

The International Power Structure

MOHAMED SAID ASSOUMANI

*PhD in International Politics
Lecturer, the University of Comoros*

ABDALLAH MOURTADHOI

*Doctorate of Law
Lecturer, the University of Comoros*

Abstract

This research aimed to determine the international power structure to understand relation among nations. Indeed, since the introduction of the modern state, we must into account the notion of power that is also central to the study of political science, and the actors of the international arena who use it, in addition to polarity system. So, the presence of many international actors in the international arena today, the State, however, compared to the other players, still take a prominent place on the international and global arena. Simply, we can find some cases that these organizations get a strong influence in weak States, which is striking that these organizations carry out most of state functions at the internal level and sometimes at the global level; because they possess the physical power factors.

Keywords: international power, international politics, international relations states, organizations, actors, superpowers

1. INTRODUCTION

The international power structure is central to the study of both international politics and relations. To understand relation among nations, since the introduction of the modern state, we must into account the notion of power that is also central to the study of political science, and the actors of the international arena who use it, in addition to polarity system. Consequently, all power is political and Political power is approximately making directional change. Power structures are the vehicles with which such changes or modifications can be effected¹.

¹ Rappa, A. L. (2010). "POWER STRUCTURE." Government and Politics-Volume I: 398.

2. THE NOTION OF POWER

There are no fundamental differences, or significance, in defining the notion of power or to determine its meaning. Most definitions determine that power is the capacity to impact the conduct of others, or control their behaviour towards a particular issue... so; the power is the capacity of (A) to pay (B) to do (C), or not to do (D)². Or as defined by the Realist political scientists: Power is the ability of (A) to get (B) to execute what (B) would otherwise not execute³.

In the signified that allows (the relation) that one of Governments to conduct a government of another State to adopt certain behaviour do not freely preferred. As if it forces her to do an action that she does not wish to undertake, or to prevent her from accomplishing actions she wants to do. One of the problems of this definition is, in most cases, to be sure of the possibilities of the other party that it executes S or not to execute or, if the first party power effects are not present⁴.

Otherwise, "Realism and international system-level theories suggest that power explains everything that matters in international politics, the interests of states and the actions taken in pursuit of these interests range from trade agreements to war⁵".

It may be occurred the case where (A) wishes (B) to make the behavior (C), But does not influence (B) for fearing that (B) behaves to do the act (D) and it is a reaction that does not serve the interests of (A), according to its point of view. May be the idea of "the expected reaction" will be Multilateral, where (A) wishes (B) to make the action (C), But (A) does not require (B) to do it, for fearing that State (X) - a third State - do act (D) which does not serve the interests of (A)⁶.

² Dahl, R. A. (1957). "The concept of power." Systems Research and Behavioral Science 2(3): 201-215; Baldwin, D. A. (1980). "Interdependence and power: a conceptual analysis." International Organization 34(4): 471-506.

³ Lake, D. A. (2005). "Hierarchy in international relations: Authority, sovereignty, and the new structure of world politics."; Rappa, A. L. (2010). "POWER STRUCTURE." Government and Politics-Volume I: 398.

⁴ Hussein, K. (2008). "POWER AND ITS IMPACT ON INTERNATIONAL ALLIANCES AND CONFLICTS." from <https://www.lebarmy.gov.lb/ar/content/%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%82%D9%88%D8%A9-%D9%88%D8%A3%D8%AB%D8%B1%D9%87%D8%A7-%D9%81%D9%8A-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A3%D8%AD%D9%84%D8%A7%D9%81-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AF%D9%88%D9%84%D9%8A%D8%A9-%D9%88%D8%B5%D8%B1%D8%A7%D8%B9%D8%A7%D8%AA%D9%87%D8%A7>

Pallaver, M. (2011). Power and its forms: hard, soft, smart, The London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE).

⁵ Milkoreit, M. (2013). "Global Power Structures – (How) Do They Matter?" CCC-Brief(4).

⁶ikhlef. "the concept of power in international relations." from in Arabic on: www.freewebs.com/ikhlef/; Guzzini, S. (1993). "Structural power: the limits of neorealist power

Whatever, the differences of any basis for definition of power, it's based on the behavioral relationship that compel a party to obey the desire of the other in directions and options that satisfy his wishes, or compatible with it, in a specific or extended period in a particular area or areas⁷.

Hence, Morgenthau, Waltz and Mearsheimer agreed that anyone who wishes to know the power of any state, it must take into account the following consideration elements:

Geography, natural resources (food and raw materials), industrial capability, military preparation (technology, leadership, quantity and quality of the armed forces), population (distribution and trends), national character, national morale, quality of diplomacy, quality of government and economic wealth⁸.

Traditionally, power is defined in terms of control over material resources: the larger a state's economy and its military and natural resources, the better it can pursue its self-interest by forcing its will upon others⁹.

Despite all the above definitions of power and its components, power must be considered as¹⁰:

The way of achieving a particular goal, as Hans Morgenthau has suggested that force itself is a desirable value. Merely, is it reasonable that a state spends money and energy to have the power only because it has it, or to demonstrate its power to attack others?

- 1- The power is not really static; but a relationship between two parties in which they are framed the interaction of the means and its methods in wills and behaviour, in a period of time, formed in the final analysis, either a dialogue or clash of wills, accordingly it determined features of a pattern of the relationship between the two parties.
- 2- Power is not an absolute value, but is considered relative; it is not possible to describe a party as strong or weak except in the context of comparison with one party or parties. That comparison determines its position in the power structure at the regional or international level.
- 3- Power-effect models are complex; power is a process that involves more than the ability of a state to influence the conduct of another

analysis." *International Organization* 47(3): 443-478. ; Pustovitovskij, A. and J.-F. Kremer (2011). Structural Power and International Relations Analysis: " Fill your basket, get your preferences", Institut fuer Entwicklungsforschung und Entwicklungspolitik, Ruhr-Universitaet Bochum.

⁷ Hussein, K. (2008).

⁸ Laffaye, S., et al. (2013). "Changes in the global economic power structure: towards a multipolar world?" *Argentine Journal of International Economics* 1.

⁹ Milkoreit, M. (2013). "Global Power Structures – (How) Do They Matter?" *CCC-Brief*(4).

¹⁰ Hussein, K. (2008).

State in a specific situation, since the process of influence does not stop at the reaction of the state to the act directed against it by the first state. In particular, the reaction may be acceptable and requires by the influential state in particular, the reaction may be acceptance of what is required of the State that has a cooperative effect to support the direction taken by the affected State, or it may be not accepted which forces the influential State to counter the reaction. Thus, there is a chain of actions and a reaction following that blends a reaction, So that each party becomes effective and objective at the same time.

- 4- Each influence process has its own parameters to interact actions and reactions in the area or a specific range; According to the principles of the specific game it controls every process. To describe a State in the context of that point - as strong, does not mean that it can influence the behaviour of others in all areas, and in all cases, That is, they are capable of militarily defeating them, giving them money, controlling them culturally and penetrating them politically.

Then, whatever, each country who possesses the elements of a force become strong, And those who do not have it are weak, in the style of what is envisaged in the general thinking about power, Especially since the potentials can be seen, touched or measured, other than the effects that are difficult to grasp in their different dimensions.

3. INTERNATIONAL SYSTEM STRUCTURE

In endeavors to comprehend the international system, loads of researchers have used terms, similar to: realm, dominion, imperial power, and so on. For quite a while, they have been searching for a dialect that can depict and present chronicled and the similar view on the structure of the global request in various timeframes¹¹.

According to Hedley Bull: international system "formed when at least two states have adequate contact amongst them, and influence each other's choices, to make them carry on—at any rate in some measure—as parts of an entire"¹². As that "a global political framework is an arrangement of countries connected by an arrangement of associations"¹³.

In the event that there is a major communication between States in the universal framework, it must be contrasts of supposition and issues or

¹¹ TOMJA, A. (2014). "Polarity and International System Consequences." Interdisciplinary Journal of Research and Development 1(1).

¹² Hatsuse, R. (2010). "International System." International Sustainable Development Law-Volume III: 22.

¹³ Cioffi-Revilla, C. (2001). Origins of the International System: Mesopotamian and West Asian Polities, 6000 BC to 1500 BC. paper for the Annual Meeting of the ASOR.

collaboration between those States, the reason is the tangle of interests (monetary, political, security...); we can assume that the global framework isn't steady. Gökhan ÖZKAN disclosed to us that the meaning of the international system is complex as it is a segment of different frameworks, where he said "Universal framework can characterize as a perplexing arrangement of frameworks made of financial, politic, logical, mechanical and military frameworks. It is difficult to break down this unpredictable framework.¹⁴"

Therefore, the international system had an identifiable structure, where it has some form of power, influence and prevailing relations. Also, some scholars and writers tried to make sure that the world marked on the basis of the dominant power in the international and global levels.

Nonetheless, there is a solid connection between the structure of the framework and its capacity to work. More it carries on quite a while, or the framework can work, the structure of the framework proceeds as it seems to be, and at whatever point the capacity of the framework to play out those capacities was feeble, the odds of changing its structure have expanded or causing an occasion and changes its primary powers. The elements of the universal framework changed between accomplishing security, advancement, incorporation or organization together, adjusting to the weights and advancing authenticity.

However, after establishment of the modern state, all actors, in this system, are the states. It is not a single state or government that controls the entire the world with its power and ideology and applies its ability vis-à-vis the other States without the interaction of the other parts of this system to defeat the dominate of one or two countries in the world. In fact, the survival of some communist and Muslim countries today, towards liberal capitalism, is clear evidence for non-ideological dominance or State in the world. Or, for example, capitalist countries have accepted the Islamic banks. Besides global and international organizations such as the League of Nations and the United Nations, then other governmental and non-governmental organizations which the international system has known in its various periods that was and still achieve its influence on global and international levels.

As for the so-called new world order, it's a name closer to metaphor than truth; there is controversy over its meaning. It's not new, not in terms of trial and neither in terms of promises of peace, legitimacy and cooperation (equality and international justice). It is a system (as its supporters say) based on ideological origins and absolute perceptions of the human and the universe - about the meaning of life And the message of the human being in this system, and after that, his destiny, and human development regardless of

¹⁴ ÖZKAN, G. (2008). "UNIPOLAR, BIPOLAR OR MULTIPOLAR INTERNATIONAL SYSTEM? THE DEFENSE INDUSTRY FACTOR." *Yönetim ve Ekonomi Araştırmaları Dergisi* 6(10): 104-123.

his sex and colour and his time and place – Comprehensive system and a model compatible with his nature, And satisfy, individual and social, all his physical, mental and spiritual needs¹⁵.

As of late, this system has turned out to be clear regarding embracing double standards in treating the issues of the third world, Arabs and Muslims, this framework requests the demobilization of weapons of mass devastation, and safeguards - for instance - on Israel's maintenance of atomic weapons that damage universal conventions and peace¹⁶; Despite the West–protector of the Zionist element—its responsibility regarding the Charter of the United Nations and its resolutions on human rights and in self-determination of Nations, and requests the underdeveloped nations to sign the Environmental Protection Treaty; at the same time, major powers refuse to sign it¹⁷.

Obviously, we can state that the "New World Order" submitted the shameful and disparity on the planet; instead of showing equity and balance among countries, we see the threat of that, The United Nations came bearing the principle downside which began and finished by the League of Nations, which is the control of the effective And their persecution and carelessness for the sentiments of other individuals. Equity isn't only equity in international relations, however equity is the thing that the powers see, and regardless of whether treachery and hostility is the truth of this vision. The "Yalta" conference on February 11, 1945, where it agreed to devote injustice by enjoying five permanent members of the Security Council; and any of them has the privilege to repudiate to the position of any choice taken by the majority of the world States, which knew as the privilege of veto.¹⁸.

This veto show that these countries dominate the international decisions and not the capabilities and global power, and no nation dominates the global events, The United States, for example, can't or rather afraid of getting into a fight alone against another country or group in the world, without mobilizing international consensus. They joined forces with other countries in 1991 to liberate Kuwait, and then the occupation of Iraq in 2003, besides the so-called war against terrorism.

In this way, we can here to emphasize that from the existence of the modern State until today, there is only one system, it is a multilateral system. All that discussed by the intellectuals and researchers on this subject, is an

¹⁵ Mourad, A. F. (n-d). Globalization and Contemporary International Organization.

¹⁶ Lodgaard, S. (2011). Nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation: towards a nuclear-weapon-free world?, Taylor & Francis.

¹⁷ (1985). Impact International, News & Media.; Service, U. S. F. B. I. (1992). Daily Report: People's Republic of China, National Technical Information Service.

¹⁸ almagroghi, A. S. A. (1990). the evolution of the concept of international relations in accordance with the concept of the Green Book contemporary world problems, Tripoli, World Centre for studies and research of the Green Book.

effort to interpret the interaction and changes experienced by countries and organizations in this international system. The letter is characterized by the spread of power among a large number of States.

4. LEVELS OF THE INTERNATIONAL SYSTEM STRUCTURE

There are, in the structure of the international system, four levels:

The first is represented by the superpowers; the second level is the great powers, then the third level includes countries that have a significant role in the system, but not the ability to conduct it, and the fourth level incorporates small States which represent the majority of members of the international system.

4.1. THE SUPERPOWER

Is that exerting their effects in most types of interactions in the world¹⁹, Especially in the military field, there is no State competition it, as explained to us Michael I. Handel in his book entitled "weak states in the international system" that "a super power = military invincible power,"²⁰ But this power is not only at the military field, but also in other areas, political, economic and cultural²¹; indeed, "Until in 1991, the United States of America (USA) and the Union of Soviet Republics (USSR) were considered the only superpowers of the world; according to the definition of the former Secretary of State, Zbigniew Brezinski, a hegemonic State economically, culturally, diplomatically and militarily"²².

So, Superpowers are able to influence policy on a worldwide scale, and often in different regions at the same time²³.

4.2. THE GREAT POWERS

Great powers are exercising their effects in multiple ranges in the world, such as Japan, China, France and Britain²⁴. As well as, they "were given permanent seats in the united nation security council as well as the right of veto"²⁵.

¹⁹ Hocking, B. and M. Smith (2014). World Politics, Routledge.

²⁰ Handel, M. I. (1990). Weak states in the international system, Psychology Press.

²¹ Guay, J.-H. from <http://perspective.usherbrooke.ca/bilan/servlet/BMDictionnaire?idictionnaire=1583>.

²² TENEZE, N. (2012). "Grande puissance émergente et dissuasion nucléaire : des concepts complémentaires ou antinomiques ?" Perspectives Internationales 2.

²³ Brandt, C. M., et al. (1989). Military assistance and foreign policy, Dept. of the Air Force, Air University, Air Force Institute of Technology.

²⁴ Evans, G. H. (1963). "The World of Nuclear Plenty." Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists 19(2): 26-30.

²⁵ Handel, M. I. (1990). Weak states in the international system, Psychology Press.

4.3. THE MIDDLE STATES

Classical school scholars, writing across the Cold War, argue that a state's material position in the international system defines its status as a middle power. This approach reduces a state's hierarchical rank based on structural elements, including resources such as population, territory and economy, and as power capacities such as power projection or nuclear weapons²⁶.

Giovanni Botero, a chairman of Milan in the fifteenth century, characterized a "center power" as a performing artist with adequate quality and specialist to remain without the requirement for help from others²⁷.

However, middle power states are that:

- 1- Have mid-range capabilities and are medium sized;
- 2- Perceive multilateralism and soft power as the optimal way to maximize their foreign policy interests;
- 3- Self-identify as middle powers to domestic and international audiences²⁸.

Therefore, in international relations, a middle power is a sovereign state that is neither a superpower nor a great power, but still has large or moderate influence and international recognition²⁹.

So, middle powers that states that exert their influence in most types of interactions at the regional level, such as Brazil, India, Indonesia, Canada and Turkey.

4.4. SMALL STATES

As has mentioned Michael I. Handel in his book: a weak state in the international system, "One of the major characteristics of a weak state (a Small power or small state) is the inability to secure its own existence, especially against a great power, or even against another weak state supported by a major power"³⁰

Finally, we can say here that any country in the world as possible to pass in these four phases, like all phases of human progress; it is born, then it becomes smaller, then young, then old, and it becomes weak as it was at the beginning of its origin.

And from here, it is necessary to know the actors who utilize power in the international scene to better understand the structure of international power.

²⁶ Bezglasnyy, A. (2013). Middle power theory, change and continuity in the Asia-Pacific, University of British Columbia.

²⁷ Shin, D.-m. (2015). "A Critical Review of the Concept of Middle Power." E-International Relations 4.

²⁸ Lima, T. M. G. "The changing diplomacy of emerging middle powers: from colonial independence to global governance."

²⁹ encyclopedia, t. f. middle power, Wikipedia.

³⁰ Handel, M. I. (1990). Weak states in the international system, Psychology Press.

5. THE ACTORS ON THE INTERNATIONAL SCENE

The notion of international actor has continued to develop till today; since a long time, it has been reserved for pre-state companies as the cities and towns, empires, feudal and monarchical regimes, besides churches, commercial and financial bodies. But it is only since the seventeenth century that the state has become the principal international actor until today³¹.

Today, international actors are so many and different natures like international organization (OI), non-state actors, NGOs, firms, multinationals, political parties, trade unions, mafias, terrorists... etc., that is a difficult to give a precise and concrete definition. Here, we can see Carolina García Hervás, in her website saying that "an actor is one who is acting on the international system, but also an actor is expected to act on the international arena."³²

In general, we can say that an international actor is any physical or person's morale, as well as anything that acts internationally. Indeed, international actors can be distinguished between two main groups, including state and non-state actors, which form the international power structure.

5.1. STATE ACTORS

One of the oldest and universally acknowledged actors on the contemporary world stage is the state³³. A state could be a political unit that has sovereignty over an area of territory and a people within it. Sovereignty is the legitimate and the ultimate authority over a polity.

We can deduce during in this definition that the State is characterized, at the international level, by its following elements:

A population living in a territory headed by a government, thus the existence of a very essential element which is sovereignty³⁴, and in the end its worldwide recognition. Because, "States are no longer able to claim that the reason of State to legitimize their actions. They are observed, scrutinized, suspected, disputed at national as well as at international level, by their peers, by the international organizations that they have created, by the particular interests organized. But the state is nonetheless the basic structure

³¹ Sabourin, L. (2012). Acteur international [Le Dictionnaire encyclopédique de l'administration publique](#). J.-F. Savard, www.dictionnaire.enap.ca.

³² Hervás, C. G. (2016). "What is an international actor?". from <https://carolinagarciahervas.blogactiv.eu/2016/01/12/what-is-an-international-actor/>.

³³ Grimsley, S. "State & Non-State Actors in International Politics." from <http://study.com/academy/lesson/state-non-state-actors-in-international-politics.html>.

³⁴ (1996). Etat. [Dictionnaire des relations internationales](#), Hatier.

of the organization of nations and remains a key player in international relations³⁵. "

As for the other actors, they are many as already said previously, consisting of the governmental and non-governmental organizations, including the following:

5.2. NON-STATE ACTORS

Here, we discuss non-State organizations (NGOs) that react on national, then regional, continental and finally across the international. Modern international NGOs have developed in the seventeenth century, and they had as a main role to fight slavery, and in the nineteenth century to promote peace in Europe³⁶.

Today, NGOs possess the role to intervene in the humanitarian field anywhere in the world; even they have the ability to influence the country. We can sit among these most influential NGOs as follows:

- 1- Intergovernmental Organizations (IGOs): are organizations whose members consist of three or more nations-states; like the United Nations (UN), World Trade Organization (WTO), International Monetary Fund (IMF) the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), European Union (EU) and many others.
- 2- Transnational Actors: are actors that function below the state level, but functioning across the state borders.
- 3- Multinational corporations (MNCs): are companies that possess headquartered in one state but invest and control extensively in other states.
- 4- Political groups that advocate violence (Terrorists)
- 5- International Criminal Groups³⁷.

³⁵ (2014). "Les États, acteurs incontournables des relations internationales." from <http://www.ladocumentationfrancaise.fr/dossiers/d000547-les-acteurs-des-relations-internationales/les-etats-acteurs-incontournables-des-relations-internationales>.

³⁶ Sabourin, L. (2012). Acteur international Le Dictionnaire encyclopédique de l'administration publique. J.-F. Savard, www.dictionnaire.enap.ca.

Zarei, M. H. and A. Safari (2015). "the status of non-state actors under the international Rule of law: a search for Global Justice." Rethinking International Law and Justice: 233.

³⁷ Joey, A. "The Role of Non-state Actors in International Relations." from https://www.academia.edu/5124220/The_Role_of_Non-state_Actors_in_International_Relations.

ibid.

Joseph, S. and A. McBeth (2010). Research Handbook on International Human Rights Law, Edward Elgar.

Utnes, P. (2010). Non-state actors in world politics: a case study on how transnational advocacy networks seek to influence the Arms Trade Treaty, Universitetet i Tromsø.

Despite the presence of many international actors in the international arena today, The State, however, compared to the other players, still take a prominent place on the international and global arena. Simply, we can find some cases that these organizations get a strong influence in weak States, which is striking that these organizations carry out most of state functions at the internal level and sometimes at the global level; because they possess the physical power factors.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Almazroghi, A. S. A. (1990). the evolution of the concept of international relations in accordance with the concept of the Green Book
2. Baldwin, D. A. (1980). "Interdependence and power: a conceptual analysis." *International Organization* 34(4): 471-506.
3. Bezglasnyy, A. (2013). *Middle power theory, change and continuity in the Asia-Pacific*, University of British Columbia.
4. Brandt, C. M., et al. (1989). *Military assistance and foreign policy*, Dept. of the Air Force, Air University, Air Force Institute of Technology.
5. Cioffi-Revilla, C. (2001). *Origins of the International System: Mesopotamian and West Asian Politics, 6000 BC to 1500 BC*. paper for the Annual Meeting of the ASOR.
6. contemporary world problems. Tripoli, World Centre for studies and research of the Green Book.
7. Dahl, R. A. (1957). "The concept of power." *Systems Research and Behavioral Science* 2(3): 201-215.
8. Evans, G. H. (1963). "The World of Nuclear Plenty." *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* 19(2): 26-30.
9. Grimsley, S. "State & Non-State Actors in International Politics." from <http://study.com/academy/lesson/state-non-state-actors-in-international-politics.html>.
10. Guay, J.-H. from <http://perspective.usherbrooke.ca/bilan/servlet/BMDictionnaire?iddictionnaire=1583>
11. Guzzini, S. (1993). "Structural power: the limits of neorealist power analysis." *International Organization* 47(3): 443-478.
12. Handel, M. I. (1990). *Weak states in the international system*, Psychology Press.
13. Handel, M. I. (1990). *Weak states in the international system*, Psychology Press.
14. Handel, M. I. (1990). *Weak states in the international system*, Psychology Press.
15. Hatsuse, R. (2010). "International System." *International Sustainable Development Law-Volume III*: 22.
16. Hervás, C. G. (2016). "What is an international actor?." from <https://carolinagarciahervas.blogactiv.eu/2016/01/12/what-is-an-international-actor/>
17. Hocking, B. and M. Smith (2014). *World Politics*, Routledge.
18. Hussein, K. (2008). "POWER AND ITS IMPACT ON INTERNATIONAL ALLIANCES AND CONFLICTS." from <https://www.lebarmy.gov.lb/ar/content/%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%82%D9%88%D8%A9-%D9%88%D8%A3%D8%AB%D8%B1%D9%87%D8%A7-%D9%81%D9%8A-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A3%D8%AD%D9%84%D8%A7%D9%81-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AF%D9%88%D9%84%D9%8A%D8%A9-%D9%88%D8%B5%D8%B1%D8%A7%D8%B9%D8%A7%D8%AA%D9%87%D8%A7>
19. Ikhlef. "the concept of power in international relations." from in Arabic on: www.freewebs.com/ikhlef.
20. Joey, A. "The Role of Non-state Actors in International Relations." from https://www.academia.edu/5124220/The_Role_of_Non-state_Actors_in_International_Relations

21. Joseph, S. and A. McBeth (2010). *Research Handbook on International Human Rights Law*, Edward Elgar.
22. Laffaye, S., et al. (2013). "Changes in the global
23. Lake, D. A. (2005). "Hierarchy in international relations: Authority, sovereignty, and the new structure of world politics."
24. Lima, T. M. G. "The changing diplomacy of emerging middle powers: from colonial independence to global governance."
25. Lodgaard, S. (2011). *Nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation: towards a nuclear-weapon-free world?*, Taylor & Francis.
26. Mearsheimer, J. J. (2001). *The tragedy of great power politics*, WW Norton & Company.
27. Milkoreit, M. (2013). "Global Power Structures – (How) Do They Matter?" CCC-Brief(4).
28. Mourad, A. F. (n-d). *Globalization and Contemporary International Organization*.
29. ÖZKAN, G. (2008). "UNIPOLAR, BIPOLAR OR MULTIPOLAR INTERNATIONAL SYSTEM? THE DEFENSE INDUSTRY FACTOR." *Yönetim ve Ekonomi Araştırmaları Dergisi* 6(10): 104-123.
30. Pallaver, M. (2011). *Power and its forms: hard, soft, smart*, The London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE).
31. Pustovitovskij, A. and J.-F. Kremer (2011). *Structural Power and International Relations Analysis: "Fill your basket, get your preferences"*, Institut fuer Entwicklungsforschung und Entwicklungspolitik, Ruhr-Universitaet Bochum.
32. Rappa, A. L. (2010). "POWER STRUCTURE." *Government and Politics-Volume I*: 398.
33. Sabourin, L. (2012). *Acteur international Le Dictionnaire encyclopédique de l'administration publique*. J.-F. Savard, www.dictionnaire.enap.ca.
34. Service, U. S. F. B. I. (1992). *Daily Report: People's Republic of China*, National Technical Information Service.
35. Shin, D.-m. (2015). "A Critical Review of the Concept of Middle Power." *E-International Relations* 4.
36. TENEZE, N. (2012). "Grande puissance émergente et dissuasion nucléaire : des concepts complémentaires ou antinomiques ?" *Perspectives Internationales* 2.
37. TOMJA, A. (2014). "Polarity and International System Consequences." *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research and Development* 1(1).
38. *towards a multipolar world?" Argentine Journal of International Economics* 1.
39. Utnes, P. (2010). *Non-state actors in world politics: a case study on how transnational advocacy networks seek to influence the Arms Trade Treaty*, Universitetet i Tromsø.
40. Zarei, M. H. and A. Safari (2015). "the status of non-state actors under the international Rule of law: a search for Global Justice." *Rethinking International Law and Justice*: 233.
41. "Les États, acteurs incontournables des relations internationales." (2014), from <http://www.ladocumentationfrancaise.fr/dossiers/d000547-les-acteurs-des-relations-internationales/les-etats-acteurs-incontournables-des-relations-internationales>