



Eureka Journal of Business, Economics & Innovation Studies (EJBEIS)

ISSN 2760-4950 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/6>

THEORETICAL PLURALISM IN THE STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS: REALISM, LIBERALISM AND CONSTRUCTIVISM AS ANALYTICAL LENSES

Nigina Kushaeva

Political Sciences Department, University of
World Economy and Diplomacy

E-mail: niginakushaeva@gmail.com

Abstract

The article examines the role of theoretical pluralism in the study of International Relations through three major theoretical traditions: realism, liberalism and constructivism. Contemporary world politics is marked by the coexistence of conflict and cooperation, the persistence of power politics, the growing role of international institutions, and the increasing significance of norms, ideas and identities. In such conditions, no single theoretical approach can fully explain the complexity of international processes. Realism highlights the importance of power, security, national interest and the anarchic structure of the international system. Liberalism focuses on cooperation, international institutions, interdependence, law and democracy. Constructivism draws attention to norms, identity, ideas and the social construction of state interests. The article argues that theoretical pluralism should not be understood as a mechanical combination of different theories, but rather as a conscious and methodologically grounded use of different analytical lenses depending on the research problem, the object of analysis and the nature of the international process under study.



Eureka Journal of Business, Economics & Innovation Studies (EJBEIS)

ISSN 2760-4950 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/6>

Keywords: International Relations, International Relations theory, realism, liberalism, constructivism, theoretical pluralism, world politics, international system, international institutions, norms.

Introduction

International Relations is a complex and dynamic field of study. It examines a wide range of processes, including conflict, cooperation, competition, interdependence and normative change. Traditionally, the state has occupied the central place in the analysis of international politics, since it remains the main bearer of sovereignty, national interest and military-political resources. However, the development of world politics in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries has shown that international reality can no longer be reduced only to relations among states and their foreign policy strategies.

Alongside states, international organisations, transnational corporations, non-governmental organisations, expert communities, social movements, networks and other non-state actors increasingly influence international processes. Contemporary international relations are shaped not only by interstate rivalry, alliances and the interests of great powers, but also by information, migration, trade, cultural and other transnational flows that transform the very nature of world politics [1; 2; 3]. As a result, the subject field of International Relations has expanded, and its analysis requires a more flexible theoretical framework.

The relevance of this topic is determined by the ongoing transformation of the international order, the intensification of geopolitical competition, the growth of global interdependence, the increasing importance of international institutions and the changing role of norms and identities in world politics. International conflicts, security crises, great-power rivalry, global governance, transnational challenges, environmental problems and human rights debates cannot be fully explained within a single theoretical paradigm. Each theory captures a particular dimension of international reality, but each also has its own limits.



Eureka Journal of Business, Economics & Innovation Studies (EJBEIS)

ISSN 2760-4950 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaopenaccess.com/index.php/6>

For this reason, theoretical pluralism becomes especially important. It allows International Relations to be studied not through one universal explanatory model, but through a set of analytical perspectives. In contemporary International Relations scholarship, different theories are often understood as distinct traditions of analysis, each offering its own interpretation of the nature of international politics, the role of actors, and the importance of power, institutions, norms and ideas [1]. A similar tendency can be found in Russian scholarship, where international relations and world politics are also treated as a complex set of processes involving security, conflict, globalisation, integration, disintegration and institutional change [2; 3]. This article focuses on three major theoretical traditions: realism, liberalism and constructivism. Realism emphasises power, security, national interest and the anarchic structure of the international system. Liberalism stresses the possibility of cooperation among states and the role of international organisations, law, trade, democracy and interdependence. Constructivism turns attention to norms, ideas, identity and the social nature of international politics. Taken together, these approaches make it possible to analyse international relations as a multidimensional field in which material, institutional and ideational factors interact.

The purpose of this article is to examine the analytical potential of theoretical pluralism in the study of International Relations through the comparative analysis of realism, liberalism and constructivism.

To achieve this purpose, the article addresses the following tasks: first, to define the role of theory as an instrument of International Relations analysis; second, to identify the key assumptions of realism, liberalism and constructivism; third, to examine the strengths and limitations of each theoretical tradition; and fourth, to justify the need for the combined and critical use of different theoretical approaches in the study of contemporary world politics.

Eureka Journal of Business, Economics & Innovation Studies (EJBEIS)

ISSN 2760-4950 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/6>

The object of the research is International Relations as a field of academic inquiry. The subject of the research is the main theoretical approaches used to explain international political processes.

The methodological basis of the article includes comparative, systemic and historical-theoretical approaches. The comparative approach makes it possible to identify the similarities and differences among the three theoretical traditions. The systemic approach allows international relations to be examined as a set of interconnected actors, institutions, norms and processes. The historical-theoretical approach helps to situate theories of International Relations within the broader evolution of world politics and academic thought.

1. Theory as an Instrument of International Relations Analysis

Theory in International Relations performs not only a descriptive, but also an explanatory function. It helps scholars organise complex international reality, identify causal relationships, determine relevant actors, interpret patterns of conflict and cooperation, and assess possible directions of international change. Without theory, the analysis of international relations risks becoming a mere description of events rather than an explanation of their underlying logic.

A useful way to understand theories is to see them as analytical “lenses”. This metaphor shows that every theory focuses attention on certain aspects of international reality while leaving others less visible. Realism, for example, makes it easier to see the role of power, security and national interest. Liberalism highlights cooperation, international institutions and interdependence. Constructivism brings into focus norms, ideas, identity and the social construction of interests. However, every lens clarifies and limits at the same time. By emphasising some elements of international politics, it may obscure others.

This is why theoretical pluralism is important. It does not mean that all theories should be combined mechanically or treated as equally useful in every case.

Eureka Journal of Business, Economics & Innovation Studies (EJBEIS)

ISSN 2760-4950 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaopenaccess.com/index.php/6>

Rather, it means that different theories should be used critically and consciously, depending on the research question and the nature of the issue being studied. A security crisis may require a realist focus on power and threat perception; an analysis of international cooperation may benefit from liberal institutionalism; and the study of identity, norms or legitimacy may require a constructivist perspective.

P.A. Tsygankov's work on the systemic approach in International Relations is useful in this regard, as it underlines the importance of analysing the international system and the levels through which state behaviour and international processes can be explained [4]. International politics is not simply a chaotic collection of events. It has structure, logic and internal connections. Theory helps reveal not only the visible outcomes of international processes, but also the deeper mechanisms that produce them.

At the same time, contemporary world politics cannot be understood only at the systemic level. Institutional, normative, social, historical and ideational dimensions also matter. For this reason, modern International Relations scholarship increasingly requires not the rejection of theory, but the comparison and careful use of different theoretical traditions. Theoretical pluralism helps avoid one-sided explanations and allows international processes to be examined at several levels at once.

Thus, theory should not be seen as an abstract scheme detached from reality. It is a necessary instrument of academic analysis. It helps determine which actors matter, which issues require attention and which factors explain the behaviour of participants in international relations. In this sense, theoretical pluralism expands the analytical capacity of political science and provides a more balanced understanding of contemporary world politics.

Eureka Journal of Business, Economics & Innovation Studies (EJBEIS)

ISSN 2760-4950 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/6>

2. Realism: Power, Security and National Interest

Realism is one of the most influential and enduring traditions in the study of International Relations. Its significance lies in the fact that it has shaped many of the discipline's basic assumptions about the state, power, security, national interest and the structure of the international system. Although alternative approaches have expanded the field of International Relations, realism remains highly relevant, especially for the analysis of interstate conflict, geopolitical rivalry, military alliances, great-power competition and the balance of power.

At the centre of the realist approach is the state. Realists regard states as the principal actors in international politics because they possess sovereignty, control territory and population, command military resources and make authoritative decisions on foreign and security policy. Non-state actors, such as international organisations, transnational corporations and non-governmental organisations, are not necessarily ignored by realism. However, they are usually treated as secondary actors whose influence depends largely on the interests and power of states. In this sense, realism remains a state-centred theory of international politics.

One of the core assumptions of realism is the anarchic character of the international system. In International Relations, anarchy does not mean disorder or chaos. It refers to the absence of a central authority above states capable of enforcing rules in the same way that governments do within domestic political systems. Since there is no world government that can guarantee the security of all states, each state must ultimately rely on itself. This creates a condition of uncertainty in which even defensive actions by one state may be perceived as threatening by another.

This logic leads to the principle of self-help. States cannot fully depend on the promises, institutions or protection of others. Even when they enter alliances or participate in international organisations, they continue to calculate risks in terms of survival and security. From a realist perspective, cooperation is possible, but it

Eureka Journal of Business, Economics & Innovation Studies (EJBEIS)

ISSN 2760-4950 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaopenaccess.com/index.php/6>

is always constrained by uncertainty, mistrust and concern over relative gains. States may cooperate when their interests overlap, but they also worry that cooperation may strengthen a potential rival more than themselves.

National interest is another central category of realism. In classical realism, especially in the work of Hans J. Morgenthau, international politics is understood through the concept of interest defined in terms of power [5]. This does not mean that moral values, legal principles or ideology are irrelevant. Rather, realism argues that such factors cannot be understood apart from the struggle for power and the need of states to protect their security and position in the international system. For Morgenthau, foreign policy should therefore be analysed not only through declarations or moral intentions, but through the more stable logic of power, interest and political necessity.

Realism also stresses that international politics often involves competition even when states do not openly seek conflict. Because intentions are difficult to know and future behaviour cannot be fully predicted, states tend to prepare for worst-case scenarios. This is why military capabilities, alliances, strategic resources and geopolitical position remain important in realist analysis. The realist tradition is particularly strong in explaining why states continue to prioritise sovereignty and security even in an age of economic interdependence and international institutions.

In neorealism, associated above all with Kenneth N. Waltz, the focus shifts from human nature and the motives of political leaders to the structure of the international system. Waltz argues that the behaviour of states is strongly shaped by the anarchic structure of the system and by the distribution of capabilities among major powers [6]. In this view, international outcomes cannot be explained only by the internal characteristics of states. The structure of the system itself creates constraints and incentives that push states toward balancing, competition and security-seeking behaviour.

Eureka Journal of Business, Economics & Innovation Studies (EJBEIS)

ISSN 2760-4950 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/6>

A key concept in neorealist analysis is polarity. The international system may be unipolar, bipolar or multipolar depending on the distribution of power among leading states. For neorealists, the type of polarity affects the stability of international order, the probability of conflict and the patterns of alliance formation. This structural perspective makes realism especially useful for analysing great-power politics, shifts in the balance of power and the strategic consequences of changes in the international system.

Later developments in realist thought include offensive and defensive realism. Offensive realism, most closely associated with John J. Mearsheimer, argues that great powers seek to maximise their relative power because the anarchic international system provides no ultimate guarantee of security [7]. In this logic, the safest position for a great power is not merely survival, but regional dominance or hegemony, since greater power reduces vulnerability. Defensive realism, by contrast, places more emphasis on the risks of overexpansion. It argues that excessive attempts to increase power may provoke balancing coalitions and ultimately reduce a state's security.

Despite their differences, various strands of realism share a common understanding of international politics as a sphere shaped by power, insecurity and strategic calculation. Realism has strong explanatory value when applied to war and peace, military competition, deterrence, alliance politics, territorial disputes, spheres of influence and the behaviour of great powers. It is particularly useful in periods of international tension, when questions of security and strategic rivalry become more visible.

At the same time, realism has important limitations. Its state-centred character may lead to an underestimation of non-state actors, international institutions, domestic politics, norms and identities. It can also overemphasise conflict and competition while paying less attention to long-term cooperation, legal regulation and normative change. Moreover, realism is often less effective in explaining why

Eureka Journal of Business, Economics & Innovation Studies (EJBEIS)

ISSN 2760-4950 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/6>

states sometimes act against narrow material interests because of identity, legitimacy, reputation or shared norms.

Therefore, realism should not be treated as a complete and universal theory of International Relations. It is better understood as one of the most important analytical lenses through which the power-political and strategic dimensions of world politics can be examined. Its explanatory potential is especially strong in the study of security, war, balance of power and great-power behaviour. However, a more comprehensive understanding of contemporary international relations requires realism to be complemented by liberalism and constructivism, which bring into focus institutional, cooperative, normative and ideational dimensions of world politics.

3. Liberalism: Cooperation, Institutions and Interdependence

Liberalism occupies an important place in International Relations theory and is often presented as an alternative to the realist understanding of world politics. While realism emphasises anarchy, power, security and interstate competition, liberalism argues that international relations cannot be reduced only to the struggle for survival and influence. From a liberal perspective, cooperation, international institutions, law, economic interdependence, democracy, human rights and non-state actors are essential elements of world politics.

Liberalism does not deny the anarchic structure of the international system or the continuing importance of states. However, unlike realism, it does not treat anarchy as an insurmountable obstacle to cooperation. States may develop stable patterns of interaction when they share common interests, expect mutual benefits and operate within institutional frameworks that reduce uncertainty. International organisations, regimes, treaties and legal norms can make state behaviour more predictable, facilitate communication and create incentives for long-term cooperation.

Eureka Journal of Business, Economics & Innovation Studies (EJBEIS)

ISSN 2760-4950 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/6>

One of the most influential strands of liberal thought is neoliberal institutionalism, associated above all with Robert O. Keohane. In *After Hegemony*, Keohane argues that international cooperation can persist even in the absence of a single dominant power [8]. Institutions do not eliminate conflicts of interest, but they help states cooperate by lowering transaction costs, providing information, increasing transparency and creating expectations of repeated interaction. In this sense, institutions matter not because they replace states, but because they shape the environment in which states pursue their interests.

The concept of complex interdependence, developed by Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye, is also central to the liberal tradition. It suggests that contemporary world politics is characterised by multiple channels of interaction among states and societies [9]. These channels include not only official diplomacy, but also economic relations, transnational contacts, international organisations, corporations, expert communities and civil society networks. Under conditions of interdependence, military force does not always serve as the most effective instrument of policy, especially in economic, technological, environmental and humanitarian fields.

The idea of interdependence broadens the understanding of international politics. Realism traditionally gives priority to “high politics”, such as war, security and military rivalry. Liberalism, by contrast, shows that “low politics” — trade, finance, energy, environmental protection, migration, health, education and human rights — can be equally important for the functioning of the international system. These issues are not secondary. They shape everyday forms of interaction among states and societies and often create durable patterns of cooperation.

Another important feature of liberalism is its attention to non-state actors. International organisations, non-governmental organisations, transnational corporations, expert networks, social movements and individuals can influence international agendas, shape norms and affect state behaviour. In this respect,



Eureka Journal of Business, Economics & Innovation Studies (EJBEIS)

ISSN 2760-4950 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaopenaccess.com/index.php/6>

liberalism moves beyond strict state-centrism. It recognises that the state remains a central actor, but not the only source of influence in international relations.

Andrew Moravcsik's liberal theory of International Relations further develops this argument by emphasising the importance of domestic social preferences and state-society relations. According to Moravcsik, state behaviour in world politics is shaped not only by the structure of the international system, but also by domestic groups, economic interests, political institutions and societal preferences [10]. This helps explain why states facing similar external conditions may pursue different foreign policies.

The democratic peace thesis is another important part of liberal thought. It is based on the idea that liberal democracies rarely, if ever, go to war with one another. Their political institutions, public accountability, legal constraints and shared norms make the use of force against other democracies less likely. Michael W. Doyle, drawing on the Kantian liberal tradition, links liberal legacies to a distinctive pattern of relations among democratic states [11]. At the same time, the democratic peace thesis remains debated, especially because liberal democracies have participated in military interventions against non-democratic states. This shows that liberal principles may operate differently depending on the political and institutional character of the actors involved.

Liberalism also attaches great importance to international law and human rights. While realism often views law as dependent on the interests of powerful states, liberalism argues that legal norms and institutions can constrain arbitrary behaviour, establish common standards and strengthen international responsibility. This is why liberal theory is closely connected with the ideas of collective security, humanitarian cooperation, human rights protection and global governance.

The analytical value of liberalism is particularly visible in the study of international organisations, economic integration, global governance, international trade, environmental policy, human rights mechanisms and

Eureka Journal of Business, Economics & Innovation Studies (EJBEIS)

ISSN 2760-4950 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaopenaccess.com/index.php/6>

transnational cooperation. Liberalism helps explain why states continue to cooperate despite disagreements, why institutions remain relevant during crises, and how interdependence can reduce the likelihood or intensity of conflict in certain areas of world politics.

Nevertheless, liberalism also has limitations. Its critics argue that it may overestimate the capacity of international institutions and underestimate the persistence of power politics. Liberalism may also rely on an overly optimistic view of democratisation, the universality of human rights and the ability of international law to regulate the behaviour of powerful states. In practice, institutions and norms often face serious limits when the vital interests of major powers are at stake.

Thus, liberalism reveals dimensions of international relations that realism alone cannot fully explain. It highlights cooperation, institutions, interdependence, domestic preferences, democratic norms and the role of non-state actors. However, liberalism is not a complete theory of world politics. For a more comprehensive understanding of contemporary international relations, it should be considered alongside realism, which explains the role of power and security, and constructivism, which brings into focus norms, identities and the social construction of interests.

4. Constructivism: Norms, Identity and the Social Construction of International Politics

Constructivism occupies a distinctive place in International Relations theory because it shifts attention from material power and institutional cooperation to the social and ideational foundations of world politics. While realism explains international relations mainly through anarchy, power, security and national interest, and liberalism focuses on institutions, interdependence and cooperation, constructivism argues that international reality is not entirely fixed or objective.

Eureka Journal of Business, Economics & Innovation Studies (EJBEIS)

ISSN 2760-4950 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaopenaccess.com/index.php/6>

It is shaped through social interaction, shared meanings, norms, identities and expectations.

Constructivism developed as an influential approach in the late twentieth century, partly as a response to the limitations of neorealism and neoliberal institutionalism. Constructivist scholars criticised rationalist theories for often treating state interests as fixed and given. In contrast, constructivism argues that interests are not formed outside the social context. They emerge through identity, historical experience, norms and patterns of interaction.

One of the central figures of constructivism is Alexander Wendt, whose famous argument that “anarchy is what states make of it” became one of the key statements of constructivist International Relations theory [12]. The importance of this argument lies in the claim that anarchy does not automatically produce conflict, mistrust or self-help behaviour. Its consequences depend on how states understand one another and what meanings they attach to their interaction. States may perceive each other as enemies, rivals, partners or friends. Therefore, the structure of international politics has not only a material, but also a social dimension.

From a constructivist perspective, state behaviour is shaped not only by the distribution of military or economic capabilities, but also by the meanings attached to those capabilities. For example, the military power of an ally and the military power of an adversary may be materially similar, but they are interpreted in very different ways. This means that threats in international relations are not purely objective. They are also shaped by perception, historical memory, political discourse and socially constructed images of the other.

Identity is one of the most important categories in constructivist analysis. It helps explain how states define their interests, allies, adversaries and acceptable forms of behaviour. National, regional, political, cultural or civilisational identities may influence foreign policy priorities, threat perceptions, the choice of partners and participation in international institutions. Constructivism therefore makes it

Eureka Journal of Business, Economics & Innovation Studies (EJBEIS)

ISSN 2760-4950 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/6>

possible to analyse dimensions of international politics that cannot be fully explained only through material resources or rational calculation.

International norms are equally important. Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink show that norms are not secondary elements of world politics; they can shape state behaviour, influence ideas of legitimacy and change international practices [13]. Norms may concern human rights, sovereignty, humanitarian intervention, the protection of civilians, diplomatic conduct or the prohibition of particular forms of violence. They do not appear instantly. They emerge, spread and may eventually become internalised as accepted standards of appropriate behaviour.

This makes constructivism particularly useful for understanding why some forms of conduct in international relations gradually become acceptable, while others become illegitimate or unacceptable. Changes in attitudes toward colonialism, apartheid, genocide, aggression, mass human rights violations and terrorism cannot be explained only by shifts in the balance of power. They also reflect changes in international norms, moral expectations and shared understandings of legitimate behaviour. In this sense, constructivism shows that world politics is capable of normative transformation.

Nicholas Onuf, one of the founders of constructivist thought, understood international relations as a social world created and reproduced through rules, language and practices [14]. This approach makes it possible to see rules not only as external constraints on state behaviour, but also as elements that help constitute social reality itself. States act in a world of meanings, norms and expectations that are continuously produced through interaction.

Constructivism also offers an important perspective on change in international relations. In realist theory, the international system is often presented as a relatively stable structure in which anarchy and the struggle for security remain constant. Constructivism, by contrast, emphasises that the logic of international interaction can change. If identities, norms and interests are socially constructed,

Eureka Journal of Business, Economics & Innovation Studies (EJBEIS)

ISSN 2760-4950 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/6>

they can also be transformed. This opens space for the study of reconciliation, international socialisation, the development of security communities, the spread of human rights norms and changes in foreign policy behaviour.

The analytical value of constructivism is especially visible in the study of international norms, diplomatic practices, foreign policy identity, legitimacy, recognition, reputation and the role of ideas in world politics. It helps explain why states sometimes act not only on the basis of material interest, but also because of status, historical memory, moral responsibility or a sense of belonging to a particular international community.

At the same time, constructivism has certain limitations. Critics argue that its strong focus on norms, identity and discourse may lead to an underestimation of material power, economic interests and military constraints. Constructivist explanations also often require close attention to historical and social context, which makes it more difficult to formulate general models of state behaviour. For this reason, constructivism is most useful not as a replacement for realism or liberalism, but as a complementary approach that reveals the social and ideational dimensions of international relations.

Thus, constructivism significantly broadens the understanding of world politics. It shows that international relations are shaped not only by power, institutions and material interests, but also by norms, identities, meanings and social practices. Within a pluralist theoretical framework, constructivism plays an essential role: it reveals aspects of international reality that remain less visible when only realist or liberal lenses are used. This makes constructivism a necessary component of a more comprehensive analysis of contemporary International Relations.

5. Theoretical Pluralism as a Condition for a Comprehensive Analysis of International Relations

The three theoretical approaches examined in this article demonstrate that International Relations is a complex and multidimensional field that cannot be

Eureka Journal of Business, Economics & Innovation Studies (EJBEIS)

ISSN 2760-4950 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/6>

fully explained through a single research tradition. Each theory highlights a particular dimension of international reality, develops its own key concepts and offers a specific way of interpreting the behaviour of actors. For this reason, theoretical pluralism should not be understood merely as the coexistence of different schools of thought. It is a methodological condition for a deeper and more balanced analysis of world politics [1; 2].

Realism reveals the power-political and strategic dimension of international relations. Its analytical value is especially clear in the study of war, security crises, the balance of power, great-power rivalry, military alliances and spheres of influence. The realist lens helps explain why, even under conditions of globalisation and interdependence, states continue to treat security, sovereignty and survival as fundamental priorities. At the same time, realism does not always fully capture the role of international institutions, norms, identity and non-state actors.

Liberalism, by contrast, highlights the institutional and cooperative dimension of international relations. It shows that states not only compete, but also create durable forms of cooperation through international organisations, treaties, legal norms, trade and economic interdependence. The liberal lens is particularly useful for analysing international institutions, global governance, economic integration, democracy, human rights and transnational cooperation. However, liberalism may underestimate the persistence of geopolitical rivalry and the limits of international law when the vital interests of major powers are at stake.

Constructivism complements both realism and liberalism by drawing attention to the social and ideational nature of international politics. It shows that state interests are not always fixed in advance; they are shaped by identity, norms, historical experience and interaction with other actors. The constructivist lens helps explain changes in international norms, transformations of foreign policy identity, the importance of legitimacy and reputation, and the role of mutual perceptions in world politics. Yet constructivism may be less effective when the

Eureka Journal of Business, Economics & Innovation Studies (EJBEIS)

ISSN 2760-4950 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaopenaccess.com/index.php/6>

analysis requires close attention to material constraints, military capabilities, economic resources and the structural distribution of power.

A comparison of these approaches shows that each theory has both explanatory strengths and limitations. Realism helps explain conflict, insecurity and strategic competition. Liberalism clarifies cooperation, institutions and interdependence. Constructivism reveals the role of norms, ideas and identity. None of these approaches is sufficient on its own. Their value lies in the fact that they make different aspects of international reality visible.

In this context, the metaphor of theories as analytical “lenses” is particularly useful. A lens allows the researcher to see one part of international reality more clearly, but it can also obscure other dimensions. The realist lens focuses on power, but may leave norms and identity in the background. The liberal lens highlights cooperation, but may not always explain the persistence of conflict. The constructivist lens reveals the importance of ideas and meanings, but may understate the role of material power. Therefore, theoretical pluralism does not require the rejection of any single theory. Rather, it requires their critical and conscious use.

A comprehensive study of International Relations should therefore be based not on the search for one universal theory, but on the careful comparison of different theoretical perspectives. Such an approach allows the researcher to view world politics simultaneously as a sphere of power, institutions, norms, identities, interests and social interaction. This is especially important in the contemporary international system, where classical interstate rivalry coexists with global interdependence, institutional cooperation, normative conflicts and transnational challenges.

Thus, theoretical pluralism is an important methodological principle in the study of International Relations. It expands the analytical capacity of political science, helps avoid one-sided explanations and makes it possible to interpret the complex dynamics of contemporary world politics more adequately.

Eureka Journal of Business, Economics & Innovation Studies (EJBEIS)

ISSN 2760-4950 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/6>

Conclusion

The analysis conducted in this article shows that theoretical pluralism is one of the most productive approaches to the study of contemporary International Relations. World politics in the twenty-first century is shaped by contradictory tendencies: geopolitical rivalry, growing interdependence, the continuing role of international institutions, the transformation of norms, and the increasing importance of non-state actors. Under such conditions, reliance on a single theoretical tradition limits the ability to understand the complexity of international processes.

Realism remains highly relevant because it explains the role of power, security, national interest and the anarchic structure of the international system. It is especially useful for analysing conflict, the balance of power, great-power behaviour and military-political competition. Its limitation, however, lies in its insufficient attention to institutions, norms, identity and non-state actors.

Liberalism reveals the possibilities of cooperation in international relations. It emphasises the importance of international organisations, law, economic interdependence, democracy, human rights and transnational ties. At the same time, liberalism does not always fully explain the persistence of power politics or the limits of international institutions when they confront the strategic interests of major powers.

Constructivism broadens the understanding of international politics by focusing on norms, ideas, identity, historical experience and the social construction of interests. It shows that the international system is not a fixed and purely material structure, but a social environment shaped through interaction, interpretation and shared meanings. However, constructivism also needs to be complemented by theories that pay closer attention to material power and structural constraints.

Taken together, these three theoretical traditions perform different but complementary analytical functions. Realism explains the power-political logic of international relations. Liberalism clarifies institutional and cooperative

Eureka Journal of Business, Economics & Innovation Studies (EJBEIS)

ISSN 2760-4950 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/6>

mechanisms. Constructivism reveals the normative and ideational dimension of world politics. Their combined use provides a more complete understanding of international relations than any single theory can offer.

The main conclusion of the article is that theoretical pluralism does not mean abandoning rigorous academic analysis. On the contrary, it requires a more careful, critical and methodologically grounded use of different analytical lenses depending on the research question. Such an approach helps avoid reductionism, takes into account different levels of analysis and provides a deeper understanding of the contradictory dynamics of contemporary world politics. Therefore, theoretical pluralism should be regarded as an essential methodological condition for a comprehensive study of International Relations.

References

- [1] Dunne T., Kurki M., Kušić K., Smith S. (eds.). *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity*. 6th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2024.
- [2] Цыганков П.А. «Теория международных отношений»/ Tsygankov P.A. (ed.). *Teoriya mezhdunarodnykh otnosheniy* [Theory of International Relations]. Moscow: Yurait, 2020.
- [3] Лебедева М.М. «Мировая политика учебник для бакалавров»/ Lebedeva M.M. *Mirovaya politika: uchebnik dlya bakalavrov* [World Politics: Textbook for Bachelor Students]. Moscow: KNORUS, 2013.
- [4] Цыганков П.А. «Системный подход в теории международных отношений» Tsygankov P.A. “Sistemnyy podkhod v teorii mezhdunarodnykh otnosheniy” [The Systemic Approach in International Relations Theory]. *Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta. Seriya 12: Politicheskie nauki*, 2013, no. 5, pp. 3–25.
- [5] Morgenthau H.J. *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1948.

Eureka Journal of Business, Economics & Innovation Studies (EJBEIS)

ISSN 2760-4950 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/6>

- [6] Waltz K.N. *Theory of International Politics*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1979.
- [7] Mearsheimer J.J. *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2001.
- [8] Keohane R.O. *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.
- [9] Keohane R.O., Nye J.S. *Power and Interdependence: World Politics in Transition*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1977.
- [10] Moravcsik A. "Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics." *International Organization*, 1997, vol. 51, no. 4, pp. 513–553.
- [11] Doyle M.W. "Kant, Liberal Legacies, and Foreign Affairs." *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 1983, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 205–235.
- [12] Wendt A. "Anarchy is what States Make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics." *International Organization*, 1992, vol. 46, no. 2, pp. 391–425.
- [13] Finnemore M., Sikkink K. "International Norm Dynamics and Political Change." *International Organization*, 1998, vol. 52, no. 4, pp. 887–917.
- [14] Onuf N. *World of Our Making: Rules and Rule in Social Theory and International Relations*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1989.