Pedagogical Handbook on

الانجليزية

English Terminology Module for First-Year Master's Students in International Relations – Political Science –

Dr. Salem Nisrin

Academic Year: 2024–2025

Introduction:

This module, *English Terminology*, is designed for first-year Master's students specializing in International Relations within the Political Science program. It aims to familiarize students with the key concepts, terms, and theoretical frameworks relevant to their field of study, enabling them to understand and use specialized English vocabulary with confidence and precision.

Throughout this course, we will explore essential topics such as the nature and scope of international relations, the concept of security, the dynamics of conflicts, and the major theories that explain international phenomena including Realism, Liberalism, and Constructivism. Students will also be introduced to advanced concepts such as regional security complexes, which are central to understanding contemporary global challenges.

The content and structure of this module align with the subjects covered in other Arabic-language modules of the Master's program, ensuring coherence and reinforcement of knowledge across the curriculum. By the end of the course, students will not only be able to grasp the English terminology related to international relations but also enhance their academic and professional communication skills in the discipline.

This pedagogical handbook consists of selected texts related to the field of International Relations. Each text is followed by a set of comprehension and vocabulary questions, a glossary of key terms, and an Arabic translation of the original passage. After each section, a model summary and ideal answers to the questions are provided to guide students in understanding the material and improving their academic language skills in English within their specialization.

*Learnin*g Objectives of the Module

By the end of this module, students will be able to:

1. Understand and use key English terminology related to international relations and political science.

2. Develop reading comprehension skills through the analysis of specialized texts in English.

3. Translate academic and political texts from English to Arabic and vice versa with greater accuracy.

4. Identify and explain major theoretical concepts such as realism, liberalism, constructivism, and regional security complexes.

5. Expand their academic vocabulary within the field of international relations.

6. Respond to comprehension and vocabulary questions in a clear, structured, and academic manner.

7. Summarize specialized texts effectively and provide accurate model answers to key questions.

8. Build confidence in using English as a tool for research and professional communication in political science.

Learning Outcomes

Upon successful completion of this module, students will be able to:

1. Demonstrate understanding of essential English terms and expressions used in international relations discourse.

2. Analyze and interpret specialized texts in English related to international politics, security, and global affairs.

3. Accurately translate academic content between English and Arabic, especially within the context of political science.

4. Apply key theoretical concepts (e.g., Realism, Liberalism, Constructivism) in discussing international issues using appropriate terminology.

5. Write concise summaries and provide well-structured responses to comprehension questions in English.

6. Use English-language sources more confidently in their research, presentations, and written assignments.

7. Engage with academic discussions and debates in English, using terminology relevant to their field of study.

Evaluation Grid

Component	Description	Weight (%)
Translation	Translating selected texts from English to Arabic accurately and coherently.	30%
Comprehension, Vocabulary, and Participation	Answering text-based questions, identifying key terminology, and actively participating in class discussions.	30%
Final Written Exam	A written exam assessing reading, translation, terminology, and comprehension skills.	40%

Module Content

1. The Concept of International Relations

2. The Concept of International Security and the Theories Explaining It

3. The Concept of Conflict: Types and Levels of Resolution

4. The Nature and Importance of Theories of International Relations

5. Realist Theory and Its Core Assumptions

6. Liberal Theory and Its Main Approaches

7. Constructivist Theory as a Bridge in International Relations

8. Barry Buzan's Theory of Regional Security Complexes

9. Johan Galtung's Theory: Violence, Peace, and Conflict

The Concept of International Relations

International relations (IR) is a continuously popular subject. It concerns peoples and cultures all over the world. The scope and complexity of the interactions between the various groups make IR a challenging subject to master. IR is new and dynamic and has a special appeal to everybody. However, some people perceive IR as a distant and abstract ritual conducted by a small group of people like presidents, generals and diplomats. This assumption is not accurate because, although leaders play a major role in international affairs, many other people participate as well. For instance, students and other citizens participate in international relations every time they vote in an election or watch the news. The choices we make in our daily lives ultimately affect the world we live in.

1- Concept of International Relations:

International Relations (IR) is the study of conflict and cooperation by international actors. this field of IR concerns the relationships among the various governments of the world. these relationships linked with other actors such as international organisations (IOs), non-governmental organisations (NGOs), transnational corporations (TNCs) and notable individuals make them interdependent. What is relevant in our attempt to understand the meaning of IR is the fact that people from different countries or societies get in contact and interact or relate with one another in search of one objective or the other. These relations among people of different nations representing governments, organisations, corporations, religious bodies, groups and individuals are referred to as international relations, Indeed, no nation can live in isolation independent of other nations. Whether big or small, rich or poor, powerful or weak, every nation depends on other nations. This explains why all states in the international system live in an atmosphere of interdependence and relationships[1].

The concept of international relations comprises two words; these are: 'international' and 'relations'. The prefix **'inter'** denotes between;

[1] For more see: Ademola Adeleke et al., *Essentials of International Relations and Diplomacy* (Abuja: NOUN Press, National Open University of Nigeria, 2020), p. 2.

from one to the other. While **'national'** is connected with a nation; or refers to share by a whole nation. Therefore, the word international here indicates the involvement of people from two or more countries or societies. In the other hand, the word '**relation**' shows that the people do not just meet but as well interact or relate among themselves. The **'s'** at the end of the word relation connotes plurality of these interactions. The concept of IR has two broad meanings.

- IR as an activity and as an academic discipline. IR as an activity can be viewed as interactions among people of different nationalities in one side representing states organisations, corporations and international personalities.
- In the other side, IR as an academic field of study is about the study of these relations' structures, processes and issues as they relate to the activities[1].

2- Definitions of International Relations:

Since IR is in transition following emerging realities in the international system, it has become difficult arriving at a universally acceptable definition of the subject. Aja (1992) opines that the conceptual problem of IR arises primarily because of the multiplicity of actors in the international system. Before 1945 contact and interactions were about nation-state, but beginning from 1945 and beyond, interactions have tremendously changed with the emergence of non-state actors and individuals whose actions and activities influence greatly the course of events and outcomes in international affairs. However, scholars have attempted defining international relations. "Trevor Taylor defines IR "as a discipline that tries to explain political activities across states boundaries." Another scholar, Seymon Brown postulates that international relations are the investigating and study of patterns of actions and reactions among sovereign states as represented by their governing elites"[2].

Quite often, some IR scholars view international relations as a mix of power structure and cooperation in relationships among nations. Power is germane to international politics. Indeed, power is the

---

[1] Op. cit.
[2] Ibid. p. 3.

currency of the international system. This explains why some scholars define international relations in terms of power relations between states. For example, Stanley Hoffman posits that "the discipline of international relations is concerned with the factors and the activities which affect the external policies and power of the basic units into which the world is divided." Wright (1955) defines IR as "the study of relations between and among powerful groups"[1].

Traditionally, the study of IR focused on questions of war and peace. The movement of armies and diplomats, the creating of treaties and alliances, the development and deployment of military capabilities- these issues dominated the study of IR in the past, particularly in the Cold War era. Although they still hold a central position in the field, the end of the Cold War in 1990 brought in new challenges. Indeed, IR as relations among nations covers a range of activities- diplomacy, war, trade relations, cultural exchanges, participation in international organisations, alliances and counter- alliances. The study of IR involves the mastery of some basic concepts. It is advisable that you internalise these concepts in the course of your study rather than memorising them piecemeal. Some of these concepts are international politics, international system, foreign policy, domestic politics, defence policy, national interest, sovereignty, diplomacy, international law, security, conflict and conflict resolution and so forth. The field of IR reflects the world's complexity, and IR scholars use many theories and concepts in trying to describe and explain it[2].

International relations is the study of **interactions** and **relationships** between two **states** or a state and an **organization**. The combination of all states in the world is referred to as the **international system**. This system is acknowledged because relationships between two countries will necessarily affect the relationships of these states with other states. Thus, all international relations affect the **global community.** The process of **making policy decisions** regarding other countries or states is referred to as **international politics[3]**.

---

[1] Op. cit.
[2] Ibid, p.4.
[3] Reed Hepler & Shawn Grimsley, "International Relations Definition, Importance & Topics," last modified November 21, 2023, Study.com, https://study.com/academy/lesson/what-is-international-relations.html

International relations is an academic **discipline** that focuses on the study of the interaction of the **actors** in international politics, including states and non-state actors, such as the United Nations (UN), the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank, and Amnesty International. One of the key features of the **international system** is that it's a state of **anarchy** - each state in the system is **sovereign** and does not have to answer to a higher **authority**.

International relations involve the study of such things as **foreign policy, international conflict** and **negotiation**, **war**, **nuclear proliferation**, **terrorism**, **international trade** and **economics**, and **international development**, among other subjects. As you may expect, international relations' broad **scope** requires an interdisciplinary **approach**, drawing upon the **fields** of economics, law, political science, sociology, **game theory**, and even psychology.

Questions

1- Explaining and translating the text

2- Give a title to the text?

3- What did the text take up (examining)?

4- Based on the text, provide a definition of the International relations and the actors of International relations.

5- Mentions the activities covered in IR?

6- Why do states live in an atmosphere of interdependence?

7- Opposites / synonyms:

Opposites		Synonyms	
cooperation		Conflict	
Global		Field	
Different		Interaction	
dynamic		Structures	

5- Translate the following terms into Arabic and into English

Into Arabic		Into English	
international boundaries		النظام الدولي	

transnational corporations		مرحلة انتقالية	
religious bodies		الدولة القومية	
atmosphere of interdependence		ردود الفعل بين الدول	

6- fill the gaps: (law, monopoly, the relationship, states).

Then **translate the paragraph**:

IR deals with ……………………… between nation-states, international organisations and other groups. These are the actors in international relations. The most important actors in IR are…………….. . This accounts for the state-centric-view of the international system. The nature of the international system from the realists' perspective is anarchical. This state of anarchy does not imply complete chaos or absence of structures and rules; rather it portrays a lack of central government that can enforce rules. In domestic society within states, governments can enforce contracts, deter citizens from breaking rules and use their ………………. on legally sanctioned violence to enforce a system of …………….... . In the case of international relations, the great power system and the hegemony of a superpower can provide relative peace and stability for decades on end but then can break down into costly wars among the great powers.

The Answers:

1- Translation of the Text:

العلاقات الدولية هي موضوع يحظى بشعبية مستمرة. وهي تتعلق بالشعوب والثقافات في جميع أنحاء العالم. إن نطاق وتعقيد التفاعلات بين المجموعات المختلفة يجعل من العلاقات الدولية موضوعًا صعب الإتقان. العلاقات الدولية مجال حديث وديناميكي، وله جاذبية خاصة لدى الجميع. ومع ذلك، فإن بعض الأشخاص ينظرون إلى العلاقات الدولية على أنها طقس بعيد ومجرد، يُمارس من قبل مجموعة صغيرة من الأفراد مثل الرؤساء، الجنرالات والدبلوماسيين. لكن هذا الافتراض غير دقيق، لأنه بالرغم من أن القادة يلعبون دورًا رئيسيًا في الشؤون الدولية، فإن العديد من الأشخاص الآخرين يشاركون أيضًا. على سبيل المثال، يشارك الطلاب وغيرهم من المواطنين في العلاقات الدولية في كل مرة يصوتون فيها في الانتخابات أو يشاهدون الأخبار. إن الخيارات التي نتخذها في حياتنا اليومية تؤثر في نهاية المطاف على العالم الذي نعيش فيه.

1– مفهوم العلاقات الدولية:

العلاقات الدولية (IR) هي دراسة الصراع والتعاون بين الفاعلين الدوليين. يهتم هذا المجال من العلاقات الدولية بالعلاقات بين الحكومات المختلفة حول العالم. وترتبط هذه العلاقات بفاعلين آخرين مثل المنظمات الدولية(IOs) ، المنظمات غير الحكومية (NGOs)، الشركات العابرة للحدود الوطنية(TNCs) ، وأفراد بارزين، مما يجعل هذه العلاقات متشابكة ومترابطة.

ما يهم في محاولتنا لفهم معنى العلاقات الدولية هو حقيقة أن الناس من دول أو مجتمعات مختلفة يتواصلون ويتفاعلون مع بعضهم البعض سعياً وراء أهداف معينة. وتشير هذه العلاقات بين شعوب من دول مختلفة، ممن يمثلون حكومات، منظمات، شركات، هيئات دينية، مجموعات وأفراد، إلى ما يُعرف بالعلاقات الدولية.

في الواقع، لا تستطيع أي دولة أن تعيش في عزلة، بمعزل عن الدول الأخرى. سواء كانت الدولة كبيرة أم صغيرة، غنية أم فقيرة، قوية أم ضعيفة، فإن كل دولة تعتمد على الدول الأخرى. وهذا يفسر لماذا تعيش جميع الدول ضمن النظام الدولي في جو من الترابط والعلاقات المتبادلة.

يتكوّن مفهوم العلاقات الدولية من كلمتين هما: "دولي" و"علاقات". البادئة "inter" تعني "بين"، أي من طرف إلى آخر، في حين أن "national" تشير إلى ما يتعلق بالأمة أو ما يخص الأمة ككل. بالتالي، فإن كلمة "دولي" هنا تدل على تداخل وتفاعل بين أشخاص من دولتين أو أكثر، أو من مجتمعات مختلفة. أما كلمة "علاقات" فتشير إلى أن الأشخاص لا يلتقون فحسب، بل يتفاعلون ويتواصلون فيما بينهم. كما أن حرف "s" في نهاية كلمة "relation" يدل على تعدد هذه التفاعلات.

لمفهوم العلاقات الدولية معنيان رئيسيان:

- **العلاقات الدولية كنشاط**: تُفهم على أنها التفاعلات بين أشخاص من جنسيات مختلفة، من جانب يمثلون الدول والمنظمات والشركات والشخصيات الدولية.

- **العلاقات الدولية كتخصص أكاديمي**: تُعنى بدراسة هياكل، عمليات وقضايا هذه العلاقات، كما تتعلق بالأنشطة المذكورة.

2- تعريفات العلاقات الدولية:

نظرًا لأن العلاقات الدولية تمر بمرحلة انتقالية في ظل المستجدات التي يشهدها النظام الدولي، فقد أصبح من الصعب التوصل إلى تعريف موحد ومتفق عليه عالميًا لهذا المجال. يرى أجا (**1992**)أن المشكلة المفاهيمية للعلاقات الدولية تنبع أساسًا من تعدد الفاعلين في النظام الدولي.

ففي السابق، أي قبل عام 1945، كانت التفاعلات تدور حول الدولة القومية. لكن منذ عام 1945 فصاعدًا، تغيرت طبيعة التفاعلات بشكل كبير نتيجة لظهور فاعلين غير حكوميين وأفراد، أصبحت أفعالهم وأنشطتهم تؤثر بدرجة كبيرة في مجريات الأحداث ونتائجها في الشؤون الدولية.

ومع ذلك، حاول عدد من العلماء تقديم تعريف للعلاقات الدولية:

- يُعرّف **تريفور تايلور** العلاقات الدولية بأنها "تخصص يسعى لتفسير الأنشطة السياسية عبر حدود الدول."

- ويقترح **سيمون براون** أن العلاقات الدولية هي "التحقيق ودراسة أنماط الأفعال وردود الأفعال بين الدول ذات السيادة كما تمثلها نخبها الحاكمة."

غالبًا ما يرى بعض علماء العلاقات الدولية أن العلاقات الدولية هي مزيج من هيكل القوة والتعاون في العلاقات بين الدول. فالقوة عنصر جوهري في السياسة الدولية. بل إن القوة تُعتبر بمثابة عملة النظام الدولي. وهذا ما يفسر لماذا يعرف بعض العلماء العلاقات الدولية من منظور علاقات القوة بين الدول.

على سبيل المثال، يرى **ستانلي هوفمان** أن "علم العلاقات الدولية يهتم بالعوامل والأنشطة التي تؤثر على السياسات الخارجية وقوة الوحدات الأساسية التي ينقسم إليها العالم". ويُعرِّف **رايت** (**1955** (العلاقات الدولية بأنها "دراسة العلاقات بين وبين الجماعات القوية."

تقليديًا، ركزت دراسة العلاقات الدولية على قضايا الحرب والسلام. كانت حركة الجيوش والدبلوماسيين، وإنشاء المعاهدات والتحالفات، وتطوير ونشر القدرات العسكرية — تُمثِّل المحاور الأساسية في دراسة العلاقات الدولية، لا سيما خلال فترة الحرب الباردة.

وعلى الرغم من أن هذه القضايا لا تزال تحتل موقعًا مركزيًا في هذا المجال، إلا أن نهاية الحرب الباردة عام 1990 أدخلت تحديات جديدة. في الحقيقة، فإن العلاقات الدولية — باعتبارها علاقات بين الأمم — تغطي مجموعة من الأنشطة مثل: الدبلوماسية، الحرب، العلاقات التجارية، التبادلات الثقافية، المشاركة في المنظمات الدولية، التحالفات والتحالفات المضادة.

وتتطلب دراسة العلاقات الدولية إتقان عدد من المفاهيم الأساسية. من المستحسن أن تستوعب هذه المفاهيم خلال دراستك بدلاً من حفظها بشكل سطحي. ومن هذه المفاهيم: السياسة الدولية، النظام الدولي، السياسة الخارجية، السياسة الداخلية، سياسة الدفاع، المصلحة الوطنية، السيادة، الدبلوماسية، القانون الدولي، الأمن، الصراع وحل النزاعات، وغيرها. يعكس مجال العلاقات الدولية تعقيد العالم، ولذلك يستخدم الباحثون في هذا المجال العديد من النظريات والمفاهيم في محاولاتهم لوصفه وشرحه.

العلاقات الدولية هي دراسة التفاعلات والعلاقات بين دولتين أو بين دولة ومنظمة. وتُعرف مجموعة الدول في العالم بالنظام الدولي. يُعترف بهذا النظام لأن العلاقات بين دولتين تؤثر بالضرورة على علاقات هاتين الدولتين مع الدول الأخرى. وبالتالي، فإن كل العلاقات الدولية تؤثر في المجتمع العالمي ككل.

تُعرف عملية اتخاذ القرارات السياسية المتعلقة بالدول الأخرى أو الدول المجاورة باسم "السياسة الدولية."

العلاقات الدولية هي تخصص أكاديمي يركز على دراسة تفاعل الفاعلين في السياسة الدولية، بما في ذلك الدول والفاعلين غير الحكوميين، مثل :**الأمم المتحدة(UN)** ، **صندوق النقد الدولي(IMF)** ، **البنك الدولي، ومنظمة العفو الدولية.**

أحد الخصائص الأساسية للنظام الدولي هو أنه نظام فوضوي — (anarchy) أي أن كل دولة ذات سيادة ولا تخضع لأي سلطة عليا. كما تشمل دراسة العلاقات الدولية مواضيع مثل: السياسة الخارجية، الصراعات الدولية والتفاوض، الحرب، الانتشار النووي، الإرهاب، التجارة الدولية والاقتصاد، والتنمية الدولية، وغيرها. وكما هو متوقع، يتطلب النطاق الواسع للعلاقات الدولية مقاربة متعددة التخصصات، تستند إلى مجالات مثل: الاقتصاد، القانون، العلوم السياسية، علم الاجتماع، نظرية الألعاب، وحتى علم النفس.

2- Title: *An Introduction to International Relations: Concepts, Definitions, and Actors*

3- The text examines the nature, meaning, concepts, and definitions of international relations (IR), including the main actors, activities, and theories that define the field, as well as its importance and complexity in the global system.

4- Definition of the International relations and the actors of International relations.

Definition:

International relations is the academic and practical study of the interactions, relationships, and behaviors among international actors, such as states, international organizations, NGOs, corporations, and individuals. It includes both cooperation and conflict among nations.

Actors:

States (governments), International Organizations (e.g., UN, IMF), Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), Transnational Corporations (TNCs), Religious bodies, Notable individuals (international personalities, elites).

5- According to the text, **the activities include:** Diplomacy, War, Trade relations, Cultural exchanges, Participation in international organizations, Alliances and counter-alliances, Foreign policy, Conflict and conflict resolution, International law, Security, National interest.

6- Why do states live in an atmosphere of interdependence?

Because no nation can live in isolation, regardless of size, wealth, or power. All countries depend on one another economically, politically, and socially. This mutual dependency creates an atmosphere of interdependence in the international system.

7- Opposites / Synonyms:

cooperation	conflict
Global	field
Different	interaction
Dynamic	structures

8- Translate the following terms:

Into Arabic	Into English
international boundaries	الحدود الدولية
transnational corporations	الشركات العابرة للحدود
religious bodies	الهيئات الدينية
atmosphere of interdependence	جو من الترابط المتبادل
النظام الدولي	international system
مرحلة انتقالية	transitional phase

الدولة القومية	nation-state
ردود الفعل بين الدول	reactions among states

9- Fill in the gaps:

the relationship– states- monopoly- law.

The Concept of International Security and the Theories Explaining It

The concept security is the core concept in Security Studies and it also lies at the center of International Relations, and The Security Studies includes security threats ranging from pandemics, environmental degradation, and transnational organized crime to more traditional security concerns such as weapons of mass destruction and inter-state conflicts[1].

The consensus has emerged on what Security Studies entails -it is to do with threats to survival-. There is also a consensus that security implies freedom from threats to core values. However, the precise definition of security is still contested because there is a major disagreement about whether the main focus of enquiry (or referent) should be on individual', national', or international' security[2]..

Traditionally, the state has been the thing to be secured, what is known as referent object, and it has sought security through military might. Therefore, stressing international and national security, most of the scholars define security as preventing nations/ states from threats, attacks, or aggression; but others focus more on individuals, or people, emphasizing individual emancipation and perceptions[3].

Relying on the above, the content of international security has expanded over the years. Today it covers a variety of interconnected issues in the world that affect survival. It ranges from the traditional or conventional modes of military power, the causes and consequences of war between states, economic strength, to ethnic, religious and ideological conflicts, trade and economic conflicts, energy supplies, science and technology, food, as well as threats to human security and the stability of states from environmental degradation, infectious diseases, climate change and the activities of non-state actors. so While

---

[1] John M. Nomikos, *State-Centric Security and Its Limitations: The Case of Transnational Organized Crime*, Research Paper No. 156 (Athens: Research Institute for European and American Studies, November 2011), p. 7.
[2] Idem.
[3] Ibid, p. 8.

the wide perspective of international security regards everything as a security matter, the traditional approach focuses mainly or exclusively on military concerns[1].

Some definitions provided for security:

- **Walter Lippmann** views security as the capability of a country to protect its core values, both in terms that a state need not sacrifice core values in avoiding war and can maintain them by winning war.
- **David Baldwin** argues that pursuing security sometimes requires sacrificing other values, including marginal values and prime values.
- **Arnold Wolfers** argues that "security" is generally a normative term. "Security, in an objective sense, measures the absence of threats to acquired values, in a subjective sense, the absence of fear that such values will be attacked.
- Definition of **Ole Weaver**: Security can be considered as a speech act
- **Barry Buzan**: Security is the pursuit of freedom from threat

- **Traditionalists**, adherents of the realist school of thought, define security as a freedom from any objective military threat to the state survival in an anarchic international system.

- **Neo-liberal institutionalism** considers security as a goal that can be best achieved through interdependence/cooperation, institutions/regimes and democratic peace. Besides states, liberalists also focus on other important actors.

- **Constructivism:** the best way to obtain security should be through social and culture construction, given that the key principle of social constructivism is that international politics is shaped by collective values, persuasive ideas, culture identities, and social norms[2].

   The conclusion: The concept of security has evolved beyond its traditional, military-focused and state-centric definition to encompass a broader and more comprehensive understanding. While security once

---

[1] Op. cit.
[2] Ibid, pp. 8-12.

meant protecting the state from external military threats, modern challenges—such as transnational organized crime, terrorism, environmental degradation, pandemics, and economic crises—have shown the need to expand this view. As a result, security studies now address a wide range of political, economic, social, and environmental issues. This shift has also changed the focus from solely protecting states to safeguarding individuals, leading to the rise of the human security approach. In this modern framework, security means not only the absence of war, but also the presence of conditions that ensure human well-being, dignity, and freedom from fear and want. This transformation reflects a more realistic and inclusive understanding of the threats facing today's interconnected world.

Questions

1- explaining and translating the text?

2- give a title to the text?

3- What did the text take up (examining)?

4- Based on the text, provide a definition of the term security.

5- Explain the transformation of the concept of security.

6- Opposites / synonyms

Opposites		**synonyms**	
Security		Conflict	
pandemics		Survival	
freedom		Threats	
traditional		Referent	

5- translate the following terms into Arabic and into English

Into Arabic		**Into English**	
normative term		التهديدات الامنية	
cooperation		التحرر من التهديد	
the powers		الأمن الشامل	
Constructivism		البقاء	

6- fill the gaps: (Societal security, emphasizes, religious, environmental, problems, dimensions).

Then **translate the paragraph**:

Security has five ……………… that include Military, political, economic, social and ……………… security, and therefore, global security and the security of any state cannot be achieved without good governance at all levels that guarantees security through justice for all individuals, states, and cultures.

Each of these five dimensions refers to a different set of substrates. The first dimension refers to……………….., a concept that makes the principle referent object of security the individual, not the state, and which reflects the ability of societies to reproduce their traditional patterns of language, culture, ………………… and national identity, and customs.

The second dimension is **environmental security**, which includes preserving the biosphere, and facing various environmental ……………….. that pose a threat to the ecosystem, such as pollution and global warming.

The third substrate refers to **Military security**, defined as being linked to the state's monopoly over use of force in a given territory and as a substrate of security that ……………… the military and policing components of security, and which is based on the reference of states and military force as a means of security. The fourth is **Economic security** through access to the resources, finance, and markets needed to maintain acceptable levels of well-being. Finally, **Political security** related to the political stability of states, regimes, and ideologies that confer legitimacy on them.

According to this multi-faceted security framework all five dimensions of security need to be addressed in order to provide just and sustainable global security. It therefore advocates cooperative interaction between states and peaceful existence between cultural groups and civilizations.

The Answers:

1- Translation of the Text:

يُعدّ مفهوم الأمن المفهوم الأساسي في دراسات الأمن، كما يشغل موقعًا مركزيًا في العلاقات الدولية. وتشمل دراسات الأمن التهديدات الأمنية التي تتراوح ما بين الجوائح، وتدهور البيئة، والجريمة المنظمة العابرة للحدود، إلى القضايا الأمنية التقليدية مثل أسلحة الدمار الشامل والصراعات بين الدول.

لقد ظهر إجماع حول ما تنطوي عليه دراسات الأمن، وهو أنها تتعلق بالتهديدات التي تمسّ البقاء. كما يوجد اتفاق عام على أن الأمن يعني التحرر من التهديدات التي تستهدف القيم الجوهرية. ومع ذلك، لا يزال تعريف الأمن محل جدل، نظرًا لوجود خلاف كبير حول ما إذا كان ينبغي أن ينصبّ التركيز الرئيسي للدراسة (أو ما يُعرف بـ"المرجع الأمني") على أمن الفرد، أو الدولة، أو الأمن الدولي.

تقليديًا، كانت الدولة هي الكيان الذي يجب تأمينه، ويُشار إليه باسم "المرجع الأمني"، وقد سعت إلى تحقيق أمنها عبر القوة العسكرية. وبناءً على ذلك، يركز معظم الباحثين على الأمن القومي والدولي، ويعرّفون الأمن بأنه منع الدول من التهديدات أو الهجمات أو العدوان؛ في المقابل، يركّز آخرون بشكل أكبر على الأفراد، ويؤكدون على تحرر الإنسان والإدراك الذاتي للتهديدات.

وبالاستناد إلى ما سبق، فإن مضمون الأمن الدولي قد توسّع على مر السنين. إذ أصبح اليوم يشمل مجموعة واسعة من القضايا المترابطة التي تؤثر على البقاء في العالم. ويتضمن ذلك الأشكال التقليدية للقوة العسكرية، وأسباب ونتائج الحروب بين الدول، والقوة الاقتصادية، بالإضافة إلى النزاعات العرقية والدينية والأيديولوجية، والنزاعات التجارية والاقتصادية، وإمدادات الطاقة، والعلوم والتكنولوجيا، والغذاء، فضلًا عن التهديدات التي تمس الأمن الإنساني واستقرار الدول نتيجة لتدهور البيئة، والأمراض المعدية، وتغير المناخ، وأنشطة الفاعلين من غير الدول. وبينما يرى المنظور الواسع للأمن الدولي أن كل شيء يمكن أن يُعتبر مسألة أمنية، لا يزال النهج التقليدي يركّز أساسًا أو فقط على القضايا العسكرية.

بعض التعريفات التي قُدمت لمفهوم الأمن:

- يرى والتر ليبمان أن الأمن هو قدرة الدولة على حماية قيمها الجوهرية، سواء بعدم الاضطرار إلى التضحية بها لتجنب الحرب، أو الحفاظ عليها من خلال كسب الحرب.
- يرى ديفيد بالدوين أن السعي وراء الأمن قد يتطلب أحيانًا التضحية بقيم أخرى، سواء كانت هامشية أو رئيسية.
- يرى أرنولد وولفرز أن "الأمن" مصطلح معياري بالأساس، فهو في المعنى الموضوعي يعني غياب التهديدات للقيم المكتسبة، وفي المعنى الذاتي يعني غياب الخوف من تعرض تلك القيم لهجوم.
- أما أولي ويفر فيرى أن الأمن يمكن اعتباره "فعلًا لغويًا.(Speech Act) "
- ويُعرّف باري بوزان الأمن بأنه "السعي نحو التحرر من التهديد."
- أما التقليديون من أتباع المدرسة الواقعية فيعرّفون الأمن بأنه التحرر من أي تهديد عسكري موضوعي لبقاء الدولة ضمن نظام دولي فوضوي.
- من جهة أخرى، ترى الليبرالية المؤسسية الحديثة أن الأمن هدف يمكن تحقيقه من خلال الاعتماد المتبادل، والتعاون، والمؤسسات والأنظمة الدولية، والسلام الديمقراطي. كما تركّز على فاعلين آخرين إلى جانب الدول.
- في حين ترى المدرسة البنائية أن أفضل وسيلة لتحقيق الأمن هي من خلال البناء الاجتماعي والثقافي، حيث تقوم على فكرة أن السياسة الدولية تتشكل عبر القيم الجماعية، والأفكار الإقناعية، والهويات الثقافية، والمعايير الاجتماعية.

الخاتمة: لقد تطوّر مفهوم الأمن بشكل كبير، متجاوزًا تعريفه التقليدي الضيق الذي ركّز على التهديدات العسكرية وبقاء الدولة، ليأخذ شكلاً أكثر شمولًا واتساعًا. فبينما كان الأمن يعني في الماضي حماية الدولة من التهديدات الخارجية، أظهرت التحديات المعاصرة——مثل الجريمة المنظمة العابرة للحدود، والإرهاب، والأوبئة، وتدهور البيئة، والأزمات الاقتصادية——ضرورة توسيع هذا

المفهوم. ونتيجة لذلك، باتت دراسات الأمن تشمل طيفًا واسعًا من القضايا السياسية، والاقتصادية، والاجتماعية، والبيئية. كما أدى هذا التحول إلى انتقال التركيز من حماية الدول فقط إلى حماية الأفراد أيضًا، مما أدى إلى بروز مفهوم "الأمن الإنساني". وضمن هذا الإطار الحديث، لم يعد الأمن بمجرد غياب الحرب، بل أصبح يشمل أيضًا توافر الظروف التي تضمن رفاه الإنسان وكرامته، وتحرره من الخوف والعوز. ويعكس هذا التحوّل فهمًا أكثر واقعية وشمولية لطبيعة التهديدات التي تواجه عالمنا المترابط اليوم.

2. title: The Evolving Concept of Security: From Military Defense to Comprehensive Global Protection.

3. The text examines the transformation of the concept of security in International Relations, expanding from traditional military-based definitions to a broader, more comprehensive understanding that includes non-traditional threats like pandemics, environmental degradation, and human security.

4. Based on the text, provide a definition of the term "security":

Security refers to the protection from threats to survival and core values. It involves not only the absence of war or violence but also the presence of conditions that ensure individual and collective well-being, dignity, and freedom from fear and want. It is both objective (absence of threats) and subjective (absence of fear).

5. Explain the transformation of the concept of security:

The concept of security has shifted from a narrow, state-centric and military-focused approach to a broader and multidimensional one. Originally focused on safeguarding state sovereignty from military threats, security studies now include environmental, economic, political, and societal concerns. The referent object of security has expanded from the state to the individual, giving rise to the concept of human security. This transformation acknowledges that modern threats are interconnected, often non-military, and require inclusive, cooperative responses.

6. Opposites / Synonyms

Opposites		synonyms	
Security	Threats	Conflict	Threats
pandemics	Health / Stability	Survival	Existence/Continuity
freedom	Fear / Oppression	threats	Dangers / Risks

traditional	Comprehensive/Non-traditional	referent	Object / Focus

7.

Into Arabic		**Into English**	
normative term	مصطلح معياري	التهديدات الامنية	Security threats
Cooperation	التعاون	التحرر من التهديد	Freedom from threat
the powers	القوى	الأمن الشامل	Comprehensive security
Constructivism	البنائية	البقاء	Survival

8. Filled Paragraph:

Dimensions, environmental, Societal security, religious, problems, emphasizes.

The Concept of Conflict: Types and Levels of Resolution

Traditionally, the term "international conflict" referred to conflicts between different nation-states and conflicts between people and organizations in different nation-states. Increasingly, however, it also applies to inter-group conflicts within one country when one group is fighting for independence or increased social, political, or economic power (e.g., Sudan/South Sudan, Iraq (now that the US has largely left), and Syria[1].

Conflict is commonly of three basic varieties: intra-state, inter-state, and trans-state. **Intra-State Conflicts**: These include civil conflicts precipitated by deepening political cleavages, economic distress, and growing inequalities, which in worst case scenarios can lead to the erosion of government legitimacy, a breakdown of law and order, and escalating ungovernability. **Inter-State Conflicts**: These may include conflicts over the status of disputed territories and the treatment of ethnic kindred in which intra-state conflicts can pull neighboring powers into the fray. They can also involve energy conflicts and other resource disputes stemming from the short and long-term impact of climate change. **Trans-State Conflicts**: These could include international terrorism, economic sabotage, and cyber attacks that precipitate state paralysis, undermine national security, or provoke sponsoring states[2].

International conflict resolution is concerned with processes of removing tensions between states or maintaining them at levels

---

[1] Cate Malek, *International Conflict*, updated May 2013 by Heidi Burgess, **Beyond Intractability**, https://www.beyondintractability.org/coreknowledge/international-conflict.

[2] Janusz Bugajski, *Early Warning, Conflict Prevention, Crisis Management, Conflict Resolution and Postconflict Rehabilitation: Lessons Learned and Way Ahead, Presentation for the 2011 Annual Security Review Conference, Working Session II,* (Washington, D.C.: Center for Strategic and International Studies, July 2011), p.1.

consistent with continued peaceful pursuit by states of their goals (individual or collective)[1]:

Good offices and mediation: Good offices and mediation are special forms of negotiation in which a third party plays a role. It is indicative of the comparatively recent growth and primitive nature of international arrangements for conflict resolution that even good offices is so highly valued as a method. For its import is only to restore communication and negotiation between disputants and perhaps induce some restraint in that communication; there is no obligation of the parties to go further. Mediation is widely used in the settlement of civil wars. Mediators may be states, the UN, others IGOs, local or international NGOs, religious organizations.

Arbitration: Even in modern times, when the binding force of arbitral decision is normally assured by the inclusion of at least one independent member in the tribunal, the parties to a dispute still maintain a quadruple control over the arbitral process. They control, first, the preliminary decision as to whether a dispute is to be submitted. They control, second, the selection of the arbitrators. They can control, third, the rules to be applied. Finally, even after the award, they have a certain indirect control over its effect, since under international law an award is null if induced by fraud or made without jurisdiction or based on "essential error" leading to "manifest injustice."

Negotiation: Negotiation is "the first line of conflict resolution", International negotiations involve some of the dynamics of the interpersonal and interorganizational levels of negotiation but also involve vast diplomatic bureaucracies, the possibility of military coercion, the influence of transnational and nonstate actors, the absence of an over-arching legal framework, and the influence of other international events on any particular negotiation.

Conciliation: Conciliation is another dispute resolution process that involves building a positive relationship between the parties of

---

[1] For more see: Harshita Singh and Sameeksha Bharadwaj, "Conflict and Conflict Resolution in International Relations," *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)* 27, no. 12, series 6 (December 2022).

dispute, however, it is fundamentally different than mediation and arbitration in several respects. Conciliation tries to individualize the optimal solution and direct parties towards a satisfactory common agreement.

While peacekeeping (halting the violence) is generally easier to accomplish than peacemaking (the negotiation of a peace agreement), it is not an end state. Rather it leaves the conflict in suspension until peacemaking--and later peacebuilding-- can succeed. It has been charged that in some cases this suspension of hostilities detracts from the peacemaking process, as it becomes apparently unnecessary. The warring nations or factions become dependent on the provision of outside peacekeepers forever, which is seldom, if ever, a viable situation[1].

Questions:

1. Give a title to the text

2. What is International Conflict?

3. What are the different types of conflicts?

4. What are the mechanisms for international conflict resolution?

5. Does Algeria have the potential to resolve conflicts in region?

Opposites & synonyms:

Synonyms: conflict, the dynamics, Common agreement, Conciliation, Fraud, Induce.

Opposites: increased, Civil conflicts, Escalating, Positive relationship, Good offices, Tensions.

Translate into Arabic term; international conflict. Inter-group conflicts. The first line of conflict resolution. Arbitration. Conciliation. nonstate actors. Breakdown of law.

Fill the gaps: agreement, movements, intervention, harmful, Negotiate, Instability.

---

[1] Malek, Cate. Op. cit.

There are many international conflicts in the world. Such conflicts usually exist between nations, states or peoples. International conflicts can lead to ……………… consequences, such as war, or political and economic ……………….. To prevent those consequences and resolve a conflict peacefully, many peace……………… emerge and a multitude of international organizations are established. To settle a conflict peacefully, warring parties can try to……………....... and reach an ……………… which will be beneficial for all of them. Nevertheless, in some cases, conflicts cannot be resolved by state negotiations and they need external ………………… from some international organization, such as the United Nations, external International NGOS or the Peace Corps.

The Answers:

3- Translation of the Text:

تقليديًا، كان مصطلح "النزاع الدولي" يشير إلى النزاعات بين الدول القومية المختلفة، وكذلك النزاعات بين الشعوب والمنظمات في دول قومية مختلفة. لكن مع مرور الوقت، بدأ المصطلح يشمل بشكل متزايد النزاعات بين الجماعات داخل الدولة الواحدة، عندما تسعى جماعة ما إلى الاستقلال أو إلى زيادة نفوذها الاجتماعي أو السياسي أو الاقتصادي (مثل السودان/جنوب السودان، العراق بعد انسحاب الولايات المتحدة، وسوريا).

عادةً ما تُصنّف النزاعات إلى ثلاثة أنواع أساسية: النزاعات داخل الدولة، والنزاعات بين الدول، والنزاعات العابرة للدول.

- **النزاعات داخل الدولة**: تشمل النزاعات الأهلية الناتجة عن الانقسامات السياسية العميقة، والأزمات الاقتصادية، وتزايد أوجه عدم المساواة، والتي قد تؤدي، في أسوأ الحالات، إلى تآكل شرعية الحكومة، وانهيار القانون والنظام، وتصاعد حالة انعدام السيطرة.

- **النزاعات بين الدول**: قد تشمل النزاعات المتعلقة بوضع الأراضي المتنازع عليها، أو بمعاملة الجماعات العرقية المرتبطة عرقيًا بدول مجاورة، مما قد يؤدي إلى تدخل هذه الدول. كما تشمل نزاعات حول الطاقة أو الموارد الأخرى، الناتجة عن التأثيرات قصيرة أو طويلة المدى لتغير المناخ.

- **النزاعات العابرة للدول**: تشمل الإرهاب الدولي، والتخريب الاقتصادي، والهجمات السيبرانية التي تؤدي إلى شلل الدولة، أو تقويض أمنها القومي، أو استفزاز الدول الراعية لها.

حل النزاعات الدولية يهتم بالعمليات التي تُزيل التوترات التي تُزيل التوترات بين الدول أو تبقيها عند مستويات تمكّن هذه الدول من مواصلة تحقيق أهدافها بسلام (سواء فردية أو جماعية).

الوساطة والمساعي الحميدة:

المساعي الحميدة والوساطة هما شكلان خاصان من أشكال التفاوض، يقوم فيهما طرف ثالث بلعب دور. ويُظهر التقدير العالي لهذين الشكلين من التسوية قِدم الأساليب الدولية لحل النزاعات. فالمساعي الحميدة تهدف فقط إلى إعادة التواصل بين الأطراف المتنازعة وربما حثّها على التهدئة، دون أن تلتزم الأطراف بالمضي قدمًا في التسوية. وتُستخدم الوساطة على نطاق واسع في تسوية الحروب الأهلية، وقد يكون الوسطاء دولًا، أو الأمم المتحدة، أو منظمات حكومية دولية، أو منظمات غير حكومية محلية أو دولية، أو منظمات دينية.

التحكيم:

حتى في العصر الحديث، عندما يتم ضمان إلزامية قرار التحكيم من خلال وجود عضو مستقل في هيئة التحكيم، تظل الأطراف المتنازعة تتحكم في أربع مراحل من العملية:

1. القرار المبدئي حول ما إذا كان يجب اللجوء للتحكيم.
2. اختيار المحكّمين.
3. تحديد القواعد التي ستُطبّق.
4. بعد صدور الحكم، قد تظل الأطراف تحتفظ بسيطرة غير مباشرة عليه، إذ يمكن اعتبار الحكم باطلًا في القانون الدولي إذا كان قد تم الحصول عليه عن طريق الاحتيال، أو صدر دون اختصاص، أو استند إلى خطأ جوهري أدى إلى "ظلم بيّن."

التفاوض:

التفاوض هو "خط الدفاع الأول لحل النزاعات". وتشمل المفاوضات الدولية بعض ديناميكيات المفاوضات على المستويات الفردية والتنظيمية، ولكنها تتضمن أيضًا بيروقراطية دبلوماسية ضخمة، وإمكانية اللجوء إلى الإكراه العسكري، وتأثير الفاعلين غير الحكوميين، وغياب إطار قانوني موحّد، بالإضافة إلى تأثير الأحداث الدولية الأخرى على أي مفاوضات بعينها.

التوفيق الوساطة التصالحية

التوفيق هو عملية أخرى لتسوية النزاعات، تهدف إلى بناء علاقة إيجابية بين الأطراف المتنازعة. إلا أنها تختلف جوهريًا عن الوساطة والتحكيم من نواحٍ عدة. فالتوفيق يسعى لإيجاد الحل الأمثل بناءً على الخصوصية، وتوجيه الأطراف نحو اتفاق مشترك ومرضٍ.

رغم أن حفظ السلام (وقف العنف) عادةً ما يكون أسهل من صنع السلام (التوصل إلى اتفاق سلام)، فإنه لا يُعتبر نهاية المطاف. بل يُبقي النزاع معلقًا إلى أن تنجح عمليتا صنع السلام وبناء السلام لاحقًا. وقد وُجّهت انتقادات مفادها أن وقف إطلاق النار في بعض الحالات يُضعف من جهود التوصل إلى السلام، حيث يصبح الأمر ظاهريًا غير ضروري. وقد تُصبح الأطراف المتنازعة معتمدة على وجود قوات حفظ السلام الخارجية بشكل دائم، وهو أمر غير عملي في أغلب الأحيان.

2. Title: *Understanding and Resolving International Conflicts*

3. International conflict refers to disagreements or disputes between states, nations, or groups across borders. These conflicts often involve

struggles over power, territory, ideology, or resources, and can escalate into war or severe political tensions.

4. What are the different types of conflicts?

Inter-state conflicts (between countries), **Civil conflicts** (within a country), **Ethnic or inter-group conflicts**, **Ideological and political conflicts**, **Conflicts involving non-state actors** (e.g., rebel groups, terrorist organizations)

5. What are the mechanisms for international conflict resolution?

Negotiation, Mediation and Good Offices, Conciliation, Arbitration, Peacekeeping missions, Involvement of international organizations like the UN, NGOs, regional bodies, etc.

6. Does Algeria have the potential to resolve conflicts in the region?

Yes, Algeria has historically played a diplomatic role in resolving regional conflicts, especially in Africa and the Maghreb. Its policy of non-interference and peaceful mediation, as well as its experience in internal conflict resolution, make it a credible actor in regional peace processes.

Synonyms/ opposites

Sysonyms	Opposite
Conflict = Dispute / Struggle	Increased Decreased / Reduced
The dynamics = Interactions / Developments	Civil conflicts International peace
Common agreement = Consensus	Escalating Easing / Calming down
Conciliation= Mediation	Positive relationship Hostile relationship
Fraud = Deception	Good offices Biased intervention
Induce = Persuade	Tensions Calm / Stability

Translate into Arabic & English:

English Term	Arabic Translation

International conflict	النزاع الدولي
Inter-group conflicts	النزاعات بين الجماعات
The first line of conflict resolution	خط المواجهة الأول في حل النزاعات
Arbitration	التحكيم
Conciliation	التوفيق
Nonstate actors	الجهات الفاعلة غير الحكومية
Breakdown of law	انهيار سيادة القانون

Fill in the gaps:

harmful, instability, movements, negotiate, agreement, intervention.

The Nature and Importance of Theories of International Relations

Studies of international relations of our contemporary era must consider the paramount position of theories. Most of these theories conveyor helps in the understanding of the actions of actors in national, international and transnational arena, while some other theories complement the work of interpreting or ascribing meaning to activities in our global scene. It is because of these glaring positions that theories occupied in international relations and diplomacy that scholars and researchers of the field of IR maintain that it is incomprehensive to study and understand IR in isolation of theories. This Module will discuss the major traditional and modern paradigms and theories in the study of International Relations.

Although the study of international relations must account for the unique, new, and non-recurring phenomenon, it is also concerned with recurring processes and patterns of behaviour. These patterns occur with much regularity and often transcend specific historical episodes. They provide opportunities for scholars to draw generalisations and conceptualisations that cut across historical events. The generalisations provide a platform for the formulation of explanatory paradigms on such issues as the causes of war, imperialism, escalation, crises, alliance, deterrence, etc. without having to describe specific historical wars, alliances, crisis and other issues. It is the possibility of drawing such generalisations and concepts, building explanatory models and paradigms, which underlines the importance of the theoretical study of international relations. In this unit, you learn about the nature and importance of theories of IR[1].

Theories of IR have been described as a set of images or perspectives that are used as mechanical tools in describing, explaining, analysing and predicting the dynamics of world events and possible outcomes. Events, on their side, are a wide range of issues that touches on the life of individuals across the globe and frequently taking place

---

[1] Ademola Adeleke et al, op. cit, pp. 73-74.

on daily basis. Issues here include International politics, law, strategy, economic cooperation, trade and finance, military affairs, disarmament and environmental matters. Theories of IR therefore help scholars, diplomats and students of IR to have a better understanding of a whole gamut of events that take place across national boundaries as well as providing adequate tools of analysis and predictions.

Thus, in the period before World War I, Study of IR was generally characterised by description and analysis of events like war, invasion, conflicts, military power, strategy and diplomacy. Attempts were made to understand the events and the causes of their reoccurrences as a way of finding solutions to problems associated with them and as a result secure better condition of the society. Failure of the attempts or theories to achieve the targeted goal and incessant occurrence of Conflict and wars in the growing international system called for further theoretical enquiries. To this end, scholars of idealist theoretical orientation wedged in, believing that the achievement of the ideal situation within the international arena was only possible by the establishment of the legal framework and structures to regulate the behaviours of nations in the global system. For them, the world was a community of nations that has the potential to overcome collective problems. Thus, the idealist theorists placed their hopes for peace in the League of Nations, an international organisation that existed from 1920 to 1946 to promote world peace and cooperation. This theoretical orientation of IR reigned during the 1920s and 1930s[1].

Breakdown of the League of Nations and failure of the idealist theory to prevent World War II and aftermath Cold War between the east and western blocs caused the emergence of yet another theoretical approach emphasising on power politics of nations in understanding IR in name of realist theory. Since World War II, international relations scholarship has moved from mere description of events, the analysis of international treaties with a legalistic and moral tone, to the development of explanatory theories and paradigms on international phenomena. The process evolved towards the development of a "predictive science' of international relations. The logic of international relations as a predictive science is based on the claim that when enough

---

[1] Op. cit, p. 74.

basic propositions about the behaviour of policymakers, states, and international systems have been tested and verified through rigorous research methods predictive statements[1],

i.e., theories, can be advanced with sufficient clarity. Thus, the behavioural or scientific and post-behavioural theoretical category; the theoretical paradigms shifted from the traditional perception of the idealist to the study of behavioural patterns of the individual persons and systems involved in IR to the understanding of the workings of relations among nations. Besides, the post-behavioural scholars are concerned with the relevance of a theory to the problem which the policymaker is trying to solve. They, therefore, feel that the relevance of a theory or a paradigm is dependent upon its usefulness in solving the problem of the society[2].

It is important to stress that each generation of scholars has responded to the peculiar problems that faced their specific era. The dynamics of human nature has continued to change the nature and character of events, relations and international environment where these relations operated. As such, paradigms and theories to the study of IR have accordingly continued to change with time. For our purpose, nature and relevance of theories of IR, paradigms and theories can be broadly be viewed from the perspective of two different but exclusive categories namely the traditional or classical-like Idealist, Realist and the Power theorists and modern or behavioural or the scientific orientations such as the system, the game, decision-making and functionalist. Each contains a gamut of a paradigmatic shift in theories and perception whose formulations were largely influenced by problems and issues that emanated during their times[3].

Questions
1- Explaining and translating the text

2- What did the text take up (examining)?

---

[1] Op. cit, p. 75.
[2] Idem.
[3] Idem.

3- Mention the theories of international relations that the writer mentioned in the text.

4- What is the importance of studying theories of international relations?

5- What is your perception of ideal and realistic theory?

6- Why did ideal theory fail?

7- Are there current issues and topics that can be explained by the principles of ideal theory?

8- In your opinion, what theory is suitable for explaining the current international reality?

9- Opposites / synonyms:

Opposites		Synonyms	
isolation		interpreting	
explanatory		maintain	
building		the unique	
possible		behavior	

10- Translate the following terms into Arabic and into English

Into Arabic		Into English	
our contemporary era		الجهات الفاعلة على الساحة الوطنية والدولية وعبر الوطنية	
the behaviors of nations in the global system		أنماط السلوك المتكررة	
generalisations and concepts		الظاهرة الفريدة	
the League of Nations		المسائل البيئية	

11- fill the gaps: (explored, operated, continued, reviewed).

Then **translate the paragraph**:

The unit has ……………… the nature and importance of the theoretical study of international relations. It has …………….. the dynamics nature of paradigms and theories in the study of IR that have accordingly …………….. to change with time with the nature and character of events, relations and international environment where these relations……………...

The Answers:
1- Translation of the Text:

دراسات العلاقات الدولية في عصرنا المعاصر يجب أن تأخذ في الاعتبار المكانة البارزة للنظريات. تساعد معظم هذه النظريات في فهم تصرفات الفاعلين في الساحة الوطنية والدولية وعبر الوطنية، بينما تكمل نظريات أخرى مهمة تفسير أو إعطاء معنى للأنشطة في المشهد العالمي. وبسبب هذه الأدوار الواضحة التي تشغلها النظريات في العلاقات الدولية والدبلوماسية، يؤكد الباحثون والدارسون في مجال العلاقات الدولية أن دراسة وفهم هذا المجال بمعزل عن النظريات أمر غير مكتمل. سيناقش هذا المقرر النماذج والنظريات التقليدية والحديثة الرئيسة في دراسة العلاقات الدولية.

طبيعة وأهمية نظريات العلاقات الدولية:

رغم أن دراسة العلاقات الدولية يجب أن تراعي الظواهر الفريدة والجديدة وغير المتكررة، إلا أنها تهتم أيضًا بالعمليات المتكررة وأنماط السلوك. تحدث هذه الأنماط بانتظام كبير وغالبًا ما تتجاوز الحلقات التاريخية المحددة، مما يمنح الباحثين فرصًا لصياغة تعميمات ومفاهيم تتخطى الأحداث التاريخية. توفر هذه التعميمات أساسًا لوضع نماذج تفسيرية لقضايا مثل: أسباب الحروب، الاستعمار، التصعيد، الأزمات، التحالفات، الردع... إلخ، دون الحاجة إلى وصف كل حالة تاريخية محددة. وإمكانية صياغة مثل هذه التعميمات والمفاهيم، وبناء النماذج والنظريات التفسيرية، هو ما يؤكد أهمية الدراسة النظرية للعلاقات الدولية.

النظريات في العلاقات الدولية

وصفت بأنها مجموعة من التصورات أو الزوايا التي تُستخدم كأدوات ميكانيكية في وصف، وشرح، وتحليل، وتوقع ديناميكيات الأحداث العالمية والنتائج المحتملة. تشمل هذه الأحداث بمجموعة واسعة من القضايا التي تمس حياة الأفراد عبر العالم وتحدث بشكل يومي، مثل: السياسة الدولية، القانون، الاستراتيجية، التعاون الاقتصادي، التجارة والتمويل، الشؤون العسكرية، نزع السلاح، القضايا البيئية تساعد نظريات العلاقات الدولية الباحثين والدبلوماسيين وطلبة التخصص على فهم أفضل بمجموعة واسعة من الأحداث التي تحدث عبر الحدود الوطنية، كما توفر أدوات تحليل وتنبؤ فعالة.

ما قبل الحرب العالمية الأولى:

كانت دراسة العلاقات الدولية تتسم عمومًا بوصف وتحليل أحداث مثل الحرب، الغزو، الصراعات، القوة العسكرية، الاستراتيجية، والدبلوماسية. تم بذل محاولات لفهم هذه الأحداث وأسباب تكرارها بغية إيجاد حلول للمشكلات المرتبطة بها وتحقيق ظروف

مجتمعية أفضل .لكن فشل تلك المحاولات أو النظريات في تحقيق الهدف المنشود، واستمرار نشوب الصراعات والحروب، دفع إلى إجراء استفسارات نظرية أعمق.

ظهور النظرية المثالية:

دخل العلماء المثاليون الميدان، معتقدين أن تحقيق الوضع المثالي في الساحة الدولية لا يكون إلا عبر وضع أطر قانونية وهياكل تنظم سلوك الدول في النظام العالمي .بالنسبة لهم، كان العالم مجتمعًا من الأمم لديه القدرة على التغلب على المشكلات الجماعية. لذلك، علقوا آمالهم في تحقيق السلام على **عصبة الأمم**، وهي منظمة دولية أنشئت بين 1920 و1946 لتعزيز السلام والتعاون العالمي. سادت هذه النظرية المثالية خلال عشرينيات وثلاثينيات القرن العشرين.

أفول النظرية المثالية وظهور الواقعية:

أدى انهيار عصبة الأمم وفشل النظرية المثالية في منع الحرب العالمية الثانية، وما تبعها من الحرب الباردة بين الكتلتين الشرقية والغربية، إلى بروز توجه نظري جديد يركز على **سياسات القوة** في تفسير العلاقات الدولية، وهو ما يُعرف بـ **النظرية الواقعية** .منذ الحرب العالمية الثانية، تطورت دراسات العلاقات الدولية من مجرد وصف للأحداث وتحليل المعاهدات الدولية بأسلوب قانوني وأخلاقي، إلى تطوير نظريات ونماذج تفسيرية للظواهر الدولية .وتحولت إلى ما يُعرف بـ **العلم التنبؤي** للعلاقات الدولية، القائم على افتراض أنه عندما يتم اختبار وتأكيد عدد كافٍ من الفرضيات حول سلوك صناع القرار والدول والنظام الدولي باستخدام مناهج بحث صارمة، يمكن تقديم نظريات تنبؤية بوضوح كافٍ.

الانتقال نحو النظريات السلوكية وما بعد السلوكية:

تحول المنظور النظري من المثالية التقليدية إلى دراسة الأنماط السلوكية للأفراد والأنظمة المعنية بالعلاقات الدولية لفهم طبيعة العلاقات بين الدول .ركز العلماء ما بعد السلوكيين على **مدى ارتباط النظرية بالمشكلة التي يحاول صانع القرار حلها**، معتقدين أن أهمية النظرية أو النموذج تتوقف على مدى فائدته في حل المشكلات المجتمعية.

استمرارية التغيير في النظريات:

من المهم التأكيد أن كل جيل من الباحثين استجاب للمشكلات الخاصة بعصره .وقد استمر تغير الطبيعة البشرية في تغيير طبيعة وخصائص الأحداث والعلاقات والبيئة الدولية التي تجري فيها تلك العلاقات .وبالتالي، استمرت النماذج والنظريات في التغير مع الزمن.

تصنيف عام للنظريات:

بشكل عام، يمكن تصنيف نظريات العلاقات الدولية إلى فئتين مختلفتين، كل فئة تضم مجموعة من التحولات النظرية التي تأثرت بشكل كبير بالمشكلات والقضايا التي ظهرت في أزمنتها:

1. **النظريات التقليدية أو الكلاسيكية** :مثل المثالية، الواقعية، ونظرية القوة.

2. **النظريات الحديثة أو السلوكية أو العلمية** :مثل نظرية النظام، نظرية اللعبة، نظرية اتخاذ القرار، والنظرية الوظيفية.

2. The text examines the nature, importance, and development of theories in the study of international relations (IR). It explores both traditional and modern theoretical paradigms (like idealism, realism, and behavioral theories), and how they help explain and predict international behavior and events.

3. The theories mentioned are: Idealist theory, Realist theory**,** Power theory, System theory, Game theory, Decision-making theory, Functionalist theory, Behavioral and post-behavioral approaches

4. Studying IR theories is important because they:

- Help explain patterns of behavior among nations.
- Provide tools for describing, analyzing, and predicting global events.
- Offer frameworks to interpret complex international issues.
- Assist in making generalizations beyond specific historical events.
- Support policymakers and scholars in solving global problems.

5. What is your perception of ideal and realistic theory?

- **Idealist theory** sees the international system as a community that can cooperate for peace through international law and institutions. It emphasizes **morality, peace, and cooperation**.
- **Realist theory** is based on **power politics**, viewing states as self-interested actors in an anarchic world, where survival and security are the priority.

6. Ideal theory failed because:

- It couldn't prevent the outbreak of World War II.
- The League of Nations, its institutional hope for peace, collapsed.
- It underestimated power struggles and national interests that dominate international politics.

7. Are there current issues and topics that can be explained by the principles of ideal theory? Yes, such as:

- **Climate change cooperation** through international agreements.
- **UN peacekeeping missions**.
- **Global health responses**, e.g., WHO's pandemic coordination.
- Promotion of **human rights** and **international development goals**.

8. In your opinion, what theory is suitable for explaining the current international reality?

A hybrid approach combining realism and functionalism seems most suitable. Realism explains power dynamics (e.g., US-China rivalry), while functionalism explains cooperative efforts (like climate change agreements or economic globalization). Behavioral theories help analyze individual and group decision-making in diplomacy and conflict resolution.

9. Opposites / Synonyms:

Opposites	Synonyms
isolation ↔ integration	interpreting = understanding
explanatory ↔ confusing	maintain = sustain
building ↔ destruction	the unique = the exceptional
possible ↔ impossible	behavior = conduct

10. Translate the following terms into Arabic and English:

Into Arabic	Into English
our contemporary era	عصرنا المعاصر
the behaviors of nations in the global system	سلوكيات الدول في النظام العالمي
generalisations and concepts	التعميمات والمفاهيم
the League of Nations	عصبة الأمم
الجهات الفاعلة على الساحة الوطنية والدولية وعبر الوطنية	actors in the national, international, and transnational arena
أنماط السلوك المتكررة	recurring patterns of behavior
الظاهرة الفريدة	the unique phenomenon

environmental matters	المسائل البيئية

11. Fill in the gaps:

Explored, reviewed, continued, operated.

Realist Theory and Its Core Assumptions

Realism is a school of thought that explains international relations in terms of power. Some scholars refer to the exercise of power by states toward each other as realpolitik or power politics, realism has its intellectual roots in the older political philosophy of the West and the writings of non-western ancient authors such as Sun Tzu in China, Kautilya in India, as well as Thucydides in ancient Greece[1].

Realism, a school of thought in international relations theory, is a theoretical framework that views world politics as an enduring competition among self-interested states vying for power and positioning within an anarchic global system devoid of a centralized authority. It centers on states as rational primary actors navigating a system shaped by power politics, national interest, and a pursuit of security and self-preservation[2].

Realism involves the strategic use of military force and alliances to boost global influence while maintaining a balance of power. War is seen as an inevitability inherent in the anarchic conditions of world politics. Realism also emphasizes the complex dynamics of the security dilemma, where actions taken for security reasons can unintentionally lead to tensions between states[3].

Unlike idealism or liberalism, realism underscores the competitive and conflictual nature of global politics. In contrast to liberalism, which champions cooperation, realism asserts that the dynamics of the international arena revolve around states actively advancing national interests and prioritizing security. While idealism leans towards cooperation and ethical considerations, realism argues that states operate in a realm devoid of inherent justice, where ethical norms may not apply[4].

---

[1] Ademola Adeleke et al, op. cit, p. 81.
[2] For more see : Devetak, Richard, ed. (2012). *An introduction to international relations* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 36–41.
[3] Idem.
[4] Idem.

Realists fall into three classes based on their view of the essential causes of conflict between states:

- Classical realists believe that conflict follows from human nature.
- Neorealists attribute conflict to the dynamics of the anarchic state-system.
- Neoclassical realists believe that conflict results from both, in combination with domestic politics. Neorealists are also divided between defensive and offensive realism[1].

Despite their differences on major issues such as the cause of war and the goal of states' foreign policy, all realist theories share a few basic concepts that allow them to be considered "realist": (1) the international system is anarchic, (2) states are the primary actors within that system, and (3) states act in their own interest in pursuit of either power (classical and offensive realism) or security (defensive realism). The key concepts found in realist theory are anarchy, the balance of power, and the national interest.

The basics of realism:

The first assumption of realism is that the nation-state (usually abbreviated to 'state') is the principle actor in international relations. Other bodies exist, such as individuals and organisations, but their power is limited. Second, the state is a unitary actor. National interests, especially in times of war, lead the state to speak and act with one voice.

Third, decision-makers are rational actors in the sense that rational decision-making leads to the pursuit of the national interest. Here, taking actions that would make your state weak or vulnerable would not be rational. Realism suggests that all leaders, no matter what their political persuasion, recognise this as they attempt to manage their state's affairs in order to survive in a competitive environment[2].

[1] Miller, Benjamin (2020). *Grand strategy from Truman to Trump*. Chicago. p. 3.
[2] Sandrina Antunes & Isabel Camisão, Introducing Realism in International Relations Theory, international Relations Theory – an E-IR Foundations beginner's textbook, Feb 27 2018. P. 1.

Finally, states live in a context of anarchy – that is, in the absence of anyone being in charge internationally. The often-used analogy of there being 'no one to call' in an international emergency helps to underline this point. Within our own states we typically have police forces, militaries, courts and so on. In an emergency, there is an expectation that these institutions will 'do something' in response. Internationally, there is no clear expectation of anyone or anything 'doing something' as there is no established hierarchy. Therefore, states can ultimately only rely on themselves[1].

Many critics of realism focus on one of its central strategies in the management of world affairs – an idea called 'the balance of power'. This describes a situation in which states are continuously making choices to increase their own capabilities while undermining the capabilities of others. This generates a 'balance' of sorts as (theoretically) no state is permitted to get too powerful within the international system. If a state attempts to push its luck and grow too much, like Nazi Germany in the 1930s, it will trigger a war because other states will form an alliance to try to defeat it – that is, restore a balance[2].

This balance of power system is one of the reasons why international relations is anarchic. No single state has been able to become a global power and unite the world under its direct rule. Hence, realism talks frequently about the importance of flexible alliances as a way of ensuring survival. These alliances are determined less by political or cultural similarities among states and more by the need to find fair-weather friends, or 'enemies of my enemy'. This may help to explain why the US and the Soviet Union were allied during the Second World War (1939–1945): they both saw a similar threat from a rising Germany and sought to balance it[3].

Yet within a couple of years of the war ending, the nations had become bitter enemies and the balance of power started to shift again as new alliances were formed during what became known as the Cold

---

[1] Op. cit, p. 2.
[2] Idem.
[3] Ibid, p. 3.

War (1947–1991). While realists describe the balance of power as a prudent strategy to manage an insecure world, critics see it as a way of legitimising war and aggression[1].

Questions

1- translate the text

2- What did the text take up (examining)?

3- Did the realist theory emerge as a criticism of the ideal theory?

4- What are the different forms of realism?

5- What is the unit of analysis that realist theory focuses on?

6- What is the most prominent criticism directed at realist theory?

7- Are there current issues and topics that can be explained by the principles of ideal theory? mention it.

8- What are the principles of realist theory?

9- Opposites / synonyms:

Opposites		**Synonyms**	
Chaos		Constraints	
rational		Share	
Undermining		Competition	
Defeat		Boost	

10- Translate the following terms into Arabic and into English

Into Arabic		**Into English**	
power politics		إطار نظري	
the anarchic conditions of world politics		الفلسفة السياسية	
the competitive and conflictual nature of global politics		الدولة القومية	

---

[1] Op. cit.

		فوضوية	النظام الدولي	
defensive and offensive realism				

11- fill the gaps: (emphasizes, criticizing, explains, reality).

Then **translate the paragraph**:

Realism is a theory that claims to explain the ....of international politics. It ……………… the constraints on politics that result from humankind's egoistic nature and the absence of a central authority above the state. For realists, the highest goal is the survival of the state, which …………… why states' actions are judged according to the ethics of responsibility rather than by moral principles. The dominance of realism has generated a significant strand of literature ……………… its main tenets. However, despite the value of the criticisms, realism continues to provide valuable insights and remains an important analytical tool for every student of International Relations.

The Answers:

2- Translation of the Text:

الواقعية هي مدرسة فكرية تفسّر العلاقات الدولية من خلال مفهوم القوة. يُشير بعض العلماء إلى ممارسة الدول للسلطة تجاه بعضها البعض بمصطلحات مثل السياسة الواقعية (Realpolitik) أو سياسات القوة. ولها جذور فكرية في الفلسفة السياسية الغربية القديمة، وكذلك في كتابات مؤلفين غير غربيين مثل سون تزو في الصين، كوتيليا في الهند، وتوسيديدس في اليونان القديمة.

الواقعية، باعتبارها إطارًا نظريًا في العلاقات الدولية، ترى السياسة العالمية على أنها تنافس دائم بين دول أنانية تسعى للسلطة والمكانة داخل نظام دولي فوضوي يفتقر إلى سلطة مركزية. وتركّز الواقعية على الدول باعتبارها الفاعلين الأساسيين العقلانيين في نظام تحكمه سياسات القوة، والمصلحة الوطنية، والسعي إلى الأمن والبقاء.

تشمل الواقعية الاستخدام الاستراتيجي للقوة العسكرية والتحالفات لتعزيز النفوذ العالمي، مع الحفاظ على توازن القوى. ويُنظر إلى الحرب على أنها أمر حتمي ناتج عن الفوضى في النظام العالمي. كما تؤكد الواقعية على تعقيد مأزق الأمن (Security Dilemma)، حيث تؤدي التدابير الأمنية لدولة ما إلى زيادة التوتر لدى الدول الأخرى.

على عكس المثالية أو الليبرالية، تؤكد الواقعية على الطبيعة التنافسية والصراعية للسياسة العالمية. في حين تُشجع الليبرالية على التعاون، ترى الواقعية أن العلاقات الدولية تدور حول تعزيز الدول لمصالحها الوطنية وأولوياتها الأمنية. أما المثالية، فتميل إلى التعاون والمبادئ الأخلاقية، بينما ترى الواقعية أن العالم يفتقر إلى العدالة الجوهرية، ولا تنطبق فيه دائمًا المعايير الأخلاقية.

تنقسم الواقعية إلى ثلاثة أنواع بناءً على أسباب الصراع:

- الواقعيون الكلاسيكيون يرون أن الصراع ينبع من الطبيعة البشرية.
- الواقعيون الجدد (Neorealists) ينسبون الصراع إلى فوضوية النظام الدولي.
- الواقعيون الجدد الكلاسيكيون يعتقدون أن الصراع ناتج عن تفاعل النظام الدولي مع السياسات الداخلية للدول. كما يُقسم الواقعيون الجدد إلى واقعية دفاعية وواقعية هجومية.

رغم اختلافاتهم، تتشارك كل النظريات الواقعية في ثلاث مفاهيم أساسية:
1. النظام الدولي فوضوي.
2. الدولة هي الفاعل الأساسي.
3. الدول تتصرف بناءً على مصالحها الوطنية، سواء لتحقيق القوة (الواقعية الكلاسيكية والهجومية) أو الأمن (الواقعية الدفاعية)

الواقعية تقوم على عدة افتراضات:
- الدولة القومية هي الفاعل الرئيسي في العلاقات الدولية.
- الدولة هي فاعل موحد، تتحدث وتتصرف بصوت واحد، خاصة في أوقات الحروب.
- صانعو القرار عقلانيون ويسعون للمصلحة الوطنية.
- العالم يعيش في فوضى دولية؛ لا توجد سلطة عليا يمكنها التدخل في الأزمات.

تُنتقد الواقعية بسبب استراتيجيتها المركزية: توازن القوى. هذا يعني أن الدول تسعى دائمًا لزيادة قوتها وتقليل قوة الآخرين، مما يؤدي إلى توازن غير مستقر، يردع صعود أي قوة مهيمنة. إذا حاولت دولة النمو المفرط مثل ألمانيا النازية، فإن ذلك يؤدي إلى تحالفات ضدها. لهذا السبب لا توجد دولة واحدة تهيمن على العالم، وتُفضل الواقعية التحالفات المرنة المبنية على المصلحة المؤقتة، وليس على التشابه السياسي أو الثقافي. على سبيل المثال، تحالف الولايات المتحدة والاتحاد السوفيتي في الحرب العالمية الثانية ضد ألمانيا. ولكن بعد الحرب، تحولت هذه العلاقة إلى عداء شديد وبدأت مرحلة الحرب الباردة. رغم أن الواقعية تعتبر توازن القوى وسيلة حكيمة لإدارة عالم غير آمن، يرى النقاد أنها تبرر الحرب والعدوان.

2. The text examines **Realism as a theory in international relations**, covering:

- Its core concepts and historical origins.
- The different branches of realism.
- The assumptions it makes about the global system.
- Its contrast with idealism and liberalism.
- Criticism of its ideas like the balance of power.

3. Did the realist theory emerge as a criticism of the ideal theory?

Yes, realist theory emerged as a reaction and criticism of idealist theory, especially after the failure of idealism to prevent World War II and due

to the collapse of the League of Nations. Realism criticized idealism for being overly optimistic and ignoring power dynamics.

4. What are the different forms of realism?

- **Classical Realism** – conflict arises from human nature.
- **Neorealism (Structural Realism)** – conflict arises from the anarchic system.
- **Neoclassical Realism** – combines international structure with domestic politics.
- **Offensive Realism** – states seek to maximize power.
- **Defensive Realism** – states seek to maintain security and avoid overextension.

5. What is the unit of analysis that realist theory focuses on?

Realism focuses on the state as the primary and rational unit of analysis in international relations.

6. What is the most prominent criticism directed at realist theory?

The most prominent criticism is its reliance on the balance of power, which critics argue justifies war and aggression instead of preventing them. It is also criticized for:

- Ignoring non-state actors.
- Overemphasizing conflict and downplaying cooperation.
- Dismissing ethical and moral dimensions.

7. Are there current issues that can be explained by ideal theory?

Yes, examples include:

- Global climate cooperation (e.g., Paris Agreement).
- International humanitarian law (e.g., Geneva Conventions).
- UN peacekeeping missions.
- International human rights advocacy.

These rely on collective moral responsibility, law, and cooperation, reflecting idealist principles.

8. What are the principles of realist theory?

- The international system is anarchic (no central authority).
- The state is the main actor.
- States are rational and pursue national interest.
- Power and security are primary goals.
- War is inevitable in an anarchic world.
- Alliances are temporary and interest-based.
- Balance of power is used to prevent dominance by one state.

9. Opposites / Synonyms:

Opposites	Synonyms
Chaos ↔ Order	Constraints = Limits
Rational ↔ Irrational	Share = Distribute
Undermining ↔ Supporting	Competition = Rivalry
Defeat ↔ Victory	Boost = Increase

10. Translate the following terms:

Into Arabic	Into English
power politics	سياسات القوة
the anarchic conditions of world politics	فوضوية النظام الدولي
the competitive and conflictual nature of global politics	الطبيعة التنافسية والصراعية للسياسة العالمية
defensive and offensive realism	الواقعية الدفاعية والهجومية
إطار نظري	theoretical framework
الفلسفة السياسية	political philosophy
الدولة القومية	nation-state

11. Fill in the blanks:

Reality, emphasizes, explains, criticizing.

Liberal Theory and Its Main Approaches

Liberalism is a defining feature of modern democracy, illustrated by the prevalence of the term 'liberal democracy' as a way to describe countries with free and fair elections, rule of law and protected civil liberties. However, liberalism – when discussed within the realm of IR theory – has evolved into a distinct entity of its own. Liberalism contains a variety of concepts and arguments about how institutions, behaviours and economic connections contain and mitigate the violent power of states. When compared to realism, it adds more factors into our field of view – especially a consideration of citizens and international organisations[1].

The roots of modern liberal international relations theory can be traced back farther than utopianism to Immanuel Kant's essay "To Perpetual Peace" (1795) (and arguably farther). In that essay Kant provided three "definitive conditions" for perpetual peace, each of which became a dominant strain of post–World War II liberal IR theory. **Neoliberal Institutionalism** (also called "neoliberalism" or "institutional liberalism") emphasizes the importance of international institutions (Kant's "federation of free states") in maintaining peace. **Commercial Liberalism** emphasizes the importance of economic interdependence and free trade (Kant's "universal hospitality") in maintaining peace. **Democratic Peace Theory** argues that democracies rarely, if ever, go to war with each other, and thus an executive accountable to the people or the parliament is important to maintain peace (Kant's call for all states to have "republican constitutions"). There are other forms of liberal IR theory that are not explicitly dealt with in this article, such as **functionalism** and **neofunctionalism**, for example[2].

Earlier generations of scholars refer to liberalism as "idealism." More recent scholarship uses "idealism" to refer to "utopianism" or even

---

[1] Jeffrey W. Meiser, Introducing Liberalism in International Relations Theory, *International Relations Theory* – **an E-IR Foundations beginner's textbook,** Feb 18 2018, p.1.
[2] Jonathan Cristol, Liberalism, oxford bibliographies, 2019, https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/display/document/obo-9780199743292/obo-9780199743292-0060.xml

"constructivism." However, all postwar liberal theories share a few basic concepts that allow them to be called "liberal":

(1) states are the primary actors in the international system, but they are not unitary—domestic politics matters; (2) there are factors beyond capabilities that constrain state behavior; and (3) states' interests are multiple and changing. The key concepts found in liberal theory are absolute gains, international institutions, free trade, and democracy. International Law is also important in liberal IR theory as it is seen as forming a major constraint on state behavior. Liberal IR theory is a particularly Western-focused theory that deals with the advantages, limitations, and exportability of typically Western forms of government[1].

Liberalism revolves around three interrelated principles:

- Rejection of power politics as the only possible outcome of international relations; it questions security/warfare principles of realism
- Mutual benefits and international cooperation
- The role of international organizations and nongovernmental actors in shaping state preferences and policy choices.

This school of thought emphasizes three factors that encourage more cooperation and less conflict among states:

- International institutions, such as the United Nations, which provide a forum to resolve disputes in non-violent ways
- International trade because, when countries' economies are interconnected through trade, they are less likely to go to war with each other
- Spread of democracy, as well-established democracies do not go to war with one another, so if there are more democracies, interstate war will be less frequent[2].

Liberals believe that international institutions play a key role in cooperation among states via interdependence. There are three main components of interdependence. States interact in various ways, through economic, financial, and cultural means; security tends to not

---

[1] Op. cit.
[2] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Liberalism_(international_relations)

be the primary goal in state-to-state interactions; and military forces are not typically used. Liberals also argue that international diplomacy can be a very effective way to get states to interact with each other honestly and support nonviolent solutions to problems. With the proper institutions and diplomacy, Liberals believe that states can work together to maximize prosperity and minimize conflict.

The basics of liberalism

Liberalism is based on the moral argument that ensuring the right of an individual person to life, liberty and property is the highest goal of government. Consequently, liberals emphasise the wellbeing of the individual as the fundamental building block of a just political system. A political system characterised by unchecked power, such as a monarchy or a dictatorship, cannot protect the life and liberty of its citizens. Therefore, the main concern of liberalism is to construct institutions that protect individual freedom by limiting and checking political power. While these are issues of domestic politics, the realm of IR is also important to liberals because a state's activities abroad can have a strong influence on liberty at home. Liberals are particularly troubled by militaristic foreign policies. The primary concern is that war requires states to build up military power. This power can be used for fighting foreign states, but it can also be used to oppress its own citizens[1].

Wars of territorial expansion, or imperialism – when states seek to build empires by taking territory overseas – are especially disturbing for liberals. Not only do expansionist wars strengthen the state at the expense of the people, these wars also require long-term commitments to the military occupation and political control of foreign territory and peoples. Occupation and control require large bureaucracies that have an interest in maintaining or expanding the occupation of foreign territory. For liberals, therefore, the core problem is how to develop a political system that can allow states to protect themselves from foreign threats without subverting the individual liberty of its citizenry. The primary institutional check on power in liberal states is free and fair elections via which the people can remove their rulers from power, providing a fundamental check on the behaviour of the government. A

---

[1] Jeffrey W. Meiser, op. cit, p.2.

second important limitation on political power is the division of political power among different branches and levels of government – such as a parliament/congress, an executive and a legal system. This allows for checks and balances in the use of power[1].

Democratic peace theory is perhaps the strongest contribution liberalism makes to IR theory. It asserts that democratic states are highly unlikely to go to war with one another. There is a two-part explanation for this phenomenon. First, democratic states are characterised by internal restraints on power, as described above. Second, democracies tend to see each other as legitimate and unthreatening and therefore have a higher capacity for cooperation with each other than they do with non-democracies. First, democracy is a relatively recent development in human history. This means there are few cases of democracies having the opportunity to fight one another. Second, we cannot be sure whether it is truly a 'democratic' peace or whether some other factors correlated with democracy are the source of peace – such as power, alliances, culture, economics and so on. A third point is that while democracies are unlikely to go to war with one another, some scholarship suggests that they are likely to be aggressive toward non-democracies – such as when the United States went to war with Iraq in 2003. Despite the debate, the possibility of a democratic peace gradually replacing a world of constant war – as described by realists – is an enduring and important facet of liberalism[2].

We currently live in an international system structured by the liberal world order built after the Second World War (1939–1945). The international institutions, organisations and norms of this world order are built on the same foundations as domestic liberal institutions and norms; the desire to restrain the violent power of states. Yet, power is more diluted and dispersed internationally than it is within states. For example, under international law, wars of aggression are prohibited. There is no international police force to enforce this law, but an aggressor knows that when breaking this law it risks considerable international backlash. For example, states – either individually or as part of a collective body like the United Nations – can impose economic sanctions or intervene militarily against the offending state.

[1] Op. cit, p.3.
[2] Idem.

Furthermore, an aggressive state also risks missing out on the benefits of peace, such as the gains from international trade, foreign aid and diplomatic recognition.

The fullest account of the liberal world order is found in the work of Daniel Deudney and G. John Ikenberry (1999), who describe three interlocking factors[1]:

First, international law and agreements are accompanied by international organisations to create an international system that goes significantly beyond one of just states. The archetypal example of such an organisation is the United Nations, which pools resources for common goals (such as ameliorating climate change), provides for near constant diplomacy between enemies and friends alike and gives all member states a voice in the international community.

Second, the spread of free trade and capitalism through the efforts of powerful liberal states and international organisations like the World Trade Organization, the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank creates an open, market-based, international economic system. This situation is mutually beneficial as a high level of trade between states decreases conflict and makes war less likely, since war would disrupt or cancel the benefits (profits) of trade. States with extensive trade ties are therefore strongly incentivised to maintain peaceful relations. By this calculation, war is not profitable, but detrimental to the state.

The **third** element of the liberal international order is international norms. Liberal norms favour international cooperation, human rights, democracy and rule of law. When a state takes actions contrary to these norms, they are subject to various types of costs. Nevertheless, there are costs for violating liberal norms. The costs can be direct and immediate. For example, the European Union placed an arms sale embargo on China following its violent suppression of pro-democracy protesters in 1989. The embargo continues to this day. The costs can also be less direct, but equally as significant. For example, favourable views of the United States decreased significantly around the world following the 2003 invasion of Iraq because the invasion was undertaken unilaterally

---

[1] Op. cit, p.4.

(outside established United Nations rules) in a move that was widely deemed illegitimate.

Key Assumptions:

- States are not the only important actors in world politics. Non-state actors are important entities in IR that cannot be ignored.
- International Organizations (IOs) can be independent actors in their own right.
- The organization's own decision makers, bureaucrats have considerable influence in agenda setting, namely determining which issues are most important politically.
- IOs are more than simply arenas within which sovereign states compete.
- Moreover, Multinational Corporations cannot be ignored as well in a highly interdependent world economy.
- For liberals, the state is not a unitary actor. State is composed of individual bureaucracies, interest groups, and individuals that attempt to influence foreign policy. There may be competition, coalition, conflict, compromise among these actors.
- States may not be rational actors: A particular policy may be suggested just because it serves bureaucratic power or prestige of certain groups.
- They reject the idea that the agenda of international politics is dominated primarily by military-security issues.
- For them the agenda of international politics is extensive and diversified and economic and social issues are often at the forefront of foreign policy debates.
- The problems of energy, natural resources, environment, pollution are as important as questions of security and territorial competition.
- The international system is not completely anarchic. Some domains of international relations are characterized by "international regimes". So, cooperation between states can be achieved[1].

Questions:

---

[1] https://www.cag.edu.tr/d/l/4b5f5f30-20ab-4440-9713-fa7e3f738cbc

1- translate the text

2- What did the text take up (examining)?

3- Did the liberal theory emerge as a criticism of the realism theory?

4- What are the different forms of liberal theory?

5- What is the unit of analysis that liberal theory focuses on?

6- What is the most prominent criticism directed at liberal theory?

7- Are there current issues and topics that can be explained by the principles of liberal theory? mention it.

8- What are the principles of liberal theory?

9- Opposites / synonyms:

Opposites		Synonyms	
Perpetual		Feature	
Constrain		the prevalence	
Interrelated		Provide	
Rejection		Prosperity	

5- Translate the following terms into Arabic and into English

Into Arabic		Into English	
Democratic countries do not fight		الديمقراطية الحديثة	
protected civil liberties		السلام الديمقراطي	
states' interests are multiple and changing		النظرية الوظيفية والوظيفية الجديدة	
state preferences and policy choices		اللبرالية المؤسساتية	

6- fill the gaps: (agreements, absolute, cooperate, relative).

Then **translate the paragraph**:

Liberal theorists argue that states care more about ………….. gains than ………….. gains. Relative gains, which relate closely to realist accounts, describe a situation where a state measures its increase in

welfare relative to other states and may shy away from any
…………….. that make a competitor stronger. By focusing on the more
optimistic viewpoint of absolute gains and providing evidence of its
existence via international organisations, liberals see a world where
states will likely ………….. in any agreement where any increase in
prosperity is probable.

The Answers:
1- Translation of the Text:

الليبرالية سمة مميزة للديمقراطية الحديثة، كما يتجلى في مصطلح "الديمقراطية الليبرالية" لوصف الدول التي تقيم انتخابات حرة ونزيهة، وتحترم سيادة القانون، وتحمي الحريات المدنية. داخل إطار نظرية العلاقات الدولية، تطورت الليبرالية كمفهوم مستقل يحتوي على مجموعة من الأفكار التي تفسّر كيف تعمل المؤسسات والعلاقات الاقتصادية والسلوكيات في التخفيف من استخدام القوة من قبل الدول. مقارنة بالواقعية، تضيف الليبرالية عوامل مثل دور المواطنين والمنظمات الدولية في المشهد الدولي. وتُرجع جذور النظرية الليبرالية الحديثة إلى مقال إيمانويل كانط "نحو سلام دائم" (1795)، الذي وضع ثلاثة شروط للسلام الدائم: المؤسسات الدولية، الترابط الاقتصادي، والحكم الديمقراطي. كل منها أصبح أساسًا لأشكال ما بعد الحرب العالمية الثانية من الليبرالية: الليبرالية المؤسسية، الليبرالية التجارية، ونظرية السلام الديمقراطي. تشترك هذه التوجهات النظريّة، رغم اختلافها، في المفاهيم الأساسية التالية:

1. الدولة هي الفاعل الأساسي لكنها ليست فاعلًا موحّدًا— السياسة الداخلية مهمة.
2. توجد قيود على سلوك الدولة تفوق قدراتها.
3. مصالح الدولة متعددة ومتغيرة.

تشمل المفاهيم الرئيسية: المكاسب المطلقة، المؤسسات الدولية، التجارة الحرة، والديمقراطية، كما يُنظر إلى القانون الدولي على أنه قيد رئيسي في سلوك الدولة. الليبرالية تركز، بشكل كبير، على النماذج الغربية وتبحث فوائدها وحدودها وإمكانية تصديرها للدول الأخرى.

تدور الليبرالية حول ثلاث مبادئ مترابطة:

● رفض فكرة أن السياسة الدولية تدور فقط حول القوة على غرار الواقعية.
● المنافع المتبادلة والتعاون الدولي.
● دور المنظمات الدولية والجهات الفاعلة غير الحكومية في تشكيل تفضيلات الدول وسياساتها.

تركز مدرسة الفكر هذه على التفاعل من خلال الاعتماد المتبادل، حيث تلعب المنظمات والمؤسسات دورًا في تشجيع التعاون وتقليل الخلافات بين الدول. كما يؤمن الليبراليون بأن الدبلوماسية الدولية فعالة إذا كان هناك إطار مؤسسي يضمن الشفافية والتفاوض السلمي.

أسس الليبرالية ترتكز على حماية حقوق الفرد (الحياة، الحرية، الملكية)، وترى أن النظام السياسي الذي لا يخضع للرقابة (كالديكتاتورية) لا يحمي هذه الحقوق. لذلك، تُعلي الليبرالية من شأن الانتخابات الحرة وتقسيم السلطة لتقييد حكومة قد تسيء استخدام القوة.

نظرية السلام الديمقراطي من أهم مساهمات الليبرالية في نظرية العلاقات الدولية، حيث تفترض أن الدول الديمقراطية لا تحارب بعضها البعض غالبًا، لأن لديها ضوابط داخلية على السلطة وترى بعضها كشرعي وأقل تهديدًا. نعاصر اليوم نظامًا دوليًا ليبراليًا نشأ بعد الحرب العالمية الثانية، يعتمد على القانون والمؤسسات والتجارة والديمقراطية كأساس. يتكون هذا النظام من ثلاث عناصر متداخلة:

1. القانون الدولي والمنظمات الدولية التي تتجاوز مجرد الدول.
2. التجارة الحرة والنظام الاقتصادي العالمي القائم على السوق.
3. المعايير الليبرالية (حقوق الإنسان، القانون الدولي، الديمقراطية) التي تفرض تكاليف على الدول المخالفة.

2. The text examines the evolution and core principles of Liberalism in International Relations Theory, comparing it with Realism, tracing its roots to Immanuel Kant, and explaining how liberalism promotes institutions, economic interdependence, democracy, and legal norms as tools for peace and cooperation.

3. Did liberal theory emerge as a criticism of realism?

Yes. Liberal theory emerged, in part, as a critique of realist assumptions. It rejects the idea that international politics is solely about power struggles and instead emphasizes cooperation, legal frameworks, and moral dimensions absent in realism.

4. Different forms of liberal theory mentioned

- **Neoliberal Institutionalism** (Institutional Liberalism)
- **Commercial Liberalism**
- **Democratic Peace Theory**
- Other forms like **Functionalism** and **Neofunctionalism**

5. Liberal theory focuses on the state + internal actors, including:

- Domestic institutions
- Interest groups
- Non-state actors Hence, the state is not unitary but composite.

6. Most prominent criticism of liberal theory

Critics argue that liberal theory is Western-centric, assuming universal applicability of Western-style democracy, institutions, and norms. They question whether democracy and trade inevitably lead to peace in non-Western contexts.

7. Current issues that can be explained by liberal theory

- Global climate agreements (e.g., Paris Accord)
- International trade agreements and WTO
- UN peacekeeping missions
- Human rights advocacy
- Democratic transitions and norms promotion

8. Principles of liberal theory

- States are not unitary actors; domestic politics matter.
- Multiple constraints on state behavior beyond capabilities.
- States pursue absolute gains, not just relative.
- International institutions foster cooperation.
- Economic interdependence reduces conflict.
- Spreading democracy increases peace.
- Non-state actors and international law are central to IR.

9. Opposites / Synonyms

Opposites	Synonyms
Perpetual ↔ Temporary	Feature = Characteristic
Constrain ↔ Liberate	The prevalence = The dominance
Interrelated ↔ Independent	Provide = Offer
Rejection ↔ Acceptance	Prosperity = Wealth

10. Translate Terms

Into Arabic	Into English
Democratic countries do not fight	الدول الديمقراطية لا تتحارب
Protected civil liberties	الحريات المدنية المحمية
States' interests are multiple and changing	مصالح الدول متعددة ومتغيرة

State preferences and policy choices	تفضيلات الدولة وخياراتها السياسية
الديمقراطية الحديثة	Modern democracy
السلام الديمقراطي	Democratic peace
النظرية الوظيفية والوظيفية الجديدة	Functionalist and neofunctionalist theory
اللبرالية المؤسساتية	Neoliberal institutionalism

11. Fill the gaps:

absolute, relative , agreements , cooperate.

Constructivist Theory as a Bridge in International Relations

How did constructivism start in international relations?

Constructivism in international relations began with the theories of Nicholas Onuf & Alexander Wendt, & the term 'Constructivism' was coined for International Relations by Nicholas Greenwood Onuf in his book, World of Our Making: Rules and Rule in Social Theory and International Relations [1989]. However, it was the works of Alexander Wendt especially his 1992 article, Anarchy is what States Make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics, and his 1999 book, Social Theory of International Politics which popularized Constructivism in IR[1].

What are the key principles of constructivism in IR?

Constructivism in IR is primarily concerned with three things. First, states are the core units of analysis. Secondly, that the structures of states are intersubjective and, relatedly, that state identities and interests are similarly socially constructed[2].

What is the theory of constructivism?

Constructivism in IR is a theory that most of the core concepts in international relations are socially constructed. This means that they are made through social interaction and socially-applied meanings, rather than given inherent, natural value.

Constructivism came into existence as a response to the 'third debate' in IR. The third debate, between Neorealism and Neoliberalism, was a synthesis movement to make IR more scientific. Mainstream IR theories' reliance on positivism triggered the 'fourth debate' between the proponents of positivism and postpositivism in IR in the late 1980s and that led to a number of postpositivist/ postmodernist/

---

[1] For more see : Roshan Varghese, Constructivism, in:
https://egyankosh.ac.in/bitstream/123456789/71223/1/Unit-7.pdf
[2] idem.

poststructuralist theories including Constructivism. When narrating the genesis of Constructivism one cannot ignore the influence of the English School, which is considered to be the precursor to IR constructivism. The English School interprets international relations as being social and historical. Moreover, it believes in the existence of an international society driven by norms and identity[1].

Social Construction of Reality:

Constructivists believe that reality is a project under constant construction. Instead of treating the social world as a pre-given entity, Constructivists consider it as a 'world as coming into being'. However, social reality is constituted of our inter-subjective (or shared) knowledge and interpretations about the social world and this may influence and alter our social relations. Here, the knowledge is constructed inter subjectively, which means the knowledge is produced in the interactions amongst people. For instance, Alexander Wendt in his influential article, Anarchy is what States Make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics, explains how knowledge is constructed inter-subjectively by depicting the story of 'Alter' and 'Ego'. Alter and Ego, are two imagined characters, who meet each other for the first time. Therefore, both do not have any idea about the nature of the other, which means they do not have any friendship and enmity beforehand. In such a condition, their interactions will inform them about the nature of the other – whether the counterpart is trustworthy or unreliable, friendly or hostile. The same thing is happening in international relations, where interactions among nation states inform them about the nature of international relations, who are the friendly nations and enemies. Constructivists also hold that the experiences during the course of interactions and the interpretations may change the imagery about the other. In other words, interactions and interpretations may transform the enmity to friendship and the vice versa. The book titled, The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics, edited by Peter J. Katzenstein (1996) sets forth the argument that international relations do not function independently of human action and cognition. Moreover, the book argues that norms and ideas play a

---

[1] Op. cit.

major role in defining the identities of actors thereby prescribe the proper behaviour for actors. This is just in contrast to the logic of consequences or rational-choice suggested by Neorealism and Neoliberalism[1].

Influence of Ideational Factors:

Since the reality is socially constructed, we cannot understand social realities (including international relations) by examining only material forces (such as military power, economic resources). Instead, Constructivists believe that understanding of social reality requires the examination of both ideational (identity, culture, norms) and material factors. For instance, a North Korean nuclear weapon is similar to a French nuclear weapon in terms of its material attribute and destructive effects. However, as far as the United States of America (USA) is concerned, the nuclear weapon of North Korea is dangerous and the French one is not. Both nuclear weapons get different meanings according to the nature of the USA's relations with France and North Korea. Here, 'identity' as an ideational factor gives different meanings to nuclear weapons, as the USA treats the French as its ally and North Korea as its enemy (and a potential threat to the USA's security). The notion of identity is very much related to a binary of 'we' and 'other'. History, culture, political processes, and social interactions are playing a major role in forming this binary. For instance, the common history of ancestors, sharing liberal values, mutual understanding and cordial relations inform both the USA and France that they have a lot of things in common; therefore, both of them consider each other as a friend. However, on the basis of the same criteria, the USA realizes that North Korea is the 'other'. Constructivists argue that identities are socially constructed through interactions. They, further suggest that the behaviour of nation-states in the international system is not driven solely by the distribution of power, but also depends on the 'distribution of identities'. That is, patterns of cooperation and conflict depend on how states understand themselves and others in the international system, rather than solely on material factors[2].

---

[1] Op. cit.
[2] idem.

International Anarchy:

In IR, 'anarchy', is conceived as a social system that lacks legitimate institutions of authority. During the grand debate (neo-neo debate) between Neorealism and Neoliberalism, there was a consensus about the nature of anarchy. Both Neorealists and Neoliberals held that the absence of a world government was the major reason for international anarchy. Hence, Neorealists preferred a self-help mechanism to address international anarchy. On the contrary, Neoliberals suggested interdependence for mitigating anarchy and overcoming insecurity in the international system. However, Constructivists have a different opinion about international anarchy. For instance, Nicholas Onuf holds that the absence of a world government does not lead to disorder and violence. Rather, there are three categories of rules (i.e. 'instructionrules', 'directive-rules', and 'commitment-rules') to constitute and regulate international relations. Instruction-rules set forth general principles of international relations (such as sovereignty, human rights, international law, etc.) and their importance in ensuring peaceful international relations. Directive-rules have provisions for protecting these principles and punishing offenders. For instance, invading another nation-state is the violation of state 'sovereignty', and then the international community will join together against the offender. Nation-states entering into treaties on human rights and environment means they promise to protect them, means commitment-rules play a significant role in international relations. Thus, according to Onuf international relations are regulated by rules, and international anarchy is a rule by no sovereign body, and therefore a rule by everyone associated with the aforesaid rules. Wendt also negates the Neorealist and Neoliberal assumption about international anarchy. According to Wendt, there is no 'logic' of anarchy apart from the practices and interactions among nation-state. Then the nature of anarchy is determined by ideational factors, practices, and interactions among nation-states. The relationship among friends will be very cordial, strangers will be lukewarm, and enemies will be hostile in the state of anarchy. Thus, the outcome of anarchy will be shaped by the interactions and shared understandings of nation-states[1].

---

[1] Op. cit.

However, Constructivism is also not free from criticism. Constructivism has been the target of its critics due to its bankruptcy in predicting the future course of international relations. Constructivists neither set forth a pessimistic picture of international relations depicted by Neorealists, nor does it draw a rosier picture as done by the optimistic Neoliberals. Rather Constructivists are agnostic about the future of international relations by submitting that the future can either be conflictual, peaceful or in any other forms, depending on the interactions of actors. Hence, the critics dub Constructivism as an empty vessel, which focuses only on the social construction of international relations, and due to this reason, many IR scholars consider Constructivism as an approach rather than a theory. Even so, one cannot underestimate the role of Constructivism in enhancing the scope IR by bringing ideational factors into its fold. Constructivism offers an alternative explanation of some of the core themes in international relations such as the meaning of international anarchy, and it also suggests the prospects for change[1].

Questions

1- translate the text

2- What did the text take up (examining)?

3- What is Constructivism?

4- What is the Constructivism assumptions?

5- What is the unit of analysis that are Constructivism theory focuses on?

6- What is the most prominent criticism directed at constractivism theory?

7- Are there current issues and topics that can be explained by the principles of constractivism theory? mention it.

8- How the Constructivism explained anarchy? & Is Constructivism theory or mainstream?

9- **Opposites / synonyms:**

---

[1] Op. cit.

Opposites		Synonyms	
Criticism		Pessimistic	
as a response		potential	
destructive		Rules	
Trust		anarchy	

5- Fill the gaps; Constructivists- given point- anarchy- scarce resources- self help- important-

neorealism and Neoliberalism both hold ……………. as the lack of higher authority States, according to Keohane and Mearsheimer alike, exist in a ………….. world where gains (relative: Keohane, Grieco; or absolute: Waltz. Mearsheimer) matter. Thus anarchy is a materialistic phenomenon that will drive states to compete………….. such as economic strength and security. Waltz (1993) defines anarchy as a system in which there is no legitimate use of force outside of the actors (which he defines as states) Some liberals, such as Milner (1993) have attempted to overcome the neorealist/neoliberal conception of anarchy by redefining its meaning. This project seems almost constructive in approach, but does not extend itself to the conclusions about anarchy made by constructivists such as Wendt. …………. Argue that anarchy is a deeply embedded structure that is basically only as ……..... as the actors decide it is at a …………… in time.

The Answers:

1- Translation of the Text:

كيف بدأت البنائية في العلاقات الدولية؟

بدأت البنائية في العلاقات الدولية بنظريات نيكولاس أونوف وألكسندر وندت، وقد صاغ نيكولاس غرينوود أونوف مصطلح "البنيوية" في سياق العلاقات الدولية في كتابه *عالم من صنعنا: القواعد والحكم في النظرية الاجتماعية والعلاقات الدولية* (1989). ومع ذلك، فإن أعمال ألكسندر وندت، لا سيما مقاله الشهير عام 1992 بعنوان *الفوضى هي ما تصنعه الدول منها: البناء الاجتماعي للسياسة القوة* وكتابه عام 1999 *النظرية الاجتماعية للسياسة الدولية*، هي التي جعلت البنيوية شائعة في مجال العلاقات الدولية.

ما المبادئ الأساسية للبنائية في العلاقات الدولية؟

تركز البنائية في العلاقات الدولية بشكل رئيسي على ثلاثة أمور:

1. أن الدول هي وحدات التحليل الأساسية.
2. أن هياكل الدول ذات طابع تداخلي–ذاتي (أي يتم تحديدها من خلال المعاني المشتركة بين الفاعلين).
3. أن هويات ومصالح الدول تتكون اجتماعياً بنفس الطريقة.

ما هي نظرية البنائية؟

هي نظرية ترى أن معظم المفاهيم الأساسية في العلاقات الدولية هي مفاهيم مبنية اجتماعياً، أي أنها نتاج للتفاعل الاجتماعي والمعاني التي يُضفيها المجتمع، وليست ذات قيمة فطرية أو طبيعية.

نشأت البنيوية كرد فعل على "المناظرة الثالثة" في العلاقات الدولية، وهي المناظرة التي دارت بين النيوليبرالية والنيوريالية، بهدف جعل العلاقات الدولية أكثر علمية. وقد أدى اعتماد نظريات العلاقات الدولية السائدة على الوضعية إلى اندلاع "المناظرة الرابعة" بين المؤيدين للوضعية والمعارضين لها (ما بعد الوضعية)، في أواخر الثمانينيات، مما أدى إلى ظهور نظريات جديدة مثل البنيوية، وما بعد الحداثة، وما بعد البنيوية. ومن المهم أيضاً عدم إغفال تأثير المدرسة الإنجليزية، التي تُعد رائدة للبنيوية في العلاقات الدولية، حيث تفسر العلاقات الدولية بأنها ظاهرة اجتماعية وتاريخية، وتؤمن بوجود مجتمع دولي قائم على القواعد والهوية.

البناء الاجتماعي للواقع:

يرى البنيويون أن الواقع هو مشروع دائم التكوين. فهم لا يتعاملون مع العالم الاجتماعي ككيان مُعطى مسبقاً، بل كـ"عالم في طور التكوين". ويتشكل الواقع الاجتماعي من خلال المعرفة المشتركة والتفسيرات المتبادلة عن هذا العالم، والتي قد تؤثر على علاقاتنا الاجتماعية. وهنا، يتم إنتاج المعرفة من خلال التفاعلات بين الأفراد.

على سبيل المثال، يشرح ألكسندر وندت في مقاله *الفوضى هي ما تصنعه الدول منها* كيف يتم بناء المعرفة من خلال التفاعل بين شخصيتين متخيلتين: "ألتر" و"إيغو". كل منهما لا يعرف شيئاً عن الآخر، ولا توجد بينهما صداقة أو عداوة مسبقة. من خلال تفاعلهما، يكتشف كل منهما طبيعة الآخر —— ما إذا كان ودوداً أو عدائياً. الأمر ذاته ينطبق على العلاقات الدولية، حيث تكشف التفاعلات بين الدول عن طبيعة العلاقات الدولية —— من هو الصديق ومن هو العدو. ويرى البنيويون أن هذه التفاعلات والتفسيرات قد تغير التصورات، فتحوّل العداء إلى صداقة، والعكس صحيح. كما يطرح كتاب *ثقافة الأمن القومي: القواعد والهوية في السياسة العالمية* الذي حرره بيتر كاتزنشتاين (1996)، حجة أساسية وهي أن العلاقات الدولية لا تعمل بمعزل عن الفعل البشري والإدراك، وأن القواعد والأفكار تلعب دوراً رئيسياً في تشكيل هويات الفاعلين، وتحدد سلوكهم المتوقع. وهذا يتناقض تماماً مع منطق النتائج أو الاختيار العقلاني الذي تقترحه النيوريالية والنيوليبرالية.

تأثير العوامل الفكرية (الأيديولوجية):

بما أن الواقع يتم بناؤه اجتماعياً، فلا يمكن فهم الواقع الاجتماعي (بما في ذلك العلاقات الدولية) فقط من خلال تحليل القوى المادية (مثل القوة العسكرية أو الموارد الاقتصادية). بل يعتقد البنيويون أن فهم الواقع يتطلب دراسة العوامل الفكرية (كالهوية، والثقافة، والقواعد) إلى جانب العوامل المادية. على سبيل المثال، السلاح النووي الكوري الشمالي والسلاح النووي الفرنسي متشابهان من حيث الطبيعة المادية والتأثير التدميري. ولكن بالنسبة للولايات المتحدة، يعتبر السلاح النووي الكوري تهديداً، بينما لا يُنظر إلى

الفرنسي على هذا النحو. والسبب في ذلك هو "الهوية"؛ ففرنسا تُعد حليفاً بينما تُعد كوريا الشمالية عدواً. تُبنى هذه الهويات اجتماعياً من خلال التاريخ والثقافة والعمليات السياسية والتفاعلات الاجتماعية. فالتاريخ المشترك، والقيم الليبرالية، والتفاهم المتبادل تقرب بين فرنسا والولايات المتحدة، بينما تفرّق نفس المعايير بين الولايات المتحدة وكوريا الشمالية. ويجادل البنيويون بأن أنماط التعاون أو الصراع في العلاقات الدولية تعتمد على كيفية فهم الدول لنفسها وللآخرين، وليس فقط على توزيع القوة المادية.

الفوضى الدولية:

في العلاقات الدولية، تُعرّف "الفوضى" على أنها نظام اجتماعي يفتقر إلى مؤسسات شرعية للسلطة. في "المناظرة الكبرى" بين النيوريالية والنيوليبرالية، كان هناك إجماع على أن غياب الحكومة العالمية هو سبب الفوضى الدولية. فالنيوريالیون يرون أن الحل هو الاعتماد على الذات، بينما يقترح النيوليبراليون التعاون والاعتماد المتبادل كسبيل لتقليل الفوضى وعدم الأمان. لكن البنيويين يرون الفوضى بطريقة مختلفة. فمثلاً، يرى نيكولاس أونوف أن غياب الحكومة العالمية لا يؤدي بالضرورة إلى الفوضى والعنف. بل توجد ثلاثة أنواع من القواعد تحكم العلاقات الدولية:

1. قواعد تعليمية :(Instruction Rules) مثل السيادة وحقوق الإنسان والقانون الدولي.
2. قواعد توجيهية :(Directive Rules) توفر وسائل لحماية المبادئ العامة ومعاقبة من ينتهكها.
3. قواعد التزام :(Commitment Rules) مثل توقيع الدول على اتفاقيات حقوق الإنسان والبيئة، والتي تُظهر التزاماً بحمايتها.

وبالتالي، وفقاً لأونوف، فإن العلاقات الدولية تحكمها القواعد، والفوضى الدولية ليست غياب حكم، بل حكم من دون سيادة، أي حكم من قبل كل من يلتزم بهذه القواعد. أما وندت، فقد رفض الافتراض النيوريالي والنيوليبرالي بشأن الفوضى، قائلاً إن لا وجود لـ"منطق" للفوضى خارج الممارسات والتفاعلات بين الدول. فالعلاقات بين الأصدقاء ستكون ودية، وبين الغرباء محايدة، وبين الأعداء عدائية. ومن ثم، فإن نتائج الفوضى تتحدد من خلال التفاعلات والفهم المشترك بين الدول.

الانتقادات الموجهة للبنيوية:

البنيوية ليست خالية من النقد. فقد انتقدها البعض لعجزها عن التنبؤ بمستقبل العلاقات الدولية. فهي لا ترسم صورة متشائمة مثل النيوريالية، ولا متفائلة مثل النيوليبرالية، بل تظل محايدة، معتبرة أن المستقبل يعتمد على التفاعلات. ولهذا، وصفها النقاد بأنها "وعاء فارغ" يركز فقط على البناء الاجتماعي، مما يجعل بعض العلماء يعتبرونها منهجاً وليس نظرية. ومع ذلك، لا يمكن التقليل من دور البنيوية في توسيع أفق العلاقات الدولية من خلال إدخال العوامل الفكرية، كما أنها توفر تفسيراً بديلاً لمفاهيم جوهرية مثل الفوضى الدولية، وتقترح إمكانية حدوث تغيير.

2. The text examines the theory of *Constructivism* in International Relations (IR), its origin, key assumptions, interpretation of international anarchy, and its critique of mainstream theories like

Neorealism and Neoliberalism. It also explores the role of identity, norms, and social interactions in shaping state behavior.

3. What is Constructivism?

Constructivism is a theory in IR that argues that most core concepts in world politics—like state interests, identities, and even anarchy—are *socially constructed*. This means they are created and maintained through social interactions and shared meanings rather than being inherently fixed or material.

4. What are Constructivism assumptions?

Constructivism assumes:

- States are the primary units of analysis.
- State identities and interests are not pre-given but constructed through interaction.
- The international system is shaped by intersubjective ideas (such as norms, beliefs, and identity), not just material power.
- Reality is not objective or static—it is socially constructed and constantly evolving.

5. What is the unit of analysis that Constructivism theory focuses on?

Constructivism focuses on **states** as the core unit of analysis, particularly on their **identities**, **interests**, and **social interactions** within the international system.

6. What is the most prominent criticism directed at Constructivism theory?

The most prominent criticism is that Constructivism **fails to predict** the future of international relations. Critics argue that it is overly descriptive and lacks the predictive power of other theories, leading some to consider it more of an *approach* than a full-fledged theory.

7. Are there current issues and topics that can be explained by the principles of Constructivism theory? Mention it.

Yes, many current issues can be analyzed through Constructivism, including:

- **The Russia–Ukraine conflict**, where identity, historical narratives, and social constructions of threat are central.
- **U.S.–North Korea relations**, where the perception of threat is based on identity and norms rather than just material capability.
- **Climate change diplomacy**, where evolving norms and shared ideas about responsibility and cooperation matter more than power politics.

8. How does Constructivism explain anarchy? & Is Constructivism theory or mainstream?

Constructivism explains *anarchy* as not inherently conflictual, but socially constructed—its meaning depends on how states interpret and interact under it. Alexander Wendt famously said: "*Anarchy is what states make of it*." Constructivism is not mainstream in the traditional sense like Realism or Liberalism, but it has become a major theoretical approach, especially within critical and post-positivist IR scholarship.

9. Opposites / Synonyms

Opposites	Synonyms
Criticism – Praise	Pessimistic – Negative outlook
as a response – as a cause	potential – possible
destructive – constructive	Rules – norms/guidelines
Trust – Mistrust/Distrust	anarchy – disorder (as synonym); order (as opposite)

10. Fill in the gaps

neorealism and Neoliberalism , anarchy , self-help , scarce resources , Constructivists , important , given point.

Barry Buzan's Theory of Regional Security Complexes

The Concept of Regional Security Complex:

Buzan and Wæver define the *Regional Security Complex* in their 2003 work *Regions and Powers: The Structure of International Security* as: "A set of units whose major processes of securitization and desecuritization, or both, are so interlinked that their security problems cannot reasonably be analyzed or resolved apart from one another"[1].

The regional dynamics of security complexes are shaped by two types of relations[2]:

- **Power relations:** The concept of power operates on a regional scale through the idea of the regional balance of power. Thus, regional security complexes can be analyzed in terms of polarity in the same way as the international system, which they are substructures of — such as unipolar, bipolar, tripolar, or multipolar. It is therefore necessary to distinguish between regional powers and global powers.

- **Patterns of amity and enmity:** Amity refers to relationships between states characterized by cooperation or support, whereas enmity refers to relations marked by suspicion and fear. These two patterns may contribute to shaping a set of concerns, threats, or friendships that define the security complex.

Levels of Analysis in the Security Complex and Its Variables[3]:

The theory identifies what should be examined across four levels of analysis, which together form *The Security Constellation*:

- **Local level:** Identifies internal vulnerabilities to uncover the type of security concerns.

- **Regional level:** Focuses on inter-state relations within the region.

---

[1] For more see: Barry Buzan, & Ole Wæver, **Regions and Powers the Structure of International Security**, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003).
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid.

- **Super-regional level:** The region's interaction with neighboring areas (relatively limited, as the complex is defined by internal interaction).
- **Global level:** The role of global powers in the region.

Variables Embodied by the Regional Security Complex[1]:

The basic structure of a regional security complex is embodied in four variables:

- **Boundary:** Distinguishes the regional security complex from its neighbors.
- **Anarchic Structure:** The complex must consist of two or more independent units.
- **Polarity:** Refers to the distribution of power among units.
- **Social Construction:** Covers the patterns of amity and enmity among the units.

Accordingly, three possible developments are open to a regional security complex:

1. **Maintaining the status quo** with no major changes to its basic structure.
2. **Internal transformation,** which refers to changes within the core structure while keeping external boundaries intact.
3. **External transformation,** involving changes in membership or the merging/separation of regional security complexes.

Types of Regional Security Complexes[2]:

- **Standard Regional Security Complex:** Generally anarchic in structure; polarity is entirely defined by regional powers and may range from multipolarity to unipolarity — e.g., South Africa (a regional power compared to its neighbors).
- **Centred Regional Security Complexes:** These take three main forms. The first two involve a unipolar regional complex where the central power is either a **great power** (e.g., Russia in the Commonwealth of Independent States) or a **superpower** (e.g., the United States in North America), which exercises dominance over

---

[1] Op. cit.
[2] Ibid.

the region. Other regional powers are unable to define a separate regional complex.

The third form is a region integrated through institutions or organizations comprising multiple powers rather than just one — e.g., the European Union.

In addition to these forms, the presence of superpowers spread across the international system creates two further possibilities beyond centred complexes:

- **Regional security complexes with global powers,**
- **Complexes that include more than one global power** — both scenarios are clearly visible in East Asia (e.g., China and Japan as two powers)[1].

Questions:

1- Give title to the text, and translate it.

2- What did the text take up (examining)?

3- What is the definition of Regional Security Complex according to Buzan and Wæver?

4- What are the two types of relations shaping regional security dynamics?

5- What are the four levels of analysis in the theory of security complexes?

6- Mention the four main variables that define a Regional Security Complex.

7- What are the three possible developments of a regional security complex?

8- What are the different types of Regional Security Complexes?

9- What distinguishes a "centred" regional security complex from a "standard" one?

---

[1] Op..cit.

10- Are there real-world examples that illustrate each type of security complex mentioned? Mention them.

11- Translate the following terms into Arabic and into English:

Into Arabic	Into English
Security Constellation	توزيع القوى الإقليمي
Boundaries of a regional complex	النمط الاجتماعي للأعداء والأصدقاء
Anarchic structure	اندماج إقليمي مؤسساتي
Regional transformation	تغير داخلي أو خارجي في المجمع الأمني
Global powers	الفاعلون الإقليميون

12- Opposites / Synonyms:

Opposites	Synonyms
Stability	cooperation
Internal	regional
Limited	interaction
Fear	suspicion

13- Fill in the gaps:

(Regional, transformation, amity, global, polarity, boundary)

The basic structure of a security complex includes: 1) a defined …………… that separates it from neighboring regions; 2) an anarchic structure; 3) the distribution of power or ……………; and 4) the patterns of …………… and enmity. A regional complex can either remain stable or undergo ……………, either internally or externally. Interaction with …………… powers can also shape the nature of the …………… complex.

The Answers:

1- Translation of the Text:

مفهوم مجمع الأمن الإقليمي: يعرف بوزان وويفر مجمع الأمن الإقليمي في عملهما عام 2003 "المناطق والقوى: هيكل الأمن الدولي" بأنه: "مجموعة من الوحدات التي ترتبط عملياتها الرئيسية في التأمين ونزع التأمين، أو كليهما، بشكل وثيق لدرجة أن مشكلاتها الأمنية لا يمكن تحليلها أو حلها بشكل منطقي بمعزل عن بعضها البعض."

تتشكل الديناميكيات الإقليمية لمجمعات الأمن من نوعين من العلاقات:

علاقات القوة: يعمل مفهوم القوة على النطاق الإقليمي من خلال فكرة توازن القوى الإقليمي. وبالتالي يمكن تحليل مجمعات الأمن الإقليمية من حيث القطبية بنفس الطريقة التي يُحلل بها النظام الدولي، حيث تُعد هذه المجمعات هياكل فرعية له – مثل القطبية الأحادية أو الثنائية أو الثلاثية أو المتعددة. لذلك من الضروري التمييز بين القوى الإقليمية والقوى العالمية.

أنماط الصداقة والعداء: تشير الصداقة إلى العلاقات بين الدول التي تتسم بالتعاون أو الدعم، في حين يشير العداء إلى العلاقات التي تتسم بالريبة والخوف. هذان النمطان قد يسهمان في تشكيل مجموعة من الاهتمامات أو التهديدات أو التحالفات التي تحدد طبيعة المجمع الأمني.

مستويات التحليل في مجمع الأمن ومتغيراته: تحدد النظرية ما يجب تحليله عبر أربعة مستويات من التحليل، والتي تشكل معًا ما يسمى بـ"كوكبة الأمن":

- المستوى المحلي: يحدد نقاط الضعف الداخلية للكشف عن نوع المخاوف الأمنية.
- المستوى الإقليمي: يركز على العلاقات بين الدول داخل المنطقة.
- المستوى فوق الإقليمي: يشير إلى تفاعل المنطقة مع المناطق المجاورة (ويكون هذا التفاعل محدودًا نسبيًا، حيث يُعرف المجمع بالتفاعل الداخلي.)
- المستوى العالمي: يتناول دور القوى العالمية في المنطقة.

المتغيرات المجسدة في مجمع الأمن الإقليمي: يتجسد الهيكل الأساسي لمجمع الأمن الإقليمي في أربعة متغيرات:

- الحدود: تميز المجمع الأمني الإقليمي عن جيرانه.
- الهيكل الفوضوي: يجب أن يتكون المجمع من وحدتين مستقلتين أو أكثر.
- القطبية: تشير إلى توزيع القوة بين الوحدات.
- البناء الاجتماعي: يشمل أنماط الصداقة والعداء بين الوحدات.
- بناءً على ذلك، هناك ثلاثة تطورات محتملة يمكن أن تحدث في المجمع الأمني الإقليمي:
- الحفاظ على الوضع القائم دون تغييرات جوهرية في هيكله الأساسي.
- التحول الداخلي، والذي يشير إلى التغيرات داخل الهيكل الأساسي مع الحفاظ على الحدود الخارجية.
- التحول الخارجي، ويتضمن تغييرات في العضوية أو اندماج/انفصال مجمعات أمنية إقليمية.

أنواع مجمعات الأمن الإقليمي:

المجمع الأمني الإقليمي القياسي: يتميز عمومًا بهيكل فوضوي؛ وتُحدد القطبية بالكامل بواسطة القوى الإقليمية، وقد تتراوح من تعددية الأقطاب إلى أحادية القطب — على سبيل المثال، جنوب إفريقيا (قوة إقليمية مقارنة بجيرانها.)

المجمعات الأمنية الإقليمية المركزية: تأخذ هذه ثلاثة أشكال رئيسية. الأولان يتمثلان في مجمع إقليمي أحادي القطب تكون فيه القوة المركزية إما قوة عظمى (مثل روسيا في رابطة الدول المستقلة) أو قوة عظمى دولية (مثل الولايات المتحدة في

أمريكا الشمالية)، وتفرض هذه القوى هيمنتها على المنطقة. أما القوى الإقليمية الأخرى فتعجز عن تشكيل مجمع إقليمي منفصل.

أما الشكل الثالث، فيتمثل في منطقة مدمجة من خلال مؤسسات أو منظمات تضم قوى متعددة بدلًا من قوة واحدة فقط — مثل الاتحاد الأوروبي. بالإضافة إلى هذه الأشكال، فإن وجود القوى العظمى المنتشرة في النظام الدولي يخلق احتمالين إضافيين خارج المجمعات المركزية: مجمعات أمنية إقليمية تضم قوى عالمية، مجمعات تضم أكثر من قوة عالمية واحدة — وكلا السيناريوهين واضحان في شرق آسيا (مثل الصين واليابان كقوتين)

2. The text examines the concept of the *Regional Security Complex* developed by Barry Buzan and Ole Wæver, including its components, levels of analysis, structural variables, types, and examples.

3. What is the definition of Regional Security Complex according to Buzan and Wæver?

It is a set of units whose major processes of securitization and desecuritization are so interlinked that their security problems cannot reasonably be analyzed or resolved apart from one another.

4. What are the two types of relations shaping regional security dynamics?

- Power relations

- Patterns of amity and enmity

5. What are the four levels of analysis in the theory of security complexes?

- Local level
- Regional level
- Super-regional level
- Global level

6. Mention the four main variables that define a Regional Security Complex.

- Boundary

- Anarchic Structure

- Polarity

- Social Construction (Amity and Enmity patterns)

7. What are the three possible developments of a regional security complex?

- Maintaining the status quo
- Internal transformation
- External transformation

8. What are the different types of Regional Security Complexes?

- Standard Regional Security Complex

- Centred Regional Security Complex (with a great power or superpower)

- Institutionally integrated regional complexes (e.g., the EU)

9. What distinguishes a "centred" regional security complex from a "standard" one?

A centred complex is dominated by a single great or superpower, or by a strong institutional integration, while a standard complex involves more balanced power distribution among regional powers.

10. Are there real-world examples that illustrate each type of security complex mentioned?

- Standard: Southern Africa (South Africa vs. neighbors)

- Centred: Russia in the CIS, USA in North America

- Integrated: European Union

- Multipower presence: East Asia (China and Japan)

11. Translate the following terms into Arabic and into English:

Into Arabic	Into English
Security Constellation	تشكيل/ترتيب الأمن
Boundaries of a regional complex	حدود المجمع الأمني الإقليمي
Anarchic structure	هيكل فوضوي
Regional transformation	تحول إقليمي
Global powers	القوى العالمية

توزيع القوى الإقليمي	Regional distribution of power
النمط الاجتماعي للأعداء والأصدقاء	Social patterns of enmity and amity
اندماج إقليمي مؤسساتي	Institutional regional integration
تغير داخلي أو خارجي في المجمع الأمني	Internal or external transformation
الفاعلون الإقليميون	Regional actors

13. Opposites / Synonyms:

Opposite	Synonyms
stability instability	cooperation collaboration
internal external	regional local
limited unlimited	interaction communication
Fear trust	suspicion distrust

11. Fill in the gaps:

boundary, polarity; amity, transformation.

Johan Galtung's Theory: Violence, Peace, and Conflict

Johan Galtung is considered the prominent founder of peace studies. He developed two models of peace — positive peace and negative peace — through which he presented his theory in the form of three triangles: the Triangle of Violence, the Triangle of Conflict, and the Triangle of Peace.

At the outset, Galtung viewed peace as being linked to two types of relationships between groups. Based on this, peace is divided into a negative aspect, which seeks the absence of negative relationships (the absence of organized collective violence), and a positive aspect, which focuses on fostering environments that support positive relationships (i.e., values that reduce violence). These two aspects are interconnected — in order to reduce negative relationships, positive ones must be increased. Positive relationships are primarily based on values such as: cooperation, freedom from fear, freedom from want, economic growth and development, absence of exploitation, equality, justice, freedom of action, pluralism, and dynamism. These values can be discussed both at the internal level (individuals) and the international level (states). Individuals exploit each other, and likewise, states exploit one another. Just as individuals feel fear and suspicion, so do states.

Galtung argued that the terms positive peace and negative peace are not contradictory in structure but rather represent "two dimensions of the peace problem." The difference lies in the fact that negative peace is not lasting (incomplete peace), whereas positive peace is. For example, when a ceasefire is declared, it results in negative peace — violence stops but not permanently. This impedes peace processes like peacebuilding and reconstruction, due to the lack of a stable and suitable security environment, especially because structural violence continues to fuel tensions in conflict zones[1].

---

[1] Johan Galtung, theories of peace: a synthetic approach to peace thinking, (Oslo: International Peace Research Institute, 1967), pp. 15-17.

First: Galtung's Conflict Triangle[1]

Galtung sees conflicts as formed through a complex interaction of attitudes and behaviors, characterized by dynamism and change, as they escalate and de-escalate. He believes they follow a life cycle, like an organic entity — appearing, intensifying, reaching a peak (often violent), then fading away, only to possibly reappear if settlement efforts fail. The stages of this cycle include: pre-violence, during violence, and post-violence, with a ceasefire typically occurring in between. However, this doesn't mean that conflict is equivalent to violence — it merely contains violence. Conflict consists of three components: Contradiction (C), Attitude (A), and Behavior (B), represented as:

Conflict = Attitude + Contradiction + Behavior

- **Contradiction** refers to the core conflict situation involving incompatibility or misunderstanding of goals among conflicting parties. This may result from a mismatch between social values and structural arrangements, and is shaped by the parties' interests and conflicting claims. It is seen as a root cause of conflict, especially when stemming from resource scarcity or unequal and unjust distribution, which are among the primary triggers of internal conflicts in Africa.

- **Attitude** includes the perceptions that conflicting parties have of each other and themselves. Each party sees the other as a threat. These perceptions may be positive or negative, but violent conflicts usually involve negative views, where each side forms a harmful and hostile image of the other. These attitudes are often influenced by emotions like fear, hatred, and hostility, or shaped by historical relationships — reflecting patterns of amity and enmity, as discussed by Barry Buzan.

- **Behavior** refers to actions, practices, and activities that may be cooperative or coercive. In conflict contexts, behavior tends to focus on coercion, hostile acts, threats, and destructive attacks.

---

[1] For more see: Johan Galtung, Conflict Transformation by Peaceful Means (the Trascend Method), (United Nations Disaster Management Training Program, 2000).

Second: Galtung's Triangle of Violence[1]

Galtung defines violence as:

"Any situation in which individuals are harmed such that their physical and mental realizations fall short of their potential realizations." He introduced this definition to provide a broader conception of violence, moving beyond the traditional notion of violence as deliberate action by a specific actor to harm another.

In his Violence Triangle, he outlines three types of violence:

- **Direct violence**: This is visible, intentional, and targeted aggression toward a person, causing physical harm (e.g., killing, torture) or verbal abuse (e.g., humiliation).

- **Structural violence**: This is indirect, ongoing violence embedded in the structures of the state and its basic institutions, which organize societies and perpetuate harm. Examples include political oppression and economic exploitation, such as when some individuals receive more resources at the expense of others.

- **Cultural violence**: This refers to systems of symbols, norms, and behaviors that legitimize direct and structural violence. It includes ideologies, religion, language, art, science, law, and media — all of which may condition individuals to see oppression, harm, and exploitation as natural or justified. A clear example is the justification and normalization of the use of force. The opposite of this type of violence is cultural peace.

Third: Galtung's Triangle of Peace[2]

Galtung introduced the concept of cultural peace alongside positive and negative peace, defining it as: "Aspects of culture that help justify and legitimize both direct negative peace and positive structural peace."

In this Peace Triangle, the three components of peace interact dynamically, forming a triangular model that mirrors (and counters)

---

[1] Johan Galtung, "Violence, Peace and Peace Research", journal of Peace research, Vol. 6, Num. 3 (1969), p. 168.

[2] For more see: Johan Galtung, "cultural violence", Journal of Peace Research, Vol. 27, num. 3 (1990), p. 294.

the Triangle of Violence. Peace can begin at any point in the triangle and spread to the others. These three components were laid out in Galtung's 1976 article *"Three Approaches to Peace: Peacekeeping, Peacemaking, and Peacebuilding"*. Together, they produce what he calls "general and complete peace." Galtung's Triangle of Peace offers solutions to the models of violence and conflict in the following ways:

1. **Peacekeeping**: Galtung defines this as the intervention of international armed forces to separate warring factions. It applies at three escalation points:

   - To contain violence and prevent escalation to war.

   - To limit the intensity, geographic spread, and duration of war once it starts.

   - To support ceasefire agreements and create conditions suitable for post-war reconstruction.

2. **Peacemaking**: Galtung uses this term to describe efforts aimed at resolving armed conflict, through voluntary agreements between parties. This is a more comprehensive approach than merely stopping hostilities - it focuses on addressing contradictions between conflicting sides.

3. **Peacebuilding**: According to Galtung, this process supports both peacekeeping and peacemaking by addressing the structural causes of violence. It seeks to eliminate root causes and prevent the re-emergence of conflict. It involves post-war reconstruction and work across several dimensions:

   - **Security**: Includes disarmament, demobilization, reintegration (DDR), demining, and police training.

   - **Humanitarian**: Involves providing aid, promoting human rights, punishing violators, and overseeing refugee return.

   - **Legal and Political**: Includes supervising elections, drafting constitutions, fostering reconciliation, institution-building, and political reform.

Questions:

1. give title of the text & Translate.What did the text examine or address?
2. what is his contribution to peace studies?
3. What is the difference between negative peace and positive peace?
4. What values are associated with positive peace?
5. What is the definition of conflict in Galtung's Conflict Triangle?
6. What are the three components of the Conflict Triangle, and what does each represent?
7. How do emotions and perceptions affect the 'attitude' component in a conflict?
8. **Opposites / Synonyms**:

Opposites	Synonyms
Peace	Development
Hostility	Attitude
Injustice	Behavior
Fear	Reconstruction

9. **Fill in the Gaps**: contradiction – violence – attitudes – positive peace – peacebuilding – conflict.

- According to Galtung, a **……………** includes contradiction, behavior, and attitudes.

- **……………** peace focuses on building just and supportive social structures.

- Hostile **……………** between conflicting parties are a key component in the conflict triangle.

- Galtung defines **……………** not just as physical harm but also as structural and cultural harm.

- **……………** refers to the core incompatibility between the goals of conflict parties.

- **……………** aims at eliminating root causes of conflict to achieve sustainable peace.

The Answers:

1- Translation of the Text:

يُعد يوهان غالتونغ المؤسس البارز لدراسات السلام، حيث طوّر نموذجين للسلام هما: السلام الإيجابي والسلام السلبي، ومن خلالهما قدّم نظريته في شكل ثلاث مثلثات: مثلث العنف، مثلث النزاع، ومثلث السلام. في البداية، رأى غالتونغ أن تحقيق السلام مرتبط بنوعين من العلاقات بين الجماعات، وبناءً عليه قسّم السلام إلى جانب سلبي يتمثّل في غياب العلاقات السلبية (غياب العنف الجماعي المنظم)، وجانب إيجابي يتمحور حول توفير بيئة تُعزّز العلاقات الإيجابية (قيم تقلّل من العنف). هذان الجانبان مترابطان، فلكي نقلل من العلاقات السلبية يجب تعزيز العلاقات الإيجابية.

وترتكز هذه الأخيرة على مجموعة من القيم مثل: التعاون، التحرر من الخوف، التحرر من العوز، النمو الاقتصادي والتنمية، غياب الاستغلال، المساواة، العدالة، حرية العمل، التعددية، والديناميكية. ويمكن مناقشة هذه القيم سواء على المستوى الداخلي للأفراد أو على المستوى الدولي بين الدول، حيث إن الأفراد يستغلون بعضهم البعض، وكذلك تفعل الدول، وكما يشعر الأفراد بالخوف والريبة، فإن الدول تشعر بالأمر ذاته.

يرى غالتونغ أن مصطلحي السلام الإيجابي والسلام السلبي ليسا متناقضين من حيث البناء، بل هما "بعدان لإشكالية السلام"، ويكمن الفرق في أن السلام السلبي لا يدوم (سلام غير مكتمل)، في حين أن السلام الإيجابي مستدام. فعلى سبيل المثال، عندما يتم إعلان وقف إطلاق النار، فإن ذلك يخلق سلامًا سلبيًا يشير إلى توقف العنف لكن ليس بشكل نهائي، مما يعيق عمليات بناء السلام وإعادة الإعمار بسبب عدم توفر بيئة أمنية مستقرة وملائمة، لا سيما في ظل استمرار العنف البنيوي الذي يغذّي التوترات في مناطق النزاع.

أولًا: مثلث غالتونغ للنزاع

يرى غالتونغ أن النزاعات تتكوّن من خلال تفاعل معقد بين المواقف والسلوكيات، وتتّسم بالديناميكية والتغيّر، حيث تتصاعد وتنخفض حدّتها. ويعتقد أن لها دورة حياة، مثل الكائن الحي، تظهر وتتفاقم وتبلغ ذروتها — غالبًا في صورة عنف شديد — ثم تنحسر وتختفي، لكن من الممكن أن تعود إذا فشلت محاولات التسوية. وتشمل هذه الدورة ثلاث مراحل: ما قبل العنف، أثناء العنف، وما بعد العنف، ويتخللها غالبًا قرار بوقف إطلاق النار. ولكن هذا لا يعني أن النزاع يعني بالضرورة العنف، بل يتضمنه فقط. يتكوّن النزاع من ثلاثة عناصر: التناقض(C) ، الموقف(A) ، والسلوك(B) ، ويمكن تمثيله بالمعادلة:
النزاع = الموقف + التناقض + السلوك

- **التناقض** يشير إلى الوضع الجوهري للنزاع، المتمثل في غياب التفاهم أو التوافق بين أهداف الأطراف المتنازعة، وينتج عادة عن التباين بين القيم الاجتماعية والبنية الهيكلية، ويتحدّد وفقًا لمصالح الأطراف وتضاربها. ويُعتبر التناقض من الأسباب الجذرية للنزاعات، خاصة تلك المتعلقة بندرة الموارد أو التوزيع غير العادل لها، وهي من أبرز أسباب النزاعات الداخلية في إفريقيا.

- **الموقف** يشمل التصورات التي يحملها كل طرف عن الطرف الآخر وعن نفسه، حيث يرى كل طرف أن الآخر يمثّل تهديدًا له. قد تكون هذه التصورات إيجابية أو سلبية، ولكن في النزاعات العنيفة تغلب التصورات السلبية، حيث يُكوّن كل طرف صورة سيئة وعدائية عن الآخر، وغالبًا ما تتأثر المواقف بمشاعر مثل الخوف والكراهية والعداء، أو تتشكل من خلال العلاقات التاريخية، وفي هذا الإطار تظهر أنماط الصداقة والعداوة التي حدّث عنها باري بوزان.

- **السلوك** يُشير إلى الأفعال والممارسات التي قد تكون تعاونية أو قسرية، لكن في سياق النزاع، يركّز السلوك عادة على القسر، والأفعال العدائية، والتهديدات، والهجمات المدمّرة.

ثانيًا: مثلث غالتونغ للعنف

يُعرّف غالتونغ العنف بأنه :**أي وضع يتأثر فيه الأفراد بحيث تصبح قدراتهم الجسدية والعقلية والسلوكية أقل من إمكاناتهم الممكنة** ."وقد وضع هذا التعريف لتقديم تصور أوسع للعنف، يختلف عن المفهوم التقليدي الذي يرى العنف كفعل متعمّد من طرف فاعل لإلحاق الضرر بآخر .في مثلث العنف، يُميّز غالتونغ بين ثلاثة أنواع من العنف:

- **العنف المباشر** :هو سلوك عدواني مرئي ومتعمد موجّه ضد شخص معين، يسبّب له ضررًا، مثل العنف الجسدي كالقتل والتعذيب، أو العنف اللفظي مثل الإذلال.
- **العنف الهيكلي** :هو عنف غير مباشر ومستمر، ناتج عن البنى الأساسية في الدولة التي تنظم الأفراد والمجتمعات وتُكرّس الضرر، مثل القمع السياسي أو الاستغلال الاقتصادي، كحصول بعض الأفراد على موارد على حساب آخرين.
- **العنف الثقافي** :يشير إلى الأنظمة الثقافية من رموز وقيم وسلوكيات تُضفي الشرعية على العنف المباشر والبنيوي، ويشمل الإيديولوجيا، الدين، اللغة، الفن، العلوم، القانون، والإعلام، وهي أدوات تُقنع الأفراد بأن القمع والاستغلال أمر طبيعي ومشروع، كما هو الحال مع تبرير استخدام القوة. ويُعدّ السلام الثقافي هو نقيض هذا النوع من العنف.

ثالثًا: مثلث غالتونغ للسلام

قدّم غالتونغ مفهوم "السلام الثقافي" إلى جانب مفهومي السلام السلبي والإيجابي، وعرّفه بأنه :**الجوانب الثقافية التي تُبرّر وتُضفي الشرعية على السلام السلبي المباشر والسلام الهيكلي الإيجابي** ."في هذا النموذج، تتفاعل الجوانب الثلاثة للسلام بشكل ديناميكي، لتكوّن "مثلث السلام"، والذي يعاكس "مثلث العنف"، حيث يمكن أن يبدأ السلام من أي زاوية من زوايا المثلث ويمتدّ إلى الزوايا الأخرى .هذه الجوانب الثلاثة للسلام قدّمها غالتونغ في مقالته عام 1976 بعنوان "**ثلاثة مناهج للسلام: حفظ السلام، صنع السلام، وبناء السلام**"، والتي تُنتج في مجملها ما أسماه "**السلام العام والشامل** ."وقد قدّم مثلث السلام كحلّ لنماذج العنف والنزاع على النحو التالي:

- **حفظ السلام** :عرّفه غالتونغ بأنه تدخّل القوات المسلحة الدولية للفصل بين الأطراف المتحاربة، ويُطبّق في ثلاث نقاط على مقياس التصعيد:
  - لاحتواء العنف ومنع تحوّله إلى حرب
  - للحد من شدة الحرب وانتشارها الجغرافي ومدتها بعد اندلاعها
  - ولدعم اتفاقات وقف إطلاق النار وتوفير بيئة ملائمة لإعادة الإعمار بعد الحرب
- **صنع السلام** :استخدم غالتونغ هذا المصطلح للإشارة إلى الجهود الرامية إلى تسوية النزاعات المسلحة من خلال التوصل إلى اتفاق طوعي بين الأطراف المتنازعة. وهو نهج شامل يتجاوز وقف الأعمال العدائية نحو معالجة التناقضات بين الأطراف.

1. title: *Johan Galtung's Theory of Peace: The Triangles of Conflict, Violence, and Peace*

2. the text examined Johan Galtung's theoretical contributions to peace studies, particularly his models of conflict, violence, and peace.

3. What is his contribution to peace studies? Galtung introduced key concepts like positive peace, negative peace, and formulated three analytical triangles: the Triangle of Conflict, the Triangle of Violence, and the Triangle of Peace - helping to systematically understand and resolve conflict.

5. the difference between negative peace and positive peace?

- **Negative peace** is the absence of direct violence (e.g., a ceasefire).

- **Positive peace** is the presence of justice and structural conditions that prevent conflict (e.g., equality, development, cooperation).

6. What values are associated with positive peace? Cooperation, freedom from fear and want, justice, equality, economic development, absence of exploitation, pluralism, and freedom of action.

7. the definition of conflict in Galtung's Conflict Triangle? Conflict is the interaction of Contradiction, Attitude & Behavior.

8. the three components of the Conflict Triangle:

- **Contradiction:** The root cause or incompatibility in goals.

- **Attitude:** The perceptions and emotions between conflicting parties.

- **Behavior:** The actions and conduct, such as violence or negotiation.

9. How do emotions and perceptions affect the 'attitude' component in a conflict? They influence how each party views the other — often with fear, hostility, and suspicion — which can escalate the conflict and justify violent or aggressive behavior.

10. Opposite/ synonyms:

Opposites		**synonyms**	
Peace	Conflict	Development	Advancement
Hostility	Cooperation	Attitude	Perception
Injustice	Justice	Behavior	Conduct
Fear	Trust	Reconstruction	Rebuilding

11. Fill in the Gaps:

Conflict, Positive peace, attitudes, violence, Contradiction, Peacebuilding.

Bibliography

1. Adeleke, Ademola, et al. *Essentials of International Relations and Diplomacy*. Abuja: NOUN Press, National Open University of Nigeria, 2021.
2. Antunes, Sandrina, and Isabel Camisão. "Introducing Realism in International Relations Theory." In *International Relations Theory – An E-IR Foundations Beginner's Textbook*, February 27, 2018.
3. Bugajski, Janusz. *Early Warning, Conflict Prevention, Crisis Management, Conflict Resolution and Postconflict Rehabilitation: Lessons Learned and Way Ahead*. Presentation at the 2011 Annual Security Review Conference, Working Session II. Washington, D.C.: Center for Strategic and International Studies, July 2011.
4. Buzan, Barry, and Ole Wæver. *Regions and Powers: The Structure of International Security*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
5. Cristol, Jonathan. "Liberalism." *Oxford Bibliographies*, 2019. https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/display/document/obo-9780199743292/obo-9780199743292-0060.xml.
6. Devetak, Richard, ed. *An Introduction to International Relations*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
7. Galtung, Johan. *Theories of Peace: A Synthetic Approach to Peace Thinking*. Oslo: International Peace Research Institute, 1967.
8. ———. *Conflict Transformation by Peaceful Means (The Transcend Method)*. United Nations Disaster Management Training Programme, 2000.
9. ———. "Violence, Peace and Peace Research." *Journal of Peace Research* 6, no. 3 (1969): 167–191.
10. ———. "Cultural Violence." *Journal of Peace Research* 27, no. 3 (1990): 291–305.
11. Hepler, Reed, and Shawn Grimsley. "International Relations Definition, Importance & Topics." Last modified November 21,

2023. Study.com. https://study.com/academy/lesson/what-is-international-relations.html.

12. Malek, Cate. "International Conflict." Updated May 2013 by Heidi Burgess. *Beyond Intractability*. https://www.beyondintractability.org/coreknowledge/international-conflict.

13. Meiser, Jeffrey W. "Introducing Liberalism in International Relations Theory." In *International Relations Theory – An E-IR Foundations Beginner's Textbook*, February 18, 2018.

14. Miller, Benjamin. *Grand Strategy from Truman to Trump*. Chicago, 2020.

15. Singh, Harshita, and Sameeksha Bharadwaj. "Conflict and Conflict Resolution in International Relations." *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)* 27, no. 12, series 6 (December 2022).

16. https://www.cag.edu.tr/d/l/4b5f5f30-20ab-4440-9713-fa7e3f738cbc

17. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Liberalism_(international_relations)

Table of contents