Shanghai Cooperation Organization & NATO:

Regional Polarity And Global Governance

Adrian-Florin Lupas

My name is Adrian-Florin Lupas, age 23, a graduate of a Bachelor degree in International Relations from the University of Oradea, Romania, and currently studying European Studies as a postgraduate degree within the same university. My bachelor dissertation topic was "Romanians in the UK, A Case Study", and was centered on the analysis of prejudices and attitudes towards Romanian migrant workers within papers in the UK. I currently work as a political consultant and strategist as well as an authorized translator and my interests include diplomacy, political strategy, dialectics, political philosophy and security studies.

Abstract

Regional blocs and organizations such as the Shanghai Cooperation Organization and NATO have started to assume a more significant role in establishing a clear political, economic and military agenda of their member states and can become the main instrument in solving transnational and global problems. Researching the characteristics of each of the aforementioned organizations and putting their agendas into antithesis is vital to understanding some of the future developments on a global scale. Analyzing the apparition of certain regional structures as instruments of limitation for the classic actors in global governance, the ways in which these structures clash and interact and the limitations to their power is a relatable example to the proposed general theme, worthy of discussion and debate. While the Shanghai Cooperation Organization cannot yet pride itself with the same achievements and initiatives on a global scale as NATO, the leaders of the member states and observing states are representatives of half of humanity and pose a serious question to the dynamic of global governance and regional polarity. The subject at hand, of a comparative and structural analysis of the SCO and NATO is all the more intriguing as we observe that the Shanghai Cooperation Organization can be perceived as one of the tentative limitations to US influence in Asia through NATO, acting as an instrument of global governance. Furthermore, the dynamic that can develop between the two organizations can offer interesting power plays in the not-so-distant future.

Keywords: Global Governance; NATO; Polarity; Regional Influence; SCO.

Introduction

Regional organizations such as the Shanghai Cooperation Organization and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization could be set on a path to taking a more active part in establishing the political, military and, from time to time, economic agendas of member states, while also becoming directly responsible of solving both regional and global issues and representing the interests of the aforementioned members should they succeed in gaining the necessary powers at a supra-national level. In a way, these regional structures appear to be instruments of limitation for the classic actors in the process of global governance. This research paper will focus solely on the above-mentioned organizations, deeming it important to analyze the different contexts in which they were formed, their characteristics and reactionary tendencies, their collaboration or differences with other organizations or each-other as well as the way they shift and will continue to alter regional and global influence, transforming the international stage. While a certain amount of historical analysis is necessary in order to properly comprehend the scope of each organization and their individual objectives, there are some issues to clear up regarding both the SCO & NATO as individual organizations and also a possible scenario of clashes between the two organizations in the future, should the international environment evolve in such a direction. The case study within this research paper will aim to address most of these details, such as possible motives for a future conflict or the established regional and global polarity so that a proper conclusion can be elaborated.

Descriptive Analysis

This part of the paper will focus on laying the descriptive groundwork for the case study to come, pinpointing important moments in each of the two organizations history while also touching on ideas such as context of formation, objectives, agenda, principles and cooperation with neighboring or allied entities.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization was formed in 1949 in an effort to serve three major purposes: the first, and possibly the most important, was deterring the communist threat during the years of the Cold War and halting Soviet expansion, followed by the imposing of a strong North American presence in Europe in order to stop the rebirth of nationalist militarism on the continent and last but not least supporting the idea of European integration. This organization was formed in the context of a devastated post-World War II Europe with a death toll of more than 36 million people and, of course, the poignant and destabilizing Soviet influence on elected national governments throughout

the continent (NATO Public Diplomacy Division, 2012, 1). In this respect, in an organization dominated by the United States from the moment of its conception, it is clear that one of the main functions of the alliance was the institutionalization of a relationship between Europe and North America. It is also important to pinpoint that the basic principle involving NATO is that of collective defense, as noted in Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty. From the standpoint of a historical evolution since its birth, we can clearly delimit three distinct but equally important moments that shaped NATO's development and subsequent policy. The first event, mentioned above in small detail, is based around the years preceding the Cold War and represents the first years of this organization; the second phase is tied directly to the period of the Cold War, lasting up to the early 1990's and ending with the fall of the Soviet Union, while the third moment was represented by the terrorist attacks on New York City in September 2001. Each of these separate events were marked by different challenges on an international level and required different methods of response, having a direct effect on shaping and changing the dynamics within NATO with every passing cycle (Akram, 2009, 1-2). Before moving on to discussing the context of formation and objectives of the other organization being analyzed, the SCO, it is vital to note that NATO does not "enjoy" direct competition from other regional organizations within its sector of influence, which differs greatly from the situation encountered by the SCO, which has to integrate or eliminate spheres of influence of other entities such as ASEAN (Association of Southeast Asian Nations) or the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS). Quite to the contrary, as mentioned in the beginning of this chapter, NATO has long supported the idea of developing a politically sound and united Europe in order to be able to accomplish its future goals regarding security and expand more and more into the East. NATO & the EU share common strategic interests and have long consulted and worked closely together in preventing and resolving crisis situations both in Europe and abroad. There is of course an official document cementing this partnership signed in 2002 called "The NATO-EU Declaration on ESDP", which has basically assured access for Europe to NATO's military planning and defense capabilities and has formulated some mutual standards to be respected by the two organizations such as improved consultation, equality in the decision-making process and respecting the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations (NATO-EU Strategic Partnership, 2004, 3). Additional keystone documents establishing reactionary principles also come to fruition in the following years: the "Berlin Plus Arrangements" adopted in 2003 provide European Union access to NATO collective assets in crisis situations, aiding

the process of crisis management at a global level. Other areas of cooperation include the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and combating terrorism at an international level (Akram, 2009, 4-6). Furthermore, after the accession of Romania and Bulgaria to the European Union in 2007 and Croatia in 2013, the two organizations now share 22 common member countries. Adding the United States and Canada as powerful non-European actors, the two Nordic countries of Norway and Iceland and Turkish and Albanian influences in the south of Europe, it is becoming quite clear that the level of influence of NATO both in Europe and abroad is considerable, being a strong representative of the "western world" and democratic values (Center for Non-Proliferation Studies, 2012, 1). In layman's terms, we can conclude that due to the dominant U.S. influence within NATO, and its close collaboration with the European Union, the organization is used as an instrument to achieve objectives such as improved security and defense, non-proliferation of WMD's, humanitarian efforts and regional stability, further supporting the idea that the United States, through NATO and the tight EU link, hold regional polarity until reaching the Eastern borders of the continent.

The other international organization analyzed as part of this research paper's descriptive base is the Shanghai Cooperation Organization or the SCO. It is a regional organization comprising of the original "founding five" (1996): China, Russia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan, with Uzbekistan joining separately as a member state in 2001. It also features a number of observer states, chiefly India, Iran, Mongolia, Pakistan and, more recently, Afghanistan. The SCO's declared goals are cooperation in political, military, energetic, economic and cultural areas between its member states, with the organization growing in the past decade and receiving more extensive attention from western powers. The combined population of the member states is of 1.5 billion people, representing almost a quarter of the world's population, and by adding the observer states, the rate of population representations grows towards a staggering half of the world's populous. Territorial representation is also extremely vast, encompassing extensive areas of the Near East, Central Asia and South-East Asia (de Haas, 2007, 5). This international organization was formed in the context of maintaining security and diminishing any possibility of tensions occurring along the borders of the countries involved following the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War. Taking a position and establishing a relationship with China was another key goal in the early days of the SCO for the former Soviet republics, strengthening neighborly relations involving mutual trust and cooperation. Similarly to NATO's historical evolution in distinct phases, the SCO's growth can be split

into several periods marked by different interests and objectives: the first phase, lasting from the early 1990's until 2001 marked the first agreements between the neighboring countries and established a precedent for a future, official alliance; the second phase introduced the "Declaration of Establishment of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization", marking the official beginning of the SCO and delimiting three clear objectives, or "evils", that needed to take precedence: the fight against terrorism, separatism and extremism. The third phase started in 2004, with the final touches to the institutional transformation of the organization (a secretariat in Beijing and a regional anti-terrorist structure in Tashkent) and is still ongoing today, with the declared purpose of obtaining even more influence through new member and observer states and become the most important international organization in the region, holding the helms of polarity in the area (de Haas, 2007, 7-9).

The Shanghai Cooperation Organization is also beholding to some important guiding principles, stipulated in its very own charter. These principles or norms, often referred to by theorists as the "Shanghai Spirit", sit at the opposing end of those being promoted worldwide by the USA and likeminded western powers, in an effort by the SCO to avoid international strategic and military unipolarity (held in recent years by NATO and the U.S.). Several basic principles found throughout international law sit at the foundation of the organization, such as the sovereign equality of member states and the rejection of dominance and coercive techniques in international relations. The Charter mentioned above also includes an important statement noting the fact that the SCO is not directed "against other States and international organizations". However, taking into consideration the fact that all the above-mentioned norms fit the spectrum of international relations and cooperation between member states, it is important to note that the statement and upholding of several other principles which pertain to more personal issues such as respect for human rights and the right of self-determination of peoples are omitted by the SCO. While NATO upholding of these principles is sometimes questionable (ex. Aggression against Serbia), there is no doubt that more solid guarantees are offered in the case of NATO than in the case of the SCO in relation to the above-mentioned principles. Combined, all these features and principles can be viewed as guarantees among the more powerful members of the SCO (Russia and China) to grant equality to other member and observer states and not intervene in their internal affairs without a specific request, while on the other hand also setting the stage for and supporting authoritarian, centralized forms of government and regimes (Bailes, Dunay, Guang, Troitskiy, 2007, 6). On a final note, it is also important to mention the delicate balance of powers within the SCO that

characterizes the organization to this day. The two dominating superpowers, Russia and China, are faced with fears and tensions on both sides due to small economic disputes and the factor of competition for reaching a status of world supremacy, while the other member states are isolated and have few fields of action beyond regional initiative; even still, Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan are within another layer of the SCO due in large part to their tremendous oil and gas resources and their size. Thus, harmonizing all the interests of the member states and creating stronger bonds between all SCO countries needs to continue to be done by formulating common, more widely applicable principles and delimiting areas of interest that can also be interpreted as guarantees that safeguard the state of the organization (Bailes, Dunay, Guang, Troitskiy, 2007, 8-9).

Case Study – Regional Polarity, Global Governance

While the past chapter was focused on gathering historical and general descriptive data about the two organizations and outline principles, context and objectives, among other details, this chapter will delve deeper into the issue of the relationship between SCO and NATO, notable differences, reasons for potential clashes between the two organizations, their aspirations and level of influence within the international relations system and the relationship between the comprising superpowers of Russia, China and the United States.

Based on the findings presented in the pages above, we can state that, although not directly intended in the beginning, the rise and development of the SCO as a security organization and regional pole of influence in Central Asia was in a very large part linked to the consolidation of a U.S. spectrum of world dominance leading to unipolarity. Thus, we are faced with an ever-growing alteration of the balance of power and a split towards multipolarity, with three decisive international actors and their respective organizations. Within this perspective, the SCO may be seen as a framework where Russia and China could finally balance each-other's influence and restrain each-other's power as to prevent dominance and instability within the organization and the subsequent region it dominates (Ji Noe Oest, Toft, 2007, 6-11). These views on the SCO and its relationship with the U.S. are supported by some security and international relations literature within Russia and China (authored by theorists such as Zhuangzhi), edging on the views of structural realism, which states that the international system is anarchic, leaving no sole sovereign power with the ability to use violence, and offering states the capability to balance internally and externally by allying themselves with others, creating equality between different tiers of

power and leading to bipolarity or multipolarity (Ji Noe Oest, Toft, 2007, 14-16). Stemming from this approach, we can draw the conclusion that, for the most part, even if it was done indirectly, the SCO is being perceived and has blossomed into a counter-organization for NATO. It is therefore recommended and suitable to compare these two international organizations based on the descriptive aspects discussed earlier. One of the differences that is immediately noticeable is the fact that none of the SCO members are members of NATO, although every single country which is part of the SCO with the exception of China has been named as a NATO partner. This difference is somewhat explainable due to the fact that Article 10 of the NATO Charter solely specifies European states as possible future members, and the issue does not extend to non-European states. The above-mentioned partnership can also be explained as a need of SCO countries to be closer to the decision-making process and agenda within NATO in order to better adapt their position and strengthen their own objectives (Sorkina, 2010, 104). In the context of a relationship with other organizations or structures, while NATO enjoys a strong collaborative partnership with the European Union, the SCO needs to overtake or integrate different spectrums of influence and polarity throughout the Near East and Asia. In these particular areas, organizations such as the CIS, resulting directly from the collapse of the Soviet Union and having countries like Azerbaijan or Ukraine in their ranks, or ASEAN, which is mostly an economically-oriented organization formed around South-East Asian countries such as Malaysia or Indonesia have the capacity to place even the slightest of shadows over the right of the SCO to be the sole representative structure of the Asian continent. Even still, the observed lack of activity within the CIS and growing Russian influence within most of the member countries makes it difficult to believe that it will pose a serious threat to the SCO's continental superiority. Similarly, ASEAN's different, more humanitarian and economic agenda places it out of the spectrum of oversight and control of the SCO and does not deem it to be a threat or a counterweight in the fight for regional polarity (Sorkina, 2010, 116-117). Another difference which is applicable is the fact that NATO is a declared security and military organization set on collective defense as a basic principle, also having branches that expand into the civilian sector, while also respecting national sovereignty of member countries and reaching decisions through consensus; in contrast, the SCO does not mention the concept of collective defense as a basic principle, making it seemingly less military in appearance and more oriented towards (border) security, economic development and fighting terrorism in Central Asia. This is not to say however that the SCO completely ignores the military scope, choosing instead to act more

subversively and fly below the radar when considering interventionist or reactionary military and security tactics (Sorkina, 2010, 104-105). More subtle differences can also be noticed in the organizations' respective Charters as compared to the Charter of the United Nations. The introductory part of the SCO charter speaks of historic links between peoples, based on aspects such as common culture (even a long-standing common political system) and a strategic relationship. Furthermore, the member states desire to strengthen peace and ensure security throughout the region by developing international multipolarity (giving the SCO a character of an authoritarian regional security watchdog) and supporting the globalization of the economy. In contrast, even though some of the NATO members have had brushes with authoritarian or communist governments (the example of Romania is eloquent), current NATO members have a common heritage based on principles of liberal democracy and the rule of law, even if this is somewhat recently established, contrary to the straightforward authoritarian direction and communist past and present of some SCO member states (Sorkina, 2010, 105). In regards to structure, we can encounter some similarities relating to departmental responsibilities; thus, the Regional Anti-Terrorist Structure (RATS) wing of the SCO can be compared to NATO's military structure, although in its legal capacity it is only warranted to deal with terrorist activity. This is not to say that there can be no swift military response on the part of the SCO in matters of border defense and protection of common interests should the situation demand it. The scale at which the operations of the two entities are developed is another difference, with the SCO not yet living up to and priding itself with the same achievements and initiatives on a global scale as NATO. While the SCO is struggling to maintain regional security in times of turmoil and to balance the powers of its member states equally within the organization, NATO has several partnerships and programs of cooperation all over the globe, some of them even within the SCO's sphere of influence (such as the war in Afghanistan) (Sorkina, 2010, 106). Historically, the context of each structure's formation has been relatively similar: NATO was formed at the beginning of the Cold War as a politico-military organization and a way of intervention into Europe in order to limit the possible Soviet influences on the continent, while the SCO was formed after the Cold War (similarly as a politico-military organization) in an effort of regional confidence-building and progress and also as a counterweight to the growing U.S. global influence. The SCO also presents itself with a more internal dimension to its goals, transposed in the fact that one of its declared aims is to avoid conflict within the organization, compared to NATO's protective stance against outside attacks (Sorkina, 2010, 106). The recruiting process of both organizations

may have a direct say in confirming the theory of a possible NATO/SCO multipolar system. While NATO will continue to aspire for Eastern European members to join in order to aid their efforts of securing Russian borders as extensively as possible, the SCO is on the verge of welcoming democracy-poor but economically-rich countries such as Iran as members.

Having analyzed the most important differences and similarities between NATO and the SCO, and introduced the theory regarding the SCO's role as a motor for transition towards global multipolarity and regional stability in addition to respecting its founding principles of economic and cultural development, it is vital to touch on the subject of the relationship between the two organizations through actions and negotiations on an international scale between the three main representing superpowers: the U.S., Russia and China, actions which are reflected up the chain in the agenda of the two politico-military entities. Ideological clashes, while not yet apparent, can always be an issue due to the economic, nuclear and diplomatic factors currently in play. Economically speaking, the SCO has developed both as a whole and from the perspective of its individual member countries into an organization which holds great power in the arms trade, energy and oil exploitation sectors. SCO oil reserves, including those of observer states such as Iran, account for 20% of the world total. The situation regarding gas reserves is similar, with 50% of the world's supply being available within SCO member countries. These economic facts represent the financial power base of the organization and grant increased regional and global influence to the actors involved within the SCO, matching economic capabilities offered by Western states (de Haas, 2007, 23). However, before being able to properly compete with the U.S. and its western allies on an economic front, SCO powerhouse states Russia and China need to square away the confusion and their own internal competition. Recent efforts made by both countries to reorient Central Asian economies towards themselves have somewhat clouded the credibility of a possible complete economic unity of the SCO. To this end, important steps have been made to reduce competition and normalize economic relationships between Russia and China as to pose serious individually and jointly capable competition in a multipolar international system. The goal of an EU-like economic community and the implementation of programs such as the Central Asian Regional Economic Cooperation (CAREC) program pave the way for the kind of economic stability needed for progress and matching western capabilities (Wishnick, 2009, 23-25). If from an economic point of view the "clashes" between Russia, China and the U.S., and, subsequently, the organizations they represent, seem mostly benign and too early

to call, nuclear capability is another subject which poses a serious regional and global security threat for some time to come.

In the case of NATO, there are three member countries that possess potent nuclear weapons arsenals: France, The United Kingdom and the U.S (NATO Nuclear Capability, 1). However, the SCO brings together four nuclear states through Russia and China as members plus India and Pakistan as observers. Aspiring member and observer state Iran is also deeply interested in the process of nuclear weapon development and has ignored repeated calls from the West to halt their nuclear program. These issues, combined with the fact that territorial armies of Russia and China are among the largest in the world and can pose a serious threat if the situation on a regional or global level warrants it, could make for interesting future power-plays and developments between the SCO and NATO (de Haas, 2013, 10). While one of NATO's general objectives is the non-proliferation or limiting of the number of nuclear weapons, progress in this area between the two organizations and, more significantly, between independent member states has been more for show. Initiatives between the United States and Russia such as the Treaties of Moscow and Prague, extending nuclear weapon arsenal reduction until 2021, are fading quickly in appeal compared to other responses and clashes between the U.S. and SCO observers India, which refused to enter into a non-proliferation agreement or Iran, with the internationally-known situation of snubbing NATO/UN authority (Hsiung, 5). As such, it is not impossible for further nuclear conflict escalation in future years due to the shaky stance and slow progress of diplomatic talks between member countries. Diplomatically speaking, there is no institutional framework for discussion between NATO and the SCO. For this reason, the emphasis within this case study was put more directly on the members of each organization rather than on communications and clashes of the organizations themselves. Issues of international importance are currently discussed with Russia through the NATO-Russia council, while a dialogue with China has not even reached partnership level. However, in the wake of a post-2014 regional transition period strongly linked to Afghanistan, it is in the best interest of NATO to move closer to the SCO. This, on one hand, entails that NATO actually recognize the SCO as a serious counterpart within Central Asia and not just as a forum for Sino-Russian relationships, while on the other hand necessitates disregarding the hard-line democratic values promoted by NATO alongside its security interests (EUCAM, 2012, 5).

Small steps towards organizational communication have been made as recently as last year, with the occasion of the EURISC Foundation's Bucharest Summit in September

2013. International think thanks from NATO, the European Union and the SCO met for the first time in Romania, which is considered a bridge between NATO and the SCO and an important strategic element due to its Black Sea access. Issues such as fighting terrorism, transnational organized crime and access security were discussed, leading to the first official recognition by NATO of the importance and value of the SCO within the global sphere of influence and a development towards a multipolar international system (EURISC Foundation, 1). One area of common interest of both NATO and the SCO relates to the war in Afghanistan and the subsequent withdrawal of NATO intervention from the region. Both organizations face the same threats related to terrorism by the Taliban and significant drug trafficking, which are widely discussed as issues that can be solved through global initiative and governance. While ongoing political sensitivities make it hard to envision a joint NATO-SCO military collaboration within the area, it is up to the SCO itself to regroup and promote a joint effort in fighting the evils enshrined in its formation charter (de Haas, 2013, 12). The existence of a Special Conference on Afghanistan involving the SCO and representatives from both NATO and the European Union further legitimizes the stance of the SCO as a serious regional interlocutor and leader, while also reminding the United States and NATO allies that the SCO is opposed to U.S. military expansion into Central Asia. Action plans stemming from this conference and other SCO discussions tackle the issues of combating terrorism, putting a halt to organized crime within the region, attaining regional stability and transforming Afghanistan into a viable regional partner (Hall, 2009, 7-8). The aim of this chapter was to present a constructive comparative analysis between the characteristics and agendas of the two organizations, as well as their economic, nuclear and diplomatic capabilities. Since diplomatic communication and organizational contact between NATO and the SCO is at its starting point, researching Sino-Russian and U.S.-Russia-China multilateral relations was also of keystone importance.

Conclusions

The goal proposed in the beginning of this research paper was to clear up some of the most intriguing aspects regarding the SCO & NATO and to propose a scenario for areas of future clashes of the two organizations, should they succeed in establishing their position in the detriment of member states on such an important level. Based on the information obtained through both the descriptive analysis and the case study, the answers to those questions should already be obvious. As a concept, global governance supports politically integrating transnational actors rather than classical actors on the stage of

international relations in order to solve regional or global problems. Judging by this fact, NATO has already established a clear precedent of military and humanitarian interventionism in areas of interest in the name of its democratic Western members and the values they uphold, setting the stage for integrated global governance. Similarly, although it is a much newer organization not living up to NATO achievements, the SCO is making small steps forward in order to gain a position that would allow it represent the interests of Central Asian states and intervene in crisis situations such as Afghanistan, among other areas, where serious issues like terrorism, organized crime or drug trafficking are tackled towards the benefit of not only member states but the entire world. Global governance is directed at solving exactly these types of transnational issues and, as proven by this paper, is set on the right path towards being the go-to mechanism of international problem solving. As such, the concept of global governance can be applied in the case of the two politico-military organizations analyzed in the pages above. In the case of regional and global polarity and level of influence, it can be stated that the apparition and growth of the SCO is viewed by many as a mechanism of coordinated opposition to the United States in Central Asia. Evolving into one of the most powerful post-Cold War organizations, the SCO seeks to guarantee regional security and put a halt to American interventionism and expansion further into the East. Thus, it has enacted the start of the change from an unipolar, U.S./NATO dominated international order towards multipolarity, with superpower members Russia and China gaining substantial influence both regionally and worldwide because of their strong economies, nuclear capability and renewed cooperation. Regionally, the SCO has become the strongest organization in Central Asia in the past decade, while NATO, along with the European Union, has not been replaced as the strongest representative of the West.

References

1) Sarah Akram – *"NATO in its evolving role",* Islamabad Institute of Strategic Studies, "Reflections" Magazine, No. 2, 2009.

2) Stephen Aris – *"A new model of Asian regionalism: does the SCO have more potential than ASEAN?"*, University of Birmingham, Cambridge Review of International Affairs, Volume 22, Number 3, September 2009.

3) Alyson J.K. Bailes (Pal Dunay, Pan Guang, Mikhail Troitskiy) – *"The Shanghai Cooperation Organization"*, Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, Policy Paper No. 17, May 2007.

4) EUCAM – *"NATO & Central Asia: The Two Elephants That Never Meet"*, EU-Central Asia Monitoring, Issue 11, February 2012.

5) EURISC Foundation - *"First NATO-EU-SCO Think-Thank Meeting Concludes"*, http://www.eurisc.org/news--articles/188-first-nato-eu-sco-think-tank-meeting-concludes.html.

6) Marcel de Haas, *"The Shanghai Cooperation Organization: Towards a full-grown security alliance?"*, Netherlands Institute of International Relations, Clingendael, November 2007.

7) Marcel de Haas – *"NATO & The Far East: Partners and Competitors"*, in *Atlantisch Perspectief*, No. 3, 2013.

8) Matthew Hall – *"The Shanghai Cooperation Organization: A Partner for Stabilizing Afghanistan?"*, Center For Defense & Strategic Studies. Australian Defense College, 2009.

9) Jan-Arno Hessbruegge – *"The Shanghai Cooperation Organization: A Holy Alliance for Central Asia?"*, The Fletcher School Online Journal, Southwest Asia & Islamic Civilizations, Spring 2004, Article 2.

10) James C. Hsiung – *"U.S., Russia, China: An Update on the Strategic Triangle"*, New York University.

11) Inventory of International Nonproliferation Organizations and Regimes – *"NATO"*, Center for Nonproliferation Studies, 25/04/2012.

12) Simbal Khan – *"Stabilization of Afghanistan: U.S.-NATO Regional Strategy and the role of the SCO"*, Central Asia-Caucasus Institute, China & Eurasia Forum Quarterly, Volume 7, No.3, 2009.

13) NATO – *"The NATO-EU Strategic Partnership",* Istanbul Summit, 28-29.06.2004.

14) NATO Nuclear Capability - http://www.natowatch.org/nuclear-weapons.

15) NATO – Public Diplomacy Division, *"A Short History of NATO"*, 2012.

16) Kajsa Ji Noe Oest, (Peter Toft) – *"The Shanghai Cooperation Organization: A threat or opportunity for Europe?"*, Institut for Statskunskab, 01/2007.

17) Julianne Smith – *"The NATO-Russia Relationship: Defining moment or deja-vu?"*, Center for Strategic International Studies, Institut Francais des Relations Internationales, November 2008.

18) Marina Sorkina – *"Shanghai Cooperation Organisation: Geopolitics at the crossroads of Eurasia"*, University of Gent, 2010.

19) Olga A. Vorkunova – *"Wider Black Sea: NATO, EU, SCO & Russia – Competition & Cooperation"*, Institute of World Economy & International Relations, Russian Academy of Sciences, presented at international conference, Yerevan, 14-15 January 2008

20) Elizabeth Wishnick – *"Russia, China and the U.S. in Central Asia: Prospects for great power competition and cooperation in the shade of the Georgian Crisis"*, U.S. Army War College, Strategic Studies Institute, Carlisle, February 2009.