

Preface

*Power has no limits.
(Tiberius Caesar)*

For millennia the study of power has been an essential part of human philosophical endeavours. Already in ancient times Greek and Indian philosopher as well as Roman and Chinese statesmen tried to answer questions regarding the essential nature of power, its sources and how to use power wisely in order to keep and increase it. However, despite these efforts power in essence remains to some extent a mystery. In International Relations (IR) myriads of researcher have tried to understand what power in IR might look like, which shapes it can take and how they work and interact.¹

At the beginning of the second decade of the 21st century there is a great debate going on that deals with the question whether there is a power shift taking place between the developed countries and the so called emerging or reemerging powers (mainly China, Brazil, India and Russia, but also other countries like Indonesia or South Africa). This debate is not only taking place in academic circles, but has also largely influenced public discourses around the globe. While there is a lot of academic work on the empirical implications of a perceived power shift between the western world and emerging powers (e.g. Rachman 2008; Grevi 2009; Stephens 2009; Zakaria 2009), a comparable debate has not taken place on questions connected with these implications, e.g. how power shifts in international relations can actually be captured methodological in the 21st century – comprised of an arena that is largely characterized by a complex economical, political, financial and ecological interdependence. Likewise, questions regarding the changing nature of power as an ability or function in such an environment are barely debated on a theoretical level. Especially when it comes to answer the questions of what the nature of power in today's interstate relations might look like, which forms it might

¹ For a longer discussion on the debate see Chap. 1 from Fels in this volume.

take, which new sources it can be based upon or which ways may have become more effective than others for exercising it internationally, one discovers both theoretical confusion and cacophony. Various concepts and approaches that were developed in the decades after the Second World War compete for explanatory power. On a general level Realist and Neo-Realist scholars regard hard power capabilities (military and economic resources) as the most important sources of power in IR (cf. Waltz 1990; Mearsheimer 1995; Grieco 1995). Joseph Nye, on the other hand, argues for soft power, as the ability to attract others and win their support for own positions, or smart power, a combination and application of soft and hard power resources in a 'smart' way, as the most important sources and ways for exercising power in international affairs (Nye 1990a, b; 2011).

David Baldwin (2002: 178–179) again introduced a multi-dimensional concept of power; power in his concept can be analyzed in terms of its scope, weight, means and domain. To understand power in its total character, Barnett and Duval (2005) also developed a multi-level approach towards power: They presented an approach which combined material, relational and structural components of power. Barnett and Duval distinguished on an analytical level between compulsory, institutional, structural and productive power, asserting that those four forms would be able to explain the whole picture of power in IR (Barnett/Duval 2005).

Other scholars – most prominently Stephen Krasner (1985) and Susan Strange (1987, 1988, 1996) – have argued for structural power as being the most important source of power in IR. Additionally, other scholars have brought power concepts from the field of sociology into the debate and argued for non-intentional, institutional, impersonal or discursive power as important power variants (cf. Guzzini 1993, 2005). Lukes for example pointed out the importance of the relationship between power and interests, as well as the importance of winning the “hearts and minds” of another actor in order to successfully exercise power (Lukes 2005). Other authors in IR – especially postmodern and critical scholars – understand power as being productive in terms of creating subjectivity, norms and discourses. Power in this understanding constitutes subjects by normalizing them throughout the overt and covert effects of norms and discourses (cf. Foucault 1972). These effects cannot be controlled by a single actor or small group of actors. Furthermore, norms and discourses become own sources of power, controlling the behaviour and belief-system of human beings. Power in this understanding is “making up people” (Hacking 1986). Proponents of Max Weber’s definition of power as a relational concept have followed another, quite different idea on power (Weber 1947; Baldwin 1979, 1980, 2002; Dahl 1957). Thus, every interested observer of the debates on power in IR will recognize that power in IR seems to have not only a Janus face as a defining characteristic feature, but – to stick to the image – should best be understood to have the polycephalic countenance of Hekate, Brahma or Svantovit. There is now such a variety of concepts and understandings of power in our discipline that someone might find it quite hard to stay informed and not to lose his head in the discussion. The aim of this book is therefore twofold: first, to shed some light onto the discussion on this important topic by outlining the competing strands and concepts in the literature, second – and with respect to the altered

international environment of the 21st century – to contribute to the debate by introducing novel approaches and understandings or new applications of older concepts in order to show how scholars might understand power in our changing world in this new century.

The concept of power is still today “one of the most troublesome in the field of international relations” (Gilpin 1981: 13) and a useful definition of power in IR “remains a matter of controversy” (Waltz 1986, 333). Indeed, this book likewise will not be able to give a conclusive answer towards the question “What is power?”. However, by providing approaches and studies for perhaps the two most important sectors of IR –International Security and International Political Economy (IPE) – the volume seeks to widen the understanding of power in our discipline with regards to developments at the dawn of the 21st century. To do so, on the one hand, the book focuses primarily on international relations and on power in the stricter IR sense. Accordingly, concepts of power which have been developed under the prime objective to understand power in sociological and linguistic terms (Foucaultian, discursive, impersonal and other postmodern approaches), on the other hand, will not be explored in this volume.

In order to achieve these aims, this volume brings together scholars working in the fields of IR, IPE, economics and finance as well as security studies. By approaching the subject from a variety of angles and introducing new theoretical designs and empirical analyses, they seek to foster the debate particularly in those realms that continue to be important for modern nation states: security and economics. Furthermore, this book not only includes contributions from authors with different academic backgrounds, but – even more important – very different ontological, epistemological and theoretical perspectives. Due to this basic feature, the volume is not designed to develop one specific and exclusive concept for understanding the nature of power in IR. In fact, it intends to combine the work of scholars working on issues within the fields of security and economic into a single volume in order to outline both differing and similar understandings of power (and its multiple facets) within the academic community working on the international realm, tackle different aspects, combine existing theoretical considerations with empirical evidence and present novel ideas for grasping power in the modern world.

The book’s first part, *Theoretical Considerations about Power*, deals with the various theoretical aspects of power. The contributions concentrate not only on power discourses within IR on a general level and possible shifts of it among international actor, but discuss established and novel understandings of power in its various dimensions and present possibilities for adapting them to the 21st century. The volume’s second part, entitled *International Security and Power*, encompasses contributions that deal with power developments in one field of IR, which has probably gained the most attention since the establishing of our discipline. The section assesses old and new sources of international power and analyses implications they have in the currently changing global environment. *International Political Economy and Power*, the final part of the book, contains contributions, which deal with power in the realm of trade, finance and economics. The authors examine how economic power should best be understood, in which ways economic

interdependence and the governance of the global economy affect the international power status of states, and how economics has been used in recent times to gain and exercise power in a globalized world.

The volume's first chapter, *Power Shift? Power in International Relations and the Allegiance of Middle Powers*, starts with a general overview of the competing understandings of power in IR. Enrico Fels argues that one can distinguish three power concepts: power-as-resources, relational and structural power. Combining the allegiance of middle powers and a relational understanding of power, Fels proceeds and analyses Australia's allegiance as a case study in order to give an example for measuring a possible power shift between the United States and China. Whereas in economic terms Australia's relationship with China became much more interdependent in the last decades, Canberra continues to strengthen its security ties with Washington, demonstrating the limited fungibility of power between power areas.

Cornelia Beyer continues the theoretical debate in Chap. 2, *Hegemony and Power in the Global War on Terrorism*, by using the US hegemony between 2001 and 2008 as well as US leadership in the Global War on Terror as an example in order to debate a modern concept of hegemony, combining realist, constructivist and critical IR perspectives while distancing her concept from the simple realist notion of unipolarity. She finds that the US hegemony is based on material and ideological power and validates her thesis with a qualitative analysis of interviews conducted with scholars and practitioners from the EU und ASEAN and their evaluation of US dominance.

Gitika Commuri critically discusses Joseph Nye's well-known concept of soft power in Chap. 3. In *Are you Pondering what I am Pondering? Understanding the Conditions Under which States Gain and Loose Soft Power* she uses Nye's original articulation of the concept – in terms of persuasion and attraction of others and hence without the gradual inclusion of economic power Nye himself added later. She concentrates on the conditions in which states may gain or lose soft power and investigates the relationship of these conditions with hard power capabilities, the role of the international structure and, particularly interesting, to a relational understanding of power. The article finishes by clarifying why states can gain and lose soft power in another state at the same time, since a state's soft power often only intentionally aims one group, i.e. certain elites or the population in the targeted state. Commuri argues that besides the internal conditions of nation states and the structure of the international system, historic conditions are responsible for significantly shaping the ability of states to possess and project soft power.

In Chap. 4, *Towards a New Understanding of Structural Power – "Structure is What States Make of it"*, Andrej Pustovitovskij and Jan-Frederik Kremer develop a new understanding of structural power after discussing existing approaches of structural notions of power, including Susan Strange's concept. By pointing out the importance of states' needs and goods for their structural power position in international relations and by introducing an approach for linking these to the exercise of power in structural terms they explore the very sources of structural power. They show that by influencing their baskets and the likelihood of becoming

credible outside options for other actors in international negotiations, states can gain structural power in international affairs.

Stephan Frühling and Andrew O'Neil commence the volume's second part, which concentrates on aspects of power in the field of security. In Chap. 5, *Nuclear Weapons and Power in the 21st Century*, they deal with probably the most destructive weapons mankind has so far developed and discuss possible effects of novel developments in the field of nuclear arms on future power relations. The two authors show that although nuclear weapons make massive destruction possible, states managed in the past to find a delicate balance of terror that brought stability during the Cold War. With the technological advancement of many nations especially from the Global South, however, the main pillar of the previously quite successful nuclear order – the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) – comes under rising pressure from latent nuclear powers. Frühling and O'Neil argue that while one should not conclude that latent nuclear powers will turn into de facto ones quickly, their new nuclear capabilities will nevertheless have wider systemic effects as a new type of power resource.

Sarah Kirchberger shows in Chap. 9, *Evaluating Maritime Power: The Example of China*, that in order to measure and compare national naval strength it is essential to employ an innovative multi-facet framework that goes beyond the traditional consideration of numbers, vessel types and employed personnel. After outlining the concept of sea power she proceeds with a closer look at China's naval modernization strategy and the impact the Chinese naval build-up has on the Asian naval balance of power. Following her critical assessment of the Middle Kingdom's maritime capabilities, Kirchberger concludes that although China's maritime power might be growing, it is – especially if compared to some neighbouring nations – relatively weak considering its high dependency on maritime transport, its vast coastline and the size of its Exclusive Economic Zone.

In Chap. 8, Roxana G. Radu draws attention to the increasing importance of information and communication technology both as a source of national power as well as a threat to it. After conceptualising cyber security and the novel vulnerabilities states face in an increasingly digitalized national and international environment, Radu concentrates on the role that informational power plays in trans-national relations. She concludes *The Monopoly of Violence in the Cyber Space: Challenges of Cyber Security* by using the empirical cases of Estonia, Georgia and South Korea to outline policy responses by countries that experienced critical cyber attacks in the recent past.

In Chap. 10, *Drones as Future Air Power Assets: The Dawn of Aviation 2.0?*, Louis-Marie Clouet concentrates on the important tactical and strategic impacts of Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) for 21st century power relations. Taking recent military experiences as a starting point, he outlines how UAVs are already changing the ways air power is gained and exercised by Western and non-Western militaries, e.g. by using drones for better battlefield awareness. He sketches out likely future developments within this important field and shows that drones are set to fundamentally alter the traditionally air power hierarchy as they allow for military air assets that are cheaper (compared to the costs of traditional jets and bombers) and

easier to manufacture (particularly due to dual-use technologies) – something that particularly benefits developing countries. Given the rising global demand for drones and the increasingly tougher industrial competition, Clouet concludes with a call for a stronger European cooperation in order to avoid falling behind militarily and technologically.

Following a reflection of the European discourse's development on traditional power politics in the decades after the end of the Cold War, Magnus Christiansson delves into the concept of military balancing and shows in Chap. 7, how this particular concept, which was long absent in the European security debate, continues to be relevant when it comes to certain European sub-complexes such as the Baltic Sea region. He proceeds in *The Military Balance in the Baltic Sea Region – Notes on a Defunct Concept* by concentrating on military capabilities of regional states, sorts their various balancing patterns into three basic strategies – assurance, avoidance or self-realization – and examines the impact the Russian-Georgian war in August 2008 had in altering these strategies. The results of his analysis show that balancing theory helps to get a better grasp of regional state's security behaviour and compensates for blind spots of theories dealing with governance or complex interdependence.

In the book's 6th Chapter Jost Wübbeke uses a constructivist approach to address the question of how important natural resources serve as tools or sources of power in the 21st century. After examining existing approaches towards resource power and offering an insightful assessment of today's distribution of key resources, Wübbeke analyses in *Three Worlds of Natural Resources and Power* the importance of resources in international relations by using Wendt's conceptions of three different ontological perceptions of world politics that form three idiosyncratic role models of interstate relations: Hobbesian, Lockean, Kantian. He points out that depending on the ontological perception of international relations by the international actors involved and the role model applied by them, the importance of resources as sources of power varies significantly and therefore there is neither an automatic link between natural resources and power nor between scarcity and conflict.

Benjamin J. Cohen starts the volume's third part, which concentrates on international economic aspects of power, by closer examining monetary power in international affairs. In Chap. 11, *The International Monetary System: Diffusion and Ambiguity*, he addresses the question of the ontology of power and rule-setting in the international monetary system. By distinguishing between two dimensions of monetary power – autonomy and influence – Cohen offers an innovative approach towards power in the international monetary system. Within this context he examines and analyses different developments, outlining a diffusion of power among states as well as between states and non-state actors rather in the dimension of autonomy than in the dimension of influence. Cohen introduces the concept of *leaderless diffusion*, meaning that leadership in the system has been more scattered than relocated. He argues that a power shift has taken place from few very powerful states towards a growing number of autonomous actors, especially when it comes to rule-setting abilities within the monetary system. Furthermore, he outlines that

on the level of governance, a distinction should be made between the individual state and the global system and thus offers an elaborated approach towards understanding monetary and economic power in the 21st century.

In *Leaders in Need of Followers: Emerging Powers in Global Governance* Stefan A. Schirm shows how regional and emerging powers such as Brazil and Germany strive to exercise leadership in international negotiations. By looking at negotiations within the World Trade Organisation (WTO), the founding of the G20 and both countries bids for permanent seats in the UN Security Council, Schirm explores in Chap. 12 the necessary conditions for regional powers to gain followership in the international community. In concentrating on followership as a core condition for success and failure of emerging and regional power's leadership in global governance, he succeeds in developing a thoughtful methodology that facilitates analysing the exercise of power by middle and great powers.

In Chap. 13, *A Power Through Trade? The European Union and Democracy Promotion in ACP States*, Dennis Nottebaum tests whether the EU, which he defines as a trading power, has the ability to exert power and to influence the internal development (especially the promotion of democracy) of its trading partners from Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific (ACP states) by using the access to its internal market as a bargaining chip. Nottebaum assesses the European impact on trade relations operationalized as trade openness by using a two-stage least squares model (2SLS) with panel data covering the years from 1991 to 2008. Thereby he provides evidence that the EU has considerable success in linking trade issues with issues of democracy promotion in the ACP states.

Maaïke Okano-Heijmans outlines in *Power Shift: Economic Realism and Economic Diplomacy on the Rise*, the book's 14th Chapter, how latecomer countries are much more willing to use economic tools for strengthening their position in international negotiations and for intervening in their domestic economies to achieve political goals than economically developed countries in Europe and North America. To do so she reconceptualises the economic dimension of power by adjusting existing theoretical concepts that link economics and politics, to current realities and contemporary debates. In analysing Chinese foreign policies she is able to validate her initial assumptions and confirms concerns of the future success of foreign policies from European countries.

In the last chapter of this volume, *Exploring China's Rise as a Knowledge Power*, Maximilian Mayer uses China as a case study in order to point to an often neglected aspect of national power: knowledge und technology. He argues that a truly comprehensive understanding of how China could (again) become a hub of world politics requires an historical exploration of the Chinese position within the global political economy of knowledge. Drawing from the ideas of Susan Strange, Robert Gilpin, and Joseph Schumpeter, he explores the global knowledge power politics in which China's rise is embedded and concludes that, in sum, China's knowledge power has obviously increased. However, China largely relies on creeping processes of knowledge creation that neither reduce its technological dependence nor result in a sharp increase of knowledge power. On a theoretical level, Mayer's case study illustrates that, despite the alleged conceptual elusiveness

of knowledge, a reasonably coherent and differentiated assessment of qualitative and quantitative alternations of knowledge power is possible.

Finally, carrying out this book project benefitted from the support, ideas and work of many individuals and institutions. First and foremost we would like to thank the authors not only for participating in the project and presenting fresh ideas and concepts, but also for their patience and efforts during its various stages. Furthermore, we are particularly grateful to Prof. Dr. Xuewu Gu, director of the Center for Global Studies (CGS) at the University of Bonn, for supporting the project right from the start with great enthusiasm, productive discussions and financial backing. Thanks are furthermore due to our other colleagues at the CGS – Maximilian Mayer, Andrej Pustovitovskij, Pavlina Schmitz, Ben Behschnitt, Tschén-Ing Liu, Markus Nagel, Katharina Below, and Jan-Paul Franken – for their helpful suggestions and assistance. We are also grateful to the International Studies Association (ISA) for allowing us to present our papers at its 52nd Annual Convention in Montreal (Canada) in March 2011 and discuss selected analyses and views expressed in this volume with scholars from all over the world. For a very friendly and professional cooperation we furthermore wish to express our gratitude to the economics and political science section of our publisher Springer, particularly to Barbara Fess. Finally, we would like to extend thanks to our colleagues at the Department for Political Science and Sociology at the University of Bonn – not only for providing a fruitful working environment, but also for personal and academic encouragements during the many phases of this book project.

Enrico Fels, Jan-Frederik Kremer,
Katharina Kronenberg

Bonn, Spring 2012

References

- Baldwin, D. A. (1979). Power analysis and world politics: New trends versus old tendencies. *World Politics* 31(2), 161–194.
- Baldwin, D. A. (1980). Interdependence and power: A conceptual analysis. *International Organization*, 34(4), 471–506.
- Baldwin, D. A. (2002). Power and international relations. In W. Carlsnaes, T. Risse, B. Simmons (Eds.), *The handbook of international relations* (pp. 177–191). Thousand Oaks: Sage Press.
- Barnett, M., & Duvall, R. (2005a). Power in international politics. *International Organizations*, 59 (Winter), 39–75.
- Dahl, R. A. (1957). The concept of power. *Behavioral Science*, 2(3), 201–215.
- Foucault, M. (1972–1977). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972–77*. Brighton: Harvester.
- Gilpin, R. (1981). *War and change in world politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grevi, G. (2009). *The Interpolar world: A new scenario*. Occasional Paper – No. 79, European Union Institute for Security Studies.

- Grieco, J. M. (1995). The Maastricht treaty, economic and monetary union and the neo-realist research program. *Review of International Studies*, 21(1), 21–40.
- Guzzini, S. (1993). Structural power: The limits of neorealist power analysis. *International Organization*, 47(3), 443–478.
- Guzzini, S. (2005). The concept of power: A constructivist analysis. *Millennium – Journal of International Studies*, 33, 495–522.
- Hacking, I. (1986). Making up people. In T. Heller, M. Sosna, & D. Wellbery (Eds.), *Reconstructing individualism*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Krasner, S. D. (1985). *Structural conflict: The third world against global liberalism*. Berkley: University of California Press.
- Lukes, S. (2005). Power and the battle for the hearts and minds. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 33(3), 477–493.
- Mearsheimer, J. J. (1995). The false promise of international institutions. *International Security*, 19(3), 5–49.
- Nye, J. S. Jr. (1990a). The changing nature of world power. *Political Science Quarterly*, 105(2), 177–192.
- Nye, J. S. Jr. (1990b). Soft power. *Foreign Policy*, 80, 153–171.
- Nye, J. S. Jr. (2011). *The future of power*. Public Affairs, 2011.
- Rachman, G. (2008). Is America's new declinism for real? *Financial Times* (November 24).
- Stephens, P. (2009). Financial crisis marks out a new geopolitical order. *Financial Times* (October 9).
- Strange, S. (1987). The persistent myth of lost hegemony. *International Organization*, 41(4) (Autumn), 551–574.
- Strange, S. (1988). *States and markets – An introduction to international political economy*. London: Pinter Publishers.
- Strange, S. (1996). *The retreat of the state: The diffusion of power in the world economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Waltz, K. (1990). Realist thought and neorealist theory. *Journal of International Affairs*, 44, 21–37.
- Waltz, K. N. (1986). Reflections on theory of international politics: A response to my critics. In R. O. Keohane (Ed.), *Neorealism and its critics*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organization*. New York: The Free Press.
- Zakaria, F. (2009). *The Post-American world: And the rise of the rest*. London: Penguin Books.