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***Heterarchism: Toward Paradigm Shift in World Politics***

Rosalba Belmonte (University of Perugia) and Philip G. Cerny (University of Manchester and Rutgers-Newark) pgcerny@gmail.com

*"International Relations" theory has been dominated since the study of IR formally began at the University of Wales, Aberystwyth, in 1919. There have in recent decades been three mainstream "competing paradigms" (Wolin 1966), realism, liberalism and constructivism, all of which assume that the dominant independent variables are states and the inter-state system -- what could be called methodological state-centrism. We argue that this way of conceiving world politics was (a) always problematic (Cerny 1990) and challengeable, and (b) time-bound and increasingly anachronistic. Since the mid-20th century, a dialectic of globalization and fragmentation -- political, economic and social processes above, below and cutting across states -- has caught states and the interstate system in a complex evolution or process of restructuration toward what has been called "heterarchy." Heterarchy is defined as the coexistence and conflict between differently structured micro- and meso quasi-hierarchies that compete and overlap not only across borders but also across economic-financial sectors. The core of this process is the triangulation of (a) the "disaggregated state" (Slaughter 2004), (b) fragmented global governance and "regime complexes" (Alter and Raustiala 2018), and (c) "sectoral differentiation" in the international political economy, leading to a spectrum of market/hierarchy (Williamson 1975) or public/private de facto policymaking processes and forms of "mutual capture." The result is the decreasing capacity of states to control both domestic and transnational political/economic processes or to act as Waltzian "unit actors" in world politics. This requires a new and robust competing paradigm that we call "heterarchism.”*

***The Resource-Based Account of Power***

Keith Dowding (Australian National University) keith.dowding@anu.edu.au

*Almost thirty years ago the author published Rational Choice and Political Power which defended a resource-based account of analyzing and measuring power. Most of the attention on the book centered around whether examining agential resources really captured everything we want to say about social power in society and over the account offered there on systematic luck. The book is to be re-issued by in 2018 with a new introduction and postscript. In this paper I will return to the account of power in that book, further deepening and expounding on its analysis of power. I will say more about how the five types of resources identified in the book can be used to measure the nature of the power structure in a comparative statics framework. Power as a type. Explain how resources can be utilized in more dynamic strategic and game-theoretic manner to look at actual power games. It suggests what measurement strategies we can adopt. It will return to the issue of systematic luck and how that helps us understand the power structures of society and how problematic it is to change them. It adds to the framework of the original book in terms of power to, power over and power with and how we can help empower people, and shows how our language is both an important power resource but also systematically works to the advantage of some – a form of systematic luck.*

***The Changing Face of Power in International Relations 1979-2019***

Giulio M. Gallarotti (Wesleyan University) ggallarotti@wesleyan.edu

The face of international power both in the academic community and the greater world at large changed significantly over the past four decades. The late 1970s represents an important watershed in scholarship on power given that it was the period in which Keohane and Nye’s *Power and Interdependence* appeared. In the world at large the decade showed stark manifestations of the authors’ arguments about the changing face of power in international politics, these manifestations testifying to the declining utility of military power. The US and Soviets found their preponderant military powers not only failed at containing the rival super power in the Cold War, but had feeble results in maintaining power even over peripheral territories with almost no conventional military capabilities (Vietnam and Afghanistan). Neoliberalism as a theory of power was on the rise with the work of Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye, at the same time that power politics in the world was challenged a growing recognition of the constraints on hard power and concomitantly the rising utility of a softer kind of power oriented around cooperation and the respect for international norms. Such cooperation was especially manifest with the creation of the ERM in Europe, which essentially established the European Monetary System. With the European Community’s movement toward regional monetary integration, the very hotbed of war and balance of power politics over the past 5 centuries transcended into a region in which war was virtually impossible.

This paper traces changes in the face of power in world politics over that past four decades. Along with an analysis of how the nature of power transformed in this period, this paper also chronicles developments in scholarly thinking about international power. The findings of this paper suggest a congruence between thought and reality with respect to the conceptualizations and manifestations of power in world politics over the past 40 year period.

***Globalization of Timber Trade and******Power Dynamic since the End of the Cold War***

Lena Partzsch (University of Feiburg) lena.partzsch@ifp.uni-freiburg.de

Olga Malets (Institute of Environmental Social Sciences and Geography, Freiburg) olga.malets@envigov.uni-freiburg.de

*The world economy became more systematically open to global trade especially after the end of the Cold War. Global market integration has consistently been spurred especially since the mid-1990s by technological innovations and sharply reduced transportation and cross-border communication costs. At the same time, nation-state governments are increasingly unable to track trade flows and address associated environmental and social problems. For example, Indonesia, which has the third biggest stretch of tropical forest after the Amazon and the Congo, has been losing 15% of its tree cover since 2000.1 The globalized economy has been driving this development, in particular, through the increasing demand for palm oil. It is estimated that 56% of oil palm expansion from 1990 to 2005 in Indonesia replaced forest areas.2 In response to such negative effects, new types of regulation emerged, for example, the Forest Stewardship Council as a private certification scheme founded in 1993. Moreover, new timber supply chain-related laws were adopted such as the 2008 US Legal Timber Protection Act that amended the Lacey Act to include illegally logged timber.*

*This paper reviews the literature regarding major research debates on globalization and power dynamics with a focus on global trade in timber and deforestation. In particular, we discuss ‘power shifts’ from the public to the private sphere, North-South asymmetries and whether ‘ethical’ or ‘normative’ power exists beyond the nation-states. In order to study change in power dynamics over time, we argue that acknowledging power to (empowerment and resistance) and power with (cooperation and learning) is essential.*

***China from old greatness to a new power image in the 21st century. Xi Jinping’s rise and new era under sharp power as a populist leader?***

 Marco António Batista Martins (Evora University, Portugal) mabm@uevora.pt

*With the introduction of the “logic of Westphalia” -translated into an international political order founded on a right established by a system of politically independent and territoriality sovereign states- and its corresponding European System of States, an unprecedented adventure for Europe began, which culminated in its rule over the world, and today is marked by a crisis that for many is inevitable and for others it is but a moment in a long process whose outcome is somehow unpredictable. But what is most relevant to an analysis of the European process will perhaps be to emphasize that, in reality, construction has been based on equilibrium that has simply disappeared as the international political paradigm changes under the sign of globalization characterized by dissensions that return as identity manifestations. There was an accumulation of tensions and impasses, all of them with strong political and cultural manifestations. In this context, it is important to analyse the new political role of the People's Republic of China in the projection of its power in international relations in the 21st century. Hu Jintao's successor, Xi Jinping, has been opting for another style of governance that seems to resemble or remind one of Mao Zedong's leadership. However, although similar in nature to the strengthening of the role of the state and the centralization of the party as well in order to promote his personality, there are clear differences, not only because of the times but also because the context of the balance of powers is different. Thus, it is imperative to analyse China's power, specifically from its strategic culture to understand the nature of sharp power that has been applied in China's international projection, hence it is important to position this new form of power over Russia and the United States under Trump's leadership.*

*Key-words: China, Sharp Power, World Order, European Union, USA, Russia.*

***Applying Power Analysis: Using the ‘Powercube’ to explore forms, levels and spaces of power***

John Gaventa (Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex) j.gaventa@ids.ac.uk

*In a complex, globalised and rapidly changing world, power dynamics are multidimensional, constantly evolving, and full of complexity. The ‘powercube’ (Gaventa, 2006; powercube.net) is an approach to power analysis which can be used to examine the multiple forms, levels and spaces of power, and their interactions. This paper briefly outlines the evolution of the powercube, showing how it builds upon earlier work by Steven Lukes, Power: A Radical View, and my own earlier work: Power and Powerlessness in an Appalachian Valley.*

*The paper then goes on to show how this approach has been taken up and used for the analysis of power dynamics analysis across a range of fields. Google scholar shows over 500 citations of the powercube, and we have found over 60 studies where the powercube has been applied in a substantive way by a broad range of scholars and activists in INGOs, local NGOs, social movements, think tanks, universities and donors around the world. The uses include analysing power in relationship to participation, policy and governance issues (the areas from which the first applications emerged), but also the analysis of power in a range of contemporary issues, including digital inclusion, economic justice, environmental issues, trade (including fair trade), health, housing, humanitarian relief, human rights, hunger and nutrition, legal empowerment, mental health, peacebuilding, water and other natural resources. Following a review of a select number of these studies, and reflections on their substantive contributions to the study of power, eight lessons are derived on applying and using the power cube for a) power analysis and b) learning for social change.*

***The Two Languages of Power***

David Strecker (University of Frankfurt, Germnay) david.strecker@campus.tu-erfurt.de

*Although generally recognized as a central concept in the social sciences, the diverse and in part seemingly contradictory conceptualizations of power have triggered the suspicion that completely different phenomena have been subsumed under the same term. In contrast, this paper argues that the conceptual confusion can be resolved by, first, distinguishing between three levels of power (essence, action, social; see my Logik der Macht, Velbrück 2012).*

*Arguing that discussions in the social sciences are about what I have called social power, the paper then traces how the familiar distinction between power over and power to refers to two different functions of social power, namely the repression and the constitution of social relations. A sketch of how both of these functions have been analyzed in action-theoretical as well as structural and systemic theoretical frameworks leads to a four-field-matrix which substantiates the claim that the different aspects of social power may only be separated analytically. Any essentialist isolation of these aspects into different types of power necessarily loses sight of and masks how power permeates social phenomena.*

*Accordingly, all social relations are power relations; power cannot be escaped and evaluated from an external standpoint. However, the study of power has traditionally been motivated by critical concerns. Analyses of power aim at criticizing and altering power relations. The final part of this paper argues that a totalizing conception of power and a critique of power are compatible because they are formulated in different languages: the former in the objectifying language employed by an observer of the social dynamic, the latter in the performative language of a participant entangled in social practices. The relation of these two languages of power is the topic of the theory of pespecival dualism which, I argue, forms the core of any comprehensive social theory.*

***The Advent of the Power of Numbers: Rise of Ratings as a Global Governance Tool***

Alina V. Vladimirova (Researcher Center for Southeast Asia, Australia, and Oceania Institute of Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences) alina.v.vladimirova@gmail.com

*In the paper proposed we would like to present a systematic review of national ratings to discuss their evolution and significance for world politics and global governance actors. As we see, there is a clear tendency of such reports growth to the extent where think tanks and consulting agencies view their own ratings creation as some kind of mandatory attribute of their activity. No doubts, such reports have a positive effect on an organization status and help to promote its services, therefore we could expect a further increase in the number of such publications. Meanwhile, there are many questions related not only to the methodologies and the data of national ratings but concerning a selection of a specific rating for governance needs, especially at the global level. We argue that ratings used by various actors are another tool that allows establishing rules and norms in world politics, thus, it is so important to study their development and their power of numbers*

***Domination and Acquiescence: Beyond Uni-directional Power Discourses Towards New Configurations***

Gift Mupambwa and Johan Zaaiman (North West University, South Africa) johan.zaaiman@nwu.ac.za
*Over the past few decades political scholars from different school of thoughts have often dribbled with comprehending the dynamics between domination and acquiescence in local development processes. The overarching and perennial question asked by many is ‘who dominates who?’ thus evoking incessant and indomitable incongruent debates amongst scholars interested in power theorising. Using a critical examination of scholarly literature on power relationships amongst actors in urban local development praxis, supplemented by a South African empirical study, the paper gives a scholarly overview of the shifting nature of relations of domination and subservience as found in power discourses. With the aid of an empirical qualitative study it is argued that power relations can be highly fluid and volatile. This is in contrast to the discourse from the time of Dahl’s treatise ‘Who governs’ that domination is to a large extend uni-directional and produces acquiescence. The paper opens this debate by presenting a historical and empirical scholarly discussion of power shifts from asymmetric binaries to a nuanced view of fluid, volatile and multidirectional power plays amongst actors. Deviating from earlier scholarly preoccupations with uni-directional, binary and power asymmetries, the paper augments power discussions with a focus on actors’ ability to promote hegemonic mutations, thus altering power dynamics to fluidity and volatile relationships.*

***Keywords****: Power; Acquiescence; Multi-directionalism; Fluidity; Resistance*

***The Changing Face of Russian Power 1979-2019: Currency of Power in Russia from Brezhnev to Putin***

Peter Rutland (Wesleyan University) prultand@wesleyan.edu

*State power is the result of a confluence of economic resources and a loyal population, with military power based on a combination of the former. The empire-states of the 19th century gave way to the nation-states of the 20th century, with one exception – the Soviet Union, which reinvented empire on the basis of a millenarian ideology and a sui generis economic model.
Soviet power peaked in 1979 with the invasion of Afghanistan. The next decade showed that the external and internal dimensions of power in the Soviet state were misaligned, leading to systemic collapse. In the 1990s, post-soviet Russia embraced the basic institutional shells of capitalism and democracy, while returning to military force as central to the currency of power in the 2000s. This paper analyzes the path of Russian power culminating in the Putin model.*

***The New Concepts of Power: Power to, Power over and Power with***

Pamela Pansardi (University of Pavia) pamela.pansardi@unipv.it

*In contemporary literature about power, the emergence of the theoretical distinction between a power-over and power-to concept of power was probably due to Steven Lukes, whom, in PRV (1974), introduced the distinction between a conflictual vs. a consensual understanding of power, exemplified, this latter, by the works of Parsons and Arendt (see also Haugaard 1997; 2003). While, however, the real 'invention' of the phrases 'power to', and 'power with' predates Lukes' work and has probably to be found in the writings of Mary Parker Follett - according to whom power-over is to be understood as ‘coercive’ while power with as a ‘coactive’ form of power (1940: 79) - it is possible to claim that, in contemporary literature, the distinction between the three interpretations of power is not anymore a dispute about a same concept, but that the three notions of power crystallized and institutionalized themselves into three different, freestanding concepts of power. Despite their usage spread along the whole spectrum of the power studies - the usage of these phrases is found, nowadays, not only in political and social theory and international relations, but in disciplines such as political geography, development and empowerment studies, environmental studies, psychology and so on - confusion about the real meanings of these three concepts is still present. While in my previous work I agreed with Baldwin (2016: 85) in claiming that: "The distinction between power over and power to has generated a great deal of unnecessary misunderstanding and controversy" and I challenged the distinction between the three notions from a conceptual standpoint, their recent institutionalization in the power literature and their widespread presence in the power jargon led me to recognize their usefulness in indicating different 'aspects' of power. Accordingly, in this paper, after retracing the origin of the distinction and analyzing the contributions most significant for the development of these three notions in the last forty years - starting from Morriss' (1988) impressive philosophical study of power in terms of power-to, and Dowding's (1992) distinction between power-to and power-over as two distinct self-standing notions, to Allen's (1999) interpretation of power-with in terms of empowerment and resistance, until contemporary studies dealing with empirical applications of the three notions (such as VanBaarle et. al 2019) - my aim will be to offer an analysis of three 'new' concepts of power able to untangle the confusion about their meaning. The questions this paper aims to answer are the following: Are power-over and power-to always indicating, respectively, conflictual and consensual power, or illegitimate and legitimate power? Can power-to refer to morally wrong instances of power, or it is by definition a positively evaluative concept? Is power-with just the 'collective agent' version of one of the two other types (or both) of power, or should it be characterized as an entirely different concept? By trying to provide an answer to these questions, this paper does not only attempt to provide a critical interpretation of current usages of the three notions, but its ultimate goal is to attempt to offer clear and mutually exclusive definitions for the three concepts that can be useful for future research and theorizing.*

***Transforming Asia and Changing Political Power of Russia***

Dmitry Mosyakov (Director Institute of Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences)

mosyakov.d@gmail.com