



Fundamentals of Peace Strategies in International Relations: A Comparative Study Between Liberal Democracy and Islamic Theory

Mohammad Bari¹; Hossein Arjini²

¹ PhD Student in Political Jurisprudence, Al-Mustafa International University, Qom, Iran

² Associate Professor, Islamic Education University, Iran

<http://dx.doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v12i6.6880>

Abstract

The present study attempts to reconcile the principles of peace strategies of liberal democracy and Islam. In this study, it has been clarified that there are commonalities and differences between these principles. Among the differences is that the principles of peace strategies in international relations from the perspective of Islam are based on complete and flawless divine teachings, are not subject to change and transformation, and have a superior position; However, the foundations of the liberal democratic theory are based on the conditions that man has established, and at the top of that pyramid is Immanuel Kant, the founder of democratic peace. The legal foundations used in this thought are of the type of human law, imperfect, unstable, and subject to change. Liberals believe that the culture of democratic peace should be exported to non-democratic countries, either through changing political systems or even through war if possible; But when we consider Islam from an Islamic perspective, it has used various means, including (invitation), for the culture of peace. Still, the common ground between these two theories in terms of fundamentals is that both believe in the primacy of peace in international relations. Both theories consider war as an exception and believe that disputes should be resolved through negotiation. Based on both theories, diplomatic, political, and economic relations between countries create peace and relative tranquility. Many countries prefer relations in these areas and do not consider war as a solution. War is considered a solution when national interests and the goals of the system are at risk. Unfortunately, superpowers are taking advantage of these principles and trying to eliminate weak and so-called non-democratic countries from the international scene by accusing them.

Keywords: *Fundamentals; Strategy; Islam; Democracy; Liberal*

Introduction

Every theory is composed of certain principles and rules. The recognition, criticism, and comparative study of two theories with other theories depend on the recognition of the principles and rules of those theories. One of the newly emerging theories in the field of political science and international relations is the theory of (democratic peace), which was introduced into political science by Immanuel Kant, a German philosopher in the 18th century. According to Kant's theory, the first condition

for lasting peace between nations, which is defined as the elimination of contingent action, is the establishment of order. Democratic republics strive to create and maintain peace, because the consent of citizens to make decisions on foreign policy issues, especially the declaration or non-declaration of war, means that the citizens themselves bear and pay for all the costs and damages of war (Dehghani Firouzabadi, 2012: 20 and 21).

According to this theory, peace is the basis of international relations, and war is considered an emergency and occurs in exceptional circumstances. Meanwhile, diplomatic, political, and commercial relations and compliance with treaties and international agreements play an important role in creating peace and stability among countries. The democratic peace theory considers the origin and source of culture to be human and everything goes back to human or under a democratic government, it is a people's government and its final acceptance is in the hands of the people.

In the Islamic system of thought, culture, and law have a divine origin, and according to religious teachings, the source of Islamic laws is God, the Creator of the universe. He alone has complete knowledge of the true interests and disadvantages of things, the relationships and interconnections of affairs. For this reason, in Islamic thought, all legislation is only worthy of and pleasing to Him.

It seems that the subject of the present article is of great importance in this regard, because it examines the foundations of liberal democratic and Islamic peace strategies, and identifies the common and distinctive features between these two theories. In this comparative study, it becomes clear that the principles of Islamic peace strategies are more valid than the peaceful strategies of liberalism because the foundations of Islamic peace strategies are based on divine laws that do not change, while democratic peace strategies are the product of human thought and are imperfect. On the other hand, liberals have biased and discriminatory approaches in international affairs, but the foundations of peace strategies in Islam do not tolerate biased and discriminatory approaches.

Considering the current situation of Muslims and the hostile relations of many countries, a comparative study between peace strategies, while at the same time disproving the phenomenon of (peace-fearing and Islamophobia), paves the way for achieving the goals of the theory at any time and under any circumstances. In this article, the author raises the question of (what are the differences and similarities between the foundations of the peaceful strategies of liberal democracy and Islam in international relations?). Therefore, using a comparative descriptive and analytical method, after examining the concepts used, aims to explain the differences and similarities in the strategic foundations of these two theories.

1. Conceptual Framework

1-1. Concept of Strategy

The word strategy is originally derived from the Greek language and means general planning and planning. This word was initially used only in the military context (Atiyeh, 1968: 89).

However, in the term it refers to the science and art of formulating carefully studied general plans, which are designed in a sequential, interactive and coordinated manner to use various sources of power and to achieve the main goals (Ibid., 1968: 90). This word has then expanded to all levels and fields and has been applied to the set of programs and instructions prepared to deal with any threat.

1-2. Peace

A) The word peace has several meanings in terms of linguistic usage, and its origin is an exemption. Exemption from something means turning away from it, this meaning is mentioned in the

Holy Quran (and if the ignorant address you, they greet you with peace.) (Ibn Manzur, 2005 Vol. 2, p. 1876).

B) The word peace has many definitions in terms of terminology, depending on the levels and areas in which it is used, but what we are interested in, in this research is its definition in international relations, which means the absence of war and the establishment of friendly relations with other states. (Zeitoun, 2014: 76).

1-3. International Relations

This term has several definitions, the most important one is the systematic study of the interactions of states and other actors and the tools they use in their relations with each other to influence the international community. (Al-Qawazi, 2002: 13)

1-4. Theory

It refers to the rules and principles used to describe and define something, whether scientific, philosophical, cognitive, or literary. This theory may prove a certain fact or help in constructing a new idea. (Alkiani, 2001 - 1429: 56).

1-5. Democracy

The word democracy is composed of two words (demos) and (krasi), the first word in Greek means people, and the second word (krasi) indicates power or government. The concept of democracy is the rule of the people over the people, but this word has gone through various stages, which has led to different terms and meanings. (Al-Jessor, 2008 - 1429 AH: 319).

1-6. Freedom

This word is derived from the Latin root (liberalis), meaning that which agrees with the free individual and is compatible with individual freedom, and emphasizes that man is above all a gift of his own possessions to himself, and within himself is the owner of laws. (Kiani, 2001: 752).

Therefore, the strategic principles of these two theories are the basic principles that both theories use to ensure peace and stability at the national, regional, and international levels. Here we have mentioned a summary of these basic definitions and concepts used in this research and then we will discuss the principle in question.

2. Distinctions and Differences in the Foundations

2-1. Democratic Countries Do Not Fight Each Other

This hypothesis goes back to the founder of the democratic peace theory, Immanuel Kant, who believed that the existence of a free democratic society, commercial institutions, and peaceful social unions would reduce the spread of war. (Kant, 2001: 57). After him, Western scholars came and turned this discourse into a complete theory. nowadays, liberal democratic countries are proud that liberal democratic countries do not fight each other and resolve their international differences through peaceful dialogue because they have a culture of peaceful democracy and common goals that non-democratic countries do not have. They observe and respect international law and international treaties, such as the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries and respect for their sovereignty. Moreover, there is free trade economic interdependence, and commercial initiatives among them, and the benefits that are obtained from these are better than the positive results that they get after surviving the war. (Linkler, 2005: 332.)

If we consider this basis, we understand very well that the basis of peaceful strategies in Islamic theory is sacred and divine in origin, and beyond human reach, which is primarily related to human and moral values and human dignity. Its main criterion is piety and goodness, and in the case of liberal strategic principles, their criterion is pure liberal material benefit and profit. Profit is not important for human values, and a peaceful solution is the solution to international disputes between them, not because they are democrats, but because of the commercial benefits that are widespread among them, they even use the article of war with non-democratic countries. However, regarding the foundations of Islamic peace strategies in international relations, war with a non-Islamic state without religious permission is not permissible, as some scholars have argued. In addition, the legitimacy of the Islamic government is derived from divine law, and the Islamic ruler, in turn, interprets and implements divine laws according to the circumstances of the laws. But in the case of a democratic state, which is popular; that is, the people directly or indirectly decide on their fate and politics they can discuss political and social issues and express their opinions. In this thinking, religion has no role in the future of the state (chgnollaud, 2008:56), while the Islamic state is based on religious principles and teachings.

2-2. Emphasizing the Need for Reforms in Non-Democratic Countries

This principle emphasizes that liberal democratic countries should bring about fundamental changes in non-democratic countries and export democracy to them by any means possible because it is assumed that as long as non-democratic regimes exist, the international community will not be immune to the scourge of war. Therefore, in their opinion, non-democratic systems are the source of evil, violence, conflict, and tyranny in international relations, and the only way to counter such regimes is through liberal democracies that focus on social, political, and economic justice, the preservation of freedom, private property, and multinational corporations. (Vencent, 1970: 76)

This principle is different from the principles and foundations of Islamic peaceful strategies, which are based on human values, morality, and human dignity; because the Islamic state does not consider the transfer of Islamic culture to a non-Islamic country through war permissible in any way. Even Islamic belief, which is one of the fundamental issues in the religion of Islam, cannot be obtained by force but must be achieved by one's own will, choice, and discretion. The Islamic State respects the sovereignty of independent states does not interfere in their internal affairs, and observes international covenants and charters. However, if we look at this liberal principle, we realize that democratic states do not adhere to many international covenants that are not in their interests or that do not have a place for the ambitions of liberalism. First-rate liberalism does not remain indifferent to non-democratic countries when its vital interests and lofty goals are at risk, as is the case today with the economic and political conflicts taking place between the European Union and the United States of America. But Islamic theory in international relations allows followers of other religions living under the shadow of Islamic rule to freely practice their religious rituals, and it does not allow Muslim citizens to harass them, seize their property, or insult them. While we see in the most advanced democratic countries that the most basic human rights, including wearing the Islamic hijab in schools, universities, and public schools in the West, are being denied to Muslims. Furthermore, Islam does not command opposing the interests of non-Islamic countries because they are un-Islamic or imposing Islamic culture on them, but rather commands peace and peaceful coexistence with them as long as they are present in Islamic lands and do not betray them (Al-Aziz, 2008: 87).

2-3. Rule of Law

This principle is a legacy of Kant and St. Weiss, who believed that states must have strict domestic law to ensure domestic and international peace and security, and many international relations researchers believe that the quality of power in a political system is very important. The discussion of the issue of power in the domestic system and foreign policy of the state is relevant. If a political system is authoritarian, it is easy for it to decide to go to war, and vice versa, if a system is an open democracy, the

decision to go to war will be in the hands of the people. People do not easily decide to go to war because they know the negative consequences of war, and therefore the decision to go to war will be rare. Therefore, when political regimes are democracies, they are committed to the rule of law and do not interfere in the internal affairs of other countries. Respects international law, then the word war is eliminated from the culture of international relations, because in democratic systems, both the state and the people are under the control of the law, and this helps to ensure international peace and security, and war is only used in defense. (Andrew, 2005: 123).

This principle is also different from the principles of Islamic peaceful strategies and legalism, because firstly: in the Islamic system, the law is a divine law issued by God Almighty and cannot be changed or transformed, and its goal is not only worldly. Worldly happiness means to achieve a higher goal, which is eternal happiness and closeness to God. Secondly: Not only does the democratic system have the rule of law and the peaceful nature of the ruler, but many political systems enjoy it. Among them, the rule of law is based on the ruling systems in those countries, the most valid of which is the Islamic political system, which derives its policy from Sharia, which cannot be changed. While the legal systems of global democracies do not care about the human condition. They do not care about human and moral values and respect for the law is not a virtue that distinguishes democratic countries from others, but most countries, while not being democracies, observe domestic and international law. (Sayed, 2009: 76)

2-4. Popular Sovereignty and the Culture of Peace

This principle means that people directly or indirectly participate in government decisions and the government is popular. For this reason, they usually do not want to implement oppressive policies and interfere in the internal affairs of other countries. They know the negative consequences of war, so when human societies get closer to democracy, the possibility of war between them is rare and this peaceful culture is a common culture among democratic states. Of course, governments respect the sovereignty of the people and the law of others. Democratic countries do not interfere in their internal affairs, and when conflicts arise between them, these conflicts are resolved through peaceful dialogue. While non-democratic countries are accused of cruelty, chaos, insecurity, and instability in international relations. Therefore, it recommends exporting the culture of democracy to non-democratic countries, because they believe that they are the source of evil and that as long as such regimes exist, the global community will not rest from the scourge of war. (Andrew, 2005: 65)

This principle is also completely different from the popular sovereignty that is spoken of in Islamic theory, because the will of the Islamic government is not in the hands of the people, but in the hands of the Islamic ruler, who has more authority. He is obliged to take the necessary decisions in the interests of society in order to implement the divine decree. The law is the same for all, the export of Islamic culture by using violence and force has never been recommended by others, the best proof of its approval is the Islamic invitation at all stages by sending letters, envoys, and diplomas in a peaceful manner. Moreover, the culture of democracy is not only the bearer of the spirit of peaceful coexistence but also Islamic culture. This culture is more widespread and the peacefulness of the culture of democracy is only among democratic countries. However, in the case of Islamic culture, its peacefulness is not limited to Islamic societies, but includes all human societies; therefore, it is more comprehensive and beneficial to humanity than the culture of democracy. (Al-Aziz, 2009: 134.)

2-5. Free Trade and Economic Interdependence.

Since liberal democratic countries have huge economic resources and institutions and business companies that always trade to maintain their economic resources and there are free economic relations and trade initiatives between them, this strengthens the peaceful aspect between them to prevent war among themselves. This causes them not to think about war and violence; because the benefits they gain through trade and economy are not comparable to the results of victory they achieve after the war.

Moreover, in an atmosphere of chaos, insecurity, and general instability, trade exchanges cannot be achieved. Democratic societies usually act to achieve rational goals. Common interests between countries are transferred from the regional level to the international level, then at the global level, trade will be free and all countries will benefit from it, so there will be no evidence of conflict or war in the international community. (Fathi, 2012: 87).

There is also a distinction between this principle and the Islamic principle, because in so-called democratic economic systems, economic resources are in the hands of a limited number of capitalists, and the rest of human societies suffer from poverty and destitution. Private property is the criterion of distribution, and the main problem of the liberal system is the lack of proper distribution of wealth. If we look at this principle in Islamic theory, we will find that it has given special attention to the economic aspect, not as an end, but means to achieve a higher goal, which is eternal happiness and divine proximity. Therefore, it has been considered a correct criterion for the distribution of wealth, just as it has prepared special solutions to eliminate poverty. It has made zakat, khums, and sadaqah obligatory on the rich so that poverty is eradicated from society. It has cured economic equality in society by specifying private ownership so that all financial and economic resources are not in the hands of a specific group. (Sadr, 2008:640.)

In addition, we find economic justice in the Islamic economic system tangibly and clearly. It has forbidden commercial activities that cause economic imbalance, such as usury and monopolization, and it pays attention to all financial resources that contribute to progress. Such as agriculture and industry, hence it is very different from the liberal economy that depends on material profit and benefit. Private property is unlimited and does not consider moral and human values in its commercial and economic initiatives (Al-Din, 2004: 54). However, in Islamic economics, the correct criterion for work is that it should bring material and spiritual happiness to everyone while preserving the rights of others, and one has no right to commit an act that leads to usury or violates the rights of others for one's interests (Sadr, 2008: 640).

2-6. Creating Crisis Management Institutions

This means that democratic countries want to expand their relations with other countries through diplomatic, commercial and economic relations, and for this reason, they make every effort to avoid disputes and sever ties with other countries to protect their national interests and goals at all levels, therefore, they create institutions to manage crises that may occur. It is true that the possibility of war between liberal democratic countries is very remote according to this hypothesis; but competition and control between them, especially in the economic field, still prevails. (Al-Khazraji, 2009: 380.)

Moreover, democratic countries, due to their trade and economic relations, want peace and stability among themselves, so crisis management among them will play a decisive role in establishing peaceful relations between them. At the international level, the European Union and the African Union have played this role since their inception. However, the African Union is much weaker in this regard than the European Union. (Twil, 2002: p. 70). It seems that there are differences between this principle and the principles of Islamic peaceful strategies. You can use this principle to achieve political and economic goals, but the goals are different because we said that Islamic peaceful principles are not only for the Islamic government and Muslims, rather, the peaceful foundations of Islam are based on humane and ethical standards that include all human beings, carry a peaceful message for all, and want peace for all, but some do not take the right path to achieve the goal. Furthermore, we said that peaceful relations between democratic countries are not because they are democratic, but because there are commercial and economic interests between them, knowing that the Islamic state has more credibility in its peaceful relations with other countries and is following international standards. Their law of non-interference in the internal affairs of states is the best evidence of this claim. On the contrary, when we observe liberal democratic states, we find exactly the opposite, namely peace with democratic states and war with non-

democratic states. Although they always demand respect for human rights, they kill millions of people for the sake of establishing or restoring democracy, they interfere with the internal affairs of independent states and the like under the legitimacy of democracy. However, if we observe the Islamic system in all aspects, we do not witness such negative behaviors and attitudes that have been recorded for liberal democratic governments.

So far, we have pointed out the distinction between the foundations and principles of peaceful strategies of liberal democratic theory and the principles of peaceful strategies of Islamic theory, and we will continue to discuss the aspects they share.

Second: Common Aspects

Just as there are differences between the foundations and principles of peaceful strategies from liberal democratic theory and the principles of peaceful strategies from Islamic theory, there are also commonalities between them, which we will briefly examine and compare.

1. Democrats Don't Fight Each Other

This principle is considered one of the most important principles of liberal democratic peaceful strategies in international relations. This means that liberal democratic countries resolve international disputes among themselves, as we said before, through peaceful dialogue and prefer commercial and economic benefits to the positive results they achieve after success in war. Because it helps to create a peaceful atmosphere in international relations and believes that non-democratic countries are the source of evil and chaos in the international community; therefore, democracy should be exported to them in every possible way because it is a peaceful culture with one goal: political, economic and cultural progress and development. The international community will not rest from the scourge of war as long as non-democratic systems exist. (Enrolkar, 2008: 317.)

In this principle, although there are differences between the strategic principles, there are also common aspects, which as that these two theories agree that the basis of international relations is peace, not war. War is an emergency and may not take place except in exceptional cases related to national security and the highest goals of the political system. The resolution of international disputes should be through peaceful negotiation and adherence to the principle of non-interference in the affairs of independent states and compliance with international law. Both theories agree that diplomatic, cultural, and economic relations provide an important aspect of peace and international relations, although there are fundamental differences, which we have mentioned when mentioning the differences.

2. Emphasis on Liberal Peace and the Need for Reforms in Non-Democratic Countries

Liberal democratic countries believe that for non-democratic countries to follow their path toward democracy, democracy must be exported to them in any way possible, even military because they are the source of evil and chaos in international relations. The only solution to this problem is the proliferation of liberal democratic systems because democratic states enjoy social, economic, and political justice and there are appropriate relations between the military and the civilian sector. The right to declare war cannot be implemented without the advice of decision-makers, therefore, liberal democratic systems are, in their own words, the best political systems on earth. In the case of countries that have just entered democracy, they need sufficient time to implement the rules and principles of democracy, and the same rule applies to countries that are changing political systems to democracy. (Enrolkar, 2008: 317). In this principle, it seems that the aspects in common with the principles of Islamic peaceful strategies are very rare, but it can be said that it is worth noting that, despite the appropriate relations between the military and civilian sectors, they do have common ground. No war decisions can be made without the advice of the Islamic ruler.

3. Rule of Law in Liberal Democratic Countries

Liberals believe that the rule of law plays a fundamental role in ensuring peace and stability at home and abroad. They abide by the law, do not interfere in the internal affairs of other countries, and respect international law. Both officials and citizens act under the supervision of the law, and for this reason, the constitution of states is the fundamental reference for ensuring security, stability, and peace at the national and international levels, because one of the fundamental issues raised in the constitution is the discussion of war. And this is in the hands of the people; therefore, the people do not easily decide to go to war, because they know the negative consequences of it, and it is not in the hands of military force, but in the hands of political authorities who act according to the law of democracy, who in turn cannot do this without the people's knowledge, otherwise, failure in the war will cause them to lose their political jobs or be defeated in the next elections. (Enrolikar, 2008: 145).

In this principle, there are also common points between this principle and the principles of peaceful leaders from Islamic theory. Because in Islamic theory, there is also law, because Islamic theory considers law as the basic reference for resolving issues and disputes between individuals within and between countries. Abroad, the military force has no authority to decide on war without the decision of the Islamic ruler and the legal government. It also accepts that the law is the basic reference for ensuring security, stability, and tranquility in the Islamic system. Also, citizens observe the law act based on it, and participate in political, social, and economic activities.

4. Popular Sovereignty and the Culture of Peace

The origin of democratic culture is the sovereignty of the people, and people participate directly or indirectly in decision-making and usually do not want oppressive policies and interference in the internal affairs of other countries, because they are aware of its negative consequences. For this reason, when they make decisions, they do not make decisions that cause violence and war, and this culture exists in all liberal democratic countries. Therefore, when there is a verbal conflict between two democratic countries, the probability of a physical war is zero. No matter how close human societies are to democracy, the probability of war between them is rare. (Enrolikar, 2008: 120).

In this principle, there are also similarities between this principle and the principles of peace strategies of Islamic theory, because the origin of Islamic culture is peace, not war. People have a fundamental role in political and social participation, but it differs from liberalism in that this political participation in the Islamic system is defined by legal standards and divine law. They also share in this category that people have a peaceful culture that weakens violence and avoids war. (120). This peaceful culture includes all diplomatic, economic, commercial, political, and even military fields. The resolution of disputes between countries is in fact through peaceful dialogue agreed upon by all. Also, respect for the principle of non-interference in the affairs of other countries and respect for international charters and covenants is an established and accepted principle. But in most cases, liberal democratic countries do not do these things. They do not adhere to international treaties, and this is completely against Islam.

5. Free Trade and Economic Interdependence

This principle is based on economic cooperation between liberal democracies. They believe that these trade and economic relations between them provide a favorable environment for peace because in this case, countries only think about the commercial profits they earn and do not think about war, because the profits that these countries earn through trade and economics are incommensurable with the positive results they achieve through successful war. As a result, the best option for resolving real disputes between countries is through peaceful dialogue, because they know the negative effects of war. (Fati Sarwar, 2008: 87.)

This principle also has similarities with the principles of Islamic theory, because diplomatic, commercial, and economic relations provide an important aspect of peace between states, whether democratic or non-democratic, peace is much better than the positive results that are achieved after war. (Farhani, 2009: 106.)

6. Establishment of Crisis Management Institutions

This principle is somewhat in line with the principles of peaceful strategies from an Islamic theory that defends the national and vital interests of countries because the Islamic system protects the material, spiritual, worldly, and otherworldly interests. After all, the establishment of these crisis management institutions that usually occur in the country, whether it is a political, economic, or cultural decision, whether at the national, regional, or international level, is reasonable for all countries because crisis control between all countries is for survival. Here, Islamic peaceful strategies differ from liberal democratic strategies because the Islamic ruler does not create an institution for crisis management to abuse his ability to implement expansionist policies at the expense of non-Islamic countries because Islam is undoubtedly true in the field of international relations; But liberal democratic countries perceive exactly the opposite, because it does not guarantee the desired goals of non-democratic countries, which is why they consider them the source of evil in international relations. (Enrolkar, 2008: 344).

Here, we have briefly mentioned the commonalities and differences between the principles of peaceful strategies from liberal democratic theory and Islamic theory in international relations, and then we will discuss the advantages of the principles of Islamic peaceful strategies in international relations over the principles of liberal democratic peaceful strategies in international relations.

Third: The Superiority of the Principles of Peaceful Islamic Strategies Over the Principles of Liberalism

The advantages of the principles of Islamic peaceful strategies in international relations over the principles of liberal democratic peaceful strategies became clear to us through the studies that the principles of Islamic peaceful strategies in international relations have more advantages in international relations due to the humanity and valor of this theory. Possessing unique individual characteristics that arise from the holy religion of Islam. These features are very distinct from the peaceful level of liberal democracy in international relations, because it is from God Almighty and has within itself high moral and human values that do not exist on the other side. This means that the law in a democratic country or the law of the people is imperfect and is always subject to change and amendment according to the conditions of time and place, while Islam is a divine law issued by God Almighty and is not subject to change, rather the Islamic state headed by an Islamic ruler must interpret and explain this law for a Muslim society and apply it equally within the society. Regarding its advantage over the principles of liberal peace strategies that say that democratic countries do not fight each other and resolve their real international differences through peaceful dialogue, Islamic principles of peace in international relations have preceded liberalism in this regard for more than a thousand years. When Islam came and established the Islamic government for the first time and was able to establish peaceful diplomacy with many emperors at that time in many parts of the world, the Messenger of God sent his ambassadors to China and Europe, and even in those countries, and when Islam became strong, he declared a general amnesty, and did not take revenge except on bloodless people, and the history of Islam is a witness to that.

Also, the Islamic culture of peace is a real culture in international relations and is superior to the liberal culture of peace. If a liberal culture of peace exists, it is only among liberal countries, and it does not include non-democratic countries. Many believe that the culture of illiberal democracy is the source of evil in international relations. The very claim of those who believe that we should export the culture of liberal democracy to all countries that lack it, even through war, is the best evidence of its evil nature. However, in Islamic culture, the opposite is true. No individual, society, or state should be forced by

military force to accept Islamic culture, except in exceptional cases, even religious belief is carried out by complete choice.

But if we also look at economic principles, we realize that Islamic principles are stronger and better than the principles of liberal economics, which depend on unlimited private ownership, which has placed all global financial resources at the disposal of a limited number of capitalists. Most human societies live under the shadow of absolute poverty, chronic diseases, and civil wars because there is no proper distribution of wealth. By observing the economic principles of Islam, it becomes clear to us that it is better for humanity that there is a proper distribution of wealth, because it supervises the market, monitors commercial activities, punishes monopolies, and imposes special taxes on the wealthy, which leads to relative equality between the classes of society. Some commercial activities at the regional and international levels open diplomatic, commercial, and economic relations with other countries, but all of them are subject to legal regulations that Islam has fully or explicitly mentioned. But as for the principle of liberal economy, it only considers the common economic interests between liberal democratic states and does not give importance to moral and human standards in gaining profit and benefit. For this reason, each of the independent states suffers from the scourge of liberal economy.

So far, we have conducted a comparative study of the most important principles of peace strategies in Islamic theory and the principles of peace strategies in a liberal democratic theory in international relations and presented the aspects of distinction and commonality.

Research Results

From the above, it is clear that there are commonalities between the principles of liberal democratic peaceful strategies and the principles of Islamic peaceful strategies in international relations, in that each considers peace to be the foundation of international relations and considers war to be secondary. Unlike the realist school of international relations, which considers power as the basis of international relations, on the one hand, the principles of Islamic peace differ from the liberal principles of peace because, in Islamic international relations, it has more credibility due to the human and moral values based on divine law. On the one hand, this is a partner in the rule of law, in the sense that its existence is necessary to ensure peace and stability inside and outside the country, with the difference being what the origin of this law is. The origin of Islamic principles and laws is God Almighty and cannot be changed no matter how critical and diverse the circumstances, while the principles of liberal peace believe that they originate from the people and can be changed from moment to moment according to what they see as the general interest. They also share the view that the prevailing culture is a peaceful one, with no concept of war, whether at the national, regional, or international levels. The disagreement is that this peaceful liberal culture does not include non-democratic states because, in their view, non-democratic states are the source of evil in international relations and must be eliminated by any means. Contrary to the principles and foundations of Islamic peace, it includes all countries that are not enemies of it.

These principles also share the view that economic relations and trade initiatives between states provide relative peace between states because the benefits obtained by states are better than the positive results obtained from war. However, there is disagreement over how to distribute the benefits, and in the liberal school, private property and benefits are distributed without restrictions and conditions, for this reason, a liberal economy is in the hands of a limited number of people, while the rest suffer from very severe economic problems. The fact is that the principles of Islamic economics have established a correct method for distributing wealth, have abolished private property, and have prevented some commercial activities such as usury and monopoly. In order to create economic equality within the Muslim community, it has imposed economic rights on the rich for the poor.

From this, we understand that the principles of Islamic peaceful strategies are superior to the principles of liberal peace strategies, because firstly, it is related to divine law, which cannot be changed, and secondly, this law contains human and moral values, which are not seen in the principles of liberal peaceful strategies in international relations, because moral and humanitarian issues do not exist and they interfere in the affairs of independent countries. Finally, due to the lack of scientific research on this subject, it needs to be expanded and developed, and God is the Preserver of Success.

References

1. Majd al-Din Muhammad bin Yaqub al-Firouzabadi, *Al-Qamoos al-Muhit*, Dar al-Maarefa Beirut, Lebanon, third edition, 2008.
2. Atiya Allah, Ahmed, *Al-Qamoos Al-Siyasi*, Al-Nasher Dar Al-Nahda Al-Arabiya, 23 Shareh Abdul Khaliq Tharwat, Cairo, 1968.
3. Ibn Manzoor, Jamal al-Din Muhammad bin Makram, *The Arab Language*, research d. Youssef al-Baka'i and Ibrahim Shamsuddin and Nasal.
- Ali, Al-Dar al-Medazitiya publisher for publishing and distribution of the Republic of Tunisia. Edition of Al-Alami Foundation for Publications, Beirut – 2005.
4. Al-Qawazi, Muhammad Ali, *Al-Dawliyyah relations in al-Tarikh al-Hadith and contemporary*, 2002 Dar al-Nahsa al-Arabiya - Beirut.
5. Al-Josor, Nazem Abdul Wahid, *Encyclopaedia of Political, Philosophical, and International Terms*, Manifesto Dar Al-Nahda Arabi Beirut-Lebanon. 2008
6. Al-Kiyani, Abd al-Wahab, *Al-Siyasiya Encyclopedia*, Al-Arabiya Foundation for Studies and Publications, Lebanon, 2001.
- Kant, Emmanuel, Saleh Baydar, translated into Persian by Mohammad Sabouri, published by Bavaran, Tehran 2001.
7. (Jean-Vencent, *la democracy et la guerre*).
8. Ahmed Fatty Sarwar, *Al-Alam Al-Jadeed between Economics, Politics and Law*, Dar al-Sharooq, second edition, 2005.
9. Mohammad Baqer al-Sadr, "Economics", Bostan Kitab Qom, Publications of Islamic Propaganda Office of Qom Seminary, second edition 2003.
10. Al-Khazraji, Thamer Kamel, *International Political Relations and Crisis Management Strategy*, Majdalavi publishing house Oman-Jordan, 2009.
11. Edited by Andrew Lynn Clear, translated by Ali Reza Tayyeb, *Liberal Peace*, Publisher: Political and International Studies Office Tehran, Summer 2006.
12. Saeed Farahani Fard, *Economic Policies in Islam*, research institute Publishing Organization for Islamic Culture and Thought, Edition 1.
13. Ezzat Al-Khayyat, Abdul Aziz, *The Political System in Islam*, Dar Al-Salam for Printing, Publishing, Distribution and Translation, 2004.

15. Levine, Andrew, *A Critique of the Theory of Liberal Democracy*, translated by Saeed Ziba Kalam, Organization for the Study and Compilation of Academic Humanities Books, Spring 2001.
15. Nouri al-Baziani, Muhammad Sayyed, *The Concept of Peace in Islamic Thought (A Comparative Study of Sharia and Law)*, Dar al-Marafee for Publishing, Printing, Publishing and Distribution, Beirut - Lebanon 1428 AH 2007.
16. Jean-paul Chagnollaud, *relations internationale contemporaines un monde en perte de repère*; L'Armattan 1999.
17. *La guerre et la paix*, P-J. Prodhon, 1861.
18. Yves Mény et Yves surel; *politique comparée; les démocraties Allemagne, Etats-Unis, France, Grande-Bretagne*, 8eme Edition 2009.
4. Emanuel Tawil, *International Relations*, 4th Edition.
5. Emmanuel Kant, *paix démocratique*; publication date 1796.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).