

PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt / Egyptology

THE ROLE OF LIBERALISM IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS OF NATIONS

*Mohammad Hossein Nejati*¹

¹ Master Degree International Relations, Faculty of Law and Political Science, Allameh Tabataba'i University, Dehkadeh Square, Olympic Village, Tehran, Iran.
mh_nejati1990 @ yahoo.com

Mohammad Hossein Nejati: The Role of Liberalism in International Relations of Nations -- PalArch's Journal Of Archaeology Of Egypt/Egyptology 18(15), ISSN 1567-214x

Keywords: Liberalism, International Relations, Nation, Theory, Paradigm, Methodology

ABSTRACT

The abstract world of theories and the concrete world of politics are closely interrelated. The theories are needed to make human able to extract meaning from the information that targets us consistently. In order to make a logical and principled decisions, even politicians with no good relationship with theories need to depend on their thoughts regarding how the target world functions. In the case one's organized and fundamental principles are blemished, it is exceptionally troublesome and far-fetched for him to make proper political decisions. Therefore, understanding the views of international relations theories on international cooperation can be regarded as an intellectual assistance for the politicians. The theories in the field of international relations have different views to the international issues regarding the considered and emphasized factors and the type of ontology and epistemology. This paper examined different theoretical views on the issue of international cooperation as well as liberalism school of taught and its related factors. In general, it can be concluded that liberalism is an ethical theory in the international relations, while it is more prominent than other schools.

INTRODUCTION

Nations have constantly tried to recognize and explain existing systems at the international level and to perceive and provide models in this regard. Having knowledge of the international issues is also important for international law due to their significance to comprehend issues like managing the international relations and awareness of the nation's scope (Ebrahimi and Monavari, 2012). In fact, communications and international relations are two essential prerequisites for cooperation with other nations. It is generally believed that the international relations lead to international negotiations, international negotiations lead to international cooperation, and international cooperation leads to international convergence. Since convergence is the final stage of the collaboration process, the communication process need to involve the

interrelationships between the constituent units of an international system which should be scientifically and meticulously planned and studied.

After World War II, adopting a scientific approach to the international relations became the main concern of the researchers in this field. However, previously and especially before the World War I, researchers in the study of international relations acted on the basis of their mental and educational fields, and they mainly studied issues related to the international politics. At time, the study of the international relations was mostly conducted by the historians and journalists, and sometimes jurists and ethicists (Thomson, 1952, quoted in Ghavam, 2005). Gradually, after the Second World War, international relations became more scientific and international relations field was viewed with scientific perspectives and traditions.

While realism school of taught is highly emphasized in the international relations, it can be concluded that the field of international relations is rooted in the ideas and ideals of the liberalism (Moshirzadeh, 2011). It is argued that the international relations with an intellectual origins trace to eighteenth century Enlightenment optimism, nineteenth century liberalism, and twentieth century Wilsonian idealism. Thus, the place of the liberal approach in the international relations is too serious to be ignored. Therefore, the study of international relations from the perspective of liberalism is important. The paradigm in the international relations emerges as a guide to foreign policy rather than national interests, power, security, independence, and survival in a decentralized system, with a strong emphasis on the importance of moral values, legal norms, and the coordination of interests. (Ghavam, 2005).

METHOD

The present paper was a library research with descriptive data. In the following sections, liberalism school of taught and the international relations have been taken into account.

Liberalism

Liberalism literally means “libertarianism”, derived from the word “liberty” meaning “freedom” in English. Liberalism is “a political philosophy, a movement, an intellectual tradition and a specific branch in thought and action with a history back to the seventeenth century” (Jackson and George, 2003). The opposites of liberalism are the terms such as tyranny, authoritarianism, monopoly, dictatorship, statehood, classism, guiding economics, and collectivism, that is, the rejection of pressures applied by an external power or any origin or purpose to neutralize the individual interests. (George Bordeaux, 1995). In fact, in 1812, the first use of the term "liberalism" appeared in English. In Spain, *the liberales*, was the first group to use the liberal label in a political context. It is very difficult to accurately and comprehensively express liberalism as a school of thought and politics. Liberalism can be accurately described as an attitude toward life and its issues that affirms values such as freedom for individuals, minorities and nations (Garando, Bitá, cited in Bagheri, 2005).

Liberalism is the philosophical product of Machiavelli, Thomas Hobbes, John Locke and Voltaire's views. The definition of liberalism is as follows:

"Liberalism is a collection of attitudes, policies and ideologies which basically aim to provide more freedom for an individual in all areas". Alexander Solzhenitsyn, a Russian thinker, stated: "Humanism is full of faith in human and comes from the idea that the ruler of the world is human. He is inherently devoid of evil, all faults and ugliness go back to the defects of the methods that govern society and must be removed." In fact, liberalism should be considered as one aspect of modernism, in other words, it is essence and ideology of the modernity. Thus, the main features and intellectual components of the modern civilization can be summarized in the liberalism (George Bordou).

The prevailing theory between the two wars was idealism considering as the extreme form of liberalism. Being optimistic about the international relations, it argued that peace and stability could be achieved by abandoning the rigid realms of sovereignty, by creating cooperation and participation of governments in the economic, political, cultural and even military areas. In the post-World War II period, the defeat of the League of Nations and the resumption of a full-scale war, a number of international relations scholars used the power principle as the center of their theory. The theory of realism, instead of the principles of idealists such as optimism and the need for the international cooperation to achieve peace and stability, introduced the principle of increasing the nations power to achieve a balance between governments and thus to achieve stability in the international arena. However, liberalism and its fundamental principles have never been completely excluded from the international relations studies. The Soviet Union, China, Britain, France and the United States won the war. The Eastern Bloc (China and the Soviet Union) were plagued by the ideological differences and wartime economic turmoil. In the meantime, in order to survive and solve its economic problems, the Soviet Union leaned towards the United States, despite its fundamental anti-Western principles during Khrushchev, and as a result it could not be ideologically powerful in the international relations. In the Western bloc, France and Britain were struggling with the economic consequences of wars. It can be said that the powerful winner of World War II was the United States which entered the economies of the nations and spread the school of liberalism. The American liberalism school of taught in the 21st century is still dominant and superior to other schools due to the important role of the United States in the creation of the international organizations and the elaboration and approval of their manifesto as well as the regular presence of the American thinkers in the international relations arena. Despite the strong design of the theory of realism, the important structures and decisions adopted in the years following World War II, which were largely led by the United States, have been influenced by the liberal ideas, especially American liberalism. However, the liberalism has shown flexibility over time and according to the requirements of the time. After the world war, all the nations have been trying to increase their powers, while many organizations have been established as well to make cooperation among them in the political, economic and military arenas. Meanwhile, the

emphasis on the principle of instrumental rationality and utilitarianism in foreign policy reflect the vitality and dynamism of the foundations of liberalism after World War II. Although liberalism was widely criticized in the 1930s and 1940s and was almost marginalized as idealism, it was able to revitalize itself seriously in new forms and to challenge the tradition of realism. (Moshirzadeh, 2011).

Types of Liberalism

Liberalism has three main areas, including culture, politics, and economics which have been briefly discussed below:

Cultural liberalism: It advocates the individual and social freedoms, such as freedom of thought and expression, expansion of free opportunities, moral flexibility, religious freedom, etc. For example, morality addresses liberalism as a tolerant, patient and immoral doctrine. According to this doctrine, many behaviors and actions have no ruling other than immorality. Liberalism does not believe in stable, unitary, absolute, and unchangeable rules, but in fact it believes in moral relativity.

Economic Liberalism: Economic liberalism or freedom is often used to express the freedom of capitalist trade and market and competition. It is organized on individual lines, meaning that the greatest possible number of economic decisions are made by individuals or households rather than by collective institutions or organizations. An individual should engage in business activities without political control and strive for personal gain as much as possible. In fact, this type of liberalism means “preserving economic freedom and advocating the privacy of private and capitalist property, and promoting a free and competitive market which can be seen in the capitalist systems. In general, “economic liberalism is synonymous with capitalism” (Bordeaux, 1999,16). Liberalism also encourages the individuals to resist against the state’s domination. According to the findings, liberalism is based on humanist, secularist and rationalist foundations advocating values such as freedom and equality. In political education, liberalism seeks to educate a political citizen who believes in democracy without religion. Democracy and political system provide the most material benefits and pleasure for the majority (Garando, Bitá, 2005).

Liberalism situates in the realm of the society and detects its real meaning and manifests itself objectively in the relations of an individual with his fellow human beings. In general, liberalism is also a political theory and a military technique; and also a set of political beliefs, as well as the war machine of capitalism that ignores or changes borders.

Liberalism and International Relations

According to liberals, international relations is defined as the art of good communication or good government. Liberalism believes that human beings have the ability to learn and be educated and as a result they can change their behaviors. Thus, they have to change their abnormal and immoral behavior and performance according to moral and human standards and practice normal and moral behavior. In this regard, some approaches, such as communication approach in the international relations is based on liberalism. For example, borrowing from the liberalism taught and using the concept of communication, the communication approach in

international relations has three important effects on the international relations: first, the communication approach no longer considers power as a fundamental variable in explaining the political phenomena. In this respect, the essence of politics is related to the existence of a secure harmony between the efforts and expectations of human beings to meet the goals of society. Second, much emphasis is placed on the empirical nature of the concepts and an it has been attempted to operationalize all the concepts through measurement and mapping. Communication theorists highlight all types of communications equally and measure whatever statistics allow. Third, the communication approach is not limited to any level of analysis. For example, Cobb and Alder presented a model to examine the international cooperation based on the communication approach. This model links among “underlying factors” on the one hand, and the creation of reciprocal behavioral relationships between two nations (through their exchanges and interactions) and also levels of the international cooperation on the other hand. This model has been experimentally tested globally and regionally. Although all liberal theories agree that the idea of cooperation rather than war has become more prevalent in the international systems, each liberal theory offers a different direction to increase cooperation in the international arena. (Pour Ahmadi, 2011).

The most basic layer of liberal thought expresses that the economic interdependence is a factor that makes governments reluctant to use force against each other, as war threatens well-being and happiness of each involved party.

In the next layer of liberal thought, in the twentieth century there emerged a much more full-blown sense of liberal internationalism, understood as a set of prescriptions for organizing and reforming the world in such a way as to facilitate the pursuit of liberal democracy at home. Beginning with Woodrow Wilson in 1919, liberal internationalism emerged as an agenda for building a type of order—a sort of ‘container’ within which liberal democracies could live and survive. (Jackson and Sorenson, 2003).

The third layer of liberal thought argues that international institutions, including the International Energy Agency and the International Monetary Fund, can help reduce the selfish behavior of governments; in particular, these institutions encourage governments to relinquish short-term and immediate benefits in exchange for more important benefits that can be achieved in the long run through constant cooperation. Accordingly, liberalism in the field of internationalism believes that due to three major processes in the international arena, nations are moving towards greater and stronger cooperation:

First, it is the process of interdependence of the nations, especially in the economic and trade fields, that has led them to benefit from cooperation.

Second, increasing economic interdependence leads to the emergence and creation of a series of international norms, rules and institutions that have been created to make, facilitate and cooperate the nations.

Third, the process of international democratization, in which governments become more democratic, reduces conflict and increases cooperation.

Neoliberalism and International Relations

Neoliberalism or neoliberal institutionalism was a theoretical attempt to reconcile liberalism and realism. Neoliberalism has a lot in common with neorealism. Neoliberal institutionalists like neo-realists recognize the role of nations and their power in the international system. The nations are also regarded as wise actors seeking to maximize their interests. More importantly, they also consider the international system anarchic which lacks a central authority. But unlike neorealism, neoliberal institutionalism believes in the constructive role of the international institutions in the international politics independent of the distribution of power among the nations. Neoliberals believe in the element of incompatibility and conflict in cooperation, and view it as an integral part of the performance of governments, and do not believe in what classical liberals seek based on Smith's concept of the "invisible hand". They say governments work closely together, but that cooperation causes friction and tension due to too much proximity, while that is not the end and a new effort to fill the gap begins again and new collaboration is resulted.

Neoliberalism, based on the international system and its characteristics, explains cooperation at the international level. International anarchy creates a major obstacle to the international cooperation by creating an atmosphere of mistrust and increasing deception. But according to those who believe in this theory, anarchy and disorder are not equal and synonymous with non-cooperation. The lack of information can be repaid by using mechanisms and strategies to reduce the level of distrust resulting from and increase in costs of fraud as creating an international cooperation between the dictator nations is possible as well. The basic belief of neoliberal institutionalism is that governments are activists that try to maximize their absolute unique achievements and are indifferent to the achievements of others. Thus, if cooperation makes more profit for them, they will take it. What matters is not what others achieving, but what themselves achieving. As a result, the biggest obstacle to cooperation between rational and self-centered governments is the issue of fraud. Adopting strategies of interaction between the nations and making thematic connection on the one hand, and the establishing international institutions and regimes in which the mentioned strategies can be implemented, on the other hand, can overcome any deception and breach of treaty. Through international interaction, the possibility of retaliation strengthens which increases the cost of deception. Under such circumstances, the actors will sacrifice the short-term benefits of breach of contract and deception to the greater benefits of long-term cooperation, based on cost-benefit analysis, and begin and continue cooperation. Thematic linking also allows partner nations to implement a compensation and retaliation strategy. Thus, a nation that has been deceived and harmed in one subject area is able to retaliate in another subject area. Regarding the possibility of retaliation in various areas, the cost of breach of contract and deception also increases. But from the point of view of neoliberalism, the international institutions

play a key role in promoting and facilitating the international cooperation. Within the framework of the international institutions and regimes, it is possible to implement the different strategies. International institutions mean known patterns of behavior or action around which the expectations of actors converge and get closer to each other (Amoui and Hossein Khani, 2010).

Government and Liberalism

In state liberalism, the condition is freedom, not the enemy of freedom. The fact is the extent to which liberalism imposes on the state and the task of withdrawal is measured by the circumstances of the political, economic, and social situation. Liberalism considers the state as an actor in the international political arena and believes that it pursues the national interests in a rational way. However, in addition to this main actor, other transnational actors such as multinational organizations, transnational organizations, associations, international regimes, etc., and, unlike the realists who emphasize military security priorities, insist on the civilian dimension. In the realm of liberalism, various thinkers, including Adam Smith, John Stuart Mill, John Locke, Emmanuel Kant, etc. are prominent who have been able to significantly influence the evolution of the international relations. From the beginning of the establishment of sovereignty and the formation of the national governments, the need for rules governing relations between the countries was considered necessary and since then its scope has increased constantly. It is clear that the theories of liberalism in the international relations have played a clear, important and irreplaceable role in the spread of the international law. In general, liberals have tried to create and develop lasting peace in various ways by emphasizing peace. For example, the emphasis on the international institutions and regimes, international law, collective security, governance based on law and the creation of various organizations and institutions, especially the United Nation have addressed many issues of international law and expressed the important role of the school of liberalism in the development of the international law. However, the role of realistic theories of the international relations in this field is indirect and ambiguous (Bordeaux, 1998).

Paradigm of Liberalism in International Relations

The paradigm of liberalism in international relations which believes in rationalism, idealism, and optimism in the international system, also emphasizes on ethical principles and the international standards to create and manage peace as well as collective security and disarmament. People like Locke, Rousseau, Bentham, Kant have been considered liberals. Liberalism rejects war, strife, and anarchy in the nature of states. Traditional liberalism, based on the views of Immanuel Kant and Bentham, calls for lasting peace with the transformation of human consciousness through social contract, extendable to other levels of government and the international system. Neoliberalism which believes in the mixed actors, including states, international and non-governmental organizations, stated that political and diplomatic tools can be used instead of force, and

influential individuals and leaders which are more involved in the international relations than governments.

The Degree of Dominance of Paradigms of International Relations

Michael Banks, one of the top thinkers of the international relations, called the competition between the theories of international relations an “inter-paradigm debate”. Hence, he probably considered the international relations as a paradigm and different theoretical approaches within it as different theories of a single paradigm. However, according to many thinkers, competing theories in different disciplines of social sciences are presented as competing paradigms of each other, while they don’t regard some features of Cohen’s paradigm concept including the incomparability of the paradigms. In addition, the degree of superiority or acceptance of each of the named paradigms in academic circles and prestigious scientific journals is a significant debate. Scholars working on the international relations generally believe that after the end of World War I until the beginning of World War II, the paradigm of liberalism became the dominant paradigm of the international relations. The paradigm of realism, with its emphasis on the concepts of power, security, anarchy, survival, self-determination, and the balance of power, has abolished the paradigm of liberalism and became the dominant paradigm. This dominance continued until the end of the twentieth century, and with the collapse of the Soviet Union and the emergence of new paradigms, such as constructivist and feminism, it also faced with new weaknesses and challenges. Nevertheless, among the proposed paradigms, it seems that realism is still the most popular in the international relation literature. Theorists and thinkers such as Michael Doyle considered realism to be the dominant theory in the international relations (Doyle, 1999). Legro and Moravchik, two prominent liberal thinkers, also considered realism to be the oldest and the most dominant approach in the international relations. In addition, studies conducted at the institute in 2007 also partially confirmed the theory and its application in the international relations (Morausic, 1999).

Considering the previous studies in terms of the number of articles, the number of proponents, and the number of training hours allocated to each paradigm, significant results have been obtained and the findings were shown in the Figure 1 related to the results of the studied paradigms from 1980 to 2006 (Milliank, 2006). According to this study and based on the views of many theorists and researchers in the international relations from the 1980s to 1990s, realism and then liberalism theories have been the most popular theories in the literature of this field of study. During these two decades, the popularity of realism and Marxism theories have declined and liberalism, constructivism and other approaches related to the views of the theorists and researchers of this field have increased. Political developments such as the collapse of the Soviet Union and the rise of globalization have had a dramatic effect on these surveys. The following figures also shows the percentage of literature allocated to each paradigm in 2006 and 2008 from the perspective of the international relations’ experts. According to the results of this survey, liberalism and realism are still at the top while their dominance significantly decreased when it is compared with published

studies in 80s and 90s, and constructivist, feminism and also non-paradigmatic approaches' dominance increased significantly as well.

The number of the articles considering Marxist approach significantly decreased due to the collapse of the Soviet Union as the greatest promoters of Marxism, but the interesting point related to the number of published articles related to the realism and with a decrease of 5%, has remained fixed. Besides, recently the number of articles with no special paradigms and theories which have been more descriptive and comparative, decreased from 47% to 7%. Interestingly, the number of the published articles of all paradigms (realism, liberalism, constructivism, feminism, and Marxism) never reached less than 50% and it has been lower than this percent for a long time. Along with an increase in the number of non-paradigmatic articles, it is important to consider the low percentage of the articles published with a realistic approach. This is despite the fact that the main impression is that realism has already acquired the most literature in this field. As an example, in his book in 1999, Vasquez noted that between 1945 and 1970, realism possessed 90% of the literature in this field. The results of the research of "Institute of Theory and its Applications in International Relations" were not consistent with the results of Walker and Morton (2005)'s studies. They reviewed 515 scientific articles published between 1970 and 2000 and concluded that realism was the dominant approach with 38% in the first half of the 1980s, and it was dominant with 48% in the second half of the 1980s. However, in the first half of the 1990s, Realism dominance declined to 36% and by in the second half of the 1990s, it reached to 22% (Martin and Walker, 2005). It should be mentioned that the main reason for the significant difference between the results of the previous two studies with the recent research is their lack of attention to the articles conducted qualitatively while the results only included the articles conducted quantitatively. During the period reviewed in the study of "Institute of theory and its applications in international relations", the realism paradigm has never been dominated in the number of articles published, while in 2006, the percentage of articles published with a realistic approach reached to 6%. In an article entitled "Is anyone a realist?", Legro and Moravchik examined that in the absence of a decisive and even relative dominance of any international relations paradigm, the fundamental question that arises at this stage is if the international relations can be regarded a paradigm according to Michele Banx, or if it is possible to call the theoretical debates as paradigmatic competitions? According to the results of a study conducted at the "Institute of Theory and its application in international relations", the answer to this question is clearly "no", since the number of all articles published in the prestigious scientific journals, based on the paradigm of realism, liberalism, constructivism, feminism, and Marxism, has not reached 50%, and the number of articles with a non- paradigmatic approach have always been higher. These results bring us to the conclusion that the international relations in the field of theorizing is more non-paradigmatic rather than paradigmatic. Being non-paradigmatic relations has strengthened the importance of issues such as inter-paradigm debates, which are not only unreal debates, but also made by some writers and thinkers who have studied the evolution of the international relations and looked at it from the

perspective of debates, that is, differences in ideas (not real debate in the sense of dialogue between the parties).

Methodology of International Relations Paradigms

In the early years of emerging the discussion of the international relations, the aim of researchers was merely to help prevent war, but not as an academic field of study with a specific discipline. Therefore, researchers working on the international relations did not benefit from a special academic identity and position. Anyone who concerns about war and its prevention started writing and reviewing based on his own and others' experiences, historical events and the principle of morality. Therefore, initial research in the field of the international relations did not have any specific cognitive methodological framework. In the following section the evolutionary process of the international relations from 1950s to 1960s, and the efforts made to turn it into an academic field of study by the behaviorists, from the methodological point of view, and by using a specific scientific method in the international relations studies have been taken into account (Mir Mohammadi, 2007, 671). The results of a study conducted in 2007 by the Institute of Theory and its Application to International Relations in the United States showed that in terms of methodology, most journals tend toward quantitative articles.

Lisa Martin reviewed seven important publications between 1994 and 1998 and concluded that the argumentative articles possessed only 13% of security studies. Sperenz and Woolinsky (2004) reviewed the political science articles between 1975 and 2000 and came to the same conclusion that was around 14% to 17% as shown in Figure 4, while the percentage of the argumentative articles was measured 13% that was the same as the result of the previous study. The number of the quantitative studies have constantly increased, and until 2006, it reached to 53%. During the same period, the number of articles conducted with quantitative method significantly reduced from about 32% to 5%. However, the number of qualitative articles increased from about 20% in 1980 to 33% in 2006.

Epistemology of International Relations Paradigms

While there is a variety of theories and methods to write the articles on the international relations, but in case of epistemology of the articles, positivism with a great deal of difference is the most common approach. Positivism which has various stages is divided into different branches and it is generally based on the principles of science integrity (all science can evolve based on a pattern similar to the natural sciences, so the social sciences should have the same methodology as natural sciences). The distinction between the facts and values (having a positive approach to believe in objectivism and to consider that the scientist achieves truth through an objective observation and free from value) and finally, empirical validity or invalidity has been established. Based on the predominance of the same principles of positivism in the cold war, most scholars sought to find and study the general rules governing the conduct and interactions of the states in the international arena and to make predictions regarding the natural sciences (zargar, 2009).

It led to the rise and domination of realism in the international relations in the twentieth century. The international researchers' attitudes toward the epistemology of positivism remain unique. In the previous sections, the emergence of non-paradigmatic approaches and existence of quantitative and qualitative paradigms in methodology reflect the results of the recent research on dominance of positivism in the epistemology. Superiority of positivism naturally pleases the proponents of this school of thought, but people like Steve Smith who referred to the epistemological diversity (Figure 5) out of the United States and focused on its attraction, while they don't believe in dominance of one approach on the international relations. In the surveys conducted in 2004, 2006 and 2008 by the Institute of International Relations (Theory and its Application in International Relations), the scholars were asked to introduce their used doctrine of epistemology (positivists, non-positivist, post-positivists). In 2004, 64%; In 2006, 70%, and in 2008, 65% of American researchers chose positivism. Figure 5 also shows the percentage of articles published with epistemological teachings between 1980 and 2006 and it reflects the strange dominance of positivism in the United States. While in 1980, about 58% of the articles published in prestigious American journals followed the positivist method in 2006 this figure was 90%. When the researchers in other countries answered the same questions, the ones from Canada and 10 other countries in 2008 showed the dominance of positivism declined. Most scholars from countries such as Canada, New Zealand, Britain and South Africa preferred non-positivist and post-positivist teachings. Therefore, it is concluded that the paradigm of the doctrine of positivism, which was mentioned above, is not at the global level but only in the US and globally there is deeper differences and diversities in epistemology that prevents calling the doctrine of epistemological positivism in the international relations as paradigmatic (Maliniak, 2011)

Assumptions of Liberalism

Liberalists have common assumptions about reality and the world of politics. In general, the liberal worldview is based on the following beliefs and assumptions:

1. Human nature is basically good or altruistic, so human beings are able to help each other and cooperate with each other.
2. The main concern of human beings for welfare makes growth and development possible. That is, the principle of enlightenment about the possibility of progress and development of civilization is reaffirmed.
3. Human's bad behavior is not the result of evil man, but the result of human institutions and structural arrangements that motivate human beings to act selfishly and to harm and fight others.
4. If a person acts on the basis of his good nature and kind nature, he will have a participatory and peaceful behavior. As a result, international peace and cooperation will be achieved if self-made and educated individuals and politicians take power in the countries.
5. In order to establish international peace and cooperation, the institutions and structures in which man has strayed from his nature and does not act according to it must be reformed. If a person wants to be able

to behave according to his nature, educational and social processes and systems must be reformed.

6. Nations are not inherently selfish and belligerent, but they are cooperative and altruistic and they are able to correct abnormal behaviors (Arblaster, 1877; Mokhber, 2008).

CONCLUSION

Many theoretical efforts have been made to systematically and legally explain the cooperation in the international relations. But there is no consensus among the scholars and policymakers on a single general theory to be used in the international cooperation. Everyone considers it according to a specific theoretical framework, worldview, value, discourse, and different perceptions of the reality of society and international relations. Each of these theories paints a distinct picture of cooperation based on the principles and assumptions which derive from different ontologies, epistemologies, and methodologies.

As many acknowledge, the school of liberalism and its sub-disciplines have greater potentials for the international cooperation due to the optimistic attitude of the followers of this school. Nevertheless, the view of liberalism cannot be considered to include all the realities of the international relations. No single approach can fully explain the complexities of the contemporary world of politics and offer definitive solutions to its problems. The international relations are so complex that one theory and one school of thought cannot be understood and used to solve problems and give solutions. A complex world requires a complex and holistic thinking, which means the need to use all theories to understand the international relations and the subject of the international cooperation. Therefore, instead of taking a single approach to interpret the global politics, it is better to give a different arrangement to competing ideas in the interpretation of the global politics. The competition between the theories helps to reveal their strengths and weaknesses and it acts as a stimulus for their reform and development. But it is necessary to be creative in choosing and combining theories and to avoid rejecting one and choosing the other. It is essential to encourage contemporary research diversity and to consider diversity as an advantage, not a disadvantage.

Thus, it is important to solve the problem between power and justice in theories of the international relations. The theory of justice is not considered realistic despite the background of the politics, which has often been associated with the use of military force. On the other hand, Thucydides and Catilia, as two realist theorists, referred to the central concept of power emphasized on power in conflict with the concept of government as an institution for the realization of justice. In this context, they introduce the art of politics as a unifying concept of power and justice. politics combines the human affairs, a human being who has acted under the auspices of individuals, groups, national governments, alliances, empires and transnational and international organizations and has tried to achieve his individual and collective well-being. The main challenge any policy encounters with is to achieve practical and equitable coordination between the conflicting individual, group and collective needs of human beings. In well-functioning societies and also in sensitive and legitimate

organized institutions necessary regulatory work are needed for effective and equitable distribution of opportunities, incomes and responsibilities. They point to the lack of effective and legitimate political institutions as the main problem of the current international system, which they see as a shaky system based on the risk of war. According to some scholars, the principle in the international relations is “peace and peaceful coexistence” and war and conflict are permissible only if hostile governments invade a territory or persecute other citizens or conspire against their religion.

Liberalism is not just structural guidelines to establish a particular type of government and its relationship to society or to make a desired kind of international order in its own right, but at a higher level, liberalism is a set of normative and value do's and don'ts that before a structural organization, it institutionalizes its philosophy and culture. According to the principles of liberalism, what is important is the individual and his goals, and other social institutions are at the service of the individual and are opposed to anything that restricts the individual's freedom and power to decide and rethink. The tasks that the classical liberals enumerated for the government were very limited and fell into the form of security and protection tasks. For example, Nozick proposed a minimal government to perform tasks such as “protection against violence, theft, fraud, etc.” In his view, the government is merely a force to guarantee the implementation of social contracts. Sometimes the preservation and expansion of the individual freedom is conditional on the government intervention (Moshiria, 2011). If the government does not intervene in these matters, the freedom of individuals will be endangered. This conflict became more pronounced in the 19th century with the theory of John Stuart Mill, the most important representative of the philosophy of democracy at the time. First Cohen theory was presented to explain the progress of science (physics) and methodology in the context of the philosophy of science. He knew physics paradigm devoted to its specific time that must respond to the problems of the time. He believed that the past paradigms had lost this ability. Comparing two fields of study such as the international relations and physics is not something rational, despite the similarities in the disciplinary developments such as debates and the relative dominance of the theoretical approaches to liberalism and realism in special historical periods due to main differences in subject and goals. The field of international relations is part of the larger branch of the social sciences and it is very difficult to discover the permanent rules that govern it, if it is not impossible. As it was mentioned earlier, the field of international relations in the theoretical approaches and attitudes is completely non-paradigmatic and its high theoretical diversity is visible and obvious. Thus, mostly the number of published articles with non-theoretical approaches are higher than the number of articles with theoretical approaches. It has become more common with different theoretical approaches. In the field of methodology, with the relative dominance of quantitative and qualitative methods, it is very difficult to believe that methodology can be paradigmatic, because although both quantitative and qualitative methods are dominant, they are regarded as competitors. It does not seem that in the short term, the dominance of one methodological approach and marginalization of the other one is possible. In the field of epistemology,

despite the dominance of positivism in the United States, it has been shown that in other countries and regions similar studies have shown different results. For example, epistemology of positivism in Canada, New Zealand, United Kingdom and Africa was not dominant. These differences make us increasingly skeptical of considering the field of international relations as a paradigmatic approach. Therefore, according to the researcher of the present study, the application of Cohen's theory of scientific development and inaccuracies of his paradigms in the field of social sciences (including inter-international relations) is not very appropriate. In addition to what can be deduced from Cohen's theory, paradigms cannot relate significantly to each other. Confirming this concept in the international relations shows the full independence of the theoretical approaches of the international relations to each other in which their non-comparability seems illogical. Meanwhile, regarding the various differences between the theoretical approaches of the international relations, there are many similarities between them that is in stark contrast to Cohen's ideal of paradigm. On the other hand, according to Cohen's theory, the new paradigm, as a result of the failure of the old paradigm to meet the scientific needs of the time and the inability to answer the emerging questions by the old paradigm, replaces it, and in each period of time, a dominant paradigm dominates the scientific community. Hence, the fact of the international relations indicates the effective presence of all paradigms of the international relations, including realism, liberalism, structuralism, modernism, feminism, Marxism and even other paradigms such as post-modernism simultaneously.

Examining the science of the international relations reflects that the science of the international relations which was often used in the approach of liberalism in the twentieth century, takes on a purely epistemological approach and means paying attention to norms and values which take a philosophical and value burden. Wisdom-centeredness, individual-centeredness, freedom, personal but not governmental religion, and personal but not social ethics are important propositions of the liberalism. Relying on peace in liberalism stems from a moral issue that does not just mean opposition to war. Rather, it is a step forward to prevent war and create ideal conditions. This peace is achieved through human choice in which liberalism does not consider the motive for this choice to be negative or evil. Liberalism sees the way to achieve this peace as cooperation in the international relations, for which there is a value and normative aspect. It does not mean that liberalism is a moral theory in the international relations, but in any case, the moral atmosphere of liberalism is more prominent than realism. Because of Kant's view of peace between democratic states, Puff considered Kant the founder of liberalism in the international relations. However, after World War II, liberal theorists came to the conclusion that they could not have a complete analysis of the international issues by relying solely on the political issues. Therefore, theories of liberal political economy became especially important.

REFERENCES

- Arblaster, Anthony (1877). *Western liberalism; Rise and Fall*, translated by Abbas Mokhber (2008), Tehran: Markaz Publishing.

- Bordeaux, George. (1998). *Liberalism*. Translated by Abdul Wahab Ahmadi, Tehran: Ney Publishing.
- Billy, John and Steve Smith (unpublished). *Globalization of politics: International relations in the new field of historical context, theories, structures and processes*, translated by Abolghasem Rahchmani and others (1383). Tehran: Abrar Contemporary International Studies Cultural Institute, Tehran.
- Poor Ahmadi, Hossein (1390). *Conceptualizing the Moral Necessity of Punishment in Some Paradigms of International Political Economy* ", in *Ethics and International Relations*. Tehran: Imam Sadegh (AS) University Press.
- Jackson, Robert and Georg Sorenson (2003). *An Introduction to International Relations*, translated by Mehdi Zakerian et al. (2011). Tehran: Mizan Publishing.
- Chernov, Fred. (1998). *Theory and sub-theory in international relations: Contradictory concepts and interpretations*. Translated by Alireza Tayeb, (2009). Tehran: Ney Publishing.
- Uncle, Hamed and Hossein Khani, Hamed (1389). *Perspectives of different approaches to international relations on the issue of peace*. *Journal of Political Science*, 5, 149-160.
- Zargar, Afshin (2008), *Political Science: Knowledge of International Relations (Objective, Subject, Method)*, Tehran: Ministry of Science, Research and Technology, Deputy Minister of Culture and Social Affairs, Office of Social Planning and Cultural Studies.
- Qawam, Abdul Ali (1384). *International Relations: Theories and Approaches*, Tehran: Samat Publications.
- Garando, Michael (Bita). *Liberalism in the History of Western Thought*, translated by Abbas Bagheri (2005), Tehran, Ney Publishing.
- Mushirzadeh, Homeira. (1390). *New theoretical developments in international relations: a suitable ground for indigenous theorizing*. *Journal of Political Science*. 6 (12). 22-38.
- Mir Mohammadi, Mehdi (2007), *The Dynamics of Cognition Methods in International Relations*, *Journal of Strategic Studies*, Year 10, Issue 4, Winter 2007, Serial Number 38.
- Doyle, Michael. (1997). *Ways of War and Peace: Realism, Liberalism, and Socialism*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Legro, Jeffrey W., & Andrew Moravcsik. (1999) *Is Anybody Still a Realist?* *International Security* 24 (2).
- Linklater, Andrew & Burchill, Scott (1996), *Theory of International Relations*, New York: Mcmillan Press LTD.
- Maliniak, Daniel et Al. (2011). *International Relations in the US Academy*. *International Studies Quarterly* (55).
- Martin, Lisa. (1999). *The Contributions of Rational Choice: A Defense of Pluralism*. *International Security* 24 (2).
- Smith, Steve. (2002). *The United States and the Discipline of International Relations: Hegemonic Country, Hegemonic Discipline*. *International Studies Review* 4 (2).
- Sprinz, Detlef, & Yael Wolinsky-Nahmias. (2004). *Models, Numbers, and Cases: Methods for Studying International Relations*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

- Vasquez, John A. (1999). *The Power of Power Politics: From Classical Realism to Neotraditionalism*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Walker, Thomas, & Jeffrey Morton. (2005). Re-Assessing the “Power of Power Politics” Thesis: Is Realism Still Dominant? *International Studies Review*.