

Social International Politics

Wameed Khaled Nassif, Naji Mohammad Abdullah Al-Hattash

^{1,2}College of Political Science - Tikrit University. E-mail: wk230002ppo@st.tu.edu.iq. Naji_alhatash@tu.edu.iq

KEYWORDS

Social, International,
Politics

ABSTRACT

Constructivism emphasizes the importance of ideas in the “subjective interaction” between the materialisms and ideals of international politics. The value of the former comes from the meanings of the latter, which are variable meanings and not fixed. Therefore, what explains the transformation of material things from one meaning to another is the change of ideas, rules, standards and values in the international system, which enters into a relationship of “mutual formation” with its main units, that is, the states, and affects their local structure, leading to a change in their perceptions, thus contributing to the formation of the identities of the states in a way that directs their interests. Its behavior is determined so that this behavior comes as a result of the subjective interaction between the structure of the state and the structure of the international system. Thus, states form the system and the system forms states. Therefore, constructivism, specifically according to its main theorist, “Alexander Wendt,” revolves around the concept of identity, which is essentially “a characteristic rooted in the state’s understanding of itself in a certain image and the recognition of that image by other states.” Hence, identity expresses the existence of two types of ideas, those embraced by the self and those that The other embraces it. Because identity expresses the ideas of the self, it is a “local culture,” and because it expresses the ideas of the other, it is an “external culture.” And because it is based on the other’s recognition of it, it is formed through interaction between the self and the other. Thus, identity is a characteristic rooted in the self that is formed by the interaction of local cultures. With other external ones. Wendt goes on to explain that identities indicate who that state is, so they are convictions, while interests indicate what that state wants, so they are desires. States cannot know what they want before they know who they are, so interests arise as a result of identities. As long as identities are culturally shaped, interests will also be culturally shaped. Because identities are always forming, the possibility of them changing is possible hierarchically or collisionally, which means changing interests and policies to suit the international system without disturbing the identities and interests of states.

1. Introduction

The emergence of the "constructivist school" in the field of knowledge for the study of international relations at the end of the eighties of the twentieth century came as a result of the major transformations witnessed in international politics represented by the end of the Cold War in 1989, as Nicholas Onuf gave the opportunity for the emergence of constructivism in the study of international relations in his book: "A World Who We Made: Foundations in Social Theory and International Relations" published in 1989. Then came “Alexander Wendt” with his article published in 1992: “Chaos is what states make of it: The social construction of power politics” and then his book: “The Social Theory of International Politics” published in 1999 His social theory occupies a prominent place in the study of international relations as a systemic, comprehensive and structural theory Constructivism stresses the importance of ideas in international relations through the sociality of international politics, the subjectivity of the international system, and the mutual formation between it and its main units. , which creates in the minds of states a perception of the logic of appropriateness that stipulates “following certain rules that are viewed as natural, legitimate, expected, and legitimate by the system,” that is, compatible with it. . As states seek to absorb that logic as a value standard and integrate it into their identities in a way that directs their interests and determines their behavior. Its international interaction will be in a manner that does not violate its obligations towards the regime, nor its identities and interests. Thus, the regime once again contributes to reshaping the behavior of its units. Wendt Social Binaries: Wendt refers to what he calls the four sociologies, which are two dualities: mutual formation and subjectivity Mutual formation of the agent-structure:

In 1984, sociologist Anthony Giddiness pointed out: To mutual formation in his theory “Theory Structure” through what he called duality, as Giddiness saw that the individual influences the construction of society and the society influences the individual’s behavior. Explaining that neither the agent nor the structure takes priority in understanding society, but rather the process of interaction between the two parties is what should be studied, indicating that what links the two parties are the

rules, customs, symbols, and institutions that individuals build. . Nicholas Onuf, in his book “A World of Our Making: Norms and Rules in Social Theory and International Relations” in 1989, pointed out that individuals and society interact in a continuous joint process; individuals make their society, and it in turn makes them as well. As for Alexander Wendt, he explained that the study of social phenomena cannot be reduced to studying the characteristics of agents without studying the characteristics of structures, or vice versa. Structure and agent constitute one another and there is no priority between them. Also, the international system would not have existed without the practices of states, without which the system would not achieve its international character. Wendt explains that the mutual formation between the structure and the agent is due to two postulates: The belief that human beings are conscious actors whose actions lead to change and reproduce their society. The belief that society is made up of social relationships that structure interaction between humans and influence their behavior, and that individuals shape and reshape this society at every moment.

The subjectivity of the phenomena of international politics: The concept of selfhood consists of Inter subjective consists of two parts, the first is (Inter) which means within, overlapping, reciprocal, or between, and the second is (subjectivity) which means subjectivity, meaning perception of the environment from within the individual’s limited perspective according to that individual’s view of the world. . Subjectivity is the opposite of the term objectivity. objectivity), as the concept of subjectivity is built on multiple copies of knowledge and is based on the intersection of subject and object, which justifies the presence of the prefix (inter) in this term. The concept of subjectivity is given several names, such as “subjectivity, intersubjectivity, intersubjectivity, or intersubjectivity,” and it is sometimes interpreted as “collective intent,” “shared collective ideas,” or “shared collective understanding.”

The idea of subjectivity goes back to “idealist philosophy,” which viewed matter as a reflection of consciousness, as it does not exist without it, and even sensation does not come through the five senses, but rather through human perceptions. Material things take on their meaning through human consciousness. Sociologist Anthony Giddens addressed the concept of subjectivity implicitly in his theory, as he explained that human societies are built and shaped anew at every moment through the thinking and behavior of individuals, through their socially constructed knowledge, meaning that the individual and society constitute each other and also interact qualitatively through rules, standards, and resources. Nicholas Onuf also referred to subjectivism, as he saw that the world is composed materially and socially, and the truth is only that which we accept.

As for Friedrich Kratochwil, he addressed it in his talk about the “Theory of Discourse Acts.” An action has meaning only when it is in a shared subjective context, that is, when it results from a two-way interaction between individuals and society, an interaction governed by rules and standards, warning that any rational action has meaning. The concept of subjectivity was also used in interpreting foreign policy by postmodern constructivists who view foreign policy - the source of international interactions - as a subjective world whose ideas can be examined by tracking the influence of decision-makers’ discourses on foreign policy. Many speeches translate ideas into actions on the ground. Strategists, for example, formulate them as a reflection of their strategic cultures, which explains the difficulty of formulating a unified European policy on security and defense. As for the modernist constructivists, they expanded the subjectivity of foreign policy to include the influence of identities rooted in ideas and discourses, which are the basis for knowing interests and are what stand behind any foreign policy taken by states. Since its appearance in the 1970s, Giddens’ theory has inspired Alexander Wendt He referred to the concept of subjectivity repeatedly in his social theory, especially in his talk about what he called the “materialism-idealism” dichotomy. Wendt is keen to clarify what he means by the term “idealism.” It does not search for what the world should be like, as its theory is not standard, nor does it mean that human nature is inherently good. It assumes that common ideas are social facts external to individuals only, not to society, and it believes that social change is not an easy matter. There are restrictions that hinder change, such as institutions, power, and problems of collective action. It recognizes that power and interest are important, but along with ideas. Wendt provided a good example

in which he explains the role of social structures in international politics, as he explains that (500) nuclear bombs possessed by Britain are considered less of a threat to the United States than (5) nuclear bombs possessed by North Korea. The reason for this is that the threat to my verses comes from the physical structure (nuclear weapons) but rather from the meaning given to them (the intellectual structure). Power takes its meaning from its social structure (who has it) and not according to its material structure (what has it).

Based on the above, subjectivity is a concept that views phenomena as being formed by a material side and an ideal side. There is no value for a material thing unless we realize its essence and we do not know its connotations and meanings. These are meanings that are formed according to the collective common consciousness, which is composed of ideas, rules, standards and values that go through an endless series of production and reproduction. Here the truth appears, that is, the truth is socially created. An example of this is language and power; Language is produced by individuals, but they reshape it through their linguistic interaction, an interaction governed by the rules of the language itself. Any language is in a state of continuous growth and change. As for power, its value stems from its cultural meanings and does not exist without it. Therefore, states do not establish a balance of power, but rather a balance of threat, which depends mainly on the perceptions of decision makers, that is, on their culture shaped by ideas, rules, standards and values. If the value of things comes from their meanings, then these meanings, in contrast to material things, are variable and not fixed, which explains the transformation of material things from one meaning to another, as the meaning of power may change from hostile to friendly. A change in meanings is a change in the ideas, rules, standards and values of society and a change in the perceptions of its actors, whether individuals as senior officials or states as mutual agents. In other words, everything that is social is subjective and has meaning for the people who made it, live in it, and understand it because they are the ones who built it. The social construction of states' identities and interests:

Constructivism gave special importance to the identities of states, and Wendt did not believe in the importance of identities in determining the interests of states or even in shaping their policies. Rather, it is important in changing the structure of the international system. Through identities, interests are formulated, according to interests, goals are drawn, and on the basis of goals, states take their decisions, thus transforming identity from a social structure into a subjectively interactive material structure. In order to achieve this, the study will address identities first, then interests. Identities of countries: The concept of identity is one of the main concepts in constructivism, and Alexander Wendt dealt with it thoroughly in his social theory. Wendt clarifies the role and importance of identity for agents and for the international structure as well. Agents' identities are not given objectively before, but are developed or transformed through subjective interaction. This means the possibility of changing the identities and policies of agents and thus changing the nature of the interactions between them, given that the international structure is shaped by the interactions of its units. The international system may change as a whole as well.

Wendt defines the concept of identity as "a characteristic of intentional actors that produces certain behavioral and motivational tendencies. This means that identity is essentially a subjective trait or quality, rooted at the level of unity in the actor's self-understanding." Wendt points out that the actor's understanding of himself in a certain way depends on others' recognition of that image that he attributes to himself. Wendt's identity as a professor will not work if his students do not see him as such. Accordingly, "identity has two types of ideas: those embraced by the self and those embraced by the other."

Wendt emphasizes that the identities of states are mutually formed and not given objectively, independent of the interaction between states. It is the interaction between the self and the other that shapes the identities of states. As for the interaction itself, Wendt believes that the five-fold structure of the agent, which is "a social legal system, the legitimate monopoly of organized violence, a sovereign organization, a society, a territory," exists before the interaction, since it is she who creates it; In other words, the interaction between states is the interaction of ideas, rules, standards, and values

resulting from the five-member structure of the agent, not from the characteristics of his mutually supportive tripartite. . Wendt goes on to explain that the interaction of ideas is what builds identities through three mechanisms: the agents' perception of what can be done and what should be done, the communication of the agents' representatives with their institutions, such as the decision of American presidents to intervene in the affairs of others based on human rights standards, for example, and the agents' restriction of their policies for moral motives. . Countries have four types of identities: "personality, gender, role, and collective." The last three identities are referred to as social identities. .

Personal identity (Corporate):

Personal identity (self, mutual, organizational, and institutional) is an identity with a material basis that arises as a result of territory and self-organization. It has a memory and a sense of self that requires a common history for its individuals, as they are a group of selves with the ability to collective perception. Just as a human being has one body, countries have one territory and one personal identity, which is a starting point for the interaction of other identities.

Type Identity:

It has a socio-cultural basis rooted in the self, which means that its existence does not depend on the recognition of the other, but rather arises as a result of the common characteristics between the agents, such as language, values, knowledge, experience, and history, and these characteristics exist whether the other acknowledges it or not. The agent may have more than one identity as a reflection of his cultural and historical characteristics and characteristics, such as classifying countries into capitalist, socialist, republican, or monarchy. Possessing a gender identity is the result of sharing one or more traits that have a social, not a racial, content. There may be two states, one with a presidential system and the other with a parliamentary system, but both are democratic, which results in a democratic type of identity for them.

Role identity:

It has a functional basis and arises as a result of social relationships between agents, which is what makes them possess more than one role identity. This identity requires the presence of certain behaviors and traditions. The role identity of a professor, for example, requires him to exercise the teaching function within the formal educational structure in society. Role identity was used in analyzing foreign policy before the emergence of constructivism because it was given in an objective, prior manner, while constructivism considered it to be socially constituted. What is important is the recognition of others. For example, mutual recognition of sovereignty creates an identity and an independent role. Collective identity: It has a common collective basis that arises as a result of the disappearance of the separations between the self and the other. The disappearance of the separations does not occur on one specific level, but rather it may be on several levels, which means the possibility of the existence of more than one collective identity for the agent. This identity requires the presence of role and gender identities, as the collective identity is built according to the role assigned to the agent or the type to which he belongs, and because it includes a gender identity shared by its members, the personal identity is built according to the collective identity. Egypt and Saudi Arabia, for example, have an Arab collective identity because they have a specific identity as Arabs. From the above, all identities except the first (personal identity) have multiple forms and one identity or several identities may be activated, and only one or more identities may be activated for each identity. The professor activates his role identity as a professor when he meets his students and his role identity as a father when he meets his children, and perhaps he activates more than one Ban role identity when he meets his students as his children as well. With the presence of multiple identities, conflicts may occur between them, but the most important identity will be presented by the agent. Because agents act according to their identity, their policies are predictable. States' interests: The concept of identity is linked to the concept of interest among all constructivist thinkers, as the four identities of agents are what give rise to their interests. While identities refer to who agents are, interests refer to what they want, so agents' behavior is understood based on conviction (identities) and desire (interests). That is, without knowing who it

is, the state cannot know what it wants, as the syndrome of “Who am I? What do I want?” sequentially linked. While they provide identities that motivate action, identities provide agents with directing, not floating, interests.

Wendt distinguishes between two types of interests, objective and subjective. Objective interests are formed independently of the perceptions of decision makers, but failure to achieve this type of interests leads to the disappearance of the identity guiding them. When agents internalize their identity, they will achieve two goals: the first is to understand identity requirements, and the second is ways to meet those requirements. But when that understanding is wrong, the behavior will contradict that identity, leading to its disappearance. Wendt points out that objective interests are the most important because they understand the requirements of identity- It arises as a result of countries having a personal identity, an identity that is formed before interaction, so these interests will also be formed before interaction. As for Self-interests refer to the conviction of agents on how to meet the requirements of their identity, and although they are centered around “how,” they are preferences about results, not strategies, that is, they are concerned with the end, not the means. Self-interests arise as a result of social identities that are formed during interaction, so they will also be formed during interaction.

Therefore, it is necessary to know the objective interests first and then know the subjective interests second. Without the first, the second will not be achieved, and failure to agree between them leads to the disappearance of the agent himself. . Both of these interests constitute the national interest. The national interest is objective interests that stem from personal identity when it is formed before interaction. These are self-interests that stem from social identities when achieved after interaction. In other words, the national interest goes through two stages. The first is the stage of objective interests before interaction, which seeks to understand the requirements of its personal identity, and the second stage is the stage of subjective interests after interaction, which seeks to achieve the requirements of its social identity. Wendt points out that there are four national interests: “physical survival,” which means the survival of the state-society complex, and “independence,” which means the state’s control over its resources and choosing its government. Independence is represented by sovereignty, meaning that states are not restricted in meeting their internal or external demands, so it is Relative independence may be replaced when the benefits of dependence on the outside are greater than its benefits, while “economic recovery” refers to the standard of well-being that is achieved through the possession of resources and manufacturing processes, while “collective self-esteem” is a feeling of satisfaction with oneself motivated by respect, a sense of value, and the group’s view of The self is linked to the other's view of it. The negative image pushes the self to compensate for that insult, either through aggression, devaluing the other's view, or emphasizing the self. While a positive image, such as recognition of sovereignty, stimulates cooperation and reduces the need to destroy others, sovereignty ensures the safety of the state from external and psychological threats as well. International structure and chaos: International relations are a social construct. Their existence is the result of a construction process and is a meaningful act. Wood, for example, is a material that exists naturally, but the carpenter’s work is what gives “wood” meaning when he builds a musical instrument or a killing tool from it. Without this work, it has no value like that. The carpenter gave it to him. Likewise, relations have existed between countries since time immemorial as a natural state, but human interaction (the work of a carpenter) is what gives them a positive or negative meaning (a musical instrument or a killing tool). The idea of the social construction of social phenomena, including international politics, can be summarized in three conclusions Reality is variable and varies from one case to another and is not objectively given prior to interaction. Reality is subject to ideal, not material, influences only, as social values (ideas, rules, and standards) have special importance within the context. International politics and the aspects and events it contains are a human-made world, and they are “Industry takes its meaning from the ideal material interaction according to the context. Nuclear missiles are not made for themselves, but rather in response to a specific interaction between humans.” . Based on the above, the study addresses this topic: “the nature of the international structure, the culture of the international structure, and forecasting the change in the international structure.”

Meanings of material things	Ideals	Materials
Entertainment and fun	Musical instrument	wood
Comfort and safety	a house	wood
A fighting and war machine	catapult	wood

The nature of the international structure:

According to Alexander Wendt, the state represents a local social structure that includes “formal institutions” such as ministries and offices such as the office of the head of state, and “systems of conviction” such as laws and customs. It possesses human characteristics, an “intentional, rational, mutually active agent,” possesses a legitimate monopoly on organized violence in society, and is shaped internally and externally. . As for the international system, it is “an international social structure consisting of material resources and ideal meanings.” The first includes power resources such as weapons and economic resources such as natural resources and productive capabilities, while the second includes ideas, rules, standards, values, and culture of states’ societies, which interact with each other in a subjective manner through the practices of agents. ; The interaction of materialism with ideals gives the former meaning and the latter influence, so that all of this is reflected in reality as influential meanings.

The gun has a different meaning when it is in the hand of a friend than in the hand of the enemy, meaning that friendship and enmity are a social relationship before they are physical forces. . Therefore, the international system is not given in advance. It is not something that exists like the solar system. Rather, it exists in a shared, subjective form as a reflection of a common awareness and self-understanding among people. It is shaped by a set of ideas and norms organized hierarchically by specific people at a specific time and place . Constructivists view the international structure as a “social cultural structure” governed by subjective interaction, like other social phenomena in the lives of agents, whether individuals or states. While Nicholas Onuf stresses that the world is “a world of our making,” referring to countries, societies, and the world as a whole. Van Wendt describes chaos as “made by states.” It is an “empty vessel” that has no intrinsic meaning of its own. Rather, states are the ones who place the meaning within it. . The international system - which is a system between sovereign states - is considered a coin with two sides, the first is local, based on the “institution of sovereignty,” and the other is global, based on the “institution of non-sovereignty.”□" So the chaos (Anarchy is the principle of the international system, where there is no guarantee for one state against the aggression of another state, no judge to decide between cases, no force to punish the violator, and no body to compensate the victims. Legitimacy is the law of the unseen. Here the “security dilemma” appears, and countries seek to address it by adopting a “self-help system.”But in the view of the constructivists, self-reliance does not necessarily mean hostility to others. The state of global non-sovereignty does not mean the inevitability of hostility or the lack of opportunities for competition or even cooperation; The international structure is a cultural structure that is socially constructed (relational), and cooperation and conflict are both products of the shared ideas of that culture, regardless of whether they are “good or bad.” In the perceptions of decision makers, war may represent a “heinous” or “glorious” matter, depending on the context of the subjective interaction between countries. Thus, the constructivists conclude that chaos is not a material reality devoid of ideas that cannot be changed, but rather it is “a cultural and social structure that includes a set of standards, rules, values, common ideas, and ways of mutual understanding that countries create during their interactions, which in turn affects their identities and then their behavior.” In other words, the chaos of the international system is a culture, but it is not one culture, but rather three cultures. However, what prevails in the international system is one of those cultures, not all three together. This depends on the type of role that countries play collectively and which dominates the international structure. When states exercise a specific role, the culture of the structure will be formed according to this role, and then that culture will be embedded in three levels in the identities of states. Accordingly, states constitute the international structure and the international structure constitutes states, which is known as the mutual formation between the structure

and the agent.

Here Wendt stresses the necessity of distinguishing between roles and role identities. The first represents “structural conditions” and not individual convictions (an external structure given objectively, independent of the interaction of agents), and the second represents a “temporal, subjective understanding of the self.” It is personal convictions (a subjective structure personally shaped by the agents themselves). Thus, roles are what give role identities meaning and significance, and while the first is continuous, the second is discontinuous. An example of this is what was the situation of Great Britain in the nineteenth century as the “bearer of the balance” in the European balance of power system. While Britain may abandon its identity as the “bearer of the balance,” the role of “bearer of the balance” will remain and be given to another country that possesses the identity of the role of “bearer of the balance.” Otherwise, the entire system of balance of power will disappear from Europe. In other words, the roles are “jobs” and the role identity is “employee”. Culture of the international structure: The international structure varies into three different cultures: “Hobbesian, Lockean, and Kantian,” as follows: The “Hobbesian” antagonistic structure: It is named after the British philosopher Thomas Hobbes 1588-1679 "In this structure, the culture of chaos is hostile, portraying the other's violence towards the self as being unrestrained, as the other does not recognize the right to sovereignty.

So it is "all against all", which forces the adoption of a "self-help system", and countries compete to arm themselves to ensure their existence. Therefore, the level of hostility is decided according to the perceptions of decision makers and may be a bad perception. In Hobbesian culture, the interaction takes four applications: “response at the same level (kill or be killed); Negative perceptions of decision makers, awareness of the other’s power as absolute (if you want peace, prepare for war) and not being restricted in fighting unless it is beneficial.” States in this case act according to the logic of hostility, regardless of the nature of the other’s threat, which continuously feeds the culture of hostility. The more the number of hostile states has increased, the critical point of conflict has approached, and the logic of the international structure has become dominant, not the logic of agents. Their exercise of self-restraint will not be present, but rather they will search for power, not security. Wendt explains that states will internalize the “Hobbesian culture” with three levels in their identities. At the first level, states are forced to be hostile to others, meaning that their hostile behavior is externally shaped. Once it disappears, they change their behavior, which is the least apparent throughout history. At the second level, countries adopt the option of enmity with others, among several options, out of self-interest. Their behavior is shaped internally and their interest is what forces them to adopt this option in order to obtain external benefits, the achievement of which is often restricted internationally. As for the third level, states absorb the “hostile culture” motivated by their beliefs and convictions. In this case, hostility is subjectively perceived as a legitimate standard appropriate to the state’s self-identity. Which makes its submission to this level of hostile culture highly voluntary, so the state will refuse and resist changing this situation. Wendt warns that such a level of internalization of hostility in the identities of states and thus their interests and behavior may stem from local pressure groups, such as arms manufacturers, the military establishment, and anyone who has a personal interest in increasing military spending, for example.

“Local” competitive structure:

It is named after the British philosopher Jean Locke 1632-1704 "In this structure, the culture of chaos is competitive, portraying the violence of the other towards the self as restricted violence. The other recognizes the right to sovereignty, and decision makers perceive the other as less threatening than he was in the "Hobbesian culture." The logic of this situation is the logic of Locke's anarchic society, "Live and let." "For others to live," so the culture of this structure occupies a middle position between chaotic cultures. Wendt confirms that the culture of competition, which was launched by the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648 under the shadow of the institution of sovereignty, gave the international structure a legal dimension despite the absence of a central authority. Which made “the contemporary competition between countries restricted by the rights of sovereignty recognized by international law, and thus today’s competition is “based on the rule of law.” Wendt warns that “competitive culture”

does not mean governing the international structure on the basis of law, but rather restricting the practice of violence between countries. The institution of sovereignty has succeeded in creating a kind of mutual trust between countries, especially since the other will not confiscate the individual's right to exist and will not unleash its violence during fighting. This state of competition is what often prevails in today's world, except for a few exceptions, such as the relationship between the two Koreas and the Palestine-Israel relationship. .

Wendt explains that states will internalize "Lockean culture" on three levels in their identities. At the first level, states will be forced to absorb "Lockean culture" through their commitment to the rules of sovereignty and not allowing the confiscation of the right of other states to exist. Its behavior is shaped externally, as without coercion and coercion, some countries may understand sovereignty but not accept it or apply it with others. At the second level, states absorb this culture out of self-interest. Commitment to the institution of sovereignty achieves an interest given objectively and independently according to the perceptions of decision makers, such as trade and security. The interest of states lies in preserving the sovereignty of others, and the benefits of recognition outweigh the costs of non-recognition. Which means that some countries will not violate the sovereignty of others, even if the benefits are balanced with the costs, as commitment to sovereignty achieves other goals of a material nature. As for the third level, countries absorb Lockean culture motivated by their beliefs and convictions. In this case, competition is self-aware as a legitimate matter or an axiom that serves everyone by adjusting their policies with international laws. Some countries, although they have sufficient power to seize control over others, do not do so for ideal purposes, such as positive impressions of others about oneself. .

"Kantian" cooperative structure:

It is named after the German philosopher Immanuel Kant¹⁷²⁴⁻¹⁸⁰⁴". In this international structure, the culture of chaos is a culture of cooperation. The absence of a central authority does not necessarily mean that countries are in a state of hostility or competition. Rather, cooperation may appear as a result of shared ideas. This explains the unification of economic procedures, the coordination of environmental and security policies, and the integration of international policies. . Wendt points out that states in this case are committed to resolving conflicts without using violence or threats (the law of non-violence), but will fight together as a team if one of them is exposed to an external threat (the law of mutual assistance). Wendt identifies three observations about these two laws: everyone lives in peace, but "each goes alone." Force may be used within the same team. Friendship differs from alliance, as the latter is temporary and may witness its members fighting among themselves. As for friendship, it is permanent even if its levels decline. Wendt emphasizes that the source of peace in Kantian culture does not emanate from the "dragon" that rules the world, but rather comes from knowledge of intentions, but this knowledge is relative, so the chances of war erupting will remain. International and civil wars will not disappear even in the shadow of the global or national "dragon." War An issue inherent in the nature of states. But what is different in light of Kantian culture is that war is considered illegal. Friends will solve their problems through negotiations, arbitration committees, and the judiciary, even if the costs of war are low.

Wendt points out that the "culture of friendship" includes two security mechanisms, "pluralistic security and collective security," and the difference between them. In the first, conflicts may occur within it, while in the second, conflicts will occur with internal or external parties that reject collective security standards. The principle of collective security is based on the "Law of Mutual Assistance" or "All for One, and One for All." When the security of one of the members is threatened, everyone will come to his defense, even if their personal security is not threatened. Wendt points out that the concept of "collective security" is not framed by threats, meaning that security here is formed in an ongoing, reciprocal manner. It does not disappear with the disappearance of the threat, as is the case in military alliances, as "collective security" exists between "friends, not allies," which makes The capabilities of the other are the capabilities of the group, as they are "wealth for all." What motivates countries in a particular region to cooperate in security is not fear of others, but rather because they are friends and

their relations remain with or without the threat. .

According to Wendt, states will internalize the “Lockean culture” on three levels in their identities. At the first level, states will be forced to absorb the “Kantian culture” with others through their commitment not only to the right to sovereignty, but also to their right not to be subjected to violence. The reason for coercion here is either deterrence or the high costs of war, or it may be due to mutual dependence. Coercion does not only push towards non-violence, but also towards cooperation, as there is a fear of environmental collapse or the occurrence of a nuclear war. At the second level, states absorb Kantian culture out of self-interest, as adherence to the standards of friendship achieves an external benefit for the state. Countries view this culture through cost-benefit calculations, and believe that the benefit resulting from friendship is greater than its costs. The criterion of friendship here is a utilitarian, not a moral, standard. As for the third level, states absorb the “Kantian culture” motivated by their beliefs and convictions. Friendship is perceived as a legitimate matter, as the image of the self is similar to the other in the perceptions of decision makers, so common ideas such as “loyalty, solidarity, and team spirit” prevail in the collective identity of states over their individual identities, which prompts them to adopt A “common superior identity” that creates collective interests and harmonious policies.

Wendt explains the mechanism of transition to “Kantian culture” through “cultural selection” as a means by which the determinants of behavior are developed and transmitted from one individual to another through “imitation and social education.” “Imitation” means similarity, imitation, and following a role model as a successful model, resulting in the creation of similar social cultural structures that lead to the creation of identities and then homogeneous interests and behaviors, which creates harmony between agents (biological and mutualists). Wendt explains that the simulation may be materialistic when collecting money is seen as a criterion for success, or it may be an ideal simulation in which virtuous values are the criterion for success. Here, Wendt points out that simulation, in contrast to natural selection (survival of the fittest), has a faster ability to change the characteristics of societies or agents. While natural selection requires several generations, simulation achieves the same degree of change within only one generation. As for “social education” Wendt considers it the most important means of cultural selection, which includes four basic variables: “mutual dependence, common destiny, homogeneity, and self-limitation.” The international structure being a culture means the possibility of change from an individualistic (selfish) culture to a cooperative (collective) culture. Here comes the role of these four variables as causal forces that help create cooperative behavior between countries and reshape role identities from competitor to friend. While “interdependence” helps the emergence of a collective identity for agents, in which interaction is intense Whether between enemies or between friends, between friends it enhances opportunities for cooperation, especially economic ones, such as supply chains, for example. As for the “common destiny”, which is one of the most important motives for cooperation, whether it is the result of a common ideology or a chronic threat, it leads to the adoption of common behaviors, creating the principle of “we.” Homogeneity is one of the reasons for cooperation emanating from within, but it may have negative consequences due to similarity in job role. Finally, Wendt stresses that “self-restraint” is the most important mechanism that enhances the transition to “Kantian culture,” as the previous three forces are worthless without it. Self-restraint is what cultivates mutual trust between countries, which confirms self-respect for the other’s privacy and differences. This is what prompts members to trust the group, that it will not swallow up their individuality. States are subjected to self-restraint and their identities are restricted Either through repeated self-control, or through democratic institutions, or by a unilateral side that redefines the self and shapes its identity, interests, and behavior. Forecasting the change in the international structure: Prediction is one of the most important functions of scientific theory in the cognitive field of studying international relations. It provides research centers and decision-makers with a forward-looking vision of what the development of events in international politics may lead to. This gives the ability to take the necessary measures to confront developments, both negatively and positively, which may spare countries from major consequences (war and international isolation). Although some thinkers reject prediction as a criterion for evaluating theory; According to them, it is an unrealistic goal and a daunting task that requires arriving at agreed-upon

generalizations, in which many theories have failed. However, prediction remains the backbone of future studies. Even if it is not important in evaluating the theory, it represents the content and content of the study of the future, and without it, the future study would not be... truly future. Within the framework of prediction, the positivists, especially the neo-realists, believe that the transformations of international politics stem from the system itself, not from its units. The constructivists - in contrast to that - relied on the characteristics of the units, specifically the characteristics of identity, so they focus on analyzing the identities of countries to predict not only the policies of the units, but also transformations. The entire structure of the international system. Therefore, the constructivists succeeded in predicting the end of the Cold War based on the change in the identity of the former "Soviet Union" role following President Mikhail Gorbachev's talk about "common security." This historical transformation came as a result of changing the rules and standards establishing international politics, not as a result of war.

In the past, wars and the resulting demise of major powers were an indicator of the establishment of a new international order, as happened after the First and Second World Wars, while all of this did not happen when the new international order was established (at that time) after the end of the Cold War. The United States was the only global power to dominate international political affairs, opening a new era in international relations based on the principles of liberal capitalism and American globalization and their applications in interfering in the affairs of states, imposing human rights and the free market system, and reducing the role of the institution of sovereignty, which was inaugurated in "Iraq and Yugoslavia." In other words, the constructivists' reliance on identity in predicting the policies of states and the transformations of the international system is closely linked to the understanding of identity as giving a perception of what the self is and what the other is like. Under identity, states draw specific choices for themselves, and then they - that is, identity - will reflect actions. The prospective countries, including the changes they will make to their policies, and then it is possible to predict the major transformations that international politics will witness, especially if they are superpowers. And through the rule of "Who am I? What do I want?" Or "Tell me who you are... I will tell you what you want." Here we find some people making a (mistake) about constructivism because it is based on ideas in predicting the behavior of states. They ask: As long as prediction is based on perceptions, how can we predict what is going on in people's minds?! Here, Alexander Wendt explains this issue. Predicting the policies of states (which is what concerns us in the study of international relations) is much easier than predicting the behavior of individuals. As states are cooperative agents, predicting their behavior requires access to the structure of their minds, which is a structure consisting of a documented database in the form of official letters and correspondence. Government reports, financial budgets, and military capabilities, as well as the trends of public opinion, the plans of presidential candidates, and the backgrounds of ministers and officials, are data that are not difficult to access in light of digitization and technical development, not to mention the role of intelligence institutions, reconnaissance, research and study centers in investigating this data. The constructivists add that prediction is also possible through studying the policies of countries, and they present the "Kingdom of Bhutan" as an example of this. This kingdom, small in area, small in number, and weak in power, is located between two giant Asian countries with many outstanding issues between them. To its north lies China and to its south lies India. Bhutan's relationship with the former was severed after the annexation of Tibet, and good with the latter. What makes matters worse is the Indian hegemony, which was legitimized under a friendship treaty it signed with Bhutan in 1949, where India was granted the right to advise Bhutan's foreign policy, despite the amendment of this treaty in 2007, but Bhutan remained under Indian influence. According to the realistic perspective, the existence of the "Kingdom of Bhutan" as an independent state is based on its geographical location and depends greatly on its relationship with its two giant neighbors, and is clearly threatened by China. But from a constructive perspective, China's annexation of Tibet and the conclusion of a friendship treaty with India was portrayed in Bhutan's perceptions as a Chinese threat to it and an Indian peace with it, which gave a special meaning to its two giant neighbors, as it portrayed India as a friendly country while it portrayed China as an enemy. Thus, Bhutan's identity, interests, and behavior are shaped, albeit partially, by the outside. That is, the

status of friend or enemy was not granted because of the physical structure, that is, the geographical location and the balance of power between China and Bhutan, but rather because of the difference between China's policies and India's policies. From this, it is possible to predict Bhutan's policies based on reshaping the meaning given to its two giant neighbors. If a friendship is reached with China, its image will change in Bhutan's perceptions, and this will be reflected in its identity, interests, and behavior.

2. Conclusion

The major transformations in international politics confirmed the validity of the concepts of the "constructivist school" and the assumptions of its theorist, "Alexander Wendt," which he presented in his book: "Social Theory in International Politics." With the adoption of the former "Soviet Union" discourse of "common security" in 1988, the identity of the Soviets was reshaped and with it the structure of the international system was reshaped. This is an example that identity change is shaped by the internal cultural and social structure. Just as the two parts of Germany adopted a political system compatible with the structure of the "bipolar system." To reshape the identity of its two parts, their interests, and their politics. They no longer aspire as a conviction and do not desire, as an interest, to be a competing global power. Rather, they have created for themselves a contented personal identity, an identity of a cooperative role, an identity of a "communist-socialist" and "liberal-capitalist" type, and a collective identity of "Eastern and Western." "Respectively, and thus he gave the two parts of Germany an example that identity is shaped externally by the system and internally by the social cultural structure." The characteristics of the international system would have changed depending on Germany's identity if the "Third Reich" had won. The constructivist school also succeeded in explaining all the major transformations that international politics witnessed, starting from the end of the Cold War until the war on terrorism, through all the repercussions that the world witnessed following the demise of the former Soviet Union, the socialist camp, the Warsaw Pact, the Second Gulf War, the establishment of a unipolar system, and the events of September 11. The year 2001, the occupation of Afghanistan and Iraq, the events of the "Arab Spring" and its international repercussions; All of this came at a time when other theories failed to achieve this.

Reference

- [1] (Paul A. Kowert, "The Peril and Promise of Constructivist Theory", *Ritsumeikan of International Studies*, No.3 (Japan, *Ritsumeikan of International Studies*: March 2001), p165.
- [2] (John T. Ishiyama & Marijke Breuning, *21st Century Political Science: A Reference Handbook*, (California: Sage Publications, 2011), p. 471.
- [3] (James G. March & Johan P. Olsen, "The logic of appropriateness", No.9/2004 (Oslo, *ARENA Center for European Studies*:2004), p3.
- [4]) Alexander Went, *The Social Theory of International Politics*, translated by: Abdullah Jabr Saleh Al-Otaibi (Riyadh: Scientific Publishing and King Saud University Press, 2006), pp. 322-323.
- [5]) Tim Dunne, Melia Korki and Steve Smith, *Theories of International Relations: Specialization and Diversity*, translated by: Dima Al-Khadra (Beirut: Arab Center for Research and Policy Studies, January 2016), pp. 438-439.
- [6]) Alexander Went, previously mentioned source, pp. 36, 41.
- [7] (Khaled Al-Masry, "Constructivist Theory in International Relations," *Damascus University Journal of Economic and Legal Sciences*, Issue 2 (Damascus: 2014), p. 319.
- [8] (Maja Zehfuss, *Constructivism in International Relations: The Politics of Reality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002) p. 19.
- [9] (Alexander Wendt, "The Agent-Structure Problem in International Relations Theory", No. 3 (Cambridge-Massachusetts, The MIT Press: 1987), p. 360.
- [10]) Alexander Went, previously mentioned source, p. 21.

- [11] (Alexander Wendt, “The Agent-Structure Problem” Op.cit, P. 337-338.
- [12] (Multilingual and Multidisciplinary Dictionary and Dictionary of Meanings, “Meaning of Concepts,” in <https://bit.ly/3JhaR17>(03/03/2024).
- [13] (Muhammad Hamshi, “Theories of International Relations between Hegemony and Pluralism,” unpublished master’s thesis, University of Batna, Algeria, Faculty of Law and Political Science, 2011, p. 91.
- [14]) Hassan Al-Haj Ali Ahmed, “The World is Made: A Study in the Social Construction of Global Politics,” Alam Al-Fikr Magazine, Issue 4, (Kuwait: 2005), pp. 176, 179.
- [15]) Maan Ziadeh, The Arab Philosophical Encyclopedia, Volume One (Beirut: Arab Development Institute, 1986), pp. 844-846.
- [16] (Anthony Giddens, Sociology, translated by: Fayez Al-Sayyagh (Beirut: Arab Organization for Translation, 2005), pp. 37-41.
- [17]) Maja Zehfuss, Op.cit, p. 22.
- [18]) Ibid, p. 97.
- [19] (Robert Jackson & Georg Sørensen, Introduction to International Relations: Theories and Approaches, 5th Edition, (Oxfordshire: Oxford University Press, 2013), p. 256.
- [20]) Martin Greifish, Fifty Thinkers in International Relations, translated by: Gulf Research Center (Dubai: Gulf Research Centre, 2008), p. 408.
- [21] (Alexander Went, previously mentioned source, p. 39.
- [22] (Stephen McGlinchey & others, International Relations Theory (England: E-International Relations, 2017), p36.
- [23])Khaled Al-Masry, previously mentioned source, p. 319.
- [24]) Muhammad Al-Taher Adila, a previously mentioned source, p. 365. Qalamin Wahiba, “Constructivist Theory in Security Studies,” unpublished master’s thesis, University of Muhammad Boudiaf M’sila, Algeria, Faculty of Law and Political Sciences, 2017, pp. 39-41.
- [25] (Stephen McGlinchey & others, Op.cit, p36-37.
- [26] (Robert Jackson & Georg Sørensen, Op. cit, p212.
- [27] (Maja Zehfuss, Op.cit, p38.
- [28]) Alexander Went, previously mentioned source, p. 313.
- [29]) Abdullah Jabr Saleh Al-Otaibi, “Theory in International Relations between the Neo-Realist School and the Constructivist School,” Social Affairs Magazine, No. 108 (Saudi Arabia: 2010), p. 135.
- [30] (Scott Burchell and others, Theories of International Relations, translated by Muhammad Al-Saffar (Cairo: National Center for Translation, 2014), pp. 333-334.
- [31] (Alexander Went, previously mentioned source, pp. 313-322.
- [32] (Hassan Al-Haj Ali Ahmed, previously mentioned source, p. 173.
- [33])Same source,p. 174.
- [34])Alexander Went, previously mentioned source, pp. 316-317.
- [35]) Hassan Al-Haj Ali Ahmed, previously mentioned source, p. 174.
- [36]) Alexander Went, previously mentioned source, pp. 317-319.
- [37] (Hassan Al-Haj Ali Ahmed, previously mentioned source, p. 174.
- [38] (Alexander Went, previously mentioned source, pp. 321-322.
- [39] (Hassan Al-Haj Ali Ahmed, previously mentioned source, pp. 174-175.
- [40] (Stephen McGlinchey & others, Op.cit, p. 38.
- [41]) Alexander Went, previously mentioned source, pp. 322-323.
- [42])Same source,pp. 323-325.
- [43])Same source,pp. 326-327.

- [44])Same source,pp. 327-332.
- [45]) Tim Dunne, Melia Corky and Steve Smith, cit., pp. 434-435.
- [46])Same source,pp. 434-435.
- [47])Same source,p. 440.
- [48]) Alexander Went, previously mentioned source, p. 104.
- [49])Same source,p. 345.
- [50])Same source,p. 203.
- [51] (Abdullah Jabr Saleh Al-Otaibi, previously mentioned source, p. 129.
- [52]) Muhammad Al-Tahir Adila, previously mentioned source, p. 365.
- [53] (Robert Jackson & Georg Sørensen, Op. cit, p 209.
- [54]) Khaled Al-Masry, previously mentioned source, p. 318.
- [55]) Alexander Went, previously mentioned source, p. 346.
- [56] □ The institution of non-sovereignty: It is a result of the institution of sovereignty and means the absence of a central authority in the world, and it is a term created by the researcher.
- [57] (Alexander Went, previously mentioned source, p. 343.
- [58])Same source,p. 350.
- [59] (Alexander Wendt, “Anarchy What States Make of It,” International Organizations, No. 2 (Cambridge-Massachusetts, The MIT Press: Spring 1992), pp. 391-392.
- [60]) Alexander Want, a previously mentioned source, p. 349. Abdullah Jabr Saleh Al-Otaibi, a previously mentioned source, p. 127.
- [61])Same source,p. 352.
- [62]) Abdullah Jabr Saleh Al-Otaibi, previously mentioned source, p. 126.
- [63] (Alexander Went, previously mentioned source, p. 357.
- [64] (Same source,344-345.
- [65] (Abdullah Jabr Saleh Al-Otaibi, previously mentioned source, p. 128.
- [66]) Alexander Went, previously mentioned source, p. 359.
- [67])Same source,pp. 361-367.
- [68])Same source,pp. 372-380.
- [69])Same source,p. 385.
- [70] (Same source,pp. 386-387.
- [71])Same source,pp. 388-389.
- [72])Same source,pp. 394-398.
- [73]) Khaled Al-Masry, previously mentioned source, p. 323.
- [74] (Alexander Went, previously mentioned source, pp. 410-412.
- [75] (Same source,pp. 412-414.
- [76])Same source,pp. 416-419.
- [77])Same source,pp. 443-444.
- [78] (Same source,p. 445.
- [79])Same source,p. 446.
- [80] (Abdullah Jabr Saleh Al-Otaibi, previously mentioned source, p. 146.
- [81])Same source,p. 148.
- [82] (Alexander Went, previously mentioned source, p. 467.
- [83]) Abdullah Jabr Saleh Al-Otaibi, previously mentioned source, p. 148.

- [84] (Alexander Went, previously mentioned source, pp. 479-482.
- [85]) Abdullah Jabr Saleh Al-Otaibi, previously mentioned source, pp. 146-147.
- [86]) Alexander Went, previously mentioned source, pp. 489-490.
- [87]) Belkhairat Hussein, *The Future of the International System: A Constructive Forward-looking Vision* (Istanbul: Egyptian Institute for Studies, 2017), pp. 3-4.
- [88])Hassan Al-Haj Ali Ahmed, a previously mentioned source,p. 178.
- [89] (Same source,p. 173.
- [90]) Alexander Went, previously mentioned source, pp. 310-312.
- [91]) A group of authors, *The Theory of International Relations*, translated by: Haider Zuhair Jassim and Russell Yassin Mazal (London: Nour Publishing, 2024), pp. 57-58.
- [92]) Richard W. Mansbach & Kirsten L. Rafferty, *Introduction to Global Politics*, (New York: Routledge, 2008), p. 190.
- [93] (Maja Zehfuss, *Op.cit*, p. 25-26.
- [94] (Hassan Al-Haj Ali Ahmed, previously mentioned source, p. 175.