international system and should limit their appetite for more power. If not, they would threaten their own existence. Offensive Realists such as John Mearsheimer and DC Copeland think otherwise; they think that yes, there is an attempt to balance the aggressive states, but the balancing is generally not enough and so, the aggressor states may benefit from this inefficiency. Both sides agree that nuclear weapons have little utility for offensive purposes except the cases when only one side of the conflict owns them. Offensive realists expect that the great powers will always look for opportunities to gain advantage over each other.

In the 21st century, the Realist doctrines seem to have problems due to three major problems in world politics that contrast with the Realist worldview. These problem areas are:

The War against Terror: According to Realism, all other actors except the state are unimportant or, at least, not very important. However, the international environment is hugely affected by non-state actors such as the Al-Qaida terrorist organisation. So, the states of the world are facing a threat from a non-state actor and the Realists have no means to develop a meaningful relationship for terrorism in the international system. Some try to use Samuel P. Huntington’s “clash of civilisations” concept as a general cover to connect the only states but non-state actors, but the Realist theory is not very strong in this point.

Globalisation: Due to globalisation, goods, people, money and information flow from one state to another far more freely than at any previous time in human history. As a result, globalisation reduces the strength of the states as the major actors of international relations and sometimes it limits their sovereignty on their own territories.

Failed States: The concept of “failed state” became important in the studies of IR in the last decade. These states have names, borders, even administrations, but they lack the power associated with normal functions of state. For instance, Chad, Iraq, and Rwanda are failed states: They cannot exercise authority and rule of law over their citizens, they cannot collect taxes, they cannot provide services that a state is expected to provide for its citizens such as health, education, roads, safety, etc. So, the failed states are a problem that challenges the Realist school of thought.

In recent years, the major debate in Neorealist circles is the NATO expansion issue. Some as Christopher L. Ball look at it as spreading the stability towards the East, and that the prime objective is regional security. Those who argue against NATO expansion as Michael McGwire claim it will threaten Russia and therefore cause greater insecurity. When we look at both sides, we see that they both operate within the same realist arguments but have different judgements on