SECURITY STUDIES AND INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM[20]

Ramazan Erdag
Assist.Prof.Dr., Eskisehir Osmangazi University,
Department of International Relations Eskisehir, Turkey

Abstract

The realist school of international relations regards the international environment as anarchic. Sovereign states are perceived as being engaged in a struggle to maximize their individual interests. Therefore, the states' chief priority is to counter threats from their adversaries so as to ensure the security of their citizens. In this context, the concept of security has traditionally been understood as an environment that is free of danger and threats. As International Relations IR theory has evolved, however, new approaches to the concept of security have been developed. New understandings of security have made the concept more multifaceted and visionary. This article firstly focuses on security studies field, in this regard and asks what can be done to combat global terrorism and how the conditions for peace and stability can be ensured? Given the rise of new global disputes and cultural perspectives, security can no longer be isolated venture; rather, it is a collective endeavor. In the contemporary era, greater international collaborations and broader alliances are needed to provide international security. This article discusses the effectiveness of such global alliances -especially NATO- in providing global security.

Keywords: Security, Terrorism, Alliance, Cooperation and NATO.

Introduction

The Cold War era was characterized by the competition and arms race between the two superpowers. In bipolar framework, states were forced to side with one of the two superpowers to survive. Conceptions of security in this era were based on nuclear threats. The dominant themes were

[20] This article is the updated and enhanced form of the article published under the title "Security Debates and Alliance Against Terrorism" in *Alternatives*, Vol. 9, No. 4, 2009, pp.133-148.

classical security threats and an arms race.[21] States were forced to develop their power and to provide security via military force. This was the primary concern of nation-states. However, the end of the Cold War changed this paradigm. The collapse of the Soviet Union brought the bipolar era to a close, and this not only changed the world order but also threat perceptions of actors. When new states gained independence from the Soviet Union, new security concerns emerged in the Caucasus and Eastern Europe. Disputes arose over whether these states could survive. As the Caucasus had rich energy resources and countries in Eastern Europe had fought wars against one another in the past, this prompted the question: would the world face new security issues and threats as in the case of , the Balkan crisis that represented an important challenge.

During the debate over such issues, a new security crisis emerged following the 9/11. The attacks in the US represented a transition to the fight against terrorism. Attacks in London, Madrid and Istanbul followed , and a wave of global[22] terrorism began to threaten the entire world. All of these events demonstrated the reality that security concerns are still of the primary focus of international relations and cannot be addressed without collaboration. Therefore, this article aims to explain how security can be reconceptualized and describes new approaches in security studies. It emphasizes the importance of collective security and focus on NATO in particular, which is one of the most important international organizations for global security, and finally, it summarizes the current situation and proposals for the future of global security.

Security Studies

If we begin with the question of what security[23] is, we face a variety of definitions. For instance, according to Emma Rothschild, "…security was seen throughout the period as a condition both of individuals and of states. Its most consistent sense…was indeed of a condition, or an objective, that constituted a relationship between individuals and states or societies" (Rothchild, 1995:53-98). Rothschild states that the principles of security are (i) to "provide some of guidance to the policies made by governments"; (ii)

[21] These claims are generally arguments of Realism. Realists perceive the international arena to be anarchic, which is why states have to struggle against one another to survive, and this competition would normally lead to a war. For more on realism and realist thought, see Morgenthau (1993) and Waltz (1990).

[22] "A [G]lobalized world is one in which political, economic, cultural and social events become more and more interconnected, and also one in which they have more impact." (Baylis and Smith, 2001).

[23] "The key question in security analysis is, who can 'do' security in the name of what? For a time, experts could get away with analyzing only 'states,' and system was then the sum of the states. Regional security meant the sum of national securities or rather a particular constellation of security interdependence among a group of states." (Buzan et al., 1998:45).

"guide public opinion about policy, to suggest a way of thinking about security, or principles to be held by the people on behalf of whom policy is to be made"; (iii) "to contest existing policies"; and (iv) "to influence directly the distribution of money and power" (Rothchild, 1995:53-98). In its classical sense, security can be defined as "…the move that takes politics beyond the established rules of the game and frames the issue either as a special kind of politics or as above politics" (Buzan et al., 1998:23).[24]

The central tenet of the classical view is "the more security the better" (Buzan et al., 1998:29). However, Ken Booth stresses the importance of emancipation to the concept of security. In his view, emancipation could take the form of freeing people from physical threats and providing security (Booth, 1991:313-326). "… security is about survival. It is when an issue is presented as posing an existential threat to a designated referent object (traditionally, but not necessarily, the state, incorporating government, territory, and society). The special nature of security threats justifies the use of extraordinary measures to handle them" (Buzan et al., 1998:21). Security is also linked to politics. "'Security' is the move that takes beyond the established rules of the game and frames the issue either as a special kind of politics or as above politics" (Buzan et al., 1998:23).

As Stephen M. Walt emphasizes, "…research in security studies has been heavily shaped by changing international conditions" (Walt, 1991:228). In this context, the definition of security has gained new meanings in light of different (IR) theories. The important issues of security studies are reflected in questions such as whose or what's security? Who or what provides security? And to whom or what is security provided against? (Kardaş, 2006). From the realist perspective, security issues are primarily the concern of states. According to realist theory, the primary actor in the international system is the state (Waltz, 2002; Waltz, 1979; Walt, 1997:931-935). A state must have power and sufficient military force to provide security because the international system is anarchic.[25] Realism understands security as the ability of states' to prevent and respond to military threats. War is a natural consequence of the absence of a higher authority. Security is the states' first

[24] According to the classical security complex theory "… security… for thinking about the political and military sectors, states were its referent objects. Security regions therefore had the following characteristics: (1) They were composed of two or more states, (2) These states constituted a geographically coherent grouping (because threats in these sectors travel more easily over short distances than over long ones), (3) The relationship among these states was marked by security interdependence, which could be either positive or negative but which had to be significantly stronger among them than between them and outside stares. (4) The pattern of security interdependence had to be deep and durable (i.e., much more than a one-time interaction), although not permanent" (Buzan et al., 1998:15).

[25] *Anarchy* is not chaos but simply refers to uncertainty, that is, there is no authority over the states. See Terriff et al. (1999).

priority because in the absence of security, the state has no meaning. In other words, being secure also implies being powerful.[26] Power struggles and security competition could lead to an unsecure situation, which is generally termed a security dilemma.

The term security dilemma has been begun to be used in international relations for more than half-a-century. "Security dilemma theory tells us that in an anarchic context [,] successfully communicating intentions is difficult, since efforts at self-protection often threaten others" (Mitzen, 2006:354). The term is also used to describe the situation in which a state begins to expand its security capabilities, which in turn reduces the security of other states. When a state improves its defense and security capabilities, the others can interpret such action as hostile to their interests (Cerny, 2005). The dilemma is a result of the ambiguity surrounding the aims of such efforts. Are these activities belligerent, and should they hence be treated as security concerns"? These two-sided arguments and disputes create security dilemmas. In sum, realism understands security as state security, which can be provided via military power, and this is why states are compelled to expand their capacities and abilities.

When considering that security studies inform a constructivist perspective,[27] the relationships among states, mutual cooperation and norms are important. Constructivists regard security as a produced object (Wendt, 1999). Security is produced via the interactions between actors and structures[28], as mutual relationships, perceptions and norms determine policy. For instance, while the UK's nuclear weapons are not a threat to international society, North Korea's nuclear weapons would constitute a threat (Wendt, 1992). Social constructivists do not disregard material capacities but stress the importance of social discourses and knowledge. In this regard, the democratic peace[29] discourse is related to social constructivism. Democratic peace theory asserts that democratic states do not fight one another. Because citizens of democracies select their leaders by voting and do not want war, leaders and states are constrained from waging them. This does not imply that democratic countries will necessarily wage

[26] Power is the most important object of security. Of course, this argument refers to material and military power. If a state can become powerful, this will the provide state with the possibility of preventing and responding to threats and *deterrence* ability. For power and the state, see Lin and Carroll (2006) and Pepper (2005).

[27] Social constructivist theory came into general use in IR following the end of the Cold War. The central arguments of theory regard the possibility of socially constructing politics under anarchy. Social constructivists also stress the importance of peace and democracy.

[28] "… a structure is a set of relatively unchangeable constraints on the behavior of states" (Hopf, 1998:172).

[29] For debates on democratic peace theory, see Bohman (2006), Russett (2005), Chernoff (2004), Farnham (2003) and Russett and Moaz (1993).

war against other types of governments.[30] In contrast to realism, social constructivists believe that the security of society is the most important and can be provided via international relations and norms.

Another contemporary IR theory, postmodernism,[31] reveals the roles of the media, text and images (Campbell, 1998). States refer to enemies and the anarchic structure of the international system to ensure internal unity. In this context, enemies must always exist. "However, the real danger always was anarchy and disorder" (Sheehan, 2005:137). A lack of security may cause people to feel a sense of unity. States attempt to exploit this unity to provide security. The media and visual materials in particular are the focus of this perspective. When people observe a picture of an enemy or a suicide bomber on TV or in newspapers, this automatically prompts feelings of fear. This situation provides leaders with the opportunity to take steps against threats. In sum, this theory argues that the security of others is important and that security is provided against the threat of destructive differences

The critical security studies (CSS) perspective addresses aspects of security such as terrorism, torture, immigration, poverty, human rights, etc. According to Keith Krause, "… there can be no security in the absence of authority, the state becomes the primary locus of security, authority and obligation, and the security of 'citizens' is identified with (and guaranteed by) that of the state" (Krause, 1998:309). Moreover, the "… standard definition of security - to do with being or feeling safe from threats and danger - security in world politics can have no final meaning. ….being or feeling safe is experienced and understood in terms of political theories about nations, sovereignty, class, gender, and other facts by human agreement" (Booth, 2005:13). In brief, critical approaches conceptualize security in deeper and broader terms (Booth, 2005:14-15). For instance, Booth interprets 9/11 as:

> "… colliding with the World Trade Centre on September 11: what it does mean, however, is that one's political understanding of those collisions is navigated via one's own cultural maps and political theories. The material facts spoke that dreadful morning, but not for themselves. They were spoken for the most part by long dead political theorists and philosophers, and we who watched, in horror and amazement, were for the most part merely their mouthpieces" (Booth, 2005:14-15).

[30] The Afghanistan and Iraq wars are examples of this argument.

[31] Postmodernist theory contends that no understanding of one's surroundings is neutral. One cannot understand the world without a tool or instrument. "… [P]ostmodernists argue that there is no single truth, no single ideology, no single text, no particular authority or set of values that in claiming absolute truth deserves unquestioned loyalty and obedience" (Sheehan, 2005).

An Alternative Security Paradigm: Global Struggle Against Terrorism

These different approaches to security studies demonstrate that there is no single, common definition of security. The various approaches have revealed diverse dimensions of security. These new conceptions of security began to be debated in earnest after the end of the Cold War.The 9/11 attacks in particular following the turn of the century also introduced the new security concern of global terrorism. With the 9/11, the threat of terrorism spread around the world. This new wave of terror reached Europe via the attacks in London, Madrid and Istanbul. As a result of these events, security concerns have become the first priority of states. Security plans and precautions have been revised. These events demonstrated the necessity of forming a global alliance against the threat.[32] For example, The National Security Strategy of the United States of America[33] explains the current terrorism threat as follows:

> "The United States of America is fighting a war against terrorists of global reach. The enemy is not a single political regime or person or religion or ideology. The enemy is terrorism… The struggle against global terrorism is different from any other war in our history. It will be fought on many fronts against a particularly elusive enemy over an extended period of time. Progress will come through the persistent accumulation of successes—some seen, some unseen. Today our enemies have seen the results of what civilized nations can, and will, do against regimes that harbor, support, and use terrorism to achieve their political goals. Afghanistan has been liberated; coalition forces continue to hunt down the Taliban and al-[Qaeda]. But it is not only this battlefield on which we will engage terrorists. Thousands of trained terrorists remain at large with cells in North America, South America, Europe, Africa, the Middle East, and

[32] As mentioned in the European Security Strategy, a single county cannot confront terrorism alone. The EU also perceives terrorism as a substantial threat against its interests. "Terrorism puts lives at risk; it imposes large costs; it seeks to undermine the openness and tolerance of our societies, and it poses a growing strategic threat to the whole of Europe. Increasingly, terrorist movements are well-resourced, connected by electronic networks, and are willing to use unlimited violence to cause massive casualties. The most recent wave of terrorism is global in its scope and is linked to violent religious extremism. It arises out of complex causes. These include the pressures of moderni[z]ation, cultural, social and political crises, and the alienation of young people living in foreign societies. This phenomenon is also a part of our own society. Europe is both a target and a base for such terrorism: European countries are targets and have been attacked. Logistical bases for Al Qaeda cells have been uncovered in the UK, Italy, Germany, Spain and Belgium. Concerted European action is indispensable" (European Union, 2003:3).

[33] This document was first published in September 2002 and is known as the Bush Doctrine.

> across Asia. Our priority will be first to disrupt and destroy terrorist organizations of global reach and attack their leadership; command, control, and communications; material support; and finances. This will have a disabling effect upon the terrorists' ability to plan and operate" (United States of America, 2002:5).

As seen in the document US defines the new threat paradigm as global. In order to struggle global terrorism requires effort in global scale. This collaboration and operative affectivity could be assured via joint security approach.

Key Factors: International Organizations

The security strategies of the US, EU and nearly every other country highlight the concept of a global alliance against terrorism, as the current security risks[34] require collective action. "The first objective clearly expresses the international commitment of the EU to the idea that terrorism can only be fought in a multilateral way. Indeed, since September 11, one of the priorities of the EU has been the implementation of the UN Security Council Resolution 1373 on the fight against terrorism (United Nations, 2001)" (Thieux, 2004:61). How will the maintenance of this alliance be assured? International organizations such as the UN, NATO, OSCE, and EU have played important roles in conflict areas around the globe. Because they shared common threats. In Somalia, Bosnia, Kosovo, Macedonia[35], Afghanistan, Iraq and Lebanon, peacekeeping operations have helped prevent protracted civil wars. The UN's diplomatic and political decisions[36] and NATO's military operations have been employed in an attempt to forge international cooperation against terrorism.

NATO's enlargement and development hence acquires further significance in conflict management . "While debates in the late 1980s often revolved around whether NATO would, could, or should survive, they now centre around the implications of its centrality, and its current and (possible) future enlargement. While disputes remain concerning the wisdom of NATO's policies, the place of the Alliance at the centre of contemporary relations seems beyond dispute" (Williams and Neumann, 2000:357). After

[34] Overall, we regard the primary subjects of conflicts and disputes as follows: in Africa, the problems are primarily internal tribal conflicts, starvation and nation building; in Latin America, the lack of or weak military security and regionalism; in North America, military and political security concerns; in the Middle East, the Arab-Israel conflict; in South Asia, struggles between India and Pakistan (such as in Kashmir); in Southeast Asia, Western interests, especially in Singapore and Malaysia; in East Asia, power balancing among China, Japan, Korea et al.; in the former Soviet Union, Russian and post-Soviet impacts on the states of the former Yugoslavia (Buzan, Waever and De Wilde, 1998: 124-137).

[35] Turkey recognizes the Republic of Macedonia by its constitutional name.

[36] The decisions of the United Nations Security Council's are effective because they are binding. Every member state has to obey and implement these decisions.

the collapse of the Soviet Union, newly independent states began to join NATO and the EU. Russia perceived these former Eastern Block countries joining NATO as a threat because it did not wish to have NATO countries on its borders.[37] Because the Warsaw Pact had been dissolved, many assumed that NATO would also be disbanded, but contrary to these expectations, NATO was enlarged. As a result of this process, "NATO is the key site in the rearticulation of security and the securitization of culture" (Williams and Neumann, 2000:364).

NATO also assumes the responsibility of linking North America and Europe. The member states are attempting to maintain an alliance against terrorism and to keep the peace under NATO auspices. At present, the necessity of such an organization is demonstrated in light of new security concepts.[38] Currently, instability is considered the greatest risk. To prevent conflicts and establish stability, NATO emphasizes democracy and freedom, thinking the more these values spread, the more peace and faith there will be. The new NATO members wish to share these values and to improve their security. Thus, the alliance constitutes a security community and forges a new security culture.[39]

For instance, NATO's role in combating terrorism is described as follows: "The North Atlantic Council, the Alliance's principal decision-making body, decides on NATO's overall role in the campaign against terrorism. Specific aspects of NATO's involvement (e.g., co-operation with partners) are developed though specialized bodies and committees…. On the

[37] NATO's enlargement is also an example of a security dilemma; NATO regards its enlargement as an attempt to improve security, but Russia regards it as a threat.

[38] "The question of what security was (or, alternatively, who or what now constituted 'threats') was at the core of NATO's post-Cold War dilemmas. Different answers to the question generated different visions of the future of the Alliance, and when viewed through traditional strategic lenses none looked promising for that future…. Security, too, came to be re-envisioned in cultural terms. Positively, security is identified with the cultural and civilisational principles now held to be the foundation of NATO itself. Negatively, threats are seen as emerging from the absence of such conditions. The challenge that NATO faces is increasingly portrayed not as a particular state or group of states whose adversarial position is dictated by the geopolitical logic of the balance of power" (Williams and Neumann, 2005:369).

[39] "…NATO, which stress its essential nature as a democratic security community, must consider the new kinds of power made possible that very identity. This in no way means that material power is unimportant; indeed, it is doubtful that NATO could have played the role it has without its capacity for military strength and its reputation as such. But NATO's power cannot be reduced to this. Indeed the power of the Alliance in the post-Cold War period derives in considerable part from the ability to maintain its military dimension while at the same time combining that dimension with a powerful cultural and political narrative that overcame the challenges faced by a purely military representation of the Alliance" (Williams and Neumann, 2005:386).

military side, Allied Command Operations is in charge of NATO's counter-terrorism operations, while Allied Command Transformation is leading the transformation of the Alliance to face today's new security threats, including terrorism."[40] In this context, NATO members reached consensus on combating terrorism through the Partnership Action Plan at the Prague summit in 2002.[41] This new common strategy allows to allies act together against global security matters.

In addition to sanctions and military interventions, the academic aspect of the fight against terrorism is also on the agenda. In this regard, centers of excellence were founded in the wake of NATO's new expansions and structural reorganization.[42] The aims of these centers are to engage in education and training, to facilitate joint study, and to improve doctrines and concepts. In this context, the Centre of Excellence Defense Against Terrorism[43] was established in Turkey in 2005. Since its establishment, the center of excellence has held symposiums, courses, and conferences. These centers will provide the opportunity to research problem areas and propose new solutions.

Conclusion

The new century presents the world with new understandings of security. Given the changes in threat perceptions and different approaches to studying them, it is becoming more difficult to define security. The end of the Cold War and the 9/11 attacks represent two turning points in the international order. Specifically, 9/11 and the attacks in Europe led to the

[40] Official NATO web site, URL: http://www.nato.int/issues/terrorism/main_bodies.html, accessed on 27 December 2007.

[41] "The principal objectives of the Partnership Action Plan against Terrorism are to: [a] Reconfirm the determination of EAPC States to create an environment unfavorable to the development and expansion of terrorism, building on their shared democratic values, and to assist each other and others in this [endeavor]. [b] Underscore the determination of EAPC States to act against terrorism in all its forms and manifestations and their willingness to co-operate in preventing and defending against terrorist attacks and dealing with their consequences. [c] Provide interested Partners with increased opportunities for contributing to and supporting, consistent with the specific character of their security and [defense] policies, NATO's efforts in the fight against terrorism. [d] Promote and facilitate co-operation among the EAPC States in the fight against terrorism, through political consultation, and practical programmes under EAPC and the Partnership for Peace. [e] Upon request, provide assistance to EAPC States in dealing with the risks and consequences of terrorist attacks, including on their economic and other critical infrastructure", URL: http://www.nato.int/docu/basictxt/b021122e.htm.

[42] The decision to establish the Centers of Excellence was made at the Prague Summit in 2002.

[43] In the Centre of Excellence Defense Against Terrorism, in addition to Turkish staff, there are also personnel from Romania, the United Kingdom, Bulgaria, Germany, Holland and the United States.

recognition of the necessity of adopting a new method to combat global terrorism, forming alliances. The development of alliances to address security concerns - such as border controls, illegal immigration, containing the spread of weapons of mass destruction, and intelligence sharing - is the key factor for success. In isolation, a state's efforts cannot be sufficient to overcome terrorism. Because terrorism is considered a global phenomenon, the fight against it must be a collective endeavor. In this regard, international organizations are important components of a global alliance. NATO's involvement in international conflict areas represents an especially strong deterrent. The effectiveness of NATO and its enlargement process are crucial steps in the formation of a global alliance. Such an alliance is necessary in combating global terrorism and establishing stability. States must participate in this alliance and collaborate symmetrically. In other words, to achieve these goals, it is also necessary to condemn terrorism and terrorists, disrupt terrorist networks and their financial support, foster cooperation and collaboration, faithfully implement international laws and respect the rights of others.

References:

Baylis, John and Steve Smith (2001), *The Globalization of World Politics: An introduction to International Relations*, (Eds.), Oxford University Press.

Booth, Ken (1991), "Security and Emancipation", *Review of International Studies*, Vol, 17, p.313-326.

Bohman, James (2006), "Beyond the Democratic Peace: An Instrumental Justification of Transnational Democracy", *Journal Of Social Philosophy*, Vol. 37, No. 1, p.127-138.

Booth, Ken (2005), *Critical Security Studies and World Politics*, (Ed.) Lynne Rienner,

Buzan, Barry, Ole Waever and Jaap De Wilde (1998), *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*, Boulder: Lynne Reinner.

Campbell, David (1998), *Writing Security*, Manchester, Manchester University Press.

Cerny, Philip G. (2005) "Terrorism and the New Security Dilemma", *Naval War College Review*, Vol. 58, Issue 1, pp.11-33.

Chernoff, Fred (2004), "The Study of Democratic Peace and Progress in International Relations", *International Studies Review*, Vol. 6, No 1, pp.49-77.

European Union (2003), "A Secure Europe in a Better World", *European Security Strategy*, Brussels, December 12.

Farnham, Barbara (2003), "The Theory of Democratic Peace and Threat Perception", *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 47, No 3, p.395-415.,

Hopf, Ted (1998), "The Promise of Constructivism in International Relations Theory", *International Security*, Vol. 23, No. 1, p.171-200.
Kardaş, Tuncay (2006), "New Perspectives in Security Studies", *Bilgi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 2006/2, İstanbul, Değişim Yayınları.
Krause, Keith (1998), "Critical Theory and Security Studies: The Research Program of 'Critical Security Studies'", *Cooperation and Conflict*, Vol. 33, No. 3, pp.298-333.
LIN, Ka and Eero Carroll (2006), "State Institutions, Political Power and Social Policy Choices: Reconstructing The Origins Of Nordic Models Of Social Policy", *European Journal of Political Research*, Vol 45, Issue 2, pp.345-367,
Mitzen, Jennifer (2006), "Ontological Security in World Politics: State Identity and the Security Dilemma", *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 12, No. 3, pp.341-370.
Morgenthau, Hans J. (1993), *Politics Among Nations : The Struggle For Power And Peace*, rev.by. Kenneth W. Thompson, New York, Mc Graw Hill.
Pepper, Andrew (2005), "State Power Matters: Power, The State And Political Struggle In The Post-War American Novel", *Textual Practice*, Vol. 19 No. 4, pp.467-491.
Rothschild, Emma (1995), 'What is Security', *Daedalus*, Vol. 124, No. 3, pp.53-98.
Russett, Bruce (2005), "Bushwhacking the Democratic Peace", *International Studies Perspectives*, Vol. 6, Issue 4, pp.395-408.
Russett, Bruce and Zeev Moaz (1993), "Normative and Constructural Causes of Democratic Peace", *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 80, No. 3, pp.624-638.
Sheehan, Michael (2005), *International Security*, London: Lynne Rienner.
Terriff, Terry, Stuart Croft, Lucy James and Patrick Morgan (1999), *Security Studies Today*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
Thieux, Laurence (2004), "European Security and Global Terrorism: the Strategic Aftermath of the Madrid Bombings", *Perspectives: Central European Review of International Affairs*, Vol. 22, pp.59-74.
United States of America (2002), *The National Security Strategy of the United States of America*, September.
Walt, Stephen M. (1997), "The Progressive Power of Realism", *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 91, No. 4, s.931-935.
Walt, Stephen M. (1991), "The Renaissance of Security Studies", *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 35, No. 2, pp.211-239.
Waltz, Kenneth N. (2002) "Structural Realism after the Cold War", (Ed.), G. John Ikneberry, *America Unrivaled; The Future of Balance of Power*, London,Cornell University Press.

Waltz, Kenneth N. (1990), 'Realist Thought And Neorealist Theory', *Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 44, Issue 1, p.21-38.
Waltz, Kenneth N. (1979), *Theory of International Politics*, McGraw-Hill.
Wendt, Alexander (1999), *Social Theory of International Politics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Wendt, Alexander (1992), "Anarchy is what States Make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics", *International Organization*, Vol. 46, No. 2, pp.391-425.
Williams, Michael C. and Iver B. Neumann (2000), "From Alliance to Security Community: NATO, Russia, and the Power of Identity", *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, Vol. 29, No. 2, p.357-387.