Modern Schools of Thought in Security Studies

Muhanad Abdullah Abdulrahman Al – Rasheed[1], Dr. Usama Murtadha Baqir Al-Saeedi[2]

Abstract

Europe represents the main source of the emergence of schools of thought, including security, as it contributed to expanding the concept of security to include economic, social and political aspects in addition to the military, where some of them focused on the impact of discourse on security issues and others on the liberation of individuals from tyranny and injustice and others on the integration of internal and external security and the exchange of roles at the global level, and the activity of these schools increased in Europe after the end of the Cold War aware of the position of the European Union in the new international political system at the time, in addition to The increase in the number of immigrants and the accompanying emergence of problems within Europe are at the same time an attempt to break free from the traditional understanding of security adopted by American think tanks that support the sole and dominant superpower.

Introduction

Security studies are an important field in political science, especially in strategic studies, which occupy the attention of researchers with their various intellectual orientations, and the development of the concept of security between traditional theories in international relations and modern schools of thought until the concept reached global security to include a group of traditional and non-traditional security threats, and this security reality is one of the reasons for expanding the concept of security, until the complexities and difficulties in the intertwining and interdependence of contemporary security issues such as poverty, hunger and health reached terrorism and transnational organized crime. Borders and national security of countries, climate and pollution and their link to economic growth, development, prosperity, well-being, migration and others.

The importance of the study: The importance of the study lies in the fact that it helps to understand the intellectual developments that have occurred in security studies to reach an understanding of global or comprehensive security, which includes new security issues that existed in the past, such as environmental, health, community and other security, and then, laying the foundations for decision-makers to develop appropriate strategies in the face of security threats resulting from those issues.

Problematic: The subject of research faces the problem of the intertwining of security issues, their acceleration and cross-border impact, and fragmented security no longer works against the comprehensiveness of these new security threats.

---

[1] Research head of PhD stage, Department of International Politics, College of Political Science, Al-Nahrain University, Baghdad – Iraq, muhanadalrasheed4@gmail.com

[2] Dean of the College of Political Sciences, Al-Nahrain University, Baghdad - Iraq

Hypothesis: The research proceeds from the premise that the expansion of the circle of security issues and their modernity, the failure to keep pace with traditional theories in international relations and the different ideas of researchers, helped the emergence of new schools specialized in security studies to develop new intellectual foundations and foundations from which security analyzes are launched in a scientific and objective framework. To prove the validity of the hypothesis, the following questions must be answered:

1-   What are the intellectual propositions of modern security schools?

2-   How have the security sectors been expanded?

3-   Have modern security schools succeeded in finding convincing explanations for contemporary security phenomena?

Methodology: To verify the validity of the hypothesis from which the researcher started, the theoretical basis on which the research is based depends on the descriptive approach used by the researcher in the context of presenting the topic according to his scientific development and making comparisons between the ideas put forward in the security schools subject of the research.

The research was divided into three axes:

The first axis: Copenhagen School

The Second axis: Wales School

The Third axis: Paris School

The first axis: (Copenhagen) School

Europe has proven to be the focus of non-traditional research in some aspects, specifically in security studies, where central schools of thought have been developed through the contributions of scientists and self-awareness free from the constraints of realism and rational thought, and working away from the mainstream (American) by promoting research grants from European funding agencies, and this move represents an important step towards global security, and the interest in these studies may have come as a result of the end of the bipolar phase and the rise of the European Union in the international system New.

The Copenhagen Peace Research Institute was founded in 1985 and closed in 2004, and it was an intellectual platform in the study of security and peace issues, hosting a group of researchers such as Barry Buzan, Ole Weaver and others, where these theorists were able to develop a research program in security studies as a critical and alternative analysis of the prevailing concepts and intellectual frameworks of traditional security concepts.

The school (Copenhagen) presented three basic ideas on which it was based; expanding the concept of security, the idea of community security and the idea of security, for the concept of security, we find four main ideas, namely :

1-   The study of security should be both a practice and a process.

2-   - Do not confuse security issues with political problems.

3-   The reference of security is societies and the state.

4-   Security areas are not necessarily military.

 As for societal security, which was presented on the basis that society is determined by its identity, but the continuation of this identity is a condition for the survival of society as long as it constitutes that identity, including individuals, on their different identities, so identity can determine the status of individuals, whether they are essential or non-essential actors, and here is a reference to the identities of immigrants coming from

abroad, which prompted the Copenhagen School to link race to the nation through identity, given that the second is an extension of the first.

Matt McDonald argues that the approach to security is defined by three levels; form represents the focus on the dominant actors, context and represents the focus on the moment of security intervention, and nature represents the focus on identifying threats, and the Copenhagen school has been criticized by proponents of the approach to monetary security studies, from Ken Booth's point of view, the Copenhagen school does not move towards real people in real places, because it wrongly links security and survival, and it is centered around the state and specifically about the elite. Rita Floyd identifies two main trends of ethical criticism; the first explores the inherent deficiency of a libertarian project or normative concept of the Copenhagen School, and the second focuses on the school's external role in security research, the alleged disregard for the school's political consequences (writing and speaking), especially when it comes to societal security and its reference topic, identity.

The concept of security sectors in the Copenhagen School has been expanded to include, in addition to the military aspects, political, economic, societal and environmental aspects, as the end of the cold war and the end of the conflict between two great powers left behind a vacuum that was then filled with previously neglected and marginalized issues, leading to a new approach in security studies, unlike the traditional approach that focuses mostly on military threats arising from other States. These security sectors that refer to a certain logic and type of interaction between units are used as a main analytical tool in security studies, where the military sector is linked to power relations, the political sector to power, the economic sector to economic relations, the environmental sector to the relationship between man and nature, and the societal sector to relations between social groups, certainly all these sectors overlap and affect each other as a result of the fact that most security issues in real life involve a combination of several security sectors that are accurately separated only for analytical purposes.

Buzan, Weaver and their Copenhagen School partners recommend a reverse process, namely desecurity as a path to security, i.e. a situation in which any threats can be dealt with through normal policy.

The theory of safety is the most characteristic of the school (Copenhagen), the process of security has tried to understand the discourse about threats, survival and emergency measures, safety from the point of view of theorists of this school is a successful process if the public accepts such a discourse and agrees to introduce emergency measures.

Much of the security debate revolved around expanding the concept of security, and this was manifested in the resistance of strategic studies to virtue regardless of the concepts of strategy and security, and the most common rhetorical defense in this regard was the claim that expanding the concept of security is a call for more disciplined chaos, and the most widely cited defenses among many traditional defenses was the article (Stephen Walt) entitled (Renaissance for Security Studies), one of its main topics was its attack on the idea of Broadening the security agenda, and criticizing the perception of non-military issues such as poverty and the environment, Walt argued that such an expansion would destroy the "intellectual cohesion" of the field, Despite this, he proceeded to present his research agenda that proved to be too broad and not entirely compatible with his basic argument – his attack on enlargement was also an invitation to join enlargement – and included in his agenda the role of domestic politics, the causes of peace and cooperation, the power of ideas, the end of the Cold War, economics and security, and the refinement of existing theories. At the heart of realism, the more realistic realism tries to become, the more inconsistent it becomes, while the more consistent it remains in theory, the more deviant it is from reality.

Buzan categorized the issue areas for an expanded security agenda related to five sectors :

1-   The political sector: This area is embodied in the relationship between the security variable and the constituent elements of the state (sovereignty, territorial unity), the political field for national security is the freedom of states from internal political pressures resulting from political interaction, so that security is achieved by ensuring and imposing respect for political actors and this leads to stability and national unity, either at the external level, through the ability of countries to adapt to pressures aimed at forcing them to change their positions or adopt positions that conflict with their interests.

2-   The economic sector: revolves around the ability of countries to reach the financial resources and capabilities necessary to provide an acceptable standard of living and stability of the system of governance and provide protection for the national economy from the various threats resulting from the disturbances of the economic system internally, the effects of globalization and the subsequent social unrest, the ability of countries to compete to access foreign markets and financial sources, and the relationship between the economy and security is a complementary relationship.

3-   The military sector: It is the most important because military threats affect all components of the state, as it puts the protection and safety of citizens, which is the duty of the state to be tested, and awareness of the intentions of countries and the extent of interaction between the offensive and defensive military capabilities of countries, and that major industrialized countries can militarize at any time, because their industrial fabric and scientific development allow them to do so.

4-   The environmental sector: Security in this sector is based on two units; natural threats (such as volcanoes, melting ice, floods, drought and desertification) and social threats (everything that harms the environment and its safety from human activities such as pollution and depletion of natural resources), and may make human civilization in danger, and these threats will not concern one country in itself, but affect all countries.

5-   The societal sector: It is the ability of societies to re-maintain and reproduce their patterns of specificities such as language, culture, identities and customs in light of competition for the same elements with other patterns as a result of globalization, which has created a dynamic escalation of integration within broader entities, phenomena that threaten the national and religious identity of society, represented by migration, invasion and the large import of foreign goods.

For Buzan, it was the interests of the state that determined the nature of these agendas, so the main text of his book (People, States and Fear) was not so much a call for a radical rethinking of security theory as it was a call for mainstream analysts to expand the security agenda of states away from their overriding concern with military force.

The general approach advocated by the Copenhagen School works in parallel with many central themes of critical thinking about security; such as emphasizing political power, the symbolism of the word "security", appreciating the resources and other implications of including issues outside of "normal politics" on the security agenda, understanding security as a subjective concept, committing to trying to avoid militarization of issues by challenging traditional security thinking that analyzes issues from a zero-sum perspective, and finally seeking to resolve security issues without violence.

There is another less obvious but equally powerful theoretical effect of the Copenhagen school in the work on securitization theory that sets it apart significantly from the trend in traditional security studies: security in Copenhagen is not just a type of speech, not just any form of social construction, it's a certain type of action; what makes a particular speech a security act specifically, is its portrayal of the issue as an existential threat, which calls for exceptional measures beyond Routine and the rules of everyday politics, in the words of school theorists.

In the security discourse, an issue is presented and presented as a top priority issue for securitization, allowing the decision-maker to have more room to maneuver when it

comes to vital issues, and this enables him to make urgent decisions without going through traditional institutional and oversight channels, especially when obtaining a popular mandate that enables him to mobilize the necessary resources, but Buzan places restrictions on this process (securityization) by identifying it, Three steps to the success of this process are.

1- Explain how the alleged threat can affect the survival of individuals or states.

2- Develop emergency measures that can control and control these threats.

3- The extent to which authoritarian discourse succeeds in gaining public satisfaction on certain issues, as a result of violating applicable laws such as transparency and oversight.

Buzan is the first to point out that the term security is a multi-meaning term, explaining that it is a controversial term in the first place, not only because of its inclusion in most areas of social and daily life, but especially because this term itself is likely to have ideological, moral and normative connotations, so it is this ideological tone that precludes any consensus on it that makes it a controversial term in the first place.

Buzan believes that the definition of security should take into account at least three things, from the political context of the concept, through its various dimensions, to the ambiguity and difference that accompanies it when applied in international relations.

Buzan suggested that security be studied from three separate perspectives: the individual, the state, and the international system, pointing to the difficulty of defining a reference to security, however, the security of the individual and the international system remains subject to state security because it is the most important reference unit, but it is not the only subject to understand security behaviors, and the state as seen by Buzan consists of three components: the idea of the state (national / national), the physical or physical base of the state (people / resources / technology), the institutional appearance of the state (political and administrative system), and accordingly, believes By defining the state in this way, it is easy to visualize threats to any of these three components.

Buzan also differentiated between strong and weak states as a condition for security at the state level, states need strength to enhance the legitimacy of ruling elites at the local and international levels, if the strength and weakness of states in the analysis of (Walts) is measured only by the extent of their material capabilities and their ability to interact between actual offensive and defensive capabilities of the actual armed forces, and on the other hand the perceptions of states for the capabilities and intentions of each other, and that (Buzan) sees that it depends on the level of institutional stability and the extent of internal political and social harmony, and the complex interdependence of contexts, make Internal and external issues It is difficult to determine whether the threat to government security emanates from within or outside, which further complicates the problem of security analysis.

Ole Weaver believes that with the end of bipolarity and the escalation of phenomena such as globalization, European construction and the expansion of the focus on nationalities in Eastern Europe, society has become more interested in the threat than the state as individuals, and they have become busy and their fear is linked to issues such as migration, loss of cultural values, loss of lifestyle and others, and believes that the concept of societal security is the most consistent and harmonious theoretical concept to analyze these new challenges, the societal dimension that symbolizes one of the sectors of the state in the perception of (Buzan) was considered a subject and a security reference in Thus, the important point in reconstructing security studies is the distinction between state and society, as security studies need to adopt a dual understanding, security that mixes state security, which revolves around sovereignty, and the security of society linked to identity.

The Cpenhagen school formed a middle ground between traditional state centralism and traditional peace research studies on the one hand, and monetary and global security studies on the other. Security was developed as a way to limit the excessive expansion of security, and it was a successful concept, at least in Europe, so there was no criticism at first, especially those with curricula that call for a further expansion of the concept of security, but the criticism later came from the owners of critical security studies, where (Booth) argued that the school (Copenhagen) does not move far enough in the direction of real people and in real places, and that it mistakenly links security and survival, because it is centered on the state, and centered around The most prominent criticism of societal security has been that of identity as fixed rather than organized, that is, as in traditional constructivism, a focus on the (causal) consequences of identities rather than on the discursive and political processes through which these identities are (unstable).

Although both Buzan and Weaver question the individual as a security reference entity, the Copenhagen school framework allows the individual as an auxiliary reference element in analysis.

The Second axis: (Wales) School

The Wales School, or what is sometimes called the Aberystwyth School after the name of a city located on the west coast of Wales, is one of the projects of critical security studies, and its most prominent theorists are (Ken Booth) and (Richard Wyn Jones), who have a positive perception of the concept of security, for them security means emancipation or emancipation, according to their view that the focus of security studies should not be in security as claimed by (Weaver) in the school (Copenhagen), but should be Emancipation of individuals, and trying to stand self-consciously outside the internal system of the state or even the world, and then discover the latent and driving forces of this system in order to provide ideas that help in the emancipation of people from situations of tyranny, such as illiteracy, racial and sexual discrimination, poverty and others, and the school (Wales) sought to develop what he called (Booth) as (global ethics) as an alternative to traditional security, and (Richard Wyn Jones) believes that critical security studies rethink from the bottom up in order to promote a more humane humanity.

The first critical security studies of the Wales School were through the article (Booth) in 1991 and was developed in 1997, where (Booth) asserted that security should be understood as the liberation of people - individuals or groups - from physical or other constraints such as poverty, violence and political repression, and security analysts should avoid monitoring security through the lenses of the state, because often the state itself is the root of the problem, so the best way to visualize security is to link it to individuals and explain the conditions for emancipation.

The Wales School stipulated the redefinition of security as an existential condition for individuals, away from the traditional security concepts of order and power in reality, which is the need for individuals to insure from threats and risks that exceed national survival and interest, so the school's supporters decided to move security from the state to individuals, and says (Booth) "The heart of emancipation is the heart of the critical theory of global security".

The roots of the critical school are derived from the works of both (Antonio Gramsci) and theorists of the school (Frankfurt)(*) (Jurgen Habermas) and (Max Horkheimer), this link produced a certain set of contents: theoretical, methodological, and normative, where these contents require expansion, deepening, extension and focus of security studies, where the expansion refers to the concept of security studies to include a range of issues beyond military power, while the deepening includes a theoretical approach to security linking the understanding of security with basic assumptions about the nature of political life where states and the state system appear As a natural response, the extension refers to the expansion of the security studies agenda not only to recognize the multiplicity of issues, but to the plurality of actors such as the state, the deepest location of security,

where critical security studies claim to adopt a security approach that focuses on the emancipation of individuals as a normative goal.

Emancipation means freedom from all restrictions that may hinder individuals and peoples from embodying their choices, it is the pursuit of material well-being and a decent living, freedom from the constraints of nature and scarcity and freedom from ignorance and superstition, and it seeks justice and freedom from tyranny in its various forms of politics and economic exploitation.

Proponents of the Wales School believe that the security of individuals cannot be framed from the perspective of national security, as there are many cases in which the state enjoys security while individuals live inside it under conditions of insecurity, and therefore, limiting the security reality to individuals may be shady if they are not perceived outside the state, that is, as individuals in themselves, so the subject of truth or security knowledge is not the individual in the context of the state, but the insecure individual in his subjective dimension.

Wales proponents also argue that going beyond the traditional perspective of security requires more than just criticizing the background of traditional security studies, but also criticizing the institutional framework in which it was produced, this means investigating how the field of knowledge is formed within institutional contexts, i.e. research centers, universities, institutes, government departments, organizations, etc.

There are two sources of knowledge within the institution; the first is scientific supervision, where we find most students withdrawing in the style of their professors or following the prevailing trend, and the second funding and financial support, there has been a strong influence of institutions and institutes in addition to the increasing public interest in national security led to the doubling of financial and technical support by many institutions such as the Carnegie Foundation for International Peace and the Mac Arthur Foundation and others.

In summary, the Wells School's contribution to critical security studies was revolutionary by all accounts; defining security as a policy of emancipation, considering the individual as a subject of reference, and putting the relationship between the academic institution and security knowledge under scrutiny, helped to build a critical theory of security that expanded rather than shrinking the concept of security, explored common humanity rather than national sovereignty, and emancipation rather than security.

From the point of view of Ken Booth, there is a need for a critical theory of security, in order to rise to the challenges of the times and pursue political ethics, and satisfy empirical curiosity, which is a driving force for all students, however, those who study international politics are often taught only the concepts to be taught according to the questions posed, so the (epistemology) provided by critical theory is the most convincing in order to get the right answers.

As for political ethics, all social, political and economic theories have ethical connotations, and therefore there must be the ability to express the reason for thinking and feeling this thinking, and finally enlightened social and political values are threatened as a result of unsustainability and keeping pace with natural and human developments in the era of globalization, so security must be global to respond to these variables .

During the Cold War, the security studies specialist was seen as a specialist in nuclear deterrence, the state of strategic equilibrium, the control of the weapons of the great powers and so on. In the context of global politics, Booth argued that security may be an emergency concept and not a fundamentally controversial concept, as the concept of security begins in conditions of insecurity for individuals or groups, and it is wrong to consider security synonymous with survival, because safety is always relative.

Proponents of the Wales school argue that theory should not be separated from its political/social/historical context, so attention should be focused more on the search for meaning than on the continuous accumulation of knowledge, that political and social science is inseparable from life just as it cannot be separated from critical discourse and political and social practice, that theory is more formative than explanatory, that the quest to create a libertarian/emancipatory future is more urgent than the quest to discover fundamental philosophical foundations. The role of the academic is not and cannot be that of a neutral observer, but that of an organic thinker, so politics at the global level should be based more on the logic of moral choices than on the logic of natural instincts.

The link between the concept of emancipation and the human dimension indicates the extent to which the school's supporters are preoccupied with human security with its multiple contents, individual and social, and therefore, the list of threats to human security is not determined by reference to the state, because it is no longer the only reference subject for security, nor is it determined by evoking the enemy's discourse (external and/or internal) lurking in the security and stability of the homeland, because it is no longer the only source of threats for them.

The first analytical step taken by the theorists of the Wales School of Security Studies is to deepen the understanding of security by revealing the politics behind scientific concepts and political agendas that allow analysts to consider other actors who are above and below the state level, and the second step is to broaden the understanding of security in order to consider the range of insecurities faced by these actors, and in this sense, they do not believe in the issues, but politicize security, in order to reveal the political character. Structural security thinking and reference to simple experiences that threaten individuals, so that they are able to dismantle military and state-focused threats that dominate traditional security agendas.

The first is strategic, arguing that existential threats to security should be abandoned to traditional forms of military thinking and action that result in zero? If taken in this way, the politicization of security facilitates questioning the uses of security by the elite in the state, and the second argument is political morality, and here security should not remain related to the state and its concerns and according to the description and understanding of the political elite in the state, but the definition of security must include anything and everything depending on their policy agenda and on the historical and political context, and security is likely to be conceived globally and practiced locally with regard to the future effects of current thinking and practices. The third argument is analytical: fears of new threats such as communicable diseases and illegal migration have become global security issues, reflecting the fears of some about political and social engagement with migrants who pose a risk and dealing with them more difficult.

From the point of view of the theorists of the school (Wales), the perception of security contradicts logic, and in order for security to have value at the international level, it must first be logical at the individual level, existential security is a natural subconscious motive inherent in everything - the individual since childhood is a necessity to feel safe and control his social relations - and the Wales school does not hide its normative agenda, but seeks to present a security concept that will help improve people's lives and maximize their security through integration instead From isolation, through opportunity rather than need or necessity.

The Wales School starts from the critique of traditional security studies, especially realist theories of security, where it begins its critique by saying that post-Cold War state-centered global realism cannot satisfactorily explain or analyze the complex web of global politics, and in a 1991 Booth article predicted the end of the Westphaly system of state sovereignty, arguing that it is better to view the post-Cold War world order as a transitional phase from the old system (the state system) to a new one (A global society emerging without borders), so the concept of the Wales School and its conception of

security as liberation, and liberation must begin from within the Academy from the ideas of traditionalists keen to secure their position and status, and their vision of security as the state and the army.The theorists of the Wales school sought to reformulate the concept of emancipation (emancipation) outside the traditional and revolutionary constructivist understanding of the concept as stated in Marxism, liberalism and postmodernism, which led to the development of a concept through the article (Ken Booth) published at the beginning of the nineties of the twentieth century entitled (Emancipation and Security), in which he focused on liberating people from material and human restrictions such as poverty, poor education and political repression, and has contributed to expanding the concept of security by giving it a concept related to the individual as a unit of analysis, which is Threatened by non-military sources related to human, political, food security and others.

The Third axis: School (Paris)

The Paris School focused within the context of critical security studies on the new and changing nature of political violence, and instead of paying attention to the issue of war, which goes beyond the traditional representation of violence at its minimum and least overt levels such as crime, liquidation, torture and kidnapping, while also focusing on threats resulting from societal insecurity such as migration issues, organized crime, protest and riot phenomena, border control and crossing points, this led to the emergence of a new knowledge map of global security with overlapping and complex dimensions. This security globalization forces the abolition of national borders and commits all actors in the international community to the need to cooperate.

The supporters of the school (Paris) in the development of a new concept of the concept of security to the need to abandon the traditional distinction between internal security and external security, where there is the origin of this distinction in the idea of the sovereign state and the method of bureaucratic organization associated with it, the nature of the new security threats made the concept of the state in their view unable to adapt to the tense atmosphere between political professionals, judges and police, and accordingly the Paris School believes that the integration of internal and external security is a necessary condition for the exercise of the security field The merger of the two would expand internal security activities by exporting policing methods to world politics, while the local character of external security would be eliminated by the routine nature of military operations in the national arena. Proponents of this school believe that the security field is not based on the exercise of force or coercion only, but on the ability of actors to produce data and information on which security facts and strategies are based.

These developments, which affected the concept of security, were accompanied by other views that the concentration of security in the sovereign State has become incompatible with the international environment, since the threat is no longer directed at the survival and independence of the State, but at social groups such as minorities, migrants, refugees and other sub-State actors.

The Paris approach modifies the prevailing perspective on security in three ways :

First, rather than analyzing security as an imperative concept, it proposes to address security as a "government technology."

Second, rather than investigating the intentions behind the use of force, this approach focuses on the effects of power games.

Third, rather than focusing on speech acts, it emphasizes practices and contexts that encourage or hinder the production of specific forms of governance.

The Paris School was able to introduce many new analytical concepts and tools to the field of security studies, and contributed vitally to the redefinition of security, and the most important contribution was to visualize the concept within the framework of police

practice, or in a more comprehensive sense, the practice of governance, security is no longer just protection from objective threats, but a continuous process of surveillance and societal control, reflected in the security discourses and the accompanying technological logic, and thus the Paris School has transformed security from a defensive position of protection From the threat, to the site of an attack, where the threat is anticipated and anticipated by exercising strategic logic on suspects or potential sources of insecurity.

The attacks of September 2001 constituted an explicit confirmation of the studies, methodological approaches and theorizing at the Paris School, especially those related to the effects of security practices on the future of freedom, and in this context (Didier Bigo) in 2002 established a research working group known as "European Liberty and Security", through which it seeks to know the negative repercussions and effects of the fight against terrorism on public freedoms, as the legalization of immigration issues and the criminalization of migrants through the exceptional case made them incompatible with security practices.   The United States of America may often be responsible for the escalation of terrorist threats as a result of its brutal foreign policy, on the one hand, and its use of these threats by creating a more obscure enemy through which to strengthen its global position and hegemony.

The phenomenon of illegal immigration has become a global phenomenon, as it comes in view of its criminal seriousness after the trafficking in drugs and weapons, and it has expanded after the end of the cold war because of technological development in the field of communication, means of transportation, inserious border control and deplorable and difficult living conditions.

The achievement of security is the essence of governance policies and their first, basic and permanent goal, each system of government seeks on the one hand to achieve its security by ensuring its stability and then its continuation away from the sources, causes and forms of threats all, and seeks on the other hand to achieve the security of its society by ensuring its stability and then its continuation away from the sources, causes and forms of threats.

Didier Bigo argues that non-traditional security threats have made the concept of the state unable to adapt to the growing tension caused by transnational bureaucratic ties between political professionals, the judiciary, the police, intelligence agencies and the military, and that the integration of the internal and external security fields due to globalization, the activities of cross-border security bureaucracies and the nature of non-traditional threats, which constitutes the security field, which involves the various security actors, mentioned above, that have been excluded in traditional security studies, despite their influence. and its efficiency in dealing with current security threats and challenges.

Didier Bigo defines the basic characteristics of the security field as follows :

1- The security field as a field of forces that exert pressure on the actors to which they belong, due to the gathering of a group of actors with a minimum degree of homogeneity in their bureaucratic interests, in the similarity of their way of defining a potential enemy.

2- The security field as a field for conflicts between actors, each according to its location, in order to maintain or transform power arrangements.

3- The security field as a field of domination in relation to other social fields, it is a struggle for the authority to impose their definition about what can be considered a source of fear, and the authority to define threats recognized as legitimate threats.

The Paris school focuses on practical application rather than rhetoric, as can be inferred from their representation to institutionalize security. In fact, after the end of the Cold War and the disappearance of the enemy, and what was called the "triumph of liberalism", the process of role-playing began as a means of maintaining security, for example, the army began to focus on inside borders to track down the enemy and internal security services

such as police forces looking for enemies outside the borders, and despite the claim that the September 11 attacks caused this change, The structural developments of the various agencies specialized in security and their relationship with political professionals, whether internal or external, have led to insecurity, allowing for the legitimization of practices and the interdependence between internal and external security.

In other words, agencies and security professionals maintain their relevance and ensure their survival by managing and obsessing with insecurity, perhaps the best example of this is the security of migration, in fact it is a political technique used as a method by governments by various institutions to play with discomfort to reassert their role as providers of protection and security, and when there is no concern, these institutions create anxiety and use techniques to manage fear and turn migrants into groups that pose threats, in the sense instead of From providing reassurance to society through unified internal and external security, individual and collective security, citizens worry so that they have no choice but to trust the authorities that are usually under the auspices of the state and who actually cover the weakness of its public policies, and this is not only problematic for individuals, states and their peoples but also for the world as a whole, and when internal and external security is integrated, the field of safety begins to globalize automatically, in other words, this security convergence through institutions, professionals and their international cooperation generates a process The globalization of insecurity, especially in the context of universality, such as the war on terror.

The Paris School of Security Studies, focusing on the internal and external dimensions of security practices with a focus on the process of insecurity, is also a reflexive school with a practical orientation, relying on post-structuralist and critical epistemology represented by Michel Foucault and Pierre Bourdieu and Jacques Derrida, who attempts to systematically deconstruct elements using discourse analysis through texts, interviews and other possible manifestations of practical application.

Her view of security (Paris School is the lack of separation between security in its internal and external aspects, and her theorists believe that there is a merger between the internal and external factors of security, and the reality is the merger of the two).

The main perception in the school (Paris) came from the ideas of (Pierre Bourdieu) and other sociologists such as (Michel Foucault), and the basic ideas were put forward in this school; that there is a close link between security studies, security policy and security analysts, and theorists had a direct impact on the policies of countries from the same concept in the field, and they also sought to clarify the activities of various governmental and non-governmental agencies related to security, they are interested in those practices and processes that occur outside the boundaries of official discourse, which are not It distinguishes between internal and external security, and that the security services in the state compete for security functions, whether political or military, and that the insecurity felt by society is a direct result of the traditional security policy carried out by the security services, which, unlike the school (Copenhagen), is concerned with the experimental practice of security and not discourse, from a methodological point of view, despite its complexity.

Supporters of this school emphasize the necessity of analyzing security, insecurity and various limits of danger or fear or response to violence or the relationship to freedom as a process in security and on the basis of security practices, these practices are forms of social interactions derived from objective relationships and rules of play, which are not directly visible or conscious, and try to integrate other disciplines in the study of security and conflict, and aim to analyze security issues using conceptual and practical tools in the fields of international relations and sociology, and the practices It is framed by the nature of the individual, which can be compared to how routine is framed by identity according to an existential security approach.Didier Bigo believes that safety sometimes leads to

unwanted side effects, particularly in EU countries through migrants, as they are seen as threatening indigenous dynamics.

Conclusion

Perhaps it is useful to emphasize, that the schools of thought that have been presented in this research are focused on the European continent and provide effective solutions to meet the security challenges, most of which are internal represented by immigrants, social cohesion and cultural identity of the nation, as they described, and neglected the positive side of immigrants from the competencies and manpower because the European continent complains about the lack of young people compared to the elderly, and that cultural diversity in societies is a positive feature, so those schools did not shed light on developing countries and did not It gives solutions to address the causes of migration in those countries and did not seek to achieve lasting peace and did not seriously seek to stop the wars in them and double standards in the aspects of human rights and interference in internal affairs under humanitarian pretexts.

It is not possible in security studies to build a general and comprehensive theory capable of explaining all security phenomena and issues at all times and places, all the security theories or schools mentioned in the research faced several criticisms because modern security challenges are characterized by interdependence, and complexity on the one hand, and on the other hand characterized by universality, that is, they include everyone.

References

Rita Floyd, Stuart Croft, European Non-Traditional Security Theory: From Theory to Practice, Geopolitics, History, and International Relations, No. (2), Addleton Academic Publishers, Now York – The United States Of America, 2011, pp. 152-153.

Sayed Ahmed Kogaili, The Development of Security Studies and the Dilemma of Application in the Arab World, Strategic Studies, Issue (169), Emirates Center for Strategic Studies and Research, Abu Dhabi - United Arab Emirates, 2012, p. 25.

Dr. Saeed Mustafa, Radwani Faisal, In Criticism of the Traditional Perception of Security: Critical Constructivist Contributions to Security Studies, Researcher Journal for Academic Studies, Issue (1), Algeria, 2019, pp. 553-554.

Dr. Miloud Amer Haj, Arab National Security and its Future Challenges, Naif University Publishing House, Riyadh - Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, 2016, p. 169.

Luiza – Maria Filimon, An overview of the Copenhagen School's Approach to security studies: Constructing (in) security through performative power, The Romania Journal for Baltic and Nordic studies, No,(2), Bucharest – Romania, 2016, p. 59.

Ibid, p. 60.

Branka Panic, Societal Security – Security and identity, Journal Western Balkans Security observer, No.(13) , Belgrad – Serbia, April 2009, p. 30.

Ibid, p. 31.

Marko Zilovic, The concept of political and future of the Copenhagen School of security studies, journal Western Balkans security observer, No. (13), Belgrade – Serbia, April 2009, p. 25.

Ibid, p. 24.

Ken Booth, Theory of world security, Cambridge University press, New York – The United States of America, 2007, p. 161.

Dr. Tawfiq Busti, The Copenhagen School Towards Expanding and Deepening the Concept of Security, Strategic Studies, Egyptian Institute for Studies, Istanbul - Turkey, March 22, 2019, pp. 6-9. See also: Barry Buzan, people, States, and Fear the National security problem in

International relations, Second Edition, Wheatsheaf Books Ltd, Great Britain, 1983, pp.75-83.

Ken Booth, op – cit, p. 162.

Ibid, p. 164.

Michael C. Williams, Words, Images, Enemies: Securitization and International politics, International Studies Quarterly, No. (47), Black well publishing, USA, 2003, p. 514.

Dr. Adel Zagag, The Societal Security Dilemma: Securitization Discourse and Public Policy Making, Journal of Politics and Law Notebooks, Issue (5), University of Batna, Algeria, 2011, p. 112. See also: Rita Floyd, Human Security and the Copenhagen School's Securitization Approach: Conceptualizing Human Security as, a securitizing move, Human Security Journal, Vol (5), United Kingdom, 2007, p. 42.

Salim Qusoum, New Directions in Security Studies, A Study of the Development of the Concept of Security in International Relations, Emirates Center for Strategic Studies and Research, Abu Dhabi - United Arab Emirates, 2018, p. 107.

Ibid, p108.

Ibid, p109.

Compare with: Hussein Bassem Abdel-Amir, The Concept of Securitization and Its Significance in Contemporary Security Studies, Journal of Strategic and Military Studies, Issue (11), Arab Democratic Center for Strategic, Political and Economic Studies, Berlin - Germany, 2021, p. 89.

Salim Qusoum, op-cit, p.118.

Barry Buzan, Lene Hansen, The Evolution of International Security Studies, Cambridge University press, United Kingdom, 2009, p. 213.

Ibid, p.215.

Rita Floyd, op-cit, p.42.

Sayed Ahmed Kogaili, The Development of Security Studies and the Dilemma of Application in the Arab World, Strategic Studies, Issue (169), Emirates Center for Strategic Studies and Research, Abu Dhabi - United Arab Emirates, 2012, p. 30.

Kestutis Paulauskas, The Security Studies: The Status Quo and the Trends, Lithuanian Annual Strategic Review,General Jonas Zemaitis military Academy of Lithuania, Brussels, November 2007, p. 221.

Sayed Ahmed Kogaili, op- cit, pp.31-32.

The (Frankfurt) Institute for Social Research was established as a center for socialist research in 1923, that is, after the First World War, and a group of thinkers were associated with that school, most notably Theodor W. Adorno, Max Horkheimer, and Herbert Marcuse. For more see: Ian Cribb, Social Theory of Parsons To Habermas, translated by: Dr. Muhammad Hussein Ghuloom, The World of Knowledge Series (244), The National Council for Culture, Arts and Letters, Kuwait, 1999, pp. 275-277.

Dr.Tawfiq Bosti, The Concept of Security and Post-Positivist Perspectives, Strategic Studies, Egyptian Institute for Studies, Istanbul - Turkey, March 12, 2019, p. 16.

Ibid, p.17.

Sayed Ahmed Qojili, Critical Security Studies, New Approaches to Redefining Security, Scientific Center for Political Studies, Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, 2014, pp. 39-40.

Ibid, pp.40-41.

Ibid, pp.40-41.

Ibid, pp.42.

Ken Booth, Theory of world security, Cambridge University press, New York – The United States of America, 2007,p. 89.

Ibid, p.90.

Ibid, p.109.

Ibid, p.110.

Dr. Mohamed Hamchi, Introduction to European Schools of Critical Security Studies, Algerian Journal of Human Security, Issue (6), July 2018, pp. 356-357.

Ibid, p.359.

Pinar Bilgin, Critical Theory, From book: Security Studies An Introduction, Routledge, New York - The United States Of America, 2008, p.98.

Ibid, pp. 99-100.

Ibid, p.100.

Kestutis Paulauskas, op-cit, p.221.

Rita Floyd, Towards a consequentialist evaluation of security: bringing together the Copenhagen and the Welsh Schools of security studies, Review of international studies, No.(2), British International studies Association, United Kingdom, April 2007, pp. 332-333.

Mounir Al-Omari, Community Security: Its Concept and Relationship with Other Security Sectors, Afaq Scientific Magazine, Issue (4), Algeria, September 2020, p. 582.

Abdel Fattah Ali Al-Rashdan, The Development of the Concept of Global Security in a Changing World, Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, third issue, University of Jordan, 2019, p. 123.

Ibid, pp.123-124.

Ibid, p.124.

Ibid, p.124.

Sayed Ahmed Qojili, The Development of Security Studies and the Dilemma of Application in the Arab World, Strategic Studies, Issue (169), Emirates Center for Strategic Studies and Research, Abu Dhabi - United Arab Emirates, 2012, pp. 32-33.

Seyyed Ahmed Kogaili, Critical Security Studies: New Approaches to Redefining Security, op-cit, p.68.

Dr. Idris Attia, Theoretical debates in European security schools regarding the issues of migration and asylum, Journal of Strategic and Military Studies, Issue (1), Arab Democratic Center, Berlin - Germany, September 2018, pp. 51-52

compare with: Felix Seidler, How can critical security studies approaches be applied to the "the war on terarism"?, Auflage, Germany, 2009, p.4.

Dr. Zarrouk Al-Arabi, Illegal Immigration and Mechanisms to Combat It, Journal of Comparative Legal Studies, Issue (1), Algeria, June 2020, p. 66.

Dr. Ali Abbas Murad, Security and National Security, Theoretical Approaches, Ibn al-Nadim for Publishing and Distribution, Algeria, Dar al-Rawafid al-Thaqafiyya - Publishers, Lebanon, 2017, p. 99.

Dr. Muhammad Hamshi, Paris School of Security Studies and the Problematic Level of Analysis in International Relations, International Politics, Issue (212), Al-Ahram Foundation, Cairo - Egypt, 2018, p. 177.

Ibid, p.177.

Mustafa Ali Sezal, Origins of differentiation in critical security school, PhD thesis,(unpublished), University of Groningen,Netherland,2019, pp. 96-97.

Ibid, pp. 97-98.

Ibid, p.101.

Munir Al-Omari, op - cit, pp. 582-583. For more information, see: Adel Antar Ali, Theories of Securitization in the Field of International Relations: From the Copenhagen School and

Toward a Proposed Communication Theory for the Study of Securitization, Journal of the College of Politics and Economics, Issue (14), College of Politics and Economics - Beni Suef University, Egypt, April 2022, pg. 581- 583.

Kestutis Paulauskas, op-cit, p. 2221.

Look: Didier Bigo, Emma Mecluskey, What is a Paris Approach to (in) securitization? Political Anthropological Research for International Sociology, From book: The Oxford Handbook of International Security, Oxford University Press, United Kingdom, 2018, pp. 119-123.

 Rita Floyd, Stuart Croft, op-cit, p.160.