that prioritize consensus-building (Boele van Hensbroek, 1999). Tribal and ethnic conflicts significantly influence Afghanistan's elections, which frequently suffer from fraud, violence, and questions of legitimacy (Barfield, 2012; Rubin, 2002). Nkiwane (2001)

argues that in Africa, liberal democracy could turn into illiberalism when imposed on societies lacking the historical or cultural foundations necessary to sustain it. In Afghanistan, elections are frequently perceived as instruments of foreign domination rather than genuine reflections of the populace's desires (Saikal, 2012).

Liberalism presents a broader perspective on governance; however, Afghanistan's traditional Loya Jirga exemplifies a governmental structure that is more sensitive to local cultural contexts. Members of this historical institution convene from various tribes and communities to discuss significant issues and reach consensus (Barfield, 2012). The Loya Jirga embodies Afghanistan's collectivist values and facilitates decision-making through consensus. This contrasts significantly with the confrontational characteristics of free democracy in Western societies. Boele van Hensbroek (1999) presents a similar argument within the African context, asserting that the Ujamaa community principles provide an alternative to Western democracy. The Loya Jirga, similar to Ujamaa, rejects the notion that democracy must adhere to Western standards. Incorporating indigenous customs into the study of international relations would enhance the discipline and promote greater acceptance (Odoom and Andrews, 2017).

Constructivism emphasizes the significance of rules, ideas, and personalities in international relations, providing some insights into Afghanistan; however, its applicability is limited in certain contexts. (Wendt, 1999; Heywood, 2014, pp. 53-83; Baylis, Smith, & Owens, Eds, 2020; Acharya, 2004; Ling, 2018). Amitav Acharya (2004) argues that constructivism frequently adopts a "top-down" perspective, emphasizing the dissemination of Western ideals globally while neglecting local narratives. Traditional Afghan values, including melmastia (hospitality) and Pashtunwali (the tribal code of behavior), play a significant role in daily life and political dynamics in Afghanistan (Spain, 1962; Barfield, 2012; Jones, 2010; Malik, 2016; Devasher, 2022). Constructivist interpretations frequently overlook local values, prioritizing Western-imposed standards such as democracy and human rights.

L.H.M. Ling's concept of "epistemic compassion" emphasizes the significance of engaging with non-Western knowledge systems (Ling, 2018). In Afghanistan, this entails acknowledging and integrating local concepts rather than dismissing them as trivial or inferior. The West encounters challenges when attempting to enforce liberal values, such as equal rights for women and marginalized groups, in Afghanistan (Manchanda, 2020; Rubin, 2002). Constructivism posits that individuals adopt standards via persuasion and socialization; however, it overlooks the significant religious and cultural values that influence Afghan society. Ling's advocacy for "epistemic compassion" is particularly pertinent as it encourages scholars to approach differences with openness and understanding (Ling, 2018).

Nivi Manchanda (2020), critiques the prevalent Orientalist perspective found in Western theories of international relations (Said, 1978). These theories frequently characterize non-Western nations, such as Afghanistan, as underdeveloped or disordered (Manchanda, 2020). She argues that these concepts stem from a Eurocentric perspective that characterizes Afghanistan as a "failed state," neglecting its extensive political history and indigenous governance structures. This narrative endorses foreign intervention as a means to foster civilization, perpetuating a hierarchical relationship between the West and other regions, thereby positioning the West as the singular source of modernity and advancement. These models fail to consider Afghanistan's political motivations and its right to self-determination (Manchanda, 2020).

In addition, Manchanda (2020) examines the influence of colonial concepts on Western theories of international relations. These theories frequently neglect to consider the impact of empire or the historical perception of the "Global South" as a region characterized by conflict and instability (Acharya, 2004; Smith, 2009). Western concepts of governance, such as liberal democracy and centralized statehood, are being applied in Afghanistan due to colonial assumptions that generalize Western experiences while neglecting non-Western alternatives (Manchanda, 2020). This epistemic dominance marginalizes systems such as the Loya Jirga and disregards culturally acceptable alternatives. These omissions perpetuate a limited and prevailing perspective on world politics, rendering Western theories of international relations ineffective in addressing the intricate challenges encountered by postcolonial states such as Afghanistan (Rubin, 2002; Jones, 2010).

Afghanistan's history demonstrates that Western models of international relations are inadequate for predicting political changes in the region. Individuals who believed that centralized governance, democratic institutions, and intervention would ensure stability overlooked the complexities of Afghanistan's tribal politics, local power dynamics, and the resistance to external influence (Barfield, 2012; Kang, 2003). David Kang (2003) identifies comparable shortcomings in Asian contexts, where Western theories of international relations fail to consider local conditions. Andrew Phillips's concept of "customization" challenges Western methodologies by illustrating the collaboration between colonial officials and local groups in altering governance practices (Phillips, 2016). The experiences of Afghanistan challenge the emphasis on the state in realism, the individual in liberalism, and the inadequacy of constructivism in addressing local epistemologies. Incorporating Afghanistan's political customs and cultural practices into international relations theory can enhance the field's accessibility and applicability globally.

5. Locating Loya Jirga and International Relations

Afghanistan's experiences, especially its indigenous governance and conflict resolution methods, highlight the shortcomings of Western international relations theories. These theories exhibit fundamental limitations by neglecting or undervaluing non-Western perspectives, practices, and histories. This underscores the necessity for a more comprehensive, contextualized, decolonized, and pluralistic approach to the study of world politics and international relations (Acharya & Buzan, 2010; Tickner, 2003; Bilgin, 2008). This involves acknowledging and integrating Afghanistan's traditional governance methods, such as the Loya Jirga, which exemplifies decision-making through consensus and is grounded in collectivist traditions. This section of the paper focuses on the concept of 'Loya Jirga' and its potential contributions to IRT for enhancement purposes.

The history of civilization and culture in Afghanistan is rich. It has a rich culture, stories, and experiences that can contribute to and reshape the field of international relations and offer profound lessons (Hopkirk, 1992; Barfield, 2010; Dalrymple, 2013; Elliot, 1999; Crews, 2015; Michener, 1963; Hiebert & Cambon, 2008; Simpson, 2011; Ghobar, 2001; Katin, 1912-1923; Kakar, 1995; Habibi, 2003; Habibi, (N/A). The idea of the "Loya Jirga" sticks out among these contributions as a crucial case study. The ideas of "Jirga" and "Loya Jirga" have the potential to improve international relations significantly. Jirga refers to a council, and Loya Jirga is a grand council that prioritizes consensus-building, community involvement, and group decision-making (Wardak, 2003; Barfield, 2010; Noelle, 1997). The Afghan people's problems have historically been resolved via the Jirga. Despite its lack of legal authority, it is more effective than Western judicial systems at settling the contradictory and conflicting problems in Afghan society. For example, the people of Afghanistan still choose to use Jirga to resolve their disputes and problems. Put differently, they give Jirga precedence over modern courts. Because the Jirga prioritizes social harmony and reconciliation over conflict and favors consensus, they contend that Western judicial systems are inflexible, rigid, and hostile (UNDP, 2006; Mason, 2011; Torabi, 2011).

Traditionally, Loya jirgas have served as a platform for deliberating and achieving consensus on significant political matters. Proper conceptualization and incorporation of Jirga and Loya Jirga within the discipline of International Relations can enhance their effectiveness. Not all states globally adhere to democratic principles; consequently, many make decisions through consensus and agreement (Wardak, 2003; Torabi, 2011; UNDP, 2006; Barfield, 2010; Mason, 2011; Maley, 2005; Rasanayagam, 2003; Roy, 1985; Sripati, 2020; Noelle, 1997). This paper contends that case studies, experiences, and extensive research from Afghanistan can contribute significantly to the field of International Relations. Theorization in international relations lacks substantial insight into Afghanistan, indicating that an understanding of its cultural, political, and economic contexts should contribute to the development of international relations theory.

Moreover, the idea of Loya Jirga, or 'Grand Council,' has the potential to enhance various theories and branches of international relations. To start, a significant contribution of Loya Jirga to International Relations Theory is its ability to transcend what John Agnew refers to as the 'Territorial Trap." This concept highlights how mainstream IR theories tend to be overly focused on the state, frequently neglecting the influence of non-state actors and the importance of local customs and institutions (Agnew, 1994). The Loya Jirga incorporates non-state actors into governance and decision-making, facilitating the emergence of hybrid governance. It expands discussions

surrounding governance, state-building, and legitimacy by integrating traditional practices with formal political institutions. Furthermore, Loya Jirga demonstrates how local and ethnic groups can shed light on the ways regional actors impact national politics, contributing to theories regarding ethnic identity and inter-group relations in international relations. It also informs IRT about the influence of local norms, cultures, and practices on global issues like human rights, governance, and conflict resolution (Wardak, 2003).

Loya Jirga exemplifies the integration and promotion of local cultural perspectives in governance and conflict resolution, offering an opposing viewpoint to state-centric and Western-centric views on political structures. This Afghan approach to conflict resolution emphasizes the importance of community consensus in addressing and resolving political challenges and problems. At the same time, it offers perspectives on non-western approaches to mediation and conflict resolution (Wardak, 2003; Torabi, 2011; UNDP, 2006). Loya Jirga embodies a model of participatory governance. Additionally, the Loya Jirga can play a significant role in diplomacy and negotiation by involving and engaging local participants in these processes. Loya Jirga serves as a means of cultural diplomacy, shaping political discourse in significant ways. This can enhance theories concerning diplomacy and soft power, illustrating how cultural practices and identity influence international relations.

Furthermore, it challenges the prevailing concepts of sovereignty and the sources from which legitimacy is obtained. It demonstrates how local customs, institutions, and mechanisms provide authority and governance, as well as how legitimacy is derived in various contexts. In conclusion, Loya Jirga demonstrates the impact of local governance structures on national and international politics (Mason, 2011; Baig, NA).

The Loya Jirga has the potential to enhance significantly international relations theories by making sure that Afghan perspectives are acknowledged while being incorporated into broader geopolitical and global political discussions. The necessity of non-Western IR is apparent. Every location and role in the world holds significance, providing unique contributions that can enhance and deepen the field of International relations. As a result, it is essential to shift away from the prevailing influence of Western and American international relations. The aim of non-western and Global IR is to encourage the IR community to look beyond the dominance of American and Western perspectives in the discipline and to embrace greater diversity by acknowledging the places, roles, and contributions of "non-Western" individuals and societies. The endeavors of non-western scholarships create room for insights, narratives, experiences, values, and norms within the framework of international relations theory.

Additionally, non-Western international relations seek not to replace the current theories and approaches but aim to integrate the theories, experiences, and narratives of non-Western societies to enhance the inclusivity and universality of the discipline. The aim of non-Western perspectives is not to supplant the parochialism of Western International Relations with their own but rather to cultivate a relationship that is overlapping and intertwined between Western and non-Western approaches to International Relations. This paper contends that non-Western international relations provide a platform for those who have been marginalized.

6. Way Forward for the Afghan knowledge (s)

Non-Western international relations can both develop and thrive effectively. However, it is contingent upon specific criteria and factors (Acharya & Buzan, 2010). The non-Western community must evaluate several factors to influence the trajectory of IRT. The establishment of additional publication venues constitutes the initial component in the expansion of the non-Western International Relations project. The project on non-Western International Relations will advance as the publication of books and journals focused on Global and Asian International Relations increases (Acharya, 2014). Significant effort has been expended in this context. Various journals and book series are working to enhance non-Western international relations.

The elimination of methodological and linguistic barriers is a crucial factor in the progress of non-Western International Relations. Developing non-Western International Relations requires the identification or establishment of numerous distinct schools of thought beyond the Western paradigm. Consequently, the establishment of multiple national schools is essential to further the trajectory of non-Western International Relations (Acharya, 2011). It is essential to establish an Indian School of International Relations or a Japanese

School of International Relations, given that the Chinese School of International Relations is already contributing to the field (Behera, 2010; Suzuki, 2008).

Moreover, non-Western international relations experts should refrain from applying mainstream international relations theories to non-Western cases or limiting themselves to the traditional deductive methodology. Researchers should ground their work in local norms, narratives, and experiences (Qin, 2007). Additional cross-national, comparative research with a regional focus is essential for advancing the field of non-Western International Relations. According to Acharya (2014), "Engaging in more comparative, cross-regional work will provide a larger canvass for testing insights from different sub-regions and opportunities for theory development."

Scholarships and academic pursuits ought to remain free from political influence. This suggests that scholars ought to distance themselves from legislators and policymakers. Non-Western International Relations should pursue independent knowledge advancement instead of aligning with politicians and policymakers (Acharya & Buzan, 2010). Acharya (2014) asserts that the first generation of non-Western scholars has played a significant role in enhancing awareness. Second-generation scholars ought to incorporate non-Western or Global South concepts and theories into International Relations to advance the field. Non-western international relations studies ought to possess wide applicability. Efforts emerging in regional or national contexts should possess broader relevance. They should be relevant to other regions and globally, transcending national and regional boundaries. Concepts such as "international society" in Western Europe, "balance of power" in Europe, and "hegemonic stability" in the United States possess wider applicability. These concepts are employed and utilized by scholars globally. Consequently, the challenge facing non-Western International Relations is the formulation of ideas and theories that possess wider applicability.

Thus, in this context, advancing Afghan narratives, discourses, and knowledge in international relations requires more than mere criticism of American and Western hegemony, domination, and biases. Practical and institutional measures must be implemented by Afghan and global international relations scholars and institutions to effect change in the discipline. Acharya argues that Tang advocates for the inclusion of more scholars from the Global South on the editorial boards of ISA journals, a heightened focus on regional studies, encouragement of contributions from non-English speakers, and the acceptance of submissions in languages other than English (Acharya, 2016, p. 9). Editorial boards of reputable journals should incorporate Afghan members. Afghans ought to be allowed to write in their native languages. Furthermore, it is essential to organize specialized workshops aimed at training Afghan scholars alongside critical scholars and relevant platforms. The IR community and critical IR experts should focus on human relations and give greater consideration to local contexts.

Additionally, Afghan intellectuals should enhance their expertise to strengthen and enrich international relations. Afghan scholars should engage in discussions regarding contemporary foreign relations and international affairs. It is essential for them to consistently articulate and disseminate their perspectives on global and international matters and their consequences for Afghanistan. Furthermore, it is essential to establish universities and departments at the national level aimed at promoting Afghan indigenous knowledge and narratives. In India, South Asian University has advanced the objective of promoting knowledge from the global south to enhance international relations theory. Finally, to establish a position within the theory of international relations, Afghan researchers must familiarize themselves with Western genres, writing styles, and textual traditions (Canagarajah, 2002). Afghan scholars should engage in international conferences and conventions to advance Afghan knowledge, customs, narratives, and discourse.

On the theoretical level, Afghan scholars should critically engage with Western meta-narratives, including the US's "hegemonic theory" and Britain's "the expansion of international society," while exploring and articulating diverse interpretations and alternative perspectives (Acharya, 2016, p. 10). Afghan scholars should develop concepts and ideas that hold relevance beyond Afghanistan. The concept of "Loya Jirga," as presented in this work, should be considered generic and applicable beyond the context of Afghanistan. Furthermore, Afghan scholars should strive to create national schools similar to the Chinese model to promote a distinct Afghan perspective, as this could substantially impact the evolution of global International Relations. Barry Buzan asserts that "challenging Western dominance, generating enthusiasm and support for alternatives (as well as popularizing IR

in general as a subject of study), developing alternative and new concepts and approaches to solve problems, and supporting new publications" (Acharya, 2016).

To put it briefly, Afghan scholars should develop concepts and theories rooted in Afghanistan's history and practices to effectively contribute local knowledge to the enhancement of international relations. The development of Afghan conceptions of international relations aims to pluralize existing Western theories rather than replace them (Sil & Katzenstein, 2010). Acharya asserts that "Global IR should not displace but subsume existing IR theories and approaches" (Acharya, 2016, p. 11).

7. Conclusion

Throughout history, state-centric geopolitics has approached, implicated, and remembered Afghanistan. Afghan society, along with its narratives and experiences, has been overlooked and marginalized (Chaturvedi, 2017). Simultaneously, several extensively published studies on Afghanistan encompass all elements of traditional state-centric international relations, identifying the country's primary issues from a Western viewpoint (Manchanda, 2020). Much of the literature has concentrated on the Western perspective of Afghanistan, including Western fears regarding the country, rather than examining how Afghanistan perceives the West or the fears Afghans may have towards it (Embree, 2020). This state-centric and colonial trend persists in 21st-century global politics, with connectivity as the defining theme. Afghanistan is regarded as essential to this connectivity, and a significant body of literature has emerged regarding its geoeconomic benefits for major powers and the surrounding region. All work has been conducted from a Western perspective, integrating aspects of state-centric Western ideology (Gregory, 2004). The available information regarding the Afghan perspective on connectivity is limited. Consequently, numerous imposed theories, ideologies, and systems in Afghanistan have experienced significant failures. No efforts were made to comprehend the significance and aspirations of Afghan society or the potential contributions of Afghanistan to the global community. Afghanistan exemplifies the limitations of traditional international relations theories.

Afghanistan's experiences, particularly its use of the Loyal Jirga, illustrate the limitations of Western theories of international relations and highlight the necessity for a more comprehensive and contextualized approach to the study of world politics. The lessons from the Loya Jirga regarding governance, diplomacy, legitimacy, and conflict resolution challenge prevailing assumptions and provide alternative frameworks for comprehending global politics. Realist concepts prioritize the state and material objects. Non-material factors such as social conventions, cultural practices, and religious views, along with the significant roles of individuals outside the state, are often overlooked. The unique history and culture of non-Western nations are often neglected by the universalist viewpoint of liberalism. While constructivism highlights identities and standards, its Western viewpoint often disrupts and overlooks indigenous knowledge systems. Nivi Manchanda (2020) argues that the colonial and Orientalism frameworks embedded in international relations theories perpetuate a Eurocentric view of global politics, resulting in the misinterpretation and distortion of non-Western civilizations, including Afghanistan.

Therefore, international relations specialists must adopt a pluralistic and decolonized perspective in order to address these core issues. To make their field genuinely global, international relations scholars must embrace intellectual plurality and actively incorporate non-Western perspectives. This entails acknowledging and embracing Afghanistan's ancient systems of governance, such as the Loya Jirga, which demonstrates how choices are reached by consensus and have their roots in collectivist customs. Moreover, relational theories that emphasize the importance of social contexts, such as the relational theory of Yaqing Qin (2007; 2016), offer crucial analytical frameworks for comprehending the functioning of politics in non-Western nations. International relations can develop into a more comprehensive field that appropriately depicts how complex a world that is getting more multipolar and culturally diverse truly is by utilizing these new concepts.

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Informed Consent Statement/Ethics Approval: Not applicable.

References

Acharya, A. (2004). How ideas spread: Whose norms matter? Norm localization and institutional change in Asian regionalism. *International Organization, 58(2),* 239–275. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818304582024

Acharya, A. (2004). Will Asia's past be its future? *International Security, 28(3),* 149–164. https://doi.org/10.1162/0162288043467492

Acharya, A. (2011). Dialogue and discovery: In search of International Relations theories beyond the West. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies, 39(3),* 619–637. https://doi.org/10.1177/0305829811401452

Acharya, A. (2014). Global international relations (IR) and regional worlds: A new agenda for international studies. *International Studies Quarterly, 58(4),* 647–659. https://doi.org/10.1111/isqu.12171

Acharya, A. (2016). Advancing global IR: Challenges, contentions, and contributions. *International Studies Review, 18(1),* 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1093/isr/viw005

Acharya, A. (2017). *The end of American world order.* Polity Press.

Acharya, A. (2017). Theorising the international relations of Asia: Necessity or indulgence? Some reflections. *The Pacific Review, 30(6),* 816–828. https://doi.org/10.1080/09512748.2017.1301416

Acharya, A., & Buzan, B. (2010). *Non-Western International Relations Theory: Perspectives on and beyond Asia.* Routledge.

Acharya, A., & Buzan, B. (Eds.). (2007). Why is there no non-western international relations theory? Reflections on and from Asia. *International Relations of the Asia Pacific, 7,* 285–286.

Acharya, A., Deciancio, M., & Tussie, D. (Eds.). (2021). *Latin America in global international relations.* Routledge.

Acharya, A. (2007). Theoretical perspectives on international relations in Asia. In *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific: A Handbook.* Oxford University Press.

Agathangelou, A. M., & Ling, L. H. M. (2004). The house of IR: From family power politics to the poisies of worldism. *International Studies Review, 6(4),* 21–49. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1521-9488.2004.00448.x

Agnew, J. (1994). The territorial trap: The geographical assumptions of international relations theory. *Review of International Political Economy, 1(1),* 53–80. https://doi.org/10.1080/09692299408434268

Anyidoho, K. (1985). *Earthchild.* Woeli Publishing Services.

Barfield, T. (2012). *Afghanistan: A cultural and political history.* Princeton University Press.

Behera, N. C. (2010). Reimagining IR in India: Some preliminary explorations. *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific, 10(3),* 431–461. https://doi.org/10.1093/irap/lcq012

Boele van Hensbroek, P. (1999). *African political philosophy, 1860–1995.* Routledge.

Buzan, B. (2009). Non-Western international relations theory. In A. Acharya (Ed.), *Non-Western International Relations Theory* (pp. 11–35). Taylor & Francis.

Buzan, B. (2016). The English School: History and evolution of international society. *Global International Relations Journal, 5(2),* 189–205.

Baig, S. (n.d.). *Loya Jirga and the democratization process in Afghanistan.* [Unpublished academic work].

Barfield, T. (2010). *Afghanistan: A cultural and political history.* Princeton University Press.

Baylis, J., Smith, S., & Owens, P. (Eds.). (2020). *The globalization of world politics: An introduction to international relations.* Oxford University Press.

Callahan, W. A. (2010). *China: The pessoptimist nation.* Oxford University Press.

Chaturvedi, S. (2017). Remapping Tibet: Colonial cartographies, neoliberal geopolitics and return to Himalayan human-cultural geographies. In S. Wahid (Ed.), *Tibet's relations with the Himalaya.* Academic Foundation.

Canagarajah, A. (2002). *A geopolitics of academic writing.* University of Pittsburgh Press.

Crews, R. D. (2015). *Afghan modern: The history of a global nation.* Harvard University Press.

Dalrymple, W. (2013). *Return of a king: The battle for Afghanistan.* Knopf.

Devasher, T. (2022). *The Pashtuns: A Contested History.* HarperCollins Publishers.

Elliot, J. (1999). *An unexpected light: Travels in Afghanistan.* St. Martin's Press.

Embree, A. (2020). *Frontiers into borders: Defining South Asian states, 1757–1857.*

Fukuyama, F. (1989). The end of history? *The National Interest, 16,* 3–18.

Ghobar, G. M. (2001). *Afghanistan in the course of history.* Government Printing House.

Gregory, D. (2004). *The colonial present: Afghanistan, Palestine, Iraq.* Wiley-Blackwell.

Heywood, A. (2014). *Global politics* (Vol. 19). Bloomsbury Publishing.

Hoffman, S. (1977). An American social science: International relations. *Daedalus, 106(3),* 41–60.

Hiebert, F., & Cambon, P. (Eds.). (2008). *Afghanistan: Hidden treasures from the National Museum, Kabul.* National Geographic Society.

Hopkirk, P. (1992). *The Great Game: On secret service in high Asia.* Oxford University Press.

Habibi, A. H. (2003). *Afghanistan: An abridged history.* Fenestra Books.

Habibi, A. H. (n.d.). *The history of Afghanistan in the 19th century* (Vols. 1–2). [Publisher unknown].

Jones, S. G. (2010). *In the graveyard of empires: America's war in Afghanistan.* W.W. Norton & Company.

Jordan, R., Maliniak, D., Oakes, A., Peterson, S., & Tierney, M. J. (2009). *One discipline or many? Survey of international relations faculty in ten countries.* Teaching, Research and International Policy (TRIP) Project, Institute for the Theory and Practice of International Relations, College of William and Mary.

Kakar, M. H. (1995). *Afghanistan: A political history.* Afghan Book Center.

Katib, F. M. (1912–1923). *Siraj al-Tawarikh [The Lamp of Chronicles]* (Vols. 1–3). Government Press.

Kang, D. C. (2003). Getting Asia wrong: The need for new analytical frameworks. *International Security, 27(4),* 57–85. https://doi.org/10.1162/016228803321951091

Ling, L. H. M. (2018). *Heart and soul for world politics: Advaita monism and Daoist trialectics in IR.* Routledge.

Ling, L. H. M., & Nakamura, M. (2017, December 7–8). *Narrative & power in East Asia: Re-imagining the Senkaku/Diaoyutai Islands dispute through popular culture* [Conference paper]. Narrative Power in East Asia Workshop, Swedish Defence University, Stockholm.

Malaquias, A. (2001). Reformulating IR theory: African insights. *Third World Quarterly, 22(2),* 209–228. https://doi.org/10.1080/01436590120037001

Manchanda, N. (2020). *Imagining Afghanistan: The history and politics of imperial knowledge.* Cambridge University Press.

Malik, I. H. (2016). *Pashtun Identity and Geopolitics in Southwest Asia*. Anthem Press.

Mearsheimer, J. J. (2003). *The tragedy of great power politics* (Updated ed.). W.W. Norton & Company.

Morgenthau, H. J. (1973). *Politics among nations.*

Mignolo, W. D. (2009). Epistemic disobedience, independent thought and decolonial freedom. *Theory, Culture & Society, 26(7–8),* 159–181. https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276409349275

Maley, W. (Ed.). (2005). *Rebuilding Afghanistan: Civil-military experiences in comparative perspective.* Routledge.

Mason, W. (2011). *The rule of law in Afghanistan: Missing in action.* Cambridge University Press.

Michener, J. A. (1963). *Caravans: A novel of Afghanistan.* Random House.

Nkiwane, T. C. (2001). Africa and international relations: Regional lessons for a global discourse. *International Political Science Review, 22(3),* 279–290. https://doi.org/10.1177/0192512101223005

Noelle, C. (1997). *State and tribe in nineteenth-century Afghanistan: The reign of Amir Dost Muhammad Khan (1826–1863).* Routledge.

Odoom, I., & Andrews, N. (2017). What/who is still missing in international relations scholarship? Situating Africa as an agent of IR theorizing. *Third World Quarterly, 38(1),* 42–60. https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2016.1245104

Phillips, A. (2016). *War, religion and empire: The transformation of international orders.* Cambridge University Press.

Qin, Y. (2007). Why is there no Chinese international relations theory? *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific, 7(3),* 313–340. https://doi.org/10.1093/irap/lcm011

Qin, Y. (2016). A relational theory of world politics. *International Studies Review, 18(1),* 33–47. https://doi.org/10.1093/isr/viw002

Rubin, B. R. (2002). *The fragmentation of Afghanistan: State formation and collapse in the international system.* Yale University Press.

Rasanayagam, A. (2003). *Afghanistan: A modern history.* I.B. Tauris.

Roy, O. (1985). *Traditional authority, Islam, and rebellion: A study of the Afghan resistance.* Cambridge University Press.

Saikal, A. (2012). *Modern Afghanistan: A history of struggle and survival.* I.B. Tauris.

Samuel, H. (1993). The clash of civilizations. *Foreign Affairs, 72(3),* 22–49.

Saul, J. S. (1997). For fear of being condemned as old fashioned: Liberal democracy vs. popular democracy in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Review of African Political Economy, 73,* 339–353. https://doi.org/10.1080/03056249708704298

Said, E. W. (1978). *Orientalism*. Pantheon Books.

Sil, R., & Katzenstein, P. (2010). *Beyond paradigms: Analytic eclecticism in the study of world politics.* Palgrave Macmillan.

Smith, S. (2009). *The globalization of world politics: An introduction to international relations.* Oxford University Press.

Smith, S. (2002). The United States and the discipline of international relations: Hegemonic country, hegemonic discipline. *International Studies Review, 4(2),* 67–85. https://doi.org/10.1111/1521-9488.00253

Smith, K. (2009). Has Africa got anything to say? African contributions to the theoretical development of international relations. *The Round Table, 98(402),* 269–284. https://doi.org/10.1080/00358530902895378

Suzuki, S. (2008). The rise of the Chinese "Other" in Japan's construction of identity: Is China a focal point of Japanese nationalism? *The Pacific Review, 21(1),* 23–44. https://doi.org/10.1080/09512740701876171

Sripati, V. (2020). *Constitution making under UN auspices: Fostering dependency in sovereign states.* Oxford University Press.

Simpson, S. J. (2011). *Afghanistan: Crossroads of the ancient world.* British Museum Press.

Spain, J. W. (1962). *The Way of the Pathans*. Robert Hale Ltd.

Tickner, A. B. (2003). Seeing IR differently: Notes from the Third World. *Millennium, 32(2),* 295–324. https://doi.org/10.1177/03058298030320020801

Tickner, A. B., & Wæver, O. (Eds.). (2009). *International relations scholarship around the world.* Routledge.

Torabi, Y. (2011). The Loya Jirga: An effective tool for peacebuilding in Afghanistan? *Peacebuilding Journal.*

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). (2006). *Traditional mechanisms of dispute resolution in Afghanistan.* UNDP Report.

Yako, L. (2021, April 9). Decolonizing knowledge production: A practical guide. *Counterpunch.* https://www.counterpunch.org

Yew, L. (2003). *The disjunctive empire of international relations.* Ashgate.

Wardak, A. (2003). *The Afghan Loya Jirga: Shaping a national consensus.* United States Institute of Peace. Retrieved from https://www.usip.org

Waltz, K. N. (1993). The emerging structure of international politics. *International Security, 18(2),* 44–79. https://doi.org/10.2307/2539097

Wendt, A. (1999). *Social theory of international politics* (Vol. 67). Cambridge University Press.