

From bipolar confrontations to a new scope of security - Books in English on foreign and security policy in Europe

Kanet RE, Ibryamova NV

OSTEUROPA

52 (4): 512-522 APR 2002

Document type: Review    Language: German    Cited References: 22    Times Cited: 0

Addresses:

Kanet RE, Univ Miami, Sch Int Studies, Coral Gables, FL 33124 USA

Univ Miami, Sch Int Studies, Coral Gables, FL 33124 USA

Publisher:

DEUTSCHE GESELLSCHAFT OSTEUROPAKUNDE E. V, BERLIN

IDS Number:

551XD

ISSN:

0030-6428

Gülnur Aybet: A European Security Architecture after the Cold War: Questions of Legitimacy. Houndmills, ENG: Macmillan Press; New York, St. Martin's Press, 2000, XIII, 316 S.

The collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 and the demise of the bipolar security systems in Europe raised the issue of the nature and importance of a new security system that would help to guarantee Europe's future. Several recent publications deal directly with this and related issues. Gülnur Aybet's "A European Security Architecture after the Cold War: Questions of Legitimacy" is arguably the single best treatment of the process of transition of NATO, and other security institutions, in Western Europe into the foundations for a broader European security organization. Ms. Aybet notes that the process occurred in three stages between 1990 and 1995. First came the need to redefine European security, including NATO's mission and relevance to the new situation in Europe and to gain acceptance for these views. Both the Gulf War and the conflicts in former Yugoslavia helped to solidify the view that the existing Western security community and its institutions should be expanded to incorporate other parts of the continent.

The second stage followed directly from the first and was characterized by emphasis on the importance of interlocking security institutions - NATO, WEU, OCSE, and the emerging EU foreign and security policy - and their transition from a commitment to collective defense to collective security. The third stage, more or less complete by 1995, was the acceptance within both the old and the expanded community of the legitimacy of the new commitment to collective security. The author concludes her persuasive analysis by noting "that no matter how flawed the collective security

system mapped out in 1992, in reality the western security community has indeed acquired legitimacy in terms of a Gramscian hegemony, and it has been able to project this through a system of interlocking institutions." (p. 256).