

SUMMARY

About the monograph

Professor Georgi Genov, as one of the reviewers, thinks manuscript *ADAPTATION OF THE SYSTEM OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS IN CRISIS: Alternative Theoretical Models Directed Towards the Future*, is a comprehensive and systemic theoretical research of International Relations in case of risks, having both educational and applied scientific value.

According to Colonel Associate Professor Petko Dimov, the other reviewer, the applied value of the work is in its possible use as a practical manual, directed both towards the general public and the academic circles in the areas of International Relations, comparative theories of International Relations and Political Science.

The monograph represents models of adaptation of the system of International Relations, relevant to changes in the environment. Adaptation, adaptive behavior or homeostasis is the achievement of equilibrium by the Ross Ashby's model (*Design for a Brain*, 1954) which serves as the basis of the Morton Kaplan's analysis for the structure of the system of International Relations. The adaptation as transformation in this case is a slow, cumulative process, based on continuity. The advocated thesis is that the reaction/output of the system in case of crisis starts with the perception of wholeness of the system (Bertalanffy, *An Outline of General System Theory*, 1950), where synergy is achieved by different theoretical models, leading to stability. The latter suggests the existence of choice for making adequate decisions.

Kaplan's system theory allows for the integration of variables from different disciplines. That is why, instead on the "pure" the author focuses on the mixed models, which are more relevant for the contemporary environment. The models are based on combinations of theories from the two basic camps in International Relations: positivists and non-positivists.

The three mixed models described in the monograph are based on situational as well as futuristic analysis and include: 1) a model of *transformation* as the most successful model in the version of NATO adaptation, including a sub-model of combination between *unit veto* and a *balance of powers* in the sphere of nuclear deterrence, 2) a model of *post-modern adaptation-atomization* with a final version of collapse of the system in the case of *reflexive modernity* and *risk society* and 3) a model of *economic adaptation* and *hegemonic stability*.

The comparative theoretical analysis of alternative scenarios, based on theories of International Relations in case of a systemic risk focuses on the big picture, bird's eyes view. It searches for different paths to adaptation and suggests variants as a reaction to crisis or its prevention. The presented "pure" and mixed variants cover more cases from the probability scale.

The first chapter applies system analysis to Kaplan's theoretical models which have been modified by introducing three variables: international cooperation, state and adaptation. Using this as a foundation, four "pure" scenarios (transformation, isolation, discipline and collapse) as reaction to crisis as well as three mixed scenarios (reconstruction, disintegration and Renaissance) have been developed. The second chapter combines two opposing tendencies in International Relations – those of positivists and non-positivists, viewed as continuity and change (transformation). The third chapter, the optimistic scenario, includes a bottom-up approach and combination of the three levels of analysis. The fourth chapter suggests the relevancy of the application of legal norms and deterrence by denial, information exchange, good practices and development of cyber defense capabilities. Again, the focus is on ad-hoc decisions and cross-domain deterrence, asymmetric relations and retaliation dimensions, where crisis originates out of the pure internal dynamics of the system. This calls for reconsideration of the *balance of power* concept. The fifth chapter views *reflexive modernity* as a reaction capability in case of hybrid threats. It combines hierarchy and network forms of state organization. The sixth chapter applies macroeconomic theory to open systems, the idea of liberal

hegemony, economic nationalism, complex interdependence, constant adjustment and participation in multiple coalitions, the acceleration of the transition period between waves and waves' coincidence. The focus is shifted to innovations and change.

The type of the crisis and the type of adaptation differ in the specified models. In the case of the optimistic scenario, the crisis stems from the internal dynamics of the system and a problem in the system-environment relation. In the case of "reflexive modernity", the crisis stems from the atomization and acceleration. In the case of the long cycles, the crisis stems from the internal cyclical dynamics of the system.

The first model achieves adaptation as a holistic approach, innovative diplomacy, as well as understanding about the indivisibility of security, craftsmanship and pragmatism. Kaplan's holistic adaptation could be applied to multiple states of equilibrium where the "balance of power" is a constant value. The *perfect market* model exhibits itself either as universal international system or as hierarchical international system of democratic community of interests.

The second model applies a multi-layered approach, legal norms and balance of powers, whose achievement relies on coalitional (for nuclear parity) and national (for cyber security) capabilities. The model is a combination of unit veto, balance of power and loose bipolar system.

The third model focuses on ad-hoc global risk community as response to hybrid threats. Depending on whether hierarchical or network structure prevails, it applies ad-hoc decisions and thus could be universal or hierarchical international system- a unit veto model where each actor is important.

The fourth model applies the idea of a hegemon or global leadership. Here the combination is among monopoly, monopolistic competition and loose bipolar systems.

Models could transform in each other according to the situation. The *balance of power* or perfect competition is behavior typical of every state, dictated by the natural priority- national interest. When national interest

coincides with international law, this represents the first model, i.e. the balance of power transitions into a model of *universal* international system or *hierarchical* international system, with cartelization being the economic analogue. The opposite end represents the *risk society* and the unit veto model or perfect oligopoly. The intermediate variant represents a case where some of the actors gather more power, so that *monopolistic* model is achieved where stability exists only in hierarchical international system. Monopoly could easily turn into *monopolistic competition*, *loose* or *tight bipolar system*. The second model has elements from *balance of power*, *unit veto* and *loose bipolar system*.

The models are almost always mixed, without “pure” variants, especially having in mind the acceleration of the transition between separate states of the system in the post-modern society where each event could be an urge for change and change could be interpreted as crisis by. Adaptation with multiple paths is an element of innovative diplomacy and creates a relative competitive advantage of the state.

About the author

The author has a PhD from the University of National and World Economy, Sofia, Bulgaria with a PhD work entitled: “Classification Logic in the Discussion on Widening of the Contents and Definition of the “Security” Category in International Relations (the Problem of the Definition as Different Logic between Flexibility and Stability)”

Currently, the author is a Senior Assistant at the Department of Distance Learning, Language Training and Qualification in Rakovski National Defense College, Sofia, Bulgaria

e-mail: h.dobreva@rndc.bg,
n_hris@yahoo.com