International relations and crisis management international relations

Mahdi Barouh *

Johannes Kepler University of Linz, Linz, Austria (JKU)

Abstract: Experiences and practices of international crisis management by the four great powers (America, Europe Union, China and Russia) before and after the Cold War, and the operation of the transitional period for the recognition of the international system and the complex situation is an important scientific. Experiences and perspectives of each of the major powers in the management of international crises of the military, political, economic and strategic culture stems but what is essential in the development of the international system and its impact on the decision-making structure. Thus, an important question to be addressed in this paper is the development of a new international system, what effect is the decision of the great powers in the management of international crises. In this study, the specific features of the crisis, the variation of the amplitude and increase in number during the Cold War is been studied and in particular the complexity of the great powers in respect of the management of specific conditions of competition and cooperation in resolving this crisis is also discussed. Finally, this paper describes the similarities and differences of each crisis management powers during the Cold War, according to the interests and objectives of them.

Key words: Accounting conservation; Dividend polices; Managers' bonus

1. Introduction

During the Cold War, international crises are managed by the two super powers and crises are not in and of itself, but by stimulating or supporting one of the two super powers or powers to block their function was updated and to try and block the other super power him how to fight through it and how to manage concessions would come to an end. A good example of this is the Cuban Missile Crisis. The crisis is largely due to Soviet deployment of nuclear missiles in Cuba began the short range and the advantages include the dismantling of America Jupiter missiles in Turkey and Cuba ended the political entity. During the Cold War bipolar situation of the international system and internal components of power in decision-making, effective and decisive factors in the management of international crises.

The end of the Cold War, the end of the practices of crisis management. In this era of liberalism in America against the Soviet Union led to an ideological victory achieved it as a "victory without war" is mentioned. With this victory, America and the West more responsibility in promoting democracy and Western norms for itself in one. The problem with the current transitional arrangement, a complex agenda of crisis management has completed the Great Powers. In other words, during the Cold War political decision has been releasing a series of controls that are very recessionary and Balkan crisis in the territory of the former Yugoslavia and Georgia are obvious examples. On the other hand, the disappearance of communism and Islamic ideology is challenging because of another kind of crisis that is far more complex. Terrorism in the after math of the events of 11 September 2001 and in Afghanistan and although Iraq's energy major powers involved have remained unresolved.

Now, with the end of the Cold War, the international system is in a transitional period and in terms of the distribution of power, America as the dominant power in addition to other major powers has a decisive role. Although the United States has maintained its excellence in all areas, but other powers too low and too high in a particular field of competence.

This paper attempts to answer the question that new developments in the international system, what effect on the decision of the great powers in the management of international crises affected. Since the structure of the international system and its evolution and the nature of their influence on the formation of international crises. Research hypothesis is that the new developments of the international system of decentralization of decision making in the management of international crises is great. Thus, paper and evaluate the experience of the four great powers(America, Europe, Russia and China) in the management of international crises, in theory a general picture of the conditions prevailing in the international system and the requirements of the international crisis management. The experience and approach each of the major powers in the field of crisis management has been analyzed and at the end of the transitional requirements of the international order, described as the most important component

* Corresponding Author.

in the approach of the great powers in international crisis management deals.

2. Theoretical approach

"Experience" and "Crisis Management" great powers in the past can no lights; no way to analyze the current situation is different. It is essential that theoretical findings from past experience in the field of crisis management in the post of the Cold War are obtained.

This theoretical approach is generally based on the comparison of crisis management during the Cold War and then around three crucial variables: Distribution of power in the international system, the decision of the great powers, and the strategic culture of the ruling power. First, it includes a diverse range of international system and a transition from a relatively flexible bipolar system is a transitional period in addition to superior strength, Another important role of the great powers and abilities in non-military field shave been added.

Following the significant changes that occurred in the wake of the Cold War, the decision-making power in the face of change: The United States has undergone a few changes like the system has its own specific decision, but due to the loss of "balance of terror", paying more attention to the views of other powers in their shows; decision-making and other powers have also been faced with changes in Russia, though does not have of the decision earlier, but also to a limited group of survivors of that period, the situation is more or less seen as strategic, is based. But the decision in Europe is faced with significant changes. Council of Europe to a democratic union of European governments becomes the resultant emphasis on the management of international crises through the peaceful and of multilateralism. Although the structure of decision-making in China has not been changed, but the ruling Communist Party to follow the policy of non-intervention in international crises far more attention to the economic advantage is taken. The discussion of the evolution of strategic culture as the third variable is not far away. While the Cold War influenced the culture of the "balance of terror" great powers required by conventional international conflicts, low range and keep the satellites in the world, now it is more important to pay attention to civil actions. In during of the Cold War strategy, competition and cooperation replace confrontation strategy and competition among powers in the international crisis management.

Huntington, the distribution of power in the post-Cold War era of "hegemony" to describe the United States as the world toward a "Huntington, the distribution of power in the post-Cold War era of "hegemony" to describe the United States as the world towards a "one or more-polar" in transition in transition (Huntington, 1383). If you fulfill these conditions, the dominant power in the world, with some power store solve the issues. For superior strength without the help of other great powers,

solve international problems would be extremely difficult. Iraq is clearly revealed such a thing.

In addition to Huntington explanation of the terms of the international order, provided that the views of the other theories of international relations theory is largely compatible (Waltz, 2000). However, according to some theories, during the of the Cold War transition, which can be very long. In this situation, crisis and disaster management easier than ever harder. The writer's view, the international system remains in transition. About how to manage the crisis of the Great Powers offered no single theory. Perhaps the best way to provide a theoretical explanation, using the method of comparative studies the trends and effective internal crisis management to identify and extract the min common (Caporaso, 1997). Accordingly, in the case of each of these can be seen in the context of the goals and interests of the great powers, approach and examine their experiences in crisis management.

United States, as the only remaining super power of the Cold War, is still trying to dominate the world. Especially in the Bush administration's desire to lead the world in the light of the situation after 11 September 2001, rose sharply and thus unilateral military action in Afghanistan and Iraq and in the case of Ukraine, Serbia and Georgia tried to use soft power to achieve your goals and focus on the development of Western values. In this situation, America is creating crisis and in the wake of the crisis management. United States tend to increase the influence and presence in areas such as the Middle East and Europe pursues the goal of having unquestionable dominance in this regard is the powers of rival had no intention of compromise. However, in the second term of President Bush following the failure of the policy of unilateralism, there are changes in the policy and the interests of other powers were considered somewhat. For example, America is now about Iran's nuclear program, with Russia, China and Europe cooperate, the Common wealth of Independent of Independent States that were previously satellites of Russia, Russian security considerations and somewhat understand about Georgia is not a confrontation; America's relationship with China is currently the North Korean issue through dialogue and resolve economic sanctions. The process has not changed much since the advent of the Obama White House is simply mixed with strands of multilateralism and confidence. For example, in the case of Iran, Obama continues to follow a policy of dialogue and consensus, and has great powers the Russian security concerns have been a missile defense shield in Poland and the Czech dismantle.

Union of Europe after the Cold War with the ultimate trends accelerates convergence and unity, consistency is more important in light of the military, economic, and political and Great Britain, France and Germany, the block is strong in international developments. The union heir of the colonial past and usually tries at all levels with the United States and NATO's intervention and manipulation.

European crisis management, crisis management practices compared to US-based division of labor and reduce the risk of unilateral action. In fact, this is also a good partner for the Union policy in the United States, Its ability to maintain and enhance its global position to take advantage. For Europeans, multilateralism is largely shared the influence with the United States. Hence, most Europeans of the use of soft power through international bodies and enjoying the prestige and credibility of the Europe in resolving the crisis.

Europe the Union not merely an economic bloc and as Japan's power. The Europe Union military issues almost unilaterally attempting to resolve issues and concerns brought to the United States through NATO. In other areas such as the Middle East and Southeast Asia, along with the United States is trying this way, the interests and compete with China and Russia to gain more influence. The Union's role in crisis management in Georgia, Showed that the Union is willing to play a role even in areas where the United States refuses or fails to act on behalf of Western thought and using soft power is active.

China is a country whose leaders understand that their ambitious goals only through the strengthening of economic and cultural and increase internal coherence can be achieved in the distant future and in this sense, seeks the intervention as possible to avoid high international crises. China's rise is full of crisis areas around the country to see if they look for security, China has lo stall power and might make progress. China's top priority is economic goals and therefore, efforts to present an image of itself to all parts of the world economic cooperation. On the other hand, China is a very important objective to seek "peaceful rise" has found that progress depends on its strong partnership with the West and the United States. China's peaceful rise in long-term aims, policies and trade cooperation with the West and from containing the privileges of a multilateral economic and political privileges and security in the region outside the region, and support.

However, it has two significant ways in different regions of chaotic follows. The crises in East Asia, particularly in the areas such as North Korea or Taiwan, China, the United States sought to exert political and economic pressure and Or concessions in other areas of the force does not act unilaterally and considerations to take into account the country. In the more distant crisis, the Chinese if they have the opportunity to participate and influence-such as the Middle East, especially Iran- Following are the first, and ultimately make political concessions to the economic benefits provided by powers like the United States, they exchange.

Russian military power remains in serious rival to the United States and their military arsenals not only not disappeared but have been strengthened. Russia after the Cold War in terms of political legitimacy and international influence declined. Economic problems, Moscow has largely been in the shadow of the United States and Europe Union. In this analysis, Russia is a great power in the region that could affect some international issues. Nevertheless, the Russians continue to revive their former power than previous instruments, including military strength, balance, the energy diplomacy, and military technology today.

Russian management of international crises after the Cold War greatly affected by the breakdown of extracellular levels near and far abroad. In the near abroad, including the Soviet Union, the Russian influence in neighboring West to accept and deal with it seriously. Military intervention in the crisis in Georgia, the Ukraine's energy concerns and opposition to the missile shield in Europe and Its resistance to NATO expansion in the former republics of the country shows that Russians in areas where resistance is not serious international military action even use all their tools and otherwise, resorting to other methods known. Russians in other places such as Iran, North Korea and the Middle East or some special privileges to gain political and economic cooperation with the other actors.

In connection with the four major powers can be said that the United States is superior and the promise of Huntington, unlike other great powers, in all three areas of military, political and economic power is the best place in all parts of the world (Huntington, 1383). America's interests in the world, in the sense that the international crisis management aims and interests consolidated its leadership are present.

Other powers are hierarchical, geographical and are interested in a variety of aspects of power in international crisis management. For example, in areas where there is a serious military conflict, Russia and Great Britain have a serious partner. In addition, each of the major powers in the region with more seriousness and impact of the crisis to come. If the economic consequences of this crisis are also, along with China, Germany and Japan will be in a better position.

Another interesting point in the management of international crises that any of the major powers in the acute problems of and particularly in the following areas are competing for power; this means that both America and other major powers in the wake of marches and challenging each other to thereby, In other words, the balance between great powers with respect to the situation there is always soft. Hence, according to the international system in transition, crisis management in certain areas cannot change the status hierarchy. International order in favor of their own.

Continuity and change in all three categories of variables involved in crisis management major powers is important. You should see a change in the distribution of power after the Cold War has brought changes in the approach of the great powers and the extent to which the structure and culture of strategic decision-making powers in the management of a crisis has arisen. Then, the components of the evaluation approach and experience in crisis management attention will be four.

America's experience and approach to crisis management. American approach to the management of international crises and intellectual logic of grand strategy is identical in both parties but in terms of procedures and tactics, the two parties have differences with each other.

The empirical basis of American management of international crises since World War II has been based on the principles and framework for the analysis and evaluation, in connection with external components, in cooperation with the Western allies and sometimes tend to unilateralism and in relation to the internal components, Both individual and collective decision-making procedure on the one hand and on the other organization, should be considered: The first method is more psychological approaches and positions of power or decision points, the second method is more related to the management decision making processes. More accurately represent the policy of unilateralism and indeed multi-lateral policy in this type of management. These two kinds of attitudes and practices of administrative decision-making power, the power of integration, cooperation within and outside the organization. One of America and second synchronization between internal systems of coordination between US and allies agencies story.

These two approaches (multilateralism and unilateralism) to promote national interests, greater recognition of the international environment, the ability to appeal to non-governmental organizations, diplomatic and military capabilities to use forms and different ways.

It should be noted that although the management of the foundation named column with the procedures and in the framework of the two parties have been following principles:

Individual and organizational decision-making process of party politics has always been effective in critical condition;

Differences in organizational behavior, which shows the effectiveness of the management of the state is seen.

Crisis management and the interests of each individual level or at the level that they are associated with public opinion (Neack, 2003).

Records indicate that the presidents of America during the crisis of diplomatic missions granted to some trusted people delusion and some have chosen to come as close advisors. For example, Harry Truman in 1950 following the Korean War, the Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, to a team of experienced consultants to analyze the critical situation in the Korean Peninsula gathered. It was said that the working group had counseling for weeks about the Korean War, Truman. Also, this pattern was repeated during the Vietnam War. Johnson became consultants working group lunch Tuesday. Reagan also the policy pursued during the crisis of his presidency. He created a Select Committee of the National Security Council and the Special Conditions groups called it under your assistant (Neack, 2003).

America's approach to crisis management America's approach to international crisis management can be broadly described as follows:

Logic and mentality of this approach is that America considers itself the custodian of international crisis management. Perhaps this belief in technological and military superiority, America's political and economic returns.

When a crisis occurs, a strong sense of crisis management team to study the history and future plans are to be seen. For example, a North Korean attack on South Korea in 1950, the Truman administration was ready to enter the war. Also during the Cuban crisis, a military option on the table beside diplomacy was John F. Kennedy (Dannereuther and Peterson, 2006). Robert Kennedy, brother of the former president, Jan F Kennedy, America, in this regard, said: "Khrushchev knew that the Americans finally find a way out of the crisis, Cuba (Caldwell, 1989).

Speaker or speakers try crisis management during the crisis with the public and also direct connections of the crisis and the public about government decisions are important, not persuasion. For example, Adela Stevenson America's representative to the UN, during the Cuban missile crisis, the Soviet authorities tried to make contact and the proposal suggests that if the United States and its military forces out of the Guantanamo Bay and 15 units of Jupiter missiles from Turkey to pick, then expects the Russian nuclear missiles from Cuba to collect dust (Caldwell, 1989).

America presidents have attempted to control the military tactics during the crisis and have conflict. For example, in 1962, Kennedy in his ability to control the military and the strict supervision of military power brought to realize. Gen. David Purchytal, chief of staff of the Air Force in America, in 1962. In this regard, said: "The Russian army has decided to make a significant impact, but the Secretary of Defense and the President is strongly opposed to it." This approach was also followed by Johnson on the Vietnam War. It is said that the procedure from Ford about the crisis of Lebanon in 1975 and 1976, Carter, Reagan, in the case of the Iranian hostage crisis and the crisis in Lebanon in 1982 was followed (Caldwell, 1989).

The crisis management decisions through diplomatic channels of communication networks and information technology and human resources necessary to acquire the critical situation. For example, the technological superiority was seen during the Cuban crisis. Henry Kissinger, said: "The people of America expect the unexpected things that happen in the world, US government information through reliable sources that they have the necessary knowledge; However, in some cases, White House officials will be shocked at the number of incidents and crises."

Gary Sick, former member of America's National Security Council, the Iranian hostage crisis, "says Crisis Staff members rely heavily on media reports and information. » (Caldwell, 1989)

United States military during international crises in different ways to the use of nuclear forces resorted to threats. (Caldwell, 1989)

3. Decision of America in crisis management

Historical experiences of these two parties suggests that the choice of international crisis management team from the National Security Council goes America and then integrating the White House turns its decisions, while also recognizing the institutional capacity to manage more and more tied to the international crisis. More Eisenhower administration tried to resolve international crises through the channels of the White House's National Security Council and the resort was not so much the organizational system. Kennedy administration sought to reverse the Executive Committee, called the Cuban Missile Crisis Management Exam to pay. The committee was composed from different members of the National Security Council and was supposed to go through diplomatic channels and informal control and restrain their missile crisis. Johnson administration during the Vietnam War was resorted to crisis management and institutional responses and Through the Ministries of Defense and State and was trying to decide on the internal and external crisis caused by the Vietnam War's dimensions. Nixon High Crisis Management Committee headed by Henry Kissinger payment and Relations between China and America from the channel to resolve the crisis that eventually led to tensions between Washington and Beijing. Carter administration tried to move through the National Security Advisor and the National Security Council manage the hostage crisis in Iran. Crisis management is completely centralized government under the Reagan White House staff had and formed working groups under the special conditions Vice President and National Security Advisor to the bargaining parties to international crises dealt with. Reagan also ordered the creation of a crisis management center, Congress through the State Department and National Security Council during the crisis the country is but he was more focused on dealing with critical conditions based working groups.

Bush's administration tried to make more use of diplomacy and through the State Department and National Security Advisor to manage their international crises. Along the Clinton administration also sought to engage with the policy of the State Department's management of international crises. The George W. Bush administration's focus on working with former team-oriented management of the crisis in the former Republican state, Condoleezza Rice, The National Security Council and the State Department and from Ministry of Defense in the benefits. In fact, the Bush Jr. Administration's most international crises management focus was placed on the Department of Defense and the National Security Council and the second major government efforts in this regard was placed around the State Department (Dannereuther and Peterson, 2006).

With regard to the transfer of the international system, the United States on the one hand trying to push regional powers and influence to disrupt the status of "hegemony" is, on the other hand, the regional powers, in turn, seek to put pressure on power and weaken the regional capacities to increase their power. In short, the United States has experienced a period of crisis management after the Cold War. On the one hand by its domestic situation and policies of the Democratic Party, relatively few comprehensive policy measures for the various crises, including the crisis in Bosnia and Somalia took. After that, increasing the economic strength of the United States during the one hand and the events of September 11, 2001 led to the subsequent outcome of the neoconservatives who have experienced a period of unilateral measures. Experienced relatively incomplete and unsuccessful conservatives, the economic crisis of 2008, and the arrival of the Democrats, this policy has turned back into management experience in multilateral international crises. Current experiences in Afghanistan and Iraq, and even North Korea and Iran have shown that the United States intends to multilateral considerations both in respect of international crisis management.

4. Europe and crisis management

Europe as a result of the expansion of its international competence the Union from 1957onwards, as well as the development of foreign policy and common Security and since 1992 has managed to gain some international crises necessary authority to manage the crisis. By the end of the Cold War and the war in the former Yugoslavia, the European Union European military reorganization plan covering three main missions, humanitarian missions, peacekeeping missions and combat missions to manage crises and restore peace to be had. The mission called Petersburg missions as they were taught, were included in the Amsterdam Treaty in 1997.

Petersburg missions to maintain or restore peace and also emphasizes protecting civilians. Europe's security strategy, which was published in 2003. The aggressive interpretation from Europe crisis management policy provided. The document stresses that in a world where the non-committed maneuver increased role in international affairs, Europe and international security cannot be from government's ability to maintain order within its borders separated. Deterioration of some governments to undermine the global order and fueling regional instability is a serious threat. Restoration of state authority in cases where the power has gone from Europe policy goals, including crisis management in general.

A crisis management operation when considered from the perspective of supporting the government or state building consists of several steps:

-Preventing the collapse of central authority and attempt to prevent from the beginning internal conflict:
-Interventions aimed at ending the internal conflict;
-Stability of the post-intervention and
-Physical and institutional reconstruction aimed at the restoration of the legitimate and effective government (Perret, 2006).

Europe's approach to crisis management Europe's whole approach to international cooperation in the management of international crises Europe countries and international organizations based diplomacy. Of course, the big the Union countries in Europe that have a significant influence on the Union policy in addition to from features and tools and To manage its economic crisis they have from full support the Union are also sometimes defined as a union representative role, Such as France's role in the crisis in Georgia in August 2008, which was sponsored by the Union. Most European countries have shown their interest in fostering a common European identity. Crisis management approach consistent with a common European policy. This type of management is thought from two terms:
- First, according to a multidimensional concept and functions of international crises;
-Second, in terms of the willingness of European countries to adopt a common European management to deal with international crises (Perret, 2006).

European Management with the aim of gaining more credibility spirit of international crises and use of soft power and seeking greater role in international politics is and try to play a strong role on the world stage but is common. The logic of intergovernmental cooperation within the Europe the Union Europe is based. For example, Europe the Union Europe was trying to manage the crisis caused by the genocide and ethnic cleansing in the Balkans from NATO's Europe facilities use, the lack of these facilities has led the United States to NATO military intervention in the Balkans and the Dayton Peace pivot point is (Houben, 2005).

In fact, the column foundations of international cooperation with international crisis management Europe institutions and international organizations were based on a common European identity. However, the management style of the historical processes successfully and frustrations faced the culmination of those efforts failed for the realization of humanitarian intervention in the crisis Europe, the Balkans, NATO finally acted around America.

This management includes the concept of collective action in the context of Europe and the Atlantic cooperation is seen. However, this exception is Great Britain. Strategic partnership with the United States and Great Britain international politics as well as continuing relations with the Europe Union. Tony Blair at the height of the crisis in the Balkans in 1999, called for the cooperation of Europe-America in European NATO humanitarian intervention-the Atlantic (Houben, 2005).

Today the Union Commission's Europe-oriented foreign policy in many sensitive international crises such as the Middle East crisis and Iran's nuclear program participation. European countries are trying to work within the framework of the joint committee on foreign policy, defense and security, and for each institution to adopt a foreign policy of the Commission, and other of cooperation with NATO have been defined. Europe management of international crises they have a non-zero-sum game in terms of cooperation between European countries and also in cooperation with the Atlantic the Union tasks. This discussion applies to the creation of the NATO Rapid Reaction Corps and in cooperation with NATO and Europe rapid deployment unit for the executive arm of the Europe management of international crises visible. Another example of this is the participation of European countries in the deployment of military troops in ISAF and NATO in Afghanistan after the 2002 war. Therefore, the management of international crises has one foot in Europe Security and Defenses Policy and the Europe common foreign policy and a leg in the Atlantic Arrow cooperation (Cosgrove, 2001).

The need to manage international crises caused by the fact that the Europe the Union. One is that the world has become a dangerous place than before and no country alone can deal with a wide range of security threats and the resulting search for Threat Assessment, Reactions to and understanding of long-term measures to mitigate the sufferings and dangers than any time in the past has been crucial. Hence, for the Europe the Union multilateral action, there is no solution except a real view. Second, as indicated Iraq, the international community and multilateral structures are fragile. Union for Europe of the multilateral entity which life depends, it is necessary to bring in world affairs, otherwise you risk of collapse due to unrealized expectations and return of international relations John buys a zero-sum games and more. (Crisis Group Europe, 2005: 2) Hence, the Europe the Union in crisis management style based on "effective multilateralism" is.

5. Europe in crisis management decision-making procedures

Most European countries are trying their collective decisions based on the decisions of the Europe Parliament and the Formation of Security Council resolutions. For example, in the case of Afghanistan, the Union Europe in partnership with America, but America's military intervention in Iraq without UN Security Council is justified. In summary, the management of international crises Europe retailers is seen in the following ways:
-Countries which are subject to change and continuity rules, such as Belgium and the Netherlands;
-Countries where the necessary consensus, such as Denmark and Norway;

-The holder of the governments of countries that are influential example of Great Britain, France and Spain;

-Countries with parliaments and high penetrating power, for example, Germany and Italy.

Europe in crisis management decision-making and decision-making in the examination of this question we face is how and why sometimes contradictory loyalties with national and international crisis management Europe transnational tendencies face? Are these paradoxes have caused the failure of European Management provides international crises?

Countries, Great Britain, Spain, Italy and France are influential government position, while in Germany and Denmark are influential parliamentary position and The result is a kind of contradiction in the management where the concentration of decision-making with potential transnational Arrow nationalism-Atlantic decision finds discrepancies. The small countries like the Netherlands and Belgium also find a compromise position. This contradiction leads to challenge Europe and international crises, and sometimes the Kennedy administration's management of its Central America and European countries has no choice but to cooperate. This is a clear example of the Balkan Wars, specifically the three powers Europe, England, France and Germany against the Serbs, Croats and Muslims had the same positions, and each one of them supported.

Although European countries called for military cooperation with America in the 2003 war in Iraq and from military actions are not welcome and Iraq wants to resolve issues through peaceful means, and even in the sectional meeting between the presidents of the three countries, France, Germany and Russia were established in the United States of America in Iraq are actually strategies and the use of and the work of the United Nations and the Iraqi crisis management was advised to take advantage of the influential countries, But with the change of government in Italy, Germany and France, after the arrival of Berlusconi in Italy, Merkel of Germany and President Nicolas Sarkozy of France, each assumed the role of logistics in Iraq (Busek, 2009).

It is clear that the country's parliament holds powerful coalition governments faced with important decisions on the basis of international cooperation in crisis management could be opposed by coalition faced serious. For example, Italy's participation in the 2003 war against Iraq led by the leftist-dominated parliament and the decision to withdraw its forces from Iraq Prodi was taken. The same situation was repeated after coming to power of the Socialists in Spain. But those who are influential governments are trying to cooperative policy in the management of international crises and add some continuation of this policy has led to the resignation of leaders. For example, Great Britain cooperates with America in Afghanistan and Iraq wars eventually led Tony Blair to step down.

The fact that the holder of Europe's sovereign government (executive) and also holds a strong parliament (legislature) to national interests and social responsibility in the face of public opinion over think common European policies. Given that the European Parliament is partly directly participate in the management of Europe governments in international crises and sometimes it is engaged in formal and informal meeting, an interaction between governments and Europe Parliaments in the Europe manage international crises there (Busek, 2009). Another point is that the power and weight of European countries is considerable advance in the management of international crises Europe. Countries, Great Britain, France and Germany, the weight of the weight of foreign policy and foreign trade are among the first countries Europe to be fitted.

The transfer of the International the Union Europe of the United States sought to convince multilateralism in international crisis management in different parts of the world contribute. The attitude of the Europe the Union the struggle for power and influence in the international system is and represents the Union intends to continue to keep the lines of influence in the former colonial areas. In addition, the Union more democratic Europe by internal developments and policies that follow, in general, seek to manage multiple tasks and prefer peaceful means on the violent ways. In fact, the hard decisions in Europe in terms of number of players needed to support decision-making and monitoring mechanisms from action are not easily opportunities. To overcome the problems of this complex structure, Europe the Union a two-pronged policy to gradually put on its agenda and has experienced. These policy decisions the Union on the one hand, the Union and the international system focuses on important structures, and the other is very important to entrust the affairs of the world to some of the members.

The latter, which seeks to preserve the Union power and influence in Europe to international issues, Ability to make decisions, especially about politics is more violent and often the most important members including Great Britain, Germany and France in Group Eight, groups 20 and even Iran's nuclear program is pursued.

6. China's experience and crisis management

At a time when China was gradually declining and has colonized the one hand, On the other hand, was a civil war and In fact, the Communist Revolution in 1949 talking about the Chinese style of crisis management can be very local Arabs. A phenomenon was first imported from the Soviet communist system and model, and secondly in the early decades after Mao's victory and a lifetime, Chinese culture through out there action considered, so that the Communists Confucius Chinese history was named the most reactionary. So speaking of Chinese management crisis in the early decades after the

revolution did not have a basis in reality. Just after the start of the reform and open-door policy and China's rapid development in the decades-from which was coupled with various crises and the political system is able to intelligently manage- Gradually literature on the management of international crises arose Chinese style. China is one of those countries that have internal crises, regional and international faced and crisis management in China is rooted in the history and culture of the Chinese character. Chinese management style and the way they've been able to manage crises in the field of international relations and area. Requisite knowledge of this type of management style, this records the experiences in dealing with these crises. For example, the Taiwan Strait crisis, the crisis of the bombing of the Chinese embassy in Belgrade and illegally spy plane incident in China can be named America's airspace.

Characteristic of this type of management decision-making process in the political culture, the teachings of the party, the undisputed leader in China and the most important feature of social decision-making is concerned. .It should be noted that unlike Western countries, valid documents have been published by the Chinese government in this area and depending on the country's political system and prevent the publication of books and articles related to the management of international crises is Chinese. More information gathered thus obtained the views of researchers, as well as some articles about the outcome of international conferences.

The Chinese government has the tools and resources available to conduct negotiations on international crises and uses and this experience can lead to better understanding of the methods and tools that the Chinese government for crisis management decision-making processes benefits.

7. China's approach to crisis management

Party and the Chinese government has always normalized relations issues, stability, mutual benefit in the management of international crises has followed. Following the style of crisis management bargaining.

This way the Chinese Crisis Management in the 1991 war in Kuwait, the 1997 financial crisis, East Asia, South-West Asia Nuclear Arms Race, 1998, September 11, North Korean nuclear crisis and the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq in 2002 and 2003 have been followed. China's growing global interest requires that the policy of détente and stability in international crisis management pursue. China's development in the context of international security following. Strategic thinking process and the subsequent crisis management practices in China are significant differences with the West. Strategic thinking in the West tradition of Thucydides begins in ancient Greece to modern times continues Klazuvytis. But in China's strategic thinking and that SunTzuisa representative index. He wrote in the sixth century BC The Art of War, unlike Western

theorists who emphasize the battle and win it, and the psychological stresses to win the war and demoralize the enemy. In fact, in his famous book, rather than focus on winning the war is focused on winning without resorting to war. But the tradition of strategic thinking in China, unlike the West, representatives of Sun Tzu's no way to maintain and improve the richness of his heritage. So, he's still a top Chinese thinker in the field of strategic issues, particularly in crisis management and conflict stratosphere. SunTzu's influence on China's strategic thinking rock Confucius influence on the whole Chinese culture.

Perhaps the Chinese management of international crises in the definition of the concept of crisis, saying that the crisis was a "dangerous opportunity" is. Chinese in Taiwan in 1996 to solve the crisis of the last three decades of the third crisis to crisis, the bombing of the Chinese embassy in Belgrade and American fighter to enter the territorial waters of the country's crisis in 2001, the intelligence of the opportunities that have benefited dangerous.

The essential characteristic of Chinese style international crisis management that makes it somewhat different from other styles, the impact of macroeconomic strategy-targeted deployment of available resources to achieve goals-on foreign policy in general and specifically coming crisis management.

Grand Strategy of China's reform and open-door policy so far with ups and downs "of economic development and political stability" is. The grand strategy, china's foreign policy in the direction of promoting security and stability in relations with the centers of wealth and power has. In this type of foreign policy, cooperation in crisis management is considered a strategic choice. It states that an object on the one hand, the Chinese have adopted some form of preventive diplomacy (Gudgel, 2004).

Potential sites in the chaotic environment disable your security and on the other to bring up the "new concept of security" (in the form of a national document) that the four foundations of cooperation, mutual trust, mutual benefit, equality is trying to develop partnerships with others to manage international crises that affect the interests of China, elsewhere. In this framework to resolve border disputes with most of its neighbors China (China border dispute with neighbors 23, 17 dispute has been resolved) and its role in shaping the Shanghai Cooperation Organization and cooperation with ASEAN countries, as has been analyzed.

In recognition of the universality of Chinese management of international crises as the ideology of the column bases of the management hierarchy that is noted. Chine sensationalist and Marxist ideology and social hierarchy of decision making in the management of cultural and political issues associated with the management of international relations distinct from other management styles. The Cultural Revolution in China led the Chinese leaders believe that ideology and party hierarchy and

administration over the past can help in the management of international crises (Kaibin, 2007).

So looking at the security's dominant power in international crisis management. Two security totality seen in the study of national security; Inland source of threats and crises school and school finds that the origin of the threats and external threats imagine. The interface of the security of looking at them. Chinese security management of international crises viewing party of the second school follows. Taiwan Strait crisis, the North Korean nuclear crisis, the crisis of the arms race with India and China as well as India and Pakistan-Pakistan's ally China-Energy Crisis and high dependence on China's economic development and security management of such a concentration of Chinese international crises viewed and measured (Kaibin, 2007).

Therefore, the management response and reaction to the threat theory from within and outside the boundaries of the authority of the party and its leadership is interpreted. This theory is an attitude of mutual economic security and crisis management to deal with these types of threats and mobilize the crisis. Pathology seen this type of management structure and its resources. The main focus of this two-pronged approach to target the United States and then in countries like Japan, South Korea, Taiwan and India as America is concerned binding rings. Manage the most economical answer to these two types of threats (Wuxinbo, 2007).

8. China's decision-making structure in crisis management

The Chinese Communist Party's unchallenged role in international crisis management decision-making process. Lack of coverage and lack of contradictory realities and consequences of the crisis in the party or party's external to international crises one of the special characteristics of this style of management (Budgle, 2004).

International crisis management structure in China with the concept of functional leadership of the party organs in the decision-making process along. Institutional decision-making process of the Board of Directors based on consensus within the top. This type of management has claimed that this process is prevented from making hasty and irrational response to international crises (Christensen, 2006).

The fact that China after the Cold War did not face the risk of external threats but mainly domestic issues, natural disasters, catastrophes mining industry and most of all internal uprisings and political and economic crisis threatening the country. Autopsy leadership in the management of closed political system means that the forces loyal to seek political which lack of transparency and accountability to the people and is accountable only to the hierarchy. It is natural that this style of management has no standard practices of good governance.

This style of limited government capacity to manage the pathology associated with deficiencies in the ability to deal with international crises shows. Structural constraints and resource management of pathological symptoms mentioned. These symptoms are effectively prevented the development of a comprehensive system of international crises in China and the roots and origins of the concentration of power at the head of the party. Thus, the general public does not have much impact on decisions. Usually when China is facing a crisis, in his first public reaction to the crisis of global leadership positions in their party says and tries to use tools of its own public opinion support. Under the authority of the message and sensitive to the implications for decision-making in critical situations also caution that the news would be contrary to policies to reflect. Criteria and procedures for this type of management are adopted conflicting results have been counterproductive and harmful. (Deng, 2006:) For example, the Chinese government strongly denied the SARS crisis and prevents the infiltration and influence public opinion was on the news this dangerous phenomenon, but the pressure of public opinion news from foreign media, the Chinese government was forced to react against it. In fact, the party leadership's lack of accountability and lack of transparency in the policy was adopted.

New initiative to strengthen the institutional leadership in international crises Chinese management integration plans for emergency responses to the crisis. China's State Council in the years 2005 – 2004 a national plan for emergency response aimed at preventing prepared for unexpected events. The purpose of this project is to provide a unified mechanism for anticipating and responding to national and international crises and domestic crises. The design of the party leadership and resources for resolving structural obstacles in the management are presented. The plan requires all ministries to cooperate and supervision of the Ministry of Internal Affairs is responsible for the design and management of the crisis. In the event of international crises on the internal dimensions of the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, security and so on the external dimension in the design and management of international crises participate. National Emergency Management Agency was formally established in 2005 to deal with international crises. Inter-agency cooperation and coordination required by the State Council and the representatives of the duties of the office. China's constitution in great condition for sensitive international crises such as the financial crisis and the anticipated invasion (Deng, 2006).

Therefore, to predict how the Agency will act in the face of international crises is very difficult and this requires a greater understanding of the response of the ruling party and government leadership. Culturally and politically, the Chinese nation's tradition of collective decision-making and consensus follow and obey the highest levels of the

social hierarchy of the family has its roots in the teachings of Chinese education is.

In short, the distinguishing feature of Chinese in international crisis management can be a side effect of grand strategy in this country on its approach to crisis management and the other in the policies of macroeconomic stability stated.

Factors associated with decision-making and decision-making in crisis management, strategic decision-making process in China, unlike liberal democracies first and second focuses on the media and the general public have little effect and trends and circumstances after the Cold War had a great impact on the decision making process and is a continuation of the previous trend. Hence, leaders or elite ruling Communist Party is manifested, capable of making large-scale and long-term crisis management in the context of this policy.

Past experience has taught in China in the form of a share in the success of strategic culture more in the regional crisis management through bargaining Earth herself. Moreover, China's successful experience from outside the region, to learn as much as possible in this country outside the region is not present crisis. This isolationism and regionalism China is mainly a strategic decision: a peaceful rise. In the end, China's influence in the following way: the balance of soft power to persuade the United States to China's political and military considerations, influence and take advantage of economic opportunities, especially in the sense that the Chinese economy has shown very little vulnerable and still retains the capacity to grow.

9. Russian experience and crisis management

Russians during the Cold War Cuban Missile Crisis brought to the brink o a nuclear war. Perhaps the words of Thomas Schelling of the major causes of the roots of the problem, namely the Russian resort to force, fear of failure to resolve the crisis peacefully. In fact, in security and psychological perception of their decision to adopt this approach prevailing. Russians win at zero sum game-losing to look at the management of international crises. Russian international treatment strategy has always been that the cards can be won by force behind the conference table. New evidence that the Russian military action in Georgia over South Ossetia in 2008 that the territorial and ethnic crises. Historical examples of this kind, it is common to Soviet military intervention in Cuba in 1977 in Ethiopia 78 years, soviet military intervention in Angola, Soviet efforts to deploy missile installations in Cuba in 1962, in the soil, and its invasion of Afghanistan in 1978 with the goal of having the winning card for negotiating and bargaining with America note.

In 1961 the Berlin Wall crisis, America and the Soviet Union, to the extent a provision of military investment and staffing went. In 1945 crisis, Azerbaijan, Iran, the United States put pressure on Russia to withdraw from the occupied territories of Iran's nuclear ultimatum. Russians are thought to hold the areas occupied during World War II in talks with the West, especially America benefit from a balanced situation.

America's Foreign Minister George Marshall said:"The Soviet leaders had thought that having the military and go to the extent of negotiation and dialogue can specify preconditions and their opponents by surprise." Richard Pipes, said: "The Soviet leaders' perceptions of foreign policy, national security and international crisis management elements of Soviet military power was exaggerated. They have forgotten the art of diplomacy and the art of war in international negotiations to come to America and the West pulled and military pay policy (Adomeit, 1982).

Brzezinski and Huntington addition to the above issues, particularly exaggerated military element, the element in the thinking of the leaders of the Soviet ideology in the face of international crises described. From the perspective of these two ideological behaviors on national security policy of the Soviet Union had complete control. In the Soviet era, the ideology, the red line in the external behavior of the Russians and the crime was betrayed and betraying the cause of the proletariat were interpreted And the enemy crossed the ideological values were considered as rape and war could just stop it (Herman, 1985).

10. Russia's approach to crisis management

Russian management of international crises by historical traditions of Russian behavior at the international level. The management of archaeological or territory of Tsarist Russians, the Russians and Soviet Russia, and their resultant emergence of a common political behavior of the tsars is. The same behavior can be called Russian political strategy of international behavior. This approach has the overtones of this strategy at the national level on the risky behavior of the Russians and the foundation pillars of the ideological, military power and geopolitical dominance is detected (Adomeit, 1982). This is a dangerous and aggressive strategy and the risks to their own historical memory Mala recorded. Aggressive motivation in adopting this strategy of seeking territorial expansion, borders, territorial and military interventions.

Tsarist rule in Russians territorial expansion in the Caucasus and Central Asia began to quiver and bow they took Heart and parts of Iran in the Qajar era. Russians Soviet military intervention in the crisis of the Prague Spring, East Germany and Poland in the 1960s was invoked. Russians reacted to the crisis of the Soviet era invasion of Afghanistan in 1978 to attempt hidden.

When you see the weakness of the Russian crisis in international crisis management in order to earn more bargaining resorting to force. Whatever the crisis the country is closer to Russia's borders, it also increases the possibility of a military attack. Historical examples of this country in the 1970s,

Czechoslovakia, Poland and East Germany 1960 and Georgia in 2008. Now days, diplomacy, arms and diplomacy, military and economic power in the last column are the foundation of the management (Adomeit, 1982).

Generally, either before or after the collapse of the Soviet Union, Russia's response to the crisis, the least threat to national security or strategic interests have been followed, Primarily through the use of military force or the threat of it has been done. In other words, the initial reaction to the crisis Russians have always been a binary opposition.

The latest example of this behavior, various reactions to Russia between 2007 and 2009 to design a missile defense shield in Eastern Europe, America and Georgia also showed provocative behavior. Russian response to the issue of a range of military actions to threats of military action category. Unilateral withdrawal from the Treaty on Conventional Forces Europe Aiming missiles into Eastern Europe, threatened to deploy Eskandar missiles in Kaliningrad and ultimately a military attack on Georgia in August 2008, samples of the Russian response to threats and crises considered.

It can act in the face of crisis in Russian cultural space and normative studied. It would not confirm the withdrawal of Russian strategic issues. This is in the era of the former Soviet Union and Russia has the same syntax. In the Cold War, the government, international relations and the international norm, The cultural and ideological issues such as war, peace, security , justice and national interests on the cultural context to explain it. The very definition of the Soviet enemy, friend, ally and rival offered. Now, in Russia the same definition of the concepts presented, with the difference that the ideological content and interpretation of these concepts is small but the revival of Russia follows. The normative image of exaggerated idea of military power with the purpose to intimidate others. The theme of the relationship between politics and culture, mythology and politics appears. Myth revival of Russian history and restore the undisputed power of the Soviet Union, the common cultural and normative issues in the management of international crises that era Russian and Russian current period. A similar line in the management of international crises categories concentric to the ideology and technology. In that era and now also of military technology and strategic assessment of ideology-oriented mind set and mentality of the Soviet Communist Russians wing ideology of Russian nationalism, Russia has learned. Has a historical link between military technology, power and ideology in the management of international crises, there have been Russian. Energy weapons technology and power tools are Russians. Develop strategic relationships with some Latin American countries, strategic cooperation with China and India, Arms and energy diplomacy with some Middle Eastern countries, and above all energy policy for Europe retaliatory bases of the columns named in the management of international crises is Russian (Alexander, 2005).

11. The decision of the Russian crisis management

Typology of management decision-making process in line with international crises of the Cold War and bureaucratic organization like the Red Army and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and Soviet intelligence service had a major role and today is still the governor of Russia's security services and the military in government benefits. Domestic and foreign policy during the Cold War system, a decision by the party. National security policy was developed with the Politburo Euro and personnel specified in the proxy role played by international crisis management and according to their behavior and self-possession and had a will. Russian management of international crises was the decision of the administrative hierarchy and those decisions were appointed. Nowadays, in the new Russia, the mechanism has changed over the past decisions of the President and the National Security Council is involved in these matters. However, when Prime Minister Vladimir Putin to the presidency after, he was also one of the key decisions is spines. The mentality of the past, history and methods of Communist influence in the decisions of the post-Cold War era. Therefore, some analysts believe that the communist ideology and party structure in the management of international crises to new Russian crystallized. Most importantly, their mutual exaggerated impression of military power and advance to the extent of the crisis is a threat of war. In the fight against imperialism was indicted today for the revival of Russian power. (Herman, 1985)

In total, Russia after the Cold War and the maximum accepted that an isolated power at the regional level is a great power. Russia is a power between China and Europe Union. On the one hand, China's economic power, and the influence off it can be achieved in this way, on the other hand, the broad relationships with many parts of the world, especially Europe Union, the United States has not. However, Russia has shown that a strict policy for the management of international crises. At the regional level, it simply does not accept the presence and influence of powers outside the region and outside the region are largely in the United States has enough tools to balance the directions and the consequences of acting in this field demands that the United States will get more opportunities in the international arena for Moscow to consider or at least multilateral policies and adopt measures to ensure that a minimum of Russia's power and influence. Russia is greatly affected by the experience and insight to the identity policy decisions reflects Russia's position on the status of "superpower" or "great power" of giving. As a result, Russia, unlike China, is a soft approach to crisis management does not believe has been tough trying to learn the position.

12. The resulting discussion

Great powers in the management of international crises after the Cold War have certain conditions. On the one hand, the transitions from an international order are uncertain and in this way, suffer in tough competition. In this competition, they have been playing together in the wake of the crisis and seek to resolve the issue to make a similar game. The competition was tough and so unlike the Cold War, mostly not to win points and interests, but also to change or maintain international order and find a better place or maintain a place in the present.

On the other hand, due to the release of political and security decision that has been made in the post-Cold War, the major powers heavier security agenda and, in many cases, the power crisis can occur too often they cooperate with each other can lead to resolving the crisis. Terrorism-related crises (especially in the case of al-Qaeda in Afghanistan), the spread of nuclear weapons, and more recently, the global economic crisis are one of those cases.

Thus, in the post-Cold War era, the prevailing crisis management is a complex process in which, great powers compete with each other and within a matter of international concern such as terrorism and work together to solve problems. In this complex process, the management of international crises, largely as a function of the power and influence of each of the big powers. The most important is that the benefits of power management of the crisis are over. Then, in the presence or absence of adjacent critical, and a plurality of terms related to the security crisis or economic and political crisis, a very important factor in determining the direction of international crises in recent times. In such circumstances, the study aims and approach of the four major powers in international crisis management can light the path to power for the purposes of crisis management in the international system is a transitional.

International crisis management approach is a combination of American unilateralism and multilateralism which aims to promote national interests, international Security and influence in the international arena and this is done with the help of the capacities of NGOs, Two and multilateral diplomacy and military capabilities to fulfill accepts forms and in different ways. America's strategic culture and the decision to intervene in international crises continue to have, but in the after math of the Cold War has always aimed to establish America's leadership in the world has followed.

European crisis management, crisis management practices compared with the US, the division of labor and Mitigation refers to a country. Collective action in crisis management, risks arising from its distribution among the countries involved. The components can be used as an economic, political influence and the use of common facilities in adopting this style of crisis management ignored. European crisis management aims to gain more credibility and soft power to pursue its role in the international arena and is based on international cooperation, European institutions, international

organizations and shared identity. In the post-Cold War strategic culture of Europe more democratic decision-making structure is based on the use of soft power is and work with America looking multilateralism is to enhance its international status.

Chine sensationalist and Marxist ideology and hierarchy of decision making and cultural background, to distinguish the Chinese crisis management styles in crisis management. Chinese crisis management mechanisms with the functional elements of the party leadership in the decision-making process along. Centralized decision-making and the media and public opinion have no effect on it. The Chinese government aims to achieve economic security and stability in crisis management is considered and looking for bargains in order to further the interests of education. This style of crisis management, strategy, macro precedence over other policies and soft power resources used to achieve it all. After the Cold War, China's strategic culture is focused on the avoidance of conflict and decision-making structure has arisen. Multilateralism and promotion of new approaches to international economic cooperation, China is around.

In international crisis management approach of Russian military power, ideology, economic and military technology has always been an influential role in the new era of military power in international crisis management and energy diplomacy aimed at restoring Russia's power will be used. The revival of Russian history and influence in the former Soviet sphere of influence, especially in peripheral areas of the main objectives of the Russian crisis management. Russian strategic culture is based on the use of military power and centralized decision-making structure is still continuing, but multilateralism with the aim of restoring the power of Russia, Russia's new approach.

In general, the transformation of the international system, two types of challenges in the field of international crisis management has put forward the great powers. On the one hand, the former order and taken to the great powers seek to maintain and upgrade its previous position, and in this way, they are pressed together. On the other hand, the transformation of the international system, the degree of freedom of the two poles of his former experiences that have led to a chaotic region and security agenda of the power in the region has increased. In other words, any of its powers with multiple crises in the face of the crisis is past. Free broad political decision in this regard, a large number of emerging countries to develop and expand efforts for democracy in this country, foreign policy created a very serious crisis, resulting in ever increasing amounts of political, military, economic and social.

Strong impact on the structure of the international system as a result of the great powers, these powers is a very flexible and competitive experience. This competition is challenging opportunities super power and assistance from outside the region and international powers to

resolve countless lists of crises. The conflict in Afghanistan and Iraq, and Palestine, has shown that the crisis is very complex and simply could not find a concentration of power in one or two pole end. Thus, the prospect of a far more complex than the competition and cooperation of these powers can be traced.

References

Adomeit, Hannes (1973" (Soviet Risk Taking and Crisis Behaviour, From Confrontation to Coexistence?" Adelphi Paper, no. 101, International Institute of Strategic Studies .

Alexander, Arthur J" (**1984**).Modelling Soviet Defense Decision Making "in Jiri Valenta and William C. Potter (eds) Soviet Decision Making for National Security) London; Boston: George Allen and Unwin)

Busek, Erhard (2009) "Too Little, Too Late: Europe Needs Better Crisis Management", Korber Policy Parper, no.7 .

Caldwell, Dan (1989) "The Cuban Missile Affair and the American Style of Crisis Management", Parameters, vol.XIX.no.1 .

Caporaso, James (1997" (Across the Great Divide: Integrating Comparative and International Politics", International Studies Quarterly, no.41 .

Christensen, Thomas J" (**2006**).Windows and War", China's Foreign Relations: Essays in Honor of Allen S. Whiting (Stanford, Ca.: Stanford University Press) .

Cosgrove, Carl (2001) Europe, Diplomacy and Development (New York: Palgrave)

Dannereuther, Ronald and John Peterson (2006) "Security Strategy as Doctrine" in Ronald Dannereuther and John Peterson (eds) Security Strategy and Transatlantic Relations (London: Routledge)

Deng Yong (2006" (Reputation and the Security Dilemma: China Reacts to the China Threat Theory" in Alastair Iain Johnston and Robert Ross (eds) New Approaches to the Study of China's Foreign Policy (Stanford, Ca: Stanford University Press)

EU Crisis Response Capability Revisited" (2005) Crisis Group Europe Report, no.160 .

Gudgle, Andy (2004) "Chinese Crisis Management", The Heritage Foundation no.1-3 .

Herman, Richard K. (1985) Perceptions and Behavior in Soviet Foreign Policy (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press)

Houben, Marc (2005) International Crisis Management: the Approach of European States (London: Routledge)

Huntington, Samuel (1383), "Culture, Power, and Democracy" in globalization, power and democracy, gathering marking Asmular Platner and Alexander, translated Cyrus grace and Ahmed Rashidi(Tehran: the desert).

Kaibin, Zhong (2007) "Crisis Management in China", China Security (Winter)

Neack, Laura (2003) The New Foreign Policy: US and Comparative Foreign Policy in the 21stCentury (Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.)

Perret, Quentin (2006) "The European Union and Crisis Management", European Issues, Robert Schuman Foundation, no.22 .

Waltz, Kenneth (2000) "Structural Realism after the Cold War", International Security, Vol.25. No.1 (Summer(

Wuxinbo (2007) "Understanding Chinese and U.S. Crisis Behavior", The Washington Quarterly, no.8. (Winter).