



Main Directions of Modern International Security Approaches

Habibullo Y. Azimov

Lecturer, Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies, Tashkent, Uzbekistan, Uzbekistan

<http://dx.doi.org/10.47814/ijssrr.v5i2.217>

Abstract

This article analyzes modern approaches to international security. Opinions on international security are now based on four main ideas: idealistic, realistic, liberal, and neorealist, the article theoretically reveals that it reflects other approaches in one way or another, that these elements of the idea develop over the next hundred years, and that they relate to events that have taken place and are taking place in practical human life. The article also addresses issues that could become key areas of international security in the near future.

Keywords: *Security, State; National Security; Idealistic; Realistic; Liberal and Neorealist Approaches to Security; Security Concept; National and Social Conflicts; War and Military Security; Power Factor in Security; Anarchism in International Security*

Introduction

The concept of security is one of the longest-running concepts in world history. Also, the concept of security in the processes of human development, the development of society until recently was developed and implemented in two stages. The focus on security as a conceptual issue at the state and political levels was first implemented by the Romans in the centuries before Christ, and it had a political significance that influenced social conflicts and belief groups.

Later, in the late Middle Ages, the concept of security underwent changes in its leading goals, and as Thomas Gobbs noted, it now entered a second period of international relations strategy and its organizational system that served the interests of the modern superpower (Leviathan according to Gobbs philosophy).

The Main Results and Findings

Defining the concept of security of the countries of the world is difficult in two ways. First of all, in ancient times there was no permanent international system that kept states interacting with each other. In some countries, the holding of prominent representatives of other states as hostages only served to ensure supremacy and vassalship. The second aspect is that states were not participants in the international political arena. In those days, only neighboring empires and Greek city-states interacted. The most important point of this relationship was the issue of military security.

But at that time, the concept of nationality, which was one of the important elements of international relations, did not have a vital significance in the concept of security. In historical debates over how to best ensure national security, Gobbs, Machiavelli, and Russo paint a more pessimistic picture of state sovereignty and influence. Because even in this period, the international system was an area where states sought to ensure their security at the expense of their neighbors, and interstate relations stemmed from a policy of struggle for power in which states sought to benefit from each other.

It should be noted that national power, which in the past was not given enough attention and plays an important role in international relations, is one of the main principles of the traditional concept of security. According to the traditional notion of security, national power and national security are intertwined chambers and cannot be separated from each other. The traditional security approach was formed around the ideas of realists, and the concept of national security was first used by Machiavelli. According to him, in a general sense, national security is defined as the freedom of states to stay away from harmful threats. The concept of national security is a term currently used to ensure the security of states. Accordingly, any element that serves the interests of a state can be described as beneficial to that state and, in turn, any means that threaten its security is considered negative. The main point of security definitions is formed around power and military threat. The concept of national security encompasses all of its economic, military, political, and technological elements. Although elements of national security are seen as a separate threat, they are issues that are not independent of each other.

According to the traditional concept of security, national security is defined as “the protection of the territorial integrity and independence of a state”. According to this approach, the fact that the territory of states is secure means that national security is ensured. States develop a number of strategies to maintain and safeguard the country’s territorial integrity and national security. We can see these strategies below:

1. *Live and live*: It is a strategy to build good relationships with neighbors and live in peace.
2. *Join the strong*: A strategy aimed at maintaining the security of a weak state under a strong state leadership.
3. *Taking responsibility*: Security strategy of states by choosing a strong hegemonic system.
4. *Neutrality*: It is a strategy to stay away from various conflicts, wars and various structures, stating that it is always and regularly neutral.
5. *Balance of forces*: A strategy of unification of states in order to create a balance of power and prevent aggressive policies.

For example, China's relations with Central Asia and other neighboring countries are based on the first, second and third types of security strategies and are aimed at gradual pressure, while relations with Russia, the United States and the European Union are based on the fifth security strategy. But in both relations, China will pursue a policy related to the Fourth Security Strategy.

With the end of the Cold War, the perceptions of states about national security also began to differ and changed. Therefore, states must take into account the balance and all other elements that have changed under the influence of globalization processes when determining security policy.

Today, the debate over security is divided. The first is the traditional-realistic side, which emphasizes that the structure of the international system is anarchic and anti-expansionist. The second is

that the security sector is changing under the influence of globalization, advocating a new approach to security. Although they seem to be different from each other, the new security field cannot be separated from the traditional security concept.

The Westphalian system was adopted as the beginning of the process of national statehood and is the foundation of modern traditional security. According to the definition, "*the state is built on a certain territory and has inviolable borders, territorial integrity*". The Treaty of Westphalia actually reflects the concept of national security in protecting the borders, territorial integrity and sovereignty of states, while maintaining the highest level of military-political superiority for their preservation.

According to traditional security, state and security are interrelated concepts. The traditional concept of security is state-oriented and is shaped around military security. According to him, the main goal of security is to protect the territory, sovereignty and political independence of the state. In this context, traditional security also depends on conflict and competition between states.

In general, there are five dimensions of traditional security. These are: the cause, nature of threats, how to respond to threats, who and how to ensure security, what security is ensured.

According to traditional security, the biggest factor threatening a country's national security is other states. Other states that pose a threat usually emerge as revisionist participants who are dissatisfied with the current situation. Powerful states with big interests, neighboring states with problems such as nationalism are usually states that make up the majority of threats. According to the traditional security approach, the threat lies at the military potential of other states. The situation that has arisen or is likely to occur must be carefully studied and the use of defensive and countervailing capabilities properly assessed. Aggressive realism, defended by Mersheimer, and defensive realism, which reflects Jervis' views, play an important role in traditional security theories.

According to Jervis' defensive approach, when a defensive policy is preferred in an offensive-defensive balance, war is less likely. When the policy of attack is applied, the probability of war increases.

According to Jervis's optimistic defensive realism, the goal of defense is to see war as a last resort and to minimize the security problem. Improving cooperation through international institutions can be seen as a way to prevent conflicts. By mutual cooperation, the parties are less likely to use military force and war is averted.

Mersheimer argues that aggressive realism and a pessimistic view of interaction and the effectiveness of international institutions do not affect wars. The anarchy of the structure of the international system is beyond the scope of the possibility of the formation of various alliances. The method of enhancing the interests of states is done at the expense of discrimination and restriction of other states.

In the system of international relations, each state is constantly on the move to ensure its security. The anarchic structure of the international system and the lack of a supreme body to control the states make the security race and security a priority. Another reason is that states do not have full confidence in other states' goals and the likelihood of changing intentions is always high.

Due to the uneven, chaotic structure of the international system and the environment of uncertainty, each state creates a defense policy in accordance with its national interests. The possibility of war is always in front of the state and therefore they are constantly trying to increase their military power.

According to the traditional concept of security, the most important way to ensure mutual security is to form an alliance. All the efforts of states to protect their independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity are related to national security and their commitment to various forms of alliances, treaties and agreements. For example, the Nagorno-Karabakh war between Azerbaijan and Armenia is a clear proof of this.

Buzan explains these threats as threats to the ideas, structures and institutional assets of states. Therefore, these threats to the values of states are given priority in the field of national policy. The strategies of states to respond to or prevent these threats constitute their military policy. Accordingly, according to realists, states are the main participants in international relations, and military security issues are the most important issue in the system of relations. In this sense, "power" is one of the most important factors in international relations. In turn, in this regard, the use of force to resolve conflicts, to ensure the stability and security of states in the international arena. However, the efforts of states to increase their power not only serve their own stability, but also provoke conflicts with others. According to realists, security can be generalized as an attempt by states to protect their resources and acquire new ones.

States, like individuals, seek power and benefit. In the absence of a central authority in international relations, each state has a responsibility to ensure its own security. To do this, they use similar methods to each other and pursue the same interests. Based on this, realism interprets the security phenomenon in the categories of reliable, and unreliable. In fact, while the realistic approach to recording the level of security was widely developed after World War II, scholars such as Machiavelli, Thucydides, and Hobbes were the first thinkers in history to establish it.

The idealistic concept of security was born in the 18th century on the basis of the ideas of international peace. While the idea is to ensure international order and eliminate the causes of conflict through the establishment of a system of mutual cooperation and central governance, there is a need to create an international security force to maintain common peace, but in practice all attention is focused on conflict prevention. The same practical approach strengthened the anarchic structure of the international system.

Changes and rules between the two world wars failed in this regard, and the collapse of the pre-war idea of "ensuring international order and eliminating the causes of conflict through cooperation and central government" became the basis for realism. These views apply to the beginning of the second - modern phase of the concept of logical security. Because, after the First World War, the idealistic ideas and norms of the League of Nations, aimed at changes in the international system and the maintenance of peace in general, had lost their effectiveness in practice.

The realistic concept of the next period of security is based on three principles:

- State security is a priority and state-oriented security in turn indicates that the security of the individual depends on state security;
- The lack of a higher authority to direct the actions of participants in the international arena leads to an anarchic view of this system;
- Power is crucial to security and success in conflict.

Thus, the emphasis on the anarchic nature of the international system was one of the main arguments in determining security in international relations. Modern neorealists emphasize the structure of the international system rather than the human factor, and put national security above all else. Waltz argues that the main goal in the anarchic structure of the international system is everyone's own security.

In other words, ensuring the survival of the state is a necessary condition for achieving all other goals.

In the 1970s, neorealists also tried to reject realism based on its critics. They sought to undermine the foundations of classical realism through their analysis of the place of power in the international system and how its distribution would affect international politics. Because there were really good reasons for this:

In the international system, power is not always equally distributed, powerful states always put their own interests first, and the interdependence of states determines their relations in the international system, that is, the distribution of power in international relations forms the system;

The most important and powerful state in international relations determines the specific political directions in the system and seeks to achieve hegemony by striving to maintain its influence;

"The struggle for power always leads to a balance of power in the end," he said. Because in any case, no government can have an absolute advantage, and this naturally leads to a balance between the existing forces".

Conclusion

In short, in the modern system of views of the concept of international security, there is still a debate among the proponents of idealistic, liberal, realistic and neorealist approaches.

On the basis of idealistic views, the idea that wars and their causes can be eliminated with the cooperation of states has taken a firm place. Kant's views were reshaped under the influence of US President Woodrow Wilson. In fact, Wilson was also a pioneer of the ideas of democracy, the League of Nations, and open diplomacy. There is no group that claims to be idealists, a notion that arises from the fact that realists call those who oppose them so.

According to idealism, new rules are needed to prevent wars. Because of the wrong rules in institutional structures, people exhibit behaviors that contradict them. The best way to ensure international security is to institutionalize international law and establish international organizations. International organizations based on legal norms will guarantee security.

A liberal view of international relations and security emerged after the First World War as a result of efforts to ensure peace and security and to prevent wars. But there are traditional differences between the skepticism of realism and the optimism of liberalism. Liberalism focuses not on conflicts and wars, but on issues of peace and cooperation in the international system. According to the Liberals, foreign policy is determined not only by security, but also by important areas such as health, economy, ecology.

Woodrow Wilson, who also played an important role in liberal views, said that through democracy, countries can prevent war. He believes that strengthening democratic governments and democracy will lead to peace in the world. According to liberal theories, cooperation is more important than the defense theories of realism. According to liberals, economic relations between states and international organizations strengthen interdependence. Therefore, they emphasize the weakening of the anarchic structure of the international system. Security is directly related to economic power and trade cooperation, emphasizing that it is not useless.

Realists prefer to define international security on the basis of the most precise approaches in the international relations of states. That is, for each state, its security will always remain a top priority, and

this cannot be changed by any law or system. It is a dream to form some kind of central structure to address the most important issues in international relations, because the participants see the regulation of their interests and actions by other states as a threat to their sovereignty and do not want to have such a high authority over them, this maintains the optimality of equal agreements and justifies the anarchic approach. As long as there is an anarchic approach, there is a need for an international force to ensure security and resolve conflicts at the international level, and some states and international structures are bound to act for this position.

The neorealist theory tries to explain conflicts with a universal definition of security and emphasizes that the main cause of conflicts in the international arena is in the anarchic construction of the system. He explained the security and anarchic nature of the system: that states are the core value of security, that international security is very important because states are the main object of security, the concept of national security is more relevant to external security than internal security, due to the anarchic structure of the international system, security has become a relative concept, absolute security does not exist in practice and can not exist.

References

- Azimov Habibullo, Madaminova Durdona (2021). Xalqaro xavfsizlik o'quv qo'llanma.
- Azimov, H. Y. (2019). The emergence of the Syrian crisis and the impact of the external forces on it. *Bulletin Social-Economic and Humanitarian Research*, (4), 92-97.
- Azimov, H. Y. (2019). THE PROBLEM OF MORO MUSLIMS. *Theoretical & Applied Science*, (6), 519-521.
- Baysoy, E. (2011). Bir güvenlik-siz-leştirme aracı olarak terörizm. *SAREM Stratejik Arastirmalar Dergisi*, 9(17), 98-122.
- Buzan, B., & Hansen, L. (2009). *The evolution of international security studies*. Cambridge University Press.
- Buzan, B., Buzan, B. G., W'ver, O., Wæver, O., & Buzan, O. W. B. (2003). *Regions and powers: the structure of international security (Vol. 91)*. Cambridge University Press.
- Dannreuther, R. (2014). *International security: The contemporary agenda*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Machiavelli, N. (1995). *The Prince [1513]. The Prince and other Political Writings*, ed. S. Milner.
- Madaminova, D. (2020). Migration Process and Problems in North Africa and the Middle East. In *ОБЩЕСТВЕННЫЕ НАУКИ В СОВРЕМЕННОМ МИРЕ: ПОЛИТОЛОГИЯ, СОЦИОЛОГИЯ, ФИЛОСОФИЯ, ИСТОРИЯ* (pp. 80-85).
- Mythen, G., & Walklate, S. (2008). Terrorism, risk and international security: The perils of asking 'what if?'. *Security dialogue*, 39(2-3), 221-242.
- Özcan, A. B. (2011). ULUSLARARASI GÜVENLİK SORUNLARI ve ABD'NİN GÜVENLİK STRATEJİLERİ. *Sosyal Ekonomik Arastirmalar Dergisi*, 11(22), 445-466.



- Ravshanov, F. R., & Azimov, H. Y. (2021). Danger and Security: History and Present. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding*, 8(4), 280-285.
- Ravshanov, Fazliddin Ravshanovich, & Azimov, Habibullo Yakubovich (2021). Terror Va Terrorism. *Oriental renaissance: Innovative, educational, natural and social sciences*, 1 (4), 1038-1046.
- Suhrob Buranov. (2021). Afghanistan National-Regional Dualism: New Scientific Approaches. *The American Journal of Political Science Law and Criminology*, 3(05), 112–116.
- Гоббс, Т. (2021). *Leviathan in 2 volumes. V 2. Левиафан в 2 т. Том 2 (Vol. 2)*. Litres.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).