**DIFFERENT INTERPRETATION OF STATE CONTROL AS A CORE NOTION WITHIN THE REALIST CONCEPTUAL APPROACH**

# ABSTRACT

The idea of force is not a recent phenomenon, but it is possible to locate the philosophical roots of this concept in ancient thinkers as well. However, this definition was re-examined 60-70 years earlier in the Foreign Affairs and Security Studies. The practical theoretical approach was mainly portrayed by those concerned with the idea of state control, as well as members of other theoretical approaches (e.g. liberalism, social constructivism, critical theories, feminist approaches, etc.). Despite the considerable interest in this idea, however, unity still remains on two main issues pertaining to state authority. First, everybody agrees that the strength of the state is one of the main principles in terms of meaning, and second, in terms of sophistication. Therefore, the pluralism of points of view surrounding the definition does not surprise anyone. Three dominant understandings of state power could minimize such points of view: power as control over capital, power as control over actors, and power as control over activities and effects. These dominant understandings all have their own benefits and drawbacks. The purpose of this paper was to present the viewpoints of the related thinkers (not just of the realists in the theoretical discussion) and to provide an accurate description of the advantages and drawbacks of both of these understandings. In the case of choosing an appropriate interpretation of the power of the state for their particular basic study, such a review of literature will definitely be beneficial for researchers. This form of decision should be taken by the researcher based on a certain school of thinking he/she likes, his/her personal affinities, but mostly based on the goal and intent of his/her study. The conclusion of the paper may be reduced to the notion that the idea of state power is well beyond the limits of a practical theoretical approach, and that it constitutes a crucial concept (and is the most important concept in the IR, according to some scholars), as well as that each of these prevalent understandings of state power has its own position in the theoretical conceptual app.

Keywords: Realism, state, power, resource control, actor control, event and outcome control.

# LITERATURE REVIEW

Today, power as well as 60 to 70 years ago, when a grounded debate on this concept began within the science of international relations, is a key concept for understanding relations between states. The whole realistic paradigm is based on the notion of the power of the state, however, the significance of this notion certainly does not end within the framework of this theoretical approach. Therefore, it is necessary to make two additional additions in connection with this statement. First, the approach, that is, the views, the assumptions and the conclusions developed within realism, although grounded in power relations between states, are not just that. Realism, only in terms of the theoretical network of concepts it uses, implies far more than that. Realists, in addition to concepts that are immanent to this theoretical setting (eg national interests, anarchy, hegemony, balance, polarity, security dilemma, patterns of friendship and hostility, etc.), apply a wider set of concepts that are primarily developed within other theoretical approaches (eg cooperation , relative and absolute gains, identity, amalgamation and pluralistic communities). (Mearsheimer 1994)

Second, although immanent to realism, the notion of state power transcends the framework of this theoretical approach. The application of the notion of the power of the state in the study of the subject of the science of international relations of security studies does not automatically imply belonging to a realistic school of thought. The power of the state as an analytical term is applied in almost all theoretical frameworks of two scientific disciplines: liberalism, social constructivism, critical theories, etc. Taking into account these specifics of the central concept, the paper will certainly review the views of the first theorists of state power such as Robert Dahl, Herold Laswell, Abraham Kaplan, Kalevi Holsti, Rudolf Rummel, but with special emphasis on the views of the most famous representatives of the realistic theoretical approach such as Hans Morgenthau, Raymond , Kenneth Volc and John Mirsheimer. (Hoag 1970) The theoretical discussion will be supplemented by the views of other relevant theorists such as Karl Deutsch, Jeffrey Hart, Eric Gertzky, David Baldwin, Joseph Nye and others.

## THE POWER OF THE STATE IS AN UNREALISTIC THEORETICAL APPROACH

It has already been pointed out that the notion of the power of the state in the science of international relations has been mathematical almost since the emergence of the discipline itself, and that even then its emphasis was of first-class importance. Even today, when the science of international relations and security studies is far more developed than in the period when the notion of state power was just established, there is almost a consensus that state power is one of the fundamental notions. Some realists even consider it the most important term. Thus, for example, the founder of classical realism, Hans Morgenthau, emphasized that the notion of power represents the "theoretical core of international politics", and he presented complete international politics as a "struggle for power". Some theorists also want to emphasize the importance of this concept, often quoting the British philosopher Bertrand Russell, who considered the power concept in the social sciences in the same way as energy is a basic concept in physics. (Nye 1990)

The explanatory potential of the notion of the power of the state can also be seen through various relations between the state and other relevant actors in the field of international relations and security studies. Klaus E. Knorr believed that relations between states (but also other relevant actors) can be roughly divided into three categories of relations: conflict and cooperation, as two endpoints of the same spectrum, and indifference, as a complete absence of dependence between two countries. in terms of conflict as a possible relationship between states, power is a key characteristic, which makes the notion of state power a fruitful analytical tool, because it allows the study of the circumstances that led to the outbreak of conflict; by applying the notion of power, it is possible to explain the course, ie the direction of the conflict development, and to predict its outcome with certain reservations. In this way, it is possible to argue the importance of the term in the study of conflicts between states and other security actors.

On the contrary, the power of the state can be a very useful analytical concept in the study of cooperation between states, because in cases of great disparity of power, the weaker state often has complete freedom to independently regulate the manner, scope of cooperation with a single partner. Finally, there are authors who believe that the notion of power has significant explanatory potential even in cases where the two states do not establish any relations. Of course, in these cases, power is not a constituent of such a relationship, but quite the opposite - such a relationship or more precisely the non-existence of a relationship affects the capacities, resources that are the presupposition of power. Thus, for example, (*SAGE Journals* n.d.) Duncan Snidal and Robert Powell pointed out in separate papers that the two countries that exclude mutual cooperation weaken both sides, and reduce the capacities of both countries in relation to third countries. Something similar to the notion of lost profits in economics. In any case, there is agreement on the meaning of the term power in relations between states, whatever those relations may be. Also in terms of emphasizing the importance of the notion of state power, according to many, the "greatest living realist" John J. Mearsheimer believes that "the causes of war and peace largely depend on the balance of power." However, although power is one of the key concepts in the study of international security, which theorists dealt with long before the constitution of the science of international relations and the study of security, in addition to its significance, agreement exists only in terms of its complexity and uncertainty. Karl Deutsch also pointed out the complexity of the concept of power, pointing out that: “it is clear that power is not one thing but more. Or better yet, power is one sign or symbol that we associate with many different sources, relationships, and possibilities.”

As a logical consequence of this complexity, there is an uncertainty of power, so, for example, the founder of a realistic approach to the study of international security Hans J. Morgenthau pointed out that "the concept of (political) power is one of the biggest and most controversial problems / concepts in political sciences ”. The founder of neorealism, Kenneth N. Waltz, shares this belief and emphasizes that its "adequate definition remains a matter of controversy." While, for example, Robert Gilpin even considers power "one of the most problematic concepts in the field of international relations"

In contrast, the greatest disagreement among theorists concerns the importance attached to the notion of power when it comes to international or national security. Therefore, answers to the question of whether power is a determining factor in explaining the behavior of actors or states seeking their security and / or whether power is crucial in determining how states will pursue their national interests may be a good criterion for determining with the great reliability of the author's principled attitude (which gives answers to these questions) towards a realistic theoretical approach. Representatives of the realistic school of thought believe that the answers to these questions are determined by power relations between actors, like states. While, say, liberalists, social constructivists or representatives of the critical school, although they respect the importance of the notion of state power, they usually give priority to some other notions, such as cooperation, ideas (social constructions) or emancipation.

## DETERMINING THE POWER OF THE STATE

Numerous authors point out that power is not only a central concept in international politics, international relations and security studies, but in the social sciences in general. Therefore, there are numerous philosophical, sociological and other settings of the most general social sciences about the notion of power, but it has already been said that the emphasis of this paper is on certain powers that are immanent in the theoretical framework of international relations and security studies. This way of the matizing power begins with the classical realists, primarily with Hans Morgenthau and Raymond Aron. Morgenthau finds the causes of the "realpolitik" in international security on an individual level, emphasizing that aggression and conflict are the consequences of "unchangeable human nature." People consistently transfer the unchangeable nature to all the entities they create, where the state is the most important form of political organization and for realists the most important actor in international relations. (Whitton 1949) Morgenthau sees the essence of power in the psychological relationship between the one (that state) who exercises that power and the one (that state) over whom that power is exercised. He explains this psychological relationship by "the will to power", which is again a consequence of unchanging human nature, so for Morgenthau, the central concepts in the study of relations between states, in addition to the national interest, are power and the struggle to preserve power.

Aaron believes that the goal of the state in relations with other states is to impose its will and victory not only for the sake of victory. In this sense, Aaron distinguishes power, strength, and potential; he defines power as the ability to impose will, force as the totality of material resources currently available in the event of violence, and potential as the ability to use force extensively depending on the time, space, and strength of the adversary. Aaron cites the example of how Japan had more power in 1941, but the United States had greater potential, which enabled it to create more power after only a few years of war. According to Aaron, the goal of a realistic foreign policy can be power (in itself), which is achieved by the state trying to increase its own resources, but also to "reduce the available or potential resources of its enemy, and increase the resources of allies, as well as to gain non-aligned and neutral.” Although Morgentau and Aron are not the first theorists to define the notion of power in this way, their views can certainly serve as a good introduction to a theoretical discussion of the views of other relevant theorists, which can be divided into three groups: understanding power as control over resources, understanding power as control over actors / states, perceiving power as control over events and outcomes.

## UNDERSTANDING POWER AS CONTROL OVER RESOURCES

Understanding power as a control over resources is certainly the best known and most commonly used approach to power, at least when it comes to studying the relationship between states. Because, as Georg Schwarzen berger believes, power is "the ability of an individual, group, or state to impose its will on another, relying on the effectiveness of the means of force in the event of disobedience." While, for example, Volc points out that "the most important events in international politics are explained by differences in the capabilities / capacities of states (and not by economic forces operating inside and outside states)". Thus, for the advocates of this understanding, certain resources (their quantity and quality), ie control over these resources, represent the reference framework for the analysis of the state's power. The central idea, and at the same time the advantage of this understanding in relation to the other two, is reflected in the claim that control over resources can be turned into control over actors and / or events / outcomes, if the state that controls those resources wants it.

Another important feature of this approach, pointed out by ErikGartzke, is that power is the basis for determining state preferences, which has a decisive influence on the same states cooperating or opposing each other under different circumstances. Another.” Although he advocates a relational understanding of power, Gertckism considers that power relations between states do not represent per se the cause of conflict, like war. As a key driver of security dynamics, he emphasizes "a change in the relationship of relative power", like "what a state knows or does not know" about itself or another state can lead to mutual competition in the resources at their disposal. That is why Gertzki advances this position with Grikov's (Joseph M. Grieco) notion of relative gains, emphasizing that a positive outcome or benefit is not (only) important to states in their mutual relations, but it is more important that this benefit / profit is greater than in other states. This practically means that the states can "profit" even if they realize damage, including losses to each other, but under the condition that the damage / losses are greater on the other side. It does not matter how much one state gains, but it is important that the opponent of that state gains less and vice versa, it is not important whether the state loses, but that its opponent loses more. (Barnett &#38; Duvall 2005) The next important characteristic is the possibility of some kind of measurement, ie comparison of the power of different countries. Power, understood as control over resources, implies different resources, which can be objectively measurable (such as the size of the territory, the number of inhabitants, the gross domestic product, etc.). Rudolph J. Rummel points out that these indicators enable the ranking of all countries in a consistent and unique way. On this trail, and on the basis of certain indicators of power, theorists distinguish between superpowers, great powers, regional powers and small states.

The fourth important characteristic of this understanding of power stems from ideas developed independently of each other by Rudolph J. Rummel and Johan Galtung. The two authors considered that there is a connection between large differences in the values of individual indicators on the one hand and the behavior of actors, ie states on the other. Countries with high values of some and low values of other indicators, have a tendency to violent behavior towards other countries. For example, a large number of inhabitants and a high gross domestic product, and a small territory of the state or large industrial production, and a small amount of economic wealth on which that industrial production is based can be a reason for aggression against other countries, which in history has not been a rare case.

## UNDERSTANDING POWER AS CONTROL OVER ACTORS

In addition to the stated material understanding of power, ie the understanding of power as control over resources that are more or less objective and therefore measurable, there is another very widespread position in international relations and security studies, which is referred to as the relational understanding of power. This understanding occurs in two variations, where the first represents the understanding of power as control over the actors. In this view, Robert Dahl "defines power as the ability of A to do something he would not otherwise do." Dahl's definition is the most commonly used in the relational approach, and as Baldwin observes, to date this definition of power has not been particularly improved. Within the relational approach, Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan developed a broader definition a few years before Dahl, according to which power is a (real or potential) relationship in which the actions of actor A at least partially lead to changes in the behavior of actor B, with the proviso that "the behavior of actor B" in this case is the most widely understood, and may include beliefs, attitudes, inclinations, opinions, expectations, emotions and / or predispositions to behave in a certain way. According to the representatives of this approach, power is the current or assumed relationship between two actors, ie two states, and not just a question of owning a good, ie a resource.

An actor, ie the state, has power if it manages to influence the decisions and behavior of another actor. According to this understanding, power is a phenomenon that is always established in relation to other states, that is, all the capacities that a state has at its disposal become power only when they are assumed or opposed to another state. Thus, the notion of power understood in this way emphasizes the inequality of states at the international level, which (as in the case of various resources at their disposal) are classified as superpowers, great powers, regional powers and small states.

The criticisms that can be made of Lesville's and Kaplan's, as well as Dahl's understanding of power within a relational approach, can be reduced to the following: criticism of the lack of restrictions on the behavior of actors changes in B's behavior, which implies confirmation of power if B behaves differently under the influence of A. However, the disadvantage of this definition of power is that changes that consequently occur in B's behavior are not limited to those alternatives acceptable to A. B to do something that B would not otherwise do, but that something does not have to correspond to A; in connection with the previous, B can also under the influence of A do something that does not correspond to either A or B.

## UNDERSTANDING POWER AS CONTROL OVER EVENTS AND OUTCOMES

As Jeffrey Hart points out, this understanding of power was first developed by James S. Coleman in his book The Mathematics of Collective Action. Coleman believed that the understanding of power as control over events and outcomes is based on the theory of rational choice, where the reasons for controlling / managing resources or other actors stem from the desire to achieve certain outcomes. Although the possibility is not ruled out that an actor, ie a state that has power, ie control over events and outcomes, can control other states or resources as a value per se, this type of control can only be considered a secondary ability in relation to control over events and outcomes. Therefore, the central idea of ​​understanding power as control over events and outcomes is that when one actor has complete control over all events and all outcomes, he has no need at all to control other actors or resources. Instead of making a direct connection between the actions / efforts that the actors undertake and the outcome, Coleman sees it as an interdependence, that is, a connection between the effort and the event and a connection between the event and the outcome. Therefore, one of the advantages of this approach is in narrowing the research focus on those events for the outcomes of which the actor is interested. (Baldwin 1985)

Elaborating on Coleman's position as a starting idea, Hart defines outcomes as social states that are the result of individual or collective action and are mutually exclusive. While it defines desired outcomes or goals as outcomes that produce and / or increase the benefit per actor / state, and where the benefit depends on the possible outcomes that the actor with power most desires. Actors, ie states, do not have the capacity to deal with all events, but only those events that are important for that state for a certain reason. With this in mind, one of the assumptions developed within this view is that actors (states) generally seek to control (manage) events that are mutually conditioned, that is, to manage those events that are interrelated / consequential. Therefore, control over events in the study of international or national security, according to Hart, can be equal to control over "common consequential / consequential events". Hart, as probably the most famous representative of this understanding of power, points out three main advantages of this approach:

1) this approach enables analysis that has both a descriptive and normative advantage over the other two approaches;

2) it is more general than the relational approach and the approach according to which power represents control over resources. It encompasses several factors, and does not exclude the importance of direct influence on the actor, nor does it diminish the importance of the resources that the actor or the state has at its disposal, but in the end what is really happening is what is happening "on the ground";

3) only within this approach, the interdependence of events is emphasized, ie it is emphasized that there is a consistent connection between the events in which a certain actor or state is interested.

In addition, the question arises at what price a certain event should be controlled and a certain outcome achieved. A great power or superpower may be interested in outcomes in several different events at the same time. That is why it is necessary to prioritize these events, and which may also depend on the current circumstances and on the basis of which the countries decide on specific events and outcomes. These circumstances may lead to a certain event not being controlled due to other priorities, so it would be a wrong conclusion that that state is not interested in that event and / or that it cannot permanently establish power after that particular event. Rather, it will be that this attitude towards the event is a consequence only of current circumstances. The state itself can lead to such a situation if it is interested, ie if it wants to control a large number of events. The best example is Nazi Germany during the Second World War, which, when it opened a large number of fronts (events), could no longer achieve the desired outcomes. Finally, the possibility of "immediate consent" of other states is neglected. For example, other states may "agree" to a particular outcome that they are not too interested in, but if circumstances change significantly and those other states (with the same power) now want a different outcome, they may challenge a state that is wrong based on initial assumptions. attributed attribute of power.

# CONCLUSION: DIFFERENT UNDERSTANDINGS OF THE POWER OF THE STATE AND THE CHOICE OF AN ADEQUATE APPROACH

What theorists point out as the lack of view that power is understood as a resource is the main reason why this understanding of power seems more appropriate in the study of relations between states of the same level of power, or the study of mutual relations of small states or relations of forces (regional, large or superpower). ) that verify or validate power at the regional or global level. Because the critique that control over certain resources does not imply certainty in terms of achieving a goal or imposing one's will on another actor / state, seems to be more appropriate for relations between states that have a uniform amount of resources. It seems that it is expected that states whose resources are in balance try to increase the amount of resources over which they have control, in order to create an imbalance, ie a disproportion in the amount of controlled resources in relation to another state and how this disproportion could be the basis for imposing their own interests. Where the realization of these interests could be a confirmation of the power relationship. (Baldwin 2012)

Having in mind all the mentioned advantages and disadvantages of understanding power as control over resources, understanding power as control over actors and understanding power as control over events and outcomes, one gets the impression that each of these approaches is important in studying international relations and security studies, as well as that each of these understandings can provide a special insight into the study of specific phenomena. Thus, for example, the relational concept of power, ie power understood as control over actors, may have a greater explanatory potential in the study of the relationship between great powers, between superpowers and great powers on the one hand, on the other hand. This is also probably the most common assumption in the science of international relations, ie security studies, that the big ones put pressure on small states and that they sometimes have a decisive influence on their behavior.

The study of relations between small or equal states, where neither can impose a certain behavior on each other's national interests, requires a different understanding of power as a key analytical concept. In this sense, the view that power is a resource may have greater explanatory potential in the study of relations between small or equal states, or in the study of the national security of small states in relation to other small states. In contrast, understanding power as control over events and outcomes can provide a good framework for analyzing power relations between small states. If we accept the previous assumption, which is the central idea, if not the complete science of international relations and security studies, then at least a realistic approach, that states in international or national security are primarily guided by their own interests and that this interest is often opposed to other states, then the existence of opposing interests of small states, that is, the existence of desired outcomes that are different and even mutually exclusive, proves nothing more than that. Therefore, the existence of conflicting interests, ie desired outcomes that are mutually exclusive, and in connection with events that are significant for several countries, are not sufficient for the actual establishment of power, ie the imposition of a certain outcome. The existence of mutually contradictory desired outcomes is only a precondition for the establishment of a power relationship, and for such a relationship to really establish all the prospects that either control over the actors (states) or over a larger amount of resources is necessary. Small states almost never have the capacity / power to control other women's states because of the minimal differences in resources available to other small states, they cannot impose desired outcomes on other small states. If the difference in resources was greater, then there would be greater chances of achieving a certain interest.

In any case, the notion of state power transcends the framework of a realistic theoretical approach, and each of the presented notions of power has its place in the theoretical conceptual apparatus of the science of international relations and security studies. The final choice of the determination of power that will be used as an analytical tool in a specific research will be a decision made by the researcher on the basis of belonging to a particular school of thought and primarily on the basis of the subject and goal of the research.
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