

Martin MAŠĽAN *

The difficulties in relations with Russia and Arab Spring as a most important factors affecting the security in Europe

Trudności w relacjach Rosja – Wiosna Arabska jako najważniejsze aspekty wpływające na bezpieczeństwo w Europie

Streszczenie: Bezpieczeństwo w Europie jest bardzo ważnym i aktualnym tematem. Odpowiedni poziom bezpieczeństwa wymaga dużych nakładów finansowych. Największe gospodarki europejskie wydają na ten cel sumy, które plasują je wśród dziesięciu krajów na świecie, które mają największe wydatki na cele militarne. Jeśli weźmiemy pod uwagę to, że takie kraje jak Francja, Wielka Brytania i Niemcy wydają na te cele blisko 165 miliardów dolarów rocznie, to zasadność tych wydatków może zostać zakwestionowana, ponieważ nasza umiejętność reagowania na zagrożenie w obliczu fali migracyjnej w zasadzie bliska jest zeru. Pomimo że zagrożenie jest realne, jesteśmy w stanie tylko rozmawiać, działać kolektywnie powoli i nieefektywnie. Europejska społeczność nie jest absolutnie przygotowana na radzenie sobie w sytuacji kryzysowej. Mowa tu nie tyle o braku rozwiązań dla sytuacji związanej z falą migrantów, co o nieumiejętności dwustronnej współpracy w zapewnieniu bezpieczeństwa granic.

Słowa kluczowe: polityka zagraniczna, konflikt zbrojny, migracja, stosunki międzynarodowe, niestabilność, uchodźcy, współpraca

Abstract. The security of Europe is a very important and frequent topic. The required security level needs a lot of financial costs and the strongest European economics spend on this purpose amounts which rank them among the ten world countries with the largest military expenditures. If we take into consideration that countries such as France, Great Britain and Germany spend for this area approximate USD 165 bilion per year, then the effectiveness of these expenses is very questionable because our ability to face a danger or only react on existing migration wave is substantially close to zero. Although we are threatened, we are able only to discuss, act collectively, slowly and inefficiently. European community is absolutely not prepared for the management of crisis situations. I do not mean the lack of immediate solutions to stop the migrants flow but the inability to mutually coordinate the activities, serving to protect the borders.

Key words: foreign policy, military conflict, migration, international relation, instability, refugees, cooperation

Received: 03.2016

Accepted 06.2016

* Ing., Vysoká škola bezpečnostného manažérstva v Košiciach, Ústav ekonomickej a technickej bezpečnosti, Košice, Slovensko

INTRODUCTION

Nowadays Europe can be proud of existing for more than 70 years without a war, which is probably the longest period in its history. Of course, smaller conflicts have occurred in this period, but even though this period could be called as peaceful. War was typical for the history of this continent, the most important war conflicts have been fought and decided on this territory. The war was also an important export commodity of this continent which have been exported to the countries of all continents for a very long time. The population of Europe have been always formed mostly by Christians, but their mania for fight and war has a lot of common characteristics with the Muslim militants, who are nowadays strongly scoured and criticized. The actual situation in Europe shows, that we still have not learnt from our history, we have forgotten where Iron Curtain was situated. We still have tendency for confrontation rather than cooperation. A lot of Europeans consider the former socialist countries as Slovakia or Hungary as a part of Eastern Europe up to these days. This may be due to the lack of their geographical knowledge, or by the fact that their Europe end at the eastern border of Schengen area. In case they are able to take into consideration Europe finishing at Ural, they would know that these countries belong to the central Europe. It is a typical feature of our European coexistence. We do not want to cooperate with Russia in building of secure Europe, despite the fact that it takes more than a third part of European territory, historically and also actually has in this continent very important position. We do not take in to consideration that this country has defeated fascism, since the end of World War II is a nuclear superpower, has very important mineral sources, which are an essential part for functioning of economies. Their gradual depletion constantly increasing their importance. The truth also is that this state realize its status and adapt it's behaviour in case of necessity. But this is typical for powerful contemporary world.

The rising expenses for military combined with more and more arrogant and aggressive global policy may mean the end of peaceful period in Europe. We are facing now to two cardinal problems, first is a migration wave which have been caused by Western policy, second is military conflict in Ukraine caused by permanent confrontation of "pro-Russian" and "pro-European"

forces in this country. We already realise, that our effort for Ukrainian joining to NATO was the same absurdity and provocation as for example Mexico connection in to the former Warsaw pact which have been brought into effect one year after the finish of Carribbean crisis. Each independent state has a right to decide about it's policy, but the results of both integration experiments could be probably the same, regardless of its democratic nature.

Aggressivity and confrontational nature of actual world policy can be declared by answering of one of involved person on question regarding the USA enemies. Direct response Iran and Putin, in the context of running pre-election battle and thus the possible future direction of the most important world power, does not need absolutely any comment. We used to diplomacy, tolerance and decency in responses of politicians only a few years ago. Into the risks and dangers have been involved for example hunger and misery in the world, the necessity of environmental protection and deepening of social inequality. In case the foreign policy and international relations are conceived in this way then will always be valid that higher expenses for the security means the less secure continents and world.

CREATING THE SECURE EUROPE WITHOUT RUSSIA IS IMPOSSIBLE

It is obvious that the relations between Russia and the European Union (EU) after the fall of the Iron Curtain and the dissolution of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) can not be characterized otherwise than strained. Collapse of the USSR and the entire socialist bloc and the changes that took place in the states did not mean an expected mitigation in international tension. We can also find some period of warming in mutual relations, but tension was still present with various intensity. Annexation of the Crimea and conflict in Ukraina have significantly affected EU-Russia relationships. It is necessary to realize, that Russia is and always was a world power, which defend their interests around the world. The same behaviour is typical also for other major international players. The collapse of Soviet empire allowed the formation of new European states which have a lot of experiences with the Soviet governance and therefore logically tried to find a support and protection in the integration groups. Presently countries as Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia are EU and also NATO members. Unfortunately Europe is still missing the constructive dialogue between the Alliance and Russia. Redistri-

bution of powers in Europe, continuous efforts to extend the alliance directly to the borders of Russia, as well as the increase the number of its members in Europe evokes the feeling of threat in Russia and increasing efforts to stop this trend. The result is a growing nervousness and military spending, which is declared by approval of a National Security Strategy RF 2020 and security policy. This document was approved in 2009 and very precisely defines Russian position to NATO efforts for extend this alliance towards to Russian borders, as well as the priorities of Russian foreign policy, which is oriented to former CIS countries and the Organisation of the Collective Security Treaty (CSTO), China and India. EU is not defined as a strategic partner of Russia in this document. Russia prefer the open system of collective security in the Euro-Atlantic area. Russia gradually perform the largest reorganization of its army after the 1945, focussing at the reduction of the numbers and professionalization, as well as 70% rearmament of the army. According to this strategy Russia is going to invest about 700 billion USD to modernisation of their weapon systems until the end of 2020. The planned expenses are only a fraction of the costs that were spending for military by former Soviet Union, anyway we can observe their gradual re-increase from 64.5 billion in 2009 to approx. 85 billion in 2014, which represented 4.1% of GDP. In assessing this increase of military spending we have also to take into consideration the most significant growth of the military spending in the US, which have been increased from the amount of 290 billion in 2001 to the current 600 billion USD.

THE PROBLEMS OF RUSSIA'S MINORITIES IN SOME COUNTRIES OF FORMER SOVIET UNION

The serious problem of the states that were created after the collapse of the Soviet Union and the subsequent disintegration of the CIS are numerous Russian minorities which represent up to 40% of the population. We will pay our attention only to countries which have a direct impact on Euro-Russian relations. Ukraine has about 18% of Russians who are situated mainly in the eastern part of the country. In the Crimea, it is for example approx. 58% of the population, in Donetsk and Luhansk region 39% in Kharkiv 26%. Moreover, according to researches, 40% of Ukrainian population consider Russian as their native language. The similar situation is in Baltic republics, because Russians represent 27% of Latvia population (50% of capital Riga), little over

30% of Estonia (37% of capital Tallin), around 5% in Lithuania. The status of the Russian minorities is very problematic. More than half of this ethnic group are without a country, because citizenship can only be obtained by passing the language test. The use of Russian language as the "language of the invaders" is in the official contact prohibited and severely penalized. For example the Latvian state language center has already penalized a thousands of Russian speaking citizens since its founding in 1992. Russians are not citizens of these states without passing the language tests, even though they were born and grew up here. As non-citizens they do not have the basic rights, they can not vote or stand for election. The usual trend is also adaptation of their names into official languages. Any Russians sights are also prohibited. For completeness we have to note that situation of Polish minority living in this countries is very similar.

The Baltic countries are already more than 10 years members of the EU and NATO. Membership in these organizations brings them significant benefits, but should also be associated with following the rules and fulfillment of obligations. The EU belongs to the world leaders in respect of human rights and is based on democratic values. These values are disorted in Baltic countries and unfortunately their respecting does not interest of anyone competent. This can be declared by the fact that during the negotiation about the Estonia's integration into the EU, Estonians refused to use the word „integration“ in connection with Russian minority, or by the statement of the Court of the European Community spokesman that Lithuania has the right turn to Lithuanian language the names of their inhabitants belonging to minorities. This mutual intolerance is rooted in the historical injustices, but such attitudes may lead to spin of new spiral with grievances and vengeances resulting to worse relation with Russia, which is carefully monitoring the situation of their minorities in these countries.

From the global aspect we can tell that insignificant international players provoke a sleeping bear. It is only senseless, dangerous and fortunately still tolerated provocations. The same provocation directed against the citizens of US nationality, living anywhere in the world, cause adequate, resolute and fully justifiable response of USA. Unfortunately we do not pay adequate attention to this aspect, we are not going to form any external pressure and

effort for correct the situation, despite the fact that the EU has a significant number of organizations for democracy and human rights. These rights are respected in absolute majority of European countries. We are immediately informed about the human rights violations in Russia, or any other part of the world, but we know almost nothing about the situation in the countries around the Baltic Sea.

CAUSES AND IMPACTS OF UKRAINIAN CONFLICT

The struggle for power between Russia and Western Europe is typical for Ukraine since its establishment in 1991. These efforts for the domination have led into the election of pro-Russian or pro-Western oriented government. There was no willingness to achieve any consensus that would include reasonable requests of both parties. The government of parties oriented to Moscow have been often ended on the Maidan. Such confrontational policy, bilateral unwillingness to reach a consensus and the integration efforts of Ukraine have gradually escalated tensions, which finally led to the military conflict in this country. The fights are situated to the eastern part of Ukraine, where as we have already mentioned, living large Russian-speaking minority. Conflict has started at the beginning of 2014 and, despite of some effort for cease fire, still continue. The actual situation we could call a tense draw which is not satisfactory for any of involved party. We can consider as positive that any belligerent is not trying now to decide the conflict by increasing of the military pressure on his opponent. But the problem will not be certainly solved by increase of defense spending declared by Ukraine. Different opinions on justification of fighting parties requirements means introduction of economic sanctions between EU and Russia. The mutual exchange between Russia and the EU have been decreased about more than 10% after the introduction of sanctions. Very interesting is that exchange between the US, as one of the most important initiators of the sanction introduction, and Russia have been increased about 7% at the same period.

Russia is trying to find a new strategic partners due to the existing problematic relations with Europe and breakdown of mutual trade exchange. The logical choice was China, the country with gradual increase of international importance and one of the fastest growing economies in the world. Exchange between Russia and China has a growing trend and should reach

the planned level of 100 billion USD per year. The countries have signed a lot of contracts, the most important of them are contracts for supply of natural gas in total amount 400 billion USD and monetary agreement. The main goal of the agreement is strengthening the yuan and weakening the international position of the US dollar as official international reserve currency which is used for a large part of world trade. US dollar status is a remnant of postwar period and Bretton Woods Agreement in 1944. China has already signed the same currency agreement with Japan, South Korea, Brazil, Argentina, but for example also with London, Paris, Frankfurt and Zurich. The agreements themselves do not have the strength to put an end to the dollar's role as world reserve currency themselves, but they still weaken this currency and its share gradually drops to today's 60%. About 25% of reserves are currently created in EUR (introduction of the common European currency has been so far the most sensitive weakness of USD), but more than 40 central banks create the currency reserves also in yuan. Another example of cooperation between China and Russia is also about 60 joint projects which are now in different stages of implementation. Some of them were currently delayed or postponed due to the slower economic growth in China and Russia's problems. Main Russian problems are associated with decline of the ruble, falling oil prices as the main export item of this country and obtaining the finance due to economic sanctions. These circumstances have negative impact on cooperation between these countries in 2015, when is estimated reduction about 30%. Very important for Europe is a fact that Russia has started to turn away from Europe.

The regular reasons of world tensions are raw material resources. It is difficult only to guess how many resources are located on Russian territory. In the 80s of the last century the resources of oil as the basis of all economies have been estimated for approximate 50 years. Nowadays we know that we have much more oil than we previously estimated, but consumption is also still growing as well as the importance of resource development.

Economic war in Europe can not win even one of the involved parties. The final result, since we compete only on this continent, will be only the overall weakness of Europe and its international status. Both the players involved basically shooting only own goals. Economic problems of Russia

could mean the higher nervousness of this country resulting to dangerous solutions and situations. Due to this reason Ukrainian conflict and possible future development in the Baltic countries could have some common features. What will happen if Russia decides to defend the rights and interests of Russian minorities living in this region? Of course these states are members of the alliance and have signed the pact about the collective security, but it is controversial if alliance risk the global conflict in event of any Russian intervention due to the countries where live around six million inhabitants, furthermore 2 millions of them are Russians. Theoretically? Certainly so. Really? It could be better never to know. Our policy and pushing Russia close to the acceptable limits increase a chance that this country could decide to bear a risk of such confrontation.

TENSE AND DANGEROUS SITUATION IN THE COUNTRIES OF NORTH AFRICA AND MIDDLE EAST

The revolutionary wave called the Arab Spring have passed in the African and Middle Eastern countries since 2011. The wave have been started by Jasmine revolution in Tunisia and quickly crossed the Tunisian border. Another African revolutionary countries were Morocco, Egypt, Libya, Syria, Kuwait or Yemen. The main cause of this revolutionary wave could be found in the fact that the Western world has accepted, legitimized and started to support the Muslim Brotherhood, as a legal opponent of existing regimes (military, presidential) in these countries. We have again decided to assert our interests and started to intervene to the internal affairs of independent and sovereign states. Unfortunately such interference is presently a rule not exception. We have supported a Pan-Arabism whose motto is "Jihad is our way. Dying on the way of Allah is our highest hope", the movement which has been previously prohibited in the most countries. The reasons of our support could be various, one could be our effort to weaken the Russian influence in Middle Eastern and Mediterranean area another could be efforts of African states to build the African Union (AU). First step for its creation was the signing of the Declaration of Syrte (Libya), which was prepared according to the EU model. Muammar Gaddafi became a president of AU in 2009. He has turned attention to the important questions as African currency, passports and also idea about the creation of United States of Africa. Of course we are talking only about the efforts, but it is questionable whether

the consolidated and economically united Africa is acceptable and satisfactory for everybody.

The parliamentary elections have been subsequently appealed in the countries where the revolutions have been already passed. We have disregarded the fact that the western-style elections have in most of these countries absolutely no importance due to the religion, different historical development and life style. Paradoxically, such election can for example lead to the situation happened in Weimar Germany (victory of Hitler). The result of such election can thus be worse regimes than those we originally wanted to overthrow. The winners of the elections were a parties of the Pan-Arabism Muslim Brotherhood. In Egypt the Muslim Brotherhood and Mursi tried to monopolize power, they wanted to usurp a competences which did not have either the pharaohs. However, we have still supported them even in time when 30 million Egyptians have been demonstrating against them in the streets. Situation in Egypt after the "democratic elections" can be characterized by the answer of new parliament member on question „Where are the women who played very important role in revolution, but they are not in parliament“ he replied: "They are in our hearts ". This is a normal position of women in the Muslim world and it is still senseless to expect any serious changes in the present. Another example for functionality of such elections could be Libya. Justice and Development Party (Muslim Brotherhood) finished only on the second place in 2012, but in fact became the largest and leading party in parliament, because the winner- National Forces Alliance consists of 58 parties and 236 non government organisations . Composition of the winning party is typical for the fragmentation of Libya. It is unthinkable that result of any elections can create a coalition able to lead and manage this country. A much more likely is a longterm military conflict and constant power struggle which is reality today.

The revolutionary waves had in these countries a different development. We can consider them as a successful in countries where they have taken place by mostly bloodless form it means in countries such as Egypt, Tunisia or Morocco. It is necessary to emphasize the fact that success is evaluated only through small number of victims and we do not take into account the possible impacts of these waves on international relations. However, exist

some countries, where the revolutionary changes have not overrun by peacefully forms such as Libya and Syria. Unfortunately we have to say that revolutions ment military conflict, the number of casualties and chaos for these countries. Their territory is now divided into several parts, controlled by rival warring parties. These long-lasting conflicts have a negative impact on the local population and create a strong migratory pressure that must be managed by Europe, as well as by countries that share borders with these conflicts. If migrate such a large number of Muslim population, it is mostly impossible to find and select the Islamic radicals, who can come easily to the territory of the European countries. We have already had a several possibilities to watch the practical deployment of Islamic fighters and passions created by their deployment among the majority of the European population. Probably we will have to face the same threats also in future.

We can say that Africa already has its own color revolution-Jasmine. If we take into account the results of color revolutions which have been already carried out in Europe, we should Tunisians rather to regret. All of us know what was a result of Rose and Orange revolutions for Georgians and Ukrainians. It is a typical paradox of our time that the success of the Muslim Brotherhood is caused by the economy and civilization of the West. We have only achieved the destabilisation of this region by our involvement. We have overthrown the functional and friendly regimes that cooperated with us for a long time and we replaced them with new which could be devious and perhaps even worse.

MIGRATION TO THE EUROPE AND ITS POSSIBLE SECURITY EFFECTS

The current migration is not a normal immigration which daily meet the USA. It's coordinated and organized migration of nations to the Europe. Instead of efforts to quickly remove the causes of existing conflicts and non-functioning protection of our borders, Europeans probably prefer to eliminate the long-lasting consequences. Unfortunately it will be neither cheap nor easy. We can say that EU is totally dysfunctional state department in border protection. Entity of the states has always been associated with the territory, boundaries and their defense in the history. It is very difficult to imagine that a similar situation could exist on the borders of the United States or Russia. In fact EU's border protection partially corresponds to its

overall functioning. Here's a lot of states and interests, difficult and lengthy agreements, actions of central authorities without the necessary seriousness and competence, in contrast of those which exist for example in the USA. Typical example for effectiveness of central European authorities could be immigrants quotas. How many European countries follow the regulation about the quotas? The introduction of quotas is solution for redistribution of migrants among the member states, but without a final estimate of the number of persons that will be divided among them, loses its meaning. There are various estimates of the number, but any precise estimate of the final status is more or less impossible in actual situation. The fact that Europe wants to help has been already shown, but such aid should not exceed the acceptable level. Declared opening of European doors is a mistake not from the perspective of necessity to help, it is human and in case of existence the appropriate conditions fully understandable. It is mistake in time when we are able to handle existing flow of migrants only with a great difficulties and we're not absolutely able to select them. Such declaration only increase their future numbers.

We absorb enormous numbers of migrants now. Europe has already met the similar situation and had a lot of experiences with migration, for example about 672,000 people migrated to the EU in 1992 and 424,000 in 2001. According to the estimates, the number of migrants to the territory of the EU will exceed these figures at the end of this year. The main reason for migration is the conflict in Syria-more than five millions of locals have left the territory of this country,another reasons are situation in Afghanistan and Eritrea. Migrant population can be divided into refugees and economic migrants, who are coming for economic reasons. Europe is their destination due to the possibility to achieve much higher standard of living. Important is also existing European legislation concerning family reunification. While refugees (persons who have been at risk of life in the home country) have internationally guaranteed rights and mostly fulfill the conditions for asylum granting, the same for economic migrants is very individual. In case the asylum will not be granted for them, they should be returned to their country of origin. It is very difficult (mostly impossible) and expensive to sort this part of migrants and return them back to home. In case of successful completion of

the asylum process, applicants has a right for normal accommodation and family reunion, so their final number will be increased again. The number of migrants in Europe is still in principle negligible (whether in absolute terms or per 1 inhabitants) in comparison to the numbers in refugee camps in Turkey (1.6 million), Lebanon (1.1 million refugees in comparison with 4 million inhabitants) and Jordan (600,000). Most of these migrants would like to reach European countries. In case we stop their flow to Europe we will have to provide assistance for them who stay in camps. The problem will be solved only a partially. Final solution is finishing the war in Syria. The basic positive of migration is providing the missing part of population in productive years, enriching the social and cultural exchange. The essential condition of these positive impacts is successful integration of refugees / migrants into the host society. Successful migration requires the coordination and managing the migrants, their consistent inclusion into normal life, as well as their positive (neutral) acceptance by the majority population. Unless we do not meet to these conditions, either due to absence of a common immigration and asylum policy, or for other reasons, then costs associated with migratory flow will markedly exceeds its potential benefits.

Instead of migration positives, it can mean a future economic problems and decline in living standards of the majority resulting to consequential increase of anti-minority feelings. Such feelings always provide the fertile ground for the popularity growth of radical parties, which are always able to provide very simple, fast and effective solutions. The victory of radicals in one or two smaller European countries does not mean the serious menace, but if they take a power in ten states with 70% of European population, then Europe will be changed and attenuated. Currently, it is still unimaginable for us, but according to our past experiences it is not impossible. Europe is still a important player with considerable military and economic strength which is gradually decreasing by the actual short-sighted foreign policy containing minimum of pro-European elements. This policy release a space for other world powers. Europeans already pay for strained relations with Russia and mutual sanctions. The overall situation could lead to a general tension and recession in the region, which only repeatedly escalate the existing nervousness and pressure.

CONCLUSION

The Russia is involved in the Syrian conflict through the air and maritime forces . The Russian campaign is criticized but much less than for example 5 or 10 years ago. All involved parties become aware of necessity to solve the problem in Syria. The solution of this problem only with use of domestic-Syrian sources either non-exist or is in sight. Russian military involvement in the Syria is criticized mainly from two perspectives. First is dying of the civilians and second are strikes against the „moderate“ Syrian opposition which is supported by Euro-Atlantic structures. Civilians were always dying during the air strikes , whether these attacks have been led by Russia or NATO in the past. This is unfortunately inevitable and charakteristic for those operations. The question is the justness or pointless of foreign military participation in existing conflict, which always has its genesis and causes. Phrase Syrian moderate opposition is the same logical nonsense , as the possibility to wage a moderate war with lasting for example 2 months, fighting only in the Staurday afternoon and number of victims not exceeding number 150. The sense of moderate is restrained, while retaining an appropriate margin, in this word are contained elements of self-control, self-restraint, reticence. As a moderate opposition can be considered Slovakian right-wing parties, which have lost the election, but do not try to create own military forces for overthrow of legal government. In contrast, the moderate opposition of Syria has such military forces which openly fighting against the Syrian government. When such opposition is moderate from the Euro-Atlantic point of view, than same criteria of moderation are also fulfilled by forces of Islamic state on Syrian territory or pro-Russian rebels in Ukraina. A several very surprising but agreeable signals have been already sent during the Russian campaign in Syria. One of them was range and accuracy of missiles fired from the Russian fleet in the Caspian Sea. We can say today that Caspian volley largely redistribute the balance of power in the conflict region. Russia supports Syria's president Bashar Assad as a legitimately elected representative of the country The same Assad is not acceptable by Western countries due to his methods of governance. European countries have already started to realize the seriousness of the problem with still growing number of new refugees on their territory due to the Syrian conflict. Everybody who is involved know

that flow of migrants could be managed and stopped only after the completion of war in Syria.. This situation gradually create a space for mutual cooperation and coordination of activities, which are inevitable for peaceful and prosperous Europe.

Secure Europe can not exist without Russia and this fact is gradually taken into consideration by politicians. The continuing cold and strained mutual relations are a permanent threat to this continent. Some change in minds can be declared through a statement of the European Commission president, Jean-Claude Juncker, who has recently warned Russia that EU will always be able to defend its borders (what was a little bit amusing at a time when a thousands of migrants enter to EU territory without coordination) but now he is already talking about the need to change mutual relations. Europe can be the strong, stable and prosperous only on condition that this continent will not finish at the Eastern border of the Schengen area. Mutual consensus and cooperation may enlarge the Europe to the coast of Japan sea. Confrontational policy, which has been so-far performed by all involved parties, can only help to build new Iron Curtain, which is already very good known for a lot of Europeans.

LITERATURE

- PALÁT M.: Determinanty vzniku migrace a statistiky cizinců v Evropské unii, Key publishing, 2015
- AMIN, M., et al. After the Spring: Economic Transitions in the Arab World. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012
- FERGUSSON, N.: Civilizácia, západ a zvyšok sveta, Kaligram 2014
- STICA P.: Migrace a státní suverenita, Pavel Mervart, 2011
- LIŠÁK J.: Medzinárodné vzťahy-Medzinárodná politika, Sofa
- ČENĚK A.: Extremismus, Aleš Čeněk, 2012
- BERANEK, O.: Arabská revoluce, Demokratické výzvy, politický islam a geopolitické dopady, Academia 2011
- LAQUER W.: Posledný dny Evropy. Humanistická Europa nebo islamistická Eurábie? Praha: NLN, 2006.
- SARTORI G.: Pluralismus, multikulturalismus a přistěhovalci, Dokořán, 2011

- HOKAYEM E.: Syria's Uprising and the Fracturing of the Levant. Routledge, 2013
- ČERNÝ K.: Svět politického Islamu, Nakladatelství Lidové noviny, 2012
- GELLNER E.: Nacionalismus, Centrum pro studium demokracie a kultury, 2003
- RUŽIČKA F.,KARVAŠOVÁ Ľ.:Európska diplomacia, Epos, 2012
- KUPKA P. a kol.:Krajní pravice ve vybraných zemích střední a východní Evropy, Mezinárodní politologický ústav Masarykovy univerzity,2009
- PALÁT M.: Mezinárodní migrace a ekonomika v Evropské unii, Key Publishing, 2015
- Kleinschmidt J.Brška M. : Integrácia alebo islamizácia? Dostupné na internete:
http://www.tyzden.sk/sk/kriticka_priloha/kp03_35.php?searchstring=sekularizmus
- Energetická bezpečnosť a mezinárodná politika, Professional Publishing, 2011
- Bezpečnostná rada RF, 2009, *O strategii nacionalnoj bezopasnosti RF 2020*, 13. 5. 2009.
<http://www.scrf.gov.ru/news/437.html>
- Bezpečnostná rada RF, 2009, *Strategia Nacionalnoj bezopasnosti Rossijskoj Federacii do 2020 goda (Utverždena ukazom prezidenta RF ot 12 maja 2009 No 537)*.
<http://www.scrf.gov.ru/documents/99.html>
- <http://www.scritub.com/limba/ceha-slovaca/O-STRATGII-VEOBECNE111951917.php>