

## **International Relations from a theoretical perspective**

Peetra Uksi

Latvia University

---

**Abstract:** The terminological question must be posed on two levels. One, the denomination that defines the object of study. Another, that of the expression that individualizes the scientific discipline that deals with that material object.

Object of study: We accept the denomination of "international relations" since, despite its inaccuracies, it reflects more correctly and comprehensively the sector of social reality object of our consideration, but with a precision, that the object of study of our discipline is the result of these relations, the international society. The term "international" encompasses all kinds of social relations that shape and affect international society in an essential way. This allows us to accept other expressions such as transnational, interstate, intergovernmental, intercultural relations, etc., which can serve to individualize a specific type of international relations.

**Keywords:** International Relations, paradigms, theoretical approach to IR.

---

### **Introduction**

The State has lost significance as a sovereign entity and as a structure capable of guaranteeing the well-being and security of its citizens and new actors have appeared, both intergovernmental and non-governmental (non-State, supranational, transnational, subnational and even human level actors), which tend to further limit the room for manoeuvre of States. In other words, the international system has lost its statocentric character.

Given the changes that have taken place in the social, economic and communications fields, it is no longer possible to speak exclusively of a society of States with relations practically limited to the diplomatic and military field, but rather respond to a model based more on cultural, technological and economic factors. This has favoured the emergence of growing interdependence and cooperation and a transformation into a global society. This phenomenon has given rise to the emergence of new values and interests common to that global society as a whole.

The traditional distinction and separation between the internal and international spheres has disappeared. Interdependence and the need to meet the demands of economic and social development have forced the State to open up more and more to the outside, further increasing this interdependence and restricting its margin of autonomy.

International society is no longer essentially conflictive, but also cooperative. To the classic problem of war and peace are added problems arising from economic and cultural relations, development and underdevelopment, inequality and socio-economic deprivation, hunger and the population explosion, the depletion and exploitation of resources, ecological imbalance and oppression and violation of human rights.

There is a change in the prevailing values: from the exclusively individualistic and national values of the past to the affirmation of common and universal values. This is a consequence of the global nature of the problems and the community of interests.

### **The Dependency Paradigm**

It has its roots in the Marxist conception. It refers mainly to the theory of imperialism elaborated by Rosa Luxemburg and Lenin. On the other hand, it responds to the new political and economic phenomena of domination and exploitation that appear in international relations as a result of the process of decolonization and the worldwide affirmation of the capitalist system.

It emerges as a response to theories of economic development, which inspired theory and politics during the fifties and sixties. Although its focus is on international economic relations, its interpretation of them is mainly in terms of dependence, that is, in terms of inequality and domination. It starts from the unbalanced and unjust nature of the international system and the phenomena of domination and exploitation that characterize it.

### **Principios**

Los actores son fundamentalmente las clases transnacionales, las empresas transnacionales, las organizaciones no gubernamentales y los movimientos de liberación nacional. Aunque se asume la posición marxista de que el Estado es sólo una superestructura y que los actores reales son las clases y grupos socio-económicos, se afirma también el papel decisivo del Estado en las relaciones de explotación y dominación que caracterizan el sistema.

La naturaleza de las relaciones internacionales es conflictiva y se considera que la causa de ello está en los intereses y en la naturaleza del propio sistema capitalista mundial, el cual constituye la unidad principal de análisis, pues todos los procesos y relaciones se producen en su seno y vienen determinados por ese sistema global. Se afirma que no es posible un cambio radical en las estructuras de un Estado sin que tenga lugar un cambio en el sistema global..

La consideración del mundo como un único sistema económico dominado por el capitalismo transnacional. El sistema mundial se caracteriza principalmente por la desigualdad económica entre el centro y la periferia, por la explotación y dominación, de creación continuada de lazos de dependencia entre el Norte y el Sur, entre el centro y la periferia, y por la lucha de los pueblos y clases oprimidos contra la explotación y dominación

No existe distinción entre la esfera estatal y la internacional.

No hay valores, intereses y objetivos comunes y globales en el ámbito de todo el sistema global y de todos los actores, sólo existe la afirmación de valores e intereses de naturaleza particular.

## **UNIDAD II: Las Relaciones Internacionales como Teoría y como Disciplina Científica**

### **ANTECEDENTES**

#### **Consideraciones Previas**

**Se hace necesario distinguir entre el desarrollo de una teoría o teorías de las relaciones internacionales, o teoría internacional, y la génesis, aparición y evolución como disciplina científica y académica. La existencia de una teoría internacional es mucho más antigua.**

**La teoría internacional se inicia con las primeras interpretaciones del mundo internacional. Desde los tiempos más remotos de la historia del pensamiento, problemas relativos a la convivencia de los pueblos han sido objeto de la reflexión humana. La disciplina, aunque tiene antecedentes a lo largo de la Edad Moderna europea, su camino como tal sólo se inicia después de la Primera Guerra Mundial.**

The development and emergence of a science that deals expressly and concretely with international phenomena coincides with the emergence of the sovereign State. International law is historically the first discipline to deserve the qualification of science of international society, followed later by diplomatic history and diplomacy. Only after the First World War did international relations appear as a scientific discipline that aspires to apprehend international phenomena globally. What characterizes it compared to other disciplines that also deal with international phenomena is, on the one hand, its globality, and, on the other, the emphasis it places on the properly international point of view, as opposed to the point of view that starts from the State.

The Peace of Westphalia (1648) marks the end of one era and the beginning of another. It represents the majestic portico that leads from the old world to the new. The State constitutes the center on which political thought gravitates in the following centuries. The principle of balance of power will be the key notion that illuminates and allows the functioning of the system, which is simply aimed at ensuring the perpetuation of the States themselves. G.R.s. II. are seen as a consequence of the nature of the state, and of international theory as a simple extension of political theory.

International society is considered in a situation of anarchy, as opposed to the state society in which through the social pact order reigns. The only principle of order that reigns in this international environment is that which derives from the principle of equilibrium that governs the European system.

Until the beginning of the twentieth century, international theory was presented primarily as an extension of political theory, without producing in general terms an awareness of the very nature of international society and the need to study and interpret its problems, not only from the perspective of the State, but also, from the perspective of international society as such. The result is that international theory has functioned until recently as an "ideology" of the nation-state system, rather than as an explanatory theory of the social science type.

#### **International History**

Our considerations begin with the Modern Age, with the emergence of the State and the configuration of a European system of States, which is when history, first through the history of treaties and, later, diplomatic history, begins to deal in a specialized and concrete way with international relations, or better, of interstate relations that stand out above the others.

The history of treaties begins in the sixteenth century, it is largely dominated by the legal dimension. It is the **history of the part of international law that is founded on treaties.**

In the eighteenth century, history will turn to the factors that gave rise to treaties and even try to find the principles that dominated diplomatic action. It thus gave rise to a political history of G.R.s. II. This new perspective meant entering into a more all-encompassing analysis of international political phenomena. The object of study is not only European public law, but also the European system of States.

The nineteenth century will already be the century of diplomatic history, as a consequence of the progress that leads from an international-legal historiography to a historiography of diplomatic action. **It is that branch of general history whose specific field of research is the study of relations between States.** Its attention remains, however, on the role played by men, heads of State, ministers and their collaborators and agents. It was fundamentally a history of international politics, focused exclusively on interstate relations, which meant ignoring other aspects and actors of international relations. Its greatest development occurs in the second half of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth. The optics of diplomatic history were incapable of grasping the complexity of international reality. Historians are not aware of changes and transformations, continuing to focus on governmental protagonism.

En el plano científico-metodológico, la innovación más significativa es la que realizan los autores de la escuela de los Annales. Con ellos se inicia la historia sectorial y se atiende en la tarea del conocimiento histórico a las grandes fuerzas y factores que protagonizan realmente el devenir humano, los movimientos sociales y fuerzas económicas. Del protagonismo individual se pasa al protagonismo colectivo, a la historia de los pueblos, de las clases sociales.

La historia diplomática empieza a dar paso a la historia de las relaciones internacionales, que introduce nuevos enfoques en la historia internacional. Las relaciones entre los Gobiernos no son ya el aspecto más interesante, lo que importa es la historia de las relaciones internacionales entre los pueblos.

International history has been, along with international law and diplomacy, the science that has been able to be considered the science of international society. However, by remaining tied to the paradigm of the State, it has suffered from a lack of an all-encompassing perspective on international society. Since the change that has occurred since the First World War, the RRs have been able to do so. II. begins its configuration as an autonomous discipline not identifiable with the history of international relations.

### **International Law or Law of Peoples**

International law is the oldest discipline of the international disciplines, since it began its configuration as a scientific discipline in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, while the history of treaties is only considered as an auxiliary science of the former.

It begins with the European Modern Age. The profound political, economic and social transformation that took place in the late Middle Ages was accompanied by a profound evolution of ideas. The Sovereign State emerges, at the same time the changes that occur both at the level of extra-European and European international relations will make the question of the ordering of international relations become one of the central concerns of the time.

As an autonomous discipline and theory it clearly appears in the eighteenth century. Spanish theologian-jurists try to interpret and understand the new problems. The result will be the development of the idea of an international society and international law, with a universal and modern meaning, culminating in a global interpretation of international relations. These authors, in basing international law on natural law, do not consider the former as a discipline distinct from morality and theology. They tend not to reflect in their legal consideration the actual practice of States at that time.

This juridical-international consideration will progressively enter into crisis as a consequence of the secularization of thought and the role attributed to sovereignty, which turned the State into a political community of absolute power and undermined the idea of the international community.

The law that is being formed among the States will tend to consecrate their independence and sovereignty and the doctrine will progressively assume and accentuate the contractualist and individualistic aspects of it.

The practice of the State becomes the main source for the knowledge of the law of nations. This process will lead to a purely formal conception of international law, in which States present themselves as ends in themselves and international law is nothing but an instrument at their service, which distances the idea and reality of an international society as something more than the simple juxtaposition of States. The iusinternationalists start from the Hobbesian idea of a state of nature between states and will be opposed to the idea of a social pact as the basis of the international community.

The sovereign State and its external projection guide the development of the science of international law. International society ceases to be the starting point and goal of theoretical inquiry and is only considered as the sphere of inter-State relations, which are ordered in a system of equilibrium whose objective is the perpetuation of States themselves.

The nineteenth century will be dominated by legal positivism, voluntarist positivism that reinforces state exclusivism.

On the other hand, international law will be configured as an autonomous legal science, separate from philosophy, theology and diplomacy.

The science of international law has been characterized in the period up to the First World War, despite its role as a science of international society, by the predominance of an individualistic and formal conception, in which international society as such had little relevance.

Voluntarist positivism sacrificed the idea of an objective order to a fully formal conception of international law, which relegated beyond law the considerations of reason, justice and common utility that constitute its essential foundation. The need for a new discipline whose object would be international society in all its aspects was thus evident.

### **Diplomacy**

In the eighteenth century and, especially in the nineteenth century, a current developed that considered diplomacy as a science.

Its development rests on the configuration of a European system of States, whose function is to preserve the existence of States. Thus, a diplomatic system emerges that deals with intergovernmental relations, which in some respects implies an overcoming of the individualism that characterizes the external world of States.

**Diplomacy is the science of relations and the respective interests of States, or the art of reconciling the interests of peoples with each other.** It encompasses the whole system of interests arising from the relations established between nations; It is aimed at their respective tranquillity, security and dignity, and its direct purpose is the maintenance of peace and good harmony among Powers.

From the second half of the seventeenth century diplomacy progressively acquires autonomy within the administration of the States.

It sought to understand and guide international relations globally. It did not exceed the paradigm of the State.

At the beginning of the twentieth century it ceased to play the role attributed to it in the field of international relations. The transformations experienced by international society and the awareness of the need to study globally the complex international reality, together with the development of the social sciences itself, will lead to the overcoming of diplomacy as a science of international relations. This is not alien to the reaction in the United States against the classical diplomacy that is considered to have led to the First World War.

From that moment on, diplomacy will simply become a means of implementing the foreign policy of States.

## **International Relations as a Scientific Discipline**

### **Genesis and development**

The empirical theory of GRs II. as opposed to philosophical theory has not begun until after the Second World War. However, there is no shortage of authors who, given the absence of an object of study and a commonly accepted methodology, do not hesitate to point out that our discipline is in a pre-scientific state.

The structural changes experienced by international society as a result of technological and industrial development, the growing influence of social and political movements on international relations, the heterogeneity of international society since the Bolshevik revolution, the horrors of the First World War and the desire to establish an order of peace and security, the responsibility that in this changing and complex world falls on the great Powers, the awareness of the role played by ideological, economic and social factors and the international role of actors other than States, the fact of the increasingly intense development of cooperation between States, as a result of the growing interdependence between them, the accentuation of the interrelation between the internal policy of States and their foreign policy, the vital problems facing humanity, and the scientific concern that originates from the elaboration of a theory of society, are some of the factors that contribute to generate the need to individualize the study of international relations and to develop a discipline that deals with international society as such. The inability of traditional disciplines to account adequately for such transformations and of international society itself and their partial or sectoral perspective on international society, together with the development of political science and sociology, which seek to respond to new problems within State societies, They will make clear the need for a new discipline that globally addresses international problems.

The late development of GRs II. is due to the late awareness of the process of accelerated change experienced by international society since the early nineteenth century.

### **'20 Idealism:**

It is the League of Nations and its project of international society that, at least in the twenties, acts as the most determining element of the development of international studies.

Consequently, the two dominant perspectives in international studies of the twenties are, on the one hand, a predominantly descriptive approach to international events of the time, in which diplomatic history continues

to play an important role, and on the other hand, a normative approach, in which international law weighs heavily. What characterizes these studies is that they are dominated by a sense of boundless optimism; secondly, that research and academic interest is focused on the field of international law and international organization; and third, that there is a clear tendency for them to make moral judgments in favour of all international development. The analysis of GRs. II. it must make a direct contribution to peace and security. Now it is no longer the perspective of the State that dominates, but it is superimposed on a perspective that starts from the existence of an international society in which States are condemned to live together and in which there are collective interests to satisfy.

### '30 Realism:

However, it is in the thirties when the RR II. you affirm yourself as a scientific discipline.

Instability and economic, political and ideological, internal and international upheavals will accentuate the process of renewal of international studies. Political realism will provide the discipline of GRs. II. the defining features of its autonomous character vis-à-vis international law and diplomatic history. The concept of power will become the key to understanding and explaining them.

In this way, the formal and descriptive conception in the study of the international reality progressively gives way to a socio-political conception that opens an immense field of inquiry, adopting a purely interdisciplinary character.

### '40

The Second World War and the post-war period accentuated this dynamic, producing the generalization of GRs. II. as a scientific discipline expanding theoretical inquiry. This is due, in addition, to the appearance of nuclear weapons and their revolutionary impact on the consequences of war, to the development of IGOs and NGOs, to the bipolarization of the international system, to the decolonization and birth of new states, to the growing inequality between industrialized and developing countries, the emergence of new actors, especially economic actors, and the increasingly marked interdependence between domestic and foreign policy.

### American Science? Western Science? Universal Science?

#### **Why American science?**

The fact that we are talking about American science responds to the spectacular development that GRs have been able to develop. II. have had in the U.S. Since the end of the First World War. Almost all the contributions that have occurred in our field can be said to have taken place there.

#### **Why Anglo-Saxon science?**

The participation, from its first steps, of the United Kingdom, and the fact of the existence of a common language that allowed an easy and fluid scientific communication between this country and the USA and with other developed English-speaking ones, has led some scholars to talk about GRs. II. as an Anglo-Saxon company and have pointed out the existence of a British-American intellectual condominium, with clear American hegemony.

While in Europe the theoretical-methodological avatars of HR are kept up to date. II., in the United States, in this country practically everything that is contributed to that field that is not in English is ignored. They have developed as a science in an absolutely exclusivist context and closed by the decisive dependence they have had and have in relation to the US foreign policy itself and by the ignorance that these scholars have of other languages and other scientific and cultural worlds.

### **International Relations as a Scientific Discipline**

We understand by science a body of knowledge to discover new knowledge through observation and logic, which allows us to establish generalizations and enables us to predict. From this perspective, the notion of science is perfectly applicable to GRs. II., without the widely debated problem of their greater or lesser predictive capacity being an obstacle that disqualifies GRs. II. and to other social sciences such as sciences, but simply a current limitation of them.

There are authors who consider that GRs II. are a part of political science, estimating that there is a general political science and particular or special political sciences. Among these particular political sciences would be GRs. II., which would deal with the processes and phenomena of power of States in their reciprocal relations. This is a restrictive conception, since it inevitably tends to reduce them to international politics, when it does not exhaust the field of GRs. II., since these are a relational complex in which relations that are not strictly political are integrated, otherwise it would lead to exclude from our consideration other aspects that affect international society in an essential way.

The perspective provided by political science is also far from the global and all-encompassing perspective of GR. II. as a science of international society.

Nor can it be spoken of as the branch of sociology that deals with international society, because, although it is true that GRs are concerned. II. is the science of international society and therefore requires a sociological approach, no less so, both by its object and by its perspective, it goes beyond the characterizing approach of sociology.

GRs. II. are an international sociology, a theory of international society as such, that is, a sociology is itself, autonomous and differentiated from sociology in the strict sense.

It also derives from the perspective of analysis itself, that of international society as a whole, globally considered, which supposes a totalizing vision of a reality that exceeds the perspective of sociology, which also translates into the need for concepts and categories that sociology cannot provide.

### **Unit III: Theoretical Conceptions of International Relations**

#### **General Considerations**

##### **Currents of thought in International Theory**

Throughout the history of the modern system of States, three traditions or lines of thought can be distinguished:

- **The Realist or Hobbesian tradition:** Considers international politics as a state of war. Its most general characteristics are to consider that GRs are not the most important features of the II. represent a pure conflict between States and resemble a game that is totally zero-sum, to consider that the key to international activity is war, so that peace is simply a period of recovery between one war and another, that each State is free to pursue its ends in relation to other States, without moral or legal restrictions greater than those that the State itself wishes to impose on itself, so that the only limits to its action derive from the principles of prudence and expediency.
- **The Universalist or Kantian tradition:** Considers that the essential nature of GRs is in the process of being the most important of the **Universalist or Kantian tradition**. II. rests not on the conflict between States, but on the transnational social ties that unite the human beings who are subjects of the States. There are moral or legal imperatives which, derived from the common interest of all men, limit the action of States.
- **The Internationalist or Grociana tradition:** Describes GRs. II. in terms of a state corporation or an international partnership. It considers that States are not in a situation of continuous and naked struggle, but limited in their conflicts by common rules and institutions. However, he accepts the Hobbesian premise that the immediate members of international society are states before individuals. What most adequately typifies international life are economic and social exchanges between States.

Each of these traditions encompasses a wide variety of doctrines on GRs. II.

##### **Stages in the theory of International Relations**

We must not forget that the fact that we speak of phases does not mean that the passage from one to another supposes the disappearance of the scientific orientations characteristic of the previous one, since these orientations persist with greater or less force in each or each of the phases, but simply that there is a change in the dominant scientific orientation at a general level.

Since the First World War the study of GRs. II. has gone through four stages. The first, idealistic and normative, reaches the thirties; the second, realistic and empirical-normative, reaches the fifties; the third, of behaviorist-quantitative, characterizes the fifties and sixties; and a fourth, postbehaviorist, begins in the late sixties reaching the end of the seventies.

##### **Idealistic Regulatory Phase**

It responds both to the international intellectual context caused by the First World War, and to the insipient nature of the new discipline of GRs. II.

The First World War had demonstrated the fragility of international European diplomacy as a means of ensuring international order and peace. The enormous human and material losses had created a public opinion at the international level that favoured the eradication of war as an instrument of State policy and the establishment of a global system of collective security capable of preventing future conflicts. The creation of the League of Nations will further enhance optimism for the future of international society.

The dominant international theory is guided by the paths of idealism, of the projects of international organization, of the implementation of mechanisms aimed at the peaceful solution of conflicts and of disarmament plans.

The thirties, characterized by growing international stability, and by the realization of the failure of the Geneva system, will open in the field of international theory the debate between idealists and realists.

### **Realistic Phase**

The second phase begins in the forties and lasts until the late fifties.

The debate between idealists and realists is over, with the latter imposing.

It is a reaction of specialists to the theoretical inadequacies of the idealists, which the international convulsions of the thirties and the Second World War itself have revealed.

For realists, appeals to reason and public opinion have proved incapable of preventing war, so it is necessary to return to the ideas of national security and military force as supports of diplomacy. Only through effective power can States ensure international peace and the peaceful settlement of disputes.

They link, in this way, with the realist or Hobesian tradition.

The movement occurs on both sides of the Atlantic, but its greatest development occurs in the United States.

The realistic conception, which aims to understand the world as it is and not to change it, is what provides GRs. II. the defining features of its scientific and autonomous character, making power the key to understanding and explaining those relationships.

### **Behaviorist Phase**

At the beginning of the fifties, the postulates of political realism were reconsidered, based on their imprecise and intuitive character for the analysis of international reality, and they sought a "scientific" approach.

The behaviorist or behaviorist perspective is based on the application of quantitative-mathematical methods.

It meant shifting the focus of concern from prescription, ethical inquiry and action to description, explanation and verification. He justifies this shift on the grounds that without the accumulation of verifiable knowledge, the means of achieving the objectives would be so uncertain that they turned the action into a futile game. The ultimate goal is to establish a "science" of GR. II.

### **Characteristics:**

- It maintains that only generalizations based on empirical evidence should be made and should be tested according to a scientific method.
- It aspires to a theory of GR. II. whose propositions are based on logical and mathematical proofs and on strict and empirical verification processes.
- In political behavior there are uniformities with explanatory or predictive value.
- It needs to be measured and quantified only when possible, relevant and meaningful in light of other objectives.
- Nothing prevents a student of political behavior from enunciating propositions based on ethical or empirical evaluations, as long as he does not confuse them.
- Research must be systematic, theory and research must be considered intertwined parts of a coherent and orderly body of knowledge.
- It considers that GRs are not in the process of being able to do so. II. are so broad that they must be interdisciplinary. If scientific research dispenses with findings from other disciplines, it risks reducing the validity of its own results.
- Despite its quantitative methodology, it cannot avoid personal judgments in the selection of problems and in the formulation of hypotheses.
- The value of historical knowledge is not excluded.

It responds to the internationalist, or Grocian, tradition in that they deny the specificity of GRs. II. with respect to state society, rejecting the thesis of international anarchy, typical of idealists and realists, and affirming that politics has the same character both in the internal and international spheres.

The development of the behaviorist current provokes in the mid-sixties a great theoretical-methodological debate between the realistic and the scientific approach. This debate constitutes a questioning of behaviorist approaches and methods.

**Post behaviorist Phase**

The Post-behaviorist phase or "new revolution of political science occurs due to dissatisfaction with the political research and teaching of behaviorists, by the achievements and concrete results achieved in the previous decade, far from any possibility of application to reality and disconnected from it and by the generalized crisis in which the international system and American society itself enter.

At the global level, the existence of an apocalyptic weapon, an unstoppable population explosion, dangerous pollution, a growing concentration of technical resources and the well-being of a few advantaged countries, and a growing distance at all levels between rich and poor countries. At the level of the United States, the emergence of serious internal conflicts of economic and racial origin, an undeclared war in Vietnam that violates the moral conscience of the world.

Faced with this, post-behaviorism demands a more relevant investigation, according to human criteria.

The two flags it raises are relevance and action, without abandoning the scientific emphasis. It directs its attention to human behavior as such, to the real problems of the world, to the motivations and values underlying all behavior. From the abstract we tend to descend to the concrete, to the real, in search of relevant research in order to solve the serious problems of the world.

**Neorealist phase**

At the same time, from the sixties realism has once again acquired great importance.

This has been strongly influenced by the domestic and international context of the United States. On the one hand, "regenerationism" or the overcoming of the Vietnam syndrome that has led to a reassessment of realistic postulates, and, on the other, the failure of the policy of détente and the opening of a new "cold war".

In this way, neorealism or "structural realism", a revamped and updated version of realism, appears today with force in the field of GRs. II.

**Debates**

**Idealism vs. IdealismRealism**

Idealism	Realism
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They fail to recognize the problems that arise from the security and power dilemma.</li> <li>• Faith in progress.</li> <li>• Belief in the effectiveness of change through human action.</li> <li>• It considers that States are capable of behaving towards each other in a rational and moral manner.</li> <li>• It understands the interests of States as complementary rather than antagonistic.</li> <li>• Rejects that political power is a natural phenomenon</li> <li>• No role model is immutable since man has the ability to learn, change and control his behavior.</li> <li>• It expresses an optimistic vision of human nature and the possibility of peaceful resolution of political conflicts.</li> <li>• <input type="checkbox"/> He considers realism as a reactionary, cynical and pessimistic current.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is a thought that takes into consideration the factors of security and power that are inherent in human society.</li> <li>• Given his anthropological pessimism, he denies the possibility of progress.</li> <li>• They regard politics as a struggle for power.</li> <li>• Attempts to perfect the system are doomed to failure.</li> <li>• It has a more deterministic vision of the historical process, so it recognizes less room for action when acting human. You can try to understand the process of historical change, but not control it.</li> <li>• There is no natural harmony of interests among States. They are seen as in a state of constant competition.</li> <li>• There is a clear distinction between the moral codes of the individual and the state.</li> <li>• <input type="checkbox"/> Only prudence and opportunity should act as limits of action.</li> </ul>

**Traditionalism vs. Scientism**

Both supporters of the classical approach and those of the scientific approach can subscribe to an idealistic or realistic perspective, and vice versa.

It focuses on the theoretical and methodological perspective and should be placed in the fifties, when the behaviorist reaction against political realism occurs, however, when the debate is institutionalized it is in the mid-sixties, above all, by the hand of traditionalists who face the excesses and shortcomings of behaviorism.

It is the "mode of analysis", not the subject matter under study, that is at the heart of the debate. Although the different methods of analysis carry in many cases implicit different visions or conceptions of the world and of international society. It can therefore be said that there is an important divergence as to the very model of international society that is the object of study.

Traditionalism	Scientism
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is the theoretical approach that derives from philosophy, history and law and manifests confidence in the exercise of reason.</li> <li>• He considers that general propositions must be derived from a scientifically imperfect process of perception or intuition.</li> <li>• They make their analysis based on historical context.</li> <li>• There is a difference between domestic and international politics:</li> <li>• Internal Pol.: Action within the state to solve a particular internal problem.</li> <li>• Pol. Exterior: Actions that seek an outward State.</li> <li>• Pol. International: Actions or interactions that occur between all States in the international context.</li> <li>• La Sociedad internacional es anárquica y no existe la cooperación.</li> <li>• <input type="checkbox"/> Los tradicionalistas estiman que es vano querer aplicar los métodos modernos de las ciencias sociales a las RR. II. debido a la naturaleza anárquica del objeto estudiado.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It maintains that only generalizations based on empirical evidence should be made and should be tested according to a scientific method.</li> <li>• It aspires to a theory of GR. II. whose propositions are based on logical and mathematical proofs and on strict and empirical verification processes.</li> <li>• The way to explain reality according to realism is very hard. It recognizes that there are certain degrees of cooperation.</li> <li>• There is no difference between the internal and the external because there is cooperation.</li> <li>• There are other actors, such as IGOs or NGOs, translated from individual movements and even beyond state borders.</li> <li>• <input type="checkbox"/> Acepta la idea de que el campo de las RR. II. debe ser objeto del conjunto de las ciencias sociales y puede inspirarse de sus métodos y resultados porque no considera que ese campo sea diferente sustancialmente del medio estatal.</li> </ul>

**Críticas:**

AlenfoqueTradicional	AlenfoqueCientífico
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tienen sólo una limitada utilidad en la identificación y análisis de los problemas importantes, porque los instrumentos de investigación son demasiados toscos.</li> <li>• Se han basado en sistemas internacionales y modelos que difieren fundamentalmente del actual sistema internacional.</li> <li>• La capacidad explicativa y predictiva es limitada, con lo que se tiene que acudir a soluciones pragmáticas para los problemas específicos e inmediatos.</li> <li>• GRs. II: they are full of implicit and unverifiable propositions.</li> <li>• <input type="checkbox"/> The absence of widely accepted agreement on the use of terminology prevents the development of a cumulative literature on GRs. II.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Al abstenerse del empleo del “enfoque intuitivo” o de la “sabiduría” literaria”, los científicos se mantienen alejados de la sustancia de la política internacional.</li> <li>• Lo que hay de valor en su trabajo consiste esencialmente en juicios que no son establecidos por los métodos matemáticos o científicos que emplean.</li> <li>• Están muy alejados de hacer la clase de progreso al que aspiran. Su alegación es que su enfoque no debe juzgarse por los resultados, sino por las promesas de progreso que conlleva.</li> <li>• Han construido y manipulado los llamados “modelos”, que son metáforas más que sistemas deductivos de axiomas y teoremas.</li> <li>• Work is distorted and impoverished by the fetish of measurement.</li> <li>• Precision in HR theory II. that admits the object of study can be found within the classical approach.</li> <li>• <input type="checkbox"/> By dispensing with history and philosophy, they have deprived themselves of the means of self-criticism and, consequently, have a vision of the object and its possibilities of adventurous and narrow study.</li> </ul>

**Relevance vs. relevance Abstraction**

This debate decisively marks the GRs. II and occurs from the late sixties.

The basis of his argument is that the preoccupation with theories and models has led to an effort far removed from the reality and substance of the relevant issues. Consequently, the Post-behaviorist

reaction raises two flags that are relevance and action. However, it should not be understood as radically opposed to theory, but simply as a reaction against the abstraction excesses of behaviorism. The question is how to conduct rigorous studies that produce relevant and meaningful results.

Criticism of behaviorism:

- It is more important to be relevant to urgent social problems than to be sophisticated in research.
- The key to behaviorist research is abstraction and analysis, and this serves to obscure the harsh realities of politics.
- Research on values and their constructive development are a necessary part of policy.
- The intellectual, as a scientist, has the obligation to use his knowledge in practice.

**Globalism vs. Globalism Realism**

This debate arose at the end of the seventies in the framework of the post-behaviorist reaction, characterized by its globalist and transnational vision of the international reality, and neorealist approaches.

The confrontation with globalist conceptions is based on the inadequacies of the transnational model, which, on the one hand, has reduced to the maximum the role of the State as an actor of GRs. II. and has accentuated the influence of cooperative aspects as a dynamic phenomenon that has transformed traditional international society into a world or global society, on the other, however, in the opinion of neorealists, it has not been able to provide a theoretical framework capable of apprehending it. This is because the key structures and dynamics of the international system have not changed substantially to the extent that a new model or paradigm of analysis is necessary.

Globalism	Abstraction
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• He considers that the State has been joined by new actors.</li> <li>• It recognizes conflict but also cooperation in the international system.</li> <li>• <input type="checkbox"/> There are no differences between domestic and international politics.</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. They deny that the international system has become globalized.</li> <li>2. They recognize that domestic politics must be separated from international politics.</li> </ol>

**"Classic" Conceptions**

When we talk about classical conceptions, we are referring to those theoretical considerations of GRs. II. have as a common denominator to consider them as the study of the interactions between States and the very international system that they constitute, from a perspective in which war and peace are explained in terms of a series of characteristics of an international society that differs significantly from the State society, insofar as it is in a "state of nature", in a "state of war", in a situation of more or less effective anarchy.

**Political Realism**

Political realism has its roots in a long current of thought that starting from Mencius, Kautilya and Thucydides reaches its full splendor in the European Modern Age by the hand of Machiavelli and Hobbes, until reaching the twentieth century.

It has also been called "power politics". It is a normative theory oriented to practical politics, which derives its postulates both from that same practical politics and from historical experience. The study of history serves political realism both as a source of inspiration for its hypotheses, and to show the correctness of them. In his conception beats an anthropological pessimism that determines his entire theory. Man is regarded as a sinner, always desirous of increasing his power. The task of the statesman is to shape the political framework within which the human tendency toward conflict is minimized. He concentrates his attention on the "political man" who lives for power.

Power is the key to the realistic conception. Given the conflictual and anarchic nature of the international world, the natural tendency of the state and its central objective is to acquire as much power as possible, since what the state can do in international politics depends on the power it possesses. International politics is ultimately defined as the struggle for power. Power is, in this way, both a means to an end and an end itself.

**Conclusions**

The other key is the notion of national interest, which is defined in terms of power or identified with state security.

It believes that in an international system, characterized by the absence of a common Government, each State needs to seek its security based on its own power and with alarm regard for the power of its neighbours.

According to Carr, political power can be divided into three categories that are intimately interdependent: military power, economic power, and power over opinion. The most important type of power is the military since the last ratio of power in the RR is the most important type of power. II. it is war. Thus, potential war becomes the dominant factor of international politics and military force in the recognized criterion of political values.

Power politics means a type of relations between states in which some rules of conduct predominate: armaments, isolationism, diplomacy of power and war. It can be defined as a system of international relations in which groups regard themselves as the ultimate ends; They employ, at least for vital purposes, the most effective means at their disposal and are means according to their weight in the event of conflict.

He maintains that moral principles in the abstract cannot be applied to political action.

### **Bibliography**

- [1]. Armstrong, J. A. (1988). Toward a framework for considering nationalism in East Europe. *East European Politics and Societies*, 2(2), 280-305.
- [2]. Andor, L. (2015). Fair mobility in Europe. *Social Europe Occasional Paper*.
- [3]. Bergson, A. (1991). The USSR before the fall: how poor and why. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 5(4), 29-44.
- [4]. Daviddi, R., & Ilzkovitz, F. (1997). The Eastern enlargement of the European Union: Major challenges for macro-economic policies and institutions of Central and East European countries. *European Economic Review*, 41(3-5), 671-680.
- [5]. Delsoldato, G. (2002). Eastward enlargement by the European Union and transnational parties. *International Political Science Review*, 23(3), 269-289.
- [6]. Draxler, J., & Van Vliet, O. (2010). European social model: No convergence from the East. *European Integration*, 32(1), 115-135.
- [7]. Dreger, C., Kholodilin, K., Lommatzsch, K., Slačálek, J., & Wozniak, P. (2008). Price convergence in an enlarged internal market. *Eastern European Economics*, 46(5), 57-68.
- [8]. Dunay, P. (1994). NATO and the East: A Sea of Mysteries. *World Policy Journal*, 11(3), 123-127.
- [9]. Gorodetsky, G. (1990). The impact of the Ribbentrop-Molotov pact on the course of Soviet foreign policy. *Cahiers du Monde russe et soviétique*, 27-41.
- [10]. Grieco, J. M. (1995). The Maastricht Treaty, Economic and Monetary Union and the neo-realist research programme. *Review of International Studies*, 21(1), 21-40.
- [11]. Guiraudon, V. (2001). Weak weapons of the weak? Transnational mobilization around migration in the European Union. *Contentious European*, 163-86.
- [12]. Healey, D., & Healey, D. (2002). Homosexual existence and existing socialism: New light on the repression of male homosexuality in Stalin's Russia. *GLQ: A journal of lesbian and gay studies*, 8(3), 349-378.
- [13]. Hillion, C. (2014). The Copenhagen criteria and their progeny. *EU enlargement (Oxford, Hart Publishing, 2004)*.
- [14]. Kandogan, Y. (2000). Political economy of eastern enlargement of the European Union: Budgetary costs and reforms in voting rules. *European Journal of Political Economy*, 16(4), 685-705.
- [15]. Kojevnikov, A. (2002). The Great War, the Russian Civil War, and the invention of big science. *Science in Context*, 15(2), 239-275.
- [16]. Levesque, J. (1974). Modèles de conflits entre l'URSS et les autres états socialistes. *Canadian Journal of Political Science/Revue canadienne de science politique*, 7(1), 135-142.
- [17]. Pejovich, S. (2006). 3. The effects of the interaction of formal and informal institutions on social stability and economic development. *Institutions, Globalisation and Empowerment*, 56.
- [18]. Peterson, J. (2017). Juncker's political European Commission and an EU in crisis. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 55(2), 349-367.
- [19]. Price, J., Sloman, L., Gardner, R., Gilbert, P., & Rohde, P. (1994). The social competition hypothesis of depression. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, 164(3), 309-315.
- [20]. Sapir, A. (2006). Globalization and the reform of European social models. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 44(2), 369-390.
- [21]. Scherpereel, J. A. (2010). EU cohesion policy and the Europeanization of Central and East European regions. *Regional & Federal Studies*, 20(1), 45-62.
- [22]. Stephanson, A. (2002). Fourteen notes on the very concept of the Cold War. In *Rethinking Geopolitics* (pp. 74-97). Routledge.

- [23]. Threlfall, M. (2003). European social integration: harmonization, convergence and single social areas. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 13(2), 121-139.
- [24]. Troitiño, D. R. (2021). La «Década Digital» de la Unión Europea: desarrollos e impactos sobre su ciudadanía y economía. *IDP. Revista de Internet, Derecho y Política*, (34), 1-14.
- [25]. Troitiño, D. R. (2022). The European Union Facing the 21st Century: The Digital Revolution. *Tal Tech Journal of European Studies*, 12(1), 60-78.
- [26]. Troitiño, D. R. (2022). La estrategia de las instituciones de la Unión Europea ante el reto de digitalización. *Revista CIDOB d'Afers Internacionals*, 17-40.
- [27]. Troitiño, D. R. (2022). El futuro digital de la política europea.
- [28]. Waaldijk, K. (1994). Standard sequences in the legal recognition of homosexuality-Europe's past, present and future. *Australasian Gay & Lesbian LJ*, 4, 50.
- [29]. Walby, S. (2004). The European Union and gender equality: Emergent varieties of gender regime. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 11(1), 4-29.
- [30]. Whitman, R. G. (2004). NATO, the EU and ESDP: an emerging division of labour?. *Contemporary security policy*, 25(3), 430-451.
- [31]. Wivel, A. (2005). The security challenge of small EU member states: interests, identity and the development of the EU as a security actor. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 43(2), 393-412.
- [32]. Wodak, R., & Boukala, S. (2015). European identities and the revival of nationalism in the European Union: A discourse historical approach. *Journal of language and politics*, 14(1), 87-109.
- [33]. Young, J. W. (1994). Cold War Europe, 1945-1989: A Political History. *The English Historical Review*, 109(433), 1039-1040.