

Two Theoretical Perspectives on the Evolution of a Global Order

Miroslav Jurásek¹

SGIR 7th PAN – EUROPEAN CONFERENCE ON IR

STOCKHOLM, SWEDEN, 2010

Abstract:

In 1974 Immanuel Wallerstein articulated for the first time his world – system theory. 15 years later Francis Fukuyama viewed the global order from a totally different perspective. Nowadays the former lives in a world after the liberalism, the latter claims that the global order is heading towards its stop – point which is the liberalism. But must be these two concepts inevitably divergent? This paper discusses the global order from the perspective of both scientists trying to answer the question if there can't be any intersection of their apparently different approaches.

Key words: Immanuel Wallerstein, Francis Fukuyama, global order, chaos, cyclicity, theoretical approaches

INTRODUCTION

The study of how order arises is one of the most interesting and important developments of our time (Fukuyama, 1999 : 51). Many authors came with their theories what will expect us in a not remote future².

After the end of the Cold War the world changed. It has been born a new global civil society which implied a new global political order, the world – wide growth of neo – liberal economies of market and capital economies. The importance of NGOs has grown rapidly (Keane, 2003 : 5).

The theorists of globalization started to speak about a global village. All parts of the world has been closer one another, started to live as one big organism, the polarisation of the world has

¹ The author of this paper is a Phd student in the Faculty of International Relationships of the University of Prague, Czech Republic, and at the same time teaches Economics and Spanish at VŠFS of Prague; miroslavjurasek@yahoo.co.uk

² For example Jessica Mathews (2004) speaks about the horizon of 50 years. She thinks that the international order will be quite different if the actual trends continue. It's quite interesting that Wallerstein operates with the same period.

finished. But, of course, there are many obstacles impeding the perfect world unification (if ever possible). One of these obstacles is language as an instrument of identity.

Mathias Risse (2005) believes that the global order must be credited with massive advances over the historically omnipresent state of misery but on the other hand he argues that the global order does harm the poor. Wallerstein himself (1976) says that the greater wealth is maldistributed as a result of technological advance. This maldistribution leads to profound inequalities in the world³. How will this fact influence the global order in the future? This must be considered as a destabilizing factor.

Robert D. Kaplan is an American journalist who in his work deals with the reemergence of cultural and historical tensions temporarily suspended during the Cold War. His article "The Coming Anarchy" published in the *Atlantic Monthly* in February 1994 about how population increase, urbanization, and resource depletion are undermining fragile governments across the developing world and represent a threat to the developed world was hotly debated and widely translated.

The futurologist Alvin Toffler published in 1980 a book which describes the transition in developed countries from Industrial Age society, which he calls the "Second Wave", to Information Age "Third Wave" society⁴.

The technological changes were a cause of the "creative destruction" which is an expression popularized by and is most associated with Schumpeter, particularly in his book *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*, first published in 1942. Schumpeter also elaborated the concept, making it central to his economic theory and business cycles caused by innovations. In this sense Schumpeter speaks about long – wave cycle related to the name of Nikolai Kondratieff.

Of course, the list of theories and approaches mentioned here, in this paper is not complete and neither it can be. One theoretical concept of the development of the global order completes, transforms and substitutes others because each researcher highlights different aspects of the global reality, comes out from different hypothesis.

Each new life situation requires a new application of different paradigmatic system. These systems used to be and very often are inconsistent; one life role follows another, sometimes this process runs very quickly, thus we must apply other imagination of the world and ourselves (Sedláček, 2007 : 217).

³ Wallerstein thinks more or less the same thing as a philosopher, satirist and political economist of the 17th century Bernard Mandeville, the author of the famous *The Fable of the Bees*. The world needs private vices to get public benefits. The politico – military machinery can frequently best serve to maximize profit by permitting starvation because "the life of the producer can be more unprofitable as consumer of surplus than profitable as producer of surplus." (Wallerstein, 1976 : 349). Producers need an insufficiency. According to F. A. Hayek (Klusoň, 2003) Mandeville was the first who developed a classical paradigm of a spontaneous development of organised social structures. It can be also mentioned that wars are welcome by producers because they bring them a profit.

⁴ Fukuyama (1999) also mentions Alvin Toffler that has marked the actual transition of the world as the "Third Wave," suggesting that it will ultimately be as consequential as the two previous waves in human history: from hunter – gatherer to agricultural societies, and from agricultural to industrial ones.

The systems that contain the internal inconsistency, partially opposed to the reality and sometimes based on the unrealistic presumptions, are applied successfully. A system can survive not only because of it has no defects or logical consistency, but because there are no others rival system (Sedláček, 2007 : 146). But when a theory no longer seems to serve an adequate social function, scholars usually begin to question its intellectual credentials (Wallerstein, 1976)

The scientific theory, the model explanation of the world, becomes an unseparable part of the reality. We must perceive the world within a certain interpretative pattern. Otherwise we are not able to understand it. All the time we must keep in mind the effects of what sociologists have named a self-fulfilling prophecy⁵. The theory can come true in a case of some popular book (for example S. Huntington: Clash of civilisation). Moreover analyses and hypothetical expectations about the future made by presidential advisors influence the world politics every day.

We use the actual paradigmatic pattern realizing its systematic deficiency till we reach to construct a new pattern. The hypothesis are nothing else than a way how we think and perceive the world. Sedláček (2007 : 218) thinks that the world itself is chaotic if there is no observer. In his words it is our capacity of reflexion in models (they are our models, not the model of exterior world) that makes possible to observe the world intellectually. Sedláček is sure that each big model, theory which want to explain how the society is organized and how it works will never become anything more than a construct, a view of point.

In accordance with the Sedláček's opinion we can cite an american sociologist Walter Lippman (Bauman, 1965 : 119):

*"In most cases it is not true that at first we observe and after we define but on the: at first we define and then we look. The chaos of the external world which is very complex and full of sensitive impressions; from here it is chosen by us what the culture has already defined and we tend to perceive the chosen in a stereotype manner, in a way how it has already been created by our culture."*⁶

Fukuyama believes (2006 : 18) that the actual disrupted social order is experiencing a change (a reparation, reconstruction). Nevertheless he is sure that our society is able to adopt itself to the technical and economical conditions of the information Era. The development of political institutions towards the modern liberal democracy is based on the clear logic consisting in the correlation between economical growth and the stable democracy. Probably there will be no alternatives of the liberal institutions in the future (Fukuyama, 2006 : 22).

In this paper I would like to show that many concepts despite their big diversity regarding methodological approaches, hypothesis and surveyed aspects of the social reality can give a surprising similarity of results and conclusions. All made researches can reach the same goal through different means. Of course, there are many specific aspects given not only by the research intention, but also by personal qualities or experiences of the researcher.

⁵ A self-fulfilling prophecy is a prediction that directly or indirectly causes itself to become true, by the very terms of the prophecy itself, due to positive feedback between belief and behaviour.

⁶ The translation from Czech into English was made by the author of this paper.

In many cases it is not possible to keep off the subjectivity. A researcher in spite of his effort to be the most objective as possible, he can't often avoid of mixing the objective data and his subjective position. Meanwhile the positivists try to work on the purely objective basis, in the social sciences, that should serve also to normal people, not only to professionals, it wouldn't be enough. It is always necessary to offer some interpretation of the facts (this trend is clearly apparent in mass media; perhaps there is no TV or radio station or newspapers with any commentator or analyst). These analysis always reflect the individual position even if they were made on the basis of the most severe scientific requirements. And that's the principal difference between the social and natural science. Mathematicists don't agree the axioms or suppositions of others; but then they must go on the way of the "ferrous" logic and reach a different final – point. In the social sciences the situation can be different: you set off from different positions and you can reach the result which are, moreover, much worse predictable because many complex variables enter into the research what makes the reflexions about the future very difficult. Maybe it could be appropriate to present here the well – known sentence: "in the social world there are no facts, only their interpretation".

The social scientists have in their possession just material (very often incomplete and given through somebody else) which lays behind us, it means our history. They work with this material. They search for laws, a sense of what happened. The advocates of the cyclic development try to project the found laws onto the future in belief that the future comes out from the hidden spatio – temporal area characterised by the identic qualities of all its parts, i.e. the past, the present and the future. The supporters of linear progressional historical development takes a linear (although with many digressions and regressions) line towards the final point. Everything is new and unrepeteable for them.

For the purpose of this paper I decided to make a comparison of two theoretical concepts – Fukuyama's and Wallerstein's. These two scientists deal with the analysis of the critical state (both of them agree that we actually live in the crisis, that the transformation of the society occurs just now) of the actual global order and they come up with the predictions of its future appearance. They try to show what direction the global order will take. Of course, it is not possible to present all details of the changed global order presented by both of them. I focused on three topics – used methodology, the cyclicity and characteristics of the critical state of the global order at present – with the aim of showing the differences of these two views on the "nature" of the global order. In spite of some similarities these two apparently different concepts bring the identical conclusions or predictions of the next global order development.

The comparative table is presented below.

	FRANCIS FUKUYAMA		IMMANUEL WALLERSTEIN	
Unit of analyses	Partial – only western society and highly developed societies		Global - world	
Dominant perspective of analyses	society		economics	
Levels of analysis	micro ⁷		macro	
Theory of international relations	liberalism		neomarxism	
Research paradigms	Positivist position		Critical realism	
Used method	Quantitative: statistical method ⁸		Process – tracing and historical explanation	
Hypothesis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increasing poverty and income inequality - Decline of religion - Promotion of individualistic self – gratification over community obligation 		„unequal changes“	
Research question	„How can we explain the timing and speed of the subsequent transformation in the connection with the changes in social norms that occurred during the Great Disruption?“		„How connected must peoples be before we call them a "system"? "How does a "world-system" differ from a "society"?"	
Cyclicity	Political and economic institutions	Linear progression	Political and economic institutions	Cyclical development
	society	Cyclical development		
The beginning of the transition	1965		1968	
Symptoms of	Big disruption		Bifurcation, Chaotic	

⁷ In the terminology of Waltz's 'three images', or 'levels of analysis', through which to theorize international politics, liberal theories of IR tend to be second image approaches. By second image, it is meant explanations for international outcomes that are located at the level of the state. Neoliberalism, on the other hand, focus on the impact of regimes and international organizations on unit – level behaviour (Panke, 2007 : 89).

⁸ The statistical method imitates an experiment – thank to large N (number of cases) is possible to model relations among all variables in mathematic way ('quantitative' - it doesn't mean figures but number or quantity of studied units). The statistical method is used in both ways – in deductive one (to the test the hypothesis) or inductive one (so called factor analysis). The researchers usually don't work with the primary data but rather they carry out the analysis of data collected before. The analysis has two levels: 1) the macro – level (for example a national state or some region) – the Fukuyama's analysis – and 2) micro – level (the unit of analysis is an individual).

transformation		instability, Crisis
Views on the future	optimistic	Neutral
Predictions	End of actual system, the new one (but we don't know what it will be ⁹): 1) a replica of the actual one but not capitalistic, hierarchic and exploiting, 2) democratic and relatively egalitarian ¹⁰	A new system, one which may be more or less egalitarian than the present one.

FUKUYAMA'S THE GREAT DISRUPTION

Francis Fukuyama is quite optimistic about the future. He believes in a linear progress of the humankind¹¹. As Fukuyama argued in *The End of History and the Last Man* (1992), there is a strong logic behind the evolution of political institutions in the direction of modern liberal democracy, based on the correlation between economic development and stable democracy. All crisis are inevitably connected with the human nature. The development of social order must be reconstructed all the time how the progress of society is made. The shift to the information age has been accompanied by social disorder through the industrialized world.

A society built around information tends to produce more of the two things people value most in a modern democracy – freedom and equality. Fukuyama understands the social disorder as something coherent with the development of societies. It is a kind of tax paid for the progress. It can be understood also as an inseparable symptom on the way to “End of History“. The social changes occurred over a wide range of similar countries and appeared at roughly the same period in history. According to Fukuyama the transition from the industrial to the information era brings negative social trends (a decline of marriages, births; divorce soared, the crime increases, the confidence in social institutions decreases). The technological change that brought about what the economist Joseph Schumpeter called „creative destruction“ in the marketplace caused similar disruption in the world of social relationships. The Fukuyama's optimism finds its reflection in a belief that the social order, once disrupted, tends to get remade, and there are many indications that this is happening today (Fukuyama, 1999 : 51). Fukuyama doesn't see man's natural condition in the war of „every man against every man“ as Thomas Hobbes does but he is persuaded that human beings are by nature social creatures, most basic drives and instincts lead them to create moral rules that bind them together into communities. Whether information – age democracies can maintain social order in the face of technological and economic change is among their greatest challenges today.

⁹ For the Wallerstein's justification of the fact that the future is uncertain see his book (1999 : 4).

¹⁰ Wallerstein speaks about the system that is largely egalitarian and largely democratic. These two objectives are intrinsically linked to each other. A historical system cannot be egalitarian if it is not democratic (Wallerstein, 1999 : 3).

¹¹ Wallerstein, on the contrary, thinks that progress is not at all inevitable (Wallerstein, 1999 : 2).

The transition into an information society has disrupted social norms, a modern, high – tech society cannot get along without informal norms that is quite new from the times of Max Weber. This shift in norms engendered what is perhaps the most famous concept in modern sociology – the distinction drawn by Ferdinand Tonnies between what he called *Gemeinschaft* (“community“) and *Gesellschaft* (“society“).

Nevertheless, Fukuyama can't deny the apparent differences between the democracies all over the world and he neither does that. It is not sufficient just to import the democracy from the traditional democratic countries. The democratic institutions must be constructed for a long time, the democracy is not gift but hard, long – lasting work through the education. Fukuyama explains the differences between the democracies of for example Latin America and the USA on the base of the cultural aspects. Beginning in about 1965 a large number of indicators that can serve as negative measures of social capital all started moving upward rapidly at the same time. These could be put under three broad headings: crime, family, and trust (Fukuyama, 1999 : 54).

Several arguments have been put forward to explain why the phenomena we associate with the Great Disruption occurred. Here are three: they were brought on by increasing poverty and income inequality. They were products of the modern welfare state. They were result of a broad cultural shift that included the decline of religion and the promotion of individualistic self – gratification over community obligation (Fukuyama, 1999 : 55).

WALLERSTEIN'S BASIC CHARACTERISTIC OF THE WORLD SYSTEM

Wallerstein characterises (1976) a world-system as a social system that has boundaries, structures, member groups, rules of legitimation, and coherence. Its life is made up of the conflicting forces which hold it together by tension and tear it apart as each group seeks eternally to remold it to its advantage.

Most entities usually described as social systems – tribes, communities, nation states are not in fact total systems. The only real social systems, according to Wallerstein, are those relatively small, highly autonomous economies based on extensive division of labor and big cultural diversity.

Wallerstein measures the world – system through its economical function. The economics is for him the basic element which ties up all integral parts of the world – system. The modern world system is based on capitalism which insists in the constant absorption of economic loss by political entities and not in the noninterference of a state in the economic affairs. Capitalism as an economic mode is based on the fact that the economic factors operate within an arena larger than that which any political entity can totally control. It has made possible the constant economic expansion of the world-system (Wallerstein, 1976).

World-economies then are divided into core-states and peripheral areas. There are also semiperipheral areas which is a necessary structural element in a world-economy. Perhaps the

most spectacular case of upward mobility has been the United States, a region that went from being peripheralized to a semiperiphery and then to core status (1880), and finally achieved hegemony within the core (1945). The current decline of US hegemony is one of the salient features sequential change in the contemporary system.

The division of a world-economy involves a hierarchy of occupational tasks. Since a capitalist world-economy essentially rewards accumulated capital, including human capital, at a higher rate than "raw" labor power and there is no central political control mechanism, the result is a geographical maldistribution of these occupational skills.

If world-systems are the only real social systems (other than truly isolated subsistence economies), then it must follow that the emergence, consolidation, and political roles of classes and status groups must be appreciated as elements of this world system (Wallerstein, 1976).

METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH FOUNDATIONS OF COMPARED CONCEPTS

Fukuyama's social capital

Fukuyama's *The Great Disruption* is based on the careful analysis of decreasing social capital in modern societies. Social capital is a sociological concept, which refers to connections within and between social networks. Positive social contacts affect the productivity of individuals and groups. Active involvement and interest in civic affairs by citizens in a particular region generates a collective good that facilitates collaborative action for all. It was found the link between social capital and the positive (or also negative in a case of the absence or a small stock of social capital) effect that has on governmental and economic performance – and ultimately on democratic governance (Grix, 2004 : 69).

As for the paradigm of social capital the researches are divided into two groups: 1) the dominant 'Putnam school' and 2) alternative approach.

The 'Putnam school' researches work with the quantitative methods¹² used by Putnam in his study of democracy in Italy. Culture or social capital is seen as something psychological that can be measured at the individual level in a positivist manner through the concrete and quantifiable answers to survey questions. The 'Putnam school' of social capital research is based on a foundationalist ontology¹³ and positivist epistemology¹⁴. It is used the questionnaire (the research method) from which the respondents' answers to questions are aggregated and manipulated statistically. Then a quantitative measure decide if social capital is in decline or not.

¹² Quantitative research employs methods with the intention of being able to produce data that can be quantified (counted, measured, weighed, enumerated, and so manipulated and compared mathematically). This type of research is interested in finding general patterns and relationships among variables, including for some testing theories and making predictions. See (Grix, 2004 : 173).

¹³ The 'foundationalists' believe the world exists independently of our knowledge of it. This knowledge can be logically deduced from our beliefs.

¹⁴ The positivist epistemology focuses on observable and measurable social phenomena.

The alternative approach comes out from the anti – foundationalist ontology¹⁵ and interpretivist epistemology. It combines both quantitative and qualitative¹⁶ methodology, usually using small number of in – depth cases. Interview transcripts and background statistical data as sources of the next analysis are received through a method of in – depth interviews or documentary analysis.

Social capital – as propounded by Putnam et al. – has been 'borrowed' by idealists¹⁷ on the ideological right in a debate about de Tocqueville's America, involving a return to the morals and the 'good' society of that era, for this ideal is equated with the reduction in crime and a return to a sense of civic responsibility (Grix, 2004 : 74). On the ground of all mentioned before it can be concluded that Fukuyama studies social capital rather in a tradition of the 'Putnam school' than in the alternative approach.

The methodology of world – systems

The world system can be studied from the perspective of population (for example interpretive analysis of different population trends in core and peripheral countries), technological change, commodification. Moreover the theorists of the world system also focused on proletarianization and capital intensity, increasing size of firms or state formation. Chase – Dunn (1995 : 399-402) named many authors who had investigated these topics in qualitative and quantitative research. Their analyses show a vulnerability of the world system which is in a danger of collapse. We have already come to its limits.

World – systems analysis is viewed through the perspective of structural-functionalist modernizationism elaborated by Talcott Parsons. It is a synthesis of continental historicism, „Third World“ radicalism and Marxism. The researchers of world – system undertake some effort to reconceptualize a social change in terms of totalities as units of analysis; the next they want to historicize the social sciences and overcome the split between the universalizing generalizers (theory) and „idiographic“ particularizers (history). And at last they insist that motion is the essence, especially slow motion.

Referring to structure or agency social ontology inquires the essence of society. At the end of this process functionalists such as Émile Durkheim come to the conclusion that structure and hierarchy are essential in stabilising the very existence of society. On the other hand some

¹⁵ Not all social phenomena are directly observable. Anti – foundationalists do not believe that the world exists independently of our knowledge of it, but rather 'reality' is socially and discursively 'constructed' by human actors. They also believe that there are no central values that can be rationally and universally grounded (Grix, 2004 : 61).

¹⁶ Qualitative research is characterised by the use of methods that attempt to examine 'inherent traits, characteristics, and qualities of the political objects of inquiry'. The methods used in this type of research tend to be more interpretative in nature.

¹⁷ The thinkers referred to as idealists don't use the concept of idealism (in the contrast with liberalism) as mean of their identification. It is rather a 'negative label of utopia or visionary' given to them by their opponents – realists. All classical liberal theories of IR rest on the core assumption that domestic actors or structures strongly influence the foreign – policy identities and interests of states as well as their actual behaviour in international relations. Domestic properties (actors, institutions, practices) are crucial explanatory variables (also referred to as 'independent variables').

theorists such as for example Karl Marx emphasise that the social structure can act to the detriment of the majority of individuals in a society. In the world – system systematic interaction is routinized so that the connected actors come to depend, and to form expectations based on the connections (Chase – Dunn, 1995 : 388). The world – system is functionalist construct focused on the interactions between the separate units that play inferior paper in the holistic concept. The theorists of the world – system in accordance with Emile Durkheim think that a society is something more than a simple collection of individuals. The core of the world – system research is formed by interaction networks that link all units of social analysis-individuals, households, neighborhoods, firms, towns and cities, classes and regions, national, states and societies, transnational actors, international regions, and global structures. The world system is thus by definition [of Wallestein] composed of culturally different societies that are vitally linked together through the exchange of food and raw materials. It formes an economic ground of the world – system (Chase – Dunn, 1995: 389). Wallerstein takes as units of analyses economical interactions among uequally powerful and competing states.

The world-system is all of the economic, political, social, and cultural relations among the people of the earth. Thus, the world-system is not just "international relations" or the "world market." It is the whole interactive system, where the whole is greater than the sum of the parts. The ontological position of post – marxism¹⁸ is holism and social constructivism¹⁹.

As the end of the Cold War was ushered in, further questions about the social construction of IR were formulated. We can see the contstructivism as an academic debate, emerges in historically and culturally specific circumstances after the failure of IR scholars to predict or initially explain the end of the Cold War, on the basis of the dominant theories of IR analogically to the debate between realism and idealism after the First World War (Dunne 2007 : 167).

The constructivism came with a new idea: the international relations is a social construction. Social phenomena, such as states or alliences or international institutions, that is the collective subjects of international relations, may build on the basis material of human nature, but they take specific historical, cultural, and political forms that are a product of human interaction in a social world (Dunne 2007 : 168). The human interaction can be realised through new element (Wallerstein 1999 : 17) which is South – North migration (including eastern Europe – western Europe migration).

¹⁸ The marxism in cotrast with the post – marxism reflects the objective and holist ontological position.

¹⁹ In this connection Grix (2004 : 61) writes: “Examples of ontological positions are those contained within the umbrella terms ‘objectivism’ and ‘constructivism’. Broadly speaking, the former is ‘an ontological position that asserts that social phenomena and their meanings have an existence that is independent of social actors’. The latter, on the other hand, is an alternative ontological position that ‘asserts that social phenomena and their meanings are continually being accomplished by social actors. It implies that social phenomena and categories are not only produced through social interaction but that they are in a constant state of revision”.

Wallerstein's analyse of the world – system forms a grand formal theory in contrast with Fukuyama's The Great Disruption can be classified as middle – range theory²⁰. The grand formal theory is speculative and abstract. It intends to represent the important features of a total society as for example functionalism that consists of several parts that work together to achieve stability and solidarity. Functionalist sociolog Talcott Parsons describes society as a being made up of three interdependent systems: a cultural, a personality, a social system analogically with the the world system which is multidimensional. Moreover another characteristic of the grand formal theories is valid for the world – system – transhistoricity which means that they are not strictly limited to time and space. The world – system has its beginning, the moment of its birth but there is no ending – point. Neither space is shown. The world system started as a small nuclear which through the time was growing up including new and new territories that dominated by the world system accepted its characteristics.

World – economy is a basic unit of analysis for modern social change. It attacks developmentalism²¹ and anglo – american liberal triumphalism that means bourgeois constitutional right as the highest achievement of humankind²².

Immanuel Wallerstein whose works has built upon and in turn has stimulated advances in both historical sociology and the study of contemporary „development“ was looking for new basic paradigm capable of orienting investigations into large – scale, long – term change processes.

Research paradigms

Of course, Wallerstein is trying to see as far as the horizon of the actual events and tell what expects us in the future, not using intuition or lucidity but through the scientific analysis of the actual situation of the global order. In principle he makes a projection of the actual situation into the future. He reached the conclusion that the global order of nowadays is not sustainable anymore and must be replaced by other system. Wallerstein is astonished by the certainty of positivists and natural scientists that everything will be accomplished according to their predictions. Literally he says (1999 : 2): “the belief in certainties, a fundamental premise of modernity, is blinding and crippling“.

It seems that Wallerstein has denied the positivist position but it is not fully true because he uses the statistical data to show the changed trends of the world development. Many researchers do not select one research paradigm to investigate all their questions, choosing

²⁰ Middle – range theories are the most commonly used in social science. They are specific enough to be used to guide empirical work, but broad enough to cover a wide range of different phenomena.

²¹ Developmentalism presents a notion that each national society passes through a similar set of stages necessarily differentiating world – economy with necessarily different productive structures located in different zones and differentially strong states competing with and attempting to dominate one another.

²² In this sense Wallerstein (1999 : 1) writes: „it is widely thought that the collapse of the Communisms in 1989 marks a great triumph of liberalism. I see it rather as marking the definitive collapse of liberalism as the defining geoculture of our world – system.

either a normative or interpretive approach. And Wallerstein does the same. As for example K. Marx, S. Freud, T. Adorno or H. Marcuse he analyses the world system through the research paradigm of critical realism posed between positivism and interpretivism.

Critical realism has become a powerful alternative of both positivism (regular laws) and interpretivism (interpretation of meaning) since 1970s. The critical realists believe in causes; they speak about efficient causes (actors) and material causes (social structures). In this way they differ from the positivists that believe the causes do not simply determine action, instead „what causes something to happen has nothing to do with the number of times we have observed it happening. Explanation depends rather on identifying causal mechanisms and how they work, and discovering if they have been activated and under what conditions. Important characteristics of critical realism can be found in a book of Grix (1999 : 86).

The theorists of the world – system (including Wallerstein also) combine the interpretive and positivist research position. Next in the text dealing with the world – system analysis²³ I highlight the clue words that justify one or another scientific approach.

The scientists **perceive** the global nature of economic networks 20 years before such networks entered popular discourse, but they also **saw** that many of these networks extend back at least 500 years. Over this time, the peoples of the globe became linked into one integrated unit: the modern "world system." The explanation of why people became linked into one integrated unit reflects a positivist position. They had to occupy the positivist position to be able to claim that there were patterns (= world system), cause and consequences (a strong nuclear that attracts and „eats“ weak units). They had to come out from the observation to draw some logical connections.

Social scientists working in this area (it means world – system analysers) are trying to better **understand** the history and evolution of the whole system, as well as how local and national regions have been integrated into. This attitude is based on the interpretive position. The way we define a "world-system" reflects both our understanding of history and the questions we try to answer in a way of interpretive and positivist position.

Finding a definition of a „world system“ we can for example ask, how connected must peoples be before we call them a system?“ or "how does a "world-system" differ from a "society"? Using the adverbium „how“ means an explanation what matches with the positivist position.

Other work attempts to use the knowledge of **cycles and trends** that has grown out of world-system research to **anticipate** events likely in the future with a precision impossible before the advent of the theory. Many positivists believe that the real purpose of explanation is prediction. Positivists believe that „there are patterns and regularities“ (cycles and trends are nothing else than these patterns and trends).

As for the crucial research question of Fukuyama: he collects and analyses the **statistical data** very carefully which shows a clear positivist position but he wants to explain²⁴ the timing and

²³ To consult text see Chase – Dunn (1995).

speed of the subsequent transformation of the changes in social norms occurred during the Great Disruption, therefore not whether they had cultural roots, which they obviously did. It is known that culture tends to change very slowly in comparison with other factors, such as economic conditions, public policies, and ideology. In those cases where cultural norms have changed quickly, such as in rapidly modernizing Third World societies, cultural change is clearly being driven by socioeconomic change and is therefore not an autonomous factor (Fukuyama, 1999 : 58).

The researcher must decide just for one position, it is not possible to combine an approach which draws on both positivist and interpretivist paradigms (Grix, 2004 : 83). Nevertheless the statistical data seem to serve to Fukuyama to prove the intuitive fact that the social norms were changed during the Great Disruption because of cultural aspects. He got the very clear response but the ability of the positivist approach hasn't been able to give more explanation. If he wanted to explain the speed of these changes, he had to use the interpretivist approach. The clear interpretative position is reflected in Fukuyama's searching for rising crime and rising distrust during the period of the Great Disruption in spite of the fact that he analyses data (positivist position) saying that „it is hard to interpret the data either on values or on civil society in any other way than to suggest that the radius of trust is diminishing, not just in the United States but across the developed world“ (Fukuyama, 1999 : 59). Fukuyama also in the interpretivist position tries to find a response on the question how can we rebuild social capital in the future.

Process – Tracing and Historical Explanation

This method tries to find some logics in the historical process, to make sense to history. It attempts to identify the intervening causal process – the causal chain and causal mechanism²⁵- between an independent variable (or variables) and the outcome of the dependent variable.

Both of them Fukuyama and Wallerstein analyses the history. It is indisputable whose conception is more cyclical. As seen from the table presented above the conception of Wallerstein is cyclic while that of Fukuyama is cyclic only partially in some aspects. Thus, it is quite clear who the method “process – tracing and historical explanation“ will be more important for. Wallerstein must make a very deep analysis of the historical development to be able to draw cyclical trends. The more thorough he is when studying the past, the more cautious he is when predicting the future.

The case study analyst is able to identify plausible causal variables, a task essential to theory construction and testing. Case studies employing process – tracing are particularly useful as a supplement in large – N statistical analyses. A researcher using this method intends to find

²⁴ Positivists are attempting to explain social reality, interpretivists are seeking to interpret or understand it (Grix, 2004 : 78)

²⁵ For example Bunge (Hedström, 2008 : 322) gives the following definition of a mechanism: „a mechanism is a process in a concrete system which is capable of bringing about or preventing some change in system.“ Causality means to find a mechanism which connects two events.

regularities through juxtaposition of historical cases. Process – tracing is methodology well – suited to testing theories in a world marked by multiple interaction effects, where it is difficult to explain outcomes in terms of two or three independent variables (Hedström, 2008, 206). This method has its place in explaining macrohistorical phenomena used in constructivist approach²⁶. Process – tracing is an indispensable tool for theory testing and theory development.

What are the determinants in favour of the process - tracing method used by Wallerstein? This method has several varieties. The simplest one takes the form of a detailed narrative or story presented in the form of a chronicle that purports to throw light on how an event came about (Hedström, 2008 : 210). Then the method “process – tracing“ can have a form of analytic explanation and of more general explanation. But which of these forms did Wallerstein apply for example in the chapter 4 (Wallerstein, 2004 : 60-75)? He asked how had been a Geoculture created? He considers the question from the perspective of ideologies, social movements and social science.

Wallerstein combines the detailed narrative technique with analytic explanation approach. He describes what changes brought the French Revolution. He also describes why antisystematic movements (1. worker/ social, 2. ethnic/nationalist and 3. women’s) didn’t succeed in using their control of the states to transform societies. Then he continues with the description of the events of 19th century. Moreover he tried to give more general explanation why liberalism triumphed in defining the geoculture of the modern world – system in the 19th century (Wallerstein, 2004 : 67). Analytic explanation converts a historical narrative into an analytical causal explanation couched in explicit theoretical forms. We can present an example of the analytical explanation from Wallerstein’s book (2004 : 61-62): after 1793 and the Reign of Terror, in which French revolutionaries sent other French revolutionaries to the guillotine conservatives got a power. Then Wallerstein explains why conservatives abhorred democracy²⁷.

There are different types of causal processes. The challenge in using process – tracing is to choose a variant of it that fits the nature of the causal process embedded in the phenomenon being investigated. Even in Fukuyama’s book (1992) the process – tracing technique must be used because Fukuyama argued that history process advanced in a linear direction towards its end – point, that is liberal democracy. The whole process is developing under this pattern. The simplest form of the process – tracing technique is linear causality, a straightforward, direct chain of events that characterizes simple phenomena (Hedström, 2008 : 212).

Wallerstein himself (1976 : 345) describes a world – system perspective as a social action that takes place in an entity within which there is an ongoing division of labour, and seeks to discover empirically whether such an entity is or not unified politically or culturally, asking theoretically what are the consequences of the existence or non – existence of such unity.

²⁶ It suits quite well the Wallerstein’s world – system.

²⁷ Wallerstein’s explanation (2004, 62) is this: conservatives believed that respect for hierarchy is the soul guarantor of order. According to conservatives democracy signaled the end of respect for hierarchy.

Cyclicity

Each culture understands the conception of time in a different manner. T. Sedláček (2009 : 45) wrote that the Jewish linear conception of time made possible the very dynamic development of science. If the history has its own beginning and end that are not identical, then it makes a sense to start with a research whose results will not be known and used not early than in the future generation. It was the religious explanation of the fact that the research is worth to be realised.

Large political and economic institutions have long been evolving along a secular path, social life is more cyclical. Social norms that work for one historical period are disrupted by the advances of technology and the economy, and society has to play catch – up in order to establish new norms (Fukuyama, 1999 : 53). And Fukuyama (1999 : 54) concludes his essay with this words:

“In the political and economic sphere history appears to be progressive and directional, and at the end of the twentieth century has culminated in liberal democracy as the only viable choice for technologically advanced societies. In the social and moral sphere, however, history appears to be cyclical, with social order ebbing and flowing over the course of generations. There is nothing to guarantee upturns in the cycle; our only reason for hope is the very powerful innate human capacity for reconstituting social order. On the success of this process of reconstruction depends the upward direction of the arrow of History.”

Wallerstein (2004 : 76 - 90) wrote that historical systems had lives. He speaks about their cyclical rhythms. These systems are not excluded from crises. They will come and they must come. The light crises can be resolved in the framework of the system, in a case of serious problems the system can't survive in its original state. The system must bifurcate and it's decided collectively which of the alternative paths will be followed, that is, what kind of new system will be constructed. The process of bifurcating is chaotic, which means that every small action during this period is likely to have significant consequences. During the period of hard times or transition the historical system oscillates wildly but it keeps a direction. The final outcome is quite uncertain, at the end there is a new, different historical system.

According to Wallerstein all systems (not only the actual one) were cyclical. He wrote (1976 : 347):

“But the pattern of such systems was a cyclical one – expansion of size and hence total surplus – appropriation to the point where the bureaucratic costs of appropriating the surplus outweighed the surplus that could, in socio – political terms, be effectively appropriated, at which point and retraction set in. The cycle of expansion and contraction involved the perpetual incorporation and releasing of „units“.

Wallerstein (1999 : 35) characterises the cycles in this way:

“The fundamental contradictions of the capitalist system have been expressed within the systematic process by a series of cyclical rhythms, which have served to contain these contradictions. The two most important cyclical rhythms have been the 50/60 – year Kondratieff cycles in which primary sources of profit alternate between the sphere of production and the financial arena, and the 100/150 – year hegemonic cycles consisting of the rise and decline of successive guarantors of global order, each one with its particular pattern of control²⁸. The

²⁸ This division of cycles reflects two varieties of world – systems: 1) world – empires and 2) world – economy. In the former, in the latter such a political system does not exist over all, or virtually all, of the space. World-economies were highly unstable structures which tended either to be converted into empires or to disintegrate. It is the peculiarity of the modern world-system that a world-economy has survived for 500 years and yet has not come to be transformed into a world-empire—a peculiarity that is the secret of its strength (Wallerstein, 1976).

cyclical rhythms resulted in regular slow – moving but significant geographical shifts in the loci of accumulation and power, without however changing the fundamental relations of inequality within the system. These cycles were never perfectly symmetrical, but rather each new cycle brought about small but significant structural shifts in particular directions that constitute the secular trends of the system. “

The world system is very closely connected with the economic development; through the channel of production the world system suffers cyclical development. The Kondratieff (long – wave) cycles based on the rebuilding of factories, means of production, communication due to new technologies are the most important of all types of cycles for the world system. Chase – Dunn (1995) presented a list of those who had studied the world economics in connection with the cycles from different perspectives and methods used to collect and examine data.

Nevertheless a Kondratieff B – phase doesn't mean necessarily the beginning of the whole system transition. The potential of the system doesn't decrease during this period, it is only restructured. For example the region of East Asia was rising meanwhile the U.S. hegemony started to decline during Kondratieff B-phase.

The gain in one region is the counterpart of the loss in another. This is not quite a zero-sum game, but it is also inconceivable that all elements in a capitalist world-economy shift their values in a given direction simultaneously (Wallerstein, 1976).

The world system is very closely connected with the economic development; through the channel of production the world system suffers cyclical development. The Kondratieff (long – wave) cycles based on the rebuilding of factories, means of production, communication due to new technologies are the most important of all types of cycles for the world system. Chase – Dunn (1995) presented a list of those who had studied the world economics in connection with the cycles from different perspectives and methods used to collect and examine data.

In the modern world-system, the pattern of political centralization/decentralization takes the form of the rise and fall of the hegemonic core powers what is very similar to the conclusions of O. Spengler, S. Huntington and others. All these theoretical conclusion have in common the cyclical progress. In a case of the world system it must be so, because it's based above all on the economic foundations and each such a system is subject to cyclical development. Thus, in a logics of the world system it can be deducted that the hegemonic power is very closely linked to the economic position. The more developed country is, the better starting conditions has to become a hegemonic power. Although Fukuyama speaks about the linear progression of history in contrast with Huntington, Spengler and others, he also comes out from the economic situation of a country which determines the next way towards the liberal democracy.

Wallerstein also speaks about the “anarchy of production“ warning that there will soon come a point where additional production offers not profit but loss. Hence he concludes that there are cycles not political cycles of the world – empires but the economic cycles of the world – economies.

Wallerstein (1999) also explains why the actual modern world – system is in a crisis, when the crisis started and what expects us in the possible future. He predicts that the crises can lead to social conflicts. He shares with Fukuyama this point of view.

Wallerstein deals with the economic system but through the marxism closely connected with the social order because Marx posited a relational and process – oriented view of human beings. Humans are what they are by virtue of the relations through which they live their lives. These relations are understood as organic: none can be understood in abstraction from that context. This view of human social life as relations in process forms the core of Marx's famous dialectical understanding of history. Marxism is neither solely preoccupied with the economy, nor with domestic relations. Rather it aims at a critical understanding of capitalism as an historically particular way of organizing social life, one which entails political and cultural as well as economic relations. According to the idea of economic determinism related to the classical theories of imperialism whose big contributors is the Marxist tradition, the economy are the primary determinants of social and political life (Rupert, 2007).

The accompanying phenomena of cyclicity are the waves of euphoria or pessimism. As Wallerstein 1999 : 17) writes the world – system was riding a wave of enormous optimism about the future in the nineteenth century, and indeed up to about twenty years ago. We lived in an era in which everyone was sure that history was on the side of progress. Such faith had one enormous political consequence: it was incredibly stabilizing. Today the world has lost that faith, and having lost it the world has lost its essential stabilizer.

Fukuyama expresses rather optimistic prognosis about the future; he strongly believes in the final victory of liberal democracy after the end of the Cold War. Wallerstein agrees with him claiming (1999 : 18) that democratization is really occurring but it will not diminish the great disorder.

Chaos and world anarchy

The famous british scientist Stephen Hawking thinks that in the future there will be more conflicts similar to the cuban crisis from 1962. He warns of the anarchy that can lead up to the final destruction of the Earth planet. But there are more dangers coming very slowly: the human population and the rate of our using the limited resources of the planet grow exponentially and the same goes for our technological ability to influence the environment in both positive and negative way. The threat of the humankind's extermination has approached very close to us, according to Hawking we have not more than 200 years to turn away this tragic future; the only chance how to preserve the mankind is the colonization of the universe²⁹. These predictions referring to the anarchic world system which, in the end, will cause the destruction of the humankind can be considered 'the foolish fantasy' of the famous scientist, moreover not grounded on the scientific research. The number of these catastrophic scenarios (because of the rapid technological progress) has grown considerably, the questions

²⁹http://www.tyden.cz/rubriky/veda-a-technika/veda/stephen-hawking-lidstvo-musi-pryc-ze-zeme-jinak-vyhne_177950.html (www consulted 30 - 08 – 2010).

of global order and its weaknesses or potential dangers must be studied with the highest importance.

Hans Morgenthau, the author of the „bible of realism“ says that all states in the archaic system search for the their national interest, the principle goal of all their action is to survive. The essential factors that are taken into the consideration if the state succeed in this goal are the possessed economical resources, reached technological progress and military force. The states are reacting to each another in the archaic international system according to their geographical localisation, their extension and enforce their power. Neither neorealists leave the concept of anarchic system. Waltz stresses that in the anarchic system only the states carrying for their safety can survive (Eichler, 2009 : 17). But it cann't be proven that international anarchaic system must have those consequences predicted by the neorealists. Moreover realists and above all neorealists describe international security relationships in a very static and cyclic way. They are criticised because of these facts. Constructivists also accept that there is a state of anarchy in the world politics.

According to Wallerstein the world is in transition. Out of chaos will come a new order, different from one we now know, different but not necessarily better. The path of global disorder down which we have been heading, are nonstate “groups“ that are assuming the role of protecting themselves and even providing for their welfare. The population is becoming profoundly antistate. But the capitalist world – system cannot function well without strong states. Thus, the capitalistic system is in a big danger, Wallerstein thinks that it has no chance to survive. On the other hand, the end of capitalism makes free the process of democratization because it is not and has never been in the interest of capitalists³⁰ (Wallerstein, 1999 : 32 – 33).

The world – system is hierarchical formed by the “core“ (advanced) and “peripheral“ (developed) societies. The former exploit the latter ones. Wallerstein predicts caos. The hierarchical construct of the world – system will not exist any more. So, the caos means the end of hierarchy. The world – system will have to find a new shape and will have to be transformed. The world - system is relatively stabilized before coming caos, that is, the functions are divided, each part of the system (core and peripheral countries) knows its own position which is almost impossible to change. The only possibility for the peripheral countries how to change their status is to become semiperipheral countries. There is a strong and quite understandable pressure of low developed countries to change their status and not to be exploited any more. Fukuyama would have probably used the concept of “thumos“ explaining the forces of this rebellion which disrupt the relatively stabilised world system and brings caos to the international relations. But it will be just a modification of the mutual relationships among countries.

³⁰ The polish sociologist Zygmunt Bauman (1965 : 60) explaining Marx says that the rich are conservative and have a strong aversion to changes and novelties. The capitalists, having under their control capital goods which give them the profit, think that the actual state is the best one and they do their best to preserve it.

PREDICTIONS IN SOCIAL SCIENCE

Ragin (1994) names seven major goals of social research: identifying general patterns and relationships, testing and refining theories, making predictions, interpreting culturally or historically significant phenomena, exploring diversity, giving voice, advancing new theories. In a connection with a new global order we must ask not only if it's worth making predictions (the future is uncertain) but even if it is possible to make predictions.

In spite of the fact that Karl Popper (1959) criticizes the doctrine (called by him historicism) that it is the task of the social sciences to propound historical prophecies, and that historical prophecies are needed if we wish to conduct politics in a rational way, prediction is often considered the highest goal of science. We accumulate knowledge so that we can anticipate things to come. Two kinds of knowledge help us make predictions. Knowledge of history (past successes and failures) and knowledge of general patterns. Knowledge of history helps us to avoid repeating mistakes. Predicting rates (or trends) is much easier than predicting specific events. It is very difficult to predict specific future events.

According to Popper (1959) marxism³¹ has all attributes of historicism because of the claims that (a) it is a science, (b) that it is progressive, (c) that it adopts the methods of prediction which the natural sciences practice.

Sir Karl Popper suggests to recognize the scientific statements if they are falsifiable or not. What had to happen with a theory to be recognized as false? If such realistic options exist, the theory can be considered as scientific. If, on the contrary, the theory explains all possible behaviour, the theory becomes a pseudoscience. Karl Popper describes why he considered the Marxist approach to the history as unscientific: the Marxist theory is able to explain everything, including the antithetical situations. If the theory can explain all imaginable situations in the context of class – struggle, it doesn't present its, but weakness.

If there are patterns and regularities, causes and consequences, in the social world just as there are in the natural world (which is a positivist position), then there must be a possibility of making causal statements. Many positivists believe that the real purpose of explanation is prediction. In other worlds, everything that happens in the past is a cause of the future things, it must have consequences later. If we suppose the continuity of all events and, then when we find a trend of historical facts, there must be an extension of the past events to the future and it is possible to predict the future.

Quantitative techniques include make predictions based on the results received after identifying general patterns and relationships among variables, testing hypotheses and theories. Although reading about the Wallerstein's world – system there is no detailed numerical analysis we can suppose that he had to come out from the quantitative research; in other case he wouldn't have been able to formulate his theory. Nevertheless, it must be added that

³¹ In the connection with the analysis of the world – system I want to point out that some researchers (especially post – modernists) believe that grand theories as for example Marxism or functionalism have any relevance today (Grix, 2004 : 109).

each theory not only reflects the history, but also must include the supposed development of the future. A theory is tested by predicting the outcomes of observations and experiments that have not been done before.

CONCLUSION

Robert D. Kaplan (1997) thinks that a middle class and civil institutions are required for successful democracy. Fukuyama expresses more or less the same idea. From his point of view the history is directly linear. The mankind tries to reach the freedom, to manifest the humanity. The destiny of all human beings is to be recognised as human beings. That is the historical destiny of all of us. The thumos pushes a man to attain this destiny. Fukuyama thinks that the liberal democracy is the best political system serving to this purpose. The thumos is an engine, powerful force that gives direction to the historical progress. The fight between masters and serves determines all this process. According to Fukuyama the liberal democracy satisfies both masters and serves.

Fukuyama justified his vision of the human development in the direction of the liberal democracy with the innate nature of a man given by the so called antique concept of “thumos“. This part of soul is, according to Plato, responsible for the desire of a man to be recognised as an equal human beings with other people. Later Hegel in accordance with his dialectic philosophy developed this idea into the struggle for the recognition between masters and serves. So the struggle, individualistic, is a principle power leading to the system which the best corresponds with the human nature

Wallerstein also speaks about the struggle. He wrote (1999 : 3) that the struggle for the good society is a continuing one. And he continues as follows: “it is precisely in periods of transition from one historical system to another one (whose nature we cannot know in advance) that human struggle takes on the most meaning. Or to put it another way, it is only in such times of transition that what we call free will outweighs the pressures of the existing system to return to equilibria“. The crisis is an opportunity to make radical changes. T. Sedlacek (2009) tells us the same idea in his book.

What’s the difference between the struggle of Fukuyama and Wallerstein? Fukuyama’s struggle seems to be transcendental, it is an abstract struggle for something that is on the top of the Maslow’s hierarchy of needs. Even Wallerstein struggle has individualistic features posed in the basic human needs – to secure the dignified human existence consisting in economic possibilities, to increase the material welfare, shortly to be better and better as for the materialistic conditions. It reflects the innate needs of a man. To improve somebody’s individualistic economic situation is, according to Wallerstein, possible only in the cooperation with others, within a society. The more the society flourishes, the more profit have all its members. Wallerstein looks for the improvement of conditions on the macro level, thus he presents the macro – level concept.

Is it possible to compare what is incomparable at first sight? Is it possible to compare the conception of the development of global order presented by Fukuyama and Wallerstein? Yes and no. It's true that Fukuyama regards the global order from quite different perspective than Wallerstein does. The former loyal to the liberal tradition, the latter came out from the neomarxist paradigm, the former analyses the internal development of states what makes possible to have an idea what political relations will have these states with other states (Fukuyama, of course, can't manage without references to other conceptions and reflexions as for example the idea of Kant's perpetual peace), the latter analyses the global order existing among states on the economic ground. The former is optimistic as for the future, the latter occupies the neutral, rather agnostic position. Fukuyama announces a linear progression of history (although in the social sphere he doesn't deny a certain cyclicity), Wallerstein believes in the cyclic development of the global order.

The foundations of research used by both scientists are also very different. Different starting points of research lead to different research strategies. It is precisely for this reason that we need to understand the 'footings' of research (Grix, 2004 : 74). Even choosing similar research methodology, each scientist usually lays emphasis on different methods³² or sources and analyses the data differently, depending on his ontological and epistemological position.

I tried to show a number of some research differences between Fukuyama and Wallerstein; this list could be even longer. Nevertheless we can find some elements that have the two concepts in common. Paradoxically both scientists presents the similar scenario of the future (of course, Wallerstein is much more uncertain about the future than Fukuyama). Moreover rethinking about both concepts we find many startling similarities. The Fukuyama's concept is rather social than economic, nonetheless the economics is an important platform for the Fukuyama's reflexions about the democratic linear progression of the historical development. It's not also without interest that Wallerstein is above all sociologist and Fukuyama is political economist.

In conclusion we can say that although neomarxist Wallerstein is quite uncertain about the future (that's why he has proposed not only one scenario of the next world – system development but several of them), his vision doesn't differ from the quite opposite concept of liberal democracy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BAUMAN, Zygmunt (1965): *Sociologie pro každý den*. 1. vydání. Mladá Fronta, Praha, 1965.

DRULÁK, Petr (2003). *Teorie mezinárodních vztahů*. 1. vydání. Portál, Praha. 2003. ISBN 80-7178-725-6.

³² For example social capital can be analysed as a dependent variable as opposed to an independent variable as most social capital researches do.

EICHLER, Jan (2009): *Mezinárodní bezpečnost v době globalizace*. 1. vydání. Portál. Praha. 2009. ISBN 978-80-7367-540-0

FUKUYAMA, Francis (1999): The Great Disruption [online]. *The Atlantic Monthly*; May 1999, Volume 283, No. 5; pages 55-80. <http://www.wesjones.com/fukuyama.htm> (www consulted 07-08-2010).

FUKUYAMA, Francis. *The End of History and the Last Man*. Free Press. 1992. ISBN 0029109752

FUKUYAMA, Francis. *Velký rozvrat. Lidská přirozenost a rekonstrukce společenského řádu*. Academia, 2006. ISBN 80-200-1438-1.

GOLDFRANK, Walter L. Paradigm Regained? The Rules Of Wallerstein's World-System Method. In *Journal of world-systems research*, vi, 2, summer/fall 2000, 150-195.

GRIX, Jonathan (2004) : *The foundations of Research*. Palgrave. Macmillian. New York. 2004. ISBN 1-403-92145-8.

HEDSTRÖM, Peter. "Studying Mechanisms to Strengthen Causal Inference in Quantitative Research." In *The Oxford of Political Methodology*, eds. Janet M. Box-Steffensmeier, Henry E. Brady a David Collier. Oxford University Press, 2008, p. 322.

CHASE - DUNN, Christopher, GRIMAS, Peter (1995). World system analyse. In *Annual Revue Sociology*. 1995. 21:387-417.

KAPLAN, Robert. D. (1997): Was Democracy Just a Moment? [online] *Atlantic Magazine*. December 1997. (www consulted 02-08-2010)

KEANE, John (2003): *Global Civil Society?* 1st Edition. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. 2003. ISBN 0521 81 543.

KLUSOŇ, Václav (2003): Počestní darebové v ekonomické transformaci. [online]. *Listy* 3/2003. <http://www.listy.cz/archiv.php?cislo=033&clanek=030314> (www consulted 03-08-2010).

MATHEWS, Jessica T. (2004): Power Shift. *Foreign Affairs*. Volume 76, No.1. 2004.

PANKE, Diana, RISSE, Thomas (2007): Liberalism. In: *International Relations Theories. Discipline and Diversity*. (Ed.) Dunne Tim, Kurki Milja, Smith Steve. Oxford University Press. 2007. Pp. 89-109. ISBN 0-19-929833-5

POPPER, Karl R.(1959): Prediction and Prophecy in the Social science, *Theories of History*. Ed. Patrick Gardiner, New York: The Free Press, 1959, 276-285.

RAGIN, Charles (1994): *Constructing Social Research: The Unity and Diversity of Method*. Northwestern University, Pine Forge, Thousand Oaks, 1994, pp. 31-54.

RAUSTIALA, Kal (2002): The Architecture of International Cooperation: Transgovernmental Networks and the Future of International Law. In: *Virginia Journal of International Law Association*, 43 VA. J. INT'L.1, 2002.

RISSE, Mathias (2005): *How Does the Global Order Harm the Poor?* [online].
<http://www.hks.harvard.edu/fs/mrisse/Papers/Papers%20-%20Philosophy/UnjustWorldVI.pdf>
(www consulted 03-08-2010)

RUPERT, Mark (2007): Marxism and Critical Theory. In: *International Relations Theories. Discipline and Diversity*. (Ed.) Dunne Tim, Kurki Milja, Smith Steve. Oxford University Press. 2007. Pp. 148 – 165. ISBN 0-19-929833-5

SEDLÁČEK, Tomáš (2009): *Ekonomie dobra a zla. Po stopách lidského tázání od Gilgameše po finanční krizi*. 65.pole, Praha, 2009.

WALLERSTEIN, Immanuel (1976) : *The Modern World-System: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century*. New York: Academic Press, 1976, pp. 229-233.

WALLERSTEIN, Immanuel (1976): A world – System Perspective on the Social Science. *The British Journal of Sociology*. Vol. 27. No.3, Special Issue. History and Sociology. (Sep.,1976), 343 – 352.

WALLERSTEIN, Immanuel (1999): *The End of the World As We Know It. Social Science for the Twenty – First Century*. University of Minnesota, 1999. ISBN 0-8166-3397-5.

WALLERSTEIN, Immanuel. *World – systems analysis. An Introduction*. Duke University Press. Durham and London. 2004. ISBN 0-8223-3431-3.