

NATIONAL INTEREST IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS: WHOSE INTEREST?

Nnanyere C. Ogo, PhD

Department of History and International Relations, Ebonyi State
University, Abakaliki. nnannaogo@yahoo.com

kenneth I. Nwokike, PhD

Department of History and International Relations, Ebonyi State
University, Abakaliki.

Ndubuisi M. Mbam, PhD.

Department of History and International Relations, Ebonyi State
University, Abakaliki.

Abstract

The concept of national interest is central to the study of international relations, often guiding the foreign policies of states. However, the question of "whose interest" national interest represents is a complex and contested issue. While traditionally framed as the collective interest of a nation-state, national interest can reflect the priorities of policy makers of a state, the leader of such state or dominant political, economic, or social groups within a society, rather than the population as a whole. This paper examines the competing perspectives on national interest, exploring how it is constructed, who defines it, and the extent to which it aligns with the broader public needs and aspirations. Through a review of realist, liberal, and constructivist theories, this paper argues that national interest is not a fixed or neutral concept but is shaped by power dynamics, ideological, and institutional structures. Secondary source of data collection and content analytical technique were deployed for the study. Findings reveal that in the formulation of national interest, the interest of the actors behind the formulation is prioritized. Understanding this is crucial for analysing both the motivations behind foreign policy decisions and their impact on global power relations.

Keywords: National-interest, Foreign policy, State, International relations

Introduction

The concept of national interest is central to the study of international relations (IR), serving as a guiding principle for the foreign policy decisions of nation-states. It encompasses the political, economic, military, and ideological goals that a state seeks to achieve on the global stage (Morgenthau, 1948). However, the question of whose interest is being represented when these goals are pursued is often more complex and contested. National interest is not a monolithic entity but rather a reflection of competing priorities within a state, shaped by various actors such as the political elite, economic stakeholders, military institutions, and civil society (Smith, 2000).

In International Relations, the concept of national interest refers to the goals and ambitions of a

nation-state, which guide its foreign policy. These interests typically encompass a wide range of elements, including economic prosperity, security, and ideological values. However, the question of 'whose interest' is being represented, is more complex and depends on the internal dynamics and political structure of the country.

Different theoretical perspectives offer contrasting views on how national interest is formulated. The realists argue that national interest is primarily driven by the pursuit of power and security in an anarchic international system (Morgenthau, 1948), while liberal theorists emphasise the role of domestic politics, public opinion, and international cooperation in shaping a nation's goals (Moravcsik, 1997). Moreover, in practice, national interest may often reflect the priorities of powerful elites or economic groups rather than the broader population (Cox, 1981). This raises critical questions about the inclusivity and legitimacy of national interest as a guiding concept in international relations, particularly when the interests of marginalised or less powerful groups are not adequately represented.

In the light of these complexities, understanding the topic "National Interest in International Relations: Whose Interest?", requires a deeper analysis of the internal and external actors that shape it, as well as the power dynamics that influence how it is articulated and pursued in the international system.

Statement of the Problem

The concept of national interest in international relations is central to the actions and decisions of states in the global arena. However, the definition of "whose interest" is being represented under this notion remains contentious and complex. National interest is often portrayed as a unified, singular objective of the state, prioritising security, economic welfare, and political stability. However, it tends to obscure the internal divisions within states, raising critical questions about whether the interests of a few elite groups or dominant political factions are presented as the interests of the entire nation (Morgenthau, 1948).

Moreover, the pursuit of national interest often leads to conflict with the principles of global justice, cooperation, and human rights, which further complicate the debate about whose interests are prioritised and represented in national interest of states. The problem arises when leaders or policymakers claim to act in the name of national interest, potentially side-lining marginalised or dissenting groups within their own states (Waltz, 1979). For instance, in many cases, national interests reflect the preferences of powerful economic or political elites rather than a broad-based, democratic consensus (Keohane, 1984).

In an increasingly interconnected world system, the notion of national interest has also expanded beyond territorial concerns to include international cooperation, trade agreements, and environmental policies. This raises further questions about the compatibility of national interests with transnational challenges like climate change, where the "interest" of the nation may be in conflict with global collective action (Mearsheimer, 2001). Therefore, the ambiguity in defining whose interest is being served complicates international relations theory and practice, leading to conflicts between state-centric policies and broader global interests.

Theoretical Framework

The concept of national interest is central to international relations (IR) and can be interpreted

differently depending on the theoretical perspective one adopts. Realist, liberal, Marxist and constructivist theories are adopted in this research to provide distinct lenses for a better understanding of whose interests are represented in foreign policy and how national interest is formed and pursued.

Realism

The theory of Realism in international relations is most commonly associated with Hans Morgenthau, who is considered one of its founding figures. Morgenthau formalised classical realism with his work *"Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace,"* published in 1948. In this seminal work, Morgenthau argues that international politics is governed by objective laws rooted in human nature, and that states act primarily in pursuit of power and self-interest.

The Realist perceives national interest as state-centric and power-oriented. Realism posits that the international system is anarchic, meaning that there is no overarching authority above states. In this view, the primary concern of states is their own survival, and national interest is defined in terms of power and security. From a realist perspective, national interest is largely understood as the interest of the state as a unified actor. Realists assume that states are rational actors that prioritise military strength, economic power, and strategic advantages over ideological or moral concerns. But, on whose Interest? For realists, the interests represented are those of the state itself, often viewed as an entity distinct from its citizens or internal groups. The assumption is that state leaders act in the national interest, which is predominantly defined as ensuring state security and maintaining or increasing power relative to other states. As Mearsheimer (2001) notes, "great powers are always searching for opportunities to gain power over their rivals" because they operate in an inherently competitive and insecure international system.

In addition, Morgenthau (1948), a key realist thinker, argues that "interest defined as power" is the guiding principle of international politics, and all states pursue this interest regardless of their domestic ideologies or leadership. For instance, during the Cold War, both the U.S. and the Soviet Union pursued policies [arms races, proxy wars, espionage] that aimed to maximise their relative power and ensure their security in an anarchic international system.

Liberalism

Woodrow Wilson (1856–1924), is credited with bringing liberal ideas into international relations through his promotion of the League of Nations and his Fourteen Points in 1918. Wilson believed that democracy, open diplomacy, free trade, and collective security could prevent war, laying the groundwork for modern liberal internationalism. However, Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye in the 1970s and 1980s, developed neoliberal institutionalism, a theory that emphasises the role of international organisations and regimes in facilitating cooperation between states.

Liberalism perceives national interest as pluralistic and cooperative. Liberalism, by contrast, holds a more optimistic view of human nature and believes that states can achieve mutual gains through cooperation and international institutions. Liberals emphasise the importance of economic interdependence, international organisations, and democratic governance in shaping national interests. On 'whose interest?' national interest to liberalists, is often seen as a reflection of the preferences of multiple domestic actors, including political elites, interest groups, and the general public. Liberal theorists argue that in democratic states, national interest should ideally reflect the will of the people, particularly in societies where citizens have the ability to influence foreign

policy decisions through electoral processes.

Keohane (1984) suggests that institutions can help states overcome mistrust and facilitate cooperation, aligning national interest with broader international goals like peace, trade, and environmental protection. Nye (2004) expands the understanding of national interest beyond hard power, emphasising how states achieve their goals through attraction and persuasion, often aligning with liberal principles of cooperation and diplomacy. The creation of the United Nations and the European Union, among other international organisations, reflect a liberal interpretation of national interest. These institutions promote cooperation, suggesting that states' national interests can align with international norms and collective security arrangements.

Marxism

The Marxists' perception of national interest focuses on the interest of the dominant class that are in control of the state power and apparatus (see Marx and Engels (1848), Frank (1997), Ake (1982), Rodney (1972), Akpuru-Aja (1998). They believe that a state comprises two dominant but antagonistic classes, the bourgeoisie and the proletariats who are in constant competition over who controls the institutions of the state leading to class war between them. *The Communist Manifesto* written and published by Marx and Engels in 1848 showcases how the interest of the two dominant classes constitute the national interest of the state, depending on who controls the state apparatus at any given time. The implication is that, for the Marxists, national interest of the state is not the interest of the totality of the people in the state but the interest of the dominant ruling class at the detriment of the conquered class through the instrumentality of the executive. Marx and Engel (1848) went on to describe the executive as "a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie". The implication is that even within the bourgeois class, there is a committee who rules and whose immediate interest represents the interest of the whole and by extension, the interest of the state. Hence, the controversial nature of whose interest national interest serves keeps evolving in all the classes in the state.

Constructivism

Constructivism in international relations was primarily propounded by Alexander Wendt in 1992. His work challenged the dominance of realism and liberalism by emphasising the importance of social structures, shared ideas, and identities in shaping the behaviour of states. Other scholars, like Onuf (1998) and Finnemore (1996), also contributed to the development of constructivist theory.

The constructivists perceive national interest as being socially constructed. Constructivism argues that national interests are not fixed or solely determined by material factors like power or wealth. Instead, the constructivists believe that interests are shaped by social interactions, ideas, identities, and norms. National interest, from this view, is constructed through the ongoing dialogue between states and the broader international community, with attention to the historical, cultural, and ideational context in which foreign policy is made.

For constructivists, national interest is more fluid and can represent different social and political groups within a state, depending on how national identity and values are defined. They argue that the interests of a state are not predetermined but are shaped by its social context, including its leaders' perceptions, international norms, and the state's identity in the international system. As Wendt (1992) asserts, "anarchy is what states make of it," meaning that national interest is a product of intersubjective understandings rather than material necessity alone. In fact, the decision of some states to pursue nuclear disarmament or strong climate change policies can be understood

through the constructivist lens. For instance, states that perceive themselves as environmental leaders or global citizens may prioritise environmental protection as part of their national interest, even if it does not provide immediate material benefits.

Realists view national interest as focused on power and security, driven by the rational, unitary behaviour of states in an anarchic system. Liberals see national interest as shaped by domestic actors and international institutions, with cooperation and mutual benefits being central. Marxists see it as the interest of the dominant ruling class of the state. Constructivists argue that national interest is not fixed, but socially constructed, reflecting a state's identity, norms, and ideas.

The above theories highlight the different but relevant approaches to understand whose interests the 'so called' national interest is; by the virtue of the fact that, the state as an institution, does not act for itself but humans act on behalf of and in the name of the state in the formulation and pursuit of national interest. The question of "whose interest?" is therefore interpreted differently, with realists focusing on the state as a unitary actor, liberals considering pluralistic domestic influences, Marxists emphasising class interest while the constructivists lay emphasis on the role of social context and ideational factors in defining national interest.

Sources and Methodology

This research was carried out using secondary materials. This includes books, journal articles and internet materials. Content analysis and case study analysis, will be used to examine the discourse surrounding national interest. This will help identify patterns in how different actors frame national interest and whose interests are prioritised.

Review of Related Literature

In the course of the development of this research, a review of some related scholarly works, theories, and debates that have shaped the understanding of national interest, its role in international Relations (IR), and the contentious question of whose interest it serves is imperative. This review is organised around key themes bordering on the definition and evolution of national interest, theoretical approaches to national interest, and analysis that question whose interest is being represented in national interest.

The idea of national interest is foundational in the field of International Relations. It refers to the strategic goals and objectives a state seeks to achieve in the global arena to ensure its survival, security, and prosperity. Hans Morgenthau, a key figure in classical realism, posits that national interest is defined primarily in terms of power, as states exist in an anarchic international system where survival is the top priority (Morgenthau, 1948). For Morgenthau and other realists, national interest is objective and universally centres around the pursuit of power and security.

Later scholars challenged the static, power-centred view of national interest, arguing that it is dynamic and varies depending on domestic politics, leadership, and changing international circumstances (Rosenau, 1966). This opened the door to considering how the interests of different actors within a state such as political elites, corporations, or civil society might influence the formulation of national interest.

Different theoretical frameworks in IR offer varying interpretations of national interest. According to Realism, classical realists view national interest primarily in terms of power and security.

Neorealism, as advanced by Waltz (1979), refines this by focusing on the structure of the international system, where states are seen as rational actors pursuing their national interest based on their relative position in the global hierarchy. Liberal theorists, such as Keohane (1984), argue that national interest is not limited to power but also involves cooperation, institutions, and the promotion of economic interdependence. They emphasise that states can work together to achieve common interests, which may transcend narrow, power-based definitions of national interest. While, Wendt (1999), introduced a more interpretive approach, suggesting that national interests are socially constructed and shaped by identities, norms, and ideas. From this perspective, national interest is not a fixed, material objective but a fluid concept that evolves as state actors interact and reinterpret their roles on the world stage.

Marxist scholars and critical theorists challenge the notion that national interest is a neutral concept. They argue that it often reflects the interests of dominant economic or political elites rather than the general population. This approach emphasises how class structures, capitalist interests, and imperialism influence the formulation of national interest, as elites use it to justify policies that primarily benefit them (Cox, 1981). The Marxist view leads to the threshold of the contested nature of national interest with the cardinal question of whose interest?

One of the central debates in the study of national interest is whose interest is being represented. Scholars from various traditions have questioned whether national interest truly reflects the collective will of a nation or whether it is often the interest of a narrow group, such as political elites, economic actors, or military-industrial complexes giving rise to differing perspectives on the subject matter. The elite theory suggests that national interest is shaped and dominated by a small group of powerful individuals or institutions. The state, in this view, acts as an agent of elite interests rather than the public good. Mills (1956), explored this in his concept of the "power elite," highlighting how corporate, political, and military leaders in the U.S. shaped national policies to serve their own interests.

Democratic theorists on the other hand argue that national interest should ideally be shaped by the will of the people through democratic institutions. However, Chomsky (1999) and Moravcsik (1997) argue that public opinion is often manipulated or sidelined by powerful interest groups, making the concept of "national interest" highly contested. Pluralist theories, in the same vein, argue that national interest is the outcome of bargaining and negotiation among various interest groups within society. This implies a more democratic process but also acknowledges that some interests may still dominate others.

Feminist scholars challenge the gender-neutral assumptions of national interest, pointing out how foreign policy often ignores or marginalises women's perspectives. Cynthia Enloe (1989) argues that the formulation of national interest reflects patriarchal structures, privileging male-dominated institutions like the military while sidelining gender issues.

Postcolonial scholars, such as Said (1978) and Spivak (1988), critique how national interest has historically served imperial and neocolonial powers. They argue that national interest in Western countries often mask expansionist and exploitative policies, justified under the guise of security or economic development but designed to maintain control over former colonies or economically weaker states.

Mearsheimer (2001) and Ikenberry (2011) analysed U.S. foreign policy, arguing that national interest has often been defined in terms of maintaining global dominance and ensuring access to global markets. Mearsheimer, a realist, argues that the U.S. seeks to preserve its hegemony, while Gowan (1999) argues that U.S. foreign policy serves corporate interests, particularly the defense and energy sectors, which heavily influence decisions on military interventions.

In a related argument, in the context of the European Union, scholars debate how national interest is balanced against collective European goals. Moravcsik (1997) discusses how national interests are negotiated within the EU's institutional framework, where member states must reconcile their own objectives with regional policies. This has led to debates about sovereignty and whether national elites use European integration to advance their own political or economic agenda.

In the Global South, the concept of national interest is often framed in terms of resistance to foreign domination and economic development. However, critics argue that national interest in many developing countries is co-opted by ruling elites or authoritarian regimes to justify repression or enrich themselves. Gills (2000), highlights how foreign aid and development policies are frequently shaped by both external actors and domestic elites, leading to a distortion of national interest away from broader public needs.

The concept of national interest is central to international relations, but it remains deeply contested. Theoretical perspectives from realism, liberalism, constructivism, and critical theories offer diverse interpretations of what national interest means and whose interests it serves. As scholars have noted, national interest is often shaped by elites, powerful economic actors, or external forces, raising important questions about democratic control, inclusivity, and representation in global politics. Thus, exploring "whose interest" is being advanced in the name of the nation-state reveals significant power dynamics within and between states, necessitating a critical examination of how national interest is framed and pursued in international relations. None of the literature reviewed provides a wholesome answer to the problem of this present research but collectively provides invaluable information to the development of this present research.

National Interest in International Relations: Whose Interest?

The concept of national interest in international relations has long been invoked to justify the actions of states on the global stage. However, a critical examination of this concept reveals that what is often portrayed as the collective interest of a nation frequently reflects the personal, political, or economic interests of the ruling elites. Through an analysis of various case studies, this argument will be substantiated, drawing on empirical evidence and theoretical critiques. Specifically, the study makes references to U.S. foreign policy, authoritarian regimes in the Global South, and the European Union to show how national interest is often aligned with the leaders' interests.

U.S. Foreign Policy: National Interest or Elite Interests?

A classic example of how national interest is shaped by the interests of leaders and elites is in U.S. foreign policy. Many scholars argue that U.S. interventions abroad have been motivated less by the collective will of the American people and more by the interests of a powerful elite. President Dwight D. Eisenhower, in his 1961 farewell address, warned of the undue influence of the "military-industrial complex" on U.S. foreign policy. Mills (1956) further argues that a "power elite" consisting of corporate, military, and political leaders had significant control over the

formulation of national interest. These elites often shaped foreign policy to benefit defence contractors, oil companies, and other powerful industries.

Mearsheimer (2001) and other realist scholars have highlighted how U.S. military interventions, including in Iraq (2003), were justified under the guise of promoting national security and spreading democracy but were also deeply influenced by the interests of political leaders and corporate elites. Critics like Gowan (1999), argue that U.S. foreign policy reflects the interests of multinational corporations and defence contractors, which benefit from military engagements and control over foreign resources, such as oil. This demonstrates how national interest, as formulated by leaders, often aligns with the private interests of a select few.

The Iraq War in 2003 is one of the most significant examples of how the national interest can be co-opted by leaders to serve personal and political agenda. Officially, the Bush administration justified the war by claiming that Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction (WMDs), which posed a threat to the U.S. and its allies. However, investigations later revealed that no such weapons existed. Hence, the war was largely motivated by strategic interests, including securing oil resources and projecting American power in the Middle East, which benefited U.S. corporations and the political ambitions of the Bush administration (Bacevich, 2008). In a similar vein, leaders like Vice President Dick Cheney had direct ties to the defence industry. Cheney had previously served as the CEO of Halliburton, a company that secured lucrative contracts during the Iraq War. This case illustrates how national interest, framed as a security imperative, was manipulated to serve the interests of political leaders and their corporate allies.

Furthermore, in many authoritarian regimes particularly in the global south, national interest is used as a rhetorical device to justify policies that primarily benefit the ruling elites, often at the expense of the broader population. In Zimbabwe, former President Robert Mugabe frequently invoked national interest to justify policies that consolidated his power and enriched his political allies. Mugabe's government framed land reform policies in the early 2000s as essential to redistributing wealth to the majority black population and rectifying colonial injustices. However, it was observed that the land reforms primarily benefited Mugabe's inner circle, with little economic improvement for the broader population (Bond, 2001). The policies resulted in economic collapse, widespread poverty, and food insecurity, but Mugabe continued to present his actions as serving the national interest of economic empowerment. Mugabe also used national interest rhetoric to suppress dissent, branding opposition parties and civil society groups as "Western puppets" who threatened Zimbabwe's sovereignty. In this context, national interest was manipulated to serve the political survival and economic interests of the ruling elite, not the nation at large.

In Syria, the Assad regime has similarly framed its brutal suppression of the 2011 uprising as a defence of national interest, claiming that it is fighting terrorism and preserving national unity. However, scholars like Steven Heydemann (2013), point out that the regime's actions have been driven primarily by a desire to maintain the Assad family's grip on power. The Syrian conflict, which has resulted in hundreds of thousands of deaths and the displacement of millions, is a stark example of how national interest rhetoric can be employed by authoritarian leaders to justify self-serving policies, including violent repression.

The European Union (EU) provides a complex example of how national interest is often negotiated and redefined by political elites, sometimes at odds with popular sentiment within member states.

During the Euro zone crisis (2009–2013), austerity policies were implemented across Southern European countries, including Greece, Spain, and Portugal. These policies were promoted by the political leaders of wealthier EU nations, such as Germany, and justified as necessary for the stability of the European and global economy. Angela Merkel, the German Chancellor, and European Central Bank leaders framed these austerity measures as being in the best interest of the entire EU. However, many scholars, including Blyth (2013), believe that these austerity policies primarily served the interests of Northern European banks and elites who wanted to protect their financial investments. The economic hardships endured by ordinary citizens in Southern Europe, including high unemployment rates and severe cuts to public services, suggest that the national interests being served were those of political elites and the financial sector, rather than the broader public.

The critiques of national interest as merely a reflection of elite interests are deeply rooted in Marxist and critical theories. Cox (1981), affirms that national interest is often formulated to serve the interests of ruling classes, particularly in capitalist societies. National interest, from this perspective, is a tool used by elites to justify policies that maintain their economic and political dominance. Chomsky (1999) extends this critique, arguing that in liberal democracies, national interest is often manipulated to serve the interests of the corporate and political elite. Chomsky contends that public opinion is manufactured through media and political discourse, creating the illusion of consensus around policies that primarily benefit a small group of the powerful.

Conclusion and recommendations

The concept of national interest in international relations is often portrayed as reflecting the collective will of a nation state. However, case studies from the U.S., Zimbabwe, Syria, and the European Union demonstrate that national interest frequently aligns with the personal, political, and economic interests of leaders and elites. Whether through military interventions, economic policies, or authoritarian repression, leaders craft national interest narratives to legitimise their actions, often at the expense of the broader population. Theoretical critiques from scholars like Cox (1981) and Chomsky (1999) further support the argument that national interest is, often, a reflection of elite interests than a genuine expression of the nation's well-being.

To address the elite capture of national interest in international relations, a range of strategies must be employed to ensure that foreign policy reflects the broader population's values and needs. These includes enhancing democratic oversight, reducing the influence of special interests, increasing civil society involvement, decentralizing decision-making, promoting ethical leadership, and redefining national interest in human-centric terms, among other essential steps. These recommendations aim to create a more inclusive, transparent, and accountable foreign policy process that truly serves the collective national interest, not just the narrow interests of the leaders who formulate it.

References

- Bacevich, A. J. (2008). *The Limits of Power: The End of American Exceptionalism*. Metropolitan Books.
- Blyth, M. (2013). *Austerity: The History of a Dangerous Idea*. Oxford University Press.
- Bond, P. (2001). *Zimbabwe's Plunge: Exhausted Nationalism, Neoliberalism and the Search for Social Justice*. University of Natal Press.

- Chomsky, N. (1999). *The Umbrella of U.S. Power: The Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Contradictions of U.S. Policy*. Seven Stories Press.
- Cox, R. W. (1981). Social Forces, States, and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 10(2), 126–155.
- Dahl, R. A. (1961). *Who Governs? Democracy and Power in an American City*. Yale University Press.
- Enloe, C. (1989). *Bananas, Beaches and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics*. University of California Press.
- Finnemore, Martha. (1996). *National Interests in International Society*. Cornell University Press.
- Gills, B. (2000). *Globalisation and the Politics of Resistance*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gowan, W. (1999). *The Global Gamble: Washington's Faustian Bid for World Dominance*. Verso.
- Heydemann, S. (2013). Syria and the Future of Authoritarianism. *Journal of Democracy*, 24(4), 59–73.
- Keohane, R. O. (1984). *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*. Princeton University Press.
- Marx, K. & Engels, F. (1848). *Manifesto of the Communist Party*.
- Mearsheimer, J. J. (2001). *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Mills, C. W. (1956). *The Power Elite*. Oxford University Press.
- Moravcsik, A. (1997). Taking preferences seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics. *International Organisation*, Vol. 51(4), pp.513-553.
- Morgenthau, H. J. (1948). *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*. Alfred A. Knopf.
- Nye, Joseph. (2004). *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*. PublicAffairs.
- Onuf, N. G. (1989). *World of Our Making: Rules and Rule in Social Theory and International Relations*. University of South Carolina Press.
- Rosenau, J. N. (1966). Pre-theories and Theories of Foreign Policy. In R. Barry Farrell (Ed.), *Approaches to Comparative and International Politics*. Northwestern University Press.
- Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. Pantheon Books.
- Smith, S. (2000). “The Concept of National Interest” In J. Baylis & S. Smith (Eds.), *The Globalisation of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*. Oxford University Press.
- Spivak, G. C. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture*. Macmillan.
- Waltz, K. N. (1979). *Theory of International Politics*. McGraw-Hill.
- Wendt, Alexander. (1992). Anarchy is what States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics. *International Organisation*, Vol. 46,(2), pp. 391-425.
- Wendt, A. (1999). *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge University Press.