

INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AND THE BALANCE OF POWER: A THEORETICAL AND PRACTICAL ANALYSIS

Dr. Pallav Mithal,

Dept. Of Political Science, Lal Bahadur Shastri Govt. College Kotputli(Rajasthan).

ABSTRACT

International security is a foundational concept in global politics, shaped by the distribution of power among states. The balance of power theory posits that stability in international relations is maintained when no single state dominates. This paper explores the theoretical underpinnings of the balance of power, its historical applications, and contemporary challenges in a multipolar world. By analyzing historical case studies and modern security dilemmas, the paper evaluates the continuing relevance of balance of power dynamics in shaping international security.

INTRODUCTION

While very few people desire war, preventing it has never been an easy task. Throughout human history no one has ever come up with a perfect solution to war. International security is concerned with the measures states and international organizations take to ensure stability and prevent conflict.

Emerging in the sixteenth century, balance of power is the most common theory and core principle of international relations. It suggests that states may secure their survival by preventing any one state from gaining enough military strength to dominate other states. The concept can best be understood as an international order where power is balanced in such a way that nations avoid aggression out of fear of forceful retaliation.

As a key theory in international relations, balance of power argues that when power is distributed among multiple actors, it prevents any single state from becoming hegemonic. This paper examines the balance of power theory in classical, structural, and contemporary forms, assessing its relevance in an era marked by shifting global alliances, regional conflicts, and emerging security threats such as cyber warfare and terrorism.

While outlining the nature of balance of power, Palmer & Perkins, sum up its basic features as:

- It suggests some sort of equilibrium in power relations which has to be actively achieved,
- It favors status quo but it might be temporary and highly unstable,
- A real balance of power hardly exists. Its only test is war,
- It is no primary device for peace,
- Multipolarity of states is an essential condition,
- National Interest is the basis of balance of power.

THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF BALANCE OF POWER

The balance of power concept has roots in classical realism, with early formulations found in the works of Thucydides and later refined by thinkers like Hans Morgenthau and Kenneth Waltz.

CLASSICAL REALISM AND BALANCE OF POWER

Classical realists argue that the anarchic nature of the international system compels states to seek power to ensure their survival. Morgenthau (1948) emphasized that states act out of national interest, striving to prevent any one power from dominating. Historically, the European state system in the 18th and 19th centuries embodied this principle, as shifting alliances aimed to prevent a single power, such as Napoleonic France, from achieving hegemony (Waltz, 1979). But contemporary foreign policy experts instead describe it as a process of equilibrium with emphasis on skills of diplomats and statesmen, a sense of community of nations, shared responsibility and a need to preserve the balance.

Balance of power phenomenon pervades international politics and is the core feature in the power struggle among nations. It describes how states deal with problems of national security in the context of shifting alliances and alignments.

STRUCTURAL REALISM AND THE DISTRIBUTION OF POWER

Neorealism, particularly in Waltz's "Theory of International Politics" (1979), presents a systemic approach where the international structure, rather than human nature, dictates state behavior. In this view, the bipolar system of the Cold War provided stability, as the power balance between the United States and the Soviet Union deterred direct conflict through mechanisms like mutually assured destruction (MAD) (Mearsheimer, 2001).

Paul, Writz & Fortman present three concepts for balance of power:

- **Hard Balancing:** It refers to strategy often exhibited by states engaged in intense inter- state rivalry. Traditional realist and neorealist are mainly confined to this.
- **Soft Balancing:** It involves tacit balancing short of alliance - when states generally

develop limited security understanding to balance a potentially threatening state or rising power.

- **Asymmetrical Balancing:** This refers to efforts made by nation-states to balance and contain direct threat by subnational actors e.g. terrorist groups.

HISTORICAL APPLICATIONS OF BALANCE OF POWER

The Concert of Europe (1815–1914)

The Congress of Vienna (1815) established a balance of power system in Europe, where major states— Britain, France, Austria, Prussia, and Russia— collaborated to maintain stability. This period saw relatively few major wars until the early 20th century, demonstrating the effectiveness of the balance of power (Kissinger, 1994).

The Cold War and Bipolar Stability

During the Cold War, the United States and the Soviet Union maintained a bipolar balance. The doctrine of deterrence, underpinned by nuclear weapons, ensured stability despite ideological rivalry (Gaddis, 1986). Proxy wars, such as those in Vietnam and Afghanistan, highlighted the limits of balance-of-power politics but did not escalate into direct superpower conflict.

CHALLENGES TO THE BALANCE OF POWER IN MODERN ERA

Rise of Multipolarity and Shifting Alliances

Although a simple bipolar balance emerged after world war II, the fraying of cold war alliances and polycentrism have brought us back to multiple balance configurations. In the post-Cold War world, the unipolar dominance of the United States (1991– present) has been challenged by emerging powers such as China, India, and Russia. A multipolar system presents a complex balance, as seen in regional

rivalries like those in the South China Sea (Ikenberry, 2011).

Non-State Actors and Asymmetric Warfare

Traditional balance-of-power mechanisms struggle to address threats posed by non-state actors, such as terrorist organizations (e.g., ISIS, Al-Qaeda) and cyber warfare. These threats challenge state-centric security paradigms, requiring new frameworks for international cooperation.

Technological and Cybersecurity Threats

The rise of cyber warfare has introduced security challenges that do not conform to traditional balance-of-power logic. Cyber-attacks, such as Russian interference in democratic elections or China's cyber espionage, bypass conventional military deterrence models.

CONCLUSION

The balance of power remains a central concept in international security, though its effectiveness varies across different historical and contemporary contexts. While traditional state-centric models helped maintain stability during the Cold War, modern security challenges require adaptive strategies. Emerging powers, technological warfare, and non-state actors complicate balance-of-power calculations, demanding a reevaluation of how international security is maintained in the 21st century.

Today, balance of power may not be a conscious expression of general interest and may be characterized by limited objectives and shifting memberships, yet the international balance of power mechanism, whether simple or complex, is likely to prevail as long as worldwide struggle is to stay.

REFERENCES

1. Bull, H (1977), *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*, Columbia University Press

2. Buzan, B. (1991), *People, States & Fear: An Agenda for International Security studies in the post-cold War era*, Harvester Wheatsheaf
3. Claude, I. L. (1962), *Power and International Relations*, Random House.
4. Gaddis, J. L. (1986), *The Long Peace: Inquiries into the History of the Cold War*, Oxford University Press.
5. Gilpin, R. (1981), *War and Change in World Politics*, Cambridge University Press.
6. Ikenberry, G. J. (2011), *Liberal Leviathan: The Origins, Crisis, and Transformation of the American World Order*, Princeton University Press.
7. Jervis, R. (1978), "Cooperation under the Security Dilemma." *World Politics*, 30(2), 167-214.
8. Kissinger, H. (1994), *Diplomacy*, Simon & Schuster.
9. Mearsheimer, J. J. (2001), *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, W. W. Norton & Company.
10. Morgenthau, H. (1948), *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, Alfred A. Knopf.
11. Palmer & Perkins (2001), *International Relations*, (pp 218-9)
12. Paul, T. V., Wirtz, J. J., & Fortmann, M. (Eds.). (2004), *Balance of Power: Theory and Practice in the 21st Century*, Stanford University Press.
13. Robert Keohane, (1989), *International Institutions and State power*, Westview, p-62
14. Schweller, R. L. (1998), *Deadly Imbalances: Tripolarity and Hitler's Strategy of World Conquest*, Columbia University Press.

15. Stanley Hoffman, (1978) Primacy and World Order: American Foreign Policy since the world war. Revisited", *International Security*, 25(3), 128-161
16. Taliaferro, J. W. (2000), "Security Seeking Under Anarchy: Defensive Realism
17. Waltz, K. N. (1979), *Theory of International Politics*. Addison-Wesley.

Copyright © 2015 Dr. Pallav Mithal. This is an open access refereed article distributed under the Creative Common Attribution License which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.