

CHAPTER 3

CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS OF THE NOTIONS OF POWER AND GREAT POWER

3 Conceptual Analysis of the Notions of Power and Great Power

3.1 Introduction

Theoretical notions are the background and backbone of any piece of research work in social sciences. “Theory provides a framework for evaluating the policy recommendations, either explicit or implicit, that abound in all the social sciences”(James Dougherty and Robert Pfaltzgraff, 1989, p. 16). Generally, theory is meant to establish relationship among concepts. “It explains the phenomena systematically to predict the perception of relationship among the concepts”(Mingst, 2004, p. 57). This dissertation is thus going to study various important concepts and establish relationship between foreign policy and great power. Empirically, the relationship between foreign policy and great power has been analyzed by discussing Chinese foreign policy in the following chapters.

This chapter is not intended to produce any new theory or any new concept but rather discuss various meanings of the concept of power, concept of great power, foreign policy in order to understand the behaviour and policies which are discussed in the following chapters. The purpose of this chapter is twofold. First to understand various meanings of the concepts used in International Relations theories which are used in the later part of the dissertation as there are various aspects of each concept and second is to understand the characteristics of great power used in analyzing the foreign policy through various theoretical approaches as the answer to the key research questions.

3.2 Basic Concepts Used in the Research Work

As discussed above the basic concepts used in the thesis such as foreign policy, power, capability, great power etc. are very complex and dynamic. Hence, this chapter seeks to

analyze various perspectives on these complex concepts so as to render the arguments of the subsequent chapter easy to understand.

3.2.1 Concept of Foreign Policy

Foreign policy could be considered as a sub-field of international relations discipline. Foreign policy is a dynamic process. For some it is a process, for others it is a relation and some might consider it as an interaction between the units of the system. And others may consider it a tool of alliance among the units of international system. The generic concept of foreign policy has been discussed in this section. Let us observe various definitions given by scholars.

Hill has defined it as “foreign policy is the sum of official external relations conducted by independent actors in international relations” (Tayfur, 1994, pp. 117-8).

George Modelski and Pat McGowan have defined foreign policy by observing the actions of communities and the national or central governments. George Modelski has defined foreign policy as “system evolved by communities for changing the behaviour of other states and for adjusting their activities to the international environment” (Tayfur, 1994, p. 117).

According to McGowan, “foreign policy could be defined as the actions of national or central governments taken towards other actors external to the legal sovereignty of the initiating governments”(Tayfur, 1994, p. 117).

K. J. Holsti’s perception is from the domestic development or domestic benefits. K. J. Holsti, considers foreign policy as “... designed to sustain or alter a current object, condition, or practice in the external environment” (Holsti, 1995, p. 250).

James Rosenau finds a gap of scientific study of the foreign policy. Hence, he brings a new dimension to the studies of comparative foreign policy with his pre-theories that has five variables namely, “(1) idiosyncratic; (2) role; (3) governmental; (4) societal; (5) systemic. These five categories of variables were considered as the main sources of foreign policy behaviour”(Tayfur, 1994, p. 122).

Consequently, one can say that foreign policy is a way of interaction between states in the international system. Traditional concept of foreign policy was mainly aimed to achieve the national interest by the state governments and develop relations with other states in the International System. As in contemporary multipolar world, foreign policy is a conglomeration of different policies delineated and implemented at domestic as well as international level by the leaders of the states with an aim to give sustainable and developed infrastructure to their citizens.

There are several actors in the international system, which interact with one other through different ways. The interaction during traditional era was through diplomacy, propaganda, economic rewards or force. But during recent times K. J. Holsti has discussed them as “...world trade, mail flows, tourism and travel, telephone calls, foreign investment, international conferences of scientists and other academics, or international sports competitions... they are matched by contacts between governments” (Holsti, 1995, p. 71).

Since foreign policy is a dynamic process which takes place in the international system delineated by various states, James Rosenau has discussed that there are people who may

cling to traditional norms in the newly emerged circumstances hence one can find the continuities of policies and changes according to the newly emerged circumstances (Rosenau, *Along the Domestic-Foreign Frontier: Exploring Governance in a Turbulent World*, 1997, p. 442).

A successful foreign policy of any state actor has a tremendous potential to bring drastic changes in the existing international order over a period of time. In fact, foreign policy is one of the ways to attain friendship and make allies in the international system through peaceful and sophisticated means. James Rosenau describes “In a word, the analysis of foreign policy has become increasingly sophisticated, giving rise to the development of more elaborate and more precise conceptual equipment with which to sort out and access the complex phenomena that links to the world beyond their borders”(Rosenau J. N., *The Study of Foreign Policy*, 1976, p. 15). So the concept of foreign policy in this dissertation is studied with the existing continuities and changes adopted by Chinese leaders and officials since the post-Mao era till now. The effective and efficient means of success of foreign policies depend on the power of the state it possesses in the international system.

3.2.2 Concept of Power

The concept of power is the central concept in international system. What is power? To answer this question, we need to understand the meaning of power. In a dictionary, the meaning of power could be described as ability to do something, capability, authority, strength, control, influence, rule, command, muscle, etc. Power is an abstract or intangible notion, which can be stimulated by converting ability, strength, capability, control, and

influence into concrete objective, real or tangible notion. But what is this ability or capability, how that ability is gained by any state or actor in the international system? There are several definitions of power defined by various scholars of International Relations starting from Thucydides, Kautilya, Machiavelli giving the traditional use of power in politics by the leaders of the state. The modern outlook or understanding of power needs to be revitalized, in the 20th century to actually gauge power by Lasswell and Kaplan, Robert Dahl, Herbert Simon, and many more (Baldwin, 1983, p. 3).

The Concept of power is ages old. Power had been studied by Thucydides in the West as well as Kautilya in the East during 5th and 4th century BC respectively (Modelski, Kautilya: Foreign Policy and International System in the Ancient Hindu World, 1964, p. 549). The writings by ancient scholars confirm the origin, the process of progress and the essence of concept of power as well as its significance in the international system. Power was not studied separately but it was accompanied by morality (E.H.Carr, 1995, p. 93). The concept of becoming more powerful emerged out of the insecurity which existed in the psyche of human minds.

Robert Dahl has given precise definition of power and has also stated how to gauge power. He has discussed that the concrete definition of any abstract notion is difficult so he has given an operational definition used by the researchers who can gauge power. For Dahl, power is a relation amongst people. In IR, scholars study power as a relation amongst the states and other actors. His intuitive definition is:

“A has power over B to the extent that he can get B to do something that B would not otherwise do” (Dahl, 1957, pp. 202-203).

“Morgenthau held that power is ‘man’s control over the minds and actions of other men’.”
(James Dougherty and Robert Pfaltzgraff, 1989, p. 84).

Charles Kindleberger defines power as “strength capable of being used efficiently, that is, strength plus the capacity to use it effectively in support of some objective... Thus strength is a means that exists even in the absence of its use for some goal, whereas power is the use of strength for a particular purpose”(James Dougherty and Robert Pfaltzgraff, 1989, pp. 84-85).

“Also viewing power as an influence relationship, K. J. Holsti suggests that power is a multidimensional concept consisting of (1) the acts by which one actor influences another actor, (2) the capabilities utilized for this purpose, and (3) the response solicited” (James Dougherty and Robert Pfaltzgraff, 1989, p. 87).

“According to Robert J. Lieber, power is said to be the currency of the political system in the way that money is the currency of the economy”(James Dougherty and Robert Pfaltzgraff, 1989, p. 87). That is power is considered as an opportunity to quantify the attributes.

According to Organski, “Power = Economic Productivity per Capita x Population The gross national product (GNP) was the measure chosen because it combined the demographic and the economic aspects of a nation’s productivity”(Organski, 1989, p. 190).

According to Barnett and Duvall, “Power is the production, in and through social relations, of effects that shape the capacities of actors to determine their own circumstances and fate”(Duvall, 2005, p. 3).

3.2.3 Distinguishing between Power and Capability

There is a difference between power and capability. There are two dimensions of power – internal and external. The internal dimension of power explains that a state has a capacity to act and it shields the formulation and implementations of policy from external interference. The external dimension of power is generally understood as the capability of states to control the behaviour of other state (O’Callaghan, 2002, p. 220).

The concept of power here is a state’s influence in the international system. But capability of any state means power attributes. That is to increase the influence, state needs to enhance the capabilities such as economic, military, technological, demographic, having more number of embassies as well as more interaction in the international system. Consequently, capabilities are the power attributes through which states can generate power and by using those capabilities, states can get an action done by other states, i.e. execute the power over other states.

3.2.4 Concept of Great Power

The term great power is often used by the experts of international politics, as great powers are the main actors on which the whole international system is relying upon. Scholars like A.F.K. Organski, Hedley Bull, Paul Kennedy and many others have discussed at length about great powers but none has clearly defined the concept of great power. It is a challenge to define a great power. There are different factors which might help one state to become great power but those same factors may not work as effectively as it had worked for the other state. For example, U.S.A. is having ample amount of natural resources and is a super power but Kazakhstan or Kuwait also possess lot of natural resources but none of them is a great power.

Hedley Bull has discussed about great powers that- firstly, there should be more than one state which is comparable; secondly, it should be militarily powerful enough to have its control over the existing International system; thirdly, the state's capabilities should be legitimately accepted and recognized as Great power by other states and by its own people (Bull, 1977, pp. 200-205).

Lemke has quoted John Mearsheimer that "Great powers are determined largely on the basis of their relative military capability. To qualify as a great power, a state must have sufficient military assets to put up a serious fight in all-out conventional war against the most powerful state in the world"(Lemke, 2004, p. 58).

According to Paul Kennedy, "To be a Great Power- by definition, a state capable of holding its own against any other nation-demands a flourishing economic base" (Kennedy, 1988, p. 539). Paul Kennedy has analyzed the great powers' behaviour over the last five centuries. He is of view that the military power is important for a great power but the fact is that economic power supports the military power. He says that "The first is that economic resources are necessary to support a large-scale military establishment. The second is that, so far as the international system is concerned, both wealth and power are always *relative* and should be seen as such"(Kennedy, 1988, p. xxii). He mainly focuses on the "interaction between economics and strategies which stroves to enhance its wealth and its power, to become (or to remain) both rich and strong"(Kennedy, 1988, p. xv).

From above all different views we can say that there is no such fixed criteria to be considered as a great power. All the scholars have different perceptions. But great powers have specific characteristics that could be identified by studying the various perspectives.

Based on those perspectives, the characteristics of great powers are discussed in detail in this section.

3.3 Characteristics of Great Power

What are the different perspectives on great power and its characteristics? What are the various means employed for the rise of great power in International Relations? This question is one of the key research questions of this dissertation. The main reason behind this question is that the discussion about various perspectives of great powers is available but clear characteristics of great power are scarcely found. Lemke is of view that “[i]n spite of seemingly widespread agreement that world politics is undergoing an important period of change and adaptation, no one argues that the actions of great powers are unimportant. Consequently, theories purporting to explain great power behaviour are still a central focus of academic research about world politics” (Lemke, 2004, p. 52). The answer to the first question about different perspectives on characteristics of great power is discussed in this section.

According to classical realist perspective, great powers are those few powerful states that try to maintain the balance in the international system. As they are powerful states, their first characteristic could be of power-seekers. Great powers try to seek power in their initial rising phase, they seek power during the stage when they have reached hegemony to remain at the position and they seek power even at the declining stage in order to contain the rise of other great powers. “It is based on the simple assumption that states are led by human beings who have a “will to power” hardwired into them at birth. That is, states have an insatiable appetite

for power, or what Morgenthau calls “a limitless lust for power”.” (Mearsheimer, 2001, p. 19).

According to neorealist perspective, “Waltz argues for a neorealist approach based on patterned relationships among actors in a system that is anarchical”(James Dougherty and Robert Pfaltzgraff, 1989, p. 120). Another characteristic of great powers could be the self-sufficiency. The great powers were able to defend themselves from rest of the actors through its strong military power in an anarchical international system in order to ensure security. And the sufficient wealth used to help them spend it on the strengthening of military power. Consequently, not only the military power but also the economic power as well as political stability ensure the survival of the state in the anarchical international system. “In such a system, based as it is on the principle of self-help, states pursue one or both of two basic courses of action, in keeping with Waltz’s approach to structure as a variable conditioning, or circumscribing, political behaviour. They engage in internal efforts to increase their political, military, and economic capabilities and to develop effective strategies”(James Dougherty and Robert Pfaltzgraff, 1989, p. 120).

In other words, the great powers do not depend on any other state for their security. John Mearsheimer, explains it as “Japan is not a great power today, even though it has a large and wealthy economy, because it has a small and relatively weak military, and it is heavily dependent on the United States for its security”(Mearsheimer, 2001, pp. 55-56). Japan’s dependency on United States is the reason why it has been not considered as a great power. Consequently, great powers need to be self-sufficient militarily, economically, technologically, demographically as well as culturally. Mearsheimer argues that “great powers need money, technology and personnel to build military forces and to fight wars, and

a state's latent power refers to the raw potential it can draw on when competing with rival states"(Mearsheimer, 2001, p. 55).

Unlike the realist and neo-realist approaches, the interdependence approach of great power is more open for persuading free information in a globalized economic world. The interdependent economic world is making states more resilient. Another characteristic of great powers is resilience. "As the modernists of 1970s predicted, multinational corporations, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), and global financial markets have become immensely more significant. But the state has been more resilient than the modernists anticipated"(Nye R. O., *Power and Interdependence in the Information Age*, Sept/Oct 1998, p. 86). States have been more flexible with other actors of the system according to the interdependence approach in its economic relations. The 21st century is leading great powers to be resilient in military as well as cultural aspects. Keohane and Nye have further explained about the significance of persuasion through soft power. "If a state can make its power legitimate in the eyes of others and establish international institutions that encourage others to define their interests in compatible ways, it may not need to expend as many costly traditional economic or military resources"(Nye R. O., *Power and Interdependence in the Information Age*, Sept/Oct 1998, p. 86).

According to neoliberal institutional approach, the great powers have much influence to shape the international system through international organizations. "[m]uch important work has been devoted to the study of transnational regulatory networks responsible for the development, diffusion, and implementation of an increasing range of norms, rules, and regulations... Such networks allow powerful states to shape and influence the process of integration without the need for formal interstate bargaining"(Hurrell, *Power, Institutions,*

and the Production of Inequality, 2005, p. 38). So another characteristic of great power could be influencing the process of integration amongst the states. The great powers have influence over other states in the system.

So from above discussion of different perspectives on characteristics of a great power are power seeker, self sufficiency, resilience and global influence. Individually, according to realist perspective great powers have power seeking characteristic, according to neo-realist perspective great powers have self-sufficiency characteristic, according to interdependence approach great powers are resilient and according to neo-liberals great powers have global influence.

3.3.1 Rise and Fall of Great Powers

What are the various means employed for the rise of great power in International Relations?

This is the sub-question which has been answered with the help of existing theories about the rise and fall of great powers to analyze it with several theoretical notions of international relations. A world order is a system based on 'rules' set up by powerful states. The changes in the world order bring changes to the system and thus it becomes a dynamic process. This takes place due to the rise of any state as a great power. When a state rises, it upsets the existing order and redefines new world order. The process and reasons for the rise and fall of states has been discussed at length by scholars through various theoretical perspectives. Mainly, the stages of rise of a state and its fall with their behavioural expectations have been discussed below.

3.3.1.1 Power Transition Theory

According to power transition theory, Organski is of view that the states which have emerged as great powers had chosen the road of industrialization. On that basis he talks

about three stages of transition. He views a cycle of development of states dividing it into three phases. That is pre-industrial phase, transition phase and power maturity phase.

In the transition phase, that is the contemporary times, there is a hierarchy that has been explained by Kugler & Organski. “At the top of the hierarchical pyramid is the most dominant nation that, for most of its tenure, is the most powerful nation in the international order. Today that nation is United States, and its predecessor was England. Below the dominant nations are the great powers. As the name implies, these are very powerful countries that cannot match one on one the power of a dominant nation at a given point in time, but have the potential to do so at a future time”(Organski, 1989, p. 173). Consequently, great powers are generally the allies of the dominant nations and are satisfied powers when compared to other powers of the hierarchical pyramid.

Power transition theory explains the process of rise of a nation with the economic, social as well as demographic changes in the domestic transition from first stage to the second stage of transition. “As the country begins to develop, economic changes are accompanied by profound social and demographic changes that increase greatly the pool of human and material resources exposed to governmental penetration and extraction. These are the sources of major power changes that a nation experiences as it passes through the stage of power transition”(Organski, 1989, p. 178).

3.3.1.2 World System Analysis

In an interdependent world where the markets are linked with each other, Wallerstein has tried to explain the different stages of the rise of a state. “A world-system is what Wallerstein terms a ‘world economy’, integrated through the market rather than a political

centre, in which two or more regions are interdependent with respect to necessities like food, fuel, and protection, and two or more polities compete for domination without the emergence of one single centre forever”(Vela, 2001, p. 3).

Wallerstein has worked with a group of analysts about the different phases of rise and decline of powers on the basis of time seen in table 3.1. He is of view that the hegemony can sustain its position only for a certain period. “The first stage (1450-1600/50) was made possible by the conjuncture of such processes as the disintegration of Western European feudal arrangements, climatic/demographic/technological changes, the political multicentricity of the European region, and the economic need for geographic expansion...The second stage (1600/50-1730/50) was marked by a system wide stagnation that brought about consolidation and retrenchment in the world-economy...The third stage (1750/1815-1917) was characterized by a noticeable shift away from an emphasis on agricultural production toward industrial production” (Thompson, 1983, p. 38). “Stage three gave way to stage four (1917-), an ongoing period that Wallerstein associates with revolutionary turmoil and the full consolidation of the industrially based world-economy. By 1945, the United States had replaced Great Britain as the system’s strongest state or hegemonic power, only to find its position significantly eroded after two decades of dominance”(Thompson, 1983, p. 38).

Table 3.1 Hegemonic Phases of World-System Analysis

Hegemonic Phases	Behavioural Expectations
Ascending Hegemony	Acute conflict between rivals to succession.
Hegemonic Victory	New hegemonic power bypasses old hegemonic power in decline.
Hegemonic Maturity	True hegemony- competition between the hegemonic power and other core states in free-trade, generally open system.
Declining Hegemony	Acute conflict of old hegemonic power versus successors- rival core powers move to preempt potential peripheral zones.

SSource: (Thompson, 1983, p. 53)

According to Wallerstein, the rise of a state as hegemony has a process to undergo. He finds a relationship between the core states. “According to Wallerstein, the core power

that achieves hegemony does so, first, because it achieves superior agricultural and then manufacturing productivity. Then it achieves commercial and financial superiority, in that order, over all the other core powers”(Ray, 1983, p. 16). So in order to rise as a great power, a nation has to move step wise: the first step is agricultural production, moving further industrial productivity to commercial and financial superiority.

3.3.1.3 *Long Cycles of World Leadership*

George Modelski has discussed various stages of long cycle which emphasizes the global influence of the great powers that has been depicted in the following table 3.2.

Table 3.2 Long Cycle Phases

Long Cycle Phases	Behavioural Expectations
World Power	The new global order is at peak. Greatest amount of goods and services are provided by the world power.
Delegitimation	The memories of the global war fades due to which the World power’s unchallenged position is questioned by nationalistic challenges.
Deconcentration	Reduction of resource base on which global order is dependent. However, the challengers are not yet fully prepared for the succession of world power.
Global War	Drastic decline in the net availability of global order and political resources may

	lead to a global war and a new world order emerges. With this one long cycle completes and another begins.
--	--

Source: (Thompson, 1983, p. 45)

The political systems found at various levels are not territorially based but are based on the transactions conducted between them such as through intercontinental, oceanic and extraterrestrial. (Thompson, 1983, p. 43).

Modelski views the role of great powers to provide security and establish international economic relations through international organizations. “The political functions of the new world power are to serve as the system’s principal supplier of security and to establish the frameworks of the new global order as manifested in the international organizations and international economic relations”(Thompson, 1983, p. 43).

Modelski has explained that “the basic format of the long cycle begins with a major global war (usually fought at the end of one century and the beginning of a new one) which can be interpreted as a fight to determine the constitution or authority arrangement of the global political system”(Thompson, 1983, p. 43).

In order to think about a global war, the state needs enormous economic power which can sustain even after the end of war. “Global reach and global wars are expensive propositions and thus require the support of an extensive economic base, as is provided by access to the world’s dominant economy”(Thompson, 1983, p. 47).

The different ways to rise as a great power could differ as per various perspectives but Modelski assumes that the tenure of the world’s dominant state can last for a century. Since 1500, each century has moved closer to the development of states based on the criteria that

is legitimized by other actors of the international system and the people of that state. By considering the criteria (power attributes) as great powers in last 5 centuries that differ from each other, one can analyze the dynamics of the international system.

The great powers in the modern history began with Portugal and Spain with the expansion of naval power. Columbus discovered America that brought his nation recognition to be considered as a great power. The Netherlands emerged with new trading systems and Britain with its political innovations. France had its intellectuals and artists and Germany focused on education to rise as a great power. Japan, Russia and United States became great powers in the 20th century but the criteria to be considered as a great power has been different in past 5 centuries.

3.3.2 Great Power Criteria

Great powers were considered powerful during 16th century if they had strong navy and military. In 17th century the financial revolution brought changes in the criteria to be considered as Great powers. The geopolitics of a state was one of the important factors considered to become a Great power.

In 18th century new inventions in technology, and industrialization helped states maintain their economy during the wars going on. The Great powers survived even in crisis.

In 19th century there were numbers of Great powers playing the game of Balance of Power in the Concert. Mainly diplomacy was introduced and Realism was at its peak leading states to satisfy their national interest.

In the 20th century, great powers were engaged in two World Wars. The international order changed which was existent since centuries. The need of establishment of peace and to prevent war completely was the challenge. Now the Imperialism was replaced by

emergence of new independent states from Asia, Africa and Latin America. The economic development of all these new born states became the aim and now Great powers got engaged in providing all these states the tools for economic enhancement through international organizations. By the end of 20th century, economic power, military power, political stability, possession of nuclear weapons was the criteria to become a great power. Whereas in 21st century, emergence of multilateral diplomacy between the states and international institutions are playing a vital role in addressing issues of global concern such as terrorism, human rights, climate change, etc.

3.4 Various Theoretical Notions to Understand Chinese Foreign Policy Analysis

The trend in the study of international relations had changed after two decades of end of the Second World War. Due to the emergence of Bretton Woods institutions, the changes took place which resulted into increase in importance of the study of International Political Economy (Mingst, 2004, p. 233). As People's Republic of China was established in 1949, her foreign policy analysis needs to be studied with the various theoretical approaches to the international political economy.

3.4.1 Realist Approach

The realist approach is considered as the oldest approach of the international political economy. Mercantilism is considered as the economic approach of realism. The European states during the 17th Century adopted this approach in order to gain wealth for the betterment of their states. Governments used to enhance their capabilities by “encouraging exports over imports and industrialization over agriculture, protecting domestic production against competition from imports, and intervening in trade to promote

employment”(Mingst, 2004, p. 235). These patterns of economic growth were adopted by the powerful European states in order to rise and strengthen their economy.

After the World War II, the new pattern of economic rise has emerged in which, the role of the state is emphasized. “States used their power to harness industrial growth. Consistent with mercantilist logic, states single out certain industries for special tax advantages; they promote exports over imports and encourage education and technological innovations to make their respective economies more competitive internationally”(Mingst, 2004, p. 237).

There are several states such as Japan, South Korea, and Singapore after the end of World War II, which had adopted this approach in their foreign policy to make their economy stronger. As the role of state is important, it is also considered as ‘Statism’. Statists are similar to the realist thoughts considering the international system as anarchic. “Realism, as a school of thought in Western IR theory, consists of three main assumptions: (1) the nation-state is the primary actor in the international relations, hence realism is said to be state-centric; (2) there is a lack of central authority equivalent to domestic government, hence international politics is characterized as anarchic; (3) international politics is essentially power politics” (Deng, 1999, p. 48). The above characteristics give clarity to analyze the Chinese foreign policy behaviour based on those assumptions.

3.4.2 Neorealist Approach

The neo-realist approach was aimed to refine the realist approach with a systemic view to the structure of international system. Yong Deng in his work on the theoretical notions adopted in Chinese foreign policy explains neo-realist argument in simple terms. “Neorealism seeks to refine classical realism into parsimonious, scientific theory by treating the international system as a structure shaping the unit/state behaviour. Since self-

help is the ordering principle of the decentralized, anarchic international system, states are compelled to pursue uniform tasks. States only differ in their respective capabilities as determined by the distribution of power in the international system”(Deng, 1999, p. 49).

In order to understand the neo-realist conception of the international system, there are three types of changes that are expected and explained by Dougherty and Pfaltzgraff that firstly, the nature of the entities shall change. The second change is expected in the components of interaction between the units of the system as the states may rise and fall and the new risen state might define new patterns of interaction, and “finally, the third element of this neorealist theory of change has as its focus the nature of members’ political, economic, or sociocultural interactions” (James Dougherty and Robert Pfaltzgraff, 1989, p. 122).

Neo-realists are of view that the dominant states can control the states behaviour through the distribution of power. “In deciding upon foreign policies that would produce change in the international system, Gilpin suggests, states usually make trade-offs among various objective. They do not attempt to achieve one goal at the sacrifice of all others, but instead engage in a “satisficing” approach designed to attain various combinations of desired results”(James Dougherty and Robert Pfaltzgraff, 1989, p. 122).

Neo-realism is as discussed above a refined form of realism in the contemporary times in which politics determines economics, (Mingst, 2004, p. 238) while the liberal approaches such as interdependence and neo-liberalism also emerged during the same time with similar features but economics determines politics in contrast to neorealist approach.

3.4.3 Interdependence Approach

The liberal interdependence approach has widely been accepted after 1970s. The international regimes are aimed to “minimize their member’s transaction costs, assure equality of information, and assure liability” (Richardson, 1995, p. 285). These have turned into giving beneficial economic outcomes. Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) has grown faster than the trade which used to take place before 20th century. “For interdependence theorists, the qualitative change that can result from quantitative growth in international transactions change the international system itself in substantial part, because the volume induces (and is further encouraged by) the creation of regimes” (Richardson, 1995, p. 286). Consequently, the interdependence has brought the changes in the international system through regimes that “consist of norms, principles of behaviour, and decisional processes”(Richardson, 1995, p. 286). All this has contributed into the increase of role of foreign policy amongst the great powers that are allies to the hegemony and are indirectly functioning in support of regimes to maintain peace and mitigate wars.

3.4.4 Radical Approach

The radical approach is in context to bring the revolutionary structural changes into the existing domestic and international systems. “Although interpretations of radicalism vary, a number of core beliefs unite the body of Marxist and neo-Marxist writing. First, while individuals may be naturally cooperative, when in society they act in conflictual ways. Second, the conflict emerges from the competition among groups of individuals, particularly between owners of wealth and workers over the distribution of scarce resources”(Mingst, 2004, pp. 239-240).

The dependency theorists criticize the liberal economic policies and believe that it widens the gap between the states. “Dependency theorists assert that developing countries are in a permanent state of economic dependency on the capitalist states. Liberal economic policies, they believe, lead to greater inequality among states”(Mingst, 2004, p. 240).

The dependency approach had its relevance until there was North-South debate going on but after the Yalta Conference the perspective of North-South divide has been shifted to East-West perspective and the maximization of interdependence in order to address global regimes. The foreign policy of PRC was under radical influence during Mao era. The critical analysis of Mao era foreign policy and the failures of strategies are discussed in next chapter. Thus, the radical approach to foreign policy has been discussed in this section to understand it.

3.4.5 Neo-Liberal Approach

“To liberals, institutions play a key role in developing and shaping policy debates, making commitments credible, reducing transaction costs, and enduring reciprocity among participants”(Mingst, 2004, p. 256).

The trend of three different kinds of institutions has emerged at the end of World War II: intergovernmental organizations such as IMF, GATT-WTO to facilitate the trade and open the opportunities to the newly emerged states to strengthen their economy; another is multinational corporations that participate only in direct importing and exporting; and thirdly, the non-governmental organizations that is established by aiming at the improvement of weaker economic condition of states (Mingst, 2004, p. 256).

The foreign policy through neo-liberal institutional approach is mainly about the non-state actors that are the international organizations, which are the transformers of power from the dominant nations to the other states globally. These actors play a very important role as they have defined a new pattern of interaction through the information revolution.

“For institutionalist liberals, globalization and ever denser networks of transnational exchange and communication create increasing demand for international institutions and new forms of governance. Institutions are needed to deal with the ever more complex dilemmas of collective action that emerge in a globalized world”(Hurrell, *Hegemony, Liberalism and Global Order: What Space for Would-be Great Powers?*, 2006).

Thus foreign policy is one of the significant concepts to study the international relations. The relationship of foreign policy and power has been discussed by many scholars but the direct role of foreign policy in the rise of a state establishes a relationship between concept of great power and the concept of foreign policy.

3.5 Relationship between the Role of Foreign Policy and the Rise of Great Powers

The power transition theory explains the rise of a state through the process of industrialization. This is possible only when states interact with each other, and transform various raw materials, technological advancement and produce new products to sell in the foreign markets. Great nations that support the international order are the allies of the dominant nations. It is about how great nations help run the system smoothly and maintain peace and security through international order. “...power transition conceives of alliances as stable and reliable instruments created to support the international order that cannot be easily altered in the short run”(Organski, 1989, p. 173). Consequently, the role of foreign

policy in the power transition is related to the gain of relative power by great nations in the international system through its smooth functioning.

According to the world-system analysis by Immanuel Wallerstein, there is an interaction between the core states and the peripheral states. In order to expand the demands of the industries, core states started their venture throughout the world. “Foreign policies play a key role in Wallerstein’s theory when he analyzes the advantages that core states enjoy in the world-economy”(Ray, 1983, p. 16).

According to the long cycle it is the great power which can define the norms and new trends in the world with its new contribution to the world. The old global order fades away and the new pattern of interactions emerges. “...World power does not necessarily mean world hegemony or total control of world affairs, for the role of world power is basically oriented to the global layer of interaction”(Thompson, 1983, pp. 43-44).

There is an obvious and most important role of foreign policy seen in power transition theory, world-system analysis and long cycle of world leadership, which is the key tool used for the rise of great powers. Thus there is a relationship between the rise of a state and an obvious role of foreign policy.

3.6 Conclusion

All the above theoretical understanding of concepts, great power characteristics and foreign policy analysis through various perspectives might help reader to understand the Chinese foreign policy implications in the next chapters in this dissertation. In particular, realist, interdependence and neo-liberal approach have driven the Chinese foreign policy in the post-Mao period. The scholars of Chinese foreign policy have not been able to trace any one particular perspective to understand the behaviour. Hence, the eclectic means were adopted

to delineate the Chinese foreign policy that could be understood systematically with the help of this above discussion.

Works Cited

- Baldwin, D. A. (1983). *Power Analysis and World Politics: New Trends versus Old Tendencies*. In K. Knorr, *A World Politics Reader: Power, Strategy and Security* (pp. 3-36). New Delhi: Asian Books.
- Bull, H. (1977). *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*. London: Macmillan.
- Dahl, R. A. (1957). The Concept of Power. *Behavioral Science*, 201-215.
- Deng, Y. (1999). Conception of National Interests: Realpolitik, Liberal Dilemma, and the Possibility of Change. In Y. D.-L. Wang, *In the Eyes of the Dragon: China Views the World* (pp. 47-72). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Duvall, M. B. (2005). Power in Global Governance. In M. B. Duvall, *Power in Global Governance* (pp. 1-32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- E.H.Carr. (1995). *The Twenty Years' Crisis*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Holsti, K. J. (1995). *International Politics: A Framework for Analysis*. New Delhi: Prentice-Hall of India.
- Hurrell, A. (2005). Power, Institutions, and the Production of Inequality. In M. B. Duvall, *Power in Global Governance* (pp. 33-58). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hurrell, A. (2006). Hegemony, Liberalism and Global Order: What Space for Would-be Great Powers? *International Affairs*, 1-19.

James Dougherty and Robert Pfaltzgraff, J. (1989). *Contending Theories of International Relations: A Comprehensive Survey*. London: Harper Collins Publisher.

Kennedy, P. (1988). *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers: Economic Change and Military Conflict from 1500 to 2000*. London: Unwin Hyman.

Lemke, D. (2004). Great Powers in the Post-Cold War World: A Power Transition Perspective. In J. J. T.V. Paul, *Balance of Power : Theory and Practice in the 21st Century* (pp. 52-75). Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Mearsheimer, J. J. (2001). *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company Ltd.

Mingst, K. A. (2004). *Essentials of International Relations*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Modelski, G. (1964, September). Kautilya: Foreign Policy and International System in the Ancient Hindu World. *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 58(No.3), 549-560.
Retrieved July 04, 2012, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1953131>

Nye, R. O. (Sept/Oct 1998). Power and Interdependence in the Information Age. *Foreign Affairs*, 81-94.

O'Callaghan, G. M. (n.d.). *Key Concepts in International Relations*.

- Organski, J. K. (1989). The Power Transition: A Retrospective and Prospective Evaluation . In M. I. Midlarsky, *Handbook of War Studies* (pp. 171-194). London: Unwin Hyman.
- Ray, J. L. (1983). The "World-System" and the Global Political System: A Crucial Relationship? In J. Pat McGowan and Charles W. Kegley, *Foreign Policy and the Modern World-System* (pp. 13-34). Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Richardson, N. (1995). International Trade as a Force for Peace. In C. W. Jr., *Controversies in International Relations Theory* (pp. 281-294). New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Rosenau, J. N. (1976). The Study of Foreign Policy. In K. T. James Rosenau, *World Politics: An Introduction* (pp. 15-35). New York: The Free Press.
- Rosenau, J. N. (1997). *Along the Domestic-Foreign Frontier: Exploring Governance in a Turbulent World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tayfur, F. M. (1994). Main Approaches to the Study of Foreign Policy: A Review. *METU Studies in Development*, 113-141.
- Thompson, W. R. (1983). The World-Economy, The Long Cycle, and the Question of World-System Time . In J. Pat McGowan and Charles W. Kegley, *Foreign Policy and the Modern World-System* (pp. 35-62). Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Vela, C. A. (2001, Fall). *World Systems Theory*. Retrieved from www.mit.edu:
<http://web.mit.edu/esd.83/www/notebook/WorldSystem.pdf>