



Journal of Social and Political Sciences

Burkitbayevna, Orazalina Korlan (2018), Balance of Power as Main Instrument of Equilibrium in Contemporary International Relations. In: *Journal of Social and Political Sciences*, Vol.1, No.3, 424-429.

ISSN 2615-3718

DOI: 10.31014/aior.1991.01.03.32

The online version of this article can be found at:
<https://www.asianinstituteofresearch.org/>

Published by:
The Asian Institute of Research

The *Journal of Social and Political Sciences* is an Open Access publication. It may be read, copied and distributed free of charge according to the conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license.

The Asian Institute of Research *Social and Political Sciences* is a peer-reviewed International Journal. The journal covers scholarly articles in the fields of Social and Political Sciences, which includes, but not limited to, Anthropology, Government Studies, Political Sciences, Sociology, International Relations, Public Administration, History, Philosophy, Arts, Education, Linguistics, and Cultural Studies. As the journal is Open Access, it ensures high visibility and the increase of citations for all research articles published. The *Journal of Social and Political Sciences* aims to facilitate scholarly work on recent theoretical and practical aspects of Social and Political Sciences.



ASIAN INSTITUTE OF RESEARCH
Connecting Scholars Worldwide



Balance of Power as Main Instrument of Equilibrium in Contemporary International Relations

Orazalina Korlan Burkitbayevna¹

¹ School of Political Sciences and Public Administration, Shandong University, Jinan, China

Abstract

It is noted that power for a long time is the main influence of states on each other. This is due to the fact that power has always been the most effective tool for achieving specific goals. This article notes that at present power has not lost its significance. One feature of power is that it serves not only as the main tool in achieving its own goals of the state but also as an instrument of peacekeeping. Power relations between states inevitably generate such a phenomenon of international politics as the balance of power. The difference between power and balance of power lies in the fact that power is recognized as the main means of achieving and protecting national security, and balance of power is the main instrument that guarantees international security. Emphasizing on the importance of creating a balance of power at the present time in which the interaction between actors of international relations would involve in accordance with the principle of equilibrium, their national interests which do not infringe the rights of other participants in international relations and serves as a mechanism for regulation and balancing. It is stressed that each of the "centers of power" in the new alignment of forces seeks to ensure their interests, so it is necessary to determine what kind of a geopolitical structure of the world is in the best interest of Kazakhstan. Ensuring the geopolitical interests of our state, maintaining the stability of the international system are the postulates on which the balance of power in the modern world is built, and the place of Kazakhstan in it is being formed.

Keywords: Power, Balance of Power, National Security, International Security, International Relations, Equilibrium Principle, Peacekeeping

1. Introduction

Throughout human history, the force was associated, first of all, with military might. Many prominent politicians believed that military power has been and remains the main indicator of the strength and prestige of the state in the international arena. Power is inextricably linked with the nature of social relations, it is in fact, rooted in the essence of human nature with the principles of good and evil laid in it. At the same time, either one or the other of these principles prevailed in different periods of history.

Our world is an arena of constant confrontation of various world forces. In all geopolitical theories and concepts, this struggle is represented as the struggle of opposites. And this struggle cannot be abolished, however, it can be balanced. That is why the balance of power category is one of the main categories of geopolitics that reflects the struggle and unity of world forces.

The theory of the balance of power goes back deep into history. Where countries have been drawn into the battle for leadership and influence, the relationship between them has always been based on the principle of balance of power. Any other state that does not face obstacles certainly tries to expand its power and influence on as large a territory as it can get and which can effectively manage. But in practice, we can see that the obstacles arise necessarily.

Basically, there are other states that also have the desire to increase their influence or have an adverse effect on others. Therefore, there is a clash of all kinds of interests and aspirations, where the strength of the state plays the main role. From this we can conclude that the principle of balance of power is needed not to preserve peace or express assistance for international understanding, but serves to preserve the independence of each element in the system of states, preventing the rise of any of them to such an extent that it begins to threaten all.

2. Literature Review

Today, it is difficult to imagine an analysis of international relations, world processes and even specific events in a particular region or country, not to mention the studies and attempts to forecast global politics without resorting to the foundations of the systemic approach laid down in the work of Morton Kaplan (1957) "System and process in international politics", which was published more than half a century ago. Today this research is not so widely known (in comparison, for example, with the works of G. Morgenthau, K. Waltz, St. Hoffman), but it is no exaggeration to say that his appearance left a significant imprint on the subsequent development of international political theory. It is no accident that already in the 1960s M. Kaplan's book caused a huge flow of specialized literature, which led the author to clarify his positions and approaches, which remain relevant today. The typology of international political systems developed by M. Kaplan became one of the bases, on which he derived various types of political behavior of states in the sphere of international relations. Having identified five types (models) of such behavior (associated with the criteria for organizing the decision-making process, sharing benefits from interaction, preferences in creating coalitions, the content and direction of political activity, and the ability to adapt to the conditions in which decisions are necessary) for this purpose, the author turned to a direct examination of each of them, trying to show how the behavior of an actor will change depending on its type of international system.

The author of the treaty, English lord Bolingbroke (1788) notes the following: "Since the formation of two powers - France and Austria - and as a result, competition has arisen between them, the interests of their neighbors were to fight the strongest and most active and conclude an alliance and friendship with the weaker. Hence - the concept of the balance of power in Europe, which rests on the safety and tranquility of all. In turn, to break this balance was the goal of each of the rivals. The principle on which all the wise decisions of the European meetings relating to France and Austria were based and determined by the desire to prevent the imbalance, not allowing the balance to bow to one side. This principle has been in effect for the whole period, and it keeps its will until now."

Of course, the important works in this area are the works of Kenneth Waltz (2010). Waltz's theory, as he makes clear in the "Theory of International Politics," is not a theory of foreign policy and does not attempt to predict or explain certain acts of state power, such as the collapse of the Soviet Union. The theory explains only the general principles of behavior that govern relations between states in an anarchic international system, and not certain actions. These repetitive principles of behavior include balancing power that is individually tailored for optimal arms races and display restraint in proportion to relative power.

It is impossible not to leave without due attention to the work of P.A. Tsygankov (2003) in the field of the theory of international relations and diplomacy, devoted directly to the study of topical problems of international relations and global cooperation.

The next source is the scientific works of M.T. Uteubayev (2016) E.R. Khayrullina (2015) and S.V. Budaeva (2014) in which theoretical aspects of balance of power conception, their evolution, as well as the practical implementation of the concept of security in the history of international relations from the ancient period to modern times, are examined.

3. Balance of Power as the Main Category of Geopolitics

Hard power, for many centuries, was the main way for states to influence each other. This is noted by the fact that force has always been the most effective tool for achieving certain goals. Until now, the force has not lost its

significance and continues to serve not only as the main tool for states to achieve goals but also as an instrument of world regulation and domination.

Thinkers of different countries and generations, supporters of various theoretical schools and directions offered their own concepts of the security of international relations. The first such concept is considered to be the concept of balance of power, developed within the traditional direction of the theory of international relations. The concept of the balance of power is the oldest in international relations, the elements of which can be observed already in the era of antiquity (goes back to the writings of Thucydides), but the emergence of the concept of "balance of power" is associated with the name of the Italian thinker Francesco Guicciardini, who wrote the history of Italy from 1490-1534.

The use of the balance of power in international practice was recorded in the Treaty of Utrecht. The author of the Utrecht Peace Treaty is the English political philosopher, statesman, and writer Henry St. John Bolingbroke. In his work "Letters on the Study and Benefits of History," he gave the first in political philosophy a detailed substantiation of the concept of "balance of power" in the example of European history. The balance of power is one of the basic concepts in the theory of political realism and neo-realism. Representatives of these theories believe that the balance of power is the main way to stabilize the international system, the basis of international order and security.

The balance of power in international relations is the distribution of world influence between individual centers of power - poles. It can take various configurations: bipolar, three-pole, multipolar (or multipolar), and other configurations. Proceeding from the above, it can be concluded that the balance of power is connected to the world order. According to the theory of the balance of power, the world order can have three types:

Unipolarity is when the power is concentrated in one center, called the hegemon.

Bipolarity is the division of the world into spheres of influence between the two states, the creation of military-political blocs. In history, the most famous example of bipolar world order is the Cold War between the Soviet Union and the United States of America (1945-1991). The second half of the 20th century was the only period when the whole world was divided into two camps. In Aron's opinion, the bipolar system has a direction for instability, because it is based on fear, and also calls the two warring parties to cruelty against each other.

Multipolarity is a type of world order in which a large number of states have approximately equal economic and military capabilities. In theory, it is considered the least stable of all. With the development of history, multipolarity implied military action rather than peaceful co-existence of roughly equal states. But nevertheless, this system is the most stable one.

Comparing the world devices mentioned above, one can conclude that sooner or later one side will be the winner in a bipolar system, and a unipolar system will come to degradation and failure in the course of time, and the last multipolar system is the most stable of all existing ones and there can be unlimited time interval.

The "balance of power" system differs from other international systems in the following characteristics. This was interpreted by the American professor of political science, a specialist in international relations, geopolitician M. Kaplan. The "balance of power" system is characterized by the following basic rules:

1. Act to expand their capabilities, but better by negotiation than by war.
2. It is better to fight than to miss the opportunity of expanding opportunities.
3. It is better to stop the war than completely destroy one of the main national actors.
4. Act against any coalition or single actor that seeks to acquire a dominant position vis-à-vis the rest of the system.
5. Act against actors who support supranational organizational principles.

The first rule indicates that each major national actor seeks to strengthen its influence. However, this should be achieved, if possible, without war, without those equilibrium-destroying consequences that the war may have for the "balance of power" system.

According to the second rule, the duty of every national actor is to protect his own interests. This means that if the main actor cannot protect its own interests, then these interests, as a rule, will not prevail. Thus, opportunities must expand even at the cost of war.

The third rule meets the classical standards. Major national actors should not expand so much as to exceed the optimal size of a just and legitimate community. This rule is observed both in relations between legitimate

dynastic regimes and between modern national territorial states. Going beyond this rule is an explicit exception or incompatible with national identity.

The fourth and fifth rules are simply rational requirements necessary for the preservation of the international system. The formation of a dominant coalition or the desire of the main national actor to dominate the system or subordinate the other main actors poses a threat to the interests of national actors that do not belong to this coalition. In addition, if the coalition succeeds in establishing subordination relations in the international system, the dominant member (or members) of the coalition will be able to exert political pressure also on the less significant members of the same coalition. Therefore, coalitions, as a rule, receive a counterbalance - opposing coalitions are formed. They arise when the first coalitions begin to threaten states that are not participating in them and therefore become vulnerable, and when they begin to threaten the interests of their own members. At the same time, states that are under pressure from the dominant members of the coalition may find it more advantageous to take a neutral position towards the coalition or join the opposing coalition. These rules overlap with the third rule. It is necessary to limit some aspirations of states and not to destroy other main national actors; then in the future, they can, if necessary, enter into any coalition.

1. the policy of the country or several countries, which aims to achieve a certain state of the system;
2. the very state of the system, characterized by a certain correlation of forces between the leading powers;
3. the mechanism operating in the international system, regardless of the will of its participants.

4. The phenomenon of power in international relations

There are many definitions of the phenomenon of power in international relations, here are just a few of them:

G. Morgenthau - "Power is power over the minds and actions of people";

G. Kissinger - "In the international environment, force is influence";

R. Kline - "Power is the ability of the government of one country to force the government of another country to take any action that it would never have committed on its own free will," while singling out the three main methods - persuasion, coercion or use of military force;

R. Keiohein, J. Nye - "Power is the ability of one subject to force others to do something that they would otherwise not undertake, and at the same time, at a price acceptable to the person in charge";

D. Stossinger - "Power is the ability of the state to use real and potential resources in such a way as to effectively influence the way of life and behavior of other states."

All these definitions have one affinity - States are eager to influence the behavior of other states in a suitable way for themselves. In this case, different types of power are used.

Military power is a means of state policy, whereby the state is able to influence the events taking place in the world, primarily in the name of its interests.

The scientific and technical power acts as the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution. The principles of countries in the world arena are growing due to the application of scientific and technical force.

Information power is completely random because humanity has entered the age of information and information systems, but as you know whoever has information has the world.

Ideological power - reveals its own formulation within the country and also have an external aspiration, acts as a generalized characteristic, revealing the level and nature of the impact of the leading ideology, morality, way of life in general to other countries. Although the effectiveness of its action cannot be measured quantitatively, qualitative indicators are clearly visible in the desire of other countries and individual people to follow the ideals brought from outside.

Political power is the possibility of influencing the international arena through diplomacy. An example is the diplomacy of the ancient Romans at the end of the Roman Empire, which was bequeathed to Byzantium and Italy, the survival of their own state by withdrawing from armed conflicts, collision and weakening of competitors, imposing their own religion among influential countries, bribing border states to create a buffer zone around their borders and so on.

Different countries are determined by the possession of one or the other of the aforementioned species or group of types of force. Nevertheless, strong power with the ability to influence the behavior of other countries determines the three main types of power - economic, military, political.

Mr. Nicholson wrote that the engine of diplomacy has always trades, which is developed between states according to one's own laws, but having a common orientation with the laws of development of mutual relations

between states is the extraction of own benefits to the detriment of others. Indeed, the development of the economy cannot last long within the borders of a particular state, and it actively requires integration into the world market, which inevitably entails the establishment of trade relations. The closer trade relations are more closely and politically, since the nature of trade relations is in the interest, and if objectively trade relations exist, then states derive mutual benefit.

5. Balance of power in the world arena

With the collapse of the Soviet Union, the current world geopolitical order was destroyed. And of course, after the collapse of the USSR, the US took a key place in the international arena. But now the world is in a transitional state. Some political scientists believe that the modern balance of power exists within the framework of "unsettled multipolarity." The second part of the political scientists believes that the alignment of forces is unilaterally militarily: US domination, the tripolar economically - the United States, Japan and Germany, and the five-polar in organizational and political - the United States, Russia, China, England, and France.

In a new alignment of forces, each country seeks to secure its own interests. Which model of the geopolitical structure of the world is more suitable for the interests of Kazakhstan. In theory, three models of the balance of forces are possible: unipolar, bipolar and multipolar.

A unipolar model of the device implies a global American hegemony. The US is trying to control and establish hegemony through the approval of military presence in all significant geopolitical regions. NATO is a powerful military-political bloc, created by US imperialism to achieve the goals of the established world single-pole order. Kazakhstan does not like such a model, and it contradicts the principles and norms of international law. Kazakhstan's foreign policy is based on national interests based on law and justice.

The second model of the balance of power is the balance of forces within the bipolar world order. There are those who consider this model to be suitable for maintaining stability in the world, here one can agree. This point of view in the 70's. American political scientist K. Waltz put forward. In Theory of International Politics, the importance of bipolarity lies in the fact that it minimizes uncertainty since the number of participants in a confrontation in such a model is limited.

To maintain international stability, the bipolar model of the world order is the most suitable, but for Kazakhstan, this model does not fit because Kazakhstan has no potential and the opportunity to become the second pole. The latest model of a new balance of power - multi-polar - the organization of an international political system on the basis of polycentricity. The formation of such a model is more likely. The main role in structuring the international system of the largest states forming its upper level is evident. For the right to join the core of the international political system, 10 ... 15 states are competing with each other. Of course, Kazakhstan cannot enter this state, but nevertheless, it has a key position in Central Asia. It is this model of the world order that fits the interests of Kazakhstan to a greater degree.

President of Kazakhstan N.A. Nazarbayev 9 years ago in March 2009 in his speech at the 11th Congress of the Association of Eurasian Universities in Astana said that one of the most important consequences of the global economic crisis is the onset of a multipolar system of international relations. At this time, the multipolar system has come and is in the process. Multipolarity should determine the policy and strategy of Kazakhstan. The best policy for Kazakhstan is the desire for balance between the main centers of world power (Russia and China). Kazakhstan is interested in the politically stable, economically sustainable and secure development of Central Asia, and not only, today Kazakhstan is a factor of stability in the global world. Our multi-vector policy means the development of friendly, predictable and balanced relations with all countries of the world. The Republic of Kazakhstan has repeatedly managed to seat the conflicting parties at the negotiating table, then achieve mutually acceptable solutions and with honor to emerge from crisis situations.

6. Conclusion

Thus, we understand that the balance of power is an irreplaceable part of the contemporary international relations, it is the regulator of international politics. The balance of power affects all processes in this world. And so it is very important that the multipolar balance of power maintains stability on the planet.

At the present time, mankind lives in an era when constant changes are taking place in the balance of power. Between the West and the East, there is a struggle for influence and domination. That is why a multipolar world

order is necessary in order to maintain the balance of power and to prevent the strengthening of the influence of any one state. The main task of the balance of power and Kazakhstan is to prevent a violation of the strategic balance of forces to maintain security in Central Asia and, of course, the whole world.

That balance of power, which developed after the Second World War, ensured the absence of global conflicts. Unfortunately, the number of regional and local conflicts has only recently increased. However, the existing balance of power avoids global conflicts. Therefore, it is so important to maintain this balance of power. The universal balance of power depends on the decision by all the states of the world to one of the main problems that have been created in the world in recent decades - the prevention of nuclear war.

References

1. Bolingbroke G.S.-J. 1978. Letters on the study and use of history.
2. Budaeva S.V. 2014. Balance of forces as a general principle of equilibrium in contemporary international relations. Messenger ZabGU Series "Political Science" № 09 (112). P.75
3. Kaplan M. 2002. System and process in international politics // Theory of International Relations: Reader. Moscow: Gardariki. P. 220-235.
4. Khayrullin E.R. 2015. "Balance of forces" as a concept of security in the theory and practice of international relations. Bulletin of Omsk University. Series "Historical Sciences." № 3 (7). P. 115
5. Tsygankov P.A. 2003. Modern schools and directions in the theory of international relations. Dispute of neo-realism and neoliberalism // Theory of International Relations. Moscow: Gardariki. P. 131.
6. Tsygankov P.A. 2003. The problem of the laws of international relations // Theory of International Relations. Moscow: Gardariki. P.84.
7. The Concept of the Foreign Policy of the Republic of Kazakhstan for 2014-2020.
8. Uteubaev M.T. December 16 - Independence Day of the Republic of Kazakhstan. [www.http://ast.social/641-16.html](http://ast.social/641-16.html) (Accessed date 09.12.2016.)
9. Walt K.N. 2010. Theory of International Politics [Theory of International Politics]. Waveland Pr. Inc., 256 p.