



International Security Theories: Between Rational Interpretations and Reflective

Maameri khaled

University of Alger3 (Algeria)

khalouda0505@gmail.com

Abstract ;

The main aim of this study is to achieve a scientific simulation applied to the subject of international security by creating a cumulative knowledge in the theoretical construction of security studies. This is done based on the principle of communicativity, shaping and forming knowledge from a perspective, and formulating important methodological and theoretical contexts to understand the trends of transformation in global politics from another perspective.

Considering that research in this field is a scientific response to a profound problem in international relations, focusing on the effectiveness of perspectives in interpreting international policies from a specific standpoint (such as security).

The study concludes that the new engineering in security studies should originate from the outcomes of reflective theoretical dialogue, especially concerning the security actor. It is crucial not to address the security issue according to an isolated diagnostic pattern that deals with international security based on the separation of the actor, structure, and subject.

Article info

Received

23 January 2024

Accepted

05 March 2024

Keyword:

- ✓ Manuscript
- ✓ Theories of International
- ✓ Security,
- ✓ Rational Perspective,
- ✓ Contemplative Perspective..

1. *Introduction*

Security has been a central topic in the research programs of traditional and even contemporary theoretical frameworks. It is one of the complex issues that international politics scholars have researched the possibility of achieving and developing. Since the first theoretical debate (realism versus idealism) in the period between the first and second world wars, it seemed that the process of reaching a theoretical framework that explains the issue of security as a field of international politics is very difficult because it often intersects with manifestations of the crisis of theorizing in the field of international relations in general.

With the end of the Cold War, some believed that the end of the ideological conflict between capitalism and socialism constituted a turning point in international politics. Many were optimistic that the new situation could lead to the emergence of new societal values that contribute to achieving international cooperation among individuals, societies, and states. This belief prevailed more with the emergence of optimistic currents about establishing a global society dominated by peace and international security. But in contrast to this, some believed that realism would remain the safest analytical frameworks related to the concept of international security and its challenges, especially with the responses and modifications presented

by the new realism. But despite this, the cognitive deconstruction of this theoretical insight came from outside the rational perspective, as modern epistemological theories such as social critical theory, constructivist theory, and postmodern theory began to appear at the end of the Cold War, which generally considered that social reality is not a given, but is built by human will. This new perception was called the constitutive trend, which adopted post-positivist thinking and a post-experimental tendency, with presenting security interpretations contradictory to what the explanatory trend presented, and this contradiction found its justifications in the case of disagreement at the epistemological, ontological, and methodological levels between explanatory and constitutive theories.

Problematic: In light of the centrality of the subject of security as an original research field in the major theoretical debates in the field of international relations, the problem can be formulated as follows: How was the dynamics of theorizing in international security studies formed in light of the rational contemplative dialogue?

This problem also raises two subsidiary questions:

- How was the theoretical construction of rational

interpretations in international security studies established?

- To what extent have the contemplative approaches in security studies responded to the transformations of the international environment in the post-Cold War period?

Hypothesis: Within the framework of seeking to touch on aspects of the problem posed, the following hypothesis can be proposed:

The contributions of rational contemplative dialogue provide a solid methodological basis that accommodates the complexity in building theories of international security.

Theoretical and methodological approach: Based on the nature of the study, total theories in international relations such as realism and liberalism were adopted on the one hand, and social critical theory and postmodernity on the other hand. Also, the methodological context of the subject requires reliance on constructivist theory as a reference theory for understanding the dynamics of research in security studies.

As for the methodological aspect, the descriptive analytical method in its structural and configurative levels was the basic pillar for research in the subject of international security.

2. Rational interpretations in international security studies.

1.2 Structural Realism Analysis:

Many researchers in security studies have shared a deep conviction over decades that the term “security” is one of the mysterious puzzles in the specialty of international relations. Thierry Balzacq pointed out that the process of defining security does not occur without risks, not because of its presence in most areas of social life, but especially because the concept is sensitive in itself as it carries a connoted meaning (Thierry Balzacq, 2004, p34).

On this basis, the proponents of new realism tried from the beginning to establish a new concept of security through the relative separation between the concepts of power and capability, where capability refers to power in the sum of its natural, geographical, economic, political, and ideological factors, not just in its military aspect.

Therefore, we find that power in its broad concept at Kenneth Waltz is linked to the idea of the state’s ability to create a situation of influence and control in a field that is not necessarily combative.

From here and starting from the theoretical construction of new realism and the basic assumptions it presented regarding international politics, it can be said that its security perspective was basically built on the chaotic state of the international system

and the equivalent of a state of war, which is the central assumption of structural realism, especially if we take into account that violence remains a deeply rooted dimension in global politics.

In the context of seeking to find cognitive justifications that expand the concept of security, and the concept of collective security for the Cold War period, there was "a cognitive transition in rational theories (realism and liberalism) from focusing on analysis on units to focusing on analysis on interactions that are predominantly changing (Wasfi Mohammed Aqeel, 2015, p102).

The end of the Cold War represented relative stability in the international system due to the balances of bipolar polarization that was happening between the American and Soviet poles, imposed new challenges in front of the independent political units in the way that the new realists see that it may reflect on the behaviors of states, and therefore the security research of this theory started from the fundamental question about the future nature of international politics in the post-Cold War period, whether it is a consecration of a state of conflict or a trend towards crystallizing the foundations of cooperation and peace.

With the end of the Cold War, security challenges increased and became more complex, especially with the emergence of issues that may not pose a direct threat to

the existence of the state, but the increase in these challenges may undermine its sovereignty and affect its ability to protect its borders and ensure they are not breached, which may lead to the disruption of the state's stability and tension in its relations, whether that is at the internal level of the state or at the level of its interactions with the regional or international systems (Saleha Kebabi, 2017, p 27).

From here, the security perception of new realism, which started from two assumptions, was formed:

- 1- The increase in degrees of security conflict even in a non-war situation, which makes the possibility of wars always expected.
- 2- The shortcomings of cooperative frameworks and their decline in the face of the continuous tendency for power by states.

From these two elements, the realistic approach to security studies was established in its new form, which took the pattern of structural interpretation based on focusing on the structure of the international system in analyzing existing security policies, through researching the structural conditions and data on which the security dilemma is formed.

Kenneth Waltz, who is one of the poles of new realism, believes that the structure of the international system is chaotic in the

sense of the absence of a supreme central government governed by the principle of self-help to preserve oneself.

He sees that anarchy or the absence of government is associated with the occurrence or emergence of violence, and that the threat of violence and the tense use of force distinguish international affairs from internal affairs, and he also believes that the principle of everyone for himself is necessarily the principle of action in a chaotic system, and that in chaos, security becomes the highest goal (Abd al-Nour bin Antar, 2015, p13).

John Herz was the first to clarify the idea of the security dilemma in the fifties of the twentieth century, where he says: "It is a structural concept in which the attempts of states to stay up to their security requirements out of self-reliance and regardless of the purposes of these attempts, lead to an increase in the exposure of other states to danger, as each party interprets the actions it takes as defensive measures and interprets the actions taken by others as posing a potential threat" (John Baylis, Steve Smith, 2004, p418).

Based on this, doubt plays an important role in driving the behaviors of states, especially in an environment characterized by chaos resulting from the absence of a central authority, and the concept of the security dilemma is not limited to the military aspect only, but extends to all

economic and political measures taken by a certain state and perceived by other states as being primarily directed against them and hitting their national security, especially in cases where there is a conflict balance between two or more states.

But the military aspect remains the maximum levels of the formation of the security dilemma and the least possibility of mitigation, that is, the undertaking of a certain state of a set of measures such as equipping the army with military equipment or conducting military maneuvers, for example, is naturally understood by other states based on the global chaos situation as an offensive measure and not defensive, and therefore it represents one of the images of the direct threat that calls for taking defensive deterrent measures that evolve over time into offensive policies, which makes other states also understand it on the basis of the security threat, to form the cycle of the security impasse that is characterized by dynamism and rapid spread, and therefore we understand that the security dilemma does not arise between the conflicting and warring states only but between all units of the chaotic international system.

In light of the consolidation of the security dilemma, security studies in the post-Cold War period, according to the new realists, take the same path that it took in the seventies and eighties of the twentieth century, that is, international politics will

not witness deep transformations at the level of the nature of the international system during this period, and therefore security as a concept or practice will remain linked and even captive to the analytical frameworks explaining the security dilemma.

What reinforces this proposal is the difficulty of consecrating effective cooperative foundations, especially with the consolidation of the contents of the security impasse such as doubt, lack of trust, negative reaction, and other concepts that can contribute to enhancing the state of insecurity at the international level, in addition to this there are two important points in disabling the paths of international cooperation:

- 1- The issue of deception and lack of trust.
- 2- The issue of relative gains.

Because a theory that does not have the tools of change and adaptation does not necessarily have the mechanisms of dominance and survival, new realism tried to make more intellectual and practical attempts to design an accurate framework for security studies. Perhaps what links these attempts is their departure from the issue of the security dilemma in building modified perceptions as brought by Barry Buzan, or alternatives like those presented by Charles Glaser. He presented a picture of international politics different from

those presented by the thinkers of new realism such as Waltz and John Mearsheimer through his research in methods of enhancing cooperation between countries as an alternative to the ongoing state of conflict.

Despite starting from the same structural realist assumptions by adopting the international system as a level of analysis for this reason he is classified as one of the new realists - Glaser was interested in the cases that allow security assurance in a cooperative and not competitive environment.

Therefore, he sees that security is not an abstract state as portrayed by the realists in their various directions, but it is a value conditioned by understanding the international situation in order to realize it.

Duncan Snidal linked between relative gains and the absence of coherence between small states, For example, the smaller state is more interested in the implications of relative gains resulting from its entry into cooperative arrangements with larger states (Anwar Mohammed Faraj, 2007, pp. 414-415).

Therefore, security studies are not an abstract field in the same way that realists dealt with it, but it is an interactive framework built on the foundations of transformation in the international context that imposes deep transformations that affect the essence of the concept of security

and produce variables that affect the practical frameworks for achieving it.

Therefore, it is a changing concept fundamentally linked to the transformations of the international environment, and from here came the term Contingent Realism to distinguish the owners of these ideas from the rest of the realists.

Charles Glaser believes that contrary to traditional wisdom, the general tendency of rivals to compete is not a logical inevitable result of the basic assumptions of structural realism, and he listed three main reasons for the failure of the security perception of new realism (John Bells, Steve Smith, 2004, pp. 421-423):

- 1- Contingent realism rejects the inherent tendency of competition in the new realist theory, as the behavior of states within a world characterized by the tendency of international relations to self-help does not necessarily mean that states are destined for permanent competition leading to wars. As an example, states in the seventies and eighties of the twentieth century preferred cooperation instead of facing the dangers of engaging in an arms race.
- 2- The constant affirmation of structural realism on the issue of relative gains is rejected, as there are those who argue that states often resort to cooperation

exclusively due to the risks associated with the pursuit of relative advantages. Some suggest that it is better in most cases to accept approximate parity instead of striving to achieve maximum gains.

- 3- The emphasis on the issue of deception involves exaggeration. Schelling and Halperin argued that it can be assumed that an agreement that leaves the possibility of cheating is an unacceptable agreement, or that cheating necessarily leads to strategic gains. The risks involved in arms limitation may be more acceptable than the risks involved in an arms race.

2.2 Liberal revisions of international security:

Within the framework of the liberal perception of security studies, which is mainly derived from attempts to simulate the realistic perspective, from the liberal perspective, the debate lies in the fact that the importance of the international system depends on refining the hypotheses related to altruism and irrationality. When we start with the same logical premises for such incentives in the international system, we strive to show that the realism pessimism about cooperation that increases welfare is exaggerated (Niall Ferguson, 2003), Two liberal attempts can be distinguished based on the level of analysis specific to each attempt, especially what is related to the structural level and the institutional level.

The security perception of this trend was based on the idea of Kantian democratic peaceful proposition, which implies that democratic states do not go to wars. This is the idea that Woodrow Wilson adopted at the beginning of the twentieth century to avoid the outbreak of a world war. The existence of internal support for peace, societal control over the actions of the government, unbiased representation of special interests, and equal bearing of burdens in organizing policies lead to avoiding the outbreak of conflicts inevitably.

If we take the ideas of Michael Doyle, we will find him referring to the insightful views contained in Emmanuel Kant's 1795 article titled "Perpetual Peace". Doyle refers to the three elements that Kant presented regarding international security:

- Democratic republican representation
- Ideological commitment to human rights
- Transnational linkage. These elements explain the tendencies towards peace that characterize democratic states (John Bells, Steve Smith, 2004, pp. 428-430).

The truth is that Doyle did not ignore the basic assumptions of realism, but on the contrary, he tried to start from them by questioning the backgrounds and motives that make the relations between states subject to the logic of power and conflict. Therefore, we find that the approach of democratic peace - like other liberal trends

- has established its ideas from the fact that the realistic description of international politics remained short, as it deals on the one hand with chaos in an absolute way, neglecting some forms of international cooperation, and presents on the other hand international interactions in a linear way, that is, without taking into account those actual distinctions between units of the international system, whether at the level of motives or at the level of behaviors.

From here came the presentation of the Kantian foundations as a criterion for classification between states in relation to their democracy. The absence of these criteria in non-democratic - non-liberal - states makes their international behavior a conflict and inclined to violence and war in a way that threatens international security, as we are in front of a realistic international environment, that is, it is characterized by ongoing conflict.

The structural liberal perspective focuses on the relations between the state and society and their impact on global politics, and it is based on three assumptions (Andrei Moravcsik, 2007):

- Individuals and groups in the national civil society and across the international form the basic actors in international politics.
- All political institutions, including the state - the nation, represent the interests of some and not necessarily

all parties of the society under its rule.

- The behavior of the state, which is a determinant of the levels of international conflict and cooperation, reflects the nature and form of the state's purposes and choices.

From here, we can derive justifications for the variation of liberal interpretive models for the states of international conflict and cooperation, based on the aspects that each model addresses regarding the relationship between the state and society.

Relations between states are often interpreted based on their strategic alliances, more than their democratic homogeneity. This is because we may witness, on the other hand, images of the absence of war between democratically and institutionally diverse states if they enjoy a common history or a strategic intersection that guarantees states the achievement of their national interests regardless of the liberal consensus index. This represents a basis for claims rejecting the security perceptions of this trend.

However, this does not prevent the natural state in settling the disputes of democratic states in periods of conflicting interests without resorting to the use of military force or threatening it. This is because common institutional standards restrict the escalation between democracies that resort

to settling their disputes through negotiation, mediation, and other peaceful diplomatic forms.

Therefore, Doyle believes that one of the benefits of democracy is that it addresses disputes before they turn into international conflicts. (John Baylis and Steve Smith, 2000, p 309)

Here, the proponents of this approach intersect with the concept of mature chaos as developed by Buzan.

We understand from this that the democratic hypothesis is fundamentally based on the institutional value consensus to dissipate the interest conflict between democracies as a starting point for interpreting the security policies of states and the cases in which they proceed to war, which becomes an exceptional situation for liberals.

As for Bruce Russett, he presents two important models in his interpretation of the security situation at the internal level and its reflection at the international level, which are: (Chris Brown, 2004, p92)

- The standard cultural model: which is based on non-violence in resolving internal and international conflicts and assumes that the decision-maker takes into account that the decision-maker in the other state will follow the same approach as a result of the prior consensus.

- The structural institutional model: which is based on control and balance systems in disabling decisions to resort to force and violence, as decision-makers in democracies need to obtain the approval of the people before making a war decision.

Structural liberals distinguished between three images of liberalism:

- Commercial liberalism: focusing on the form of mutual dependence (socio-economic explanation).
- Representative liberalism: focusing on the boundaries of the negative representation of national interests.
- Ideal liberalism: relying on the degrees of match and contradiction in national values and the extent to which they direct state behaviors at the international level.

The study of the relationship between the state and society as presented by liberals helps us, in that it provides us with analytical tools different from those used by realism (traditional and new). It pays attention to the variable of the internal pattern of the political system and the extent of its representation as an alternative to the power variable. Even if the proponents of democratic peace do not deny the value of the power variable that drives the strategies of states, including democracies, it becomes less able to

explain in cases where power is distributed equally between states, where internal standards and institutions become the only guarantor to stop the security dilemma and achieve cooperation frameworks that work to enhance international security and peace.

This pattern of analysis has gained great credibility, especially in the post-Cold War period, in which the number of democratic states has increased significantly, in addition to the statistical approach adopted to measure the size of conflicts that occur between liberal states, in an investigation of the hypotheses of the doctrine of democratic peace.

But this achievement is not without some criticisms, especially since Russett himself (who is a neo-liberal) talks about the exceptional cases that threaten the idea of “democracies do not fight”.

Russett calls these cases points of approaching error when hitting the target (Bruce Russett, 1993, P 14-13).

Despite what was mentioned, this liberal trend is criticized for not providing a convincing explanation of the reasons that prevent democracies from fighting and to what extent this is always attributed to the hypothesis of democratic peace.

There is no doubt that the realistic perception of international security has neglected the role of international institutions in reducing the severity of international conflicts and wars. This is

fundamentally linked to the realistic hypothesis that these institutions are a natural expression of the political behaviors of states within an international system characterized by chaos. The analytical construction must be built on statism, not institutionalism, as the latter is a product of the former. The extent to which states ally or fight each other will inevitably reflect on the nature of the work of these international institutions.

However, theoretical and practical transformations in the post-Cold War world have produced a test reality and a real test for these realistic perceptions. Because the academic and even political environment has become sensitive and skeptical of everything that is a realistic plant, the destructive background has printed ideas and contributions of all theories and approaches that followed the realistic theory.

From this, the shaking of the realistic contribution to issues and operations of international relations such as international security is an automatic reflection and companion to the failure of the explanatory power of realism to predict the fall of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War.

The weakness of its handling of global political issues is from the weakness of its prediction of the future of international politics, and this raises a major problem in the theory of international relations about the credibility of relying on the inability to

predict an important event to rule on the failure of a certain theory, especially if this theory is an explanatory theory.

In light of what has been presented, institutional liberalism has confirmed that institutions play a fundamental role in achieving international security and even enhancing internal security through what they have come to possess of powers and elements that allow them to control some aspects of internal matters as a result of the transformations that have affected global politics and which no longer make states act alone in their internal policies.

This liberal institutional approach has been particularly strengthened with the success of some integration institutions such as the European Union and NATO in developing stable security systems, although the end of the Cold War was previously suggested that their role would become extinct and disappear, on the grounds that they were established on the background of the conflict between the Eastern and Western camps. But we witnessed in return a continuation in the integrative European trend through the European Union and a continuous expansion of the Atlantic Alliance, which in itself reflects an argument for institutional success.

There is also a common opinion within the institutional liberal trend that appeared in the eighties and early nineties of the twentieth century among a distinguished group of academic writers such as Timothy

Dunne. These writers believe through it that the emerging pattern of institutional cooperation between states opens the field for unprecedented opportunities in the coming years, and although the past may have been characterized by continuous wars and constant conflict, international relations witnessed significant changes at the end of the twentieth century that provide opportunities to reduce traditional security competition between states (John Bells, Steve Smith, 2004, pp. 426-427)

3. Reflective epistemology as an alternative methodological basis in security studies

1.3 Critical perception of security:

The practice of interpretation on social knowledge removes the characteristic of objectivity and opens the door to multiple theoretical perceptions. According to Chernoff: "Whenever something happens in the social world, there are several ways to interpret and describe it (Fred Chernoff, 2007, P133).

Starting from this proposition, the contributions of reflective approaches in security studies emerged, and here an important note must be recorded, which is that the transition from positivist theories to post-positivist theories should not be a violent and radical transition that deprives us of the required cumulative cognitive function.

Therefore, a flexible transition must be made from the two realistic and liberal theories in their different directions to the critical social theory. This is because much of the academic literature has attributed this theory to the category of explanatory theories as a result of their sharing some commitments with the realistic theory, and by giving importance to the social construction of international politics, and based on this agreement with the new realism regarding the structure of the international system, the critics define the structure in the image that serves their perceptions of global politics and contradicts the positivist frameworks in knowledge. The structure is not a material stratification of the units of the international system, but is a product of the social interaction between these units, and this special perception of the structure presupposes the centrality of man in the political process as an alternative to the state where John Burton "John Burton" does not put the state in the center of international life but man, and the lack of satisfaction of basic needs in the internal system is - according to him - the cause of international tensions. His scheme also starts from man and his basic needs to reach the global community (Jean, Jaques Roche, 2004, P113).

Ken Booth is considered one of the most prominent critical theorists. He believes that the state should not remain the primary reference for security, as it has become in

many cases the primary source of threat for many who live under its authority, rather than being their security guard. Thus, he expands his perception of security, which goes beyond the military threat, and thus supports the idea that human security is more important than state security (Philippe, David Jean Jacques Roche Charles, 2002, P107).

Within this social construct, material distributions are a significant determinant of state behaviors, but they are not alone. The element of knowledge between states, the experience of dealing with interaction situations, and the process of mutual cognition are all factors that contribute to shaping the structure of the international system.

Alexander Wendt presents an alternative concept to the security dilemma depicted by realists, proposing instead the concept of a security community.

Ken Booth believes that security is not a term that is difficult to define in every case. The starting point should start in the experiences, analyses, and fears of those who live in insecurity, disease, or low status (Ken Booth, 2007, P78).

Critics have criticized the neo-realist focus on the concepts of distrust and deception in their grounding of the security dilemma when interpreting international security. What the new realists did not care about is the answer to the origin of the principle of

distrust and deception in guiding international interactions. New realism, which agrees with social criticism in some assumptions, sees that the feeling of states of the existence of security threats - even if these threats are not really and tangibly present - results from the prevailing impression of them, which is ill-will or bad cognition towards other states, especially when it comes to survival threat. Therefore, it directly resorts to the principle of self-help.

But critics believe that the new realistic interpretation ignores the implicit understanding that arises from the interaction of units of the international system, which is the result of either common knowledge or past experiences or rational cognition of the capabilities of each party. Therefore, the security orientation of states is not constant or absolute, it changes according to the nature of each state. The state (A) that realizes from previous experiences that the state (B) is a peaceful state and has not entered into a previous conflict, it is unreasonable for her to interpret her policies as a security threat to her, especially the path that presents us with the security dilemma.

Here, the value of other dimensions than power and chaos in understanding international security emerges, because ideas, law, institutions, and knowledge all play an important role in guiding the

behaviors of states in the international system.

In general, critics argue that the security dilemma and wars result from self-fulfilling prophecies. The logic of reciprocity means that states gain common knowledge about the meaning of power and that they behave based on that, as well as in the capacity of reassurance policies to also help achieve a structure of knowledge that can guide states towards forming a security community that enjoys a greater degree of peace (John Bells, Steve Smith, 2004, pp. 434-435).

2.3 Postmodernism:

At the methodological level, despite the fact that the traditional positivist approach focuses on the unidirectional tendency in the scientific method to distinguish it from non-scientific propositions, post-positivist approaches focus on methodological pluralism because they provide a “different understanding of science” based on the historical and social context (Roland Bleiker and Emma hutchison, 2008, P243), and based on the theoretical construction of postmodernity, we can say that we are in front of a different security perspective or at least proportional to the epistemological and ontological dimensions of this theory.

Starting from the value of discourse, postmodernists consider it the only lens for understanding the behaviors of states and their policies, so security studies according

to them are nothing but a comparative study of diverse security discourses.

From here, and as we have previously proposed, most of the theories that followed the realistic theory tried to draw their perception of global politics against the background of criticizing the realistic perception and even demolishing it (the emergence of the destructive tendency in international relations).

The same thing applies to the two theories of social criticism and postmodernity, as both of them presented their contributions based on criticizing the realistic construction in terms of the formation and development of realistic knowledge and not in terms of realistic ideas. From this, it is very clear how the postmodern theory presented its security perspective starting from criticizing the realistic security proposition or what it expressed as the security discourse of realism.

In his study entitled “The Poverty of Neorealism”, Richard Ashley directs severe criticism to the realistic perception of global politics, where he says:

"Neorealism, as a positivist theory, deals with the structure of the international system as a natural law that mortgages temporal and spatial diversity and abstracts political interactions from the possibility of change. It is an ideology that directs a totalitarian project to the parts of the world and its parts (Paul.R.Viotti, M.V.Kauppi

P19-20). From here, Ashley acknowledges that the realist theory stands as an obstacle to establishing the pillars of an international system that enhances and preserves security. The realistic vision is the one that formulates a political discourse that represents a central problem for the lack of international security, so Ashley describes it as the ideology that carries a totalitarian project that encourages the emergence of security conflicts, considering that - i.e., realism - focuses on the variable of power in understanding state policies. In this context, John Vasquez sees that the policy of power is a picture of the world that encourages behavior that leads to war (Paul.R.Viotti, M.V.Kauppi P19-20), and in this sense, the attempt to balance power is in itself part of the same behavior that leads to war, and according to him, alliances do not produce peace but lead to war.

In light of the above, two important points can be referred to in understanding the postmodern interpretation of security or rather the postmodern criticism of the realistic security perspective:

1- The alternative to the realistic security discourse is a collective security discourse that is based on the variables of cooperation, peace, justice, and mutual understanding on the one hand, and works to uproot the seeds of realistic thinking ingrained in the minds of

politicians and academics on the other hand.

2- Designing security studies by focusing on the new security issues that realists have neglected.

As for the first point, we still have to go back to one of the epistemological foundations of postmodernity to understand the backgrounds of the idea of collective discourse and its motives.

Also, starting from the value of discourse, security studies according to postmodernists are a comparative study of diverse security discourses and the alternative to the realistic security discourse is a collective security discourse that is based on the variables of cooperation, peace, justice, and mutual understanding, and relying on self-knowledge, a cooperative peaceful security discourse is formed, with a normative dimension that aims to create a peaceful security environment, and postmodern thinkers suggest many tools to develop the collective security discourse, perhaps the most prominent of which is resorting to epistemic communities to spread common security values and cooperative and peaceful ideas among states because these communities express objective perceptions of international politics far from the positivist inductions of realists (Jouida Hamzaoui, 2010-2011, p. 17).

This theory seeks multiple interpretations of the world, not as is the case with realists who are looking for one interpretation of one world, everything according to postmodern advocates is subject to interpretation and interpretation from security, power, chaos, and the international system, even history, which is supposed to be a developmental path of agreed-upon events, as well as self-knowledge, not its objectivity, pushes them to form a security discourse with a normative dimension.

The basic value of the theoretical approach is to create a secure and peaceful environment based on a cooperative peaceful discourse. The problem with the realistic security discourse is that it presented a solid and coherent vision of international security characterized by closure and cognitive stone that deals with the human mind as a realistic mind that cannot think in alternative security frameworks and interpretations.

As for the second point, postmodernists have tried, based on the methodological deficiency of realists in dealing with the security phenomenon, to develop a new security research agenda different from those addressed by the previous theoretical and analytical frameworks, by deconstructing traditional assumptions in the security debate as a chaos assumption in the international system and the power assumption in guiding state policies.

The postmodern security construction argued about the nature of global politics and refused to deal with this issue as a fate or a given, but on the contrary, it is looking at how to change the directions of international policies by drawing new interactive paths between states, i.e., the theory performs a constitutive constructive function, for this reason, positivists, and at the forefront of them, new realists - postmodernity describes it as less contemplative than it claims, and that it is a theory that is dominated by the philosophical character more than the procedural character, which makes the benefit of the political decision-maker from it less in comparison with rational theories when making his decision (Wasfi Muhammad Aqeel, 2015, p. 108).

4. The constructivist approach to security studies assumes the instability of social factors.

For example, the concept of sovereignty in our contemporary time has been greatly influenced by international intervention under the umbrella of human rights, and therefore the rights and obligations of any state in its region decrease or increase according to its respect for human rights. Constructivism supports the idea of inter-subjectivity, as constructivists “are interested in the ideas that actors share” (Greg Cashman, 2004, P466).

The formulation of ideas in the form of shared answers determines the contents of

the identities of states: such as China's struggle to build a global identity, Russia's pursuit to regain its great status after the disintegration of the Soviet Union (Paul D'Anieri, 2002).

The constructivist theory sees that the realistic neorealist interpretation of the security dilemma is an absolute interpretation of security relations in global politics, as the new realists acknowledge that the threat is not always one in all cases, because the element of collective perception always controls the formation and direction of threats. For example, America's or any NATO member state's view of French nuclear weapons is not the same as its view of North Korean or Iranian nuclear weapons, because the preconceived idea about these countries is different even though the nuclear threat is one for America.

This constructivist perception can be called "security self-duality". That is, researching the formations and social interactions of actors to perceive the security situation.

In the view of constructivism, standards represent a set of actors' understandings, regulate the behavior of states, and determine their identity and interests. It is an independent interpretive variable that allows states and structures (standards-institutions) to interact with each other (JEFFRY CHEKEL, 1998, P 327-328).

Constructivism found its suitable environment in the post-Cold War world, as the last decade of the twentieth century witnessed a wide turnout for the concept of culture, which is the development that constructivism witnessed in its focus on the importance of ideas, values, and standards. Peter Katzenstein used cultural variables to interpret and understand the reasons that led Germany to not adopt a military policy even though it possesses high technology to do so (Abdul Nasser Al-Din Jandali, 2004-2005, p447).

This constructivist proposal has harmonized a lot with the growing new international transformations, especially with the decline of the state in its Westphalian concept, and also the emergence of many forms of ethnic and racial conflicts against the backdrop of the fall of the Soviet Union.

The constructivist theory started to present its security alternative through severe criticism of the rational perspective at two levels:

- 1- The realist liberal failure to predict the end of the Cold War, as constructivists attribute this to the lack of familiarity of these two theories with the non-material aspects in the international system and in particular the new ideas that began to be circulated at various levels in the international community.

2- The lack of theoretical flexibility for both realism and liberalism in understanding and perceiving the deep causes of the collapse of the Soviet Union, as it reduced its vision of the event within the limits of the reflection of international environmental transformations on the Soviet Union, while neglecting the internal changes of Soviet society - which is always blamed on the material interpretation of realism according to constructivists -

According to constructivism, the realist shortcoming in understanding the security environment during the Cold War period is manifested in its resort to the distributive method of power when interpreting the end of this war. In the sense that the fall of the Soviet Union is from the power of the United States, while the truth as constructivists see it lies in the new security policies that Gorbachev consolidated with regard to his adoption of the idea of international collective security.

The constructivist approach to security studies was founded on the basis of a double deconstruction of:

- The relationship of identity to interest and how that leads to the formation of the security behaviors of actors, and not chaos as realism neorealism acknowledges when it proposes the security dilemma.

- Chaos is what states make as Wendt said, and it is not a given situation because it is a result and not a cause.

For constructivists, the security dilemma is not an empirical phenomenon, as Alexander Wendt argues that it is a social structure consisting of self-concepts among individuals in which states are at a degree of distrust towards other states, so that they assume the worst possibilities about each other's intentions, and on this basis, they determine their interests from the standpoint of self-help (John Baylis, Steve Smith, 2004, pp. 314-315).

The constructivist theory focused on the variable of Identity, which all previous explanatory theories neglected, but more than that, the failure of some theories is primarily due to this neglect as indicated by the failure of realists to understand the new forms of conflicts, especially the internal ones, considering that most of them are conflicts that are controlled and fueled by the element of identity.

This latter, along with ideas, perception, and standards, determines how the interests of actors are formed, and the direction they take in their international behaviors, either competitively or cooperatively. Wendt says that the identities and interests that rationalists consider to be existing data that they see as produced in the international politics we observe, are in fact not data, but things we have created, and after we have created them, we can create them

differently and that will be difficult, because we have all worked to give a self-characteristic to the way the world exists, but we can make it otherwise (John Baylis, Steve Smith, 2004, p.397).

Rational theories did not deal with the identity of the actor in a serious way, because they considered it a constant given that does not push us to understand the differentiation in the actions of states. For example, we find that new realism links these actions to the chaotic structure of the international system, while new liberalism refers them to the institutional interactive process in international relations, and in both cases, states are viewed as independent actors that only express their own national interests. While constructivism sees that if interest in the identities of actors increased, we could form common interests that express collective identities that make us go beyond the state conception of security studies to the collective conception that is based on guaranteeing the general rules common among states.

In fact, the collective identity comes through interaction, unlike the narrow state identity that comes before interaction. Therefore, the constructivist focus is on the way in which the interactive path in global politics is formed among international players, that is, interest in the image at the moment of interaction regardless of the way of interaction.

Despite the constructivists' sharing with the neorealist realists in adopting the chaotic view of international relations, the concept of chaos does not occupy the same place and analytical value for both of them, as the chaos of the international system is not the cause of everything as realists believe, as the social structure and its collective perception are only capable of perceiving or interpreting the results or effects of system chaos. Therefore, constructivists believe that chaos is closer to being a structured mixture resulting from the practice of the actors themselves (Ammar Hajar, 2002, p. 43).

Where chaos, according to the writings of the father of constructivism, Alexander Wendt, is a basic feature of the international system, especially in the post-Cold War period, as chaos according to him is a natural thing in the international system, chaos according to Wendt is the product of what states make, and is not a law in itself, it is a social structure based on ideas, and is not a rooted phenomenon in the international system (Abdul Nasser Jandali, 2005, p. 115).

In their endeavor to reject linking security interpretations to the chaotic characteristic of the international system, constructivists argue the new realist argument that says that the nature of the international system puts states in front of one choice, which is self-reliance.

As Wendt says in this regard, collective meanings determine the structures that regulate our actions, and actors obtain their interests and identities through their participation in these collective meanings. The identities and interests have a relational definition as we know the situations, and the institutions are relatively stable groups of identities and interests, and self-help is one of these institutions. Therefore, it is not the only way to collect definitions of identities and interests in a state of chaos.

That is, self-reliance is not the only way to overcome the issue of the chaos of the international system, because this is a prior interpretation of the state in which the actors are. It is true that resorting to this option is imposed on states, but not for the chaos of the system but for the behaviors of the actors (states). From this, certain changes in the behavior of the state may lead to the emergence of bilateral and multiple understandings between the active parties in the system, and even if constructivism acknowledges the difficulty of getting rid of the issue of self-help, it aspires not to turn into a social system inspired by states.

In light of the above, the constructivist conception of security relations can be understood in the form of a security equation, the ends of which are two states (A, B), when state (A) resorts, according to the neorealist realistic conception, to taking certain political, military, and economic

measures in the form of self-reliance in order to achieve the goal of survival, the second state (B) adopts the same behaviors to realize the same goal.

But the constructivist theory imagines that if state (A) took confidence-building measures and reduced its excessive defensive behaviors, it might push other states to go along the same path, which makes both states (A) and (B) search for other tools to achieve their survival away from the self-help system, which reduces the chances of achieving international security according to constructivists.

Indeed, constructivism, while adopting the same central premise of neorealism (chaos), differs in its interpretation of state behaviors as being subject to social interpretations in the form of beliefs, interactions, and standards, and it is not chaos that drives the formation of behavioral patterns for actors.

The value of the multidimensional analysis provided by constructivist theory emerges in its formulation of broad conceptual frameworks that include variables overlooked by traditional perspectives, such as social knowledge, the relationship of identity to interest, structure, and mutual formation, etc.

Therefore, the constructivist contribution essentially came to establish the bridge linking rational theories and reflective theories. It did not deny all the cognitive

premises of the rationalists as the critics and postmodernists did, but it started from some of them to reach different results as we saw in their interpretation of chaos. It also, in contrast, was founded on the background of deep criticism of traditional theoretical construction.

Wendt, for example, sees that the mistake of rationalists lies in their exaggeration in thinking that identities and interests exist before interaction, and based on that, he rejects what is called the automatic security dilemma of states that depict the state in a situation similar to individuals, because that presupposes that states have obtained selfish interests and identities before their interaction processes (John Baylis, Steve Smith, 2004, p. 396)...

In general, constructivists see security studies as a social interactive system, not a rigid field that is content with monitoring the material relations between the basic units in the international system.

In light of the state of complexity of the internal contexts of rationality and reflection, Smith argued that what unites the reflectors is opposition to rationality in the absence of a suitable alternative (Smith, Steve, 2000, P383). The difference in reflective premises draws dividing lines between the reflectors themselves (Helena Rytovuori-apunen, 2005, P151), not just between rationalists and reflectors, which makes the measurability of theories non-existent on the one hand. On the other hand,

there is a denial of the existence of objective foundations in theoretical construction, which increases the gap of cognitive separation in the discussion, and bets on the failure of post-projects as an alternative to the crisis of positivist epistemological philosophy, due to their lack of an alternative content for positivism and their lack of liberation from alternative labels.

In general, it can be said that the historical path of constructivism, with what it produced from classifications, has affected its internal consistency and its location as a middle ground in the fourth debate, the multiplicity of constructivists means the existence of several constructivist readings. According to Price and Smith., There are two classifications of constructivism - according to the content -: modernist constructivism that searches for causality through questions related to (why?), And postmodern constructivism that searches for how through asking questions (how?) .(Reus-Smit, 1996, p10)

5. CONCLUSION

in general, and in light of the ongoing theoretical discussion between security approaches, new theories have seized the most important academic and even practical space to develop their conceptual and analytical frameworks in line with the size of accelerated and accumulated international transformations, especially with the increasing shift in the

manifestations and operations of international politics, which led to the emergence of globalization as an accumulated pattern of changes, and with the knowledge revolution that affected various branches of social sciences, where a tendency to doubt the ability of positivist philosophy to develop effective cognitive frameworks that capture the complexities of the social phenomenon, especially with the emergence of the post-positivist tendency as an alternative thinking tool.

Based on what was touched upon through the axes of the study, it can be acknowledged that any integrated engineering in international security studies should start from the following two considerations:

- The theoretical differences in describing the security phenomenon and determining the chain of variables that are classified as within the circle of the security interest of states, but the divergence also appeared in the fact of dealing with the state as the reference security unit in security studies and to what extent it is a unified and independent security actor.
- Methodological differences in addressing the security issue, especially with the emergence of new philosophical tendencies - the post-positivist tendency - pushed towards theoretical approaches that carry epistemological determinants and

intellectual contents contrary to what was brought by traditional trends with positivist philosophy such as realistic theory. It has included new dimensions overlooked by previous frameworks such as the role of ideas and interest in social contexts in the formation of the phenomenon, which we touch in the dispute over the concept of security as an existential situation or a societal condition.

These considerations have added a state of severe complexity in security studies and placed them in front of intractable conceptual overlaps in a form that is more like what we can call “the complex security blend” (power, chaos, cooperation, the international system, institutions, identity, ideas, religion, language, discourse, ... etc).

6. reference list:

1. Abdelnour Ben Antar, (April 2005), “The Evolution of the Concept of Security in International Relations”, International Politics, Issue 160.
2. Anwar Mohamed Farag (2007), The Realist Theory in International Relations, A Comparative Critical Study in Light of Contemporary Theories, Kurdistan Center for Strategic Studies, Sulaymaniyah.
3. John Baylis, Steve Smith, (2004), Globalization of World Politics, Gulf Research Center, UAE.

4. Joudia Hamzaoui (2010-2011), The European Security Perception: Towards a Comprehensive Security Structure and Strategic Identity in the Mediterranean, Master's Thesis in Political Science, Specialization in Maghreb and Mediterranean Studies in Cooperation and Security, Haj Lakhdar University, Faculty of Law and Political Science, Department of Political Science, Algeria.
5. Saleha Kabbabi (2017), The New Threats to Security in International Relations, The Algerian Journal of Human Security, Volume 02, Issue 01, Batna University, Algeria.
6. Abdelnasser El Din Jandali, (2004-2005) Reflections of the Transformations of the International System After the Cold War on the Major Theoretical Trends in International Relations, A Thesis Submitted to Obtain a State Doctorate in Political Science, University of Algeria, Algeria.
7. Abdelnasser Jandali (2005), Reflections of the Transformation of the International System After the Cold War on the Theoretical Trends in International Relations, Doctoral Thesis, Department of Political Science and International Relations, Faculty of Law and Political Science, University of Algeria.
8. Ammar Hajar, (June 2002), The European Security Policy Towards its Southern Mediterranean, A Thesis Submitted to Obtain a Master's Degree in International Relations, Batna University, Faculty of Law, Department of Political Science.
9. Wasfi Mohamed Aqeel (2015), The Cognitive Transformations of Realism and Liberalism in Contemporary International Relations Theory, Studies of Humanities and Social Sciences, Volume 42, Issue 1, Jordan.
10. Andrew Moravcsik, (2007), "Federalism and Peace: A Liberal-Neorealist Perspective", an electronic article published on the link: <https://www.liberaldemocraticpartyofiraq.com/serendipity/index.php?/archives/649-unknown.html>, consulté le 18/09/2023.
11. Bruce Russett (1993), Grasping The Democratic Peace: Principles For a Post Cold War World, Princeton University Press.
12. Chris Brown, Understanding International Relations, 3rd edition, palgrave, 2004.
13. chris Reus-smit (1996), the constructivist turn: critical theory after the cold war, working paper N°1996/4, National library of Australia, Canberra, Australia.
14. David Baldwin(ed) (1993), neorealism and neoliberalism: the contemporary debate, columbia university press,
15. Emmanuel Navon (oct,2001), the second debate: two visions of knowledge, Cambridge universitypress, uk.
16. Fred Chernoff (2007) ,theory and metatheory in international Relations: concepts and contending accounts, palgraf macmillan, NY.
17. Greg Cashman (2004) 'what causes war? An introduction to theories of international conflict', Maryland: Rowman & littlefield.
18. Helena Rytovuori-apunen(2005) ,"forget'post-positivist'IR !the

legacy of IR theory as the locus for a pragmatist turn", *Cooperation and Conflict*.

19. Jean Jaques roche(2004), théories des relations internationales, Séme édition, Montchrestien, Paris.

20. Jeffry Checkel(1998), the constructivist turn in international relations theory, "world politics.

21. John Baylis and Steve Smith, (2000), *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*, Oxford University Press.

22. Ken Booth (2007), *Theory of World Security*, Cambridge University Press, UK.

23. Niall Ferguson: *Hegemony or Empire?* *Foreign Affairs*, September/October ,2003 www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/bush/ferguson.htm, Consulté le 10-09-2023.

24. Paul D'Anieri (2002), *Russian foreign policy: continuity•revolution•and the search for status•* in Ryan K. Beasley et al.(eds.), *foreign policy in comparative: domestic and international influences on state behavior*, DC: CQ press, Washington

25. Paul.R.Viotti (2011), M.V.Kauppi, *International Relations Theory*, 5th edition , pearson.

26. Philippe David, Jean Jacques Roche (2002), *Théories de la sécurité : définition, approches et concepts de la sécurité internationale*. Paris, Montchrestien.

27. Roland Bleiker and Emma Hutchison (2008) , "fear no more :Emotions and world politics", *Review of international studies* vol.34 .

28. Smith, Steve. (2000)"the discipline of international Relations: still an american social science?" *British journal of politics and international Relations*.

29. Thierry Balzacq(2003-2004) , "Qu'est-ce Que La Sécurité Nationale?," *La Revue Internationale et Stratégique*, vol No. 52.