

imagologie și studiul mentalităților. Concis, metodic și ordonat, într-un areal de cercetare mai puțin supus rigorilor și ostil statisticilor și abordărilor schematizate.

Observăm, astfel, că de abia după aproape 300 de pagini redactate se ajunge cu adevărat la problematica profilului și imaginii romilor din Hunedoara în perioada 1918–1989 și asta spune multe nu doar despre dimensiunile lucrării, ci și despre intensitatea și meticulozitatea efortului pe care autorul l-a depus de-a lungul demersului său. Ca în capitolele anterioare, și aici regăsim metode și instrumentare sociologice de cercetare și depistăm aceeași apetență a autorului pentru conturarea unui cadru socio-politic, economic și mintal care să definească cât mai detaliat percepția populației asupra romilor. E vorba de chestiuni precum educația, școlarizarea cu accent pe alfabetizare, asistență socială, diferențe specifice între generații și epoci, centru și periferie, marginalitate și marginalizare, morală și moravuri și mulți alți senzori principali sau de detaliu care conturează, în măsura posibilului, profilul și imaginea romului hunedorean, precum și căile de relaționare de care dispune în raport cu societatea: integrare, izolare, aculturație etc. Celelalte capitole până la al VIII-lea, capitolul conclusiv, final, rămân la fel de interesante, încărcate de valențele inter- și multidisciplinarității, dar, paradoxal, nu ne schimbă spectaculos optica asupra subiectului, așa cum ne este el cunoscut din istorie și din dezbaterile actuale, nu puțin.

Remus Câmpeanu

 <https://orcid.org/0009-0006-2880-1864>

DOI: 10.59277/AIIGB/2024.63.32

Alexandra HOMOLAR, *The uncertainty doctrine: Narrative politics and US hard power after Cold War*, New York, Cambridge University Press, 2023, 243 p.

The uncertainty doctrine is research about how the uncertainty of the international system connects United States security policy with contemporary strategic planning. The work is a political study that analyses interlink between security traditions and the resilience of United States security interests from the last period of the Cold War to today. By exploring this subject, the author frames the subject in the intense bargaining processes that exist behind the public scenes within the defense establishment. This fact makes the contribution of the work part of the new wave of international relations interest that aims to blend security studies with political perspectives.

In the policy studies of the United States, the post-Cold War era is often perceived as a period of missed and gained opportunities, with proportional consequences that can be felt even today. From this point of view, the Homolars challenge the conventional approach to the history of the United States resilience as a fact prescribed by those outside its control. The work emphasizes empirically how the allowance of peace for the United States was submitted by the narrative contests over the new meaning of security in the global world order. Trying to understand the ontology significance in the national security framework, Alexandra Homolar applies it to demonstrate that political agents have the capacity to transform their discursive and reorganization into a response to systemic shocks. In the more particular case of the United States, narrative politics does not always matter in defense policy. This situation is used by the author to establish the decisive stage, which grants that a strategic point prevails over alternatives. In the research on the subject, this idea is extended in security policy emerged into strategic visions and military planning. In this part, the author argues that despite permissive conditions, political and security agents are able to cooperate and ensure a security strategy at the national level that remains stable enough to support national interests.

The analytical perspective from the book is about the ways in which the world does not change. An affirmation of realism exists in international affairs instead of ploughshares, which sustain that after “the end of history,” it is quite possible to materialize. To give a sense to this recognition,

Alexandra Homolar takes a deep look into the security change between the announcement of the end of the Cold War and the new horizon, which starts to draw the new order.

However, from a political point of view, this stage is considered to be a dilution of old logic into complex perspective over regions in world dynamics. This framework represents a topic for the US establishment on how to adapt the US defense to a new security environment. This is the backdrop that defined the dimensions of the study conducted by Alexandra Homolar. In part, it is about the political resilience in a period of transition from a hierarchy of subjects dominated by the realism perspective over security to a complex, interconnected combination of subjects. On the other hand, the study approaches the development of the utility functions of a nation through the transfer of resources from the American defense budget to sustain the competitiveness of the national market into the integration process on global markets without the illusion of a reduced defense burden.

The impact of transition on the evolution of politics is surprised in the book through two questions: "What about national security? Would a decrease in defense expenditures not put national security at risk?"³. This is a conjecture that rests in the realism philosophy that national security is strongly related to the depth of defense spending⁴. The argument for this necessity arises from the anarchy of the international system, where the improvement of survival probability is enhanced by preserving and developing in dependence the military and economic capabilities⁵. However, when the military competition factor is replaced with multiple complex and sensitive factors, a positive balance between a strong defense budget and greater national security is possible only if the security spreading does not affect the national capability to be competitive and to submit the social dividends. To obtain a balanced policy to assure this purpose, there needs to exist an equilibrium between agency-centric lenses that highlight dynamical behavior rather than passivity to change and not materialize the policy swiftly. Secondarily, the national agencies there need to have the capacity to make the difference between probability and possibility to exist as a threat. Based on empirical and governmental data, the author reflects the context, which serves to quantify the representation of this "reality," which does not occur in defense policies. Somehow, the empirical perspective launched into study is about a political omission of the Americans doctrine about the *realpolitik* regarding national security and challenges in the time of international reformation. This is an expression of the concern of the new social world, which influences the American capacity to create an illusion to cover the request for defense expenditures. In neorealist terms, it is about how a great power can prepare his defense mechanism for the new challenges without flagging this policy or altering the peace dividends. Following these distinctions, the author succeeds in capturing how the security policy of the United States was transposed into a strategic vision of the world rather than a military plan determined by the ideology of the Cold War.

The uncertainty doctrine is a political study of national resilience by a state, which confers the realism argument about the defense of sovereignty through ideology on a state of social dividends in a global world. Departing from existing theory, Alexandra Homolar admits that the existence of these disruptive moments creates the opportunity for a permissive condition for political agents to innovate and push ahead on a new policy path. This theoretical difference makes the study proposed by Alexandra Homolar a story about continuity, which characterizes the relationship between the "past" and "after" of a state. Due to that, the book provided,

³ Alexandra Homolar, *The uncertainty doctrine: Narrative politics and US hard power after Cold War*, New York, Cambridge University Press, 2023, p. 10.

⁴ Miroslav Nincic și Thomas R. Cusack, *The political economy of US military spending*, „Journal of peace research”, Vol. 16, No. 2, 1979, p. 101–115.

⁵ Kenneth N. Waltz, *Structural realism after the Cold War*, „International security”, Vol. 25, No. 1, 2000, p. 5–41; John J. Mearsheimer, *The false promise of international institutions*, „International security”, Vol. 19, No. 3, 1994, p. 5–49.

through empirical information, an account of the struggles of the United States defense establishment in responding to the changes in the security environment. In the end, *The uncertainty doctrine* is a study that brings a contribution to political studies. Specially, by laying open some of the main processes between agencies of a great power in the attempt to resilience national policy, in particular defense policy, in a new security environment.

Tudor Salanțiu

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5378-6874>

DOI: 10.59277/AIIGB/2024.63.33

The historicity of international politics: Imperialism and the presence of the past, Klaus SCHLICHTER and Stephan STETTER, (eds.), New York, Cambridge University Press, 2023, 280 p.

The volume proposed by Schlichte and Stetter as editors is a collective volume that follows to answer methodological questions regarding the significance of the recognition that international politics has a history. Distinct from the importance of this question, it is necessary to admit that it enjoys a certain appreciation because it addresses how history exists in international relations (IR) and how we should write a history of the field. In light of the complex research on the historiography of IR, it is possible to suggest that the volume addresses the sensitive subject described by the mode of historicity of IR. In our opinion, interest in the topic appears due to two facts. First, due to the theoretical crisis that sparked the largely ahistorical set-up of theories⁶. Secondly, due to a philosophical problem that brings into discussion the presence of the past (history) in the presentation of the present (evolution of reality). From an IR methodological point of view, the two facts are not individual but are connected through the importance of history as an argument. This fact represents a position and develops an argument against the trend of philosophy dissolution, which follows the disregard of history in the description of factuality.

Through these points of view, the work proposed by the two editors leaves the impression of a study that searches for the arguments of the subject in the works of Herbert Lüthy, Gamader, and Braudel. Nevertheless, the book follows to explain how the IR theorizing around the Eurocentric underpinning defines the limits of history explanation and how much we can neglect historical analysis in references. To sustain their position, the editors use the topics of the chapters to develop a conceptual angle from the extensive European scholarship based on the concept of historicity. The methodology used to sustain their point is developed around the concept of historicity as an instrument that offers the possibility of theorizing the presence of the past in IR as a general case. In particular, however, historicity is used to address the temporal dimension of international politics as a mode of narration. The main idea related to the concept of historicity presented in the volume is the assumption that the past is not over, will continue to exist, and will be developed through the present. The claim of this assumption appears from the fact that studying the relationship between social and policy, policy and economy, and policy into the world is about development in international relations vocabulary, the notions about "world history." Secondly, and related to the realist paradigm, the historical past is both about knowledge and its validation, and how we report to the present and the future through what we know. This is the logic invoked in IR analysis when the temporal extension of concepts is discussed, which makes it possible for the past to exist in present vocabulary based on

⁶ Barry Buzan and Richard Little, *Why international relations has failed as an intellectual project and what to do about it*, „Millennium: Journal of international studies”, Vol. 3, No. 1, 2001, p. 19–39.