IRSTI 11.25.40

Makangali Bauyrzhan,

PhD candidate, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Kazakhstan, Almaty,
e-mail: makangali@gmail.com

MODERN SECURITY STUDIES AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THEORETICAL EXPERIENCE IN THE GULF REGION

This article discusses the development of Security Studies and problems associated with the implementation of theoretical experience outside the spread of Western culture, since modern Security Studies are basically built on a Euro-American political culture. In this connection, scientists who study eastern countries, including the Islamic world, often face the problem that existing theories do not always work. This is related to the phenomenon of concept malformation, which was described by the well-known political scientist of the Florentine school of political studies, Giovanni Sartori. Within his theory, the simple implementation of Western concepts in the East leads to a distortion of the results. Scientists propose two ways to solve this problem, which are connected with the search for alternative theories or with the adaptation of existing theories within the region under study.

Key words: Security Studies, security, Concept Malformation, theories, Islamic theory of international relations.

Мақанғали Б.Қ.,

PhD докторанты, әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Қазақстан, Алматы қ.,
e-mail: makangali@gmail.com

Заманауи қауіпсіздік зерттеулер және Шығанақ аймағында теориялық тәжірибені қолдану мәселелері

Бұл мақалада қазіргі қауіпсіздік бойынша зерттеулердегі мәселелер қарастырылады. Оның ішінде батыс елдерден тыс аймақтарда теориялық тәжірибе қолдану мәселесі көтерілді. Себебі заманауи қауіпсіздік бойынша зерттеулердің негізі Еуропа мен Американың саяси негіздеріне сүйініп дамыған. Сондықтан бұл теориялар Шығыс өңірлерде қолдануға келмейтініне көз жеткізуге болады. Бұның себептерін Флоренция саяси мектебінің көрнекті өкілі Джованни Сартори концептердің бұрмалауымен байланыстырады. Сартори тұжырымы бойынша батыс мәдениеті, тарихы мен философиясы төңірегінде жасалған терминология Шығыстағы жаңа құбылыстардың қыр-сырларын аша алмайды, керісінше қателіктерге әкеледі. Сондықтан бұл мәселені шешу үшін зерттеушілер екі шешім ұсынады. Біріншіден жергілікті теорияларды дамыту, екіншіден батыс теорияларды жергілікті жағдайына сәйкестіріп қолдану.

Түйін сөздер: қауіпсіздік бойынша зерттеулер, қауіпсіздік, концепт бұрмалауы, теориялар, халықаралық қатынастардың ислам теориясы.

Макангали Бауыржан Конысбайулы

PhD докторант, Казахский национальный университет им. аль-Фараби, Казахстан, Алматы,
e-mail: makangali@gmail.com

Современные исследования в области безопасности и вопросы имплементации теоретического опыта в регионе Залива

В данной статье рассматривается вопрос развития исследований в области безопасности и проблемы, связанные с имплементации теоретического опыта вне распространения западной культуры, так как современные исследования безопасности в своей основе построены на евро-американской политической культуре. В связи с этим зачастую ученые, изучающие восточные

страны, в том числе исламского мира, сталкиваются с проблемой того, что имеющиеся теории не всегда работают. Это связано с таким явлением, как искажения концептов, которое описал известный политолог флорентийской школы политических исследований Джованни Сартори. В рамках его теории простая имплементация западных концептов на Востоке приводит к искажению конечных результатов. Ученые предлагают два пути решение данной проблемы, которые связаны либо с поиском альтернативных теорий или с адаптацией имеющихся теорий в рамках изучаемого региона.

Ключевые слова: исследования в области безопасности, безопасность, искажение концептов, теории, исламская теория международных отношений.

Introduction

Security is one of the fundamental and central categories of international relations (IR), and the study of security issues is considered the most important area of this scientific discipline. In turn, ensuring security is the dominant imperative of the policy of the absolute majority of states of the world, the key to their stability, development and prosperity.

The study of security in IR deals with such a scientific area as *Security Studies*. Also often in the scientific literature, the direction is called as *International Security Studies, Strategic Studies, Peace Research*, etc. It is believed that initially, this direction was independent, but rather quickly absorbed by international relations. (Buzan, Hansen 2009: 1) The issue of security became the leitmotif of the formation of international relations as a scientific discipline after the First World War (1914-1918). Since this was the world's first global scale conflict with colossal human casualties, the widespread use of new technological developments, the acts of using chemical weapons as weapons of mass destruction (WMD), etc. According to its results, the governments of the world powers, leading political figures, various researchers sought to comprehend these events in order to prevent their repetition in the future. (Collins 2009: 2) Therefore, researchers agree that the issue of security has become the most important reason for the formation of a new discipline political science.

Despite the steps taken by the world community after the First World War, the established system of international relations could not form a safe world, as the even more terrifying and tragic Second World War (1939-1945) flared up. In many ways, the failure of the system was due to differences in security approaches between Continental Europe, historically oriented to collective action in the military field, and between the Anglo-American approaches, originating from a culture of deterrence. The result of the Second World War was the creation of a new world order, where the issue of

security reached a new level. The main instrument for achieving international security was to be the United Nations (UN), created in 1945. Its creators in the preamble of the Charter of the organization stressed that the motive for integration is the desire to join forces in maintaining international peace and security. (Charter of the United Nations)

The world once again plunged into war, but of a different nature, which consisted in the confrontation of two blocks (systems) based on the ideological antagonism of the two superpowers of the USA and the USSR. This war was called the Cold War. On the other hand, these events have become a dividing line for Security Studies. According to B. Buzan and L. Hansen, works on security before 1945 can largely be described as military studies, military strategies or geopolitics. These include such famous authors as Clausewitz, Mahan, Richardson, and Haushofer. (Buzan, Hansen 2009: 1)

The cold war dictated its conditions. New elements began to be added to traditional military issues, in particular due to the sharp increase in the number of nuclear weapons in the world and strategic forces. Enhancing the security of some increased the threat to others. This situation led to "unsustainable stability" in the world, the persistence of which was always in doubt. (Lipschutz 1995: 11) It was during this period that the main research schools and the main approaches to the study of security emerged. In general, there was a qualitative and quantitative evolution of the scientific direction. New research has become more extensive, not only military, but also some non-military threats were covered, and security as a whole, and not just the issue of defense or war, became the key concept. But perceptions of each other in the West and the USSR as an existential threat created pressure on the international security agenda, leaving the military component as the main imperative. We would like to note that the development of the theories of international relations (IRT) in the XX century, in the first place, is connected with the research of Western scientists. As in the Soviet Union, world politics was viewed through the prism of the Marxist-Leninist

ideology of confrontation between the progressive communist world and the aggressive policies of Western imperialism. Therefore, the theorization of current international processes lagged significantly behind the work of western researchers.

Alternative Security Studies, including constructivist, critical, feminist, and others, began to gain great popularity in the scientific community during the Cold War era. The intellectual demand for new approaches is associated with the expansion and deepening of the most complex processes in the world: the erosion of state sovereignty; globalization; digitalization of information and an increase in the speed of its transmission; cultural-civilization and religious-confessional faults; strengthening non-state actors in international politics and much more. New types of threats, which often had a non-military character, began to play an increasingly important role in the world. Therefore, debates and discussions about the concept of "security" began to grow in the research environment, namely, the primacy of the security object. Should this be the entire international system or only nation states, or the "West" and individual communities, etc. (Lipschutz 1995:1)

In the context of this debate, Security Studies began to shape their modern structure. Such a width and depth of the research field, although indicating a sustainable development of the scientific field, but on the other hand, also points to the evolution of traditional problems and the intensification of new types of threats.

What is security?

Studying the scientific literature, one has to state that among researchers there is no consensus about the semantics of the term "security". Many authors believe that in modern science "security" has the character of multidimensionality, and also call the term "subjective and elastic". (Williams P.D., McDonald M. 2018:1) This creates a number of conceptual problems, since it does not introduce a clear definition. According to Logunov A.B. is in such a situation that "*since social problems can be viewed from the point of view of various sciences, methodologies, schools and personal bias, then this "inexhaustibility" of this concept arises*". (Logunov 2015: 7)

Specialists identify several key components of security, this is an "object" (who needs security), "subject" (who provides security) and "activity" (how security is ensured). In modern scientific thought and in world practice, it is considered traditional that the state is the main object of security. This is due to the peculiarity of the creation and development of the Westphalia political system of the world. Where any state since its inception set the main task of preserving its own sovereignty, which was understood to prevent external aggression. However, with the end of the Cold War, scientists began to revise these basic settings and make adjustments. If we consider security in the framework of modern IRT, then it is natural to regard the state as the main "object", which is still the main actor of world politics in the understanding of most researchers. In this case, the "subject" will be the legitimate leadership of the country, as an authorized body. States have interests shaped by objective needs, in particular self-preservation and development. The protection of these interests by all available means and methods is the "activity" of the subject. However, various conditions and factors hindering the implementation of the interests of the subject are perceived as security threats. (Logunov 2015: 8-10) In the early stages of the development of IRT, security and the satisfaction of interests were considered only within the framework of increasing state influence through the growth of military power or "hard power". (Lebedeva 2014: 117) However, the role of "soft power", built on increasing the country's authority based on culture, sympathy, etc. The concept of combining "hard power" and "soft power" in international relations is called "smart power". (Nye 2011)

Among the security definitions that modern researchers use, there are both general interpretations and narrower ones. For example, the majority of researchers in international relations, speaking of the term "security", have in mind "the alleviation of threats to cherished values". (Williams P.D., McDonald M. 2018: 1) What is essentially a more flexible version of one of the early interpretations of "security" «the absence of threats to acquired values, in a subjective sense, the absence of fear that such values will be attacked» that A. Wolfers gave in 1952. (Wolfers 1952: 485) Scientists specializing in Security Studies give narrower definitions, which often depend on the theoretical orientation of the researcher. At the same time, in the works of the Cold War period, the concept of "security" was generally perceived as a defense against external aggression and war. As can be seen in the work of I. Bellany "Security itself is relative freedom from war ...". (Bellany 1981: 102) In addition, for example, G. Luciani in his research says that security is the ability to resist aggression from the outside. (Luciani 1989: 151) The majority of specialists of that era followed this question. In the post-Cold

War studies, there is an attempt to take into account new trends and go beyond the boundaries of the problems of war and peace in international relations. So Edward A. Kolodziej writes: "*Security… implies both coercive means to check an aggressor and all manner of persuasion, bolstered by the prospect of mutually shared benefits, to transform hostility into cooperation*". (Kolodziej 2005: 25) Moreover, here is a well-known specialist, Mohammed Ayoob writes: "*Security-insecurity is defined in relation to vulnerabilities – both internal and external – that threaten or have the potential to bring down or weaken state structures, both territorial and institutional, and governing regimes*". (Ayoob 1995: 9) The treatment of Mohammed Ayoob gives an understanding not only of the essence of security, but also affects the very important state of "insecurity". In our opinion, with respect to this study, taking into account all the specifics of the region studied, his definition is the most appropriate.

However, the period after the Cold War reformatted not only the world order and the system of International Relations, but Security Studies. Other aspects of safety have begun to gain increasing relevance, which has created difficulties for traditional research methods. Therefore, in the 1990s, representatives of the Copenhagen School of Security, in order to cover a wider range of industries in Security Studies, suggested reconsidering the existing approaches, since some new areas of problems were fundamentally different from military-political threats. They divided the subjects of study into different sectors according to the spheres of public life: military, environmental, economic, social and political, which allows improving the perception of problems and improving the level of their analysis. (Buzan et. al. 1998: 195-213) The approach was more systematic and structured. At the same time, a security separation approach has been established in security studies, depending on the spheres of public life. There are such types of security as political, military, economic, environmental, social, informational, food and others. In turn, according to their characteristics, security types can now be classified as "hard security" (for example, military security) and "soft security" (economic, environmental, cultural security, etc.).

Theoretical Approach Map of Security Studies

Security research over the last century has evolved within the discipline of IR. Therefore, the theoretical part of Security Studies is synchronized with IRT. It can be said that the majority of security researchers offer their theoretical and methodological developments within the framework of the IRT paradigm. Scientists identify four paradigms: realism, liberalism, globalism, and postpositivism. Paradigms offer a certain set of basic principles and attitudes, within which theories of the general, middle, private level and approaches are developed in the future.

Realism as a paradigm is rightfully considered the foundation of the entire scientific discipline of the IR. Realists require the most accurate and "realistic" to describe international relations, that is, to study what is happening in reality and not the abstract possible in the future. (Lebedeva 2014: 23) In addition, to focus on the analysis of what states are doing and not that declare. The sources of realism, asserted by realists, can be found in the ancient works of ancient Greece, Rome, India and China. (Jensen, M.A., Elman 2018: 19) In the 20th century, by focusing on elements such as security, war and peace, strength and power, international anarchy, led to the long dominance of the realistic paradigm in world politics. (Glaser 2009: 16) Moreover, it is necessary to emphasize that no paradigm of IRT pays more attention to security than realism, which puts it as the main motivation of the state. (Baldwin 1997: 21)

Realism has two main variations that have emerged one after the other during the twentieth century. The first kind of realism is associated with the works of such scientists as E.H. Carr and G. Morgenthau, who defended their views on the study of international relations in debates with supporters of liberalism. (Quinn 2018: 71-72) Although the concepts of liberalism in IR were formed earlier by realism, however, a realistic paradigm emerged from the activities of G. Morgenthau took it up, because the ideas of the realists were based on more understandable and close to that time basics. The second kind of realism is associated with the name of an American political scientist Kenneth Waltz. He criticized and disavowed many of the ideas of realism, which were formed by his predecessors, including Morgenthau. First, his criticism was addressed to the approach of Morgenthau and his followers, who, studying the early actions of various countries, tried to determine the universal behavioral laws of states and their political leaders. However, according to Waltz, in view of the different characteristics of states, it is advisable to develop a structure that would explain the actions of states (for example, war or peace). Ideas formed in realism before Waltz received the name of classical realism, while the thoughts of Waltz himself came

to be called structural realism or neo-realism. (Quinn 2018: 72) Subsequently, researchers, also rethinking the ideas of both Morgenthau and Waltz, developed other variations of realism such as defensive structural realism, offensive structural realism, the theory of rise and fall, neoclassical realism, etc. At the same time, each direction is characterized by the active use of individual theories, such as the balance of power, the dilemma of security, hegemonic stability, etc. In general, such an abundance of variations within a single paradigm creates disagreements even on a number of key conceptual points of realism, for example, issues of interstate cooperation. However, in most basic aspects of the paradigm, the realists are one. For example, the nature of the international system in realism is characterized by anarchy. Realists see the reason for this in the absence of an international sovereign (authority) guaranteeing the observance of international order, agreements and obligations, and as an arbitrator who prevents the unreasonable use of military force. However, anarchy does not mean the chaos of the international system. The realistic paradigm considers the state as the main actor in international relations. At the same time focusing on the overall structure of the international system, without going into details, in the internal issues of individual countries. Realists consider states as rational actors who make decisions based on their capabilities, taking into account the motives of other states and pursuing national interests. (Glaser 2009: 16-17) Accurately following national interests is a feature of realism and one of the most important elements of the paradigm. Moreover, G. Morgenthau makes it the main category, but noting that the content of "national interests" may vary over time. (Morgenthau 1967) In the understanding of the absolute majority of realists, "force" is one of the most important category and determining factor of the international environment. This results from the anarchic state of the world system, when each state is only able to ensure its own security by building up military power. Therefore, in this process, resources play the most important role: wealth, population, intellectual and technical potential, etc. Nevertheless, the struggle for resources realists explains the nature of war. Although for Waltz, war is associated with an uneven distribution of power in the international system. (Konyshev 2004: 333) In general, at the macro level, realists try to explain the choice of the state's security strategy, which may be in a model of competitiveness or cooperation. Under the competition means security approaches through the creation of a strong army, the search

for allies and the use of military force. Whereas the model of cooperation consists in reaching certain agreements, including on arms control, the use of force unilaterally, the development of collective decisions, etc. (Glaser 2009: 16)

The second most important paradigm in security studies is *liberalism*. Liberalism is based on the understanding that anarchy in the world system is detrimental to all its participants, therefore a wide range of international actors must be involved in order to achieve the goal of ensuring security. Unlike realists, who claim that there is no universal political morality, supporters of liberalism not only believe in it but also call for it to strive. (Quinn 2018: 82) And since liberalism claims that a person is by nature non-aggressive and cooperative in perspective, perhaps, to build a single world, this paradigm is called idealistic. Supporters of liberalism refer their ideas to the works of the Enlightenment, to such philosophers as John Locke and Emmanuel Kant. (2009: 35) It is believed that the ideas of liberalism in world politics reached their peak in the first years after the First World War, largely due to the active work of the President USA Woodrow Wilson. And the first conceptual ideas were reflected in three documents, these are: the Charter of the League of the Nation of 1918, the Briand-Kellogg Pact of 1928 and the Stimson Doctrine of 1932. In general, over the past century, liberalism had three main directions. The first direction was based on the idea of the possibility of legal regulation of international relations. The second direction was aimed at overcoming the anarchy of the world system by strengthening international organizations. The third direction developed the concept of prospects for the disarmament process. (Lebedeva 2014: 29) The ideas of strengthening international institutions, disarmament, democratization of the world system, human rights issues have become the basic and distinctive concepts of the liberal idealistic paradigm, since the core is positivism regarding the prospects for building a secure world. Supporters of liberalism believe that international relations are constantly evolving and permeated by the spirit of interdependence and cooperation. Therefore, in liberalism, along with the state, the main actor is also international institutions. Among the variations of liberalism, the oldest is economic liberalism, according to which economic advantage contributes to increased cooperation, and therefore to a reduction in conflicts and wars in the world environment. Human rights liberalism focuses on human rights, as many wars are characterized by oppression of people based on racial, religious,

ethnic identity. Observance of human rights can not only reduce the conflict potential, but also prevent the chaotic disintegration of many states from separatism. Democratic liberalism supports the thesis of a democratic world where democratic countries do not fight among themselves, even though they have a large concentration of offensive military power, yet they are able to coexist without giving rise to military conflicts. Another important achievement of liberalism is the emphasis on the activities of international institutions. In particular, international regimes play a special role in ensuring security. A regime is understood as the principles, rules, norms and decision-making procedures that international actors use in relation to the correct questions. (Morgan 2009: 40)

Despite the objective decline of liberalism in the second half of the 20th century due to the dominance of realism, the global changes of the world system after the end of the Cold War contributed to the revival of liberalism. Nevertheless, now, liberalism is experiencing a number of intellectual problems associated with various trends in world politics, including the US doctrine of "force spread" of democracy in the Middle East, the new Western confrontation with Russia, global terrorism, caused by religious extremism, etc.

The third paradigm is *globalism*. The origins of globalism lie as well as among the idealists in the teachings of Emanuel Kant, as well as in the writings of the founding fathers of Marxism, K. Marx, V. Lenin and others. The core of globalism is the idea of the development of the world according to uniform and universal laws. If the states follow this single trajectory, peace and security is achieved, and, on the contrary, when deviating from these laws, countries face problems. In addition, the key concept of globalism is the process of globalization, from which the paradigm derives its name. Among modern approaches to globalism in Security Studies, the Peace Studies School occupies a special place. The school received its development in the 1950s due to the escalation of the contradiction between the two blocks, the prospects for the start of a new global war and the associated nuclear arms race. In addition, the development direction was promoted by problems along the North-South line, an increase in environmental problems, etc. The first institutions for studying the world appeared in the United States and Scandinavia. Moreover, by the 1970s, there was already a whole network of various centers and scientific journals specializing in the study of the world. The end of the Cold War gave a second wind to Peace Studies, especially the need to resolve

conflicts in the third world. (Mutimer 2009: 70) In general, if you look at the features of Peace Studies, we can say that this approach focuses on non-state, global ideas about the main problems of conflicts. For example, in contrast to the traditional paradigms (realism and liberalism), globalists have the main actor in large communities of people (classes, races, etc.).

The fourth paradigm is *postpositivism*, which unites a number of different approaches (post-structuralism, critical theory, feminism, constructivism, etc.) in the study of international relations and security issues. It is generally accepted that the general ideological origins of postpositivism originate from the ideas of the famous German philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche, as well as the thinkers of American pragmatism Charles Pierce, William James, J. Dewey, etc. The conceptual development of postpositivism is associated with the general criticism of classical theories and their methods. Post-positivist revisionism has become one of the drivers of new debates in international relations and in Security Studies after the end of the Cold War. Strictly speaking, in most cases the revisionist method of traditional theories combines various approaches, as well as various scientists under the umbrella of postpositivism. There are general points of view on certain processes in world politics. For example, in postpositivism, the problem of conflict is reduced to the question of identity. That is, in their opinion, the source of the conflict is not a clash of interests or a struggle for resources like among realists, but a mismatch of two identities (nations, states, etc.). Post-positivism approaches are not theories, and therefore often do not provide a full-fledged causal picture of international processes, as well as world political events. These approaches are designed to explain individual situations or are designed to review security issues and provide new ways to solve the problems that humanity faced after the end of the Cold War. The development of these approaches is connected with the crisis of a realistic paradigm that could not provide full-fledged answers to new challenges and security threats. Therefore, poststructuralism is trying to re-analyze not only what is safety, but also such questions where and how security is implemented. (Ahall 2018: 87) On the other hand, feminism, which says that security in realism, is the male position of the military-political format of defense against external threats and encroachment on the territory, whereas in feminism security is the defense against any kind of violence. (Lebedeva 2014: 38) Critical theory has received particular popularity among researchers. Critical analysis was developed in the early 1990s and was intended to revise the concept of

security and go beyond the Cold War category, which limited thinking about the essence of security. (Bilgin 2018: 61)

Securitization theory is another new and popular approach to security research that is related to the Copenhagen School. Theorists of this school argue that safety is a survival; therefore, the problem of security should be formulated as an existential threat. (Emmers 2009: 137) In the 90s, representatives of the Copenhagen Security School B. Buzan, O. Waver, J. de Wilde to cover more a wide range of industries in the study of security offered to reconsider existing approaches, since some new areas of problems were fundamentally different from the traditional military-political threats. They divided the subjects of study into different sectors according to the spheres of public life: military, environmental, economic, social and political. In their opinion, this allows improving perceptions of problems and improving the level of their analysis. (Buzan et. al. 1998: 195-213)

The implementation of theoretical experience in the Gulf region

The perception of international events through a theoretical lens is the most important task of any researcher. Otherwise, these processes will remain only facts without explaining the reasons for their origin. (Lebedeva 2014: 22) Another thing is that not all theories available today are able to give a full causal explanation of events occurring in world politics, especially in the field of security. Moreover, a researcher studying security issues in the East is faced with difficulties because the IRT paradigms have a Eurocentric basis. In fact, modern security studies, as indicated by B. Buzan and L. Hansen, are western security studies, as well as modern IRT are Western IRT. (Buzan, Hansen 2009: 1) In this situation, simple implementation of theories developed based on Euro-American political experience in the regions of Asia and Africa is fraught with distortion of the results obtained. In addition, in the future this leads to miscalculations in the actions of international actors on the world stage. (Voskresenskiy 2014: 85)

A researcher, who applies patterns of Western theories in the East, is faced with the fact that they do not always work. This may be associated with the phenomenon, which in comparative political science is referred to as a distortion of the concepts pointed to by Giovanni Sartori. Within the framework of his theory of Concept misformation, Sartori explains that in modern science there is a tendency to use terminology developed in European

realities in relation to new political phenomena in the East. (Sartori 1970) This leads to a distortion of concepts as, for example, the concept of a state in the East is not the same as in the West, etc. In addition to this phenomenon, it should be noted that in recent decades there has been a crisis in Western theories caused by the end of the Cold War and the formation of new international realities, problems, threats and challenges, that even in Western conditions no theory can give full answers to all the events . In turn, this led to the growth of alternative approaches in IRT and, in general, to the formation of high theoretical competition in Euro-American political thought.

To solve this complex problem, researchers offer several ways. *The first way* is to search for non-Western theories that would correspond to the realities of the studied region. In fact, the authors of the collective work "Non-Western International Relations Theory Perspectives On and Beyond Asia", published in 2010 under the editorship of Amativ Acharya and Barry Buzan, became interested in this topic. The authors wondered why there are no Non-Western theories in the international arena, since existing IRT clearly cannot fully answer all events in world politics. In their opinion, western theories are in fact limited in their base of sources, but at the same time, they have a dominant position of influence on international relations. Therefore, they decided to present the non-western traditions of international relations to the scientific community that can challenge the dominance of western theories. As an example, the cases of China, Japan, South Korea, India, Southeast Asia, Indonesia, as well as the Islamic model were considered. As a result, the following conclusions were made that neither China nor Japan fit into one of the traditional paradigms of the IRT, Southeast Asia represented by ASEAN, suggests an alternative view of regional governance through local regional powers. Most of all, close to realistic projects are South Korea and India. (Acharya A., Buzan B 2010: 2-3) However, it must be emphasized that some regions of the East are still close to the application of western concepts in practice. For example, Central Asia, which because of the Soviet legacy has lost most of its traditional orientation and fundamental foundations. Later, after the collapse of the USSR, the region chose to focus on western values and is trying to integrate into European projects. In particular, Kazakhstan, which even chaired the OSCE in 2010. Of course, regional cooperation has a large number of problems, but the prospects for implementing western experience are great. (Somzhurek et. al. 2018)

Among all the non-Western theories of international relations, the Chinese model is developing most dynamically. This is because the rapid rise of China requires it to search for its own view of current processes in international relations, as well as the importance of determining its place in world politics. Not only Chinese specialists are engaged in this topic, but Western scientists are also making a great contribution. So Henry Kissinger in his work "On China" gives an analysis of the Chinese view, not only from the point of view of the current Communist Party, but also through the prism of centuries-old Chinese philosophy, built on the position "China is the center of the Universe". (Kissinger 2012)

As for the Islamic world, the authors of the analysis of non-western traditions of international relations say that the history of the Middle East has the most competitive position with the West to be a source for IRT. (Acharya A., Buzan B 2010: 2-3) Questions about non-western theories rose again in 2012 in collective work "Thinking International Relations Differently" edited by A. Tikner and D. Blaney, which separately discussed the issue of security of the Arab world, as well as non-Western views on the central concepts of Western theories. (Tickner, Blaney 2012) Exploring this question, we can say that Islam as an integral world outlook system has all the foundations and rights for an alternative model of international relations. However, in practice, in the practice of implementation, the researcher encounters a large set of difficulties caused by the fact that the modern Islamic world is very fragmented, disintegrated and generally non-homogeneous. The states of the Islamic world are different in view of objective historical development and complex colonial heritage. Only in some states religion is absolutized, in most countries, the control system has received either western forms or hybrid forms, where religion does not have dominance in the regime of governing and political decision-making, even if the opposite is declared somewhere. In many states, secular institutions and explicit secularization of politics prevail. In this situation, the Gulf region would be the most suitable field for testing the Islamic model of international relations. Since it is here that religion is most integrated into social and political life. Nevertheless, there is a number of serious problems that impede this approach. *First*, some countries in the region are dependent, in particular in the field of security, on the global conjuncture and behavior of the United States in the international arena. *Secondly*, inside the confessional fragmentation of the region, this lies in the high competition of various religious groups and their views on the development of the Islamic world. The issue is not only in the division into Sunnis and Shiites, but in the problem lies much deeper. This is a salafi paradigm of Saudi Arabia, and some small Gulf monarchies to Riyadh, the Ibadi group in Oman, the Muslim brothers in Qatar, Khomeini model in Iran, the Shiites of Iraq, and even the terrorist jihadist project of ISIL. Each party has its own vision of relations with the outside world in the framework of the "Islamic model of international relations". *Third*, the globalization of western projects and their distribution outside the borders of the West. It can be said that the Islamic theory of international relations is the most important alternative for the theorization of regional processes in the future, but in solving a number of the above problems of a conceptual nature.

The second way is the selection and adaptation of existing IRT to a specific research object. Moreover, if the development of the first path is an opportunity for the long term, the adaptation of existing theories is a more acceptable way in the current situation. But for adaptation, it is necessary to integrate many aspects from regional realities. The Arab researcher Ahmad Said Kujiyli, that Security Studies in the Arab world require an extensive study of many problematic issues, including sources of power, the patriarchal system of relationships, the role of a woman, etc, emphasizes this context. This, in his opinion, requires further expansion of the scope of specialization in order to incorporate local political theory, historical sociology, law, and even Sharia sciences into it. (Kujiyli 2012: 66) On the other hand, this development of western theories plays to the benefit of the theories themselves. Indeed, as E. Kolodziej noted, the pursuit of knowledge about security should be a continuous process, it is necessary to constantly develop analysis that will open new frontiers in understanding security. (Kolodziej 2005: 43) The most appropriate of the modern IRT is realism as a general paradigm for studying the security of the Islamic world, taking into account the characteristics of the region of the study. Islamic world taking into account the characteristics of the region of the study. Why realism? Because realism not only appeals with clear concepts of war and peace, strength and power, but also realism is best suited for studying states of the modern era, while the other paradigms take into account that most Western countries have moved into the postmodern era. The modernist states are the traditional states of the Westphalia system, which follow their own interests, including the protection

of sovereignty, borders, non-interference in internal affairs, etc. However, under the postmodern they mean those states that no longer depend on the above categories as much as before, for example, the EU countries. (Why we still need empires 2002) In turn, it is necessary to recognize that the countries of the Islamic world have only reached the Westphalia system and have become states of the modern era.

Conclusion

Thus, the development of Security Studies can be divided into three stages: *the first stage*, until 1945, is associated with military research*; the second stage* is connected with the bipolar system of the world structure during the Cold War; *the third stage* is connected with the new realities of the world system after the end of the Cold War. Modern security research as the scientific direction of the discipline of international relations is to pose the task of studying security as a whole, and not just the issues of war and peace as it was before. At the same time, there is still no consensus among researchers on the semantic load of the term "security". Security Studies is a fairly popular and relevant area worldwide. However, researchers outside the spread of western culture, thought and philosophy encounter gaps in the implementation of theoretical experience in non-western regions, since modern Security Studies are inherently Eurocentric in nature because they were formed on Euro-American political experience. Scientists offer two ways to solve this problem. The first is related to the search for non-western theories, in particular for the Gulf region, the Islamic concept of international relations and security. In addition, the second way is the adaptation of existing theories to the realities of the studied region. At the same time, the first way of seeing the difficulties caused by the lack of an intellectual base can be viewed as a long-term perspective, while the second way is acceptable in the short and medium term.

References

Acharya A., Buzan B., (2010). Why is there no non-Western international relations theory? An introduction. In: Acharya A., Buzan B., (eds.) Non-Western International Relations Theory Perspectives On and Beyond Asia. New York: Routledge.

Ahall, L. (2018). Poststructuralism. In; Williams P.D. (Ed.), Security Studies: An Introduction. New York: Routledge.

Ayoob, M. (1995). The Third World Security Predicament, Boulder CO: Lynne Rienner.

Baldwin, D.A. (1997). The Concept of Security. Review of International Studies, 23:1, 5-26.

Bellany, I. (1981). Towards a Theory of International Security. Political Studies, 29:1, 100-105. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9248.1981.tb01276.x

Bilgin, P. (2018). Critical theory. In; Williams P.D. (Ed.), Security Studies: An Introduction. New York: Routledge.

Buzan, B., Hansen L. (2009). The Evolution of International Security Studies. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Buzan, B., Waever, O., de Wilde J. (1998) Security a New Framework for Analysis. London: Lynne Rienner.

Charter of the United Nations. Retrieved from URL: http://www.un.org/ru/sections/un-charter/preamble/index.html

Collins, A. (2009). Introduction. In: Collins A. (Ed.), Contemporary Security Studies, Second edition. New York: Oxford University Press.

Emmers, R. (2009). Securitization. In: Collins A. (Ed.), Contemporary Security Studies, Second edition. New York: Oxford University Press.

Glaser, C.A. (2009). Realism. In: Collins A. (Ed.), Contemporary Security Studies, Second edition. New York: Oxford University Press.

Jensen, M.A., Elman, C. (2018). Realism. In; Williams P.D. (Ed.), Security Studies: An Introduction. New York: Routledge.

Kissinger, H. (2012). On China. New York: Penguin.

Kolodziej, E.A. (2005). Security and International Relations, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Konyshev, V.N. (2004). Amerikanskiy neorealizm o prirode voyny: evolyutsiya politicheskoy teorii. Saint-Petersburg: Nauka.

Kujiyli, C.A., (2012). Tatau ad-dirasat al-amniy ua muadlya at-tatbik fi al-alam al-arabi. Abu Dhabi: The Emirates Center for Strategic Studies.

Lebedeva, M.M. (2014). Mirovaya politika, 3-ye izdaniye. Moscow: Knorus.

Lipschutz, R.D. (1995). On Security. In: Lipschutz R.D. (Ed.), On Security. New York: Columbia University Press.

Logunov, A.B. (2015). Regional'naya i natsional'naya bezopasnost'. Moscow: INFRA-M.

Luciani G. (1989). The Economic Content of Security. Journal of Public Policy, 8:2, 151–173.

Morgan, P. (2009). Liberalism. In: Collins A. (Ed.), Contemporary Security Studies, Second edition. New York: Oxford University Press.

Morgenthau, H. (1967). Politics among nations. New York: Knopf.

Mutimer, D. (2009). Critical Security Studies: A Schismatic History. In: Collins A. (Ed.), Contemporary Security Studies, Second edition. New York: Oxford University Press.

Nye Jr. J. (2011). The Future of Power. New York: Public Affairs.

Quinn, A. (2018). Realism. In: A.Gheciu, W.C. Wohlforth (eds.), The Oxford Handbook of International Security. New York: Oxford University Press.

Sartori, G., (1970). Concept Misformation in Comparative Politics. The American Political Science Review, 64:4, 1033-1053.

Somzhurek, B. Zh, Yessengaliyeva, A.M., Medeubayeva, Zh. M., Makangali, B.K. (2018). Central Asia and regional security. Communist and Post-Communist Studies, 51-2, 161-171. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.postcomstud.2018.04.005

Tickner, A.B., Blaney, D.L. (eds.). (2012) Thinking International Relations Differently, New York: Routledge.

Voskresenskiy, A.D. (Ed.) (2014). Mirovoye kompleksnoye regionovedeniye. Moscow: Magistr INFRA-M.

Why we still need empires, The Observer (2002) Retrieved from URL: https://www.theguardian.com/observer/worldview/story/0,11581,680117,00.html

Williams P.D., McDonald M. (2018). An introduction to security studies. In; Williams P.D. (Ed.), Security Studies: An Introduction. New York: Routledge.

Wolfers, A. (1952). National security as an Ambiguous Symbol. Political Science Quarterly, 67:4, 481-502. DOI: 10.2307/2145138