

Peter Katzenstein (ed.) (1996) *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Chapter 1: Peter Katzenstein, 'Introduction: Alternative Perspectives on National Security'

The volume offers a sociological institutional perspective on the politics of national security. It considers two determinants of security policy – the cultural-institutional context and the constructed identity of states, governments and other actors. The essays discuss how culture and identity affect national security. Katzenstein argues that the book is useful because it privileges analytical concepts that traditional (neorealist and neoliberal) studies of security ignore or refer to only peripherally.

Norms: collective expectations for the proper behaviour of actors with a given identity. Norms can be constitutive (defining actors' identities) or regulative (functioning as standards prescribing behaviour).

Identity: constructions of nation- and statehood.

Culture: collective models of nation-state authority or identity, carried by custom or law. Refers to both evaluative (norms & values) and cognitive (rules & models) standards.

Existing analytical perspectives: The two dominant paradigms in the area are structural neorealism and neoliberal institutionalism. They agree that anarchy is of key importance; they both focus on how structures affect actors' rationality (competitive international system vs institutions); both assume unitary rational state actors; both focus on systemic context. Katzenstein goes on to summarise various strands of theory, discussing work by Waltz, Keohane (multiple), Gilpin, Krasner, Mearsheimer. The book relaxes two assumptions central to neorealism and neoliberalism: that the international environment should be conceived of only in terms of states' physical capabilities; and that only institutional constraints shape interests.

Determinants of international politics: While neorealism argues that shifts in the balance of relative capabilities are the main determinants, and neoliberalism focuses on the role of institutions, social factors are introduced here. The determinants laid out here are:

- (i) Cultural-institutional context is important, requiring political scientists to look beyond institutions as principles, norms, rules and procedures and to consider cultural aspects.
- (ii) Collective identity: rationalist theories tend not to see actor identities as impacting on the definition of actor interests. Cultural-institutional contexts alter the incentives shaping actors' behaviour and actors' identities themselves. State identities emerge from interaction with domestic and international contexts. As identities change so might the policies they affect.

Thus, the book sets out a more social view of the political environment and argues that political identities are constructed as a result of interaction within the environment, not exogenously given.

Chapter 2: R. Jepperson, A. Wendt & P. Katzenstein, ‘Norms, Identity, and Culture in National Security’

This chapter sets out the analytical perspective of the book. It differs from dominant assumptions in security studies with respect to actors’ behaviour and identities:

1. The argument that the security environments in which states act comprise cultural and institutional, not just material, aspects. (cf neorealists, who focus on materialist elements, like balance of power.)

The international cultural environment consists of at least three layers:

- (i) formal institutions/regimes (NATO, OSCE, arms control regimes);
 - (ii) world political culture (rules of sovereignty, political technologies);
 - (iii) international patterns of amity and enmity (perception of similarly powerful/close countries as friend or foe depending on ideational factors).
2. Cultural environments affect both incentives for state behaviour and the nature/identity of states. (Neorealists argue that actors’ properties are essential to them and exogenous to the environment.)

Effects of external cultural environments on state identities (and so security interests and policies) are:

- (i) Effect on states’ prospects for survival at all;
- (ii) Effect of the environment on the modal character of statehood in the system over time;
- (iii) Variation in the character of statehood

The authors locate the arguments presented in the book on a map:

Unit/Environment Relations (degree of construction of units by environment)	High	IR: Marxism? Dom: Statism?	Sociological Perspectives	High
	Low	IR: Realism Dom: Bureaucratic politics	IR: Neoliberalism Trad. deterrence theory Dom: Custom, law	Low
		High	Low	
		Cultural and institutional density of environments		

They make some comments about the map:

First, two common misunderstandings are addressed: the assumption that materialist theories are about conflict and cultural theories about cooperation; and the practice of including cultural factors in apparently materialist theories. Second, they stress again that this book is distinct from mainstream security studies not because of the extent to which power and coercion are seen to matter in IR, but because of the question of whether the use of power can be explained by material factors alone, ignoring ideational and cultural factors. Third, three kinds of environmental effects are distinguished: those affecting actors’ behaviour, those affecting the contingent properties of actors (identities, interests), and those affecting the actual existence of actors.

Attention is then turned to the types of arguments presented in the essays:

- (i) Effects of norms - cultural or institutional elements of states' environments (e.g. norms) shape states' national security interests or policies: the strength of the norms varies and in turn affects the implications for behaviour.
- (ii) Effects of norms - cultural or institutional elements of states' environments shape state identities: identity functions as a link between environmental structures and interests and is a 'mutually constructed and evolving image of self and other' (p.59).
- (iii) Effects of identity - variation or changes in state identity affect the states' security interests or policies: while some interests (e.g. survival) are generic, most depend on a state's construction of self-identity in relation to the conceived identity of others.
- (iv) Configurations of state identity affect interstate normative structures, such as regimes or security communities: that is, states might seek to institutionalise their identity in international structures.
- (v) State policies both reproduce and reconstruct cultural and institutional structure: thus, cultural and institutional structures cannot be separated from the processes by which they mutually produce, reproduce and change each other.

After outlining the methodological approach of the authors – argued to be essentially a non-issue – they make some concluding remarks about the status of the national security studies area. Developments in national security studies can have (and have had) several effects. First, international developments and changing conditions in the international environment see issues previously considered as security concerns become transformed into more general domestic issues (e.g. education). Conversely, domestic policy issues can gain in relevance for the international sphere and be raised to the status of security issues (e.g. immigration).

Changes that have occurred in the security domain and have affected security discourse are the transformation of state actors themselves and the erosion of states' exclusive hegemony over security issues.