

How countries use economic, military, and diplomatic power to advance their global agendas

Mohammed Arafat Al-Ammari

Department of International Relations, Asia Pacific University of Technology & Innovation (APU), Jalan Teknologi 5, Taman Teknologi Malaysia, 57000 Kuala Lumpur, Wilayah Persekutuan Kuala Lumpur.

Email: mo.arafatalamari@gmail.com

استلام البحث: 19/03/2022 مراجعة البحث: 28/05/2021 قبول البحث: 25/06/2021

ملخص الدراسة :

في ساحة المنافسة الدولية ، ظلت القوة موضع اهتمام. منذ مائة عام إلى الوقت الذي كان فيه الفيلسوف العام العظيم صن تزو ، كان الصراع على السلطة هو الموضوع الرئيسي الذي يحدد كل السلوك الدولي. لكن مع مرور الوقت ، تطورت ديناميكيات هذه القوة والوسائل التي يتم تأمينها من خلالها. في الطريقة الحديثة حيث تستفيد الدول من وسائل القوة غير الوحشية ، تغيرت أيضًا الطريقة التي فهمت بها هذه القوة. تم تأمين القوة في الساحة الدولية من خلال الوسائل العسكرية. اشتهرت الجحافل الرومانية بقوتها التدميرية والحازمة. ومع ذلك ، هناك أيضًا أهمية الشكل القابل للتفاوض من القوة الذي يأتي مع مثل هذه القوة القوية. الوسائل الدبلوماسية للسلطة. بالإضافة إلى ذلك ، هذا هو الموضوع الرئيسي للورقة ، استكشاف مصطلح القوة. سننظر أيضًا في بعض المفاهيم الأساسية المتعلقة بالحصول على السلطة في العصر الحديث. سنناقش القوة الناعمة والصلبة على وجه التحديد كيف أن كلاهما لهما نفس القدر من الأهمية في محاولة تأسيس منصب في التسلسل الوراثي الدولي. القوة مصطلح ديناميكي ، وبالتالي فإن وسائل تأمينها هي أيضًا سلسلة. هذا ما سننظر إليه في هذه الورقة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: القوة ، الاقتصادية ، العسكرية ، الدبلوماسية ، صندوق النقد الدولي ، القوة الصلبة ، القوة الناعمة.

Abstract

In the international competitive arena, power has remained an object of interest. From a hundred years ago to the time the great philosopher general Sun Tzu was around, the struggle for power was the central theme determining all international behavior. With time, however, the dynamics of this power and the means through which it is secured have evolved. In a modern way, as states make use of non-brute means of power, the way that power was conventionally understood has also changed. The security of power in the international arena has been through military means. The roman legions were well known for their destructive and assertive power. However, there is also the importance of a negotiable form of power that comes with such a strong force. The diplomatic means of power. In addition to this, in the modern age with the advent of the Bretton woods system and other institutions such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF), we shall look at how the economy itself has become a tool in the hands of the state in order to assert power. This is the central theme of the paper, the exploration of the term power. We will also look at some of the core concepts surrounding the obtaining of power in modern times. we will discuss soft and hard power specifically how both of them are equally important in trying to establish a position in the international hierarchy. Power is a dynamic term and therefore the means of securing it are also just as fluid. This is what we shall look at in this paper.

Keywords: Power, economic, military, diplomatic, International Monetary Fund, hard power, soft power.

1.0. Introduction

Every man has an appetite for power and when all men come together, the state has the greatest appetite for the power of all. Of course, this concept of state formation comes from no one else but Thomas Hobbes through his *Leviathan*. The cover reflects the contents, people piling up together to form a great structure the state wielding the sword for war and the scepter for justice. (Hobbes, 1651) Beyond its foundation, the state has a role to take up. Not only must the state provide for its people through welfare and policies it must advance the *prestige* of its people. The state can do this because it is the epitome of social organization. This idea of the role of the state in maintaining the prestige of its people in the form of sovereignty and then advancing this further is taken up by another philosopher by the name of Jean Bodin in his, 'Six books of the commonwealth'. In which he discusses in detail the concept of sovereignty but goes further to talk about the international standing of the state and how it must behave so as to not be undermined. (Bodin, 1576)

These ideas however are not an end in themselves. Discourses on sovereignty are prestige are mere means in order to reach the true end of the state. That is the security of greater power. But what exactly is power and why is it relevant? Power can be many things. But of the May that it is, it is only important to know that it is an intrinsic part of human beings. It is the desire of a human to be greater than what he is simply. Hans Morgenthau was a leading philosopher of the 20th century on matters of power. He writes about the realism of international politics and goes on to write that power is the essential means through which any state can ensure that it remains an active player. (Morgenthau, 1948) Power is essential not only to secure self-security but also to propagate national interest and try to achieve a higher standing in the international environment.

State power, however, is reflected in its ability to achieve said goal. This goal can be understood as the national agenda. As states continue to gain power, they increasingly secure means through which they can ensure this agenda. Agendas are themselves very critical matters for not only do they require a state influence to be achieved but once achieved contribute back to the raising of the state's prestige. It is important, therefore, to understand that power is not a fixed object but rather finds dynamism in its expression through different faces. In this paper, we shall be looking at three different means through which power is secured in the international anarchical environment. These are,

1. Economic means
2. Military means
3. Diplomatic means

We shall look at these three means in detail and try to form a picture of how states operate internationally. We shall also connect the concept of power with the idea of *global agendas* through these means thereby formulating a framework that may be deemed relevant to looking at the global politics through.

2.0. Why nations want to advance their global agendas

Global agendas are the ways that nations see that they must go through to chive a higher international status. But before we look into why they are essential it is important to know what global agendas are. The international environment is anarchical. There is no king of kings and all states are equally sovereign. The international environment does not have a place for hierarchy

since it is pertinent to note that state sovereignty is valued above all. The maintenance of state sovereignty ensures that the individual states are not subjugated by any other and can independently form their policies.

In truth, this is not the complete picture. The truth is that some degree of connection is maintained between different states. This connection influences state behavior and are responsible for some of the policies that states maintain. In this relation, the international environment is not purely anarchical with absolute independencies but there is an informal hierarchy established that to some degree is useful to understanding international behavior. This is a point excellently taken up by David A. Lake, who discusses how these hierarchies operate in the international environment. He writes that although there are no formal institutions under the pining of this hierarchy there is most certainly a hierarchy from the most powerful to the least. And this influence generally is not in the form of hard power but as an authority which is less coercive. (Lake, 2007)

In this light, it can be understood that this relation of interconnection always exists, and therefore there is a requirement to actively participate in this international competition. It can be understood that there are only two conditions, to be on top of the hierarchy and to influence the subordinating nations or instead to be present at the lower location on the hierarchy and to be dominated by an agenda of the superior nation. Let us now look into how the interconnection between such states takes place which is undergoing if power influence.

K. J. Holsti takes this issue under discussion and provides models that allow for a clearer understanding of how global agendas work. (Holsti, 1964) In brief, we can summarize the desire for greater power in the following points.

1. To increase influence in the international arena.
2. To ensure that progress of the international regime is in line with the state interest.
3. To maintain a hold on global power and to prevent domination from other states.
4. To ensure that influence in the global system remains relevant.

3.0. Exploring the concept of Power

The concept of power is important since that is what global agendas are all about. Global agendas can be of many different natures they are not always directly about domination but ultimately contribute to it, in one way or another. For instance, the US Marshall plan in 1948 was intended for the reconstruction of Europe, but this had long-term effects such as the creation of a form of dependency between Europe and the United States. This dependency was not military but rather economic. This leads us to the concept that this section will cover. Power is of two types and therefore requires a clarification that in contrast to the popular belief, power may or may not be physically brute. In fact, at the turn of the century as wars between states become increasingly unlikely because of the extent of the destructive capability of conventional weapons, other forms of power become more relevant. A power that does not involve brute force or conventional armies but rather policies that constrict or influence international behavior.

In this way, power is divided into two categories, soft power, and hard power. Let us look at both of these in some detail

3.1. Hard Power

Hard power refers to power in the conventional sense. Power through the means of conventional armies and weapons. Some people claim that with the rise of conventional weapons, the concept

of hard power is becoming obsolete over time. that provided the economic interdependencies and the scope of destruction through conventional wars, hard power will over time become obsolete. That, however, is a questionable assessment since contemporary issues have begged to differ.

For instance, during the Ukraine and Russian conflict, there were speculations that Russia would not invade Ukraine simply because of the consequences that it would face that were in place through soft power (explained in the next section). However, as things appear no soft power could deter Russia from making an entry into Ukraine, and provided the conventional power Russia possessed and Ukraine did not, Russia appears to be successful for now.

One of the most important classical philosophers on conventional forms of power is Carl Von Clausewitz through his work *on war*. Through this text, Clausewitz talks of the strategies involved in the war but he is also a philosopher. He speaks of the importance that an army has for a king in his pursuit to maintain a hold over his own realm. In this way, he claims that an army is not only important in the maintenance of international affairs but also contributes to the management of the internal affairs as well since it grants legitimacy to the king. (Clausewitz, 1997) In addition to this, the realist school also puts a lot of weight behind the hard power argument. Waltz sees power as an intangible element that can be held as property, rejecting the relational claims, and instead claiming that only physical elements can provide any real measure of power. For instance, population, territory, military capacity, and so on. It is through these criteria that waltz formulates his view on the distribution of power in the international arena. (Waltz, 1979) In general, this is what hard power is all about. The form of power through muscle and most certainly even as soft power continues to develop, there is no kidding that hard power is useless. (Lee, 2018)

3.2. Soft Power

We have already looked at what hard power is. Let us now look into the rather new concept of soft power. The concept of soft power is a different view of power than conventional hard power. Soft power is all about asserting influence or control through the use of non-military means. These means include economic or other diplomatic measures that force a state to bend to whatever is intended of it without using brute military force. For instance, the cold war is a very good case study on this behalf. During almost half a century the two competing superpowers, the United States and the USSR never went into direct war with other but relied on non-conventional means to bargain their positions. The use of soft power depends on threat and aid. Whichever means is useful to accomplish the required goal is used.

One of the most important proponents of soft power is Joseph Nye. He writes that to secure power military might is not the only answer, but instead, other means such as economic aid can also serve as a form of influence. He focuses on the non-conventional means of power and therefore is one of the major contributors to the theme of soft power. (Nye, 2009) In addition to this, there are numerous other theorists who also take up this matter and discuss how economics and interdependency have been guided by soft power. This form of power has contributed to a presence of influence throughout the world, and it has been through these nonconventional means that the international order continues to operate as a hierarchy. (Gray)

As the dynamics of the world have continued to evolve with it the dimensions of power. Soft power reflects just that concept. One of the most important theses based on the foundations of this soft power is the dependency theory which is concerned with the exploitative nature of the connection between the core and peripheries of the world. The thesis talks about exploitation

through structures and reflects how it is not important that there be the military or physical presence of force but rather it is very much possible simply through the internalization of power structures which then help contribute to a set behavior without ever having to physically exert force. (Galtung, 1971) Examples of other structures that can influence behavior without physical threat are the International Monetary Fund (IMF) which has the capacity to influence state behavior but has no military capacity of its own. In this way, soft power is shown to reflect the changing trend of international affairs.

4.0. Facets of Power

Now that we have looked at the different kinds of power, let us move on to see how power is expressed by states in different forms to further their global agendas. These different forms of expression can be understood as tools that the state wields and has the capacity to bring to use should there be a need. In times when states find it important to convey a certain type of agenda to the rest of the world, they may utilize these tools to bring about the influence that it sees as important.

Of these many tools, the most important and the most influential are three which are already enlisted in the section above. In this section, we will look into the nature of these tools and look at how they are used to the furthering of the national agenda.

4.1. Economic Means

Economics is one of the most relevant tools when it comes to influencing international behavior. This type of economic influence is possible in the international environment due to the high degree of a globalized economy and economic interdependence. The institutions through which the globalized economy is maintained are the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank (WB), and other regional financial institutions such as the Asian Development Bank (ABD). Economic interdependence on the other hand is maintained through bilateral and multilateral ties between states present due to economic processes such as loans, foreign aid, and foreign direct investments. Such bilateral economic transactions create a relation between the two that allows for some degree of influence. This is doable because such payment of Aid and loans may be in the forms of episodes that require some pre-requisite adherence to a set of agreed policies that grants the donating or lending party the tangibility to guide action. In this way, the donating party can be the architect of the framework on the receiving end.

This is the way that economic means can contribute to the spread of the global agenda. The consequences of this element of power are discussed in quite a bit of detail in the structural theory of Imperialism by Johan Galtung. Although he specifically concerns himself with the relation of the post-colonial world in which there is a clear division between the core state and periphery states. (Galtung, 1971) The dependency discourse also invites a number of other theorists such as Andre Gunder Frank, Richard Wright, and Mahbub-ul-Haqq.

This form of economic power that allows states to influence agendas internationally has its own pros and cons. On one hand if one were to weigh the fact the utility of economic power as soft power, thereby decreasing the prospects of direct conflict, one can most certainly associatively declare that it is superior. On the other hand, understanding the discussions by the dependency theorists puts forward the point that such international economic relations actually have a negative effect which forces the developing or underdeveloped countries to remain as is and to continue contributing to the world order as it is. (Frank, 1966)

Nonetheless, there is no doubt that the economic dimension of power that states possess is an important factor in the 21st century and it will continue to hold relevance as more and more developing states attempt to escape their circles of poverty into developed states. The loans and Official Development Aids (ODA) will continue to give opportunities for the donor states to influence the receiving states in line with their agenda. In this way, one can only begin to appreciate the possibilities that are achievable for the purpose of expanding the global agenda.

4.2. Military Means

The second important element in the discussion about the faces of power is the military element. The military element is the epitome of the hard power discussion in international affairs. It is not very difficult to point out how the military muscle is important in spreading the global agenda around the world. The best example that we have in this case is the Cold War, close the United States and the USSR tried to attract different states around the world to their form of economic structures through lucrative military incentives. both the United States and the USSR gay away billions in their military budget to two states around the globe to strengthen their hold in different regions.

The military perspective of breaking the global agenda is rather straightforward and is obvious. It has been the most common kind of power that states have used to spread their agendas. In addition to the Cold War example that I have provided above, there is also the instance of the two World Wars in which Germany tried to spread its Nazi ideology to Europe through brute force. The military power however may not simply be hard but may also be soft power through the transfer of technology and different military weapons. In addition to this, there is also the prospect of weaker states depending on stronger states for their security against a common enemy. In this way, I do not imply strength as economic but rather strength as military capability. economically strong countries can also be militarily weak if they have known proper investment in the military sector and depend upon the economic sector purely to defend themselves. (Calhoun)

Military tools are highly relevant for ensuring that global agendas remain relevant. Some theorists claim that the rising interconnectedness through economics and other strategic means of maintaining a rather conventional military muscle is irrelevant in the contemporary period. These claims however find very little ground when put against the practical situation. Irrespective of how well a state may be developed economically and how well linked it may be through alliances there is no guarantee that its protection is ensured through these means. This is only further confirmed by the Russian campaign against Ukraine in recent times. (Drezner, 2022) Furthermore, the American hegemony on the global agenda is also maintained through its military presence throughout the world. Its basis in the Gulf region and its warships throughout the Arabian Sea ensure that countries such as Iran which can go against the popular U S narrative are held in check and do not make any decisions that go against the US interest. These states also feel threatened by US presence and thus are forced to comply, in this way US global agenda is maintained across the world. (Amin) This allows us to form a picture of how military power is important in dispersing and maintaining global agendas.

4.3. Diplomatic Means

Diplomatic means of securing and furthering national interest is the best instance of using soft power politics. Diplomatic relations are one of the oldest forms of international communications

and are important for maintaining international relations. Diplomacy involves the use of appropriate language for conveying concerns between dignitaries through negotiations and threats.

Experts have over time explored the concept of diplomacy and how it leads to the overall functioning of the international order. Leading these theorists is Robert Putnam who discusses the two-level game of diplomacy. (Putnam, 1988) diplomacy is an important tool since it allows the states to negotiate their agendas rationally without having to use the tools of violence. Diplomatic tools for spreading global agendas go back centuries however, diplomacy as a tool has become very relevant in the age of information technology. As fast communications allow for the quicker and more dynamic development of situations. Putnam puts forward the thesis that diplomacy is not simply one-level communication between the country's ambassadors, but it is connected with the local developments as well. In this way, the local politics is reflected through the international dialogue and subsequently, the international dialogue affects the local politics. This is a window that allows us to look at how international diplomacy relates with the local politics. This also aids us in linking our initial thesis of the role of spreading the global agenda with the diplomatic power that states possess.

Daryl Copeland writes that sometimes states want something done, but the way to achieve those things through action is not always the most viable solution. Sometimes, states want to achieve their goals through a more friendly persuasion without having to push people around. He writes, interestingly, that the accumulation of a great amount of force actually decreases the chance of using it and therefore this paradox between the correlation of force and diplomacy exists. This does not mean that a strong force has no effect on how diplomacy is carried out, it most certainly does. The stronger nation that has the ability to cause damage on a larger scale would most certainly have the means to carry out diplomacy from a hawk's perspective. This inter-relation also explains the nature of diplomacy between two unequal states. That the state which possesses more capacity to cause military damage will also have an advantage when trying to set out terms with international actors. (Copeland, 2007)

In this way, diplomacy remains relevant as a tool of power in the arsenal that states possess. Diplomacy is one of the most convenient ways for states to convey their agendas internationally since it is a platform specifically for the purpose of cross-national persuasion.

5.0. Interplaying of the Different Facets

In the previous section, we have looked at the three different faces of power that states possess and can use to further their global agendas. The three faces, however, are in no way independent and are in practice quite closely linked. We can see this in particular reference to the Copeland paper where he argues about the inter-relation between the diplomatic and the military face of power. This model however can be expanded to include the economic face of power as well. Economics is also a very relevant part of the new neoliberal global model and without it, no equation remains complete. (Copeland, 2007)

One example of this trinity can be provided by numerous instances from the cold war. The superpowers in their attempt to persuade countries to their side attempted to use diplomatic means through negotiations and agreements. However, all such diplomatic initiatives were supported by a high degree of economic incentives. Joining one side or the other was always seen as a quick way to develop. Address such interconnectedness it is not possible to declare 1 separate from the other through all three of them come together in order to ensure that state interest is secured. Another example of this is The US negotiation with the Iranian government on the news crisis it

wasn't necessarily essential that the diplomatic discussion between the two governments would actually work out but rather in order to aid such diplomatic persuasion, it was backed by the presence of U.S. military force within the gulf freedom specifically with the basics in among in Saudi Arabia and different aircraft carriers and other marine battleships located within the gulf region. Although these military instruments were not the only reason why Iran came to an agreement with the United States, but they most certainly do provide an incentive for the weaker state to make peace with the stronger negotiation negotiating body. In addition to this Iran also had an incentive to comply with the United States policy since EU S also offered Iran many economic packages that it needed for its socio-economic uplift.

Through this case study, it is evident that no one single form of power is in itself self-sufficient in order to secure state interest and to spread global agendas across the world. It is through the interworking of the three of these that a goal can be achieved. The three faces of power; economic, military, and diplomatic have evolved in their own stead throughout the ages and have remained an important part of how the state carries out international behavior. If one were to weigh how each of these three was relevant against each other one would most certainly reach the conclusion that both the economic and diplomatic sources of power are important, however, they remain to be of little use unless there is a strong military to back such claims. Economic development can only secure a nation diplomatically and can only through its reliance on agreements with different nations does it continue to hold its existence. For any strong nation to exist independently and to have a strong economy there needs to be a development of the military sector so that the country is no longer dependent on any other alliance or body to come about for its protection this is the point very well lived brought up by the real school of thought to claim that irrespective of the high degrees of economic development state must under all circumstances invest in military technology so as to remain independent on their defense and remain capable to protect their own Riches. (Machiavelli) This phenomenon of course is also interpreted when there is a movement from defensive to offensive diplomacy. As nations move out of their niche in order to convey their global agenda throughout the world, they must have strong military support behind them in order to ensure that the states internationally take them as a strong play.

6.0. Conclusion

In this paper, we have looked at the concept of power and have gone beyond the rather conventional understanding of the word. We have also discussed the different faces of power and how states utilize them in order to further their global agendas. One point of interest that was raised along the length of the paper was the mutual weighing of the three elements. We also launched an inquiry into this and concluded that although all three are equally as important. The economic and diplomatic find their firm footing through military strength, it is therefore voided to measure state strength in terms of its economic or diplomatic strength purely without reference to the military capacity of the states.

Countries use economics to further their agendas through the use of lending or aid programs that establish a degree of hierarchy between the donor and the receiver state. In this way, the economic policy could be useful in order to influence the receiver state through an 'invisible hand'. This would of course be reflected in the policies that the donor states make, provided that they shall be bound to comply. For the diplomatic face of power, we have discussed the two-level game of diplomacy and how it is relevant to discuss the local ongoings as well as the

international situation in order to fully comprehend just how the states are progressing with reference to a foreign-influenced global agenda. The third form of power, the conventional militarism, and the non-conventional military technology soft power was also discussed, and it was elaborated on how the military in the end does provide the support that the state needs in order to carry out any kind of economic or diplomatic activity. In brief, this paper has allowed us to hold a bird eyes view of the matter and has allowed us to better appreciate the depth of the situation and how power is not power conventional but in the 21st century, it is, in fact, an evolved and more comprehensive idea.

7.0. Bibliography

- Amin, S. (n.d.). U.S. Militarism in the New World Order. *Social Justice*, 1-21. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/29766655>
- Bodin, J. (1576). *Six Books of the Commonwealth*. Oxford .
- Calhoun, C. (n.d.). Social Science Research and Military Agendas: Safe Distance or Bridging a Troubling Divide? *Perspectives on Politics*, 1101-1106. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40984288>
- Clausewitz, C. V. (1997). *On war*. (J. J. Graham, Trans.)
- Copeland, D. (2007). James Eayrs on Diplomacy, Foreign Policy, and International Relations: A Retrospective. *International Journal*, 241-261.
- Drezner, D. W. (2022, March 3). *Can realism explain the war in Ukraine?* Retrieved from Washington Post.
- Frank, A. G. (1966). The Development of Underdevelopment. In A. G. Frank, *Latin America: Underdevelopment or Revolution* (pp. 3-17). New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Galtung, J. (1971). A Structural Theory of Imperialism. *Journal of Peace Research*, 81-117. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/422946>
- Gray, C. S. (n.d.). *HARD POWER AND SOFT POWER: THE UTILITY OF MILITARY FORCE AS AN INSTRUMENT OF POLICY IN THE 21ST CENTURY*. Strategic Studies Institute, US Army War College. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep11431>. Accessed 8 Apr. 2022.
- Hobbes, T. (1651). *Leviathan* . Baltimore: Penguin Books.
- Holsti, K. J. (1964). The Concept of Power in the Study of International Relations. *Background*, 179-194.
- Lake, D. A. (2007). Escape from the State of Nature: Authority and Hierarchy in World Politics. *International Security*, 47-79.
- Lee, T. C. (2018, Jan 14). *When Hard Power Shrinks: The Midlife Crisis of Realism*. Retrieved from [https://www.e-ir.info/2018/01/14/when-hard-power-shrinks-the-midlife-crisis-of-realism/#:~:text=Waltz%20views%20power%20as%20a,\(Waltz%201979%2C%20131\)](https://www.e-ir.info/2018/01/14/when-hard-power-shrinks-the-midlife-crisis-of-realism/#:~:text=Waltz%20views%20power%20as%20a,(Waltz%201979%2C%20131)).
- Machiavelli, N. (n.d.). *The Prince*.
- Morganthau, H. J. (1948). *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*. Newyork .
- Nye, J. (2009). Soft Power. *Public Affiars*.
- Putnam, R. D. (1988). Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games. *International Organization*, 427-460.
- Waltz, K. (1979). *Theory of International Politics*. London : Addison Weasley .