

AN EXAMINATION OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY PARADIGMS WITHIN THE  
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS DISCIPLINE AS ON AND POST-COLD WAR

*Uluslararası İlişkiler Disiplini İçinde Soğuk Savaş ve Sonrası Ulusal Güvenlik Paradigmaları  
Üzerine Bir İnceleme*



Dr. Murat ŞENGÖZ

Milli Savunma Bakanlığı, Ankara, Türkiye, muratsengoz74@gmail.com

*Araştırma Makalesi/Research Article*

**Geliş/Received:**  
13.05.2022

**Kabul/Accepted:**  
19.09.2022

**Sayfa/ Page:**  
182-198



**Abstract**

Today, the concept of national security is expanding and deepening in terms of its framework and dimensions, and threat perceptions evolve and take on an asymmetric and uncertain nature. In this context, it can be stated that conceptualizations related to national security become more complex with its interdisciplinary, pluralistic, and multidimensional structure. Thus, today's national security issues require a multidimensional and holistic understanding that balances military and non-military methods, considers cyber and asymmetric threats, and envisages comprehensive approaches. Therefore, this article presents a holistic approach to security conceptualizations that should be considered in the context of a rational and real-political foreign policy. In this study, the mainstream approaches related to national security within the discipline of international relations are discussed, and in this context, an examination of the aforementioned schools to national security within the international relations discipline are elaborated and summarized as of the cold war era and after. In this context, an analytical study is presented about the factors and components affecting national security issues, considering both current and future security paradigms, and national security issues are explained through different aspects of national security.

**Keywords:** National Security Debates, Evolvement of National Security Paradigms, Promoting Peace.

**Öz**

Günümüzde ulusal güvenlik kavramı çerçeve ve boyut olarak genişlemekte, derinleşmekte ve tehdit algıları ise evrimleşerek asimetrik ve belirsiz bir hüviyete bürünmektedir. Bu kapsamda ulusal güvenlikle alakalı kavramlaştırmaların, disiplinler arası, çoğulcu ve çok boyutlu yapısıyla daha da karmaşıklaştığı ifade edilebilir. Böylece günümüzde ulusal güvenlikle ilgili hususlar, askeri ve askeri olmayan yöntemler arasında denge kuran, siber ve asimetrik tehditleri dikkate alan ve kapsamlı yaklaşımlar öngören çok boyutlu ve bütüncül bir anlayışı gerekli kılmaktadır. Bu nedenle bu makalede, rasyonel ve reelpolitik bir dış politika bağlamında dikkate alınması gereken güvenlik kavramlaştırmaları ile ilgili bütünsel bir yaklaşım ortaya koyulmaktadır. Bu çalışmada uluslararası ilişkiler disiplini içinde genel olarak ulusal güvenlikle alakalı ana akım yaklaşımlar ele alınmakta, bu kapsamda mezkur ekollerin güvenlikle ilgili disiplin içi farklılıklarının bir incelemesi soğuk savaş ve sonrası itibarıyla ortaya koyulmakta ve özetlenmektedir. Bu bağlamda, ulusal güvenlik konularını etkileyen faktörler ve bileşenler hakkında hem güncel, hem de gelecekteki güvenlik paradigmları dikkate alınarak analitik bir çalışma sunulmakta ve ulusal güvenlikle ilgili hususlar ulusal güvenliğe dair farklı yaklaşımlar üzerinden açıklanmaktadır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Ulusal Güvenlik Tartışmaları, Ulusal Güvenlik Paradigmalarının Gelişimi, Barışın Tesisi.

**Atıf/Citation:** Şengöz, M. (2022). An examination of the national security paradigms within the international relations discipline as on and post-cold war. *MECMUA-Uluslararası Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* ISSN: 2587-1811 7(14), 182-198.

## Introduction

The new security approach depicts an understanding that can produce different modes of action in terms of decision-making mechanisms, so it does not deny social reality, adapt to dynamics and change, the balance between capacity and intent, and is prone to national and international cooperation. After each experience, new security parameters are included in the security paradigm, and the perception of the security phenomenon before the subject, scope, actor, and sovereign powers evolve. Today, security has become a more factual and anthropological concept. Approaches that take the state as the center are abandoned and approaches that take culture, economic welfare, and social texture into consideration are adopted (Waeber & Flockhart, 2014). Security perceptions have become complex, centered on the integrity of security, reversing traditional security approaches, and developing comprehensive and interdisciplinary methods for dealing with problems and solving techniques. Today, security approaches, diversity, richness, and conceptualization of security in terms of subject, scope, dimension, and unit of analysis have resulted in a “paradigm shift” as expressed by Thomas Kuhn (1982). This deepening and expansion in the concept of security bring out a new security paradigm. It describes a pragmatic and dynamic approach to security that incorporates all previous theories in the meta-analysis, but does not exclude them altogether and differs in weight and priorities. Today, security approaches focus on debates on identity and security, on the one hand, and liberal security and confidence-building measures such as military information exchange, military visits and inspections, verification and increasing transparency, as well as the elimination of military threats in the classical sense, have an identity. On the one hand, these aim at limiting the military forces of the states and consequently reducing the welfare of societies by reducing military funding, while on the other hand advances in combat weapon vehicle technologies become more lethal and shatter relative combat forces.

In the current century, experiences such as the events of 9/11, interventions in Iraq and Afghanistan, colorful revolutions, and the Arab Spring are indicative of a multidimensional security paradigm. All these developments have revealed that unilateral security approaches are far from being the solution to the current trust and crises and conflicts in the world (Ryakhovskaya, 2014, pp. 102). Thus, security parameters have evolved from the interstate approach to a mixed identity that includes diplomacy and confidence and confidence-building measures as well as military and semi-military measures which consider state and non-state factors. Thus, the perception of threats has changed in a wider range and the military threats expected to come from hostile states have gained a vague, asymmetric, destructive, and blurring of borders, such as socioeconomic inequality, ethnic and sectarian conflicts, and transnational organized crime. For this reason, the concept of security takes into consideration all the elements of national power at the same time and requires cooperation (Bails, 2008, pp. 69-85). It is not only interested in the military dimension of security, adopts multidimensional approaches, uses rapid methods with decision-making and enforcement methods, and can use conventional as well as non-conventional capabilities simultaneously while matching to operate soft security and hard security approaches in harmony. Therefore, the interaction of the military dimension of security with human rights, economy, and environmental dimension of security increases rapidly.

Regional, ethnic and religious battles continue, even though there are no direct hot conflicts between major developed states (superpowers), which could be devastating in their consequences and last for generations due to the extent of the devastation they cause. Rebellion and terrorism as instruments of proxy war, civilian and paramilitary mercenaries, as well as the hybrid states of advanced states, combined with perceptual operations to control the minds of the masses, show almost all states as an asymmetrical threat in settled areas rather than in rural areas and even in regions which are considered safe zones (Kober, 2016). Today, national security enlarges the volume of national power elements in a two-way eclectic relationship, while at the same time it requires an international unity of understanding of its regional and international dynamics. On the one hand, the influence of politics in security practices has greatly increased as a result of the increase in the capacity of military units to take control of democratic systems and on the other hand, the capacity of civilian administrators to use troops for their political purposes due to the unlimited power they obtain.

Today, the concept of security has become a comprehensive issue that should be dealt with together with the elements of national power rather than a military a. For this reason, there is a symbiotic

relationship between a strong economy, a strong state, and a strong army. Education and economic development, innovation, and the production of high high-value-added are integral to each other. As a force multiplier in terms of difference and superiority, self-development is the main focus of the countries from design to production and strategy development to all decision-making systems (İbrahim, 2020). Due to the usage of security as a domestic and foreign instrument in the hands of civil administrations and more, it is acknowledged that issues such as human rights, environment, and economic sensitivity should not be limited to the domestic policies of states and harsh debates continue on the need for the identification of the limits of the state/public power for the identification of security policies as a provider for the citizens/individuals and security services in the application of security policies. So, nowadays there is also a strong debate on the determination of the boundaries of the state / public power (Weber, 2016). In the context of shaping the war and security environment, security in the present time has become a part of the security of energy and water resources and supplies, the control of refugees within the scope of transboundary threats, the fight against disasters and infectious diseases, the unregistered export and import of all kinds of small and light weapons, the storage of conventional weapons and ammunition. The struggle against maladministration in the context of inadequacies, uncontrolled proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and the threat of global security in the socio-cultural and educational context has been indisputably included in the concept of security. Therefore, all aspects of security have to be handled holistically.

The science and concept of national security administration have been heavily influenced by technological advances. In parallel with the developments in technology, national security gaps are also increasing. At this point, it is possible to produce weapons using three-dimensional printers, which will constitute one of the most important security gaps in the coming years. However, technological advances not only affect the weapon systems but the criteria for holistic steering and administration as well. On the one hand, technological advances allow for the reduction of security costs and the transfer of funds allocated for public welfare. On the other hand, by reducing the funds allocated for security management, smaller and more effective but lethal and destructive armed force structures emerge with the effect and contribution of technology and scientific developments. Today, the United Nations (UN), NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization), CSTO (Collective Security Treaty Organization), OSCE (Organization of Security and Cooperation in Europe), and other global and regional security organizations are taking greater initiatives to ensure security through the mechanisms they have established. In addition, the number and scale of military and civil initiatives and flexible coalition forces, and field missions in an ad hoc structure are also increasing. Such initiatives on a global and regional scale try to limit the self-centered security policies of the states and eliminate the concerns of the states that have security concerns. Potential conflicts in the international security system or possible conflicts are tried to be eliminated with the use of options other than military methods. However, regional and global conflicts continue and despite all kinds of international cooperation and alliances, the method continues to change.

In this study, within the framework of the explanations related to national security in the previous paragraphs, an examination of the different approaches to national security within the international relations discipline as on and post-cold war will be elaborated and summarized. In this context, an eclectic and analytical study will be presented about the factors and components which are related national security paradigms. So, in the following sections, national security approaches on and post-cold war will be explained, and then an evaluation will be made regarding postmodern national security approaches.

## **1. THE COLD WAR PERIOD**

The Cold War period describes the bipolar world order between the United States of America (USA) and the Soviet Union and its allies. The first bloc in which the USA and its allies are located is called the Western Bloc. The Soviet Union and its allies formed the second bloc (the Eastern bloc). During this period, countries that were not members of both blocs were called third-world countries (Judge, 2012). Ontologically, the state was taken to the center as the main component of security during the Cold War. The survival of states is based on military strength and the consolidation of their national security (Kiltz, 2011). This period is characterized by the classical understanding of security that clearly describes the sovereignty, status quo, and nuclear practice of the United States and the Soviet

Union, which are the defining actors of the bipolar system. The dominant views that left their mark on the bipolar era were shaped around the ideas of realism and neo-realism. During the Détente period (the period of the easing of Cold War tensions between the USA and the Soviet Union from 1967 to 1979), liberal and neo-Marxist schools criticized classical cold war theories and expanded the ground.

The main concern of the bipolar security world is that; the military rivalry between the superpowers and the rivalry has become nuclear rather than conventional. In the bipolar security world, socio-economic inequalities and mismanagement that threaten international security and trans-border security threats have not come to the agenda. The bipolar security understanding was so focused on the narrow understanding of the continuity of the conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union that countries other than NATO and the Warsaw Pact were described as Third World countries and they were pushed out of the security paradigms and focused or directed threats to Third World countries were also excluded. The harsh understanding of the security of the international system which was realized within the framework of anarchic structure that defined the absolute power, whose unit of analysis was the state and prioritized military power was gradually abandoned with the end of the cold war with the impact of globalization and the advances in communication and information technologies.

### **1.1. The Realist Security Approach**

The two main theories that describe the Cold War period are the Realist and Neo-Realist national security theories. The realist security theory is an approach that pragmatically expresses the concepts of security as observed. The realist theory handles the components of security independently of an idealist, axiological and normative approach and in a simple and self-centered approach. The Realist Theory is based on five assumptions (Buzan, 2008, pp. 107-123). These are as follows: Identifying the states as the main actor and in the center of the security paradigm, The international system of hegemonic countries has an anarchic structure based on uncertainty and some kind of jungle laws, In this anarchic order, states should endure, cooperate, and enter into conflicts of interest to realize their aims. Regarding this approach there is no harmonization exists between states, the existence of interests between states limits the power of other states, and states always need to maximize their interests, Assumptions that those wars are a part of the internal and external politics of states. Realism is like the human nature of states; it is hypothetical and ambitious. For this reason, according to realist theory in the international system, there is a constant struggle for the attainment of power. In this environment of uncertainty, states aim to gather power and use it for national interests. States need military power to consolidate their interests. In this sense, military power is the most decisive relative to manpower, trade, the economy, and all other power elements. It is certainly not possible to talk about absolute power here. According to realist theory, power is relative. The power balance paradigm expresses a constant search for security in the sense of preserving existing security. Machiavelli, in his work Prince, explains the situation of war and peace as a continuous union. According to him, states are either at war or preparing for war. According to Plato, there is no peace in the world, but a constant war environment prevails in the world. Morgenthau argues that the anarchic structure of the international system is the reason for the continued state of war.

According to the realist theory, the anarchic structure of the international system claims that states' military dominance, as well as their economic dominance and market superiority, are fundamental values to support their military power. This period was marked by the concept of balance of power that emerged as a result of relative power comparisons. The concept of balance of power essentially describes a foreign policy that prioritizes maintaining stability as a result of a comparison of activities. This implies that states unintentionally pose a threat to other states while increasing or balancing their relative power and therefore, trying to increase their military capacities by continuing their efforts to strengthen the international security system in a bilateral or multilateral manner. The reason for this is the perception of threats and potential threats by other states. In the literature, this is called the security dilemma (Rauchhaus, 2000). According to the realist view, it is not possible to establish a permanent balance of power between states. This is also the case for power focuses that have emerged as a result of alliances. Power balance is a dynamic and constantly evolving concept. It is not possible to achieve a permanent balance of powers. According to the realist view, power structuring can be aggressive based on a defense-based approach or a tendency towards continuous empowerment outside threat

perception. Because, according to realist thinking, the anarchic structure of the international security environment is based on the assumption that only the strong ones can survive and the more powerful ones can develop and expand the field of life with a changeable approach. In this respect, it can be stated that the realist theory is influenced by the theory of capitalism and evolution.

### **1.2. The Neo-Realist Security Approach**

The neo-realist security approach is based on the assumption that states such as realistic security perceptions act rationally to realize their interests and that the international environment has an anarchic structure. However, the neo-realist theory has placed not only the state but also the alliances and cooperation developed by states with other states at the center of their security approaches. According to the neo-realist security theory, the main factor determining the perceptions of the states, their military expenditures, their relations, and their cooperation with other states is the international security environment. The neo-realist security approach has adopted an approach that takes into account the international security environment in the production of security policies and aims to establish holistic and allied relative superiorities. According to neo-realist theory, each of the inner, immediate, and distant circles should not be considered independent of each other and should be considered holistically, rather than deeming one as a priority over the other. Neo-realists were influenced by the contingency theory when determining security policies. Just as a pawn has the ability of a vizier to gain the proper position in the game of chess, when the international security environment is well-read and attention is paid to the importance of the right kind of cooperation and not making contradictory moves in power balancing, the states can realize their national aims regardless to their power assets. Although neo-realist theorists (Kolasi, 2013, pp. 149-179) accept military power as the main component of power, they accept the contribution and symbiotic relations between economic power to military power. So, they enriched the realist theory by pointing out the strategic link between military power and economic goals, stating that economic power is undoubtedly important for the financing and maintenance of power. Neo-realists have an eclectic, structuralist point of view in terms of method. The neo-realist theory was influenced by conditionalist and behavioral theory in the social sciences and attempted to explain the anarchic structure of the international system from a structuralist perspective. Although the realist theory treats the international system only as a state-centered and interstate process, the neo-realist approach abandons the generalist approach and examines the relations between states, and evaluates the context.

### **1.3. The Security Approach of Liberal Theories**

The liberal theory represents a national security paradigm that places the individual at the center and emphasizes cooperation and solidarity by referring to the good side of human nature. This theory defines the state as the main responsible authority for the protection of citizens' security and freedom. According to the liberal theory it is regarded, analyzed, and taken into account in addition to the individual, the relationship of states with individuals and international organizations, multinational corporations, and non-governmental organizations. The liberal theory differs from the realist theory in the description of power and its components. According to the realist theory, while conservation of power balance and relative power considerations are the main factors in the adoption of security approaches, the liberal theory centers on the central axis of information, discourse, and perceptions that can be regarded as projections of reality rather than facts.

The liberal theory argues that conflict between states and the anarchic situation in the international security system arises not only from the fact that states are interested and opportunistic but from the pessimistic security perceptions created. The liberal theory (Keohane & Nye, 1987, pp. 725-753) argues that the anarchic perception of the international security system and the distrust between states is not a natural consequence; that the created reality is different and more optimistic than absolute reality; and that the problem is a systematic error. The theory emphasizes that to correct perceptions, it is necessary to establish a common ground for discussion of the projection of the international security system based on common benefits rather than interests. The liberal theory states that states do not always act rationally like humans and that assumptions about security build on rationality and constitute the paradox of absolute interest and security. The liberal theory argues that it is possible to break free from the paradox of absolute interest and security as a result of prioritizing gains by shifting conflicts. Liberal theory also rejects absolute rationality perceptions. By rejecting absolute rationality

perceptions, it assumes that the flattened and crooked structure of the international security system, which prepares the ground for conflict, can be replaced by international organizations and intergovernmental cooperation. The liberal theory claims that international control mechanisms, the establishment of judicial systems, and the construction of security norms, which are understood by all states in the same way, should be addressed before the conflict.

The liberal security theory means developing cooperation with other states to combat evil as a security system and individual, state, and collective security. According to liberal theory, the state is considered the main actor in the protection of the security of individuals, societies, states, and the international system in total. One of the most important differences between the liberal theory and the realist theory is that the realist theory has adopted the concept of absolute gain by which the parties can consolidate the interests of all sides and that the gain of one party will not be the absolute loss of the other, by changing the concept of zero-sum game theory, which is based on the argument that one side will prevail. This understanding encourages cooperation between states and emphasizes collective security understanding with a strong reference to international organizations. The liberal theory argues that institutionalization, transparency, good governance, and the strengthening of democratic institutions can be ensured in terms of security.

Functionalism, pluralism, and transnationalism theories are discussed within the scope of liberal theories. Functionalism (Sandıklı, 2012) deals with security studies on the axis of integration. According to functionalism, international mechanisms to be established by states will increase efforts to ensure security, and reduce misunderstandings and technical issues that can be handled without political pressure. It is claimed that the anarchic structure of the system will be terminated. It is precisely the practice of functionalist theory that the two states, Germany and France, who have perceived each other as a threat for many years and often have conflicts with each other, cooperate under the European Union and within the framework of common benefits. Of course, real-political and geo-strategic instruments have a critical position at this point. On the other hand, neo-functionalism (Sandıklı & Emeklier, 2012, pp. 3-71) states that the existing cooperation between the states will naturally create new cooperation, and that different clusters will be formed in the international security system as a result of the cooperation formed, and that each state will interact directly or indirectly with each other.

#### **1.4. The Neo-Marxist Security Approach**

The neo-Marxist conception of security differs from the others in the way it deals with the international system. According to the theory, the weak in the international security system have a unilateral and strong dependence on others. For this reason, the theory explains safety through the dependency model. The neo-Marxist conception of security (Birdişi, 2017) has a structure in which the international security system is based on the economy and the strong exploits against the weak. The inequality in inter-class conflict and sharing is the source of the conflicts; the existence of the system provides benefits in favor of developed and strong countries, and the system itself does not allow the strengthening of the weak. The theory claims that the international system in this state causes a spiral of insecurity. In this respect, the theory rejects the views of the liberal theory. The Marxist theory has taken social classes as the unit of analysis and explained security on the axis of class conflict and inequalities. However, the neo-Marxist theory considered the underdeveloped states as the unit of analysis and declared the elimination of the destructive influence of capitalism as the first condition for the preservation of security on the axis of the globalist imperialist conflict between the underdeveloped states and the revisionist expansionist countries.

According to the theory, there is a one-way relationship in favor of strong states between industrialized and imperialist states on a global scale and underdeveloped states in the world. According to the theory, the difference in development and prosperity between these two groups of state clusters is widening with each passing day. This situation is now becoming a threat to the security of hegemonic countries, which is referred to as the central generation. According to the theory, capital is constantly flowing from underdeveloped countries to developed countries. While underdeveloped countries have become consumer societies, their dependence on developed countries is increasing. The theory explains the level of development of states and the reasons for their lagging, together with the internal dynamics, of the skewed and flattened fiction of the international system.

According to the neo-Marxist theory, the substitution of the security of the developed states increases the insecurity of the underdeveloped countries due to the current distorted order, and this insecurity environment threatens the security of the developed countries. While the theory reveals the tension between central and surrounding generation states, in one aspect it reminds us of the anarchic order of the classic realist security paradigm. However, the state of continuous tension mentioned here and the described international security system are in a one-way and dependent relationship. However, according to the realist theory, the anarchic security environment is multifaceted and complex.

Neo-Marxist theory placed states at the center of the security paradigm and examined and criticized states, social classes, and aspects of relations with developed states and capitalist systems. Thus, the neo-Marxist theory did not treat security as purely security, but studied it interdisciplinary and eclectically with the social quality of life, fair sharing, and economic development. In this respect, Neo-Marxist theory involves critical approaches to security. From the Neo-Marxist point of view, the School of Addiction argues that the problem of international security stems from the paradox between underdeveloped and highly developed countries. For this reason, a single form of struggle against governments in countries, which are over-enriched despite the people and hold power in an absolute manner, is inevitably united when revolution is in question. On the other hand, a relatively soft branch of the school argues that the revolution of the sociological problems posed by the paradox between more development, extreme prosperity, and misery will create another problematic issue; yet the dominant environment will change. But the oppressed and unfair share cannot change. For this reason, this school contends that the problem can be overcome with an international perspective, with the contributions and efforts of the developed countries and the radical changes in the international economic system. Therefore, it also has a revolutionary and evolutionary character in the theory.

## 2. POST-COLD WAR PERIOD

With the developments in technology, communication, and information technologies, the globalization process, which can be defined as the increase of the permeability of the political borders of the states and the collapse of the Berlin Wall, it was thought that a bipolar international security system ended (Ripsman & Paul, 2010). For this reason, we can talk about a multipolar system in which regional powers play an important role. The multipolar international security system was built on the thesis that international organizations and mechanisms would play a greater role in the establishment and maintenance of international safety and security, which meant more peace. In this respect according to the general opinion of international security experts, there would be no more conventional military clashes and combats between the superpowers. The ambiguity of the line of separation between the internal and external borders of security has resulted in the use of security as internal political material. In parallel, the distinction between police and military force has become ambiguous. In this context, the state of security has evolved not only within the borders of the country but also cross-border in addition to military methods, even to military methods, to fight crime and police methods. This necessitated the adaptation of military structures to police methods. In this context, it is possible to say that today the security approach is directed towards the adoption of comprehensive methods of combat, especially with the police, together with military methods against both internal and external threats.

Today, the understanding of security is becoming increasingly transnational in terms of the nature of the threat and necessitates international cooperation of the states as the actors are quantitatively increased and qualitatively different. Today, the concept of security, conflict, and problems in the solution and the establishment of peace, in addition to military methods in a comprehensive way; non-traditional security components such as economic development, non-military approaches such as increasing the average life level, functional cooperation in specific problem areas, multiple integrations in terms of economic and security, necessitate the creation of several strategies. However, how much of this prediction has been made after the Cold War era is a matter of debate. Because immediately after the end of the Cold War period, many regional conflicts and finally the attacks of September 11 resulted in developments that deeply changed the security dynamics of international relations, the existing alliance system, threat perceptions, and the components of security. During this period, a dynamic international security system emerged, which was reminiscent of the anarchic environment described by realist security theorists. Consequently, it evoked an environment of

insecurity and uncertainty and the need to redefine alliance and threat definitions. This period was marked by diversity and unpredictability in security paradigms and policies. Thus, the national security theories of the Cold War and the transition period, the widening and deepening of the scope and extent of the threats and risks, were subjected to heavy criticism because the analysis unit became integrated on a scale that included the global system from state-based policies. A paradigm shift has occurred and the concept of security has been redefined. In this context, in the post-Cold War period, power and security phenomena were re-explained and the state-based security approach was expanded. With the contributions of critical, postmodern, feminist, and constructivist theories, the classical security paradigm has been replaced.

### **2.1. The Critical Security Approach**

The critical approach questioned the post-Cold War international security system in the context of power and security and redefined the eclectic point of view by rejecting the concept of centralized security. Critical theory has expanded the components of security. According to the theory, security cannot be handled with a deterministic approach, because expectations and relationships, regardless of the starting point, can completely change the whole security process and its consequences. The theory sought to establish a relationship between interest and threat perception. It did not accept wholesaler approaches to the protection of interests and perceptions of threat. The critical theory (Bohman and Rehg, 2017) criticized wholesaler approaches in terms of creating tautological and virtual threat and security perceptions and the lack of cooperation between military-civilian and natural resources. The theory ruled out all kinds of rhetoric and stereotypical rhetoric in the production of security, which ideologically focused solely on military issues, shifting social and psychological parameters, and producing easy policies through the dissipation of national interests.

According to this theory (Kolasi, 2014) the expansion of democratic practices, entering armies under the control of civilian authority and developing their contributions to the civilian political authorities, and increasing control of democratic institutions in the international security system do not eliminate the option of using force in the solution of problems and only contributes to the legitimization of the option of using force. The theory points out that the use of force by a civil or military authority does not make a difference in terms of its consequences. According to theory, this legitimacy considers the protection of security with national interests. However, the primary duty of the state should be to protect the security of its citizens. Critical theory has redefined the phenomena of power and security. The theory argues that classical descriptions are made from the point of view of power centers and developed states and that the present definitions aim to legitimize the policies of powerful states rather than providing solutions to problems and non-conflict. Thus, hegemonic countries have paradoxically been criticized for their right to resort to force with a unilateral understanding to ensure the peace of the international security system.

The critical theory accepts the decisions of competent authorities for international acceptance and legitimacy. But criticizes the veto right of the permanent members of the United Nations Security Council for legitimizing the tutelage of the sovereign powers. The critical theory supports a pluralistic understanding of the United Nations, in which the weak are taken into account, for the establishment of universal peace. The United Nations, in particular, is subject to heavy criticism for its interest, selective and distinctive preferences of Russia, the United States, Britain, France, and China, which are Permanent Members of the Security Council. Of course, the whole world can not be represented by only five privileged countries. There has been intense debate about the need to reorganize the UN Security Council because South American, African, and Middle Eastern countries are not represented in permanent member status and at least one Islamic state should be represented in the permanent council. At this point, of course, it is a matter of separate debate on which Islamic country can take place in the UN Permanent Council, representing other Islamic countries. The main reason for the debates at this point is the use of international relations as internal political material to keep governments away from universal law, democratic standards, and economic prosperity. According to the critical theory, the security phenomenon cannot be dealt with only in the military context and with the view of the sovereign powers, security policies cannot be built on pure rationality, interactions and intentions must be considered, and the concept of security should be considered in an eclectic way, leaving the majority system of the international security system and leaving the pluralist structure and



taking into account the weak and the security holistically and comprehensively.

## **2.2. The Feminist Security Approach**

From a normative perspective, the feminist theory describes an idealistic international security system. It is a theory that criticizes modern assumptions, puts women at the center, and tries to explain them from an epistemological perspective. The feminist theory (Buzan, 2015) does not address the international security system as an anarchic and confrontational, male-centered, interest-centered, sovereign, rational environment. but with a view that places security on a human-based and human-centered axis, with no racial, gender-oriented, or class differences. The theory is axiological in this aspect. The feminist theory rejects all the classical views that explain security as the use of force alone. According to the theory, the use of force is only a final result of insecurity. The main causes of insecurity are mismanagement, economic underdevelopment, human rights violations, and the devaluation and loss of women and children as a fundamental components of society. In this context, the feminist theorists, referring to the insecurity of the current international insecurity system, argue that women and children suffer the most in the Bosnian, Afghanistan, and Iraq Wars, the Arab Spring, Russian Ukrania invasion, and thus that the survival of women and children should be placed on the central axis of security. The international security perception of the feminist theory, like the post-modern theory, excludes the othering and contrasting approach that explains everything in contradiction. The theory explains security through a gender dichotomy instead of contrasting it and provides an axiological perspective.

## **2.3. The Constructivist Security Approach**

In the theory of Constructivism (Buzan, 2015); power and security are discussed in terms of economic processes and relations, innovative discoveries, the ambiguity of political boundaries as a result of globalization, intercultural interaction, ethnic, sectarian, and ideological norms, convergence between state assets and society (Friedman, 2000). The theory of constructivism focuses on the concepts of power and security and refers to social and cultural realities. It explains perceptions of threats and international security by imposing more meaning on abstract and human values, which the realist theory does not pay enough attention to. The theory interprets the international security system in a pluralistic and compartmentalized manner and this respect reminds Huntington's arguments regarding civilization. In this context, Huntington considered the international security system as a basin of civilization by placing cultural and identity differences on the central axis in his work called *The Clash of Civilizations* (Huntington, 1993, pp. 22-49; Huntington, 1996). The theory of constructivism placed the knowledge of identity at the center of the concepts of power and security; highlighted the historicity between security and threat perceptions and identity, and emphasized the importance of socio-cultural values in explaining the concept of security (Ang, et al., 2016).

So, the theory of constructivism (Waewer, 2008, pp. 51-178) states that the intention and methods of using military capacity are more important than the potential military capacity, together with the comparative power comparisons in the international security system, rather than the impression that states give about the use of their existing capacities and the way they deal with the problems. Therefore, the theory sees the creation of societies with good governance and quality of life and ethics, and values. When the constructivism theory is examined in the historical process of security perceptions, it is stated that a threat and security perception can be detected through identities and belonging, states are the main determinants in threat perceptions and seeking alliances, making racial, religious, and sectarian, cultural definitions of friends and enemies. Here, assumptions that mature in the historical process play a key role in how states define themselves and what other states have accumulated about themselves. According to the theory, racial, religious, and sectarian identity differences were the main factors in the loss and disintegration of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia after the Cold War. The aggressive attitude of the Russian Federation toward Eastern Ukraine and Crimea, the annexation of Crimea and the Donbas region, and the military invasion of Ukraine can be evaluated in this context. At this point, it was significant to point out that Russia had suspended the agreement of the "Conventional Forces in Europe" (CFE) Treaty in 2016 (Kingston, 2016).

## **2.4. The Copenhagen School Security Approach**

The Copenhagen School was influenced by political philosophy and contributed to the concepts of power and security through multidimensional and comprehensive approaches in the ontological and

epistemological context. The Copenhagen school approach has brought a critical perspective to the reality of national security issues by addressing security as a created perception, addressing the difference between national security reality and perception, and addressing security, not holistically, based on environment, politics, and society, economy, military sectors. The theory considers security to be a phenomenon that needs to be addressed within a certain context. In this way, the school conceptualized security by bringing state assets together with society to the central axis. According to the Copenhagen school approach, states are not abstract entities, which are made up, of other than societies. So, the Copenhagen School (Buzan, 2015) considered the state as the main actor of the international security system as a phenomenon that aims to realize its common interests, protect its gains and consolidate its existence with a pluralistic approach, which is brought about by the collective energy of individuals who are striving to maintain their social integrity. With this aspect, the school has attempted to conceptualize states that are crackling and exposed to disintegration complications by imposing flesh. The theory only sought to find a way out between approaches that tried to empower the individual against the state assets themselves. In some way, it endeavored to form a synthesis of international relations theories during and after the Cold War. Therefore, it adopts a liberal, structuralism, and constructive approach.

The Copenhagen School expanded its security concept components by adding economic, environmental, and social dimensions to military and political instruments. According to the school, political and military security is the sum of the defense and offensive forces of the states. Following their perceptions of security and their real policies, states form their military capacities in a combination of assault and defense. The theory considers economic power as a fundamental force for international cooperation and military power. According to the school, social security is concerned with the ability of the state to create synergy with its composition, cultural background, and identities, and not to create sensitivity. Environmental security, on the other hand, is concerned with the protection of nature, with a global collective understanding, and with leaving a livable world to future generations. In this respect, the school is theoretically opposed to weapons of mass destruction and nuclear armament.

The Copenhagen School criticizes the decisive role of hegemonic countries in the international security system, emphasizing the importance of maintaining societies and their identities and maintaining their security, and bringing the security approach to the economic, social, and environmental aspects. In this respect, the theory expands and changes the concept of state in terms of the parameters it should be taken into consideration. Security perceptions also change from society, economy, and environment-centered perspectives. Because the international security system has a dynamic structure due to its multidimensional components, the variables that have a decisive importance in the perception of threats and the formation of security strategies change over time. A previously non-threatened phenomenon may be perceived as a threat or vice versa. This is described as security exclusion.

The Copenhagen School provides a critical perspective on the concept of security; it defines security in the context of national and international security and with the concepts of the regional regional security aspects to determine the boundaries and relations of national and international security. According to the school, the security paradigm is shaped by national and international security strategies and the regional aspects together. All three have a dynamic and symbiotic relationship with each other. It is not possible to recognize each of them separately. For this reason, the school considers regional security relations from a holistic perspective in the context of power analysis, historical, values, and motives of society.

In defining the international security system, the Copenhagen School considers not only states but also relations between states, international organizations, alliances, and cooperation in a global context. The Copenhagen school has changed the concept of center and periphery country perception by criticizing the understanding of the classical perceived central Europe phenomenon. In defining the regional level and security, the theory not only approaches the issue from a geographic and geo-strategic perspective but also emphasizes the perceptions of doubt and fear that emerge in historical relations between states. According to the school, rather than geographical proximity, the perception of threats and security are more determinative in the formation of regions, and it is not possible to

define a certain region by only geographical criteria.

### **2.5. The Aberystwyth Security Approach**

Unlike the Copenhagen school of Aberystwyth, this approach was interested in how security was used as a political instrument. The Aberystwyth School has expanded and deepened the concept of security through conceptual studies. The theory criticized security by considering it as a real political axis; in fact, it was derived from the fact that security was predominantly handled by domestic political motives and argued that it was an instrumentalist concept for accruing national interests. According to the school (Booth, 2012), security approaches should be handled with a perspective of reality and constructiveness within the political framework, because it is more possible for governments that produce security-oriented policies to consolidate the power of their governments. In countries where security is used as an internal political argument by considering functionality, freedoms are restricted and societies are separated and marginalized. The exaltation of security policies against freedoms puts countries in an inexorable security spiral by delaying the demands for economy and freedom. Whereas a society that is free and prosperous essentially means a safe society.

### **2.6. The Postmodern Security Concept**

The postmodern theory criticized the method of critical theory to explain the concepts of power and security with its opponents and attempted to explain the security phenomenon through Cartesian thought, philosophy of science methods, and anthropology. The post-modern theory has reexamined the concept of security with the technique of meta-analysis, questioned traditional judgments, and tried to rebuild and explain its dimension and scope in the light of the concepts of globalization and modernity. The post-modern theory criticizes modernity for its marginalization and it is consistently considered that the concepts of anarchy-order, war-peace, threat-friend, strong-weak, good-bad, realist-idealist should be dealt with exclusively based on contradictions in terms of facilitation (McGlinchey, et al., 2017).

The post-modern theory emphasizes that the components, scope, and extent of security cannot be handled independently of the dynamics of the international environment and that paradigm shifts and concepts in the external environment should be considered (Mimiko & Oluwafemi, 2012). This theory claims that under the influence of globalization, classical perceptions have lost their certainty and that perceptions of threats and the nature of alliances have become ambiguous (Friedman, 2005).

The criticisms of the post-modern approach to modern assumptions can be summarized in two parts. The first is that the international security system is considered from the perspective of western/powerful states, which translates the interests and values of the non-Western powerless states. According to the post-modern approach, the importance and problems attributed to the receiving and emigration states of migration, the mediation, subjective and one-way perspective are remarkable. It is stated that the number of security by sovereign and powerful states, decrease of permeability between reality and virtuality; loss of importance of geography and borders, and the decrease of security for hegemonic countries on the one hand, and the decrease for others, on the other hand, reveal the paradox. In this respect, the postmodern theory also supports the pluralistic and individualistic approaches of the critical theory to security.

## **3. SUMMARY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS THEORIES AND PARADIGMS**

The post-cold war world has experienced many changes, not only in practical terms but also in the theoretical sphere. One of the significant paradigm shifts that took place was in the traditional meaning of security. The traditional meaning of security is state-centric, it means that the territory of the state needs to be protected against any hostile attack. It can also be seen as protection from external threats (Ahmed & Syed, 2019). The theories of international relations define international security conceptions differently. Realism still dominates international relations through its new versions. According to realist philosophy, if war is in their national interest the states will go to war and if cooperation is in their interest, they will cooperate with the other states. Neorealism, the branch of realism claims that there is no change in the world after the end of the cold war, power is still the main entity in international relations and this power structure is due to the anarchical structure of the international system and they still question the international system that it is still anarchic and there is constant competition among the states. On the other hand, Marxism is another mainstream theory of

international relations. According to them, the definition of security is determined by the structure of global capitalism. Constructivist schools of thought to be gained popularity after the end of the cold war. It addresses the issue of identity, security, and material issues in the contemporary world. Constructivists do not consider security as an objective reality. They view security as being constructed and re-constructed through intersubjective human understanding and the focus shifts from materialism to pure ideas. For constructivists, the concept of security is broad as they say that nothing is true or false, it's the perception of the observer of how he/she perceives that particular point. In this regard as Alexander Wendt said that anarchy is what states make of it, and the same can be said about security (Jackson & Sorensen, 2013). Along with constructivists, it is important to mention the Copenhagen school, which is framed on the thoughts of Barry Buzan. In 1983, Barry Buzan highlighted that the concept of security includes military, economic, social, and environmental security. This school of thought mainly highlights securitization (MacKenzie, 2010, pp. 151-167). It conceptualizes security as a process of the social construction of threat which includes securitizing actors who will declare that a particular threat is present which needs to be handled, this situation will be presented to the audience and if they accept it, the actors will have the legitimacy to act against that threat. This is how an issue is securitized. This is an interesting way of defining security (Sulović, 2010 pp. 1-7).

There is another significant lens to view security through critical theory. Their focus is on how the institutions and relations evolved and how they can be altered. This theory shifts the focus from the state to the individual. It envisions the freedom and liberty of individuals. When the focus is shifted to individuals, we have feminist theories. There are four strands of feminist theories, and all emphasize the fact that the current security studies have been fashioned and put into practice by males, and females have been excluded from them. If women are included in defining security, the World could be more peaceful. From Feminist theory, we move to post-modern security studies. This approach, like the critical studies, shifts the focus of security from state to non-state actors, from individuals to ethnic and cultural groups, and regional blocs. The subject matter of international relations is still evolving and the concept of security is one example of it, which is a contested concept. With the change in the geopolitical environment, contemporary theories have given their definition of security which moves away from the traditional state-centric concept of security. Contemporary international relations theories have given unconventional definitions of security which is a major development in the studies of international relations.

#### **4. POSTMODERN ASPECTS OF NATIONAL SECURITY**

Today, security threats are evolving and changing in size (Waewer, 2008). The development of nuclear, biological and chemical weapons and their launching platforms, the frequent use of ballistic and cruise missiles, insurrection and terrorism as an instrument of proxy war, rhetorical and covert operations that foster and support social segregation and dissolution, transnational crimes, human and arms smuggling, fictitious exports and money laundering, financing of international terrorism, the threat of immigration, cyber terrorism, security of energy transmission lines, environmental problems and epidemics are the main threats. Thus, the threat has changed in scale and dimension with the end of the bipolar world and the effect of globalization. For this reason, a multinational, holistic view is required for the solution of the problematic. That's why it is needed a different and solution-oriented perspective and practice that takes into account all the elements and dimensions of the threat. Due to the fact that the threats are an area of struggle of transboundary and regional power centers on an increasing scale, the integration and fragmentation processes that accelerated in the post-cold war period threaten the sovereignty of states.

In this context, military and political security have evolved in a symbiotic relationship , and the permeability between domestic and foreign politics has increased. According to this understanding, states are under constant threat and the primary purpose of states is to protect their assets. This approach engages states around a vicious circle of security concerns. States whose aim is to protect the survival of the state and increase the welfare level of their citizens, on the one hand, become authoritarian in order to maintain their sovereignty, and thus display an attitude that postpones welfare for their people.

On the other hand globalization, developments in communication and information technologies,

economic inequality, and the clarification of sub-identities, and conflicts become regionalized and globalized (Gurcan, 2012). As a result of globalization; while national states are losing their importance, supranational companies and institutions are getting stronger. Power, capital and knowledge are collected in certain hands and dispersed to the world. Centralism is gradually being replaced by decentralization. All these developments also affect national security concepts, doctrines. So, conventional warfare techniques have been replaced by proxy wars, which necessitate the use of special warfare and conventional operations concepts and doctrines together. Today, proxy wars, as a component of the blurred war concept, have blurred the battlefields and provided the super-powers with the opportunity to carry out preventive military operations for their self-defense far beyond their borders (Rothschild, Buzan, & Hansen, 2007). Thus, military conflicts have become more global. Economic and political stability has become an important parameter of national security. However, these ongoing conflicts are triggered by the superpowers to open up new life spaces for them. In essence, these conflicts are nothing but proxy wars. The only antidote to all global-scale conventional and unconventional conflicts is the building of democratic bridges between states and a fair distribution, the use of regional resources for the welfare of the people of the region.

## 5. DISCUSSION

Certainly, the stories are as important as the original events. Because, facts and perceptions are not always consistent with each other, statements and judgments do not coincide with justice, because not every statement is a provision, and not every provision is justice itself. There cannot be a fictional truth that satisfies someone. The positive one loses its credibility as it moves away from the normative. In this respect, social science is an effort to explain the existing phenomena by objective criteria and to put forward the existing ones. The normative approach is essentially a coherent unity of analysis and integration. If one of these remains incomplete, the recipe changes, and a logical and uniform result cannot be achieved (Wolfers, 1952, pp. 481-502). The national security debates should not be stuck in the trap of self-purposed tautological propositions, airy but hollow or raw discourses that present personal desires and aspirations as strategy, which consider all issues solely by the prejudices of their environment. The fact that the explanation of something is based on other arguments and becomes more complex than it makes the ground of discussion blurred, puts the discussions into an inextricable, complex situation. All propagandist claims and propositions in essence push discussions into the pit of conspiracy theories and tautological traps. Social events, especially peace, war, and security issues, never take place on a linear plane in a sequence easily understood in terms of flow. Situations in the world can never be considered as zero or one like in computer programs. Nothing is black or white. By its very nature, the security environment has a complex identity, a differential equation with many unknowns, developed by a circular loop. The actors of national security are as diverse as states, as well as international organizations, cliques, religious and ethnic communities, non-governmental organizations, and global and local business circles (Edwards, 2007). The motives that cause the events are very high cultural, religious, historical, interest, and so on (Ekblad, 2011, pp. 107-141). For this reason, it is very important to understand the motives and the actors involved in the equation that cause the events to take place. Every detail that appears to be insignificant can be critical in explaining events.

National security discussions are always critical to maintaining objectivity. Because the fact that national security debates are separated from the context of national security by an opportunist approach and pushed into the trap of internal political debates by manipulative evaluations is transformed into a means of recruitment of votes for the political mechanism is a major national security problem in itself (Rothschild, et al., 2007). Addressing national security debates as an internal political instrument may cause the question to be perceived unquestionably and mislead the acceptance of the propositions as false truths. The consequences of such an understanding can cause irreparable damage. In this way, national security is transformed into a domestic political material, which is one aspect that leads to the misleading of the false strategic choices as the dominant paradigm, thus subtracting them from the context of domestic political interests to become a 'national issue'. In essence, these kinds of security policies derogated from the context are a demolition project, a subcontractor of imperial, hegemonic order, and the prisoner of a tutelary mentality. They are the reason for a great mind is marginalized and punished by betraying all different and justified criticisms. Therefore, national security should never be made part of the populist internal political debate and

absurd, irrational national security concerns and reflexes should not be allowed to put the state mind into hypnosis. The bonding of national security debates and the masking of domestic political mistakes through national security debates are a project of betrayal by themselves. Because the consequences of pushing national security practice into the trap of populism as an internal political instrument can sometimes be very severe and destructive. Applying national security practice to domestic politics, using it as a cover to neutralize democratic institutions, can cause all the resources and opportunities of a given country to be destroyed by a domino effect (McGlinchey, 2022).

In national security debates, rationality always orders to be confident and to be cautious. In the national security debate, chauvinist and enthusiastic rhetoric may create some kind of partial enthusiasm for the public for a while, but the effect continues until they face the truth. It is perceived as an indicator of weakness in the international arena. A baseless chauvinism isolates a country, moves it away from the level of democracy and law, and turns it into an authoritarian state. These kinds of authoritarian countries, on the other hand, are always susceptible to more foreign interventions and operations in economic, diplomatic, and military terms. John Maynard Keynes, the author of the book “Money, Interest Employment and the architect of the liberal economic theory”, the Keynesian economic model after the Great Depression of 1929 makes the following conclusion about economics: “If the issue is economy and there are three economists, there are normally three different approaches, if one of them is Keynes himself, then there are at least four different views” (Snowdon & Vane, 2006). Some of Keynes’s views on the economy, who is one of the pioneers of critical perspectives and continuous observation in the scientific world, are accepted by some as indisputable truths, which reveal the gravity of bigotry (Skinner, 1998). Even all the propositions and theories put forward in the national security debate are at best a true projection of the truth. But they are never absolute truths.

Debates in the field of national security management without taking sides, consecration, and condemning them to absence can only be guiding and the rest is propaganda (Jervis, 1997). If the greatest mistake for a human being is to deceive himself, the most disastrous situation for society is that society itself always believes in its lies. For this reason, national security should be concerned with approaches that are disconnected from reality, trying to substitute individuals’ subconscious, mind backgrounds, or expectations in a fantastic way. National security debates are not absolute and objective, but relative to time, place, and subject. Enmity or empathic engagement blinds perceptions. Essentially, in all disciplines of the social sciences, all ontological processes are subjectively limited by the capacity of a person to accurately understand himself and his environment. In the national security debate, simple answers such as yes and no and the incidence of events occurring in the event sequence cannot be considered linear certainty. Therefore, scholastic deterministic approaches are not accepted in national security debates. Scholastic deterministic approaches cause issues to be simplified with precise judgments and a reductionist approach. Minimalist approaches necessarily distract from the plane of reality in the realization of aspects of national security. Perhaps rhetoric and the masses can be brought together for a while, but success cannot be achieved with rhetoric that is disconnected from reality and what is fantastic (McGlinchey, 2017).

The current climate of security has changed holistically, leading to changes in the dimensions of war and general security administration. Change in structures within the security concepts is an aspect that gives a new dimension to the security environment (Baylis, et al., 2011). The tidal wave of change has led to a restructuring of positions in security administrators. The old systems are continually adopting new systems. However, the need to adopt these changes comes with its obstacles. The process of restructuring security concepts is long and rigorous. It also requires a lot of time to implement and standardize all aspects of national security practitioners to the newly amended changes. This shift may lead to the loss of jobs in adopting new structures. The process may also cost the government a lot of taxpayers’ money at the expense of harsh economic times.

## 6. CONCLUSION

As a result of this study, mainstream approaches related to national security in the discipline of international relations were depicted, and an evaluation of the different approaches to national security within the international relations discipline was elaborated and summarized as of the cold war era and after. In this context, factors and components which are affecting national security paradigms were mentioned. So in this study, international relations theories and paradigms, epistemological and

ontological distinction, the Cold War period, and the post-Cold War period were dealt with under the two main headings, conclusions, international security system description, the concept of power and power struggle, the state and state as a unit of analysis actors, capacity to explain events and hold projections for the future, international cooperation, and reality and ambiguity. The international relations paradigm of the Cold War period tried to explain the international security system through ideologies in general and based its perception of security on a simple, realistic, anarchic environment that expresses the state's inability to dominate other states and puts the state and military power at the center.

In summary, the realist theory, excluding idealistic optimism, has centered on real political and national interests developed by the concepts of a hierarchical balance of power based on the interstate power balance and super-powers and conceptualized the perception of security from the window of existence and living in confidence (Fearon, 1995, pp. 379-414). The Cold War security approaches are mainly explained from the perspective of power balance and common security. During this period, the understanding of security focused on balancing the power struggle of states with other states that they thought threatened their national security, and if this was not possible, by creating alliances, the relative power of the respondent state was reduced. In this respect, Cold War-era international relations theories are a summary of power balance and power struggles. However, during the bipolar world order of the Cold War period, with the Détente period, steps were taken on the disarmament between the two superpowers and the restriction of nuclear weapons, and with the effect of liberalism, in addition to military methods, an approach that refers to the soft power elements of international struggle has been subjected to a romantic tendency to be maintained (Nye, 2004). Nevertheless, despite these breezes, which can be expressed as a liberal movement, the world has never experienced conflict.

The post-Cold War security paradigm, on the other hand, describes an approach that refers to the dynamic structure of the international security system and adds social structures, identities, and universal values and norms to the state-based security approaches. The post-Cold War security paradigm rather focuses on national security from the perspective of interdependence. This paradigm deals with the issue of unconventional threats such as control of energy and energy corridors, environmental problems, population movements, smuggling, transboundary terrorism, the use of space and sea, and religious and ideological radicalism. In this regard, the issue should not only be valued for the national security of a state, but rather for the security of the countries of the region and the whole region in general. According to the Post-Cold war security paradigms, there are no permanent and unchanging interests. As a result of the dynamic nature of the international security system, international norms also change and this change provides an interaction from center to center. Economic interdependence and socio-cultural relations both promote inter-state cooperation and contribute to non-conflict.

After the Cold War, especially the concept of a sovereign hierarchical balance of power has been questioned and soft balancing policies have been adopted against super-powers. Unfortunately, terrorism has also been effectively used as a soft power-balancing tool in this process. Again during this period, the contribution and usefulness of international organizations to peace were questioned and the search for bilateral military and security cooperation increased during this period. This period was marked by the distinction between democratic and non-democratic, well-governed, and other states. As a result of the democratic socialization of well-governed states, it can be stated that healthy working institutions contribute to peace and that undemocratic states provide negative feed to the international security system due to their aggressive and revisionist policies.

## References

- Ahmed, F. and Syed, A. (2020). International relations theories and security. *Modern Diplomacy*, 5(1), 1-7.
- Ang, L. Isar, Y. R. and Mar, P. (2016). *Cultural diplomacy: beyond the national interest*. Routledge.
- Bails, J. (2008). The concept of security in international relations. *International Relations*, 5(18), 69-85.

- Baylis, J. Smith, S. and Owens, P. (2011). *The globalization of world politics: an introduction to international relations*. Oxford University Press.
- Birdişi, F. (2017). *International security in theory and practice concepts-theory-practice*. Seçkin Publishing.
- Bohman, J. and Rehg, W. (2017). *Jürgen habermas*. The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy.
- Booth, K. (2012). *World security theory*. Küre Publications.
- Buzan, B. (2008). The changing agenda of military security. *International Relations*, 5 (18), 107-123.
- Buzan, B. (2015). *People, states, and fear: agenda for international security studies in the post-cold war era*. relay academic publishing.
- Edwards, C. (2007). The case for national security. *Demos Report*.
- Ekbladh, D. (2011). Present at the creation: Edward Mead Earle and the depression-era origin of security studies. *International Security*, 36 (3), 107-141.
- Fearon, J. (1995), Rationalist explanations for war. *International Organization*. 49, 379-414.
- Friedman, T.L. (2000). *The lexus and the olive tree*. HarperCollins Publishers.
- Friedman, T.L. (2005). *The world is flat: a brief history of the globalised world in the twenty-first century*. Allen Lane.
- Huntington, S. (1993). The clash of civilizations. *Foreign Affairs*, 72 (3), 22– 49.
- Huntington, S. (1996). *The clash of civilizations and the remaking of world order*. Simon & Schuster.
- İbrahim, T. (2020). *Opinion -non-military threats and the limits of national security*. E-International Relations.
- Jackson, R. and Sorensen, G. (2013). *Introduction to international relations*. Oxford University Press.
- Jervis, R. (1997). *System effects: complexity in political and social life*. Princeton University Press.
- Judge, E. H. (2012). *The cold war: a global history with documents*. Prentice Hall.
- Keohane, R. O. and Nye, J. S. (1987). Power and interdependence by international organization. *MIT Press Stable*. 41(4), 725-753.
- Kiltz, L. (2011). The challenges of developing a homeland security discipline to meet future threats to the homeland. *Journal of Homeland Security and Emergency Management*, 8(2).1-24.
- Kingston, R. (2016). *Russia completes CFE treaty suspension*. [http://www. Russia Completes CFE Treaty Suspension | Arms Control Association](http://www.RussiaCompletesCFETreatySuspension|ArmsControlAssociation).
- Kober, S. (2016). *The changing nature of war: is a philosophy of doubt the better counsel in deciding to go to war?* The Globalist. [http://www. The Changing Nature of War - The Globalist](http://www.TheChangingNatureofWar-TheGlobalist).
- Kolasi, K. (2013). Peaceful end of the cold war and theories of international relations. *University Journal of Social Sciences*, 68 (2), 149 -179.
- Kolasi, K. (2014). *Critical theory and security: security for whom? international security theoretical evaluations*. Tarcan Printing House.
- Kuhn, S. T. (1982). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Alan Publishing.
- MacKenzie, M. (2010). Securitization and de-securitization: female soldiers and the reconstruction of women in post-conflict Sierra Leone, in gender and international security: feminist



- perspectives. *Security Studies*, 18(2), 241-261. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09636410902900061>
- McGlinchey, S. (2022). *Foundation of international relations*. Bloomsbury.
- McGlinchey, S., Walters, R. and Scheinflug, C. (2017). *International relations theory*. E-International Relations.
- McGlinchey, S. (2017). *International relations*. E-International Relations.
- Mimiko, N. and Oluwafemi, N. (2012). *Globalization: the politics of global economic relations and international business*. Carolina Academic Press.
- Nye, J. (2004). *Soft power: the means to success in world politics*. Public Affairs Ltd.
- Rothschild, E. Buzan, B. and Hansen L. E. (2007). *What is security?* Sage Publications Ltd.
- Ryakhovskaya, A. (2014). Transformation of crisis management in crisis. *Management Business Jour*, 2, 102.
- Sandıklı, A. (2012). *Security, war, peace and conflict Solutions in the light of theories*. Bilge Adam Center for Strategic Research.
- Sandıklı, A. and Emeklier, B. (2012). Change and transformation in security approach, security in the light of theories, war, peace and conflict solutions. *Istanbul Bilge Adam Strategic Research Center Publications*, 3-71.
- Skinner, Q. (1998). *Liberty before liberalism*. Cambridge University Press.
- Snowdon, B. and Vane, H. R. (2006). *Modern macroeconomic*. Edward Elgar.
- Sulović, V. (2010). Meaning of security and theory of securitization. *Belgrade Centre of Security Policy*, 1-7.
- Ripsman, Norrin M. and Paul, T. V. (2010). *Globalization and the national security state*. Oxford University Press.
- Waever, O. and Flockhart, T. (2014). Cooperative security: a new concept? DIIS report. *Danish Institute for International Studies*.
- Waever, O. (2008). The changing agenda of social security. *International Relations*, 5(18), 51-178.
- Weber, C. (2016). *Queer international relations*. Oxford University Press.
- Wolfers, A. (1952). National security as an ambiguous symbol. *Political Science Quarterly*, 67, 481-502.

**Sorumlu Yazar / Corresponding Author:** Dr. Murat ŞENGÖZ

**Çatışma Beyanı / Conflict Statement:** Yazar bu çalışma ile ilgili taraf olabilecek herhangi bir kişi ya da finansal ilişkisinin bulunmadığını, herhangi bir çıkar çatışmasının olmadığını beyan etmiştir.

**Etik Beyanı / Ethical Statement:** Yazar bu makalede "Etik Kurul İzni"ne gerek olmadığını beyan etmiştir.

**Destek ve Teşekkür / Support and Thanks:** Yazar bu çalışmada herhangi bir kurum ya da kuruluştan destek alınmadığını beyan etmiştir.

Yayımlanan makalede araştırma ve yayın etiğine riayet edilmiş; COPE (Committee on Publication Ethics)'nin editör ve yazarlar için yayımlanmış olduğu uluslararası standartlar dikkate alınmıştır.

