

People's Democratic Republic of Algeria

Algiers 3 University

Faculty of Political Sciences

&

International Relations

International Relations Departement

Introduction to International Relations

Lectures for Students of Political Sciences (International Relations Major)

Prepared by: Pr. Salem Saber

Academic Year: 2025–2026

Lecture 1 : From Westphalia to Vienna

Lecture 2: Actors in International Relations

Lecture 3 : Media as an International Actor

Lecture 4: Power in International Relations

Lecture 5: Peace and War in International Relations

Lecture 6: Integration and Unification as a Transformation in the Structure of the International System

Lecture 7 : Realist Theory in International Relations

Lecture 8 :Normative Idealism in International Relations

Lecture 9 : Liberal Theory in International Relations:

Lecture10 : constructivist Theory in International Relations

Lecture 11 :Marxist Theory in International Relations

Lecture12 :Feminist Theory in International Relations

Lecture 13: Critical Theory in International Relations

Lecture14 :Human Security in International Relations

Lecture 15: Societal Security in International Relations

Lecture16 :New Security Threats in International Relations

Lecture 17 : Regional Security Complex Theory in International Relations

Lecture18 :International Law in International Relations

Lecture19:Human Rights in International Relations

Lecture 20 :Power Transition Theory in International Relations

Lecture 21 :Global Challenges in International Relations

Lecture22 :Security Governance in International Relations

Lecture 23 : Global Order in International Relations

Lecture24: The Civilizational Dimension in International Relations

References :

Lecture 1 : From Westphalia to Vienna

The modern state emerged as the central actor in international relations, Although political entities existed before the modern era, the concept of the sovereign state, in its contemporary form, is the result of a long historical evolution that began to crystallize after the Peace of Westphalia (1648).

This development continued within the European political structure, leading eventually to the reorganization of Europe through the Congress of Vienna (1815) following Napoleon's defeat.

First: Before Westphalia

Before the 17th century, European interactions and relations were characterized by several features:¹

This context created the need for political solutions capable of establishing a stable framework for relations among the various entities.

Second: The Peace of Westphalia (1648) – Birth of the Modern State

Westphalia is regarded as a foundational moment in the development of the modern international system, It established several key principles:

1. The Principle of Sovereignty

- Recognition of each state as a supreme authority within its territory.
- Rejection of any supranational authority interfering in internal affairs (such as the Holy Roman Empire or the Church).

¹ Hedley Bull, *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*, London, [Macmillan Publishers](#), 1977, p. 13.

- Legal equality among states regardless of size.¹

2. The Principle of Territorial Boundaries

- Consolidation of the idea that the state exercises power within defined geographic limits.
- Emergence of sovereignty as a determinant of relations among European political units.

3. The Principle of the European Balance of Power

- Used as a mechanism to prevent the rise of any hegemonic power.
- Contributed to the construction of the modern state and provided European international relations with a more stable legal and political framework.

Third: The Congress of Vienna (1815) – Reconstructing the European International System

1. Objectives of the Congress of Vienna

- Restoring stability after 25 years of continuous wars.
- Re-establishing the European balance and preventing the recurrence of French hegemony.
- Establishing a system of collective security.

2. Major Principles Established by the Congress

A. Balance of Power

- Distribution of influence to prevent domination by any single power.

¹ Alexander Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics*, Cambridge, [Cambridge University Press](https://www.cambridge.org/9780521875881), 1999, p. 9.

- Adjusting borders and exchanging territories to maintain equilibrium.

B. Multilateral Diplomacy¹

- The beginning of organized diplomatic conferences as tools for crisis management.
- Agreement on cooperation to suppress revolutions and maintain the conservative order.
- A mechanism for joint intervention in cases of threat.

Fourth: The Relationship Between Westphalia and Vienna – The Evolution of the State

From Westphalia to Vienna, the state underwent profound transformations that can be summarized as follows:

- Transition from a decentralized feudal entity to a sovereign state: Westphalia established the concept of sovereignty, while Vienna regulated its practice within a collective framework based on the balance of power.²
- Transition from religious–personal loyalties to national identity and citizenship.
- Transition from chaotic, conflictual interactions to a structured European international system founded on the balance of power and diplomacy as a mechanism for regulating interactions among states.

¹ Andrew Heywood, *Global Politics*, London, [Palgrave Macmillan](#), 2011, p. 13.

² Martin Griffiths, *International Relations Theory*, New York, [Palgrave Macmillan](#), 2007, p. 17.

This framework constituted the foundation of modern international relations until the 20th century, and its principles—especially sovereignty and balance of power—remain central to the international system today.

In this context, the concept of the state as the primary and exclusive actor in international relations became a fundamental pillar of the international order from the 17th century onward.

This perception emerged with the Peace of Westphalia (1648), seen as a foundational moment in the modern international system, where the state was recognized as an independent political unit possessing sovereignty, responsible for managing its internal affairs and representing itself externally.¹

Westphalia ended the plurality of authorities (the Church, the Holy Roman Empire) and established the state's monopoly over authority, as legitimacy shifted from the monarch to the nation.

This transformation turned the state into a political entity monopolizing:

- Legitimate violence (as defined by Max Weber)
- Legislation
- International recognition
- Diplomatic representation
- Military power: armies, security services, and intelligence agencies
- The taxation system

¹ Joseph S. Nye Jr., *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*, New York, [PublicAffairs](#), 2004, p. 11.

- The creation of regional and international institutions
- Guaranteeing internal and external stability

These developments reinforced the idea that the state became the central source of power and influence within the international system.

Conclusion :

From Westphalia to Vienna, the international system evolved from fragmented authority to a structured order based on sovereignty, balance of power, and regulated diplomatic interaction.

These principles have shaped the foundations of modern international relations and continue to influence global politics today.

Lecture 2: Actors in International Relations

I. The Nation-State – The Central Actor Historically (Since 1648)

In the previous lecture, we discussed the emergence of the Modern European State following the collapse of the feudal system and the rise of central authority, as crystallized by the Peace of Westphalia (1648).

This treaty consolidated the principle of state sovereignty and separated political authority from religious loyalties.¹

During the 18th and 19th centuries, this model was reinforced by constitutional revolutions (British, American, French), which established ideas of citizenship and the rule of law, later evolving toward the welfare state and subsequently to more open models due to increasing interdependence and European integration.

At the international level, the European state model spread through colonialism and then national liberation movements in the 20th century, within a framework of relations between sovereign political units.

After World War II, the establishment of the United Nations contributed to the codification of sovereignty and the principle of non-intervention, while globalization and non-state actors have redefined the functions of the state without eliminating its central role in the international system.

Thus, the modern state model became a global framework for political organization, characterized by:

- Holding the monopoly of legitimate violence within its borders, making it the only actor capable of waging war, treaty-making, and forming alliances.

¹ Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye, *Power and Interdependence*, Boston, [Little, Brown and Company](#), 1977, p. 24.

- Being the entity that creates and recognizes international organizations.
- Playing the primary role in foreign policy and formulating national strategy.¹
- Determining power balances in the international system.
- The evolution of international relations has always been linked to the relative power of states (e.g., Britain in the 19th century, the United States later).
- Even today, despite the rise of new actors, the state remains the primary source of international legitimacy.

II. Supranational Actors – Institutions Organizing the International System (19th Century – 1945)

1. International and Regional Organizations:

The Congress of Vienna (1815), aimed at coordinating European security, represents one of the earliest efforts to organize the international system. Although limited to Europe, it marked the beginning of international coordination in managing global affairs.

In 1919, the League of Nations was established as the first attempt at a collective security organization, but it failed due to the nature of its decisions.

After World War II, the founding of the United Nations (1945) established an international organization focused on preventing wars and managing the international system through:²

¹ John J. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, New York, [W. W. Norton & Company](#), 2001, p. 29.

² Kenneth Waltz, *Theory of International Politics*, Reading (Massachusetts), [Addison-Wesley Publishing Company](#), 1979, p. 81.

- Peacekeeping operations, sanctions, and conflict mediation.
- Providing legitimacy for international interventions, such as Security Council resolutions.
- Acting as platforms for coordinating global economic policies.

Following this, various types of international organizations emerged:

- Economic: International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Bank, World Trade Organization (WTO).
- Developmental, environmental, and health: UNESCO, World Health Organization (WHO).

Although these organizations derive their legal power from founding treaties and the will of member states, and some decisions are legally binding, the international power structure, particularly the influence of major powers, affects their implementation, due to the lack of clear enforcement mechanisms.

However, their effectiveness in organizing international affairs remains significant, contributing to:

1. Regulating inter-state relations.
2. Facilitating multilateral cooperation.
3. Conflict management and collective security.
4. Enhancing international legitimacy.
5. Coordinating on transnational issues, such as climate change, pandemics, cybersecurity, and organized crime.

6. Balancing global power, as they provide smaller and medium-sized states a platform to influence rule-making despite the dominance of major powers.

2. Multinational Corporations (MNCs)¹

In recent decades, multinational corporations (MNCs) have become major actors in the international system alongside states and international organizations.

With the expansion of economic globalization, trade liberalization, and capital flows, these corporations have become transnational entities with production, financial, and technological capacities that often surpass those of many states.

MNCs possess:

- Budgets larger than entire states.
- Economic influence allowing them to shape national policies.
- Impact on technology, telecommunications, energy, and food security.
- The ability to use lobbying to reshape policies within democratic states.
- A central role in international political economy.
- A shift in the concept of power from “state power” to market power.

¹ Hans Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, New York, [McGraw-Hill Education](#), 1948, p. 5.

- Competition with states in areas such as cybersecurity, energy (e.g., oil companies), and technological innovation.¹

In conclusion, multinational corporations represent a major global actor, not only as economic entities but also as strategic arms employed by states to enhance influence, secure resources, control technology, and shape the rules of the global economic system.

Their role extends beyond purely economic functions to become an integral part of global power and influence dynamics in the 21st century.

III. International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGOs)

With the collapse of bipolarity, the international system opened up to new actors. The strict constraints imposed by the Cold War receded, allowing non-governmental organizations (NGOs) to proliferate and expand their cross-border activities, particularly in areas of democracy, human rights, and development.

Globalization has increased economic and social interdependence and expanded communication networks, creating an international environment that enabled NGOs to operate across borders and bypass the exclusive authority of the state, making them an integral part of the global civil society.²

Through organizing transnational campaigns and building influential international lobbying networks, NGOs have become active participants in global campaigns in areas such as environmental protection and human rights.

¹ Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye, *Op. cit.*, p. 24.

² Martin Griffiths, *Op. cit.*, p. 17.

As the international security agenda expanded, threats were no longer limited to conventional wars but also included poverty, epidemics, climate change, and organized crime.

In recent decades, there has been a significant proliferation of international conventions addressing:

- Human rights
- Environmental protection
- International crimes
- Protection of civilians

This expansion created a need for actors capable of operating in humanitarian, social, and developmental fields that states alone cannot cover. Consequently, NGOs became key partners in monitoring compliance and implementing standards, based on global moral legitimacy.

NGOs have also gained substantial influence in international policy-making (“advocacy diplomacy”), contributing to:¹

- Pressuring governments to adopt specific policies
- Influencing international negotiations
- Proposing global standards and legislation

A prominent example is their role in the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court.

In conclusion, the rise of non-governmental organizations as informal supranational actors stems from profound transformations in the structure of the international system. Today, they are an influential and

¹ Andrew Heywood, *Op. cit.*, p. 9.

essential element in managing transboundary challenges, through roles such as:

- Exercising international oversight on states in areas of human rights, corruption, and environmental protection
- Intervening in conflict zones, e.g., Médecins Sans Frontières (Doctors Without Borders) and the Red Cross
- Influencing international negotiations, for example in climate-related issues (COP – Conference of the Parties).

Lecture 3 : Media as an International Actor

Media is no longer merely a tool for conveying information or a mediator between the ruler and the ruled; it has become an international actor capable of influencing political decisions, shaping public opinion, setting international agendas, and affecting the course of conflicts and interstate interactions.

Technological development has enabled the shift from traditional media to digital media, which has contributed to:¹

- The global dissemination of information within seconds
- Crossing borders and state media sovereignty
- The emergence of social networks that allow individuals and communities to play a global media role

Consequently, media is no longer confined to governmental institutions or major channels, as news circulates rapidly and the audience is global, creating a global media market that directly influences international relations.

Governments now find it increasingly difficult to monopolize knowledge or control messages directed to the public, internally or externally, enhancing the power of independent and transnational media.

The importance of image in international politics has also grown, with visual coverage becoming the primary factor shaping public perception of international issues. Media has thus become the primary tool in forming public opinion on:

¹Philip Seib, *The Global Journalist: News and Conscience in a World of Conflict*, Lanham, [Rowman & Littlefield Publishers](#), 2002, p. 34.

- Wars
- Humanitarian crises
- States' foreign behavior
- Human rights
- Environmental and trade conflicts

Through this, populations interact with international issues, creating public pressure on foreign policy decisions, Examples include governmental actions such as:¹

- Humanitarian intervention decisions
- Withdrawal from wars
- Supporting or condemning other governments

Media also plays a crucial role in international affairs through concepts such as:

- Media warfare: spreading information or misinformation to serve political goals
- International propaganda
- Psychological warfare
- Amplifying or concealing events to achieve political gains

Control over the narrative has become part of states' smart power.²

Meanwhile, Western public opinion has undergone significant shifts regarding the war in Gaza. Initially, much of it viewed the Israeli war as

¹ Eytan Gilboa, *Media and Conflict: Framing Issues, Making Policy, Shaping Opinions*, Ardsley (New York), Transnational Publishers, 2002, p. 57.

² Philip Seib, *Op. cit.*, p. 34.

Israel's right to self-defense, but perceptions began to change as media coverage of Gaza expanded and civilian casualties increased.

With ongoing conflict and rising reports from human rights and humanitarian organizations documenting massive human suffering, a growing segment of Western societies became increasingly critical of Israeli policies, viewing actions as severe violations or acts internationally recognized as genocide and ethnic cleansing.

This shift moved public support from initial backing of Israeli operations as self-defense to growing opposition to war management and calls for a ceasefire, with many labeling Israel a terrorist state.

Notably, the Western public observed a contradiction between their governments' hardline stance on Russia regarding the war in Ukraine and a more neutral or supportive position toward Israel despite harsh human rights reports.

This discrepancy sparked debates on double ethical standards in Western foreign policy, as many felt official positions were inconsistent with the principles their governments professed (Human Rights, Civilian Protection, International Law).¹

Consequently, public opinion increasingly demanded a more just approach. Western audiences, especially youth, began receiving a narrative differing from official and traditional media, fostering a new public opinion more empathetic and understanding of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and its historical roots.

¹ Eytan Gilboa, *Op. cit.*, p. 57.

This contributed to expanded protests in universities and cities and increased allegations of genocide, marking the largest Middle East-related protests in the West in decades, particularly in:

- United States
- United Kingdom
- Canada
- France
- Germany

Lecture 4: Power in International Relations

The Concept of Power in International Relations

Power is a central concept in international relations, serving as the framework through which the capacity of actors—especially states—to influence others' behavior or control the outcomes of international interactions is measured.

Its nature is complex and dynamic, combining material and immaterial elements, direct and indirect capabilities, both traditional and modern.

Definition of Power in IR :

Power refers to the ability of a state or international actor to achieve its objectives and influence others in ways that serve its interests.

- **Cyber Power:** The ability to use cyberspace to achieve political, military, economic, or strategic objectives.

Sources of Power :

1. Geopolitical Potential

Geography provides a state with inherent sources of power even before they are mobilized. Inherent geographical power includes:¹

- Geographic location (straits, seaports, borders with major markets)
- Territory size
- Environmental and agricultural diversity
- Natural resources
- Position in global trade networks

¹ John J. Mearsheimer, *Op. cit.*, p. 30.

Example: Turkey has inherent geographic power due to its location between Europe and Asia, while Russia's vast territory and abundant resources give it latent power.

2. Traditional Material Sources :¹

- Military power (army, weapons, technology)
- Economic power (GDP, resources, trade)
- Population (size, education, age structure)

3. Immaterial Sources :

- Culture and identity
- Values and ideology

4. Modern Sources of Power :

- Technology (AI, data, cyberspace)
- Control over global production networks
- Multinational corporations
- International and regional organizations
- Influencing global media and public opinion
- Control over digital platforms and standards

Types of Power :

1. Hard Power:

Hard power is the ability to coerce and directly influence using:

- Military force

¹ Barry Buzan and Ole Wæver, *Op. cit.*, p. 44.

- Economic sanctions
- Political pressure
- Security alliances

It is evident in wars, nuclear deterrence, and military bases.

2. **Soft Power** :¹

Soft power is the ability to attract and persuade without using force, including:

- Culture
- Political model
- Values
- Diplomacy
- Education

It is used to enhance the state's image and gain allies.

3. **Smart Power**

Smart power combines hard and soft power in a single strategy.

Example: U.S. strategies post-9/11.

4. **Cyber Power** :

Cyber power has become one of the most important forms of power in the 21st century, including:

- Control over data
- Digital platforms

¹ Kenneth Waltz, *Op. cit.*, p. 88.

- Cross-border media
- Artificial intelligence
- Cybersecurity

Power as an Actor in International Relations :

Power is considered a tool of influence, used to guide other states' behavior, economic policies, and security decisions.

Example: U.S. sanctions that alter other states' policies.

Power is also used as deterrence to prevent adversaries from taking certain actions through threats or showcasing defensive capabilities.

It can also shape the international agenda through international institutions, economic organizations, and global media.

Conclusion:

Power is not just resources, military, and economy, but the ability to influence and produce outcomes.

Lecture 5: Peace and War in International Relations

The phenomena of peace and war are among the most entrenched and complex in the field of international relations, as they form the general framework for understanding state behavior and transformations in the international system over time.

Relations between international actors are not limited to conflict or cooperation alone but move along intersecting dichotomies, revealing the core dynamics of international politics:

peace vs. war, conflict vs. cooperation, competition over resources vs. interdependence, chaos vs. order, gain/loss vs. mutual benefit, and military alliances vs. political-economic organizations.

These dichotomies indicate that the international system constantly fluctuates between forces of attraction and tension, What appears as a contradiction is actually a continuous interaction reflecting the complex nature of inter-state relations.

Studying these dichotomies goes beyond theory to analyze mechanisms of regulation and stability that prevent the system from sliding into chaos and demonstrate how institutions, interdependence, and alliances reshape patterns of international behavior.

1. Peace vs\ War :¹

Peace:

- Absence of organized violence between states.
- Stable relations based on cooperation and mutual deterrence.

¹ Hedley Bull, *Op. cit.*, p. 19.

- Differences are managed through dialogue and legal mechanisms.

War:

- Use of armed force to change the behavior of another actor.
- Represents the failure of peaceful tools to resolve conflicts.
- Emerges when deterrence deteriorates or expansionist ambitions rise.

2. Conflict vs\ Cooperation :

Conflict:

- Differences in interests that lead to political, economic, or military friction.
- Can be material (territory, influence) or symbolic (identity, status).
- Does not necessarily lead to war; may remain controlled.

Cooperation:

- Voluntary alignment to achieve common interests.
- Grows with trust, agreements, and international institutions.
- Reduces the likelihood of war by creating positive expectations.

3. Competition over Resources vs. Interdependence

Competition over resources:¹

- States seek scarce resources (energy, minerals, water).
- May escalate into conflicts or armed disputes.
- Prominent in geostrategic regions.

¹ Alexander Wendt, *Op. cit.*, p. 12.

Interdependence:

- Economic and technological linkages make separation costly.
- Reduces the desire for war due to high mutual costs.
- Example: energy networks, global trade, supply chains.

4. Chaos vs\ Order :**Chaos:**

- Not literal chaos, but absence of a supreme authority governing the world.
- States rely on self-help for security.
- Creates uncertainty, prompting power accumulation and deterrence.

Order:

- International institutions, legal norms, and security arrangements.¹
- Reduce risks of misunderstanding and escalation.
- Examples: United Nations, WTO, international courts.

5. Gain-Loss vs. Mutual Benefit**Gain-Loss:**

- One's gain is seen as another's loss.
- Common in sovereignty, influence, and arms races.

Mutual Benefit:

- Opportunities where all can benefit in different ways.

¹Barry Buzan and Ole Wæver, *Op. cit.*, p. 51.

- Seen in economic and technological cooperation.
- Strengthens peace and integration among states.

6. Military Alliances vs\Political-Economic Organizations”

Military alliances:

- Security arrangements to address specific threats.
- Increase deterrence but may drag members into partners’ conflicts.
- Examples: NATO, collective defense pacts.

Political-economic organizations:

- Link states via shared interests, making war irrational.
- Aim to maintain financial stability and reduce friction.
- Examples: European Union, WTO, OPEC+.

7. Instability vs\ Regulation and Stability:¹

Instability:

- Collapse of balances
- Prolonged conflicts
- Weak international or regional institutions

Regulation and Stability:

- Mechanisms prevent slide into chaos
- Shared security arrangements
- Effective summit diplomacy
- International legitimacy

¹John J. Mearsheimer, *Op. cit.*, p. 35.

Conclusion:

International relations can be understood as constant movement along these axes:

- Peace ↔ War
- Cooperation ↔ Conflict
- Interdependence ↔ Competition
- Order ↔ Chaos
- Mutual benefit ↔ Zero-sum game
- Economic integration ↔ Security alliances
- Stability ↔ Instability

These dichotomies are spectra rather than separate binaries. States move along them based on interests, power balances, and institutional structures.

Peace is not permanent, nor is war; both are outcomes of complex interactions among state interests, power dynamics, resources, and governance mechanisms. Enhancing international organization, expanding interdependence, and developing conflict management can reduce the cost of conflicts and turn them into opportunities for cooperation and mutual benefit.

Lecture 6: Integration and Unification as a Transformation in the Structure of the International System

Since the mid-20th century, international relations have gradually shifted from a logic of conflict and balance toward a logic of cooperation and integration, especially after World War II.

1. Definition of Integration:

Integration in international relations is a long-term, organized process through which two or more states coordinate and adapt their policies, institutions, and systems in specific areas (economic, political, security, social) to achieve greater effective cooperation, interdependence, and stability.¹

Integration usually occurs through gradual steps, moving from simple cooperation to the unification of policies and structures, without merging states into a single entity.

Instead, it establishes an organized interaction where states function as a system in certain areas while maintaining their political independence in essence.

2. Definition of Unification (Political/Institutional Integration)

Unification in international relations goes beyond traditional integration, as states move from policy coordination to political or institutional unification.

This grants supranational authorities with powers that resemble sovereignty, representing the highest degree of integration, potentially forming a federal union.

¹Ernst B. Haas, *The Uniting of Europe: Political, Social, and Economic Forces 1950–1957*, Stanford, [Stanford University Press](#), 1958, p. 16.

Factors contributing to the rise of integration include:¹

1. **Economic globalization:** increasing interdependence.
2. **Erosion of traditional sovereignty:** growing role of non-state actors.
3. **Transboundary challenges:** food security, energy, environment, migration.
4. **Complex decision-making:** need for multi-level coordination.

Regional integration—whether economic, political, or security—is now a key mechanism for managing interdependence and achieving collective development and security.

3. Functionalist Approach (Functionalism)

Developed by David Mitrany in the 1940s, functionalism was the first theoretical framework justifying integration outside the logic of power and sovereignty.

Core assumptions:

- The state alone can no longer solve complex technical-economic problems.
- International cooperation through specialized technical organizations is more effective than traditional political alliances.
- Integration begins in technical and economic “mutual benefit” areas, not political or security fields.

¹ Leon N. Lindberg, *The Political Dynamics of European Economic Integration*, Stanford, [Stanford University Press](#), 1963, p. 10.

- “Functional performance” drives cooperation: success in one sector (transport, energy, agriculture) creates needs for broader collaboration.
- This leads to gradual, apolitical, and automatic integration.

Characteristics of functionalist integration:¹

- Gradual rather than revolutionary.
- Focus on efficiency rather than political authority.
- Gradual weakening of state borders through cooperative networks.
- Priority of technical expertise (technocracy) over political decision-making.

4. Neofunctionalism (New Functionalism)

Developed in the 1950s-1960s by Ernst Haas and Leon Lindberg, neofunctionalism offers a more realistic political analysis. Integration is driven not only by governments but also by societal forces and shared values beyond the nation-state.

Neofunctionalism emphasizes that integration often begins in limited economic or technical sectors but spreads automatically (spillover) to political integration, facilitated by:²

- **Shared societal values:** belief in common interests and acceptance of interdependence.
- **Support for supranational institutions.**
- **Negotiation culture based on trust and openness.**

¹ Bela Balassa, *The Theory of Economic Integration*, Homewood (Illinois), [Richard D. Irwin, Inc.](#), 1961, p. 2.

1. ² Ernst B. Haas, *Op. cit.*, p. 16.

Three mechanisms of expansion:

1. **Functional Spillover:** Integration in one sector creates pressures for integration in related sectors (e.g., coal and steel integration in Europe led to transportation and energy integration).
2. **Political Spillover:** Transnational interest groups push for broader integration, generating loyalties beyond the state.
3. **Institutional Spillover:** Regional organizations develop organizational capacities demanding expanded powers.

5. Integration as a New Phenomenon in International Relations

Integration manifests on three levels:

1. **Actor level:** Beyond states, actors include regional institutions, multinational corporations, and civil society networks, creating multi-level governance.
2. **Structural level:** Integration produces new regional spaces that transcend rigid sovereignty, merging markets, policies, and legal frameworks, reshaping the international system into regional blocs (e.g., EU).¹
3. **Functional level:** Integration manages shared challenges that single states cannot handle: regional security, energy and climate issues, migration.

Thus, integration is a functional necessity rather than a mere political choice.

2. ¹Leon N. Lindberg, *Op. cit.*, p. 10.

Lecture 7 : Realist Theory in International Relations

Introduction:

Realist theory is considered one of the most prominent frameworks in international relations, providing an analytical approach grounded in the concepts of power, conflict, and survival.

It emerged as a response to the failure of idealist approaches in maintaining international peace, emphasizing that relations among states are governed less by moral values and more by national interests and power dynamics.

This study aims to analyze the scientific foundations of realism, trace its historical development, examine its core assumptions, and explore its main variants.

First: The Scientific Foundations of Realist Theory

Realism is rooted in deep philosophical traditions dating back to the works of Thucydides, who offered an early account of international relations based on power politics, arguing that justice prevails only under conditions of equal power, while stronger actors impose their will when power is imbalanced.¹

This perspective established the notion that international order reflects power distributions rather than independent moral principles.

Similarly, Thomas Hobbes contributed significantly through his concept of the “state of nature,” characterized by fear, insecurity, and the absence of authority—conditions that realists project onto the international system.

¹ John J. Mearsheimer, *Op. cit.*, p. 47.

In the same vein, Niccolò Machiavelli emphasized that politics is governed by interest and power rather than ethical considerations, reinforcing the separation between morality and political action in international affairs.¹

Based on these foundations, realism views the international system as anarchic—not in the sense of chaos, but in terms of the absence of a central authority capable of enforcing rules. This condition compels states to rely on self-help for their security and renders competition a defining feature of international relations.

Second: The Historical Development of Realism

Classical realism emerged in the aftermath of World War I and became more firmly established after World War II, as a reaction to the failure of idealism. Hans Morgenthau was a leading figure of this tradition, arguing that international politics is governed by national interests defined in terms of power.

As the field evolved, structural realism (neorealism) emerged through the work of Kenneth Waltz, who shifted the focus from human nature to the structure of the international system.

He argued that anarchy and the distribution of power are the primary determinants of state behavior, marking a significant theoretical advancement.

Following the end of the Cold War, realism continued to evolve, incorporating additional variables such as domestic factors.

¹ Joseph S. Nye Jr., *Op. cit.*, p. 39.

This led to the development of neoclassical realism, which seeks to provide a more comprehensive explanation of state behavior.¹

Third: Core Assumptions of Realist Theory

Realism is built upon several key assumptions that define its theoretical logic. First, the state is considered the primary actor in international relations due to its sovereignty and its ability to use force. Second, the international system is anarchic, compelling states to rely on self-help to ensure their survival.

Within this context, survival is the ultimate goal of states, and all policies are oriented toward achieving it. Power is regarded as the main instrument for securing national interests, encompassing military, economic, and political dimensions, with military power remaining the decisive factor.

However, the pursuit of security gives rise to what is known as the “security dilemma,” whereby a state’s efforts to increase its security are perceived as threats by others, leading to arms races and persistent tension. Additionally, realism assumes that states are rational actors, yet their rationality operates under conditions of uncertainty, as they cannot fully ascertain the intentions of others.

This uncertainty drives states to adopt cautious and sometimes excessive measures to mitigate potential risks.

Fourth: Variants of Realism Realism encompasses several strands that differ in their explanations of state behavior, classical realism attributes conflict to human nature but remains limited in explaining variations among states.²

¹Hans Morgenthau, *Op. cit.*, p. 39.

²Joseph S. Nye Jr., *Op. cit.*, p. 25.

Structural realism, on the other hand, emphasizes the role of the international system and is divided into defensive and offensive realism.

Defensive realism argues that states primarily seek security and avoid excessive expansion, as it may provoke counterbalancing coalitions.

In contrast, offensive realism, as advanced by John Mearsheimer, posits that states continuously strive to maximize their power in order to achieve dominance and ensure their survival.

In addition, neoclassical realism attempts to bridge the gap between systemic and domestic factors, asserting that states' responses to external pressures vary depending on their internal capacities and leadership perceptions. This approach offers a more nuanced understanding of state behavior.

Conclusion :

In conclusion, realist theory provides a robust analytical framework for understanding international relations through its emphasis on power, survival, and anarchy.

Its various developments have enriched the analysis of state behavior, despite criticisms regarding its neglect of norms and international institutions. Nevertheless, realism remains one of the most influential theories in explaining global politics, particularly in contexts of conflict and instability.

Lecture 8 :Normative Idealism in International Relations

Introduction :

Normative idealism represents one of the foundational approaches in international relations theory, offering a perspective that emphasizes ethics, law, and the possibility of cooperation among states.

In contrast to realist assumptions about conflict and power, normative idealism argues that international politics can be guided by moral principles, legal norms, and shared values.

It emerged as a response to the destructive consequences of war and seeks to establish a more just and peaceful international order.

This study examines the intellectual foundations of normative idealism, traces its historical development, outlines its core assumptions, and analyzes its principal strands.

First: The Scientific Foundations of Normative Idealism

Normative idealism is deeply rooted in philosophical traditions that emphasize morality and rationality in human affairs.

The ideas of Immanuel Kant are central to this perspective, particularly his argument that lasting peace can be achieved through republican governance, adherence to international law, and the establishment of cooperative institutions.¹

Kant's vision of "perpetual peace" reflects the belief that rational actors are capable of transcending conflict through shared norms.

¹ John J. Mearsheimer, *Op. cit.*, p. 36.

Similarly, Hugo Grotius contributed to the development of international law by asserting that relations among states should be governed by legal principles derived from natural law.

His work laid the groundwork for the idea that legal frameworks can regulate state behavior even in the absence of a central authority.

Additionally, Woodrow Wilson played a pivotal role in translating idealist thought into political practice by advocating for collective security, open diplomacy, and the creation of international organizations.

His vision reflected a normative commitment to peace through cooperation and legal order.

From these foundations, normative idealism conceptualizes the international system not merely as a field of competition but as a domain where norms, values, and institutions can shape state behavior.¹

Second: The Historical Development of Normative Idealism

Normative idealism gained prominence after World War I, as scholars and policymakers sought to prevent future conflicts through legal and institutional mechanisms.

This period witnessed the establishment of the League of Nations, which embodied the idealist belief in collective security and international cooperation.

However, the outbreak of World War II exposed the limitations of early idealist approaches, particularly their inability to deter aggressive states.

This led to a decline in idealism and the rise of realism, despite this setback, idealist principles persisted and re-emerged in the post-war

¹ Alexander Wendt, *Op. cit.*, p. 29.

period through the creation of the United Nations and the expansion of international law and institutions.

In the contemporary era, normative idealism has evolved to incorporate concepts such as human rights, global governance, and international ethics, reflecting a broader and more sophisticated understanding of international cooperation.¹

Third: Core Assumptions of Normative Idealism

Normative idealism is based on several key assumptions that distinguish it from other theoretical approaches.

It assumes that states and individuals are capable of acting according to moral principles, rather than being solely driven by self-interest.

This perspective emphasizes the role of ethics in shaping political behavior and rejects the strict separation between morality and politics.

Furthermore, it views the international system as potentially cooperative rather than inherently conflictual.

While acknowledging the absence of a central authority, normative idealism argues that international norms and institutions can mitigate anarchy and promote order.

Another central assumption is that international law plays a crucial role in regulating state behavior, legal frameworks are seen as instruments that can constrain power and facilitate peaceful interactions.

Additionally, the theory highlights the importance of international organizations in fostering dialogue, cooperation, and collective problem-solving.

¹ John J. Mearsheimer, *Op. cit.*, p. 59.

Normative idealism also assumes that progress is possible in international relations.

Through the development of norms, institutions, and shared values, the international system can evolve toward greater stability and justice.¹

Fourth: Variants of Normative Idealism

Normative idealism encompasses several strands that differ in emphasis but share a commitment to ethical and cooperative principles.

Liberal institutionalism focuses on the role of international institutions in facilitating cooperation and reducing conflict by providing mechanisms for communication and enforcement.

Legal idealism emphasizes the importance of international law as a means of regulating state behavior and promoting justice.

It argues that legal norms can gradually shape state conduct and contribute to a more orderly international system.

Cosmopolitan idealism extends the focus beyond states to individuals, advocating for universal moral principles and the protection of human rights.

It challenges the primacy of state sovereignty by emphasizing global justice and ethical responsibility.

Finally, democratic peace theory, often associated with idealist thought, argues that democratic states are less likely to engage in conflict with one another, highlighting the role of domestic political systems in shaping international behavior.²

¹Kenneth Waltz, *Op. cit.*, p. 145.

²Alexander Wendt, *Op. cit.*, p.187.

Conclusion :

In conclusion, normative idealism provides an alternative framework to realism by emphasizing the role of ethics, law, and cooperation in international relations.

While it has been criticized for its optimism and occasional underestimation of power politics, it remains a vital perspective for understanding the development of international institutions, legal norms, and global governance, its enduring relevance lies in its aspiration to create a more just and peaceful international order.

Lecture 9 : Liberal Theory in International Relations:

Liberal theory in international relations represents a major intellectual development that builds upon earlier idealist traditions while incorporating more systematic and empirical analysis.

Unlike realism, which emphasizes conflict and power, liberalism focuses on cooperation, interdependence, and the role of institutions in shaping state behavior.

It argues that international relations are not solely defined by competition, but also by mutual interests, economic ties, and shared norms.

This study examines the intellectual foundations of liberalism, traces its historical evolution, outlines its core assumptions, and explores its main strands.

First: The Scientific Foundations of Liberal Theory

Liberalism is rooted in Enlightenment thought, particularly in the works of John Locke, who emphasized individual rights, rationality, and the possibility of cooperation under agreed rules.

His ideas contributed to the belief that political order can be constructed through consent and institutions rather than coercion.¹

The influence of Immanuel Kant is also central, especially his argument that republican states, international law, and federations of states can promote lasting peace.

Kant's vision laid the groundwork for liberal assumptions about cooperation and institutional governance.²

¹ Barry Buzan and Ole Wæver, *Op. cit.*, p. 49.

²Chris Brown and Kirsten Ainley, *Understanding International Relations*, London, Palgrave Macmillan, 2009, p. 18.

In addition, Adam Smith contributed to liberal thought by highlighting the benefits of economic interdependence and free trade, arguing that mutually beneficial exchange reduces incentives for conflict.

From these foundations, liberalism conceptualizes the international system as one where cooperation is possible and often rational, particularly when supported by institutions and shared interests.

Second: The Historical Development of Liberalism

Liberal ideas gained prominence after World War I, particularly through efforts to institutionalize cooperation and prevent future conflicts.

However, early liberal approaches faced setbacks following World War II, which exposed the limitations of purely idealist frameworks.

In the post-war period, liberalism evolved into a more sophisticated theory, particularly with the rise of international institutions such as the United Nations and global economic regimes.

Scholars began to analyze how institutions could facilitate cooperation even in an anarchic system.

During the late twentieth century, liberalism further developed into neoliberal institutionalism, which provided a more systematic explanation of how cooperation can emerge despite the constraints identified by realism.

This marked a significant shift toward integrating empirical analysis and formal modeling into liberal theory.¹

Third: Core Assumptions of Liberal Theory

¹ Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, and Steve Smith, *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2013, p. 14.

Liberalism rests on several key assumptions that distinguish it from realism.

It assumes that multiple actors participate in international relations, including states, international organizations, and non-state actors such as corporations and civil society groups.

This broadens the analytical scope beyond the state-centric view.

Moreover, liberalism views the international system as characterized by both conflict and cooperation, rather than inevitable conflict.

It argues that shared interests, particularly in trade and economic exchange, create incentives for peaceful interaction.

Another central assumption is that institutions play a crucial role in reducing uncertainty, facilitating communication, and enforcing agreements.

By providing rules and norms, institutions help states overcome collective action problems and build trust over time.

Liberal theory also emphasizes the importance of domestic politics. The nature of a state's political system, particularly whether it is democratic, influences its behavior in the international arena.

This is reflected in the democratic peace argument, which suggests that democratic states are less likely to engage in war with one another.

Finally, liberalism assumes that progress is possible in international relations. Through the expansion of institutions, economic interdependence, and democratic governance, the international system can become more stable and cooperative.¹

¹Jack Donnelly, *Realism and International Relations*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2000, p. 9.

Fourth: Variants of Liberal Theory

Liberalism encompasses several strands that differ in focus but share common principles.

Liberal institutionalism emphasizes the role of international institutions in facilitating cooperation and reducing conflict.

It argues that institutions provide the necessary framework for sustained interaction among states.

Economic liberalism focuses on the role of trade and interdependence, asserting that economic ties create mutual benefits that discourage conflict.

States become less likely to engage in war when their economies are interconnected.

Political liberalism highlights the impact of domestic political systems, particularly democracy, on international behavior.

It argues that democratic norms and accountability mechanisms promote peaceful relations.

Sociological liberalism, on the other hand, examines the role of transnational networks and social interactions in shaping international relations.

It emphasizes the importance of communication, shared identities, and non-state actors.¹

¹ Andrew Linklater, *The Transformation of Political Community*, Columbia (South Carolina), University of South Carolina Press, 1998, p. 27.

Conclusion:

In conclusion, liberal theory offers a comprehensive framework for understanding international relations by emphasizing cooperation, institutions, and interdependence.

While it acknowledges the challenges posed by anarchy, it provides mechanisms through which states can achieve mutual gains and maintain stability.

Despite criticisms regarding its optimism, liberalism remains a highly influential approach, particularly in explaining the growth of international institutions and the increasing interconnectedness of the global system.

Lecture10 : constructivist Theory in International Relations

Introduction :

Constructivist theory represents a significant shift in the study of international relations by challenging the material and deterministic assumptions of both realism and liberalism.

Rather than focusing primarily on power or institutions, constructivism emphasizes the role of ideas, norms, identities, and social interactions in shaping state behavior.

It argues that the international system is not merely given, but socially constructed through shared understandings and practices. This study explores the intellectual foundations of constructivism, traces its historical development, outlines its core assumptions, and examines its main strands.

First: The Scientific Foundations of Constructivist Theory

Constructivism is rooted in sociological and philosophical traditions that stress the importance of social reality as a product of human interaction.¹

The work of Alexander Wendt is central to this approach, particularly his argument that “anarchy is what states make of it.” This statement encapsulates the constructivist claim that the meaning of anarchy depends on how states interpret and respond to it.

In addition, Nicholas Onuf contributed to the development of constructivism by emphasizing the role of language and rules in shaping international relations. He argued that reality is constructed through discourse and social practices.

¹ Steve Smith, Ken Booth, and Marysia Zalewski, *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1996, p. 5.

The influence of Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann is also notable, particularly their work on the social construction of reality, which provided a broader theoretical foundation for understanding how shared meanings and norms emerge.

From these foundations, constructivism views the international system as a social structure defined not only by material factors but also by intersubjective meanings.¹

Second: The Historical Development of Constructivism

Constructivism emerged in the late twentieth century as a critique of dominant theories such as realism and liberalism, particularly during the final phase of the Cold War.

Traditional theories struggled to explain the peaceful end of the Cold War, which did not conform to expectations based solely on power calculations.

This gap opened the way for constructivist approaches that emphasized the role of changing ideas, identities, and norms in transforming international relations. During the 1990s, constructivism gained prominence as scholars increasingly recognized the importance of non-material factors.

In the contemporary period, constructivism has become a major theoretical perspective, influencing studies on international norms, identity politics, and global governance.²

Third: Core Assumptions of Constructivist Theory

¹ James E. Dougherty and Robert L. Pfaltzgraff, *Contending Theories of International Relations*, Philadelphia, J. B. Lippincott Company, 1991, p. 21.

² Robert Gilpin, *War and Change in World Politics*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1981, p. 7

Constructivism is based on several key assumptions that distinguish it from other theories, it argues that the international system is socially constructed, meaning that its structure and dynamics are shaped by shared ideas and interactions rather than being fixed or predetermined.

A central assumption is that identities matter, states do not have fixed interests; instead, their interests are shaped by their identities, which in turn are formed through social interaction.

This implies that state behavior cannot be fully understood without considering how states perceive themselves and others.

Constructivism also emphasizes the role of norms and values in guiding behavior, international norms influence what states consider appropriate or legitimate, thereby shaping their actions beyond mere calculations of power or interest.

Another key assumption is that change is possible. Because the international system is constructed through social processes, it can be transformed through changes in ideas, norms, and identities.

Finally, constructivism highlights the importance of discourse and communication.

Language and shared meanings play a crucial role in shaping international reality, as they influence how actors interpret and respond to situations.¹

¹ James E. Dougherty and Robert L. Pfaltzgraff, *Op. cit.*, p. 21.

Fourth: Variants of Constructivist Theory

Constructivism encompasses several strands that differ in focus and methodology, conventional constructivism adopts a more positivist approach, seeking to explain how norms and identities influence state behavior through empirical analysis.

Critical constructivism, on the other hand, emphasizes the role of power in shaping discourse and challenges dominant narratives in international relations, it often focuses on issues of inequality and marginalization.

Post-structuralist constructivism explores how language and discourse construct social reality, highlighting the fluid and contested nature of meaning.

Normative constructivism focuses on the ethical dimensions of international relations, examining how norms related to human rights, justice, and responsibility evolve and influence global politics.

Conclusion :

In conclusion, constructivist theory provides a distinct and influential framework for understanding international relations by emphasizing the role of ideas, norms, and identities.

It challenges materialist approaches and offers a more dynamic and flexible understanding of global politics.

Despite criticisms regarding its abstract nature, constructivism remains essential for analyzing how international realities are shaped and transformed over time.

Lecture 11 :Marxist Theory in International Relations

Introduction :

Marxist theory in international relations offers a critical perspective that challenges mainstream approaches such as realism and liberalism by focusing on economic structures, class relations, and global inequality.

Rather than viewing states as the primary actors, Marxism emphasizes the role of capitalism as a global system that shapes international relations.

It argues that conflict in the international system is rooted not only in power struggles among states but also in economic exploitation and class domination.

This study examines the intellectual foundations of Marxist theory, traces its historical development, outlines its core assumptions, and explores its main variants.

First: The Scientific Foundations of Marxist Theory

Marxist theory is grounded in the works of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, who developed a materialist conception of history based on economic relations and class struggle.

They argued that the structure of society is determined by its economic base, and that political and legal institutions reflect the interests of dominant classes.

In the international context, this perspective implies that global politics cannot be understood without analyzing capitalism as a system that

transcends national boundaries. Economic relations, rather than political sovereignty alone, become the central factor shaping interactions.¹

Later thinkers such as Vladimir Lenin expanded this analysis by linking capitalism to imperialism, arguing that advanced capitalist states expand outward to exploit resources and markets in less developed regions.

From these foundations, Marxism conceptualizes the international system as a hierarchy structured by economic power and inequality.

Second: The Historical Development of Marxist Theory

Marxist approaches gained prominence in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, particularly in the context of industrialization and global expansion.

Vladimir Lenin's analysis of imperialism provided a framework for understanding the global dynamics of capitalism.

During the Cold War period, Marxist theory influenced the policies and ideologies of socialist states, particularly in opposition to capitalist systems.

However, the decline of socialist regimes toward the end of the Cold War led to a reassessment of Marxist theory.

Despite this, Marxist ideas persisted and evolved into new forms, particularly through dependency theory and world-systems theory, which adapted Marxist insights to explain global inequality in the contemporary era.²

¹ Immanuel Wallerstein, *The Modern World-System*, New York, Academic Press, 1974, p. 15.

² Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, and Steve Smith, *Op. cit.*, p. 90.

Third: Core Assumptions of Marxist Theory

Marxist theory is based on several key assumptions that distinguish it from other approaches, it assumes that the global system is structured by capitalism, which creates inequalities between core (developed) and periphery (developing) regions.

Another central assumption is that economic factors are primary in shaping international relations, political and military actions are often seen as reflections of underlying economic interests.

Marxism also emphasizes class struggle, not only within states but at the global level.

This perspective shifts the focus from state competition to the dynamics between dominant and subordinate classes.

Furthermore, it challenges the idea of state neutrality, arguing that states often act in the interests of economic elites rather than the general population.

Finally, Marxist theory assumes that change is driven by structural contradictions within capitalism, suggesting that the international system is inherently unstable and subject to transformation.

Fourth: Variants of Marxist Theory

Marxist theory has developed into several strands within international relations, dependency theory focuses on the unequal relationships between developed and developing countries, arguing that underdevelopment is a consequence of exploitation by more advanced economies.

World-systems theory, associated with Immanuel Wallerstein, expands this analysis by dividing the world into core, semi-periphery, and periphery regions, each playing a distinct role in the global economy.

Neo-Marxism incorporates insights from other disciplines and emphasizes the role of ideology, culture, and institutions in maintaining capitalist dominance.

Critical theory, influenced by Marxism, examines power structures and seeks to challenge existing inequalities by promoting emancipation and social change.¹

Conclusion :

In conclusion, Marxist theory provides a powerful critical framework for understanding international relations by highlighting the role of economic structures, inequality, and exploitation.

It challenges state-centric and power-focused approaches by emphasizing the importance of global capitalism and class dynamics.

Despite criticisms regarding its economic determinism, Marxism remains highly relevant for analyzing issues such as global inequality, development, and economic power.

¹ Steve Smith, Ken Booth, and Marysia Zalewski, *Op. cit.*, p. 68.

Lecture12 :Feminist Theory in International Relations

Introduction :

Feminist theory in international relations offers a critical perspective that challenges the traditionally male-dominated assumptions of global politics.

It argues that mainstream theories such as realism and liberalism overlook or marginalize gender as a central category of analysis. Instead, feminist approaches emphasize that international relations are deeply shaped by gender hierarchies, power relations, and the unequal distribution of authority between men and women.

This study examines the intellectual foundations of feminist theory, traces its historical development, outlines its core assumptions, and explores its main strands.

First: The Scientific Foundations of Feminist Theory

Feminist theory in international relations is rooted in broader feminist philosophy and social theory, particularly the works of thinkers such as Simone de Beauvoir, who argued that gender is socially constructed rather than biologically determined.¹

Her famous idea that “one is not born, but rather becomes a woman” laid the foundation for understanding gender as a social and political structure.

In international relations, scholars such as Cynthia Enloe significantly contributed to the development of feminist IR by highlighting how global politics depends on the invisibility of women’s roles, especially in war, diplomacy, and global labor systems.

¹James E. Dougherty and Robert L. Pfaltzgraff, *Op. cit.*, p. 70.

Additionally, J. Ann Tickner challenged traditional theories of international relations by arguing that concepts like power, security, and sovereignty are gendered and reflect masculine assumptions.

From these foundations, feminist theory conceptualizes international relations as a gendered system in which power is not only political and economic but also social and cultural.¹

Second: The Historical Development of Feminist Theory

Feminist approaches to international relations gained momentum during the late twentieth century, particularly in the context of the broader feminist movements of the 1960s and 1970s.

These movements challenged structural inequalities in both domestic and international spheres.

In the 1980s and 1990s, feminist IR became more formally established within academic discourse, particularly as scholars critiqued the gender blindness of dominant theories such as realism and liberalism.

This period marked a significant expansion of feminist scholarship in international relations departments worldwide.

The post-Cold War era, following the end of the Cold War, further opened space for feminist perspectives, as new global issues such as human security, migration, and globalization highlighted the importance of gender in international politics.²

Third: Core Assumptions of Feminist Theory

Feminist theory is based on several key assumptions that distinguish it from mainstream international relations theories. First, it assumes that

¹Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, and Steve Smith, *Op. cit.*, p. 39.

²Steve Smith, Ken Booth, and Marysia Zalewski, *Op. cit.*, p. 123.

gender is a fundamental organizing principle of global politics, shaping institutions, policies, and power relations.

Second, it argues that traditional international relations theories are gender-biased because they prioritize concepts such as military power, rationality, and sovereignty—concepts historically associated with masculinity.

Third, feminist theory emphasizes that the experiences of women and marginalized groups are essential for understanding global politics, particularly in areas such as conflict, development, and human security.

Fourth, it challenges the public/private divide, arguing that issues traditionally considered “private,” such as domestic labor and gender-based violence, are deeply connected to international political and economic systems.

Finally, feminist theory assumes that international relations can be transformed through the promotion of gender equality, social justice, and inclusive governance.¹

Fourth: Variants of Feminist Theory

Feminist theory in international relations includes several strands, liberal feminism focuses on achieving gender equality through reforms within existing international institutions and legal frameworks. It emphasizes equal rights, representation, and access to opportunities.

Constructivist feminism examines how gender identities and norms are socially constructed and how they influence international politics.

¹ Andrew Linklater, *Op. cit.*, p. 49.

It highlights the role of discourse and cultural practices in shaping gendered power relations.

Critical feminism draws on broader critical theories to analyze how global capitalism, patriarchy, and power structures intersect to produce inequality.

It seeks deeper structural transformation rather than reform.

Postcolonial feminism focuses on the experiences of women in the Global South, criticizing Western-centric feminist narratives and emphasizing the impact of colonialism and global inequality on gender relations.¹

Conclusion :

In conclusion, feminist theory provides a vital and transformative lens for understanding international relations by revealing how gender shapes global politics.

It challenges the assumptions of traditional theories and expands the analytical scope of the discipline to include issues of identity, inequality, and social justice.

Despite criticisms regarding its fragmentation and normative orientation, feminist theory remains essential for understanding the full complexity of international relations in the contemporary world.

¹Robert Gilpin, *Op. cit.*, p. 15.

Lecture 13: Critical Theory in International Relations

Introduction:

Critical theory in international relations represents a reflective and emancipatory approach that seeks not only to explain global politics but also to question and transform its underlying structures.

Unlike positivist theories such as realism and liberalism, which focus on describing and predicting state behavior, critical theory emphasizes the historical, social, and ideological foundations of international order.

It argues that global politics is shaped by power relations embedded in knowledge, institutions, and economic systems, and that these structures can and should be critically examined.

This study explores the intellectual foundations of critical theory, traces its historical development, outlines its core assumptions, and examines its main strands.

First: The Scientific Foundations of Critical Theory

Critical theory in international relations is intellectually rooted in the broader tradition of the Frankfurt School, particularly the work of Max Horkheimer, who defined critical theory as an approach that seeks to uncover domination embedded in social structures and to promote human emancipation.

Another foundational figure is Theodor Adorno, who contributed to the critique of modern rationality, arguing that reason can be used not only for liberation but also for domination when embedded in power structures.

In international relations, the work of Robert W. Cox is particularly significant. He famously stated that “theory is always for someone and

for some purpose,” emphasizing that knowledge is never neutral but always linked to power relations.

Cox shifted the focus of international relations from problem-solving theory to critical theory, questioning the assumptions of mainstream approaches.

From these foundations, critical theory views the international system as historically constructed and shaped by dominant ideologies that can be challenged and transformed.¹

Second: The Historical Development of Critical Theory

Critical theory emerged in the mid-twentieth century within the context of social and political upheaval in Europe, particularly following the rise of fascism and the experiences of World War II.

The Frankfurt School developed its critique as a response to both capitalist modernity and authoritarianism.

In international relations, critical theory gained prominence in the late twentieth century as a response to the dominance of realism and liberalism, especially during and after the Cold War.

Scholars sought alternative explanations that addressed inequality, dependency, and structural power beyond state-centric frameworks.

During the 1980s and 1990s, critical theory became more influential in academic debates, particularly as globalization and economic restructuring highlighted new forms of inequality and domination in the international system.²

¹ Joseph S. Nye Jr., *Op. cit.*, p. 69.

² Hedley Bull, *Op. cit.*, p. 18.

Third: Core Assumptions of Critical Theory

Critical theory is based on several key assumptions that distinguish it from mainstream international relations theories.

First, it assumes that knowledge is not neutral but is shaped by social and political interests, theories therefore reflect power relations and often serve to legitimize existing global structures.

Second, it argues that the international system is historically constructed rather than naturally given, this means that global institutions, norms, and power relations are the result of specific historical processes and can therefore be changed.

Third, critical theory emphasizes the concept of domination, not only in terms of military or economic power but also through ideology, discourse, and knowledge production.

Fourth, it adopts an emancipatory purpose, aiming to identify forms of injustice and contribute to their transformation. Unlike problem-solving theories, it does not simply analyze the world as it is but asks how it might be changed.

Finally, critical theory assumes that social change is possible through reflection, awareness, and collective action that challenges dominant structures.¹

Fourth: Variants of Critical Theory

Critical theory includes several intellectual strands. Neo-Marxist approaches focus on global capitalism and economic inequality, analyzing how the international system reproduces class-based domination at a global level.

¹ Joseph S. Nye Jr., *Op. cit.*, p. 15.

Post-structuralist critical approaches emphasize discourse, language, and knowledge, arguing that power operates through the way reality is represented and constructed.

These approaches are influenced by thinkers such as Michel Foucault, particularly his ideas on power and knowledge.

Feminist critical theory integrates gender analysis into critical perspectives, examining how patriarchy intersects with global political and economic systems.

Postcolonial critical theory focuses on the legacy of colonialism and the continued dominance of Western powers in shaping global knowledge and institutions, highlighting the marginalization of the Global South.

Conclusion

In conclusion, critical theory provides a transformative framework for understanding international relations by questioning the assumptions of mainstream theories and revealing the power structures embedded in global politics.

It emphasizes that international relations are not neutral or fixed, but historically constructed and open to change.

Despite criticisms regarding its normative orientation and lack of predictive power, critical theory remains essential for understanding inequality, domination, and the possibilities for global emancipation.

Lecture14 :Human Security in International Relations

Introduction :

Human security represents a major shift in international relations theory, moving the focus from the security of the state to the security of individuals.

Unlike traditional approaches that prioritize military threats and territorial integrity, human security emphasizes the protection of people from a wide range of threats, including poverty, disease, environmental degradation, and violence.

It argues that true security cannot be achieved if individuals remain vulnerable, even when states are stable. This study examines the intellectual foundations of human security, traces its historical development, outlines its core assumptions, and explores its main dimensions.

First: The Scientific Foundations of Human Security

The concept of human security is rooted in broader human development and ethical approaches to global politics, one of its intellectual inspirations is Amartya Sen, who emphasized development as freedom, arguing that real security depends on expanding individuals' capabilities and choices rather than merely increasing state power or economic growth.¹

Another key contributor is Mahbub ul Haq, who played a central role in formulating the modern concept of human security within the United Nations framework.

¹ Jack Donnelly, *Universal Human Rights in Theory and Practice*, Ithaca (New York), [Cornell University Press](#), 2003, p. 10.

He argued that security should shift from protecting borders to protecting people's lives and dignity.

This approach was further developed within the United Nations system, particularly through the United Nations Development Programme, which introduced human security as part of its broader development agenda.

From these foundations, human security redefines security as a multidimensional concept that includes economic, food, health, environmental, personal, community, and political dimensions.¹

Second: The Historical Development of Human Security

The concept of human security emerged prominently in the post-Cold War period, particularly after the end of the Cold War, when the nature of global threats began to change.

Traditional interstate wars declined in some regions, while internal conflicts, humanitarian crises, and economic insecurity became more visible.

During the 1990s, the United Nations began to formally integrate human security into its development and policy frameworks, reflecting a growing awareness that threats to individuals often transcend national borders.

In the early twenty-first century, global events such as terrorism, pandemics, and climate change further reinforced the relevance of human security, highlighting the limitations of traditional state-centric security approaches.²

1. ¹ Rhona K. M. Smith, *Textbook on International Human Rights*, Oxford, [Oxford University Press](#), 2012, p. 22.

² Malcolm N. Shaw, *International Law*, Cambridge, [Cambridge University Press](#), 2008, p. 15.

Third: Core Assumptions of Human Security

Human security is based on several key assumptions that distinguish it from traditional security theories. First, it assumes that individuals, rather than states, are the primary referent of security, the ultimate goal is to protect human life, dignity, and well-being.

Second, it argues that security is multidimensional and cannot be reduced to military threats. Economic insecurity, health crises, environmental risks, and social exclusion are all considered security threats.

Third, human security assumes that global interdependence means that threats in one region can affect others, making security a shared responsibility among states and international actors.

Fourth, it emphasizes prevention rather than reaction, focusing on addressing the root causes of insecurity such as poverty, inequality, and weak governance.

Finally, human security assumes that international cooperation and multilateral institutions are essential for addressing complex global threats effectively.¹

Fourth: Dimensions of Human Security

Human security is commonly divided into several interconnected dimensions. Economic security refers to access to stable income and employment, ensuring that individuals can meet their basic needs. Food security focuses on reliable access to sufficient and nutritious food.

¹ Antonio Cassese, *International Law*, Oxford, [Oxford University Press](#), 2005, p. 3.

Health security involves protection from diseases and access to healthcare services, while environmental security addresses threats such as pollution, climate change, and natural disasters.

Personal security focuses on protection from physical violence, including conflict, crime, and domestic abuse. Community security emphasizes the protection of cultural identity and social cohesion, while political security ensures freedom of expression, political participation, and protection from repression.¹

Conclusion :

In conclusion, human security represents a significant transformation in the study of international relations by shifting the focus from states to individuals.

It broadens the concept of security to include economic, social, environmental, and political dimensions, reflecting the complexity of contemporary global challenges.

Although it faces criticism for its broad scope and lack of clear prioritization, human security remains a vital framework for understanding modern threats and promoting comprehensive approaches to global well-being.

¹ Malcolm N. Shaw, Op. cit., p. 15.

Lecture 15: Societal Security in International Relations

Introduction :

Societal security is a concept within international relations that shifts the focus of security analysis from the state and the individual to the identity of social groups, particularly nations, ethnic communities, and cultural collectives.

Unlike traditional security approaches that emphasize military threats or human security approaches that emphasize individual well-being, societal security is concerned with the preservation of collective identity.

It argues that the greatest threats in contemporary politics are those that endanger the survival of a community's identity, language, culture, or sense of belonging. This study examines the intellectual foundations of societal security, traces its historical development, outlines its core assumptions, and explores its main dimensions.

First: The Scientific Foundations of Societal Security

The concept of societal security is most closely associated with the Copenhagen School of security studies, particularly the work of Barry Buzan, who expanded the concept of security beyond the military dimension to include societal and identity-based threats.

A key contribution also comes from Ole Wæver, who introduced the concept of "securitization," arguing that security is not only about objective threats but also about how issues are socially constructed as existential threats through political discourse.

In addition, Jaap de Wilde contributed to the development of societal security by analyzing how identity and collective cohesion become central concerns in modern security environments.

From these foundations, societal security conceptualizes security as the protection of collective identity against perceived threats that may lead to cultural assimilation, fragmentation, or loss of cohesion.¹

Second: The Historical Development of Societal Security

Societal security emerged in the late twentieth century, particularly in the context of post-Cold War transformations, after the end of the Cold War, traditional military confrontations between superpowers declined, while internal conflicts, ethnic tensions, and identity-based struggles increased.

During the 1990s, the breakup of multinational states and the rise of nationalist movements in various regions highlighted the importance of identity as a central security concern.

These developments pushed scholars to reconsider traditional state-centric security models.

The Copenhagen School formalized the concept during this period, emphasizing that many contemporary conflicts are driven not by territorial disputes alone, but by fears of cultural or societal extinction.²

Third: Core Assumptions of Societal Security

Societal security is based on several key assumptions. First, it assumes that identity is a fundamental component of security, groups seek to

¹James E. Dougherty and Robert L. Pfaltzgraff, *Op. cit.*, p. 23.

²Robert Gilpin, *Op. cit.*, p. 28.

preserve their language, culture, traditions, and sense of belonging, and perceive threats to these elements as existential.

Second, it argues that societal groups, rather than only states or individuals, can be referent objects of security.

This means that nations, ethnic groups, and religious communities are central actors in security analysis.

Third, societal security assumes that threats are often constructed through perception and discourse.

A group may feel threatened even in the absence of direct physical danger if it perceives cultural erosion or assimilation.

Fourth, it emphasizes that globalization and migration can generate identity-based insecurities by increasing contact between different cultures and societies.

Finally, societal security assumes that security is relational, meaning that the strengthening of one identity group may be perceived as a threat by another.¹

Fourth: Dimensions of Societal Security

Societal security can be analyzed through several dimensions. Cultural security refers to the protection of language, traditions, and cultural heritage from erosion or assimilation. Religious security focuses on the preservation of religious identity and practices in the face of external influences.

Ethnic security concerns the survival and recognition of ethnic groups within states or across borders, particularly in contexts of conflict or

¹ Steve Smith, Ken Booth, and Marysia Zalewski, *Op. cit.*, p. 12.

minority marginalization. National identity security addresses the protection of collective national narratives and symbols that define a community.

Additionally, migration-related security examines how large-scale population movements can affect social cohesion and identity balance within host societies.

Conclusion :

In conclusion, societal security provides a distinct analytical framework within international relations by focusing on the protection of collective identities rather than only states or individuals.

It highlights the importance of culture, identity, and perception in shaping security dynamics.

While it has been criticized for its broad and sometimes subjective interpretation of threats, societal security remains highly relevant for understanding contemporary conflicts driven by identity politics, nationalism, and cultural change.

Lecture16 :New Security Threats in International Relations

Introduction

The concept of new security threats represents a major transformation in international relations theory, expanding the understanding of security beyond traditional military concerns. While classical approaches focused on interstate war and territorial defense, contemporary global dynamics have introduced a wide range of non-military threats that are transnational, complex, and interdependent.

These include environmental degradation, pandemics, cyber threats, terrorism, and transnational organized crime.

This study examines the intellectual foundations of new security threats, their historical development, core assumptions, and main categories.

First: The Scientific Foundations of New Security Threats

The theoretical foundation of new security threats is closely linked to the expansion of security studies beyond the state-centric framework.

One of the key contributors is Barry Buzan, who argued that security must be understood in multiple sectors, including environmental, economic, societal, and political dimensions, not only the military one.

Similarly, Ole Wæver contributed through securitization theory, which explains how issues become security threats through political and social discourse rather than their objective material nature.

The broader intellectual foundation is also influenced by globalization studies, which emphasize increasing interdependence among states and societies, making local problems rapidly global in scale.

From this perspective, security is no longer defined solely by the absence of war, but by the ability of political systems and societies to manage complex, interconnected risks.¹

Second: The Historical Development of New Security Threats

The emergence of new security threats became particularly evident after the end of the Cold War, when the bipolar military confrontation between superpowers declined.

This shift revealed a new set of global challenges that could not be explained by traditional military frameworks.

During the 1990s and early twenty-first century, globalization accelerated the spread of transnational risks such as financial crises, environmental degradation, and infectious diseases.

Events such as terrorist attacks and global pandemics further highlighted the limitations of traditional security concepts.

In recent years, climate change, cyber warfare, and artificial intelligence risks have reinforced the need to reconceptualize security in broader, more comprehensive terms.

Third: Core Assumptions of New Security Threats

The concept of new security threats is based on several key assumptions.

First, it assumes that threats are no longer purely military but multidimensional, involving economic, environmental, technological, and social factors.

¹Barry Buzan, Ole Wæver, and Jaap de Wilde, *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*, Boulder (Colorado), [Lynne Rienner Publishers](#), 1998, p. 21.

Second, it argues that threats are transnational in nature, meaning that they cross borders easily and cannot be managed by individual states alone. This creates a strong need for international cooperation.

Third, it assumes that security interdependence is a defining feature of the modern world, where the vulnerability of one state or society can quickly affect others.

Fourth, it emphasizes uncertainty and unpredictability, as many modern threats evolve rapidly and cannot be easily anticipated or controlled.¹

Finally, it assumes that non-state actors, including terrorist organizations, multinational corporations, and cyber networks, play a significant role in generating and spreading security threats.

Fourth: Main Categories of New Security Threats

New security threats can be classified into several major categories. Environmental threats include climate change, natural disasters, water scarcity, and pollution, all of which have direct and indirect impacts on human and state security.

Health-related threats include pandemics and the rapid spread of infectious diseases, which can destabilize economies and overwhelm health systems, as demonstrated by global health crises.

Cybersecurity threats involve attacks on digital infrastructure, data breaches, and cyber warfare, which target both state institutions and private systems.

¹ Moisés Naím, *Illicit: How Smugglers, Traffickers, and Copycats are Hijacking the Global Economy*, New York, [Doubleday](#), 2005, p. 11.

Terrorism remains a significant non-traditional security threat, characterized by transnational networks and asymmetric tactics that challenge conventional military responses.¹

Finally, economic and financial threats include global financial crises, economic instability, and disruptions in supply chains, which can have widespread political and social consequences.

Conclusion:

In conclusion, the concept of new security threats reflects a fundamental transformation in international relations, moving beyond traditional military-focused definitions of security toward a broader, multidimensional understanding.

It highlights the increasing complexity and interdependence of the global system, where threats are interconnected, transnational, and often non-military in nature.

Despite challenges in defining and prioritizing these threats, this approach remains essential for understanding contemporary global security dynamics and for developing effective collective responses.

¹ Ulrich Beck, *World at Risk*, Cambridge, [Polity Press](#), 2009, p. 14

Lecture 17 : Regional Security Complex Theory in International Relations

Introduction :

The Regional Security Complex Theory (RSCT) is an influential framework in international relations that explains security dynamics through regional patterns rather than global or purely state-centric structures.

It argues that security is primarily clustered in geographically defined regions, where the security concerns of states are so interconnected that they cannot be understood in isolation.

Instead of viewing international security as a single global system, this approach emphasizes the importance of regional subsystems shaped by historical, political, and geographical factors.

This study examines the intellectual foundations of RSCT, its historical development, core assumptions, and main components.

First: The Scientific Foundations of Regional Security Complex Theory

The Regional Security Complex Theory is most closely associated with the work of Barry Buzan, who developed the idea that security interdependence is often strongest within regions rather than at the global level.¹

He argued that threats, alliances, and perceptions of insecurity tend to cluster geographically, forming distinct security complexes.

¹ Mary Kaldor, *New and Old Wars: Organized Violence in a Global Era*, Cambridge, [Polity Press](#), 2009, p. 15.

This approach is also supported by Ole Wæver, who contributed through securitization theory, emphasizing how political actors define and construct security threats within specific regional contexts.

From a broader theoretical perspective, RSCT builds on the idea of interdependence in international relations, but it modifies it by arguing that interdependence is uneven and geographically concentrated rather than global and uniform.

Thus, the theory conceptualizes international security as structured through regional clusters where states' security concerns are deeply interconnected.¹

Second: The Historical Development of Regional Security Complex Theory

The theory emerged during the late Cold War period and became more fully developed in the post-Cold War era following the end of the Cold War.

During this period, it became clear that many conflicts were no longer global ideological confrontations but rather regional and local security problems.

The collapse of bipolarity revealed that security dynamics in regions such as the Middle East, South Asia, and the Balkans could not be fully explained by global superpower competition alone.

Instead, these regions developed their own internal patterns of rivalry, alliance, and conflict.

¹ Rhona K. M. Smith, Op. cit., p. 37.

This shift encouraged scholars to focus on regional security structures as independent analytical units within the international system.¹

Third: Core Assumptions of Regional Security Complex Theory

The theory is based on several key assumptions. First, it assumes that security threats are geographically clustered, meaning that most security interactions occur within specific regions rather than at a global level.

Second, it argues that security interdependence is strongest among neighboring states. The security of one state is directly linked to the security perceptions and actions of nearby states.

Third, RSCT assumes that historical relationships, such as long-standing rivalries or alliances, play a crucial role in shaping regional security dynamics.

Fourth, it emphasizes that external powers can influence regional security complexes, but they do not fully determine them. Global actors may intervene, but regional patterns of interaction remain structurally significant.

Finally, the theory assumes that each region develops its own security logic, meaning that threats, alliances, and conflicts are shaped by regional context rather than universal global rules.²

Fourth: Structure of Regional Security Complexes

Regional security complexes are typically composed of several interrelated elements. The first is the pattern of amity and enmity, which

¹ Jessica Tuchman Mathews, *Redefining Security*, New York, [Council on Foreign Relations Press](#), 1989, p. 162.

² Mary Kaldor, *New and Old Wars: Organized Violence in a Global Era*, Cambridge, [Polity Press](#), 1999, p. 6.

refers to relationships of friendship, cooperation, hostility, or rivalry among states within the region.

The second element is the distribution of power within the region, where dominant regional powers often shape the security environment of weaker states.

The third element involves geographical proximity, which intensifies security interdependence due to ease of military, political, and economic interaction.

The fourth element is external penetration, where global powers intervene in regional complexes, influencing but not completely reshaping them.

Together, these elements create distinct regional security structures that define the behavior of states within each region.

Conclusion :

In conclusion, Regional Security Complex Theory provides a valuable analytical framework for understanding international security by emphasizing the regional level as the primary space of security interaction.

It highlights how geography, historical relations, and power distribution create distinct security environments that shape state behavior, while it has been criticized for underestimating global systemic influences, RSCT remains essential for analyzing regional conflicts and understanding the structure of international security in a fragmented and interconnected world.

Lecture18 :International Law in International Relations

Introduction :

International law represents a fundamental framework governing relations among states and other international actors.

It consists of a set of rules, principles, and norms that regulate behavior in the international system.

Unlike domestic law, international law operates in a decentralized environment without a central authority capable of enforcing compliance in a uniform manner.

Despite this limitation, it plays a crucial role in shaping state behavior, maintaining order, and facilitating cooperation in global politics.

This study examines the intellectual foundations of international law, its historical development, core principles, and main sources.

First: The Scientific Foundations of International Law

The intellectual foundations of international law are deeply rooted in legal and philosophical traditions that sought to regulate relations between sovereign entities.

One of the most influential early thinkers is Hugo Grotius, often regarded as the “father of international law.” He argued that states, like individuals, are bound by natural law and rational principles that govern war, peace, and diplomacy.

Another important contribution comes from Immanuel Kant, who emphasized the role of law and republican governance in achieving perpetual peace among states.

His vision highlighted the possibility of a legal and institutional order that constrains war and promotes cooperation.

Modern international legal thought also draws on positivist traditions, which argue that international law is based on the consent of states expressed through treaties and customary practices.

From these foundations, international law is understood as a system that balances sovereignty with legal obligation in a decentralized global environment.¹

Second: The Historical Development of International Law

The development of international law can be traced back to early modern Europe, particularly after the Peace of Westphalia in 1648, which established the principle of state sovereignty as a cornerstone of the international system.

During the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, international law expanded significantly through treaties, diplomatic conventions, and the establishment of legal norms governing war and diplomacy. However, the devastation of World War I highlighted the need for stronger legal mechanisms to prevent conflict.

After World War II, international law became more institutionalized with the creation of the United Nations, which provided a framework for collective security, human rights protection, and peaceful dispute resolution.²

¹ Jack Donnelly, *Op. cit.*, p. 19.

² Rhona K. M. Smith, *Op. cit.*, p. 45.

In the contemporary era, international law has expanded to include new areas such as environmental protection, human rights, international trade, and humanitarian law.

Third: Core Principles of International Law

International law is based on several fundamental principles that define its structure and functioning. First, the principle of state sovereignty asserts that each state has supreme authority over its territory and domestic affairs, free from external interference.

Second, the principle of non-intervention prohibits states from interfering in the internal affairs of other states, ensuring political independence and equality among sovereign entities.

Third, the principle of *pacta sunt servanda* establishes that treaties must be honored in good faith, forming the foundation of legal obligation in international agreements.

Fourth, the principle of peaceful settlement of disputes encourages states to resolve conflicts through negotiation, arbitration, or judicial mechanisms rather than force.

Finally, the principle of responsibility ensures that states and international actors are accountable for violations of international obligations.

Fourth: Sources of International Law

International law derives from several recognized sources. Treaties are formal written agreements between states that create binding legal obligations. Customary international law emerges from consistent state practice accompanied by a sense of legal obligation (*opinio juris*).

General principles of law, recognized by civilized nations, provide foundational legal concepts that are widely accepted across legal systems. Judicial decisions and scholarly writings also contribute as subsidiary means for determining legal rules.

Together, these sources form a coherent but decentralized legal system that guides international conduct.¹

Conclusion :

In conclusion, international law constitutes a vital framework for regulating relations in the international system despite the absence of a central enforcing authority.

It balances the principle of state sovereignty with the need for legal order, cooperation, and stability. While its effectiveness often depends on state compliance and political will, international law remains essential for maintaining global order, resolving disputes, and promoting justice in international relations.

¹ Jack Donnelly, *Op. cit.*, p. 19.

Lecture19:Human Rights in International Relations

Introduction :

Human rights constitute one of the most important normative frameworks in contemporary international relations.

They refer to the fundamental rights and freedoms inherent to all human beings, regardless of nationality, ethnicity, gender, or religion.

Unlike traditional state-centric approaches, human rights place the individual at the center of international concern.

They aim to protect human dignity, ensure equality, and limit abuses of power by states and other actors.

This study examines the intellectual foundations of human rights, their historical development, core principles, and main institutional frameworks.

First: The Scientific Foundations of Human Rights

The intellectual foundations of human rights are rooted in Enlightenment philosophy and natural law theory.

One of the key contributors is John Locke, who argued that individuals possess natural rights to life, liberty, and property that cannot be legitimately violated by governments.

His ideas strongly influenced modern liberal thought and constitutional governance.

Another major influence is Immanuel Kant, who emphasized universal moral principles and the importance of treating individuals as ends in themselves, not merely as means.

His philosophy contributed to the idea of universal human dignity.

In the modern era, human rights discourse has been shaped by international legal and institutional developments, particularly within the framework of the United Nations.

From these foundations, human rights are understood as universal, inalienable, and indivisible principles that transcend state sovereignty.¹

Second: The Historical Development of Human Rights

The modern human rights system emerged in the aftermath of massive global conflicts that exposed the need for international protection of individuals.

After the atrocities of World War II, the international community sought to establish universal standards to prevent future violations.

This led to the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948 under the framework of the United Nations, marking a foundational moment in global human rights history.

During the Cold War period, human rights became politically contested, with ideological differences between East and West shaping different interpretations of rights (civil and political rights versus economic and social rights).

In the post-Cold War era, human rights expanded significantly, becoming central to international law, humanitarian intervention debates, and global governance.²

Third: Core Principles of Human Rights

¹Antonio Cassese, *Op. cit.*, p. 87.

²Malcolm N. Shaw, *Op. cit.*, p. 19.

Human rights are based on several fundamental principles. First, universality means that all human beings are entitled to the same rights without discrimination.

These rights apply regardless of cultural, political, or economic differences.

Second, inalienability implies that human rights cannot be taken away except under very limited legal conditions, such as due process of law.

Third, indivisibility means that civil, political, economic, social, and cultural rights are interdependent and equally important.

Fourth, equality and non-discrimination ensure that all individuals are treated equally before the law and protected from discrimination.

Finally, accountability requires that states and institutions are responsible for respecting, protecting, and fulfilling human rights obligations.¹

Fourth: Institutional Framework of Human Rights

The human rights system is supported by a wide range of international institutions and legal instruments, the United Nations plays a central role through bodies such as the Human Rights Council and treaty-monitoring committees.

International treaties such as the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights form the legal backbone of the system.

Regional organizations also contribute significantly, such as the European Court of Human Rights and the African Commission on

¹Antonio Cassese, Op. cit., p. 19.

Human and Peoples' Rights, which provide judicial and quasi-judicial mechanisms for enforcement.

Non-governmental organizations and civil society groups play an important role in monitoring violations, raising awareness, and pressuring states to comply with international norms.

Conclusion :

In conclusion, human rights represent a central normative and legal framework in international relations that prioritizes the dignity and protection of individuals.

While their implementation often depends on political will and faces challenges related to sovereignty and enforcement, human rights remain a cornerstone of global governance and international law. They continue to shape international norms, influence state behavior, and provide a universal standard for evaluating justice and legitimacy in world politics.

Lecture 20 :Power Transition Theory in International Relations

Introduction :

Power Transition Theory is one of the most influential structural approaches in international relations that explains the conditions under which major wars are likely to occur.

Unlike classical realism, which views international politics as a continuous struggle for power, this theory focuses on the hierarchical nature of the international system and the risks created when rising powers challenge dominant ones.

It argues that global stability depends on the relative distribution of power and the satisfaction of states with the existing international order.

This study examines the intellectual foundations of Power Transition Theory, its historical development, core assumptions, and main analytical implications.

First: The Scientific Foundations of Power Transition Theory

Power Transition Theory was developed within the structural tradition of international relations and is most closely associated with the work of A.F.K. Organski.

Organski challenged traditional balance-of-power theory by arguing that international systems are not equal anarchies but rather hierarchical structures dominated by a leading power that establishes and maintains order.

The theory was further developed and formalized by Jacek Kugler, who introduced more systematic and quantitative models to analyze power distribution and conflict probability.

Their work emphasized measurable indicators such as economic growth, military capacity, and demographic strength to assess shifts in global power.

From this perspective, international relations are understood as a dynamic hierarchy in which changes in relative power between states determine the stability or instability of the system.¹

Second: The Historical Development of the Theory

Power Transition Theory emerged during the Cold War as scholars attempted to explain the structural tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union.

The bipolar system following the end of the World War II provided a clear context for analyzing rivalry between a dominant power and a rising challenger.

During the Cold War, the theory was used to interpret the strategic competition between superpowers, particularly the risks associated with near parity in military and economic capabilities.

After the end of the Cold War, the theory gained renewed relevance as scholars applied it to emerging global shifts, including the rise of new economic and political powers in the international system.

Third: Core Assumptions of Power Transition Theory

Power Transition Theory is based on several key assumptions. First, the international system is hierarchical rather than fully anarchic. A dominant state, often called the hegemon, establishes the rules and norms of the system.

¹ Chris Brown and Kirsten Ainley, *Op. cit.*, p. 27.

Second, rising powers grow at different rates, and when a challenger approaches parity with the dominant state, the system becomes unstable.

Third, the likelihood of major conflict is highest not when power is extremely unequal, but when a rising state reaches near-equal power with the dominant state.

Fourth, satisfaction with the international order is a critical variable. States that are satisfied with the existing system are less likely to challenge it, while dissatisfied rising powers are more likely to initiate conflict.¹

Finally, the theory assumes that power is multidimensional, including economic strength, military capability, and demographic resources.

Fourth: Analytical Implications of the Theory

Power Transition Theory has important implications for understanding war and peace in international relations. It suggests that major wars are systemic rather than random events, arising from structural changes in global power distribution.

It also implies that maintaining international stability requires not only balancing power but also ensuring that rising powers are integrated into the existing international order in a satisfactory way.

Additionally, the theory provides a framework for analyzing contemporary global shifts, particularly the rise of new major powers and the potential for strategic rivalry in the international system.²

¹Steve Smith, Ken Booth, and Marysia Zalewski, *Op. cit.*, p. 13.

²Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, and Steve Smith, *Op. cit.*, p. 19.

Conclusion :

In conclusion, Power Transition Theory offers a structural explanation of international conflict based on shifts in global power hierarchy.

It highlights the importance of relative power changes and the satisfaction of rising states in determining system stability.

While it has been criticized for its deterministic assumptions, the theory remains highly influential in explaining major power competition and the conditions under which global conflicts are most likely to occur.

Lecture 21 :Global Challenges in International Relations

Introduction :

Global challenges refer to a set of transnational issues that affect multiple states and societies simultaneously and cannot be effectively addressed by any single country acting alone.

These challenges have become a central focus of contemporary international relations due to increasing globalization, interdependence, and the growing complexity of global risks.

Unlike traditional security threats that are primarily military and state-centered, global challenges are multidimensional, involving environmental, economic, technological, and health-related risks.

This study examines the intellectual foundations of global challenges, their historical development, core assumptions, and main categories.

First: The Scientific Foundations of Global Challenges

The concept of global challenges is rooted in globalization theory and interdependence approaches in international relations. These perspectives emphasize that the world is increasingly interconnected through economic exchange, communication networks, and political cooperation, which means that local problems can rapidly become global in scope.¹

A key contributor to this understanding is Joseph Nye, who highlighted the importance of complex interdependence and soft power in global politics.

¹ Andrew Linklater, *Op. cit.*, p. 29.

His work shows that power is no longer solely military but also includes economic and informational dimensions, which are essential for addressing global issues.

Additionally, scholars in global governance and security studies have emphasized that contemporary threats require collective action and institutional coordination beyond the nation-state.

From this foundation, global challenges are understood as systemic problems that emerge from the structure of global interdependence.¹

Second: The Historical Development of Global Challenges

The rise of global challenges became particularly visible after the end of the Cold War, when the reduction of superpower confrontation shifted attention toward non-military issues.

During the 1990s, globalization accelerated significantly, leading to increased economic integration, rapid technological change, and greater mobility of people and capital.

This period also saw the emergence of global environmental concerns and financial instability.

In the twenty-first century, major crises such as climate change, global pandemics, international terrorism, and cyber insecurity have demonstrated the interconnected nature of global risks and the limitations of unilateral responses.²

¹ James E. Dougherty and Robert L. Pfaltzgraff, *Op. cit.*, p. 34.

² Steve Smith, Ken Booth, and Marysia Zalewski, *Op. cit.*, p. 15.

Third: Core Assumptions of Global Challenges

The concept of global challenges is based on several key assumptions. First, global problems are transnational in nature, meaning they cross borders and affect multiple actors simultaneously.

Second, no single state has the capacity to effectively manage these challenges alone, making international cooperation essential.

Third, global systems are highly interdependent, so changes in one part of the world can have immediate and far-reaching effects elsewhere.

Fourth, global challenges are complex and interconnected, often reinforcing one another. For example, environmental degradation can contribute to migration, conflict, and economic instability.

Finally, addressing global challenges requires coordinated action involving states, international organizations, and non-state actors such as NGOs and multinational corporations.

Fourth: Main Categories of Global Challenges

Global challenges can be classified into several major categories. Environmental challenges include climate change, biodiversity loss, water scarcity, and pollution, all of which threaten ecological stability and human livelihoods.

Health-related challenges include pandemics, emerging diseases, and unequal access to healthcare systems, which can disrupt global economies and societies.

Economic challenges involve financial crises, inequality, poverty, and instability in global markets, all of which affect both developed and developing countries.

Technological challenges include cybersecurity threats, artificial intelligence risks, and digital inequality, which raise concerns about security, privacy, and governance.

Finally, social and political challenges include forced migration, terrorism, and political instability, which often result from or contribute to other global problems.¹

Conclusion

In conclusion, global challenges represent one of the most important dimensions of contemporary international relations. They reflect the increasing interdependence of the international system and the emergence of complex, transnational risks that cannot be managed through traditional state-centric approaches. While these challenges are difficult to address due to their scale and complexity, they highlight the necessity of global cooperation, institutional coordination, and shared responsibility in maintaining international stability and development.

¹Chris Brown and Kirsten Ainley, *Op. cit.*, p. 18.

Lecture22 :Security Governance in International Relations

Introduction

Security governance refers to the processes, mechanisms, and networks through which security is managed, organized, and coordinated in the contemporary international system.

Unlike traditional approaches that view security as the exclusive responsibility of the state, security governance emphasizes the distributed nature of authority among multiple actors, including states, international organizations, regional institutions, and private actors.

It reflects the growing complexity of security threats in a globalized world and the need for cooperative and multi-level responses. This study examines the intellectual foundations of security governance, its historical development, core assumptions, and main features.

First: The Scientific Foundations of Security Governance

The concept of security governance is rooted in governance theory and critical security studies, which challenge the traditional state-centric understanding of security.

It builds on the idea that security is not only produced by states but also by networks of actors operating across different levels of authority.¹

A key contribution comes from Barry Buzan, whose work on security sectors expanded the concept of security beyond military issues to include political, economic, societal, and environmental dimensions.

Another important contribution is associated with Ole Wæver, who introduced securitization theory, explaining how issues become security

¹ Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, and Steve Smith, *Op. cit.*, p. 54.

concerns through political discourse and social construction rather than objective conditions alone.

From this perspective, security governance is understood as a decentralized system in which security is produced through interaction, coordination, and institutional networks rather than centralized state control.¹

Second: The Historical Development of Security Governance

Security governance emerged as a prominent concept in the post-Cold War period, following the end of the Cold War.

During this time, the international security environment became more complex, with a decline in direct inter-state wars and a rise in internal conflicts, terrorism, and transnational threats.

The increasing importance of globalization further transformed security dynamics, as threats such as cybercrime, migration pressures, and environmental risks transcended national borders.

In response to these changes, security governance developed as a framework to understand how multiple actors cooperate and coordinate to manage security in a fragmented global order.²

Third: Core Assumptions of Security Governance

Security governance is based on several key assumptions. First, security is no longer monopolized by the state but is distributed across a wide range of actors, including international organizations, regional bodies, private security companies, and civil society groups.

¹ Barry Buzan and Ole Wæver, *Op. cit.*, p. 49.

1. ²Leon N. Lindberg, *Op. cit.*, p. 17.

Second, security management operates through networks rather than hierarchical command structures. Coordination, cooperation, and information-sharing are essential elements of governance.

Third, security threats are complex and interconnected, requiring flexible and adaptive responses rather than rigid, state-centered policies.

Fourth, legitimacy in security governance depends on cooperation, transparency, and the inclusion of multiple stakeholders in decision-making processes.

Finally, security governance assumes that effective security requires multi-level coordination, from the local and national levels to regional and global institutions.

Fourth: Main Features of Security Governance

Security governance is characterized by several important features. The first is multi-actor involvement, where security is produced by a combination of state and non-state actors working together.

The second is network-based coordination, which replaces traditional hierarchical control with flexible and interconnected systems of governance.

The third feature is institutional diversity, where multiple organizations operate simultaneously at different levels, including international, regional, and sector-specific institutions.

The fourth feature is issue-specific governance, meaning that different security problems—such as terrorism, cyber threats, or environmental risks—are managed through specialized frameworks.¹

¹ Joseph S. Nye Jr., *Op. cit.*, p. 23.

Finally, security governance is adaptive and dynamic, allowing for continuous adjustment in response to evolving threats.

Conclusion:

In conclusion, security governance represents a modern and flexible approach to understanding how security is organized in the international system.

It reflects the shift from state-centric control to networked and multi-level cooperation among diverse actors. While it faces challenges related to coordination and accountability, security governance remains essential for addressing the complex and interconnected security threats of the contemporary world.

Lecture 23 : Global Order in International Relations

Introduction :

The concept of global order refers to the structured pattern of relations, rules, institutions, and power distributions that organize the international system.

It represents the overall framework within which states and other international actors interact. Global order is not static; it evolves over time due to changes in power, norms, institutions, and global challenges.

Understanding global order is essential for explaining stability, conflict, cooperation, and transformation in international relations. This study examines the intellectual foundations of global order, its historical evolution, core characteristics, and main models.

First: The Scientific Foundations of Global Order

The study of global order is rooted in classical and contemporary international relations theories. Realist thinkers such as Hans Morgenthau emphasize that global order is shaped primarily by the distribution of power among states, where stability depends on balance or dominance.¹

From a liberal perspective, scholars like Robert Keohane argue that global order is maintained through international institutions, **regimes**, and cooperation that reduce uncertainty and facilitate collective action.

Constructivist approaches, particularly those associated with Alexander Wendt, highlight that global order is also shaped by shared norms, identities, and ideas, meaning that order is socially constructed rather than purely material.

¹ Alexander Wendt, *Op. cit.*, p. 23.

Thus, global order is understood as a combination of power structures, institutional arrangements, and normative frameworks.¹

Second: The Historical Evolution of Global Order

Modern global order emerged after the Peace of Westphalia in 1648, which established the principle of sovereign states as the main actors in international politics.

Following the devastation of World War II, a new institutional global order was created, centered on the United Nations, along with the Bretton Woods economic system.

During the Cold War, global order was bipolar, dominated by the United States and the Soviet Union. After the end of the Cold War, the world moved toward a unipolar moment dominated by the United States, followed by increasing tendencies toward multipolarity in the twenty-first century.

Third: Core Characteristics of Global Order

Global order is characterized by several key features. First, it is hierarchical, meaning that power is distributed unevenly among states, with dominant powers shaping rules and institutions.

Second, it is institutionalized, as international organizations and legal frameworks regulate state behavior and facilitate cooperation.

Third, it is dynamic, constantly changing due to shifts in power, technological developments, and global crises.

Fourth, it is interdependent, as economic, political, and security relations connect states in complex networks.

¹ Hedley Bull, *Op. cit.*, p. 19.

Finally, global order is normative, shaped not only by material power but also by shared ideas about legitimacy, justice, and sovereignty.¹

Fourth: Models of Global Order

Several models explain how global order is structured. The unipolar model is characterized by the dominance of a single superpower that sets global rules.

The bipolar model is based on two dominant powers competing for influence, as seen during the Cold War.

The multipolar model involves several major powers sharing influence, creating a more complex but potentially unstable system.

Finally, the institutional model emphasizes the role of international organizations and legal frameworks in maintaining order through cooperation rather than dominance.²

Conclusion :

In conclusion, global order provides an overarching framework for understanding international relations by integrating power, institutions, and norms into a single analytical concept.

It explains how stability and change occur in the international system and how different actors influence global structure. While debates continue about whether the world is moving toward unipolarity, bipolarity, or multipolarity, global order remains a central concept for analyzing contemporary international politics.

¹ Kenneth N. Waltz, *Op. cit.*, p. 26.

²Bela Balassa, *Op. cit.*, p. 15.

Lecture24: The Civilizational Dimension in International Relations

Definition of Civilization:

Civilization is the cumulative outcome of continuous historical interaction between humans and their natural and social environment, encompassing both material and spiritual dimensions. Humans produce tools, techniques, and systems to organize life while simultaneously developing values, ideas, and visions shaping their cultural and spiritual identity.

Through this dynamic interaction, shared patterns of knowledge, organization, and innovation emerge and are transmitted across generations, forming the global human heritage contributed to by all humanity.¹

Simultaneously, each society expresses its historical, geographical, and social particularities through distinctive beliefs, customs, values, arts, and languages, resulting in cultural differentiation within the broader human civilization framework.

1. Human Civilizational Sharing

- Civilization is not the exclusive property of a nation or people.
- It is cumulative and transmitted across humanity.
- It results from global interaction via trade, migration, and communication.
- Each regional civilization contributes to the human commonwealth (science, arts, systems, major ideas).

1. ¹Samuel P. Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, New York, [Simon & Schuster](#), 1996, p. 28.

2. Cultural Differentiation

- Despite belonging to a single evolving human civilization, every society maintains a unique culture reflecting its experiences and worldview.
- Differences appear in language, customs, beliefs, and values.¹

3. Western Material Dominance – “End of History” Perspective

Francis Fukuyama argues that the West views itself as the ultimate model of political and civilizational evolution, where liberal democracy and market economy represent humanity’s final stage.

Key assumptions:

1. Western civilization is the optimal model by which all others should be measured.
2. Western liberal values are the global standard for politics, economy, and society.
3. Modernity is intrinsically linked to “Westernization,” adopting Western norms in thought, economy, and governance.

Consequences:

- Markets become a universal language.
- States are redefined as liberal entities, societies as adopting individualistic and pluralistic norms.

2. ¹Edward W. Said, *Orientalism*, New York, [Pantheon Books](#), 1978, p. 54.

- A global identity is promoted under Western cultural and material dominance.¹

Critics like Al-Masiri argue this transforms the West from a civilization capable of dialogue into a totalizing material system aiming to reshape the world through materialistic human centrality.

4. Chinese Civilizational Particularity

- China asserts its cultural and intellectual uniqueness while engaging with the international system.
- It does not fully adopt the Western material model nor confront it directly.
- China offers a “civilizational state” model combining:
 - Confucian heritage emphasizing social harmony
 - Collective societal values in governance
 - Continuity of cultural and political identity

China’s approach seeks a civilizational balance rather than conflict or assimilation, promoting global trade, technological engagement, and international cooperation while preserving cultural roots.

5. Toward a New Civilizational Balance – East-West Relations

- China’s model fosters a multipolar world where:
 - The West is not exclusive,
 - The East is open yet culturally distinct,
 - Multiple civilizations interact without erasing one another.

3. ¹Francis Fukuyama, *The End of History and the Last Man*, New York, Free Press, 1992, p. 45.

- Islam, with its historical scientific, intellectual, and artistic contributions, represents a component of global civilization, offering:
 - Deep ethical and spiritual values
 - A capacity for civilizational dialogue
 - Potential leadership in sustainable development and social justice¹

Conclusion:

The civilizational dimension highlights a multi-dimensional struggle encompassing material, technological, and cultural values. Each civilizational model contributes unique influence:

1. **Western model:** material power, technological dominance, institutional control; liberal individualism.
2. **Eastern (Chinese) model:** combines economic modernization, openness, and cultural identity; soft power through alternative development pathways.
3. **Islamic model:** ethical and spiritual guidance, historical knowledge, human and social development; potential for global influence based on values and sustainability.

The contemporary international system is moving toward civilizational pluralism, where influence is shaped not only by power and economy but also by cultural, ethical, and civilizational appeal.

¹ Samuel P. Huntington, *Op. cit.*, p. 28.

References :

1. Hans Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, New York, [McGraw-Hill Education](#), 1948, p. 5.
 2. Kenneth Waltz, *Theory of International Politics*, Reading (Massachusetts), [Addison-Wesley Publishing Company](#), 1979, p. 81.
 3. Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye, *Power and Interdependence*, Boston, [Little, Brown and Company](#), 1977, p. 24.
 4. John J. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, New York, [W. W. Norton & Company](#), 2001, p. 29.
 5. Hedley Bull, *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*, London, [Macmillan Publishers](#), 1977, p. 13.
 6. Alexander Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics*, Cambridge, [Cambridge University Press](#), 1999, p. 1.
 7. Barry Buzan and Ole Wæver, *Regions and Powers: The Structure of International Security*, Cambridge, [Cambridge University Press](#), 2003, p. 44.
 8. Martin Griffiths, *International Relations Theory*, New York, [Palgrave Macmillan](#), 2007, p. 17.
 9. Andrew Heywood, *Global Politics*, London, [Palgrave Macmillan](#), 2011, p. 9.
 10. Joseph S. Nye Jr., *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*, New York, [PublicAffairs](#), 2004, p. 11.
- * Philip Seib, *The Global Journalist: News and Conscience in a World of Conflict*, Lanham, [Rowman & Littlefield Publishers](#), 2002, p. 34.
- * Eytan Gilboa, *Media and Conflict: Framing Issues, Making Policy, Shaping Opinions*, Ardsley (New York), Transnational Publishers, 2002, p. 57.

* Ernst B. Haas, *The Uniting of Europe: Political, Social, and Economic Forces 1950–1957*, Stanford, [Stanford University Press](#), 1958, p. 16.

* Bela Balassa, *The Theory of Economic Integration*, Homewood (Illinois), [Richard D. Irwin, Inc.](#), 1961, p. 2.

* Leon N. Lindberg, *The Political Dynamics of European Economic Integration*, Stanford, [Stanford University Press](#), 1963, p. 10

1. Kenneth N. Waltz, *Man, the State, and War: A Theoretical Analysis*, New York, [Columbia University Press](#), 1959, p. 12.

2. Robert Gilpin, *War and Change in World Politics*, Cambridge, [Cambridge University Press](#), 1981, p. 7.

3. James E. Dougherty and Robert L. Pfaltzgraff, *Contending Theories of International Relations*, Philadelphia, [J. B. Lippincott Company](#), 1971, p. 21.

4. Steve Smith, Ken Booth, and Marysia Zalewski, *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond*, Cambridge, [Cambridge University Press](#), 1996, p. 5.

5. Chris Brown and Kirsten Ainley, *Understanding International Relations*, London, [Palgrave Macmillan](#), 2009, p. 18.

6. Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, and Steve Smith, *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity*, Oxford, [Oxford University Press](#), 2013, p. 14.

7. Jack Donnelly, *Realism and International Relations*, Cambridge, [Cambridge University Press](#), 2000, p. 9.

8. Andrew Linklater, *The Transformation of Political Community*, Columbia (South Carolina), [University of South Carolina Press](#), 1998, p. 27.

9. Immanuel Wallerstein, *The Modern World-System*, New York, Academic Press, 1974, p. 15.

1. Malcolm N. Shaw, *International Law*, Cambridge, [Cambridge University Press](#), 2008, p. 15.

2. Antonio Cassese, *International Law*, Oxford, [Oxford University Press](#), 2005, p. 3.
 3. Jack Donnelly, *Universal Human Rights in Theory and Practice*, Ithaca (New York), [Cornell University Press](#), 2003, p. 10.
 4. Rhona K. M. Smith, *Textbook on International Human Rights*, Oxford, [Oxford University Press](#), 2012, p. 22.
-
- * Barry Buzan, Ole Wæver, and Jaap de Wilde, *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*, Boulder (Colorado), [Lynne Rienner Publishers](#), 1998, p. 21.
 - * Mary Kaldor, *New and Old Wars: Organized Violence in a Global Era*, Cambridge, [Polity Press](#), 1999, p. 6.
 - * Ulrich Beck, *World at Risk*, Cambridge, [Polity Press](#), 2009, p. 14.

 - * Jessica Tuchman Mathews, *Redefining Security*, New York, [Council on Foreign Relations Press](#), 1989, p. 162.
 - * Moisés Naím, *Illicit: How Smugglers, Traffickers, and Copycats are Hijacking the Global Economy*, New York, [Doubleday](#), 2005, p. 11.
1. Samuel P. Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, New York, [Simon & Schuster](#), 1996, p. 28.
 2. Edward W. Said, *Orientalism*, New York, [Pantheon Books](#), 1978, p. 54.
 3. Francis Fukuyama, *The End of History and the Last Man*, New York, Free Press, 1992, p. 45.

INDEX :

Lecture 1 : From Westphalia to Vienna	p 3
Lecture 2: Actors in International Relations.....	p 8
Lecture 3 : Media as an International Actor.....	p 15
Lecture 4: Power in International Relations.....	p 19
Lecture 5: Peace and War in International Relations.....	p 23
Lecture 6: Integration and Unification as a Transformation in the Structure of the International System.....	p 28
Lecture 7 : Realist Theory in International Relations.....	p 32
Lecture 8 :Normative Idealism in International Relations.....	p 36
Lecture 9 : Liberal Theory in International Relations.....	p 41
Lecture10 : constructivist Theory in International Relations	p46
Lecture 11 :Marxist Theory in International Relations	p 50
Lecture12 :Feminist Theory in International Relations.....	p 54
Lecture 13: Critical Theory in International Relations.....	p 58
Lecture14 :Human Security in International Relations.....	p 62
Lecture 15: Societal Security in International Relations.....	p 66
Lecture16 :New Security Threats in International Relations.....	p 70
Lecture 17 : Regional Security Complex Theory in International Relations	p 74
Lecture18 :International Law in International Relations	p 78
Lecture19:Human Rights in International Relations.....	p 82

Lecture 20 :Power Transition Theory in International Relations.....	p 86
Lecture 21 :Global Challenges in International Relations.....	p 90
Lecture22 :Security Governance in International Relations.....	p 94
Lecture 23 : Global Order in International Relations.....	p 98
Lecture24: The Civilizational Dimension in International Relations.....	p 101
References	p 105
Index	p 108