

THEORIES OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND THEIR APPROACH TO SECURITY ISSUES

Ján Marek¹

Armed Forces Academy in Liptovský Mikuláš

Pavel Bučka

Armed Forces Academy in Liptovský Mikuláš

Abstract

In the 21st century, security is being discussed very often and extensively throughout the world it is one of the highest values in the life of all mankind and in the personal life of every human being. Although there are great historical, cultural and political differences between continents or even between regions we can say that humanity as a whole has experienced many historical stages characterized by concern for safety or even survival was at the top of the imaginary scale of values. Opposite that period of calm and reduced concerns about the security of states or even the whole world used to be, unfortunately, rarer and also shorter. Opinions on security have undergone a rich historical development, which has resulted in a number of established concepts that are commonly used in discussions on this topic. It follows that in the study of international security relations, it is essential that we use the most important terms and at the same time show that the meaning and content of these terms are often explained from different angles. It is therefore very important to examine the various theories of international relations and their approach to security issues.

Keywords: security; international security relations; development; theories.

INTRODUCTION

In international relations, security is defined as a fundamental value and the ultimate goal of any state or multi-state security community. Security as a condition is most often explained as the absence of a threat the highest values of the state or community. The state is safe if the defense of its territory and the values that lie on it, the functioning of its institutions, is ensured and protection of the population (Warren 2019, 50–54). As far as states are concerned, there is talk of an objective and subjective sense of their security. The first of these cases means that the values shared by society are not exposed to any direct threat. And subjective sense means that there is no fear that these shared values could be attacked. They are then derived from these fundamental questions: what dangers could threaten the security of the state and its survival, how could show how to deal with them (Waissová 2004, 78). Each state's efforts to ensure its own security focus on three main goals. The first goal is to eliminate possible threats, whether military or non-military character. The second is to ensure internal order and coherence, which is stronger the clearer the collective nature of the decisions taken. And finally, the third goal it is linked to ensuring the justice and security of citizens. State security can also be defined negatively or positively. According to the negative definition, security is a state under which the state is not exposed to any direct and an urgent threat and the ideas on which it was based are not called into question. We can talk about a positive definition of the security of states or security communities in that where the defense of their territory and of the values situated therein is ensured, when their institutions can function and their population is protected (Buzan, et al. 2009).

Security issues are constantly addressed in all theories of international relations. The most important are realism/neorealism, liberalism/neoliberalism, constructivism and critical theory (Figure1).

¹ Corresponding author: jan.marek@aos.sk

Each of these is the result of an examination of international security relations and a certain perspective. None of them is perfect; none of them has universal validity. The relevance of any of these theories is not absolute, it is always relative. In examining international security relations, it is not possible to prove the truth of one theory and at the same time it is not possible to reject one theory at the expense of another. The theory of international relations is not a direct coherent discourse, it is a dialogue between conflicting paradigms that has been going on for several centuries and which will continue for a long time to come (Sheehan 2005, 201).

In the research we will clarify the liberal-idealistic approach, the realistic school, the constructivist approach, critical theories and radical theories views on international relations. The research focused on indication of shortcomings in the case of realism and liberalism and for a basic assessment in the case of the constructivist approach, critical theory and radical theory. Before ruling any court on the solved scientific problem of international relations and their approach to security issues, we try to determine how it coincides with objects that are already known to us and how they differ from them. For this reason, we used the method of comparison in the research, which is of great importance in clarifying the processes of change, development and dynamics of the researched problem and the regularities of its development. In addition, qualitative methods of information analysis and synthesis were used, which are used at all stages as well as at all stages of scientific research (Snyder, 2017, 117).

LIBERAL-IDEALISTIC APPROACH

He sees the liberal-idealistic approach to international security relations primarily as the result of security cooperation between states that, in their mutual relations, favour friendliness and cooperation over conflicts and wars. Liberalism is based on Kant's theory of democratic peace, in which democratic states prefer peace to war in relations with other democracies, because the basic interest of their people is to secure life and well-being, as opposed to costly and unnecessarily costly violent adventures (Huntzinger 1987, 731).

COMPETING PARADIGMS	REALISM	LIBERALISM	CONSTRUCTIVISM
Main Theoretical Proposition	Self-interested states compete constantly for power or security	Concern for power overridden by economic, political considerations (desire for prosperity, commitment to liberal values)	State behavior shaped by elite beliefs, collective norms, and social identities
Main Units of Analysis	States	States	Individuals (especially elites)
Main Instruments	Economic and especially military power	Varies (international institutions, economic exchange, promotion of democracy)	Ideas and discourse
Modern Theorists	Hans Morgenthau, Kenneth Waltz	Michael Doyle, Robert Keohane	Alexander Wendt, John Ruggie

Figure 1. Three main theories of International Relations (Introduction to International Relations Theory & Its Problems, 2012, <https://medium.com/discourse/introduction-to-international-relations-theory-its-problems-500197447a63>)

Two basic methods – collective security and arms control

Karen Mingst states that the liberal idealistic approach favours two basic methods of averting threats between states: collective security and arms and disarmament control

(Mingst, et al. 1998, 172). The first method, that is, collective security, is based on the idea that members of a certain group of states warn against the use of force in their mutual relations and seek to defend any of them that would be attacked by external forces. The highest level of mutual security guarantees is collective defence, which is the basis of NATO, just as it was the basis of the Warsaw Pact, which existed in 1955-1990. It is based on the provision that an attack on one of them will be considered an attack on the others. In this context, equally hard security has recently been used (Nayef 2007).

Three preconditions for collective security

Collective security is based on three basic assumptions. According to the first of them, it is possible to prevent wars by restricting military actions. The second assumption is that it is possible to stop the aggression, because it is possible to easily detect the aggressor and prevent him from carrying out his intentions. And according to the third assumption, the aggressor knows that the international community would punish him for his action. However, the history of international security relations has shown that there are a number of pitfalls in fulfilling these preconditions: it is still not easy to say who an aggressor is, it has often happened that an aggressor has not been punished (Wilson 2014, 11).

Arms control and its basic characteristics

The second method - arms control and disarmament – is based on the assumption that fewer weapons means more security, and expects this assumption to reduce the cost of the security dilemma. Post-war history contains a number of agreements that have contributed to international security relations. However, even arms control cannot overcome the security dilemma, nor has it been possible to prevent an increase in the number of nuclear-armed states (Coe, Vaynman 2020, 342).

Pros and cons of a liberal-idealistic approach

Both basic methods of the liberal-idealistic approach in the study of the threat of war place a decisive emphasis on the collective efforts of the international community. As such, relations between democratic countries, which have very close, if not even the same expectations, approaches to issues of peace and security, are well suited. The more democracy there is in the world, the better for international security cooperation.

However, the liberal-idealistic approach also has two basic pitfalls. The first is relations between democratic states on the one hand and undemocratic or even dictatorial on the other. The second pitfall is the interrelationship between undemocratic and dictatorial states (Huntzinger 1987, 107). The Cold War has shown that the first pitfalls can be addressed by arms control and confidence-building measures. The second pitfall is much more serious — dictatorial states can only cooperate as long as they have common interests and goals. If this is not the case, security cooperation will end and armed conflicts will ensue. The most serious and toughest war between the two dictatorial regimes was the Iraqi-Iranian war in 1980-1988.

REALISTIC SCHOOL

Basic characteristics and the most important authors

The realist school differs from liberalism in that it places significantly less hope into the international community and is all the more focused on the power of individual states and their influence on international politics. According to realists, this is the result of relations between states characterized by congenital inconsistencies. Realists are the main feature of the behaviour of states considers a sustained effort to fulfil their interests. At the top of the hierarchy interests of all states are the vital interests, which are the survival of the state, the preservation of its territorial integrity and political sovereignty. Realists attach great importance to strength and determination states to use it in order to achieve their objectives.

Hans Morgenthau, author of the "Bible of Realism" (Morgenthau 1965), formulated 6 principles of a world of conflicting interests, in which "one must strive to do as little evil as possible than the

realization of absolute good" (Drulák 2003, 57). For an objective and universally valid category he described the national interest and the survival of the state as the absolute interest. This clearly defined what may be the subject of the most serious security threats.

Kenneth N. Waltz, considered the founder of neorealism, concluded that "Each state promotes its own interests, using methods that it considers to be those best. To the extent that there is no consistent and reliable process for reconciling conflicts interests, in which, in conditions of anarchy, similar units necessarily end up, force is one of the tools for achieving external goals. Foreign policy built on such a conception of international relations is neither moral nor immoral, but reflects with a rational response to the world around us".

K. Waltz followed the concept of survival as an absolute interest of every state. He stressed that only those States can survive in the anarchic structure of international relations, which are constantly looking after their security. K. Waltz considers security threats to be one of the key factors in the anarchic structure of international relations. States cooperate if they perceive a threat and evaluate it as a common threat. When such a threat disappears, cooperation also weakens.

According to classical realists, the behaviour of states is a manifestation of innate human inclination to gain power and to maintain and strengthen it. And so they conclude that "In some countries, vital interests may expand and away from interest in survival to advance international influence" (Walt 1998, 84). Realists see international security relations as a constant rivalry between states for power and security. They consider economic and especially military force to be the main tools for achieving security interests. They expected the post-bipolar world to return to open rivalry for power and influence on world politics.

Robert Cooper states that realism is characterized by the idea that "it can be good in the end be bad for the people you serve. Moral goals can also be achieved by that you think in the plane of force and its retention instead of constantly clamping yourself only to what you consider morally good" (Cooper 2005, 25). At the same time, however, he draws attention to the basics the pitfall of realism in the field of security - it is the restriction of power to exclusively military tools. He considers military interventions to spread democracy to be particularly risky and stability. Recognizes that intervention armies can create a favourable external security environment, but points out those intervening armies are not equipped to abroad create constitutional arrangements (Baylis 2011, 234).

Balance of forces as a central category

Realists conclude that conflicts of interest, conflict and war are essential features of international security relations. They believe that peace can only exist on the basis of a balance of power. They do not consider this to be the ideal solution and acknowledge that it is not synonymous with justice. At the same time, however, they view the balance of power as for the only effective protection against egoism, shocks and inclinations to hegemonies. Neorealist "renounce anthropological premises in favour of a systemic imperative: the need to ensure survival in an anarchic environment without a sovereign that would ensure security, means that states must take care of the means to provide them duration" (Morgan 2000, 371).

The balance of power is based on the premise that states strive to ensure their security makes rational and predictable assessments of the costs and benefits of its policies, and there is international balance is ensured. This is considered to be the most important way of ensuring security. The disadvantages of this method are manifested in times of revolutionary change in international security relations.

Basic methods of achieving balance of forces

There are several methods for achieving and maintaining a balance of power in international security relations as a prerequisite for stability. The following are most often mentioned: (Terrif, at al.1999, 56-57)

- a "divide and rule" policy, in which the balancer joins the side of a weaker state, and thus reduce the advantage of a stronger state,
- territorial compensation for war winners,

- the creation of "buffer states" zones,
- building security alliances,
- maintaining spheres of influence,
- intervention,
- diplomatic negotiations,
- dispute settlement through legal and peaceful instruments,
- starting a war as a way to maintain or restore the required balance.

Deterrence

The theory of deterrence is based on the belief that war between states can be averted through the threat of the use of force. The first prerequisite for its effectiveness is the rationality of those who make decisions on behalf of states - they are expected to avoid war. The second assumption is that the weapons forming the deterrent potential have such destructive force that no politician will commit to armed aggression against the country, who owns these weapons. And the third assumption says that war always has an alternative. In other words, the threat must be very serious and credible, and at the same time there are viable non - military solutions to conflicts of interest in security relations between states or coalitions (Mingst, et al.1998, 360).

We can be a textbook example of the fulfilment of all the above assumptions considered the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962. The then American President J. F. Kennedy bet on the rationality of his then Soviet Opponent N. S. Khrushchev, relied on the credible deterrent potential of the United States and directed the negotiations to an alternative solution, which was the dismantling of Soviet launchers missiles in Cuba.

Basic shortcomings of realism

Patrick Morgan evaluates them very aptly: (Morgan 2000, 45–47)

- it cannot be shown that international anarchy must have precisely the same consequences as claims realists,
- realists and especially neorealist describe international security relations too much static and cyclic,
- realists overestimate the importance of state preferences in the field of security and do not appreciate the importance of such factors as the effects of currents of opinion within states,
- the liberalization effects of US policy during the cold period remained out of their interest of war.

CONSTRUCTIVIST APPROACH

A constructivist approach to security issues and security cooperation is characterized, first of all, by doubts that there are solid, unchanging quasi-natural structures in international security relations. It rejects the view, that the conduct of states and other security policy makers would be determined in advance by some laws of an international nature. Constructivists believe that international security relationships are dependent on the interpretation of the actors, and are therefore socially constructed. He views structures in international security relations and the behaviour of states as controllable and variable phenomena. State action can have a greater or lesser effect on international security structures. Based on this, there are more or less significant ones' changes in the international security environment.

The constructivist conception of international security relations is based on two things basic elements. The first is structures that give states and security communities the opportunity to ease international tensions and widen the scope for non-aggressive behaviour. The second element is security policy actors (most often States) – they create and influence the structures and tools of action that are an alternative to rivalry and tendencies to gain dominance. International structures are designed and used to promote positive constitutive and regulatory changes standards of international security relations. Constructivists recommend a safety culture (Katzenstein 1996), which they see as

a set of values, norms and practical measures for theoretical and practical activities in the field of security. They see security culture as a stabilizing structure that is the result of the interaction of security discourses.

CRITICAL THEORY

Critical theory is most often characterized as a guide to strategic action towards an alternative arrangement. Richard Devetak adds that "Critical international theory considers the current order to be full of inequality and injustice on a global scale, and it also bases its leaning on it to an alternative vision of the world order." (Devetak 1996, 151). This approach is also reflected in research international security relations – R. Devetak calls it "critical security studies". These differ from traditional security studies in that, in addition to the basic ones Two more questions ask "what is security?" The first of them express the words "who and against whom is security ensured in the current international order?" The next question is "whose security should we care about?" This defines the key the problem of examining the relationship between inclusiveness and security exclusivity. Criticism is directed against the inclusion of inclusive in a positive way, because internal structures offer order, stability, security and safety. On the other hand, external disorder - in realistic speech it is anarchy - is shattered in threats, risks and dangers.

RADICAL THEORIES (MARXISM AND NEOMARXISM)

Radical theories assess the organization of international security relations as a result of historical development. They attach great importance to the study of economics and social contexts and determinants. The neo-Marxists base their critical views on the current order in many ways on methods and knowledge of international political economy. (IPE – International Political Economy). They draw attention above all economic and social sources of military and non-military security threats. His criticism of the current organization of international security relations are based primarily on the theory of structural power, which focuses on four basic structures: safety, knowledge, production and finance. This theory is very critical of US policy, which it considers to be the dominant player in security relations at the global level.

At the same time, however, it should be noted that the mere connection to the IPE is not a monopoly of the neo-Marxists. We meet him, for example, in the White Paper on the Defence of France of 1994, which, as one of the first doctrinal documents after the end of the Cold War, drew attention to deepening global economic inequality and described it as "Serious risk of destabilization". The Manifesto, for example, drew on some findings from IPE prominent French politicians and experts or Graham Allison, Karl Kaiser and Sergei Karaganov (The Oxford Handbook 2008, 137).

CONCLUSIONS

Thus, schools differ in their approach to security and security threats in a number of areas. Each of them has its strengths and weaknesses. Realism does not explain everything. Liberal theory identifies the tools that states use to achieve shared interests and helps us understand why states differ in their basic preferences. Constructivist theories are best adapted to analyse how identities and interests change over time (Walt 1998, 40). This is compounded by the fact that constructivist theories, as well as some liberals, have more or less detached themselves from the state centrism that is typical of neorealism.

However, all major schools respect two important facts. The first is the determining influence of historical contexts. They must take into account that perceptions of threats and security change as political-power reflections evolve. For example, even before World War II, the United States considered Great Britain a threat because its economic empire blocked the further development of its economy. However, they fundamentally reconsidered their approach in the face of the urgent threat of the fascist powers, which became a threat to the survival of the liberal-economic concept as such.

The second fact, which goes beyond the differences of individual schools, is the time factor in defining the urgency of the security threat. The most urgent security threat is those states or

coalitions of states that are currently at the peak of their strength and know that further developments would already lead to a reduction in their lead and dominance. At such a moment, they are trying to use all available means to unleash a symmetrical, asymmetrical conflict in order to defeat the states that, so to speak, stand in their way as quickly and easily as possible.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was supported by the outcome of the project "Analysis and simulation of information and security threats workplace (PASIBO)", which has received funding from the European Union's grant agreement number OPVaV-2015/1.1/03-SORO, ITMS code 26210120044 and of the project "Support for creating the security and defence capabilities of the state by preparing crisis management actors", IM_4200513, which has received funding by Ministry of Defense of the Slovak Republic. This research was also supported by the outputs of the research project "VV_4_2021 -"Support for building security and defense capabilities of the state by preparing crisis management actors" funded by the Ministry of Defense of the Slovak Republic through the interdepartmental subprogram 06E01-Research and Development to support state defence.

REFERENCES

- Baylis, John. 2011. *The Globalization of World Politics* (fifth ed.). New York: Oxford University Press Inc.
- Buzan, Barry, Hansen Lene. 2009. *The Evolution of International Security Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cooper, Robin. 2005. "Imperial Liberalism. National Interest", Spring 2005. <https://nationalinterest.org/article/imperial-liberalism-433>.
- Coe, Andrew J., Vaynman, Jane. 2020. "Why Arms Control Is So Rare". *American Political Science Review*. 114 (2): 342–355. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/american-political-science-review/issue/F419DA50E283A7EE7A9F0658542B7853>
- Devetak, Richard. 1996. "Critical Theory". In.: Burchill, Scott; Linklater, Andrew: *Theories of International Relations*. London: Macmillan.
- Drulák, Petr. 2003. "Teorie mezinárodních vztahů". Portál, Praha 2003.
- Huntzinger, Jacques. 1987. *Introduction aux relations internationales*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.
- Katzenstein, Ethan. 1996. "The Culture of National Security": Norms and Identities in World Politics. New York 1996. <https://www.fb03.uni-frankfurt.de/45503391/Introduction-from-Katzenstein-1996---The-Culture-of-National-Security.pdf>
- Mingst, A. Karen., Snyder L. Jack. 1998. *Essentials of International Relations. Essential Readings in World Politics*, Norton, London.
- Morgan, Patrick. 2000. "Liberalist and Realist Security Studies at 2000: Two decades of Progress?" In.: *Critical Reflections on Security and Change*. Frank Cass Publishers, London 2000, <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13523269908404230?journalCode=fcsp20>.
- Morgenthau, Hans. 1965. *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, New York: Knopf.
- Nayef, R. F. Al-Rodhan, 2007. *The Five Dimensions of Global Security: Proposal for a Multi-sum Security Principle*, Berlin: LIT Verlag.
- Sheehan, Michael. 2005. *International Security: An Analytical Survey*. London: Lynne Reiner Publishers.
- Snyder, L. Jack. 2017. *One World, Rival Theories. Essential Readings in World Politics*, Mingst, Snyder, Sixth Edition, Norton.
- Terrif, Terry, Croft Start, James Lucy, Morgan Patrick. 1999. *Security Studies Today*. London: Polity Press.

- Waissová, Šárka. 2004. "Od národní bezpečnosti k mezinárodní bezpečnosti". *Mezinárodní vztahy*, roč. 39, 2004, č. 3. file:///C:/Users/Jan.Marek/Downloads/124-Article%20Text-264-1-10-20111018%20(2).pdf
- Walt, Stephen M. 1998. International Relations: "One world, Many Theories". In.: *Foreign Policy*, Spring 1998, No. 110. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1149275?seq=1>
- Warren, Elizabeth. 2019. "A Foreign Policy for All". *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 1, no. 98, Jan.-Feb. 2019, pp. 50–54. <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/2018-11-29/foreign-policy-all>
- Wilson, Peter. 2014. "Idealism". *Oxfords Bibliographies*, 26 August 2014. 11-27. <https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780199743292/obo-9780199743292-0089.xml>
- The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*. 2008. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- "Introduction to International Relations Theory & Its Problems". 2012, <https://medium.com/discourse/introduction-to-international-relations-theory-its-problems-500197447a63>