

9/11 and Its Impact On Realism

Gültekin Sümer*

ABSTRACT

The impact of 9/11 has been well beyond than a terrorist attack. By these attacks, power notion of realism has lost its credibility. A non-state actor by its 'network' type of power, has demonstrated how it could challenge a superpower. As there is no specific location that can be a target, the concept of threat has taken on a more ambiguous character. Islam has risen as a non-traditional power, having no distinct boundaries, no central authority and no armed forces. The United States cannot fight radical Islam just like fighting communism. Because the religion itself cannot wither away like communism or any other ideology. The rise of transcendental values cannot agree with the immanent values of the realism. The domestic policy/foreign policy distinction of classic realism is not valid concerning the Islamic world. Security requirements of the states cannot be fulfilled by traditional instruments like armed forces. Even a superpower has become helpless with the loss of monopoly on technology. International relations cannot be identified with international politics so easily as in the past. The impact of globalization has weakened realism. Despite all, it is also possible to find some points in favour of realism concerning 9/11. Standards on behalf of international norms have dramatically fallen with the increasing security concerns of the United States. The pessimistic character of realism has increased with the rising security concerns in the international order. The question is how hard the actors of globalization will continue to exert pressure on states and how realism will react to them.

Critical events in the course of the international relations always born a crucial meaning in testing the validity of IR theories. In this regard, the end of the Cold War became a very historic test in which

* Assistant Professor, Department of International Relations and EU Studies, Maltepe University

realism was the target of nearly all the criticisms or attacks. We need to assess the value of September 11 concerning IR studies. It is not easy to make correct assessments in international relations concerning the impact of critical events until a certain period of time elapses. With the rising tension and rage following September 11, as in the aftermath of other crises, this attack might have been exaggerated. The reason for that was the only superpower United States had been exposed to these attacks which was unique in the history of the United States. Also the number of the victims died in a terror attack was at an unprecedented level. Following these attacks the world politics were redefined as post-9/11 world. The fear and the horror it had caused is not at the same level as in the study of IR. However, 9/11 has led to new controversies in the field that is hard to neglect.

As the mainstream theory of IR, realism has suffered unprecedented attacks since the end of the Cold War. It was not a coincidence that neo-realism was a theory that emerged in the bipolar world. Being not able to explain the change in the international system it could not adapt the facts of the post-Cold War world. Realism was also at the top of the IR theories that were exposed to arguments following September 11.

A Multi-Centric World

It was the book ‘Turbulence in World Politics’ by Professor James Rosenau that was closest to finding out the reasons that led to the end of the Cold War. Written short while ago just as the Cold War is about to end, it illuminated the dynamics underlying the end of the Cold War. Professor Rosenau’s major work not only clarified the dynamics that led to the end of the Cold War, but also illuminated the dynamics of IR that will predominate the post-Cold War world. Without any doubt, the end of the Cold War, set the stage for the rival approaches aiming at explaining the basic determinants of the post-Cold War world. The End of History, The Clash of Civilizations, The Unipolar Moment were the most popular of them. In his book Turbulence in World Politics, Professor Rosenau opened the doors of a new world in which state sovereignties began to erode. The book was substantial in marking the beginning of a new era that would later be called globalization. Rosenau’s book manifested how a state-centric approach was anachronistic to a world nearing the 21st century. Rosenau summarized this as follows:

Actors on the global scene today lack the capacity to create the political environment of monopolistic and oligopolistic environments. For a host of reasons, the world is too complex and too dynamic to lend itself to effective control and a meaningful reduction of its interconnectedness and variability. Even the superpowers are often at the mercy of events and trends that they would like to redirect, terminate or otherwise influence but cannot.¹

¹ James Rosenau , Turbulence in World Politics: A Theory of Change and Continuity, Princeton, University Press, Princeton 1990, p.63.

We have been living in an age of IR in which a true international relations can outweigh the classical statist norms of international politics. In an international relations where we can feel the butterfly effect, which means that any event in one part of the world can have unexpected repercussions in remote places of the world.² The word international has acquired its very meaning that international relations can influence or even control international politics or it has got ridden of the captivity of international politics not vice versa. We can easily realize this by observing the publications in the field in emerging post-Cold War Era, we observe how the boundaries between sociology and international relations became blurred.

The Cold War was the classical example of traditional international politics with superpower summits, ICBMS and Star War Project where influence of the average citizens were very limited. Diplomacy was the world of the elites that the average citizen could never penetrate into. Government and public opinion elites controlled and directed both international politics and international relations. In the post-Cold War it was realized that we had to view international relations through pluralistic lenses instead of realist lenses. Therefore the pluralistic character of international relations has been deepened by 9/11.

² Ibid,p.302.

By 9/11, it has been disclosed that IR is no more in the monopoly of the international politics. And even beyond that we do not mean always international politics when we say international relations.

Under the conditions of multi-centric world, how can we talk about the existence of a structure determining the operating principles of the international system. According to Waltz, anarchical character of the international relations encourage the states to compete and struggle with each other. But cooperation between the non-state actors and state-actors as well as conflict between them has emerged as one of the main characters of the multi-centric world. Therefore there exists no structure in the multi-centric world that has the power to dictate it to the agents of the international system. Furthermore as Rosenau states, structural account of the multi-centric world is virtually impossible; for structures can be described only within spheres of particular interest.³ We have non-state actors who possess different kinds of capabilities and goals.⁴

Thus, the most drastic impact of 9/11 on realism was the incompetence of states holding their monopolies in the international order. With 9/11 a superpower turned into an actor only reacting to the actions of another non-state actor instead of holding the course of international security in her hands.

³ Ibid. , p. 270.

⁴ Ibid.

The position of the states was not the only issue to be questioned in post-9/11 world. Rationality assumption was the second major blow to realism. Pluralism also emphasizes the existence of contest between government bureaucracies and at the same time increasing influence of interest groups in the formation of a foreign policy. Government is not regarded as a unitary body that speaks with one voice under any condition. The ambiguities concerning mainly security matters feed the uncertainty on behalf of the decision makers and render decision making bodies divided. The 9/11 attacks caused such an impact on American foreign policy making body. Beyond the threat of the Al Qaeda, the divisions were mainly concentrated on the threat perceptions against the security of the United States. Because it was hard to find the source of the real threat as opposed to a clearly defined one like the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait. Did the real threat come from the 1.3 billion Islamic world? Where to bomb? Bomb the al Qaeda cells in Hamburg, Kuala Lumpur and Detroit?⁵ What to do with Iraq? If long strategy to pursue, what kind of? The more uncertainties increase concerning the nature of the threat, so does the significance of perceptions in foreign policy which does not permit the formation of an objective rationalist foreign policy as alleged by realism. Invading Iraq or the initiative to create a new Middle East were all proofs of this division within the decision making body.

⁵Joseph S. Nye, Jr. The Velvet Hegemony ,[http:// www.foreignpolicy.com/story/cms.php?story_id=40](http://www.foreignpolicy.com/story/cms.php?story_id=40).

Al Qaeda As a New Actor in International Relations

Concerning the international relations in the age of globalization, cultural aspects of international relations has increased its might. As I have tried to emphasize, the power of globalization played a major role in breaking the basic determinants of the Cold War. With the boosting impact of the media, globalization had been perceived as dominated by economic dynamics. September 11 demonstrated by its appalling impact how globalization could be a danger for the major powers who created the conditions of globalization. 9/11 was evaluated by some as the end of the globalization.⁶ Contrary to this forecast, globalization has not lost its propelling power. As there is no state is able to maintain a fight against the West, by the accelerative effect of globalization, terrorist organizations could take it on.

In this context, the sharpest interaction is without any doubt between Islam and the West. September 11 has demonstrated perhaps the darkest side of globalization we have witnessed so far. In this regard, September 11 can also be defined as the highest stage of globalization. The outstanding examples such as the dominance of the English language, Western tourists, McDonald's stressing the Western supremacy became the main motive for Muhammad Atta's joining al

⁶ Moisés Naim, *Surprises of Globalization, Post-Terror Surprises*, 2003, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace pp.19-22, p.19.

Qaeda.⁷ The actors of globalization materially is so strong that can influence and shape the worldview of Muhammed Atta. Through the neo-realist lenses, the structure of the international system is the dynamic that encourages the states to compete. Instead of the structural means of neo-realism, it is the propelling power of the globalization that brings the hegemony of the United States to light. For there was no state agent in the Islamic world strong enough to challenge the United States that neo-realist theory sought to find. A stronger globalization is a structural phenomenon accelerated by the dynamics of capitalism. However that means a cultural fragmentation.⁸ This generates a great pressure on behalf of the worldview and actions of the micro level actors.

Al Qaeda has been a phenomenon in the post 9/11 world. Al Qaeda represents the radical Islam of today with a perfection. Globalization has created an unprecedented environment for the terrorist organizations to fight against state actors. Thus globalization encourages terrorist organizations to act. If we look at the organizational structure of al Qaeda, we notice that financial structure of the organization is ideal to use the means of globalization. There is no centre within al Qaeda from where all the financial resources are directed; instead by the help of decentralized resources the terrorist attacks are financed. Moreover, al

⁷ Lieb, Nett und Niemals Böse, Der Spiegel 39/2001(24.9.2001),pp.20-26.,p.24.

⁸ Bassam Tibi, Die Neue Weltordnung: Westliche Dominanz und Islamischer Fundamentalismus, Econ Ullstein,Munich,2001 p.62.

Qaeda looks like a multinational corporation that is active in 50 countries. It has the logistics support of NGOs all over the world which was established by itself for the preparation of its attacks.⁹ It can establish joint venture type connections with local 'firms' just as multinationals.¹⁰ We face a terrorist organization that does not suit to the features of a conventional terrorist organization. The anarchy concept of realism had assumed only state-to state threats and had been focused on state centric anarchy. By September 11, it was realized better how states were vulnerable to the threats of non-state actors. Al Qaeda uses the means of globalization such as mobile phones, text messaging, instant messaging, e-mails, blogs, chat rooms in order work more effectively.¹¹ The new recruits learn how to organize and run a cell by its training manual on the internet.¹²

We have all been conditioned to identify international relations with international politics. By saying international relations, we have always meant international politics. This age of globalization has been the age in which citizens of international relations could make the greatest impact to the international politics. The globalization process has given enormous boost to the individuals like no other age has witnessed.

⁹ Jodi M. Vittori, Geschäftszweck: Terror, Al-Qaida als Multinationales Unternehmen, Internationale Politik, 3/ 2005, pp.48-55, p.51-52.

¹⁰ Ibid. ,p.52.

¹¹ Audrey Kurth Cronin, How al-Qaida Ends: The Decline and Demise of Terrorist Groups, International Security, Summer 2006, Vol 31 No 1, pp.7-49, p.38.

¹² Ibid.

The age of globalization is unprecedented in this regard. Rosenau explains this as :

This is not to suggest, of course that any individual can alter the course of events at will. The circumstances must be appropriate, and the private actor must (normally) occupy a professional role that accords weight to his or her words and actions. If these conditions are met, however, it is a feature of postinternational politics that individuals can make discernible contributions to the shape and outcome of issues on the global agenda.¹³

Erosion of the Realist Power Concept

The dramatic increase of power on behalf of individuals eroding state sovereignties renders the concept of national power based on realism obsolete. Decentralizing dynamics increase enormously the influence of the non-state Islamic groups or organizations. New power bases have emerged. As Joseph Nye underlines:

Although force may sometimes play a role, traditional instruments of power are rarely sufficient to cope with the changing issues in world politics. New power resources, such as the capacity for effective communication and for developing and using multilateral institutions, may prove more relevant.¹⁴

A power diffusion has emerged in international relations which rendered the conventional definitions of power incompetent. Power has been less fungible, less coercive, and less tangible emphasized¹⁵. September 11 pointed out that the fungibility of power had been no more possible in the age of globalization. How meaningful is the power

¹³ Op. cit. , Rosenau, p.285.

¹⁴ Joseph S. Nye, Jr., Bound To Lead: The Changing Nature of American Power, New York, Basic Books,1990,p.187.

¹⁵ Ibid. ,p.188.

of the NATO in the eyes of the decentralized groups such as the Taliban?
As I have underlined above, the age in which we are living is unprecedented in terms of active participation in international relations on behalf of the ordinary citizens whether it is constructive or destructive. The power diffusion has emerged as a result of the five factors counted by Joseph S. Nye which are: 1) Economic Interdependence 2) Transnational Actors 3) Nationalism In Weak States 4) The Spread of Technology 5) Changing Political Issues ¹⁶ States are far from being competent against decentralized micro actors. Following September 11 CIA was accused of not being capable of making a credible estimation about the attacks. Certainly it is harder for the major intelligence agencies to make correct estimations about the specific threats in a world in which the power of the ordinary citizens have enormously increased rendering the states more vulnerable than ever.

Classical realism regards economic and military power as the basic historic trends have not shown coherence with that of the realism. After the Second World War Japan and Germany rose as economic powers without serving to the interests of political power in international politics. The fungibility of power has suffered a serious blow. A new concept of asymmetric war has emerged. The terrorists attacks are

¹⁶ Ibid. ,p.182.

directed towards soft bellies of the states by avoiding a direct confrontation with the opponent's armed forces.¹⁷

So what did September 11 signify in this context? We can take back the existence of radical Islam in modern sense in international relations till the establishment of Muslim Brothers in the 1920s. Terrorist organizations could never achieve to make such an action like 9/11. Therefore it is clear enough that when the dominance of the state actors over the non-state actors weakened, a new opportunity emerged not only for the NGOs but also for the terrorist organizations to influence the course of international politics. As Moisés Naim points out after the Colombian police killed drug lords Pablo Escobar, he was quickly replaced by other drug lords.¹⁸ Therefore it means that globalization is strong enough to replace the old actors with the new actors. Even if al Qaeda collapses, it can be easily replaced by other terrorist organizations.

In his book *Turbulence in World Politics* Rosenau foresees the possibility of four scenarios that is likely to shape the international order in the near future. Rosenau counts these scenarios as global-society scenario, the restored state system scenario, the pluralist scenario and enduring-bifurcation scenario.¹⁹ The last one enduring-bifurcation scenario anticipates that the clashes between state-centric and multi-

¹⁷ Herfried Münkler, *Terrorismus Heute: Die Asymmetrisierung des Krieges*, Internationale Politik, 2/2004, pp.1-11, p.6.

¹⁸ Moisés Naim, *Collateral Damage, Surprises of Globalization*, 2003, p.35

¹⁹ Op. cit., Rosenau, p.446.

centric world will not be resulted with one's victory over the other.²⁰ Both sovereignty-bound and sovereignty-free actors will be sufficiently powerful to resist the other and preserve their own autonomy.²¹ I think this scenario is the most realistic one among those stated.

Cultural Inputs Into International Politics

As we all know the most appropriate international environment that realism can flourish is an international order purified from ideological power struggle among the major powers. It was the very peculiarity of the Cold War that realism had most suffered during the Cold War. Because we know that as ideologies increase their power on the international 'arena' the power of realism decreases. By ideologies, I want dwell particularly on transcendental ideologies which do not suit to the bargaining nature of realism. Without any doubt, the transcendental ideology was behind the attacks of September 11. The roots of ideology behind the attacks of September 11 extended back to the Crusades. This is the ideology that weakens the explanatory power of realism at most. The radical Islam is far from entering into coalitions or part of any balance of power system. Certainly realists would love to see the Ottoman Empire as the core power of the Islamic power which would enter the coalitions without the obstacle of any ideology for the

²⁰ Ibid. p.453.

²¹ Ibid.

sake of *raison d'état*. There exists no such core state keeping the interests of the entire world of Islam. The anarchy within the Islamic world is much deeper than the anarchy within rest of the world. Among the Failed States Index of the Foreign Policy journal, Islamic states occupy a substantial place.²² Within the Islamic world, it remains hard to make a distinction between domestic policy and foreign policy as the tension between the Islamic world and the West rises from time to time.

Just like we have different interpretations of Islam, we have different interpretations of radical Islam. So was the confrontation between al Qaeda and the United States inevitable? The outstanding hegemony of the United States gave the agents of globalization the power to fight against the United States. The hostile attitude of Osama Bin Laden against the West began following the Iraqi occupation of Kuwait in 1990. The deployment of the troops of the international coalition led by the United States on Saudi soil against this invasion became a major factor prompting him to fight against the United States.²³ Bin Laden used his wealth and business skills in order to become the leader of the side challenging American supremacy. Although radical Islam and its project was not a new movement, how could it increase its strength and influence?

²² www.foreignpolicy.com/story/cms.php?story_id=3865&page=7.

²³ Gilles Keppel, *Jihad: The Trail of Political Islam*, Translated by Anthony F. Roberts, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 2002, p.316.

Why did the greatest terrorist action on earth take place in this age? The answer is certainly globalization.

By the early 90s, we have witnessed a revival on behalf of the Islamic movements. We can suppose Salman Rushdie affair as the onset of the confrontation between the West and the fundamental Islam. Bosnia, turban in France, Cartoon Crisis and the others sharpened this confrontation. While trying to establish the link between globalization and 9/11, we must place the peculiar character of the radical Islam correctly. Behind these attacks there are centuries of hatred and animosity between Islam and Christianity. Therefore it would be correct to handle radical Islam separately from the other political ideologies.

We need to find out which position Islam occupies in as an actor in international politics. However it is a very different type of power than we have got used to so far. Where as there is no core state that could lead the entire Islamic world in world politics, that could well be turned into an advantage from a disadvantage. It is an advantage as there is no concentration of power just as we witnessed during the Cold War like Moscow as the centre of world communism. This renders the Islamic world more diffuse and invulnerable than any major actor in international politics. The fact that there exists no specific target within the Islamic world renders it powerful. As I have stated above, the magnitude of anarchy within the Islamic world is much higher than any political

geography in the world. How can the United States contain the Islamic world geopolitically as it managed to do against communism? Islam as an actor in international politics takes the essence of its power from the masses and the decentralized elements rather than the state actors. Radical elements can challenge the United States with terror acts but in return for that the United States cannot find the counterpart that she has been seeking to attack despite its unprecedented military power. How could United States manage to exterminate Islamic fundamentalism by bombing Afghanistan? There are plenty of radical elements within the 1.3 billion Islamic world and it cannot be pinpointed from where they will attack. It is easy for them to hide. In addition to this there are plenty of militants who are ready to die and become martyr. The notion of holy war, jihad, in Islam is stronger than any ideology or religion on earth. As Nye indicates military power is more difficult to use in our age than in the past as social awakening has increased nationalism in poor and weak states and this increased social mobilization makes military intervention and foreign rule more costly.²⁴ So as a state actor the United States faces an asymmetrical war in which it is very hard to win an absolute victory. The emergence and popularity of charismatic type of leaders such as Nasrallah reinforcing decentralization renders Islamic world much tougher actor to be bargained.

²⁴ Op. cit. ,Nye,p.185.

As long as American or Western supremacy persists, Islamic radicalism is not likely to lose its ideological vividness. In other words, American hegemony is a *raison d'être* for radical Islam. It cannot exist without waging war against a pole of power. Because traditionally the counterpart of the states are the states themselves.

Realism is far from being adequate in fighting against radical Islam; because Islam has been a power that realism is not familiar to counter against successfully. Radical Islam cannot be contained like communism during the Cold War. Although she is the only remaining superpower, United States cannot defeat radical Islam by her military might which is a classical means of power or by entangling regional alliances. World communism ended with the collapse of the Soviet Union. But will Islamic fundamentalism or jihad cease to exist if al Qaeda is defeated? It is not hard to predict that as long as Islam exists radical Islam will never vanish. The realist notion of power has lost much of its credibility. Being unable to control those decentralized elements, great powers must heed to soft power concept in their foreign policies.

According to Condoleezza Rice, in the aftermath of the September 11, the United States is using an amalgam of pragmatic realism and

Wilsonian liberal theory.²⁵ Wilsonian liberal theory or idealism is not the language of realism even if one mixes it with idealism. The project to create a new Middle East is a project that sees no limits. It serves to the predominance of transcendental values over the immanent values that do not have the chance of being bargained.

It is useful to mention the other approaches in order to determine more correctly the position of realism among the IR theories. At first glance, it seems it is easy to explain the radical ideology behind September 11 and its impact on international relations with the constructivist approach. Nevertheless, it is hard to explain it by constructivism for the material effects of globalization was the main motive behind this incident.²⁶ The impact of globalization which manifested American hegemony would sooner or later create or appoint the agents it had sought within the Islamic world even if the magnitude of the attacks were not at this level. Therefore the impact of globalization is strong enough not to allow any intersubjectivity or what everyone makes of it.

²⁵ Jack Snyder, One World, Rival Theories, Foreign Policy, November/December 2004, pp.53-62, p.54.

²⁶ Constructivism's neglecting the material dynamics is particularly in its approach to the Cold War. Constructivist approach cannot explain the Cold War; because the materialistic elements were dominant for the emergence of the Cold War. It was not anything to do with intersubjectivity, but the clash of two hostile economic systems. Therefore, the emergence of the Cold War indicates an inevitability. As long as this ideological hostility was at the heart of the superpower relations, any question of interaction would remain a trivial issue.

In constructivism the main actor in international relations is the states. In this context what September 11 signified was religion's swallowing politics. The perceptions such as 'us' and 'them' are inherent in Islam. Therefore intersubjectivity of constructivism is not a new contribution when we talk about religious influences into international relations. The religion's role in these attacks rather connotes Samuel Huntington's thesis even if does not seem possible that it could be the main principle of the international order in the post-9/11 world. We cannot see radical Islam as an average actor in international politics as radical Islam rejects the nation-state on the point that it is peculiar to Western modernity. Therefore there is no shared knowledge as alleged by Wendt. We cannot see the same dynamics that underlies the ideology behind September 11. This stems from mainly due to the peculiar character of Islam.

Without any doubt, Marxism was the biggest loser. A religious motive was the pre-eminent driving force in those attacks. Economic concerns such as inequality did not play a role. Osama bin Laden wanted to see moderate Islamic regimes to be overthrown and make Islam a new power centre as an alternative to the West. It was confirmed that how it was impossible to reduce international politics solely based on economic motives. Certainly Marxism was one of the main losers in the process of September 11. Marxism was the ideology that was

discredited by these attacks. Bin Laden's motive has never been to eliminate the economic inequalities but to strike a blow against Western political supremacy. This has shown how political objectives could be well be independent from the economic objectives.

Backlash of Realism?

However from all these it cannot be concluded that realism has lost all of its explanatory power. We should be aware of the fact that realism has many aspects. The power of realism has been weakened but it has variety of weapons to defend itself. The pessimistic character of realism continues to be a fact of international relations. Even if the Cold War is over, as long as the hegemony occupies international politics as in the case of the United States, global power struggles will not cease to exist. The Nietzschean roots of realism based on power as end itself will does not seem to vanish. The liberal euphoria denoted by the 'End of History' has vanished. There is no mistake in regarding power and influence as the real currency of international politics. Money is a guarantee for one's future. If power is money then power is a guarantee for the future of the actors of international relations. The degree of it depends on the level of uncertainties in the international security just as the uncertainties in the economy. Globalization has increased the conflictual aspect of international politics.

9/11 has also signified how permanent was the fears of the states whether it is Hobbesian or not. The United States underwent a process in which the date of a new attack became almost an obsession itself. After a long time, security of the mainland rose to the top agenda of American foreign policy. After September 11, departments related to national security reinforced their positions and increased their budgets. These attacks led to the establishment of a new department, Office for Homeland Security. The Congress passed the Patriot Act just after 45 days following 9/11. Pessimistic view is generally one of the characters that realism is based on. American foreign policy following 9/11 adopted a more aggressive stance against the attacks. This has revealed inadequacy of the international institutions in constraining power element in the foreign policy of the United States.²⁷ This certainly questions the might of the international institutions in superseding realism.

In diplomacy the United States felt compelled to strengthen her ties with the moderate power bases within the Islamic world like Pakistan. She got military bases in Central Asia. All the bargains within the framework of these initiatives certainly signified the strengthening of the realist values in the course of American foreign policy. As the security issue of the United States began to play more vital in American

²⁷Ibid.,p.58.

foreign policy, proportionally the standards of international norms such as international law, human rights will shrink. This indicates how realism is effective in forming alliances under the conditions where security needs have become the top priority.

The reaction to 9/11 attacks was the rising security concerns on behalf of the United States and proportionally the pessimistic belief of the government departments related to the security in globalization. Of course it is not correct to limit this pessimistic view to the United States only. 9/11 has meant at the same time a new security regime for other countries that are likely to suffer from Islamic or any other type of terror. We can cite Russia and China that were alarmed by this process. And this emerging security regime has consolidated the power of the states. The strengthening of the state power was evaluated by some realists as the comeback of realism. The rising of national security issue to the top of foreign policy agenda might have increased the believers of realism worldwide. But the question is whether it is within the capacity of the states or security departments to prevent of the violent challenge of the non-state actors against the states. Under the conditions that non-state actors increase their influences, it becomes harder for the state actors to control the actions of these non-state actors.

CONCLUSION

We have no paradigms or grand theories that can explain the entire development of international politics. Instead the theories of IR explain any given incident or a given period of time better than the other. Almost all of the theories of IR have strong and weak points against each other. Certainly it does not mean that pluralism has eliminated the other rival ideologies. However pluralism has become much more powerful than it was in explaining the realities of international relations of this age. This trend had begun in the late 80s as Cold War was about to come to an end. What signified 9/11 was the manifestation of this in the strongest manner. Realism will continue to maintain its influence in the field; however in an international relations in which non-state actors claim higher position, realism must revise its position in the study of IR. Thus 9/11 signified one of the most important shocks that realism was exposed to confront. Any IR paradigm should also see Islamic world as a new type of power that is hard to contain in realistic logic if it is to be contained. Here the concept of soft power outweighs than any other types of power. Any American administration that does not make it as an element of its foreign policy cannot achieve. Despite all these, it does not seem possible to strike a fatal blow to realism as long as hegemony persists in international relations. Therefore, I believe that it is too early in order to

declare the end of realism. In a world where international politics can no longer dominate international relations, we cannot identify international relations with international politics. United States should not adopt a realist power concept by concentrating on the capture of Osama bin Laden but weaken the radical Islam within the Islamic world. This objective cannot be achieved with classical vulgar balance of power politics by giving a military and economic aid to the moderate Islamic states. Instead the United States should improve her image within the Islamic world. In the post-9/11 world realism will find itself under much greater pressure. The fundamental question will be how non-state actors increase their power in determining the course of international relations and thereby reducing the state actors only reacting actors.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Cronin, Audrey Kurth, How al-Qaida Ends: The Decline and Demise of Terrorist Groups, *International Security*, Summer 2006, Vol 31 No 1, pp.7-49.

Der Spiegel, Lieb, Nett und Niemals Böse, 39/2001(24.9.2001), pp.20-26.

Foreign Policy, The Failed States

Index, www.foreignpolicy.com/story/cms.php?story_id=3865&page=7.

Keppel, Gilles, Jihad: The Trail of Political Islam, Translated by Anthony F. Roberts, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 2002.

Münkler, Herfried, Terrorismus Heute: Die Asymmetrisierung des Krieges, Internationale Politik, 2/2004, pp.1-11.

Naim Moisés, Collateral Damage, Surprises of Globalization, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2003, pp.35-37.

Naim Moisés, Surprises of Globalization, Post-Terror Surprises, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2003, pp.19-22.

Nye Jr. Joseph S., Bound To Lead : The Changing Nature of American Power, New York, Basic Books, 1990.

Nye Jr. Joseph S., The Velvet Hegemony , http://www.foreignpolicy.com/story/cms.php?story_id=40.

Rosenau, James N., Turbulence in World Politics, Turbulence in World Politics: A Theory of Change and Continuity, Princeton, University Press, Princeton 1990.

Snyder, Jack, One World, Rival Theories, Foreign Policy, November/December 2004, pp.53-62.

Tibi, Bassam, Die Neue Weltordnung: Westliche Dominanz und Islamischer Fundamentalismus, Translated by: Klaus-Dieter Schmidt, Econ, Munich, 2001.

Vittori Jodi M., Geschäftszweck: Terror, Al-Qaida als Multinationales Unternehmen, Internationale Politik, 3/ 2005, pp.48-55.