CHAPTER 2

Realist Theories

Israeli artillery firing on Gaza, 2009.
Realism

No single theory reliably explains the wide range of international interactions, but one theoretical framework has historically held a central position in the study of IR. This approach, called realism, is favored by some IR scholars and vigorously contested by others, but almost all take it into account. Realism’s foundation is the principle of dominance; alternatives based on reciprocity and identity will be reviewed in Chapters 3 and 4.

Realism (or political realism) is a school of thought that explains international relations in terms of power. The exercise of power by states toward each other is sometimes called realpolitik, or just power politics.

Modern realist theory developed in reaction to a liberal tradition that realists called idealism (of course, idealists themselves do not consider their approach unrealistic). Idealism emphasizes international law, morality, and international organizations, rather than power alone, as key influences on international events. Idealists think that human nature is basically good. They see the international system as one based on a community of states that have the potential to work together to overcome mutual problems (see Chapter 3). For idealists, the principles of IR must flow from morality. Idealists were particularly active between World War I and World War II, following the painful experience of World War I. U.S. president Woodrow Wilson and other idealists placed their hopes for peace in the League of Nations as a formal structure for the community of nations.

Those hopes were dashed when that structure proved helpless to stop German, Italian, and Japanese aggression in the 1930s. Since World War II, realists have blamed idealists for looking too much at how the world ought to be instead of how it really is. Sobered by the experiences of World War II, realists set out to understand

THE BIG PICTURE

In a world of sovereign states and no central government, how can each state achieve its interests, indeed its survival? Traditionally, the theory of realism, based on the dominance principle, holds that each state must rely on its own power and, less reliably, on its alliances to influence the behavior of other states. Forms of power vary, but the threat and use of military force traditionally rank high in realists’ application of the dominance principle.

The nature of the international system reflects this emphasis on power. A few “great powers” and their military alliances define the world order. Two superpowers with their allies defined the system during the Cold War, and a lone-superpower world order, still evolving, shapes the post–Cold War era.

To hear the authors of this book discuss this issue, with an example from recent history, download the “IR Talk” podcast for Chapter 2 from www.internationalrelations.com.
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the principles of power politics without succumbing to wishful thinking. Realism provided a theoretical foundation for the Cold War policy of containment and the determination of U.S. policy makers not to appease the Soviet Union and China as the West had appeased Hitler at Munich in 1938.

Realists ground themselves in a long tradition. The Chinese strategist Sun Tzu, who lived 2,000 years ago, advised the rulers of states how to survive in an era when war had become a systematic instrument of power for the first time (the “warring states” period). Sun Tzu argued that moral reasoning was not very useful to the state rulers of the day, faced with armed and dangerous neighbors. He showed rulers how to use power to advance their interests and protect their survival.2

At roughly the same time, in Greece, Thucydides wrote an account of the Peloponnesian War (431–404 B.C.) focusing on relative power among the Greek city-states. He stated that “the strong do what they have the power to do and the weak accept what they have to accept.”3 Much later, in Renaissance Italy (around 1500), Niccolò Machiavelli urged princes to concentrate on expedient actions to stay in power, including the manipulation of the public and military alliances. Today the adjective Machiavellian refers to excessively manipulative power maneuvers.4

The English philosopher Thomas Hobbes in the 17th century discussed the free-for-all that exists when government is absent and people seek their own self-interests. He called it the “state of nature” or “state of war”—what we would now call the “law of the jungle” in contrast to the rule of law. Hobbes favored a strong monarchy (which he labeled a Leviathan) to tame this condition—essentially advocating a dominance approach to solve the collective goods problem in domestic societies. Realists see in these historical figures evidence that the importance of power politics is timeless and cross-cultural.

After World War II, scholar Hans Morgenthau argued that international politics is governed by objective, universal laws based on national interests defined in terms of power (not psychological motives of decision makers). He reasoned that no nation had “God on its side” (a universal morality) and that all nations had to base their actions on prudence and practicality. He opposed the Vietnam War, arguing in 1965 that a communist Vietnam would not harm U.S. national interests.

Similarly, in 2002, before the U.S. invasion of Iraq, leading realists figured prominently among the 33 IR scholars signing a New York Times advertisement warning that “war with Iraq is not in America’s national interest.”5 Thus realists do not always favor using military power, although they recognize the necessity of doing so at times. The target of the IR scholars’ ad was the group of foreign policy makers in the Bush administration known as neoconservatives, who advocated more energetic use of American power, especially military force, to accomplish ambitious and moralistic goals such as democratizing the Middle East.

Realists tend to treat political power as separate from, and predominant over, morality, ideology, and other social and economic aspects of life. For realists, ideologies do not matter much, nor do religions or other cultural factors with which states may justify their
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TABLE 2.1 Assumptions of Realism and Idealism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Realism</th>
<th>Idealism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Nature</td>
<td>Selfish</td>
<td>Altruistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Important Actors</td>
<td>States</td>
<td>States and others including individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causes of State Behavior</td>
<td>Rational pursuit of self-interest</td>
<td>Psychological motives of decision makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of International System</td>
<td>Anarchy</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

actions. Realists see states with very different religions, ideologies, or economic systems as quite similar in their actions with regard to national power. Thus, realists assume that IR can be best (though not exclusively) explained by the choices of states operating as autonomous actors rationally pursuing their own interests in an international system of sovereign states without a central authority.

Table 2.1 summarizes some major differences between the assumptions of realism and idealism.

Power

Power is a central concept in international relations—the central one for realists—but it is surprisingly difficult to define or measure.

Defining Power

Power is often defined as the ability to get another actor to do what it would not otherwise have done (or not to do what it would have done). A variation on this idea is that actors are powerful to the extent that they affect others more than others affect them. These definitions treat power as influence. If actors get their way a lot, they must be powerful.

One problem with this definition is that we seldom know what a second actor would have done in the absence of the first actor’s power. There is a danger of circular logic: power explains influence, and influence measures power.

Power is not influence itself, however, but the ability or potential to influence others. Many IR scholars believe that such potential is based on specific (tangible and intangible) characteristics or possessions of states—such as their sizes, levels of income, and armed forces. This is power as capability. Capabilities are easier to measure than influence and are less circular in logic.

Measuring capabilities to explain how one state influences another is not simple, however. It requires summing up various kinds of potentials. States possess varying amounts of population, territory, military forces, and so forth. The best single indicator of a state’s power may
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be its total GDP, which combines overall size, technological level, and wealth. But even GDP is at best a rough indicator, and economists do not even agree how to measure it. The method followed in this book adjusts for price differences among countries, but an alternative method gives GDP estimates that are, on average, about 50 percent higher for countries in the global North and about 50 percent lower for the global South including China (see footnote 8 on p. 14). So GDP is a useful estimator of material capabilities but not a precise one.

Power also depends on nonmaterial elements. Capabilities give a state the potential to influence others only to the extent that political leaders can mobilize and deploy these capabilities effectively and strategically. This depends on national will, diplomatic skill, popular support for the government (its legitimacy), and so forth. Some scholars emphasize the power of ideas—the ability to maximize the influence of capabilities through a psychological process. This process includes the domestic mobilization of capabilities—often through religion, ideology, or (especially) nationalism. International influence is also gained by forming the rules of behavior to change how others see their own national interests. If a state’s own values become widely shared among other states, it will easily influence others. This has been called soft power. For example, the United States has influenced many other states to accept the value of free markets and free trade.

As the concept of soft power illustrates, dominance is not the only way to exert power (influence others). The core principles of reciprocity and (in the case of soft power) identity can also work. For example, a father who wants his toddler to stop screaming in a supermarket might threaten or actually administer a spanking (dominance); he might promise a candy bar at the checkout as a reward for good behavior (reciprocity); or he could invoke such themes as “Be a big boy/girl” or “You want to help Daddy, don’t you?” (identity). Although realists emphasize dominance approaches, they acknowledge that states often achieve their interests in other ways. Furthermore, even realists recognize that power provides only a general understanding of outcomes. Real-world outcomes depend on many other elements, including accidents or luck.

Because power is a relational concept, a state can have power only relative to other states’ power. Relative power is the ratio of the power that two states can bring to bear against each other. It matters little to realists whether a state’s capabilities are rising or declining in absolute terms, only whether they are falling behind or overtaking the capabilities of rival states.

**Estimating Power**

The logic of power suggests that in wars the more powerful state will generally prevail. Thus, estimates of the relative power of the two antagonists should help explain the outcome of each war. These estimates could take into account the nations’ relative military capabilities and the popular support for each one’s government, among other factors. But most important is the total size of each nation’s economy—the total GDP—which reflects both population size and the level of income per person (per capita). With a healthy enough economy, a state can buy a large army, popular support (by providing consumer goods), and even allies.

For example, the United States that invaded Iraq in 2003 was the most powerful state in world history, and Iraq had been weakened by two costly wars and a decade of sanctions. The power disparity was striking. In GDP, the United States held an advantage of more than a hundred to one; in population, more than ten to one. U.S. forces were larger and much more capable technologically. In 2003, the United States lacked some of the power elements it had possessed during the 1991 Gulf War—the moral legitimacy conferred by the UN Security Council, a broad coalition of allies (including the most powerful states regionally and globally), and partners willing to pay for most of the costs of the war. Despite these shortfalls, U.S. military power was able to carry out the objective of regime change in Iraq, within a month and with low U.S. casualties.

And yet, years later, the U.S. forces’ position in Iraq as well as the stability of the new Iraqi government remained uncertain. An anti-American insurgency proved far stronger than expected, and religious violence among Iraqis took a dramatic toll. Ironically, along with an increase in the number of troops stationed in Iraq (often referred to as “the surge”), U.S. forces began to move toward a reciprocity-based strategy: funding groups that had formerly opposed the American military, in order to gain their support. The difficulties encountered by the world’s superpower in trying to establish stable political control in Iraq demonstrate that power—getting others to do what you want—includes many elements beyond just military might. GDP does not always predict who will win a war.

**Elements of Power**

State power is a mix of many ingredients. Elements that an actor can draw on over the long term include total GDP, population, territory, geography, and natural resources. These attributes change only slowly. Less tangible long-term power resources include political culture, patriotism, education of the population, and strength of the scientific and technological base. The credibility of its commitments (reputation for keeping its word) is also a long-term power base for a state. So is the ability of one state’s culture and values to consistently shape the thinking of other states (the power of ideas).

The importance of long-term power resources was illustrated after the Japanese surprise attack on the U.S. fleet at Pearl Harbor in 1941, which decimated U.S. naval capabilities in the Pacific. In the short term, Japan had superior military power and was able to occupy territories in Southeast Asia while driving U.S. forces from the region. In the longer term, the United States had greater power resources due to its underlying economic potential. It built
up military capabilities over the next few years that gradually matched and then overwhelmed those of Japan.

Other capabilities allow actors to exercise influence in the short term. Military forces are such a capability—perhaps the most important kind. The size, composition, and preparedness of two states’ military forces matter more in a short-term military confrontation than their respective economies or natural resources. Another capability is the military-industrial capacity to quickly produce weapons. The quality of a state’s bureaucracy is another type of capability, allowing the state to gather information, regulate international trade, or participate in international conferences. Less tangibly, the support and legitimacy that an actor commands in the short term from constituents and allies are capabilities that the actor can use to gain influence. So is the loyalty of a nation’s army and politicians to their leader.

Given the limited resources that any actor commands, trade-offs among possible capabilities always exist. Building up military forces diverts resources that might be put into foreign aid, for instance. Or buying a population’s loyalty with consumer goods reduces resources available for building up military capabilities. To the extent that one element of power can be converted into another, it is fungible. Generally, money is the most fungible capability because it can buy other capabilities.

Realists tend to see military force as the most important element of national power in the short term, and other elements such as economic strength, diplomatic skill, or moral legitimacy as being important to the extent that they are fungible into military power. Yet, depending on the nature of the conflict in question, military power may be only one of many elements of power. In 2007, Robert Gates, the U.S. secretary of defense, called for a “dramatic increase” in spending on diplomacy and economic aid, noting that despite very high military spending, these “other elements of national power” have lagged behind in an era of asymmetric warfare (for example, counterterrorism) in which conflicts are “fundamentally political in nature” and not simply military. Secretary Gates went on to point out that the United States has more members of military marching bands than foreign service officers. In 2009, the top U.S. military officer added that although U.S. leaders had “reached for the military hammer in the toolbox of foreign policy fairly often” in recent years, “armed forces may not always be the best choice” to achieve foreign policy goals. Consistent with this thinking, U.S. spending on foreign aid has increased dramatically (along with military spending) since the attacks of 9/11 (see pp. 35–36). A major theme of the Obama administration in 2009 was the use of multiple avenues of power, such as diplomacy and economic aid, to solve problems previously approached primarily from a military angle.

Morality can contribute to power by increasing the will to use power and by attracting allies. States have long clothed their actions, however aggressive, in rhetoric about

Military power such as tanks rests on economic strength, roughly measured by GDP. The large U.S. economy supports U.S. military predominance. In the 2003 U.S. invasion of Iraq, the United States could afford to send a large and technologically advanced military force to the Middle East. Here, U.S. forces enter Iraq, March 2003.

Hillary Clinton, Secretary of State

Hillary Clinton came to the State Department—after serving as a senator from New York and earlier as First Lady—to take the helm as “First Diplomat.” She is the most high-profile member of President Obama’s cabinet, but her abilities were tested as she stepped into perhaps the most demanding of the cabinet positions.

Rarely in its history has the United States faced such enormous challenges in the realm of diplomacy. The United States is committed to leaving Iraq in an orderly fashion while maintaining stability in the Persian Gulf region. Secretary Clinton must garner support from NATO allies to expand the war in Afghanistan. She must navigate the treacherous path of the Middle East peace process. She must also continue to maintain other nations’ support for the war on terror and American attempts to confront al Qaeda cells around the world.

Further, she was faced with these challenges at a time when international support for America was perhaps at an all-time low. Indeed, one of her key missions is to improve the public image of the United States abroad. One tool she will use to accomplish this goal is to increase foreign aid given by the United States. This will be a daunting task given the economic crisis—in times of economic difficulties, not only are there less funds to send abroad, but public (and congressional) support for aid efforts also decreases. In the realm of diplomacy and foreign policy, Secretary Clinton faces formidable tasks.

their peaceful and defensive intentions. For instance, the 1989 U.S. invasion of Panama was named “Operation Just Cause.” Of course, if a state uses moralistic rhetoric to cloak self-interest too often, it loses credibility even with its own population.

The use of geography as an element of power is called geopolitics. It is often tied to the logistical requirements of military forces. In geopolitics, as in real estate, the three most important considerations are location, location, location. States increase their power to the extent they can use geography to enhance their military capabilities, such as by securing allies and bases close to a rival power or along strategic trade routes, or by controlling key natural resources. Today, control of oil pipeline routes, especially in Central Asia, is a major geopolitical issue.

A recurrent geopolitical theme for centrally located, largely landlocked states such as Germany and Russia is the threat of being surrounded. Militarily, centrally located states often face a two-front problem. States less centrally located, such as Britain and the United States, are insular because bodies of water protect them against land attacks; their geopolitical problem in the event of war is to move soldiers and supplies over long distances to reach the scene of battle. This capability was demonstrated in the U.S. participation in World War I, World War II, the Cold War, and the Gulf War. But in general, power declines as a function of distance from a home state.

The International System

States interact within a set of long-established “rules of the game” governing what is considered a state and how states treat each other. Together these rules shape the international system.12

Anarchy and Sovereignty

Realists believe that the international system exists in a state of anarchy—a term that implies not complete chaos or absence of structure and rules, but rather the lack of a central government that can enforce rules.13 In domestic society within states, governments can enforce contracts, deter citizens from breaking rules, and use their monopoly on legally sanctioned violence to enforce a system of law. Both democracies and dictatorships provide central government enforcement of a system of rules. Realists contend that no such central authority exists to enforce rules and ensure compliance with norms of conduct. This makes collective goods problems especially acute in IR. The power of one state is countered only by the power of other states. States must therefore rely on self-help, which they supplement with allies and the (sometimes) constraining power of international norms.

Some people think that only a world government can solve this problem. Others think that adequate order, short of world government, can be provided by international organizations and agreements (see Chapter 7). But most realists think that IR cannot escape from a state of anarchy and will continue to be dangerous as a result.14 In this anarchic world, realists emphasize prudence as a great virtue in foreign policy. Thus states should pay attention not to the intentions of other states but rather to their capabilities.

Despite its anarchy, the international system is far from chaotic. The great majority of state interactions closely adhere to norms of behavior—shared expectations about what behavior is considered proper.15 Norms change over time, slowly, but the most basic norms of the international system have changed little in recent centuries.

Sovereignty—traditionally the most important norm—means that a government has the right, in principle, to do whatever it wants in its own territory. States are separate and autonomous and answer to no higher authority. In principle, all states are equal in status, if not in power. Sovereignty also means that states are not supposed to interfere in the internal affairs of other states. Although states do try to influence each other (exert power) on matters of trade, alliances, war, and so on, they are not supposed to meddle in the internal politics and decision processes of other states. More controversially, some states claim that sovereignty gives them the right to treat their own people in any fashion, including behavior that other states call genocide.

The lack of a “world police” to punish states if they break an agreement makes enforcement of international agreements difficult. For example, in the 1990s, North Korea announced it would no longer allow inspections of its nuclear facilities by other states, which put it in violation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). The international

The community used a mix of positive incentives and threats to persuade North Korea to stop producing nuclear material. But in 2002 North Korea withdrew from the NPT and built perhaps a half-dozen nuclear bombs, one of which it exploded in 2006 (the world’s first nuclear test in a decade). After reaching an agreement with the United States to stop producing nuclear weapons in 2008, North Korea refused to allow physical inspection of some of its nuclear facilities, noting that “it is an act of infringing upon sovereignty.” These examples show the difficulty of enforcing international norms in the sovereignty-based international system.

In practice, most states have a harder and harder time warding off interference in their affairs. Such “internal” matters as human rights or self-determination are, increasingly, concerns for the international community. For example, election monitors increasingly watch internal elections for fraud, while international organizations monitor ethnic conflicts for genocide. Also, the integration of global economic markets and telecommunications (such as the Internet) makes it easier than ever for ideas to penetrate state borders.

States are based on territory. Respect for the territorial integrity of all states, within recognized borders, is an important principle of IR. Many of today’s borders are the result of past wars (in which winners took territory from losers) or were imposed arbitrarily by colonizers.

The territorial nature of the interstate system developed long ago when agrarian societies relied on agriculture to generate wealth. In today’s world, in which trade and technology rather than land create wealth, the territorial state may be less important. Information-based economies are linked across borders instantly, and the idea that the state has a hard shell seems archaic. The accelerating revolution in information technologies may dramatically affect the territorial state system in the coming years.

States have developed norms of diplomacy to facilitate their interactions. An embassy is treated as though it were the territory of the home state, not the country where it is located (see pp. 262–264). For instance, when the U.S. embassy in China harbored a wanted Chinese dissident for two years after the 1989 Tiananmen Square crackdown, Chinese troops did not
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simply come in and take him away. To do so would have violated U.S. territorial integrity. Yet in 1979, Iranian students took over the U.S. embassy in Tehran, holding many of its diplomats hostage for 444 days—an episode that has soured American-Iranian relations ever since.

Diplomatic norms recognize that states try to spy on each other. Each state is responsible for keeping other states from spying on it. In 2002, China discovered that its new presidential aircraft—a Boeing 767 refurbished in Texas—was riddled with sophisticated listening devices. But China did not make an issue of it (the plane had not gone into service), and a U.S.-China summit the next month went forward. In the post–Cold War era, spying continues, even between friendly states.

Realists acknowledge that the rules of IR often create a security dilemma—a situation in which states’ actions taken to ensure their own security (such as deploying more military forces) threaten the security of other states.\(^{19}\) The responses of those other states, such as deploying more of their own military forces, in turn threaten the first state. The dilemma is a prime cause of arms races in which states spend large sums of money on mutually threatening weapons that do not ultimately provide security.

The security dilemma is a negative consequence of anarchy in the international system. If a world government could reliably detect and punish aggressors who arm themselves, states would not need to guard against this possibility. Yet the self-help system requires that states prepare for the worst. Realists tend to see the dilemma as unsolvable, whereas liberals think it can be solved through the development of institutions (see Chapters 3 and 7).

As we shall see in later chapters, changes in technology and in norms are undermining the traditional principles of territorial integrity and state autonomy in IR. Some IR scholars find states practically obsolete as the main actors in world politics, as some integrate into larger entities and others fragment into smaller units.\(^{20}\) Other scholars find the international system quite enduring in its structure and state units.\(^{21}\) One of its most enduring features is the balance of power.

**Balance of Power**

In the anarchy of the international system, the most reliable brake on the power of one state is the power of other states. The term balance of power refers to the general concept of one or more states’ power being used to balance that of another state or group of states. Balance of power can refer to any ratio of power capabilities between states or alliances, or it can mean only a relatively equal ratio. Alternatively, balance of power can refer to the process by which counterbalancing coalitions have repeatedly formed in history to prevent one state from conquering an entire region.\(^{22}\)

The theory of balance of power argues that such counterbalancing occurs regularly and maintains the stability of the international system. The system is stable in that its rules and principles stay the same: state sovereignty does not collapse into a universal empire. This stability does not, however, imply peace; it is rather a stability maintained by means of recurring wars that adjust power relations.

Alliances (to be discussed shortly) play a key role in the balance of power. Building up one’s own capabilities against a rival is a form of power balancing, but forming an
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alliance against a threatening state is often quicker, cheaper, and more effective. In the Cold War, the United States encircled the Soviet Union with military and political alliances to prevent Soviet territorial expansion. Sometimes a particular state deliberately becomes a balancer (in its region or the world), shifting its support to oppose whatever state or alliance is strongest at the moment. Britain played this role on the European continent for centuries, and China played it in the Cold War.

But states do not always balance against the strongest actor. Sometimes smaller states “jump on the bandwagon” of the most powerful state; this has been called bandwagoning as opposed to balancing. For instance, after World War II, a broad coalition did not form to contain U.S. power; rather, most major states joined the U.S. bloc. States may seek to balance threats rather than raw power; U.S. power was greater than Soviet power but was less threatening to Europe and Japan (and later to China as well). Furthermore, small states create variations on power-balancing themes when they play off rival great powers against each other. For instance, Cuba during the Cold War received massive Soviet subsidies by putting itself in the middle of the U.S.-Soviet rivalry. Other small states may, for domestic reasons, fail to mobilize to balance against threats.

In the post–Cold War era of U.S. dominance, balance-of-power theory would predict closer relations among Russia, China, and even Europe to balance U.S. power. These predictions appear to be on the mark. Russian-Chinese relations have improved dramatically in such areas as arms trade and demilitarization of the border. French leaders have criticized U.S. “hyperpower.” Europe and Japan opposed U.S. positions on a range of proposed treaties in 2001 on such subjects as missile defense, biological weapons, small-arms trade, and global warming. The appearance of a common enemy—international terrorists—brought the great powers together temporarily after September 2001. But the 2003 Iraq War brought back a power-balancing coalition of great powers (except Britain)—along with most other countries and world public opinion—against U.S. predominance.

In 2003, world public opinion revealed widespread anti-American sentiment. In Indonesia, Pakistan, Turkey, and Nigeria—containing half of the world’s Muslims—more than 70 percent worried that the United States could become a threat to their own countries, a worry shared by 71 percent of Russians. A survey of 38,000 people in 44 nations showed a dramatic drop in support for the United States from 2002 to 2003. As Figure 2.1 illustrates, this decline in favorable views of the United States worldwide continued through 2007. Yet, 2008 and 2009 brought an upturn in opinions of the United States. A survey of 24,000 people in 24 countries found a more positive view of America in ten of those countries. The survey noted that optimism over the Obama administration accounted for some of the change in viewpoints. Still, in recent years, the predominance of U.S. power may have led to counterbalancing, as predicted by balance-of-power theory.

Great Powers and Middle Powers

The most powerful states in the world exert most of the influence on international events and therefore get the most attention from IR scholars. By almost any measure of power, a handful of states possess the majority of the world’s power resources. At most a few dozen

states have any real influence beyond their immediate locality. These are called the great powers and middle powers in the international system.

Although there is no firm dividing line, great powers are generally considered the half-dozen or so most powerful states. Until the past century the great power club was exclusively European. Sometimes great powers’ status is formally recognized in an international structure such as the 19th-century Concert of Europe or today’s UN Security Council. In general, great powers are often defined as states that can be defeated militarily only by another great power. Great powers also tend to share a global outlook based on national interests far from their home territories.

The great powers generally have the world’s strongest military forces—and the strongest economies to pay for them—and other power capabilities. These large economies in turn rest on some combination of large populations, plentiful natural resources, advanced technology, and educated labor forces. Because power is based on these underlying resources, membership in the great power system changes slowly. Only rarely does a great power—even one defeated in a massive war—lose its status as a great power, because its size and long-term economic potential change slowly. Thus Germany and Japan, decimated in World War II, are powerful today, and Russia, after gaining and then losing the rest of the Soviet Union, is still considered a great power.26

What states are great powers today? Although definitions vary, seven states appear to meet the criteria: the United States, China, Russia, Japan, Germany, France, and Britain. Together they account for more than half of the world’s total GDP and two-thirds of its
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FIGURE 2.2 Great Power Shares of World GDP and Military Expenditures, 2007

Note: GDP calculated by purchasing-power method. China’s GDP using alternate method would be about half as large.
Data sources: World Bank, World Development Indicators 2007; SIPRI, SIPRI Yearbook 2007

Military spending (see Figure 2.2). They include the five permanent members of the UN Security Council, which are also the members of the “club” openly possessing large nuclear weapons arsenals.

Notable on this list are the United States and China. The United States is considered the world’s only superpower because of its historical role of world leadership (especially in and after World War II) and its predominant military might. China has the world’s largest population, rapid economic growth (8–10 percent annually over 15 years), and a large though not very modern military including a credible nuclear arsenal. Indeed, in 2008, the U.S. National Intelligence Council’s long-range planning report noted that China is poised to have a profound effect on the world over the next 20 years—perhaps more than any other state. Japan and Germany are economically great powers, but both countries have played constrained roles in international security affairs since World War II. Nonetheless, both have large and capable military forces, which they have begun to deploy abroad, especially in peacekeeping operations. Russia, France, and Britain were winners in World War II and have been active military powers since then. Although much reduced in stature from their colonial heydays, they still qualify as great powers.

Middle powers rank somewhat below the great powers in terms of their influence on world affairs. Some are large but not highly industrialized; others have specialized capabilities but are small. Some aspire to regional dominance, and many have considerable influence in their regions.
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A list of middle powers (not everyone would agree on it) might include midsized countries of the global North such as Canada, Italy, Spain, the Netherlands, Poland, Ukraine, South Korea, and Australia. It could also include large or influential countries in the global South such as India, Indonesia, Brazil, Argentina, Mexico, Nigeria, South Africa, Israel, Turkey, Iran, and Pakistan. Middle powers have not received as much attention in IR as have great powers.\(^{28}\)

**Power Distribution**

With each state’s power balanced by other states, the most important characteristic of the international system in the view of some realists is the distribution of power among states. Power distribution as a concept can apply to all the states in the world or just the states in one region, but most often it refers to the great power system.

Neorealism, sometimes called structural realism, is a 1990s adaptation of realism. It explains patterns of international events in terms of the system structure—the international distribution of power—rather than in terms of the internal makeup of individual states.\(^{29}\) Compared to traditional realism, neorealism is more “scientific” in the sense of proposing general laws to explain events, but neorealism has lost some of the richness of traditional realism, which took account of many complex elements (geography, willpower, diplomacy, etc.).\(^{30}\) Recently, neoclassical realists have sought to restore some of these lost aspects.\(^{31}\)

The polarity of an international power distribution (world or regional) refers to the number of independent power centers in the system. This concept encompasses both the underlying power of various participants and their alliance groupings. Figure 2.3 illustrates several potential configurations of great powers.

A multipolar system typically has five or six centers of power, which are not grouped into alliances. Each state participates independently and on relatively equal terms with the others. In the classical multipolar balance of power, the great power system itself was stable but wars occurred frequently to adjust power relations.

Tripolar systems, with three great centers of power, are fairly rare, owing to the tendency for a two-against-one alliance to form. Aspects of tripolarity colored the “strategic triangle” of the United States, the Soviet Union, and China during the 1960s and 1970s. Some scholars imagine a future tripolar world with rival power centers in North America, Europe, and East Asia. A bipolar system has two predominant states or two great rival alliance blocs. IR scholars do not agree about whether bipolar systems are relatively peaceful or warlike. The U.S.-Soviet standoff seemed to provide stability and peace to great power relations, but rival blocs in Europe before World War I did not. At the far extreme, a unipolar system has a single center of power around which all others revolve. This is called hegemony, and will be discussed shortly.

Some might argue that peace is best preserved by a relatively equal power distribution (multipolarity) because then no country has an opportunity to win easily. The empirical evidence for this theory, however, is not strong. In fact, the opposite proposition has more support: peace is best preserved by hegemony (unipolarity), and next best by bipolarity.

Power transition theory holds that the largest wars result from challenges to the top position in the status hierarchy, when a rising power is surpassing (or threatening to surpass)
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\(^{29}\) Waltz, *Theory of International Politics* (see footnote 7 in this chapter).


At such times, power is relatively equally distributed, and these are the most dangerous times for major wars. Status quo powers that are doing well under the old rules will try to maintain them, whereas challengers that feel locked out by the old rules may try to change them. If a challenger does not start a war to displace the top power, the latter may provoke a “preventive” war to stop the rise of the challenger before it becomes too great a threat.

When a rising power’s status (formal position in the hierarchy) diverges from its actual power, the rising power may suffer from relative deprivation: its people may feel they are not doing as well as others or as they deserve, even though their position may be improving in absolute terms. Germany’s rise in the 19th century gave it great power capabilities even though it was left out of colonial territories and other signs of status; this tension may have contributed to the two world wars. China may face a similar problem in the future.

According to power transition theory, then, peace among great powers results when one state is firmly in the top position and the positions of the others in the hierarchy are clearly defined and correspond with their actual underlying power.

**Hegemony**

Hegemony is one state’s holding a preponderance of power in the international system, allowing it to single-handedly dominate the rules and arrangements by which international
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Realists emphasize relative power as an explanation of war and peace. The modernization of China’s military—in conjunction with China’s rapidly growing economy—will increase China’s power over the coming decades. Some observers fear instability in Asia if the overall balance of power among states in the region shifts rapidly. Here, China’s air force, whose inventory of combat aircraft still lags in terms of technology, conducts training exercises, 2005.

Realist Theories

Political and economic relations are conducted. Such a state is called a hegemon. (Usually hegemony means domination of the world, but sometimes it refers to regional domination.) The Italian Marxist theorist Antonio Gramsci used the term hegemony to refer to the complex of ideas that rulers use to gain consent for their legitimacy and keep subjects in line, reducing the need to use force to accomplish the same goal. By extension, such a meaning in IR refers to the hegemony of ideas such as democracy and capitalism, and to the global predominance of U.S. culture (see pp. 377–378).

Most studies of hegemony point to two examples: Britain in the 19th century and the United States after World War II. Britain’s predominance followed the defeat of its archrival France in the Napoleonic Wars. Both world trade and naval capabilities were firmly in British hands, as “Britannia ruled the waves.” U.S. predominance followed the defeat of Germany and Japan (and the exhaustion of the Soviet Union, France, Britain, and China in the effort). In the late 1940s, the U.S. GDP was more than half the world’s total; U.S. vessels carried the majority of the world’s shipping; the U.S. military could single-handedly defeat any other state or combination of states; and only the United States had nuclear weapons. U.S. industry led the world in technology and productivity, and U.S. citizens enjoyed the world’s highest standard of living.

As the extreme power disparities resulting from major wars slowly diminish (states rebuild over years and decades), hegemonic decline may occur, particularly when hegemons have overextended themselves with costly military commitments. IR scholars do not agree about how far or fast U.S. hegemonic decline has proceeded, if at all, and whether international instability will result from such a decline.

Hegemonic stability theory holds that hegemony provides some order similar to a central government in the international system: reducing anarchy, deterring aggression, promoting free trade, and providing a hard currency that can be used as a world standard. Hegemons can help resolve or at least keep in check conflicts among middle powers or small states. When one state’s power dominates the world, that state can enforce rules and norms unilaterally, avoiding the collective goods problem. In particular, hegemons can maintain global free trade and promote world economic growth, in this view.

This theory attributes the peace and prosperity of the decades after World War II to U.S. hegemony, which created and maintained a global framework of economic relations supporting relatively stable and free international trade, as well as a security framework that prevented great power wars. By contrast, the Great Depression of the 1930s and the outbreak of World War II have been attributed to the power vacuum in the international system at that time—Britain was no longer able to act as hegemon, and the United States was unwilling to begin doing so.38

Why should a hegemon care about enforcing rules for the international economy that are in the common good? According to hegemonic stability theory, hegemons as the largest international traders have an inherent interest in the promotion of integrated world markets (where the hegemons will tend to dominate). As the most advanced state in productivity and technology, a hegemon does not fear competition from industries in other states; it fears only that its own superior goods will be excluded from competing in other states. Thus hegemons use their power to achieve free trade and the political stability that supports free trade. Hegemony, then, provides both the ability and the motivation to provide a stable political framework for free international trade, according to hegemonic stability theory. This theory is not, however, accepted by all IR scholars.39

From the perspective of less powerful states, of course, hegemony may seem an infringement of state sovereignty, and the order it creates may seem unjust or illegitimate. For instance, China chafed under U.S.-imposed economic sanctions for 20 years after 1949, at the height of U.S. power, when China was encircled by U.S. military bases and hostile alliances led by the United States. To this day, Chinese leaders use the term hegemony as an insult, and the theory of hegemonic stability does not impress them.

Even in the United States there is considerable ambivalence about U.S. hegemony. U.S. foreign policy has historically alternated between internationalist and isolationist moods.40 It was founded as a breakaway from the European-based international system, and its growth in the 19th century was based on industrialization and expansion within North America. The United States acquired overseas colonies in the Philippines and Puerto Rico but did not relish a role as an imperial power. In World War I, the country waited three years to weigh in and refused to join the League of Nations afterward. U.S. isolationism peaked in the late 1930s when polls showed 95 percent of the public opposed to participation in a future European war, and about 70 percent against joining the League of Nations or joining with other nations to stop aggression.41

Internationalists, such as Presidents Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson, favored U.S. leadership and activism in world affairs. These views seemed vindicated by the failure of isolationism to prevent or avoid World War II. U.S. leaders after that war feared Soviet (and then Chinese) communism and pushed U.S. public opinion toward a strong internationalism during the Cold War. The United States became an activist, global superpower. In the post–Cold War era, U.S. internationalism was tempered by a new cost consciousness, and by the emergence of a new isolationist camp born in reaction to the displacements caused by globalization and free trade.42 However, the terrorist attacks of
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September 2001 renewed public support for U.S. interventionism in distant conflicts that no longer seemed so distant. Recently, though, opposition to the Iraq War, a protracted conflict in Afghanistan, and difficult economic times at home have spurred a new isolationist trend in the United States.

A second area of U.S. ambivalence is unilateralism versus multilateralism when the United States does engage internationally. Multilateral approaches—working through international institutions—augment U.S. power and reduce costs, but they limit U.S. freedom of action. For example, the United States cannot always get the UN to do what it wants. Polls show that a majority of U.S. citizens support working through the UN and other multilateral institutions. However, members of the U.S. Congress since the 1990s, and the George W. Bush administration as well, expressed skepticism of the UN and of international agencies, generally favoring a more unilateralist approach.

In the 1990s, Congress slipped more than $1 billion behind in paying U.S. dues to the UN. Similarly, in the late 1990s Congress passed the Helms-Burton Act, which provides for sanctions against countries that do business in Cuba, and the Iran-Libya Sanctions Act, which imposes sanctions on countries that invest in Iran or Libya. These unilateralist U.S. policies drew resistance from European states and Canada. In 2001, the new Bush administration declined to participate in such international efforts as a treaty on global warming (see pp. 389–393), a conference on racism, and an International Criminal Court (see p. 271). The international community's united front against terrorism pushed these disputes to the back burner, but they soon reemerged. The 2003 U.S.-led war in Iraq, with few allies and no UN stamp of approval, marked the peak of U.S. unilateralism. The new Obama administration, however, has taken a more multilateral approach in these issue areas.

The Great Power System, 1500–2000

The modern international system is often dated from the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648, which established the principles of independent, sovereign states that continue to shape the international system today (see Figure 2.4). These rules of state relations did not, however, originate at Westphalia; they took form in Europe in the 16th century. Key to this system was the

FIGURE 2.4 The Great Power System, 1500–2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wars</th>
<th>Spain conquers Portugal</th>
<th>30 Years' War</th>
<th>7 Years' War</th>
<th>Franco-Prussian War</th>
<th>World War I</th>
<th>World War II</th>
<th>Cold War</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major Alliances</td>
<td>Turkey (Muslim) vs. Europe (Christian)</td>
<td>Hapsburgs (Austria-Spain) vs. France, Britain, Netherlands, Sweden</td>
<td>France vs. Britain, Spain</td>
<td>France vs. Britain, Netherlands</td>
<td>Germany (&amp; Japan) vs. Britain, France, Russia, United States, China</td>
<td>Russia vs. U.S., W. Eur., Japan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rising Powers</td>
<td>Britain, France</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Prussia</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Japan Italy</td>
<td>China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declining Powers</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Ottoman Empire</td>
<td>Britain, France</td>
<td>Austria, Italy</td>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1500 - 1600 - 1700 - 1800 - 1900 - 2000
ability of one state, or a coalition, to balance the power of another state so that it could not gobble up smaller units and create a universal empire.

This power-balancing system placed special importance on the handful of great powers with strong military capabilities, global interests and outlooks, and intense interactions with each other. (Great powers are defined and discussed on pp. 52–55.) A system of great power relations has existed since around A.D. 1500, and the structure and rules of that system have remained fairly stable through time, although the particular members change. The structure is a balance of power among the six or so most powerful states, which form and break alliances, fight wars, and make peace, letting no single state conquer the others.

The most powerful states in 16th-century Europe were Britain (England), France, Austria-Hungary, and Spain. The Ottoman Empire (Turkey) recurrently fought with the European powers, especially with Austria-Hungary. Today, that historic conflict between the (Islamic) Ottoman Empire and (Christian) Austria-Hungary is a source of ethnic conflict in the former Yugoslavia (the edge of the old Ottoman Empire).

Within Europe, Austria-Hungary and Spain were allied under the control of the Hapsburg family, which also owned the territory of the Netherlands. The Hapsburg countries (which were Catholic) were defeated by mostly Protestant countries in northern Europe—France, Britain, Sweden, and the newly independent Netherlands—in the Thirty Years’ War of 1618–1648. The 1648 Treaty of Westphalia established the basic rules that have defined the international system ever since—the sovereignty and territorial integrity of states as equal and independent members of an international system. Since then, states defeated in war might have been stripped of some territories but were generally allowed to continue as independent states rather than being subsumed into the victorious state.

In the 18th century, the power of Britain increased as it industrialized, and Britain’s great rival was France. Sweden, the Netherlands, and the Ottoman Empire all declined in power, but Russia and later Prussia (the forerunner of modern Germany) emerged as major players. In the Napoleonic Wars (1803–1815), which followed the French Revolution, France was defeated by a coalition of Britain, the Netherlands, Austria-Hungary, Spain, Russia, and Prussia. The Congress of Vienna (1815) ending that war reasserted the principles of state sovereignty in reaction to the challenges of the French Revolution and Napoleon’s empire. In the Concert of Europe that dominated the following decades, the five most powerful states tried, with some success, to cooperate on major issues to prevent war—a possible precedent for today’s UN Security Council. In this period, Britain became a balancer, joining alliances against whatever state emerged as the most powerful in Europe.

By the outset of the 20th century, three new rising powers had appeared on the scene: the United States (which had become the world’s largest economy), Japan, and Italy. The great power system became globalized instead of European. Powerful states were industrializing, extending the scope of their world activities and the might of their militaries. After Prussia defeated Austria and France in wars, a larger Germany emerged to challenge Britain’s position. In World War I (1914–1918), Germany, Austria-Hungary, and the Ottoman Empire were defeated by a coalition that included Britain, France, Russia, Italy, and the United States. After a 20-year lull, Germany, Italy, and Japan were defeated in World War II (1939–1945) by a coalition of the United States,

Alliances

Britain, France, Russia (the Soviet Union), and China. Those five winners of World War II make up the permanent membership of today’s UN Security Council.

After World War II, the United States and the Soviet Union, which had been allies in the war against Germany, became adversaries for 40 years in the Cold War. Europe was split into rival blocs—East and West—with Germany split into two states. The rest of the world became contested terrain where each bloc tried to gain allies or influence, often by sponsoring opposing sides in regional and civil wars. The end of the Cold War around 1990, when the Soviet Union collapsed, returned the international system to a more cooperative arrangement of the great powers somewhat similar to the Concert of Europe in the 19th century.

Alliances

An **alliance** is a coalition of states that coordinate their actions to accomplish some end. Most alliances are formalized in written treaties, concern a common threat and related issues of international security, and endure across a range of issues and a period of time. Shorter-term arrangements, such as the U.S.-led forces in Iraq, may be called a **coalition**. But these terms are somewhat ambiguous. Two countries may have a formal alliance and yet be bitter enemies, such as the Soviet Union and China in the 1960s or NATO members Greece and Turkey today. Or, two countries may create the practical equivalent of an alliance without a formal treaty.

**Purposes of Alliances**

Alliances generally have the purpose of augmenting their members’ power by pooling capabilities. For smaller states, alliances can be their most important power element, and for great powers the structure of alliances shapes the configuration of power in the system. Of all the elements of power, none can change as quickly and decisively as alliances. Most alliances form in response to a perceived threat. When a state’s power grows and threatens that of its rivals, the latter often form an alliance to limit that power. This happened to Iraq when it invaded Kuwait in 1990, as it had to Hitler’s Germany in the 1940s and to Napoleon’s France in the 1800s.

Realists emphasize the fluidity of alliances. They are not marriages of love, but marriages of convenience. Alliances are based on national interests, and can shift as national interests change. This fluidity helps the balance-of-power process operate effectively. Still, it is not simple or costless to break an alliance: one’s reputation may suffer and future alliances may be harder to establish. So states often adhere to alliance terms even when it is not in their short-term interest to do so. Nonetheless, because of the nature of international anarchy, the possibility of turning against a friend is always present. Realists would agree with the British statesman Lord Palmerston, who told Parliament in 1848, “We have no eternal allies and we have no perpetual enemies. Our interests are perpetual and eternal and those interests it is our duty to follow.”

Examples of fluid alliances are many. Anticommunist Richard Nixon could cooperate with communist Mao Zedong in 1972. Joseph Stalin could sign a nonaggression pact with a fascist, Adolf Hitler, and then cooperate with the capitalist West against Hitler. The United States could back Islamic militants in Afghanistan against the Soviet Union in
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48 Remarks in the House of Commons, March 1, 1848.
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MARRIAGE OF CONVENIENCE

Alliances generally result from a convergence of practical interests, not sentimental or ideological reasons. Here, a U.S. general gets rival Afghan warlords to patch up relations, 2002.

Alliances generally result from a convergence of practical interests, not sentimental or ideological reasons. Here, a U.S. general gets rival Afghan warlords to patch up relations, 2002.

the 1980s, then attack them in 2001. Every time history brings another such reversal in international alignments, many people are surprised. Realists are not so surprised.

The fluidity of alliances deepens the security dilemma (see p. 52). If there were only two states, each could match capabilities to have adequate defense but an inability to attack successfully. But if a third state is free to ally with either side, then each state has to build adequate defenses against the potential alliance of its enemy with the third state. The threat is greater and the security dilemma is harder to escape.

Alliance cohesion is the ease with which the members hold together an alliance. Cohesion tends to be high when national interests converge and when cooperation within the alliance becomes institutionalized and habitual. When states with divergent interests form an alliance against a common enemy, the alliance may come apart if the threat subsides (as with the U.S.-Soviet alliance in World War II, for instance). Even when alliance cohesion is high, as in NATO during the Cold War, conflicts may arise over who bears the costs of the alliance (burden sharing).49

Great powers often form alliances (or less formal commitments) with smaller states, sometimes called client states. Extended deterrence refers to a strong state’s use of threats to deter attacks on weaker clients—such as the U.S. threat to attack the Soviet Union if it invaded Western Europe. Great powers face a real danger of being dragged into wars with each other over relatively unimportant regional issues if their respective clients go to war. If the great powers do not come to their clients’ protection, they may lose credibility with other clients, but if they do, they may end up fighting a costly war.50 The Soviet Union worried that its commitments to China in the 1950s, to Cuba in the 1960s, and to Syria and Egypt in the 1970s (among others) could result in a disastrous war with the United States.


Alliances

At present, two important formal alliances dominate the international security scene. By far the more powerful is the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), which encompasses Western Europe and North America. (The second is the U.S.-Japanese alliance.) Using GDP as a measure of power, the 28 NATO members possess nearly half the world total. Members are the United States, Canada, Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, Denmark, Norway, Iceland, Spain, Portugal, Greece, Turkey, Poland, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, Slovenia, Slovakia, Bulgaria, Romania, Albania, and Croatia. At NATO headquarters in Brussels, Belgium, military staffs from the member countries coordinate plans and periodically direct exercises in the field. The NATO “allied supreme commander” has always been a U.S. general. In NATO, each state contributes its own military units—with its own national culture, language, and equipment specifications.

NATO was founded in 1949 to oppose and deter Soviet power in Europe. Its counterpart in Eastern Europe during the Cold War, the Soviet-led Warsaw Pact, was founded in 1955 and disbanded in 1991. During the Cold War, the United States maintained more than 300,000 troops in Europe, with advanced planes, tanks, and other equipment. After the Cold War ended, these forces were cut to about 100,000. But NATO stayed together because its members believed that NATO provided useful stability even though its mission was unclear.51 Article V, considered the heart of NATO, asks members to come to the defense of a fellow member under attack. It was envisioned as a U.S. commitment to help defend Western Europe against the Soviet Union, but instead was invoked for the first time when Europe came to the defense of the United States after the terrorist attacks in 2001.

The first actual use of force by NATO was in Bosnia in 1994, in support of the UN mission there. A “dual key” arrangement gave the UN control of NATO’s actions in Bosnia, and the UN feared retaliation against its lightly armed peacekeepers if NATO attacked the Serbian forces to protect Bosnian civilians. As a result, NATO made threats, underlined by symbolic airstrikes, but then backed down after UN qualms; this waffling undermined NATO’s credibility. These problems, along with tensions between the American and European NATO members over Bosnia policy, dogged the first major NATO mission of the post–Cold War era. Later NATO actions in the Balkans (the air war for Kosovo in 1999 and peacekeeping in Macedonia in 2001) went more smoothly in terms of alliance cohesion.

Currently, NATO troops from a number of member countries are fighting Taliban forces in Afghanistan. Since 2006, these forces, known as the International Security Assistance Forces (ISAF), have been under NATO leadership, with generals from various states in command for six-month periods. Over 55,000 troops serve in the ISAF, with NATO states providing the bulk of the forces. Non-NATO states, such as Australia, New Zealand, and Jordan, have also contributed troops to ISAF. Tensions have arisen between NATO states in the operation, with some states limiting the number of their troops or the areas in which they operate.

The European Union has formed its own rapid deployment force, outside NATO. The decision grew in part from European military weaknesses demonstrated in the 1999 Kosovo war, in which the United States contributed the most power by far. Although this Eurocorps generally works with NATO, it also gives Europe more independence from the United States. In 2003, the European Union sent military forces

as peacekeepers to Democratic Congo—the first multinational European military operation to occur outside NATO. In 2004, NATO and U.S. forces withdrew from Bosnia after nine years, turning over peacekeeping there to the European Union (as they had in Macedonia). But NATO forces including U.S. soldiers remain next door in Kosovo.

The biggest issue for NATO is its recent eastward expansion, beyond the East-West Cold War dividing line (see Figure 2.5). In 1999, former Soviet-bloc countries Poland, the Czech Republic, and Hungary joined the alliance. Joining in 2004 were Estonia,
Latvia, Lithuania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Romania, and Bulgaria. In 2009, Albania and Croatia accepted membership in NATO. Making the new members’ militaries compatible with NATO was a major undertaking, requiring increased military spending by existing and new NATO members. NATO expansion was justified as both a way to solidify new democracies and as protection against possible future Russian aggression. Yet, the 2003 Iraq War bypassed and divided NATO members. Longtime members France and Germany strongly opposed the war, and Turkey refused to let U.S. ground forces cross into Iraq. At the same time, U.S. leaders began shifting some operations (and money) to new members in Eastern Europe such as Romania—with lower prices and a location closer to the Middle East—while drawing down forces based in Germany.

Russian leaders oppose NATO’s expansion into Eastern Europe as aggressive and anti-Russian. They view NATO expansion as reasserting dividing lines on the map of Europe, but pushed closer to Russia’s borders. These fears strengthen nationalist and anti-Western political forces in Russia. To mitigate the problems, NATO created a category of symbolic membership—the Partnership for Peace—which almost all Eastern European and former Soviet states including Russia joined. However, the 1999 NATO bombing of Serbia heightened Russian fears regarding NATO’s eastward expansion, as has NATO cooperation with Ukraine and Georgia, the latter of which fought a short war against Russia in 2008. In response to NATO expansion, Russia has attempted to expand its own military cooperation with states such as Venezuela, a government critical of U.S. foreign policy.

**Other Alliances**

The second most important alliance is the U.S.-Japanese Security Treaty, a bilateral alliance. Under this alliance the United States maintains nearly 35,000 troops in Japan (with weapons, equipment, and logistical support). Japan pays the United States several billion dollars annually to offset about half the cost of maintaining these troops.
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The alliance was created in 1951 (during the Korean War) against the potential Soviet threat to Japan.

Because of its roots in the U.S. military occupation of Japan after World War II, the alliance is very asymmetrical. The United States is committed to defend Japan if it is attacked, but Japan is not similarly obligated to defend the United States. The United States maintains troops in Japan, but not vice versa. The United States belongs to several other alliances, but Japan’s only major alliance is with the United States. The U.S. share of the total military power in this alliance is also far greater than its share in NATO.

Japan’s constitution (written by U.S. General Douglas MacArthur after World War II) renounces the right to make war and maintain military forces, although interpretation has loosened this prohibition over time. Japan maintains military forces, called the Self-Defense Forces, strong enough for territorial defense but not for aggression. It is a powerful army by world standards but much smaller than Japan’s economic strength could support. Japanese public opinion restrains militarism in general and precludes the development of nuclear weapons in particular after Japanese cities were destroyed by nuclear weapons in World War II. Nonetheless, some Japanese leaders, including the new prime minister chosen in 2006, believe that Japan’s formal security role should expand commensurate with its economic power. Japanese troops participated in Afghanistan in 2001 and Iraq in 2004 (though not in combat roles), and Japan seeks a permanent seat on the UN Security Council. The UN in turn is pressing Japan to participate fully in peacekeeping missions.

For its part, the United States has used the alliance with Japan as a base to project U.S. power in Asia, especially during the wars in Korea (1950–1953) and Vietnam (1965–1975), when Japan was a key staging area. The continued U.S. military presence in Japan (as in Europe) symbolizes the U.S. commitment to remain engaged in Asian security affairs. However, these U.S. forces have been drawn down somewhat in the past decade in response to high costs, reduced threats, and some opposition by local residents (especially on Okinawa). As the United States begins to focus more on the Middle East, more cuts in troops could follow.53

Parallel with the U.S.-Japan treaty, the United States maintains military alliances with several other states, including South Korea and Australia. Close U.S. collaboration with militaries in other states such as Israel make them de facto U.S. allies.

The 11 members of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) comprise the former Soviet republics except the Baltic states (Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania). Russia, the official successor state to the Soviet Union, is the leading member and Ukraine the second largest. Although some military coordination takes place through the CIS, initial plans for a joint military force did not succeed. Among the largest CIS members, Kazakhstan and Belarus are the most closely aligned with Russia, while Ukraine is the most independent (and in fact never officially ratified the CIS agreement). In 2009, Georgia withdrew from the CIS, due to its 2008 military conflict with Russia.

Regional Alignments

Beyond the alliances just discussed and the regional IGOs mentioned earlier, most international alignments and coalitions are not formalized in alliances. Among the great powers, a close working relationship has developed, with China the most independent.

control of Kashmir. Your advisors also remind you that China still has a healthy relationship with Pakistan, selling large numbers of weapons and giving military assistance to Pakistan. Indeed the main political opposition parties argue that you have been too "soft" on both Pakistan and China in your time as Prime Minister. Any public backlash against your foreign policy on these issues could be widespread and bring calls for new elections that could unseat your government.

SCENARIO
Imagine the government of Pakistan begins to suffer from large-scale instability. Islamist militants are close to overthrowing the government there, giving them control of Pakistan’s nuclear weapons. They are also calling for Muslims in Kashmir to rise up against Indian control, promising to openly assist a rebellion in that province by providing weapons and intelligence. Your own intelligence service considers the collapse of the current Pakistani government “likely.”

CHOOSE YOUR POLICY
Do you push for closer relations with China as a result of instability in Pakistan? Can you trust China to support you in a dispute with Pakistan, given those countries’ close relationship? Do you ask China to help mediate between your government and Pakistan in the event of hostilities? Or do you continue your course as independently as possible, not trusting Chinese intentions toward your country?
In the global South, many states joined a nonaligned movement during the Cold War, standing apart from the U.S.-Soviet rivalry. This movement, led by India and Yugoslavia, was undermined by the membership of states such as Cuba that were clearly clients of one of the superpowers. In 1992, the nonaligned movement agreed to stay in business, although most of its member states now prefer to cooperate on security matters through more regionally based institutions.

At the turn of the century, the 53-member Organization of African Unity, an IGO with few powers, re-formed as the African Union (AU), a stronger organization with a continent-wide parliament, central bank, and court. The African Union’s first real test came with allegations of genocide in the Darfur region of Sudan in 2004. In response, the AU deployed 3,000 troops, but their effectiveness has remained limited. AU forces are to be joined by a much larger force of UN peacekeepers, but their deployment has been delayed so much that it will take more than two years to complete the deployment (about two-thirds of the planned 20,000 were deployed by the end of 2009).

In Asia, China has long been loosely aligned with Pakistan in opposition to India (which was aligned with the Soviet Union). The United States tended to favor the Pakistani side as well, but both U.S.-Indian and U.S.-Chinese relations have improved since the Cold War ended. The United States has 25,000 troops stationed in South Korea under terms of a formal bilateral alliance dating to the Korean War (North Korea is vaguely aligned with China). Other long-standing U.S. friends in Asia include the Philippines (where joint anti-terrorist operations began in 2002), the Chinese Nationalists on Taiwan (only informally since the 1970s), Singapore, and Thailand. In 2007, the third East Asia Summit encompassed 16 states including India, Russia, and New Zealand, with the notable exception of the United States. Although these meetings have been more symbolism than substance, they have addressed important issues such as terrorism, trade, and the environment.

In the Middle East, the Arab-Israeli conflict created a general anti-Israel alignment of the Arab countries for decades, but that alignment broke down as Egypt in 1978 and then Jordan in 1994 made peace with Israel. As the Israeli-Palestinian peace process moves forward and backward year by year, Arab countries continue to express varying degrees of solidarity with each other and opposition to Israel. The latest trough in Israeli-Arab relations came in 2006 when Israel fought a month-long war with Hezbollah guerrillas in southern Lebanon and, simultaneously, fought Hamas militants in Palestinian-administered areas. Meanwhile, Israel and Turkey formed a close military relationship that amplifies Israeli power and links it to the oil-rich Caspian Sea region (see pp. 404–405). Also, despite its small size, Israel has been the largest recipient of U.S. foreign aid since the 1980s (about $3 billion per year). The United States has close relations with Egypt (since 1978) and cooperates closely with Turkey (a NATO member), Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, and Morocco. U.S.-Iranian relations remain chilled 30 years after the 1979 revolution. But, oddly, Iran, with its Shi’ite population, has close ties with Iraq’s new U.S.-backed government, which is dominated by Shi’ite religious parties. The United States had very hostile relations with Iraq before the 2003 war, and has faced stronger antipathy in the region thereafter. U.S. relations with Libya were also hostile for decades until a 2003 agreement normalized Libya’s place in the international system in return for Libya’s reformed behavior.

It is unclear what new international alignments may emerge in the years to come. The fluidity of alliances makes them a wild card for scholars to understand and for policy
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makers to anticipate. For the present, international alignments—both military alliances and trade relationships—center on the United States (see Figure 2.6). Although several independent-minded states such as China, Russia, and France keep U.S. hegemony in check, little evidence exists of a coherent or formal rival power alignment emerging to challenge the United States.

**Strategy**

Actors use strategy to pursue good outcomes in bargaining with one or more other actors. States deploy power capabilities as leverage to influence each other’s actions.\(^56\) Bargaining is interactive, and requires an actor to take account of other actors’ interests even while pursuing its own.\(^57\) Sometimes bargaining communication takes place through actions rather than words.

**Statecraft**

Classical realists emphasize statecraft—the art of managing state affairs and effectively maneuvering in a world of power politics among sovereign states. Power strategies are plans actors use to develop and deploy power capabilities to achieve their goals.

---


Chapter 2  Realist Theories

A key aspect of strategy is choosing the kinds of capabilities to develop, given limited resources, in order to maximize international influence. This requires foresight because the capabilities required to manage a situation may need to be developed years before that situation presents itself. Yet the capabilities chosen often will not be fungible in the short term. Central to this dilemma is what kind of standing military forces to maintain in peacetime—enough to prevent a quick defeat if war breaks out, but not so much as to overburden one's economy (see pp. 223–224).

Strategies also shape policies for when a state is willing to use its power capabilities. The will of a nation or leader is hard to estimate. Even if leaders make explicit their intention to fight over an issue, they might be bluffing.

The strategic actions of China in recent years exemplify the concept of strategy as rational deployment of power capabilities. China's central foreign policy goal is to prevent the independence of Taiwan, which China considers an integral part of its territory (as does the United Nations and, at least in theory, the United States). Taiwan's government was set up to represent all of China in 1949, when the nationalists took refuge there after losing to the communists in China's civil war. Since the international community's recognition of the Beijing government as "China," however, Taiwan has attempted to operate more and more independently, with many Taiwanese favoring independence. China may not have the military power to invade Taiwan successfully, but it has declared repeatedly that it will go to war if Taiwan declares independence. So far, even though such a war might be irrational on China's part, the threat has deterred Taiwan from formally declaring independence. China might lose such a war, but would certainly inflict immense damage on Taiwan. In 1996, China held war games near Taiwan, firing missiles over the sea. The United States sent two aircraft carriers to signal to China that its exercises must not go too far.

Not risking war by declaring independence, Taiwan instead has engaged in diplomacy to gain influence in the world. It lobbies the U.S. Congress, asks for admission to the UN and other world organizations, and grants foreign aid to countries that recognize Taiwan's government (23 mostly small, poor countries worldwide as of 2009).

China has used its own diplomacy to counter these moves. It breaks diplomatic relations with countries that recognize Taiwan, and it punishes any moves in the direction of Taiwanese independence. Half the countries that recognize Taiwan are in the Caribbean and Central America, leading to a competition for influence in the region. China has tried to counter Taiwanese ties with those countries by manipulating various positive and negative leverages. For example, in Panama, where China is a major user of the Panama Canal (which reverted to Panama from U.S. ownership in 1999), Taiwan has cultivated close relations, invested in a container port, and suggested hiring guest workers from Panama in Taiwan. But China has implicitly threatened to restrict Panama's access to Hong Kong, or to reregister China's many Panamanian-registered ships in the Bahamas instead. (The Bahamas broke with Taiwan in 1997 after a Hong Kong conglomerate, now part of China, promised to invest in a Bahamian container port.) Similarly, when the Pacific microstate of Kiribati recognized Taiwan in late 2003 to gain Taiwanese aid, China broke off relations and removed a Chinese satellite-tracking station from Kiribati. Because the tracking station played a vital role in China's military reconnaissance and growing space program—which had recently launched its first astronaut—its dismantling underscored China's determination to give Taiwan priority even at a cost to other key national goals.

Two of the five vetoes China has used in the UN Security Council were to block peacekeeping forces in countries that extended recognition to Taiwan. These vetoes demonstrate that if China believes its Taiwan interests are threatened, it can play a spoiler role on the Security Council. When the former Yugoslav republic of Macedonia recognized Taiwan in
1999 (in exchange for $1 billion in aid), China vetoed a UN peacekeeping mission there at a time of great instability in next-door Kosovo (by 2001, Macedonia had switched its diplomatic recognition to China). By contrast, when its Taiwan interests are secure, China cooperates on issues of world order. For example, although China opposed the 1991 Gulf War, it did not veto the UN resolution authorizing it.

These Chinese strategies mobilize various capabilities, including missiles, diplomats, and industrial conglomerates, in a coherent effort to influence the outcome of China’s most important international issue. Strategy thus amplifies China’s power.58

The strategy of deterrence uses a threat to punish another actor if it takes a certain negative action (especially attacking one’s own state or one’s allies). If deterrence works, its effects are almost invisible; its success is measured in attacks that did not occur.59

Generally, advocates of deterrence believe that conflicts are more likely to escalate into war when one party to the conflict is weak. In this view, building up military capabilities usually convinces the stronger party that a resort to military leverage would not succeed, so conflicts are less likely to escalate into violence. A strategy of compellence, sometimes used after deterrence fails, refers to the use of force to make another actor take some action (rather than refrain from taking an action).60 Generally it is harder to get another state to change course (the purpose of compellence) than it is to get it to refrain from changing course (the purpose of deterrence).

One strategy used to try to compel compliance by another state is escalation—a series of negative sanctions of increasing severity applied in order to induce another actor to take some action. In theory, the less severe actions establish credibility—showing the first actor’s willingness to exert its power on the issue—and


the pattern of escalation establishes the high costs of future sanctions if the second actor does not cooperate. These actions should induce the second actor to comply, assuming that it finds the potential costs of the escalating punishments greater than the costs of compliance. But escalation can be quite dangerous. During the Cold War, many IR scholars worried that a conventional war could lead to nuclear war if the superpowers tried to apply escalation strategies.

An arms race is a reciprocal process in which two (or more) states build up military capabilities in response to each other. Because each wants to act prudently against a threat, the attempt to reciprocate leads to a runaway production of weapons by both sides. The mutual escalation of threats erodes confidence, reduces cooperation, and makes it more likely that a crisis (or accident) could cause one side to strike first and start a war rather than wait for the other side to strike. The arms race process was illustrated vividly in the U.S.-Soviet nuclear arms race, which created arsenals of tens of thousands of nuclear weapons on each side.61

Rationality

Most realists (and many nonrealists) assume that those who wield power while engaging in statecraft behave as rational actors in their efforts to influence others.62 This view has two implications for IR.

First, the assumption of rationality implies that states and other international actors can identify their interests and put priorities on various interests: A state's actions seek to advance its interests. Many realists assume that the actor (usually a state) exercising power is a single entity that can "think" about its actions coherently and make choices. This is called the unitary actor assumption, or sometimes the strong leader assumption. The assumption is a simplification, because the interests of particular politicians, parties, economic sectors, or regions of a country often conflict. Yet realists assume that the exercise of power attempts to advance the national interest—the interests of the state itself.

But what are the interests of a state? Are they the interests of domestic groups (see Chapter 3)? The need to prevail in conflicts with other states (see Chapter 5)? The ability to cooperate with the international community for mutual benefit (see Chapter 7)? There is no simple answer. Some realists simply define the national interest as maximizing power—a debatable assumption.63 Others compare power in IR with money in economics—a universal measure. In this view, just as firms compete for money in economic markets, states compete for power in the international system.64

Second, rationality implies that actors are able to perform a cost-benefit analysis—calculating the costs incurred by a possible action and the benefits it is likely to bring. Applying power incurs costs and should produce commensurate gains. As in the problem of estimating power, one has to add up different dimensions in such a calculation. For
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63 Waltz, Theory of International Politics (see footnote 7 in this chapter).

64 Morgenthau and Thompson, Politics among Nations (see footnote 6 in this chapter). Mearsheimer, The Tragedy of Great Power Politics (see footnote 14 in this chapter).
instance, states presumably do not initiate wars that they expect to lose, except when they stand to gain political benefits, domestic or international, that outweigh the costs of losing the war. But it is not easy to tally intangible political benefits against the tangible costs of a war. Even victory in a war may not be worth the costs paid. Rational actors can miscalculate costs and benefits, especially when using faulty information (although this does not mean they are irrational). Finally, human behavior and luck can be unpredictable.

These assumptions about rationality and the actors in IR are simplifications that not all IR scholars accept. But realists consider these simplifications useful because they allow scholars to explain in a general way the actions of diverse actors.

The Prisoner's Dilemma

Game theory is a branch of mathematics concerned with predicting bargaining outcomes. A game is a setting in which two or more players choose among alternative moves, either once or repeatedly. Each combination of moves (by all players) results in a set of payoffs (utility) to each player. The payoffs can be tangible items such as money or any intangible items of value. Game theory aims to deduce likely outcomes (what moves players will make), given the players' preferences and the possible moves open to them. Games are sometimes called formal models.

Game theory was first used extensively in IR in the 1950s and 1960s by scholars trying to understand U.S.-Soviet nuclear war contingencies. Moves were decisions to use nuclear weapons in certain ways, and payoffs were outcomes of the war. The use of game theory to study international interactions has become more extensive among IR scholars in recent years, especially among realists, who accept the assumptions about rationality. To analyze a game mathematically, one assumes that each player chooses a move rationally, to maximize its payoff.

Different kinds of situations are represented by different classes of games, as defined by the number of players and the structure of the payoffs. One basic distinction is between zero-sum games, in which one player's gain is by definition equal to the other's loss, and non-zero-sum games, in which it is possible for both players to gain (or lose). In a zero-sum game there is no point in communication or cooperation between the players because their interests are diametrically opposed. But in a non-zero-sum game, coordination of moves can maximize the total payoff to the players, although each may still maneuver to gain a greater share of that total payoff.65

The game called Prisoner's Dilemma (PD) captures the kind of collective goods problem common to IR. In this situation, rational players choose moves that produce an outcome in which all players

are worse off than under a different set of moves. They all could do better, but as individual rational actors they are unable to achieve this outcome. How can this be?

The original story tells of two prisoners questioned separately by a prosecutor. The prosecutor knows they committed a bank robbery but has only enough evidence to convict them of illegal possession of a gun unless one of them confesses. The prosecutor tells each prisoner that if he confesses and his partner doesn’t confess, he will go free. If his partner confesses and he doesn’t, he will get a long prison term for bank robbery (while the partner goes free). If both confess, they will get a somewhat reduced term. If neither confesses, they will be convicted on the gun charge and serve a short sentence. The story assumes that neither prisoner will have a chance to retaliate later, that only the immediate outcomes matter, and that each prisoner cares only about himself.

This game has a single solution: both prisoners will confess. Each will reason as follows: “If my partner is going to confess, then I should confess too, because I will get a slightly shorter sentence that way. If my partner is not going to confess, then I should still confess because I will go free that way instead of serving a short sentence.” The other prisoner follows the same reasoning. The dilemma is that by following their individually rational choices, both prisoners end up serving a fairly long sentence—when they could have both served a short one by cooperating (keeping their mouths shut).

PD-type situations occur frequently in IR. One good example is an arms race—the rapid buildup of weapons by each side in a conflict. Consider the decisions of India and Pakistan about whether to build sizable nuclear weapons arsenals. Both have the ability to do so. Neither side can know whether the other is secretly building up an arsenal unless they reach an arms control agreement with strict verification provisions. To analyze the game, we assign values to each possible outcome—often called a preference ordering—for each player. This is not simple: if we misjudge the value a player puts on a particular outcome, we may draw wrong conclusions from the game.

The following preferences regarding possible outcomes are plausible: the best outcome would be that oneself but not the other player had a nuclear arsenal (the expense of building nuclear weapons would be worth it because one could then use them as leverage); second best would be for neither to go nuclear (no leverage, but no expense); third best would be for both to develop nuclear arsenals (a major expense without gaining leverage); worst would be to forgo nuclear weapons oneself while the other player developed them (and thus be subject to blackmail).

The game can be summarized in a payoff matrix (see Figure 2.7). The first number in each cell is India’s payoff, and the second number is Pakistan’s. To keep things simple, 4 indicates the highest payoff, and 1 the lowest. As is conventional, a decision to refrain

![Figure 2.7 Payoff Matrix in India-Pakistan PD Game](image_url)

**Figure 2.7 Payoff Matrix in India-Pakistan PD Game**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cooperate</th>
<th>Defect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooperate</td>
<td>(3,3)</td>
<td>(1,4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defect</td>
<td>(4,1)</td>
<td>(2,2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: First number in each group is India’s payoff, second is Pakistan’s. The number 4 is highest payoff, 1 lowest.
from building nuclear weapons is called “cooperation,” and a decision to proceed with nuclear weapons is called “defection.” The dilemma here parallels that of the prisoners—each state’s leader reasons: “If they go nuclear, we must; if they don’t, we’d be crazy not to.” The model seems to predict an inevitable Indian-Pakistani nuclear arms race, although both states would do better to avoid one.

In 1998, India detonated underground nuclear explosions to test weapons designs, and Pakistan promptly followed suit. In 2002, the two states nearly went to war, with projected war deaths of up to 12 million. A costly and dangerous arms race continues, and each side now has dozens of nuclear missiles, and counting. Avoiding an arms race would benefit both sides as a collective good, but the IR system, without strong central authority, does not allow them to realize this potential benefit. This example illustrates why realists tend to be pessimistic about cooperative solutions to collective goods problems such as the one that the PD game embodies.

IR scholars have analyzed many other games beyond PD. For example, Chicken represents two male teenagers speeding toward a head-on collision. The first to swerve is “chicken.” Each reasons: “If he doesn’t swerve, I must; but if he swerves, I won’t.” The player who first commits irrevocably not to swerve (for example, by throwing away the steering wheel or putting on a blindfold while behind the wheel) will win. Similarly, in the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis, some scholars argued that President John F. Kennedy “won” by seeming ready to risk nuclear war if Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev did not back down and remove Soviet missiles from Cuba. (There are, however, alternative explanations of the outcome of the crisis.)

This chapter has focused on the concerns of realists—the interests of states, distribution of power among states, bargaining between states, and alliances of states. The chapter has treated states as unitary actors, much as one would analyze the interactions of individual people. The actions of state leaders have been treated as more or less rational in terms of pursuing definable interests through coherent bargaining strategies. But realism is not the only way to frame the major issues of international security. Chapter 3 reexamines these themes critically, relying less on the core principle of dominance and more on reciprocity.
SUMMARY

■ Realism explains international relations in terms of power.
■ Realists and idealists differ in their assumptions about human nature, international order, and the potential for peace.
■ Power can be conceptualized as influence or as capabilities that can create influence.
■ The most important single indicator of a state’s power is its GDP.
■ Short-term power capabilities depend on long-term resources, both tangible and intangible.
■ Realists consider military force the most important power capability.
■ International anarchy—the absence of world government—means that each state is a sovereign and autonomous actor pursuing its own national interests.
■ The international system traditionally places great emphasis on the sovereignty of states, their right to control affairs in their own territory, and their responsibility to respect internationally recognized borders.
■ Seven great powers account for half of the world’s GDP as well as the great majority of military forces and other power capabilities.
■ Power transition theory says that wars often result from shifts in relative power distribution in the international system.
■ Hegemony—the predominance of one state in the international system—can help provide stability and peace in international relations, but with some drawbacks.
■ The great power system is made up of about half a dozen states (with membership changing over time as state power rises and falls).
■ States form alliances to increase their effective power relative to that of another state or alliance.
■ Alliances can shift rapidly, with major effects on power relations.
■ The world’s main alliances, including NATO and the U.S.-Japanese alliance, face uncertain roles in a changing world order.
■ International affairs can be seen as a series of bargaining interactions in which states use their power capabilities as leverage to influence the outcomes. But bargaining outcomes also depend on strategies and luck.
■ Rational-actor approaches treat states as though they were individuals acting to maximize their own interests. These simplifications are debatable but allow realists to develop concise and general models and explanations.
■ Game theory draws insights from simplified models of bargaining situations. The Prisoner’s Dilemma game embodies a difficult collective goods problem.
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CRITICAL THINKING QUESTIONS

1. Using Table 1.4 on pp. 24–25 (with GDP as a measure of power) and the maps at the front of the book, pick a state and speculate about what coalition of nearby states might form with sufficient power to oppose the state if it became aggressive.

2. Choose a recent international event and list the power capabilities that participants used as leverage in the episode. Which capabilities were effective, and which were not? Why?

3. The modern international system came into being at a time when agrarian societies relied primarily on farmland to create wealth. Now that most wealth is no longer created through farming, is the territorial nature of states obsolete? How might the diminishing economic value of territory change the ways in which states interact?

4. If you were the leader of a small state in Africa, bargaining with a great power about an issue where your interests diverged, what leverage and strategies could you bring into play to improve the outcome for your state?

5. Given the distinction between zero-sum and non-zero-sum games, can you think of a current international situation that is a zero-sum conflict? One that is non-zero-sum?
Can the United States and China Peacefully Coexist?

ARGUMENT 1

The United States and China Will Find It Difficult to Peacefully Coexist

**U.S. and Chinese allies create conflicts between them.** China’s ties to North Korea, Iran, and Sudan have strengthened in the past five years. The United States considers each of these states to be hostile, while China has courted each for economic or strategic reasons. On the U.S. side, although there is no formal alliance, American friendliness to Taiwan, which China regards as a renegade province, also creates tensions.

**China already promotes its interests in conflict with the United States.** China currently pegs its currency to keep its goods cheap in the United States. Despite many protests against this policy, China persists in pegging its currency, which harms domestic manufacturers in the United States.

**China is already attempting to compete with the United States as a global superpower.** China has expanded foreign aid to Africa (even to states sanctioned by the United States). China has increased weapons sales around the world. China is also courting states with hostile relationships to the United States such as Venezuela and Iran. All signs point to China attempting to build relationships in an attempt to compete with the United States for global supremacy.

Overview

In this chapter, we noted that realists emphasize the idea of the balance of power—states may ally with one another to prevent another state from becoming too dominant. Yet, in the current system, the United States is clearly unparalleled in military and economic power. Some scholars argue that China will be the state that challenges the leadership position of the United States in the future.

Historically, the relationship between China and the United States has been rocky. During the Cold War, after the United States opened the relationship with China, the two great powers cooperated against a common enemy, the Soviet Union. After the Cold War, that cooperation has varied significantly as China has expanded economically and militarily, filling the global power vacuum left by the collapse of the Soviet Union.

Although China is still smaller economically and less powerful militarily than the United States, if current growth continues, it will eventually surpass the United States in economic might. Armed with such a large economy, it will not take long for China to then catch the United States militarily. These changes are referred to as power transitions (see p. 57). While sometimes these transitions between powerful states are peaceful (the United States replacing Great Britain, for example), oftentimes they are not (Germany’s attempts to overtake Great Britain in World Wars I and II). Should China grow to challenge the United States, what does the future hold for these two great powers? Will their relationship be one of peace or hostility?
ARGUMENT 2

The United States and China Can Peacefully Coexist

The United States and China agree on many important issues. On issues such as terrorism and nuclear proliferation, China sees eye-to-eye with the United States. As with the United States and the Soviet Union during the Cold War, there is room for agreement on issues of strategic importance that will allow for cooperation between the two great powers. In addition, China’s “peaceful rise” strategy has avoided direct conflict with the United States for 30 years.

Nuclear deterrence will keep relations stable. Both states have large, credible nuclear forces that can deter the opponent from attacking. While this may not rule out proxy wars (as in the Cold War), it does suggest that relations will remain civil and stable between the United States and China.

Economic interdependence will keep relations peaceful. The United States and China depend on one another economically. America depends on Chinese goods flowing in at reasonable prices, while China depends on the U.S. market for its export-led growth strategy. This situation of mutual dependence will keep relations warm, since hostility would threaten to undermine these trade relationships.

Questions

- Is conflict inevitable between the United States and China? If China were to become a democracy, would conflict be more or less likely?
- If conflicts occur in the future, are there ways to discourage them? Or are these conflicts just part of global politics between great powers? Can international organizations (such as the United Nations) help to ameliorate the potential for great power conflict?
- Taiwan is an important source of friction between the United States and China. Although the United States does not formally recognize Taiwan, American has signed a friendship treaty with the island. Should the United States risk its relationship with China over honoring its commitments to Taiwan? If China forces the United States to choose between Taiwan and lower tensions, which should the United States choose?
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