

The study for international relations

[Politics](#), [International Relations](#)



The study for International Relations takes a wide range on theoretical approaches, this is important when choosing which theory to use because they are internally and externally contrasted with each other and rests in different assumptions about the nature of politics and offers contrasting set of foreign policy recommendations. Differentiated principles- e. g. military power, ideological beliefs and material interests. The international system of Realist is defined by the absence of a central authority-anarchy (Waltz). Meaning states are sovereign and self-ruling and act only upon force. In an anarchic system state power is most important because through power they can be respected but feared, they are seen as unapproachably strict but reasonable to an extent. Its strengths being are Straightforward and have historical evidence to help support the theory.

Critics argue about this theory being Vulnerable and has too much emphasis on conflict which underestimate the role of international institutions. This can be challenged at the end of the Cold War, it has a hard time explaining peaceful change. For realist the way you have change in the distribution of power is through war and the demise of bipolar system at the end of the Cold War brought a unipolar system that isn't explained well through. The basic insight of the ' Liberalist' theory is that the national characteristics of individual states matter for their international relations. They Believe in reason and possibility of progress that's why: laws, judges, and police are in place in order to insure the citizens life and liberty. Their Contribution view the individual as the seat of moral value and assert that human being should be treated as ends rather than means. They believe Sovereignty is not sacrosanct, which makes them responsible to protect the vulnerable

populations and are obligated to use armed force to stop any type of violations of human rights.

This idea can be proven through commercial productivity, financial and economic affairs. Still, critics claim that it is an open door to International Prohibition (Poverty, disease, discrimination and ignorance) Challenging this Herevia 1 theory, Liberals believe moral imperatives can guide and constrain leaders whereas realist claim that heads of state are driven by strategic necessities. Constructivism is a learning idea that “ equates learning with creating meaning from experience” It’s Not a theory, but rather an ontology. With that in mind, it offers an account of the politics of identity. Like liberalism, it runs on ideology and awareness of how our understandings of the world are individually and socially constructed, and how prevailing ideas mold our beliefs about what is unchangeable and what can be reformed but based on criterial of nationalism, race, gender and religion. Constructivist are looking at how and why we arrived at the current state of affairs and international relations and argue that the structure of the international system whether it’s by pole or multi polar is not an all determining factor in how states behave. Unlike Liberalism that say, ‘ ideology exist’ but doesn’t go beyond philosophical, constructivism takes the form of these more identifiable variables. Their straights can be admired by their higher order thinking skills and problem solving.

Critics argue that constructivism has limited attention to methodological issues. Methodology would help us to consider both the material and ideational factors that shape world politics. And certain ideas would become

more prominent while other ideas fall behind. Challenging its theory is its counterpart is not Realism, intuitionism, or Liberalism, but rather rationalism by challenging the framework that undergirds theories of international relations, Constructivism alternates in each of these families of theories. In comparison, Constructivism considers historical subjectivity, rather than Realism's 'All states are States'. Lastly, Marxists argue that in order to change our nature, we must work together to remake it to fit our needs through labor to free ourself from natural constraints.

Their strengths can be seen through revolutionary action, the international proletariat will free humans from exploitation. Their lack of exploitative alliances between dominant class interest in core and periphery (dependency theory) prevented the periphery from industrializing. This theory can be challenged by knowing the difference between; Realists emphasizing state security, Liberals highlighting individual freedom, Constructivists calling attention to ideas and identities, socialists focus on class conflict and the material interest of each class. Even though these theories of international relations are contested daily, it is improper to see them as rivals over the universal truth in World Politics. Fairly, each rests on certain assumptions, and is constrained within certain specified conditions, and pursues its own cogent goal. While here via 2 various theories can lead to a more or less conclusion about international relations, none of them are specifically right or wrong. Instead they each possess some tools that can be of use all together in International politics.