

Regional Security : A Conceptual Approach

Badreddine LAIFAOU

University of M'sila

badrlaifaoui@gmail.com

/

Nacer SOULA

Continuous Formation University of Setif

soulanacer@yahoo.fr

/

Hakim HALLAB

University of Mohamed Boudiaf - M'sila

hakim.hallab@univ-msila.dz

RASS. Pensées Genre. Penser Autrement. VOL 4, No 5 (Novembre 2024)

Abstract

The concept of regional security is complex due to its overlap with security and regional studies, leading to difficulties in clearly defining it because of the ongoing transformations affecting it on both horizontal and vertical levels. This study aims to analyze this concept and clarify the ambiguity surrounding it by exploring its developments in these two fields of knowledge. The study concludes that regional security is a multidimensional concept influenced by changing local and international contexts, making it challenging to provide a fixed definition. Understanding it requires a comprehensive approach that takes into account the political, economic, and social transformations impacting the regional environment.

Keywords : Security, Region, Regional Security, Complex Regional Security.

Sécurité régionale : Une approche conceptuelle

Résumé

Le concept de sécurité régionale est complexe en raison de son chevauchement avec les études de sécurité et les études régionales, ce qui rend difficile de le définir clairement en raison des transformations continues qui l'affectent à la fois sur des niveaux horizontal et vertical. Cette étude vise à analyser ce concept et à clarifier l'ambiguïté qui l'entoure en explorant ses évolutions dans ces deux domaines de connaissance. L'étude conclut que la sécurité régionale est un concept multidimensionnel influencé par les contextes locaux et internationaux changeants, rendant difficile la fourniture d'une définition fixe. Sa compréhension nécessite une approche globale qui prend en compte les transformations politiques, économiques et sociales impactant l'environnement régional.

Mots-clés : Approche Conceptuelle, Approche Globale, Sécurité Régionale, Transformation.

Introduction

The concept of regional security is marked by significant complexity due to the overlap of two continuously evolving fields of knowledge: security studies, which focus on national and international security and its development, and regional studies, which address the political and geographical relationships between countries within specific geographic areas. These cognitive interactions make defining the concept of "regional security" a considerable challenge, especially in light of the rapid transformations at both horizontal levels (in terms of the widening scope of security threats) and vertical levels (in terms of the structural depth of political and economic transformations).

On one hand, we find that security studies have significantly expanded with the evolution of the nature of security risks and threats. They are no longer limited to traditional military threats but now encompass new and unconventional threats, such as international terrorism, transnational organized crime, cybersecurity, and climate change. These security developments have added new dimensions to the understanding of security, necessitating a reevaluation of what "security" means at the regional level.

On the other hand, the concept of "region" has evolved within the field of regional studies. The region is no longer understood merely as a confined geographical space; it has developed into a framework that defines the political and economic relationships between countries, influenced by common geographical, cultural, and economic factors. This evolution has made regions important analytical units in understanding security dynamics. The region is no longer just a border area but rather a network of complex interactions among different countries that may share interests or compete for them.

Based on this, the central question can be posed: What is the concept of regional security?

In the context of studying the concept of regional security, three main hypotheses can be proposed. The first assumes that regional security is directly influenced by changes in the international system and geopolitical developments, as shifts in international relations and alliances among major powers affect the strategies of security regions. The second suggests that achieving regional security largely depends on joint cooperation among countries within the region, requiring the establishment of security and economic partnerships to address common threats, whether military, economic, or environmental. The third hypothesis states that unconventional threats, such as terrorism and climate change, contribute to reshaping the concept of regional security, making the security priorities of regional states more complex and diverse, moving away from the traditional focus on military conflicts alone.

1. The Concept of Security

There are multiple perceptions and concepts related to the idea of security, along with diverse references and definitions. This variation stems from the different security environments to which thinkers belong, as well as the differing circumstances being analyzed, in addition to the evolving security threats faced by states and other actors in the international arena. Despite the significant importance and widespread prevalence of the concept of security, it is challenging to confine it to a single definition, as is the case with many concepts in the social sciences.

The concept of security has evolved through two main phases: the first is known as the reductionist phase, where the concept was limited to the state as the primary reference and the military dimension as the sector for analysis. The second phase is known as the expansionist phase, where the concept was expanded vertically to include groups and individuals, and horizontally to cover economic, political, social, and environmental sectors. This led to the emergence of many sub-concepts such as securitization, community security, and emancipation, among others, which are related to various schools of security studies.

Arnold Wolfers' definition of "security" in 1952 serves as a foundational reference for scholars and researchers in security studies. Wolfers defined security as "the absence of threats against acquired values," which has an objective aspect, while its subjective aspect is the absence of fear that any of these values will be compromised (Wolfers, A., 1952, p. 485).

Barry Buzan viewed security as an "underdeveloped concept" in terms of content, meaning that it does not keep pace with the developments accompanying its uses. He acknowledges that it has not received the necessary conceptual attention, which is reflected in the lack of conceptual literature on security during the Cold War. This motivated him to dedicate his efforts to bridging the conceptual gap and providing a definition that aligns with the new developments occurring in the scientific field (Stone, M., 2009).

The initial attempts to expand the concept of security came from outside strategic studies, as the theorists of "peace research" were pioneers in finding new ways of thinking about the phenomena of international peace and security. Kenneth Boulding introduced the term "stable peace," while Johan Galtung called for "positive peace." According to these thinkers, security should be based on positive and stable peace. Following this, the critical school expanded the concept more clearly both horizontally and vertically.

Buzan defines security as "the effort to free oneself from threats (in the context of the international system, this means) the ability of states and societies to maintain their independent entity and functional cohesion against forces of change that they perceive as hostile. The

minimum of security is survival, but it also reasonably includes a range of fundamental concerns regarding the conditions for protecting that existence.

2. Methods

La méthode utilisée dans le texte est analytique et comparative, basée sur l'exploration des concepts clés de la sécurité régionale et de la région à travers une revue de la littérature théorique. L'auteur analyse l'évolution de ces concepts, en les situant dans le contexte historique et géopolitique, notamment après la guerre froide, et en les confrontant aux théories de chercheurs influents tels que Barry Buzan et John Hettne. Une approche comparative est adoptée pour confronter différentes théories et modèles, en mettant en évidence leurs similitudes et différences, tout en appliquant ces théories à des exemples concrets pour illustrer les dynamiques de sécurité. En outre, la méthode inclut la présentation et l'analyse du modèle du *Regional Security Complex Theory*, qui sert à examiner les relations de sécurité entre États au sein d'une région spécifique, en prenant en compte des variables comme les relations de pouvoir, d'amitié et d'hostilité.

3. Results

The concept of region has posed a challenge for scholars of international relations due to the differing perspectives on what constitutes a region. Three categories have emerged in an attempt to define, delineate, and distinguish regions.

The first category focuses on **geographical factors and mutual dependence**, while the second emphasizes **cultural harmony and consistency** as a critical variable in defining and determining regions. The final category relies on **conceptual variables and discursive action** by practitioners, asserting that regions are built on social foundations rather than being geographical constants (Abdelkader, M., 2002, p. 73).

However, John Hettne distinguishes between three different structural types of regions: core regions, intermediary regions, and peripheral or marginal regions, and how they differ from one another in terms of political stability.

- a- Core Regions:** These are economically centralized regions that strive to maintain a prime position for monitoring and controlling the rest of the world outside their regional system. They are regions with political efficiency and capability, regardless of whether that capability is expressed in the form of a political organization or not.
- b- Intermediary Regions:** These regions meet the criteria of economic development and political stability; unlike core regions, they are unstable.

- c- Peripheral Regions:** These regions are marginal and peripheral in the political sphere and stagnant economically. Their regional arsenal is weak and ineffective, and this situation makes regional security and development more important than creating systems for free trade, such as the areas emerging from the dissolution of the Soviet Union, which are mostly on a path toward reintegration in the form of a Commonwealth of Independent States. This may serve as a foundation for a future central regional system.

3.1 The Nature of Regional Security

The intellectual roots of regional security studies can be traced back to geopolitical writings from the late 19th and early 20th centuries. During the Cold War, regional security and stability were largely defined in terms of the geographic position occupied by the region within the strategic perspective of the United States or the Soviet Union. Consequently, the context of the Cold War imposed standards and requirements on the concept of regional security.

The contemporary focus on regional security reflects a convergence between the ongoing importance of traditional geopolitical considerations and the emergence of new security challenges that have redefined the content and scope of regional security in the contemporary international system. The rising significance of regional security and regional security systems across all dimensions of interaction has led to the generation of a large number of formal international arrangements that vary in scope, complexity, and strength.

Before addressing regional security, it is essential to discuss the concept of the region and its types.

3-2 Perceptions of Regional Security

The concept of regional security is one that has undergone notable transformations due to the changes that have occurred in the international system following the end of the Cold War, leading to a diversity of topics and mechanisms for achieving it. After the failure of traditional theories to predict and explain the end of the Cold War and the subsequent events, a new wave of writings emerged that contributed to the rise of regional studies and regional security systems (Buzan, B. & Ole, W., 2003).

had a significant impact on the study of regional security due to the authors' positioning and the empirical application of the concept of regional security complexes. Additionally, the study by Lake and Morgan in 1997 also contributes to this field (Lake, D. & Patrick, M., 1997).

on the concept of regional security complexes in a comparative study of major regional systems, while Kelly (2007) places regional security within the broader framework of "new regionalism."

Katzenstein (2005) introduces the concept of "permeable regional systems" to explore American agency in shaping Asia and Europe as regions. Solingen (1998) treats regional security systems as a joint product of local coalition formation among states, while Acharya and Johnston are concerned with the issue of institutional design (Acharya, A. & Johnston, A.I., 2007).

Professor Lemke (2002) generalizes the dynamics of regional security systems, while Fawn (2009) represents a power transition theory to accommodate the regionalization of the global. This addresses the major gaps in international relations theory and provides a comprehensive account of the increasing stability of regional security systems despite the pressing need. James Sperling also contributes to the discussion on regional security.

The end of the Cold War allowed for greater autonomy in security dynamics, particularly at the regional level. It resulted in three main impacts on the concept of regional security that changed the nature of the security agenda, which now includes non-military issues and actors. Additionally, it lifted the overarching influence of major powers over certain regions and also led to changes in the nature and intensity of global power penetration into regional security complexes in third-world countries.

The impacts of the end of the Cold War extended to the emergence of the idea that the international system was divided into two worlds: a zone of peace and a zone of conflict (Buzan, B. & Ole, W., 2003, p. 18).

Regional security pertains to a region in which its units engage in cooperation, mutual trust, and homogeneity. Achieving regional security requires prior cooperative relationships among the units of the regional system, which states strive to establish by creating structures aimed at fostering trust among the members of the regional system.

Thus, regional security is not merely the sum of the national security of each of the states within that region; rather, it falls under the concept of consensus among all parties within the regional framework, which have mutual and ongoing interests in finding common solutions to shared issues. This ensures that the rights and interests of all parties are upheld in an equitable and balanced manner.

3-3 Characteristics of Regional Security

From the above, we can identify three key characteristics of regional security. First, it is intrinsically linked to the perceptions and sentiments of all parties involved, particularly those

with mutual interests within the regional framework. Second, it emphasizes that these mutual interests must be viewed as continuous, highlighting the ongoing nature of relationships among the parties within the regional system. Finally, it asserts that common solutions must be established to ensure and safeguard the rights of all parties involved; no single party should be allowed to impose its will on others, thereby fostering a cooperative and equitable regional environment (Mustafa, K.M., 1996).

Some consider that regional security is a political concept that refers to the common security policy shaped by the political units forming the regional system to confront the risks of shared external threats to the region. Moreover, regional security cannot be separated from international security, as they both involve the same units (Nazim Abdul, W.A.-J., 2004, p. 79).

3.4 Levels of Regional Peace According to Benjamin Miller

Regional security seeks to achieve a set of goals, including defending the units that make up the region by developing military capabilities, unifying the will to confront shared threats, and fostering self-development and resource enhancement to achieve integration at various levels among the units of the regional system.

The goal of maintaining regional peace is to prevent the spread of local conflicts (Bjorn Hettne: *Security Regionalism in Theory and Practice*). According to Mohamed El-Sayed Said, states enter into regional arrangements voluntarily when they expect to achieve their objectives more effectively through regional cooperation. The aim of establishing regional security systems is to stabilize strategic relations among the parties to reduce the likelihood of armed confrontation.

According to Benjamin Miller, in his study "When and How Regions Become Peaceful," he identifies three levels of regional peace:

- **Cold Peace:** This is characterized by the absence of war and the lack of threat of force among the states in the region. Here, the main issues of regional conflict remain at a standstill, although they have not been resolved definitively. Relationships are primarily at the governmental level, rather than transnational or non-governmental levels.
- **Normal Peace:** In this level, most, if not all, of the fundamental issues of conflict are being resolved, although this does not negate the possibility of war; it is not completely absent from the scene. Here, relations between states begin to develop away from intergovernmental levels.
- **Warm – Moderate Peace:** According to this level, the use of force is seen as a completely distant option. The nature of relations is characterized by extensive

transnational connections and a high degree of regional interdependence (Rebaï, S., 2008).

3.5 Theoretical Models of Regional Security

There are many theoretical models of regional security that reflect the extent of overlap and complexity present at the level of regional security.

3.5.1 Theory of Regional Security Complex : The Theory of Regional Security Complex marked a significant shift from national-level analysis of international relations to the regional level, as well as a transformation in the content of traditional concepts related to security. This has given it considerable new importance in understanding and analyzing international politics, as outlined by Barry Buzan in his book "People, States, and Fear" (1983).

There is no doubt that this concept does not entirely dismiss the state as a key actor in the analysis of international relations; however, it primarily focuses on security dynamics that transcend state borders, making security stability dependent on the security of the surrounding region (Misbah, A., 2013, p. 294).

This theory aims to distinguish between the interactions of powers at the global system level, which have the capacity to transcend distance, and the interactions of less powerful actors at the sub-system level, representing their local area—essentially their primary security environment. The Theory of Regional Security Complex is based on a set of rules, the most important of which are:

Most threats tend to spread more easily over short distances than over long distances. According to "Walt," geographic proximity is an effective factor in security because many threats move more easily across short distances than long ones.

It is considered that the security capabilities and intentions of states have historically been related to their neighbors; thus, the degree of mutual security dependence is usually more acute among actors within the security complex than between actors inside the complex and others outside it. Additionally, the security complex may be penetrated by global powers if it is extensive, and regions possess a significant degree of autonomy in establishing patterns linked to their regional dynamics (Buzan, B. & Ole, W., 2003, p. 4).

The use of the concept of Regional Security Complex in security studies facilitates the adaptation and restructuring of countries' foreign policy strategies by assessing the efficiency of the regional context. The interaction between the anarchic structure and the outcomes of the balance of power on one hand, and the pressures of local geographic proximity on the other, acts as a contributing factor in shaping a Regional Security Complex.

In addition, one of the objectives of establishing the concept of Regional Security Complex is to emphasize the importance of the regional level in security analysis. Typically, the focus is on national or global security; however, both the security of political units and the processes of global power intervention can only be understood through the dynamics of regional security.

Barry Buzan was the first to use the term "security complex" or "regional security complex" to facilitate security analysis at the regional level. It serves as a consideration of the regional level as the main unit of analysis from which security issues arise. Most countries determine their security relations from regional rather than global perspectives, even when dealing with global issues; they tend to view those issues from a regional standpoint. The region dominates the perspective of security, without negating the crucial role of external actors and various powers in influencing the security complex. The term "security complex" refers to: "A group of states whose fundamental security interests are closely interconnected, such that their national security situations cannot be considered in isolation from one another."

3.5.2 Variables of the Regional Security Complex Theory : The Regional Security

Complex Theory is based on a set of conditions; without them, we cannot use the term "Regional Security Complex" to describe any group of states, nor can we apply this concept to a cohesive group that is distinct from the surrounding security regions.

a- Power Relations: Power is a significant factor in any region; it clearly defines the balance of power within the region. Therefore, we can rely on the concept of polarity to analyze regional relations, distinguishing between unipolar, bipolar, and multipolar patterns.

b- Patterns of Friendship and Hostility: Regional security relations are predominantly characterized by a binary nature of historical friendship/hostility, as well as security competition or cooperation among regional parties. Additionally, the Regional Security Complex Theory does not overlook the cultural relationships between major civilizations.

The security analysis of friendship-hostility relationships starts at the regional level and then traces its impact and extension globally and locally.

Assuming that the regional level of the friendship-hostility relationship generates strategic options and defines the content of each party's security objectives, this then manifests at both local and international levels. Furthermore, this level of security interaction is important not only for the regional powers involved in the security complex but also for external great powers.

Even if some of these great powers that previously acted as facilitators of regional security dynamics have disappeared from the international system (Misbah, A., 2013, pp. 297-298).

The mutual security dependence between states refers to two characteristics; **The first characteristic:** Exists in relationships between states based on the balance between friendship and enmity; **The second characteristic:** Exists in shared security opportunities and threats, but they are not identical.

3.5.3 Levels of Analysis in the Regional Security Complex Theory: The Regional Security Complex Theory identifies four distinct levels of analysis that contribute to understanding regional security dynamics. The first level is the **Domestic or Internal Level**, which examines the internal dynamics of states within the region, highlighting vulnerabilities that arise from domestic factors. The second level is the **International Relations Level – State**, which focuses on the unique characteristics of the region itself. The third level, **Interaction with Neighboring Regions**, explores how the region engages with adjacent areas, while the fourth level addresses **The Role of Global Powers in the Region**, emphasizing the interplay between global and regional security structures.

The structure of the regional security complex is defined by four essential variables that collectively shape its dynamics. The first variable, **Boundary**, establishes a clear line between the regional security complex and neighboring regions, identifying the unique security concerns and interactions within the complex.

Anarchic Structure is the second variable, highlighting that the complex is composed of two or more self-reliant units. These units operate independently, without a central authority, and their interactions are crucial for forming a distinct regional system.

Polarity represents the third variable, focusing on how power is distributed among the units within the complex. This distribution of power affects the balance and influence of each unit, shaping the internal dynamics and responses to security threats.

Finally, **Social Structure** encapsulates the patterns of relationships among the units, particularly the alliances and rivalries that emerge. These patterns of friendship and enmity play a pivotal role in determining how units within the complex interact and respond to security challenges, further defining the overall structure of the regional security complex.

Within the regional security complex, there can be sub-complexes that exist within a larger regional security complex, representing distinct patterns of security dependence. This can be observed in the Middle East, where we differentiate in the Mashriq: Egypt, Israel, Jordan,

Lebanon, and Syria, and in the Gulf: Iran, Iraq, and the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC). Such sub-complexes help to eliminate overlaps between regional security complexes.

The variation among regions at the international level, in terms of structure and interactions, has led to the formation of multiple types of security complexes. The regional structure of international security is fundamentally based on the distribution of power. At the highest level are the United States, followed by the European Union, Japan, China, Russia, and the rest at the bottom or lower end of the hierarchy.

This structure can be categorized into three distinct sections of regional spaces. **Section One: The Curtain** serves as a barrier, representing the influence of external powers, such as colonialism and competing great powers during the Cold War. These regional spaces have largely vanished since the end of the Cold War. **Section Two: Unstructured Regions** is characterized by areas where regional interactions are inadequate to create a recognizable structure based on mutual dependence. These regions often emerge in areas left void by security complexes, such as the South Pacific. Finally, **Section Three: The Most Important Space** is regarded as the most significant, defined by regional security complexes. This level is marked by a close interconnection among states or other units, where the security of one entity is inextricably linked to the security of another, emphasizing the importance of cooperative security arrangements within the region.

Eleven types of regional security complexes can be distinguished worldwide, divided into three categories based on the number of great powers positioned within them. Three of these are called concentrated complexes, represented by North America and the European Union. These complexes are formed either through a global power or through some collective institutions, allowing the regional security complex to operate collectively at a comprehensive level.

When a security complex is formed by a global power, it will dominate the region, leaving none of the regional powers with sufficient weight to become another regional pole. This results in a unipolar regional security complex. If a security complex is formed by a global power, it will dominate the region, and no regional power will have sufficient weight to become another regional pole, leading to a unipolar regional security complex.

A. Security Systems: Robert Jervis defines security systems as collaborative efforts among states to manage disputes and prevent war by addressing the security dilemma through their actions and assumptions about other states' behaviors. These systems establish behavioral rules,

including non-use of force and respect for international borders, to promote stability and cooperation among participating states.

More specific legislation can be established regarding certain types and uses of weapons or activities such as military movements and transparency. Many regional structures can be viewed as security systems, such as the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. Additionally, some regional arms control measures, like establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones or the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe from 1990, can also be considered part of this framework. The effectiveness of these systems depends on the extent to which their standards are respected, influenced by the degree of incentives and penalties enforced by their institutions.

B. Security Regimes: Before delving into the concept of security regimes, it is necessary to first address the concept of the international system, as it is a broader and more encompassing concept than that of security regimes.

The international system refers to a network or an interconnected and interdependent group of sub-systems, whether they are global, regional, or local. Hedley Bull defines the international system as: "A system that comes into existence when two or more states are in contact with each other and when the influence of one state on the decisions of another is sufficient to make them act as parts of a single whole."

Meanwhile, Charles McClelland and John Burton view the international system as composed of groups of links and relationships, representing an expanded form of interaction between two active and interacting parties. These systems contribute to building international security at both the regional and global levels, as Krasner suggests, by reducing uncertainty, lack of trust, and the risks of conflict between states.

The security system refers to those principles, rules, and norms that constrain nations in their behavior based on the belief that others—states—will do the same. This encompasses not only the standards and hopes that facilitate cooperation but also a form of cooperation that goes beyond the pursuit of short-term self-interest.

In this regard, we can distinguish between a multipolar security community and a collective security system. The former pertains to disputes within the group, while the collective security system relates to conflicts between the group and those who are non-members. It is based on the principle of mutual assistance or the idea of "one for all, and all for one." When one member's security is threatened by aggression, it is assumed that everyone will rush to defend it, even if their personal security is not at risk. Furthermore, achieving collective security is

done through relatively independent regional systems or security complexes, not with those outside the region. According to Robert Jervis, security systems arise when a group of states cooperates to manage their disputes and avoid war by addressing the security dilemma through their actions and assumptions regarding the actions of other states.

First: Community Security: This area of security is considered the most recent compared to other fields. It simply relates to the identity survival of state actors as well as non-state and supra-state actors that contribute to altering the identity of the state, as expressed by Barry Buzan. Identity survival refers to "us," which is reproduced and distinguished from others. This constructivist perspective on security is crucial for understanding the new internal conflicts that have emerged and spread since the end of the Cold War. Any threat to our existence, whether ethnic, tribal, state-related, or religious, becomes a security issue (Charles-Philippe, D., p. 117).

The factors of social insecurity vary among countries and regions, with two main features dominating community security and current concerns for human security: **Competition among actors for identity:** This competition aims to claim, defend, and strengthen identity. When the state and the nation are not aligned, it indicates a significant potential for destabilization. Ted Gurr argues that secession, ambitions for annexation, ethnic confrontations, religious exclusion, marginalization of classes, and policies of racial discrimination all represent security challenges that raise issues to the extent that they redefine identities within and between states. As a result, this leads to tension between these identities and their societies. Thus, competition over identity is one of the most dangerous factors for community security; **Exporting community security challenges beyond national borders:** This leads to cooperation among various actors (states, governmental and non-governmental organizations) that contribute to the regionalization and statehood of these challenges. The issue of refugees is a serious example of the impacts of community security on states and their individuals. This includes the internal displacement of citizens from their countries due to conflicts, the majority of whom are women and children lacking international protection, as well as their recruitment into armed factions and even by their own governments. Additionally, there is the flow of migrants due to internal violence and state collapse.

Second: International Security : International security is considered the largest and broadest unit of analysis in security studies, as it is related to the security of each member state within the international system, which consists of a group of normatively interconnected units through

a process of interaction. The system is characterized by the interconnection between its units, and the interaction is marked by a pattern that can be observed, interpreted, and predicted.

Achieving international security requires collective mechanisms, including: the balance of power system and the collective security system.

- **Balance of Power System:** The balance of power system emerged after the Peace of Westphalia in 1648. Its basic idea is that conflict is the distinguishing characteristic of international relations, where states vary in their relative power and have differing national interests, each seeking to maximize its gains at the expense of others (Hamid, N.F., 2007, pp. 14-15).

Dr. Ismail Sabri Muqallid defines it as follows: a balance is established when one state is able to achieve a massive and overwhelming superiority in its forces, threatening the independence of other states. This challenge compels weaker states to confront strength with strength by forming coalitions or opposing alliances.

However, the balance of power is not a policy in itself that states strive to achieve; rather, states do not seek balance but rather superiority and dominance, which leads to the emergence of a balance of power. Thus, the balance of power is a condition reached incidentally at a specific historical moment. Especially if a state gains overwhelming superiority in its forces and capabilities, it will threaten the remaining states, prompting them to gather in opposing coalitions against the state posing the threat.

The balance of power system is characterized by a relatively equal distribution of power among a number of states, where no single state has the ability to impose its hegemony over others.

The balance of power is achieved in two situations: **Maintaining international peace** by forming opposing coalitions against threatening powers to achieve deterrence and maintain the status quo; **Creating balanced power coalitions** among states with different objectives to prevent any disruption of the existing balance of power and to maintain the independence of its constituent units.

- **Collective Security System:** The collective security system emerged as a reaction to the old system based on the balance of power. Its first application was under the League of Nations and later within the framework of the United Nations to prevent and contain wars. This system does not mean the end of existing differences and contradictions in the interests of states, but rather the rejection of armed violence as a means to resolve them and a focus on peaceful methods and means. It can be defined as: "the commitment of all states to participate with their forces against an aggressive state as soon as the aggression is determined through specific procedures." This

definition is limited to the role of states in maintaining international peace and security. It is also defined as: "a system in which member states of organizations or international bodies bear the responsibility of protecting each member of their community.

This definition is more comprehensive because it focuses on the role of states and international organizations, which allow membership for all members of the international community. This is what distinguishes collective security from alliances (Al-Hilali, N.O., 2005, p. 09)

To implement collective security, it is required to consider peace as indivisible. This principle entails that states must accept sacrificing their freedom of action and relinquishing their right to make national decisions. They must adhere to the operational framework imposed by the collective security system and be prepared to go to war to defend the established order, regardless of the strength of either the aggressor state or the state being attacked (Badawi, M.T., 1971, p. 252).

4. Discussion

La discussion des résultats précédents permet d'approfondir la compréhension des dynamiques de sécurité régionale à travers l'évolution des concepts et des théories. Il apparaît que la notion de sécurité régionale est en constante transformation, influencée par des facteurs géopolitiques, historiques et les nouvelles menaces qui émergent dans le système international. Les résultats montrent une convergence entre les préoccupations de sécurité traditionnelles (telles que les menaces militaires) et les défis contemporains comme le terrorisme international, le crime transnational, la cybersécurité et les enjeux liés au changement climatique. Cette évolution pose la question de la pertinence des anciens modèles de sécurité, qui étaient centrés sur des confrontations militaires entre puissances, pour aborder les enjeux de sécurité actuels.

D'un autre côté, l'analyse des théories régionales, notamment celle du Regional Security Complex de Barry Buzan, met en lumière l'importance de comprendre la sécurité au niveau régional. Les résultats montrent que les interactions entre les États au sein d'une région peuvent souvent être plus influentes sur la sécurité de ces États que leurs relations avec des puissances mondiales extérieures. Ce constat suggère que les dynamiques locales, notamment les relations de pouvoir, les alliances et les conflits internes, jouent un rôle crucial dans la stabilité régionale. L'accent mis sur la "proximité géographique" et l'interdépendance régionale dans la théorie de Buzan permet de mieux saisir comment les crises de sécurité peuvent se propager rapidement au sein d'une même région.

De plus, les résultats indiquent que la fin de la guerre froide a permis une réévaluation de la sécurité régionale, en permettant une autonomie accrue dans les dynamiques de sécurité. Cependant, cette autonomie a également été confrontée à l'émergence de nouvelles puissances régionales, avec des ambitions de redéfinir leurs zones d'influence et de sécurité. Le cadre de sécurité complexe proposé par Buzan, qui suggère que la sécurité régionale dépend de la sécurité de la région elle-même, introduit une approche plus nuancée de l'analyse des relations internationales.

Ainsi, la discussion des résultats montre que la sécurité régionale est désormais un phénomène multidimensionnel qui nécessite une approche intégrée, prenant en compte non seulement les facteurs militaires traditionnels mais aussi les menaces non conventionnelles, et qui doit être analysée à travers des modèles théoriques adaptés à la réalité complexe des régions contemporaines.

Conclusion

Maintaining international peace and security requires adherence to several fundamental principles, including the prohibition of resorting to the use of force or threats in international relations, with specific exceptions. These exceptions include the use of force through the United Nations Security Council, which is the body responsible for maintaining peace and security, according to Article 24 of the UN Charter. The Council has the authority to impose sanctions, whether military or non-military, through a range of peaceful measures such as negotiation, mediation, and arbitration, or by using force when necessary. Self-defense is also permitted under Article 51 of the Charter.

Furthermore, maintaining international peace and security necessitates respect for international obligations and non-interference in the internal affairs of states, along with the requirement to resolve disputes by peaceful means. The scope of collective security membership expands to include all states, and when the Security Council approves the use of force, member states of the collective security system must exceed the military and non-military power of the aggressor state.

Although the balance of power system and the collective security system aim to preserve international peace and security, they differ in the means used to achieve this goal. Theoretically, these levels represent integration and harmony, but in practical realities, they may be subject to certain conditions that render them competitive and contradictory at times.

Bibliographic references

- Abdelkader, Mahmoudi (2002). *Arab-Arab Conflicts and the Arab Regional System: Focusing on Conflicts Related to the Palestinian Issue* Algeria: M W Q M Publishing.
- Acharya, Amitav, & Johnston, Alastair Iain. (2007). Comparing regional institutions: an introduction. *Crafting cooperation: Regional international institutions in comparative perspective*, 1-31.
- Al-Hilali, Nashat Othman (2005). Collective Security. *Cairo: Journal of the Foundations of Scientific Knowledge*.
- Badawi, Muhammad Taha. (1971). *Introduction to the Science of International Relations* Egyptian Printing House.
- Buzan, Barry, & Ole, Wæver. (2003). *Régions et puissances : La structure de la sécurité internationale*. Charles-Philippe, David. *War and Peace*.
- Hamid, Nabil Fouad. (2007). *NATO: The Unipolar World Order and the Greater Middle East Project*. Dar Al-Jumhuriya for Press.
- Lake, David, & Patrick, Morgan. (1997). *Regional Orders: Security in the New World*.
- Misbah, Amer (2013). *Strategic Perspectives in Building Security*. Dar Al-Kitab Al-Hadith.
- Mustafa, Kamel Muhammad. (1996). Regional Security and Stability in the Middle East: Risks and Opportunities. *International Policy Magazine*.
- Nazim Abdul, Wahid Al-Jasour. (2004). *Encyclopedia of Political Science*. Dar Al-Majdalawi for Publishing and Distribution.
- Rebaï, Samia. (2008). *Mechanisms of Transformation in the Regional System - The Regional System of East Asia* University of Algiers].
- Stone, Marianne. (2009). La sécurité selon Buzan : une analyse de sécurité complète. *Cahiers de discussion sur la sécurité, printemps (09)*. Groupe d'études et d'expertise "Sécurité et Technologies" GEEST.
- Wolfers, Arnold. (1952). " National security" as an ambiguous symbol. *Political science quarterly*, 67(4), 481-502.

Badraddine LAIFAOU, a Doctor in Political Science and International Relations at the University of Algiers 03, specializes in analyzing political and international affairs. His academic work contributes to a deeper understanding of political dynamics, diplomacy, and global relationships, positioning him as a significant figure in the field within Algeria's academic landscape.

Badraddine LAIFAOU
University of M'sila
badrlaifaoui@gmail.com

Soula NACER, a doctor in Sciences, specializing in Sharia and Law from Batna 1 University. He currently works as a professor at the Faculty of Law, Continuous Formation University, Setif Center. Dr. Soula contributes to the advancement of legal education and Islamic jurisprudence through his lectures and specialized research.

Nacer SOULA
Continuous Formation University of Setif
soulanacer@yahoo.fr

Halim Helab is a doctor specialized in sociology and an adjunct professor at the University of M'sila. He specializes in the study of social phenomena and the analysis of relationships between individuals and communities, delivering lectures and conducting research in various areas within this field.

Hakim HALLAB
University of Mohamed Boudiaf - M'sila
hakim.hallab@univ-msila.dz
