RECASTING STATECRAFT
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND STRATEGIES OF PEACEFUL CHANGE

T.V. Paul
Presidential Address
International Studies Association (ISA), 57th Annual Convention
Atlanta, March 17, 2016

I**ntroduction**- First of all, I would like to mention outgoing President Paul Diehl's contributions to ISA and to the profession. Paul has been an inspiring scholar for over three decades in a number of areas ranging from peace keeping/building and enduring rivalries, to international law and mediation. He is a role model for many of us through his accomplishments in scholarship, teaching, and institution-building. We will be continuing his conference theme on peace by focusing on 'change in world politics' as next year's conference theme. I want to thank Paul for his support for two initiatives we have proposed which the governing council has just approved: the setting up of a Presidential Taskforce on the Global South and allowing members from underrepresented regions such as Africa, East Asia, South Asia, Southeast Asia, Latin America and the Middle East to set up thematic Sections under ISA. I wish him much success in the years ahead.

 I also want to thank the Hon. Joe Clark, former Canadian PM, for attending this presentation and the ISA conference for the first time. Mr. Clark has been an inspiring statesman with his humility, approachability, and commitment to peace and mediation in regions such as Africa. We at McGill have benefitted from his presence and advice as a senior distinguished fellow at the Institute for the Study of International Development. We hope to attract more prominent world figures and practitioners like Mr. Clark at ISA conferences in the coming years. Now let me get to my presentation.
_____

Last summer I visited Vienna where I had the opportunity to see two exhibitions: One observing the 200th anniversary of the Congress of Vienna which heralded the Concert of Europe and the other, the World War I exhibit at the Vienna Museum of Military History {Show Slides}.

Both visits reminded me of the value and need for a strategy of peace and how the absence of it can generate extraordinary violence and conflict in the international system.

It was English scholar E.H. Carr who admonished European leaders to think about peaceful change more seriously in the 1930s. Carr said in his book: *The Twenty years Crisis:*

"The defence of [the] status quo is not a policy which can be lastingly successful. It will end in war as surely as rigid conservatism will end in revolution. 'Resistance to aggression,' however necessary as a momentary device of national policy, is no solution; for readiness to fight to prevent change is just as unmoral as readiness to fight to enforce it. To establish methods of peaceful change is therefore the fundamental problem of international morality and of international politics" (Carr, 1964: 222).

And a few decades later Robert Gilpin argued:
"The basic task of peaceful change is not merely to secure peace; it is to foster change and achieve a peace that secures one's basic values. Determining how this goal is to be achieved in specific historical circumstances is the ultimate task of wise and prudent statesmanship" (Gilpin, 1981, 209).

Carr's and Gilpin's words are becoming very relevant in the contemporary world where a power transition conflict involving the U.S. and China is increasingly a possibility.

Is International Relations (IR) as a discipline offering much by way of ideas for change without war? **My submission is that when we read the mainstream journals and books in the field, peaceful change as a specific topic appears to be receiving little attention**. It may well be that we have generated many ideas on peace and change in our field but they are scattered and do not often reach the right audience, especially policy makers.

Three key dimensions of peaceful change relevant to IR in a positive sense are, first, ***global/systemic*** *level change*, related to power transitions and the peaceful status accommodation of rising powers, as well as the creation of a just world order as its actual or perceived absence often produces much conflict and violence. Second, at the ***regional level***: i.e., change in regional orders from conflict to cooperation and possibilities of producing security communities. Third, at the ***domestic*** level, improvements to state capacity and democratic order that can have a positive impact on international and regional orders. My primary focus today is on strategies at the global level, especially the peaceful accommodation of rising powers.

Why is it important that we understand and cope with change in a meaningful manner? A failure to appreciate change and deal with it can have disastrous consequences, especially if it involves competing major power states.

From a U.S. national security perspective, America's biggest strategic challenge in the years to come is how to accommodate China, Russia, and potentially other

rising/resurging powers peacefully without succumbing to appeasement or aggression, that is avoiding the so called: "Thucydides Trap."

The challenge for the rising powers is how to reach their goals without war. In order to accomplish that they need a grand strategy that calls for gradual accommodation and integration rather than outright confrontation.

Traditionally, strategy and grand strategy have been about how to attain the objectives of war, and then post-war security through minimum costs to nation-states. **Strategy is defined as**: "the employment of battle as the means toward the attainment of the object of war" (Clausewitz, 1989). To Basil Liddell Hart, strategy is "the art of distributing and applying military means to fulfill the ends of policy" (1991, 321).

Grand Strategy: is defined as "the collection of military, economic and political means and ends with which a state attempts to achieve security" (Posen, 1986).

The nuclear age brought about a revolution in strategy as the absolute or uncontestable weapon encouraged deterrence as the key basis for strategy over offensive or defensive uses of military power. However, the nuclear discourse largely ignored peaceful change as the focus was on status quo preservation through mutual deterrence.

The grand strategy literature has mostly been Realist in orientation. This is inadequate. We need to broaden strategy and grand strategy to include a statecraft of peace as a definitive dimension of national security doctrines.

The key to understanding change is an appreciation of both **structure** and **agency**.

IR THEORY AND PEACEFUL CHANGE

Let me briefly discuss how the major perspectives in IR deal with peaceful change.

Classical Realism offers ideas of prudence for statecraft. It calls for focusing on national interests without undue attention to ideology. Morgenthau's nine rules of diplomacy are examples of prudent statecraft. Though the premium is on stability, the classical realist admonition is that states need to pursue their genuine security interests and not abstract religious or ideological goals, and if they recognize the vital interests of other states, peaceful order is possible.

Classical realists have received a fair amount of criticism, as national interest is an ambiguous concept as distinguishing it from the narrow interests of political elite is often difficult. One challenge is that classical realists produce contradictory positions on war and peace. There is great faith in balance of power, and in the post-War years in containment and deterrence, as the key mechanism of international and regional order, but history shows us these strategies do not often make peace or peaceful change possible.

Peaceful change has been relegated to near impossibility in **neorealist*, and offensive realist scholarship*.** To neorealists, stability can be achieved if a correct configuration of power exists. Bipolarity is stability preserving, while multipolarity is not. International politics is characterized by recurring, not changing patterns. The challenge for statecraft is therefore how do we understand change and develop a strategy to cope with it based on this logic.

Neoclassical realism has more possibility for dealing with peaceful change. Its efforts to link systemic forces with intervening variables including domestic politics and ideational factors may have value in understanding peaceful change. However, scholars in this vein have not yet produced a cogent set of literature on this subject.

While Realist insights are important for comprehending conflict and stability to an extent, they need not be **extremely useful in understanding peaceful change** or the strategies that lead to peace.

Liberalism has offered the most prescriptions on peaceful change among all IR perspectives. Various branches under this school locate the sources of peaceful change within the establishment of the **Kantian tripod**: i.e., international institutions and regimes, economic interdependence among major actors, and democratic norms among all states. States with similar commercial and political interests tend to cooperate for peaceful change.

The big challenge is how liberal states can encourage non-liberal states to accept liberal ideas without violence? How do liberals integrate them peacefully? If integration efforts do not succeed, how can liberal states co-exist with non-liberal states? Can liberal states accept non-Western and non-liberal norms some of which may be peace-generating?

The need for a **second enlightenment and refined liberalism** based on cosmopolitanism and progressive global values, not just European values, is all the more pressing today even in Europe where much of the liberal thought arose.

The third dominant paradigm**, Constructivism,** has much to offer for understanding peaceful change. If proper norms, ideas, and practices are developed, peaceful change can take place. Ideational changes are often engineered or promoted by norm entrepreneurs who were key to altering some long-standing ideas such as slavery, colonialism, and racial discrimination that were once upon a time considered unshakeable. The security community literature in constructivism also discusses sources of change.

There is much merit in the Constructivist reasoning. The important question is: how do we translate ideas into national practices?

Not all norm entrepreneurs promote peace. Some indeed attempt to create violent norms and succeed in that as we see in the M. East and N. Africa today.

There is also a tendency to pick good norms and view Western/liberal norms as the yardstick for norm diffusion and little of non-Western norms are discussed in the Constructivist literature.

Further, scholars in this tradition have presented few concrete strategies for policy makers to adopt. Sustaining peace or normative change is another major hurdle. Even democratic societies such as the U.S and the European Union are seeing the resurgence of illiberal ideas today and this transformation needs a proper explanation.

Critical Theorists: Including post-structural and post-positivist scholars force us to think about problems with existing theories and belief systems which have much value for thinking about change. But alternative policy prescriptions are rarely discussed or offered- and we do not know if the alternative propositions critical theorists imply in their analyses will work to obtain change without violence. As I see it, linking critical and problem-solving theories is a major challenge here as they are often presented as binary and in oppositional terms.

Peace Studies: A branch of IR that has attempted to deal with peace is the umbrella discipline of peace studies. Their contributions include analysis of negative peace, pertaining to the elimination of direct violence; and positive peace, relating to the eradication of indirect or structural violence.

Unfortunately, some of these approaches got marginalized in the U.S. in particular during the Cold War era largely because of the activism attached to them. But the time for resurrecting peace studies as a serious sub-discipline is overdue. Peace studies should come up with concrete strategies for changing inter-state and intra-state relations.

Other Disciplines: Strategies of peaceful change are very much part of disciplines like Sociology, Anthropology and Social Psychology. Inter-personal, community and societal level ideas and strategies exist for peaceful change. For instance, Anthropologists talk about tribal society practices for peace, order and social harmony with techniques that may have relevance for IR which we often overlook.

Strategy is not all about War or Narrow National Security
Strategy got a bad rap as cunning and crafty military planners think about war and its prosecution, largely because of the classical European strategists, whose ideas led to two world wars, and the cold warriors whose prescriptions led to a major arms race and the possibility for global nuclear catastrophe. Although a global war was avoided, it still leaves room for understanding change without war.

Think of Economics or Management as disciplines talking about causes of abstract market phenomena only or exclusively on disruptive economic changes. What makes both disciplines appealing is that they offer solutions to economic and business problems along with abstract theories. IR appears to be reticent to do so.

Strategic studies ended up as a sub-discipline of IR concerned about narrow military dimensions. For too long, we have relegated strategic planning to a small group of men in political and military leadership who often have a peculiar way of looking at the world. Imagine what they can do: it was a small ideologically-oriented decision-making team in Washington, driven by groupthink that led to a disastrous war in the Middle East in 2003, the consequences of which are still haunting us today.

Western strategic thought, during the past 125 years or so, has been heavily influenced by Clausewitz, Jomini, and others who believed in the "cult of the offensive." Clausewitz's dictums such as "'complete disarming or overthrow of the enemy must always be the aim of warfare" had historically done much harm to prospects of peaceful change. I see parallels today in strategies such as "full spectrum dominance" of the U.S. military.

We need to appreciate that military strategy today has become very complex along with the rise of a complex international system. Facing a China with its own Sun Tsu logic with Clausewitzian ideas may produce potentially deadly consequences.

As we enter the third decade of the 21st century, one thing is clear: a country planning war using worn-out ideas of grand strategy may end up losing peace, even if it wins the war. Great powers, including the U.S., Russia, and China, that unnecessarily destroy regional orders are often driven by archaic strategic ideas.

As war as a system changing mechanism is fast becoming anachronistic, a rethinking of grand strategy has become all the more important. How can we adapt to the 21st century and how can states, especially big powers, achieve their goals without war?

STATECRAFT FOR PEACEFUL CHANGE

We need to encourage our discipline to think about peaceful change more effectively. This would mean scholars discussing the policy relevance of their work, especially on how they deal with change.

It would also mean departments and programs hiring and promoting scholars with different perspectives and methods. We need realists, liberals, post-modernists and constructivists under the same roof to debate issues and teach students divergent ideas and arguments. We need qualitative, quantitative, and formal methods. Privileging one over the other (as is happening in many schools today) has long-term consequences for the discipline and how it is researched and taught.

We need to encourage scholars to think with historical understanding about which strategy produced conflict and which strategy generated unnecessary violence while accepting the contextual variance. Macro and micro-level forces that generate war and peace need to be identified more clearly. Psychological theories may be relevant here as well. Better bargaining theories are needed. Strategies such as Robert Osgood's Graduated Reduction in international Tensions GRIT need to be resurrected in the discourse more often.

A statecraft for peaceful change should include diplomacy at the highest level. Soft balancing based on institutions and interdependence, both at economic and societal levels, are useful under some conditions.

Legitimacy is key to achieving higher international status peacefully. How can rising powers obtain such legitimacy through institutional practices and normative innovations than resorting to brute force? Integrating rising powers peacefully through institutional mechanisms should form a focal point of status quo power strategies.

We already have examples of contributions from different parts of the world for peaceful change. Some have been successful, some not so. Here are some select contributions.

Western Contributions

It should be noted that the West as the dominant actor in the past 500 plus years has contributed to peaceful change, although much of Western history is characterized by aggressive warfare and the pursuit of colonial and imperial dominance. It is victory of certain strategic beliefs and myths that led to many European wars and the manner in which they were fought.

However, it was European Enlightenment thinkers who brought to the world notions of liberty and equality grounded in reason. They were the ones who questioned the Hobbesian view, as well as religious superstitions, and presented alternative mechanisms enshrined in Lockean and Kantian interpretations.

The Concert system following the Napoleonic wars innovated conference diplomacy and collective security, which would later become the bedrock of the League and UN systems. But the Concert was based on an exclusionary understanding of international politics. The anti-colonial and anti-imperial struggles in many parts of the world in the 20th century were indeed against Western exclusionism.

Post-War Europe and Peaceful Change: The key contribution of Western Europe has been the creation of a pluralistic security community. Yet the Kantian progression in all dimensions is yet to take place. Kant's third definitive article of peace based on cosmopolitan law "the right of a foreigner not to be treated with hostility when he arrives at someone else's territory," is neglected in Europe as the peaceful integration

of racial minorities has not been very successful. Yet Kantian ideas do offer much hope for Europe and the world.

The Helsinki process and the associated CSCE/OSCE institutions in which European states played a critical role, along with their eastern counterparts, are credited with the Soviet acceptance of certain common norms and principles of international conduct. These efforts might have helped to end the Cold War relatively peacefully.

US Contributions

The accommodation of the United States as a great power by the United Kingdom during the late 19th and early 20th centuries is one of the rare examples of peaceful rise. A key U.S.-led attempt at peaceful change was Wilsonian internationalism based on institutions, i.e. the League and its collective security system, the ideas of which lingered beyond the League's demise.

In the post-World War II period, the U.S. played a significant role in dismantling the European colonial order somewhat peacefully. The use of the Marshall Plan for reconstruction of the war-ravaged Europe, and the reordering of Germany and Japan as peaceful nations were major accomplishments.

The Cold War era policies turned the goodwill into considerable suspicion in the emerging world. Restraint was missing in anti-Communist interventions, especially in Vietnam. Grand strategic myths played a big role in these U.S. policy failures.

During the transitions that took place in the 1990s, the U.S. played a crucial role as a facilitator. Helmut Kohl, Margret Thatcher, and George H. Bush showed prudence by not taking advantage of the Soviet Union at its moment of disintegration.

Subsequent U.S. strategy has not been successful with respect to Russia, partially due to NATO expansion and failure of Western integration policies. Also, U.S. policies have been substantial failures in the Middle East, where forceful regime changes since 2003 have ushered in a very violent phase. A big question today is: Can the U.S. craft a strategy for peaceful change in the Middle East?

More importantly: Can the U.S. **accommodate a rising China peacefully**? What are the components of such an accommodation strategy without turning the policy into appeasement? Can the U.S. and China peacefully resolve the key issues such as Taiwan and South China Sea disputes?

Non-Western Ideas of Peaceful Change

It is important that IR scholars and students pay close attention to ideas of peaceful change that have originated from other parts of the world.

In this context, I want to explore (as examples) the so-called BRICS countries that have made contributions to peaceful change. I do not claim other countries or civilizations do not matter.

Soviet Union/Russia*:* The contributions of the Soviet Union and its somewhat peaceful dismantlement following the end of the Cold War need to be analyzed further. The Soviet participation in the Helsinki process helped to ease the East-West tensions at various points. Soviet support for decolonization, and its declaration of a no-first use doctrine of nuclear weapons contained strategic elements of peaceful change.

It should be noted that the strategies inherent in **Glasnost and Perestroika**, produced far reaching changes that the world had not seen in the four decades of the Cold War. Yet, the Soviets also contributed to much violence by helping to spread arms and supporting regimes and causes for narrow national interests including a failed military intervention in Afghanistan, the consequences of which are still ongoing.

Obviously, in today's world, as Vladimir Putin is asserting his strength militarily around Russia's neighborhood, there is considerable anxiety about where Moscow is heading.

China: China's grand strategy in the past 3 decades offer interesting clues on peaceful change. Sun Tzu's and Confucian ideas have influenced these strategies. Sun Tsu's *Art of War* also contains strategies for achieving one's goals without using force.

In the annals of strategies for peaceful change, Deng Xiaoping is a pivotal figure. His successor Hu Jin Tao's policy of "peaceful rise," later christened as "peaceful development," stands out as an example of how a rising power can carve out its position without war. China is indeed one of the rare rising powers in history that crafted an explicit strategy for peaceful rise.

The strategy of resurrecting the Silk Road and the Maritime Silk Road, and supporting developing countries through the creation of the New Development Bank and Asian Infrastructure Development Bank contain ideas for peaceful institutional bargaining with established powers.

If China reaches global power status without a war that will be a tremendous accomplishment to the idea of peaceful change, although the prospects are looking increasingly dim. What kind of normative and political order does China want to create after it reaches its power status is a big question yet to be answered. Future peaceful change involving other rising powers such as India will be determined greatly by the Chinese strategy.

India*:* India's freedom struggle is an exemplar of peaceful strategy as it was Mahatma Gandhi's non-violent struggle that helped the liberation of India from colonialism and subsequently propelled the massive decolonization that took place in Asia, Africa, and

other parts of the world. Despite all its weaknesses, India's democratic constitution, based on fundamental rights, secularism, federalism, and the three language formula, has done much to integrate and help peacefully change a country with an approximate population size of Africa and the Middle East combined.

Independent India's policy of non-alignment, beginning with the Bandung conference of 1955, support for disarmament, decolonization, and new international economic order all had some impact on world order discourses. India has played the role of a norm entrepreneur, not always succeeding, and eventually abandoning the same ideas it preached such as nuclear disarmament.

Brazil: has not been pursuing hegemonic aspirations in the military realm, even as it could have been the U.S. of South America. Questions remain as to whether its focus on soft power, multilateralism, non-intervention, and nuclear free zone have been conscious decisions or making a virtue out of necessity. Regional institution building has been another focal point of the Brazilian strategy.

South Africa: Nelsen Mandela and the ANC's conscious decision to forgive and forget and avoid ethnic purification as neighboring Zimbabwe did is an example of a strategy of peaceful change. South Africa has not been all that successful in economic redistribution, but a democratic system is in place however corrupt it might be. Also, Pretoria is not pushing to become the regional hegemon militarily in Africa. It has been contributing to conflict resolution in many African countries. And it is holding on to its anti-nuclear norm as well.

I must mention that at the regional level, ASEAN stands out as a community that has created a separate peace at the inter-state level based on institutional and normative means, as well as partial liberal ideas such as economic interdependence, although most of the states in the grouping are not proper democracies and show high levels of internal violence.

Why do countries Change Peaceful to Violent Strategies?
It is interesting to examine why countries after pursuing initial peaceful strategies turn toward a violent strategy.

The **Soviet** decline contributed to peace at the great power level, and conflict resolution in many regions of the world, but it generated domestic forces that did not see any benefits coming to Russia. Western non-recognition of Russia's aspirations for higher status including non-fulfillment of verbal commitments of non-expansion of NATO may be a major reason.

In the **Chinese case**, the arrival of XI Jinping and his regime's aggressive push for territory in the South China Sea is threatening all that was accomplished using the 'peaceful rise strategy' of Deng, Hu Jin Tao, and followers. The 'salami slicing' of the

South China sea and the rapid militarization of the region has potential to upset the peaceful rise strategy in the years to come.

In the **India case**, the failures of Nehru's neighborhood policy, especially after the 1962 China war, led to a rethinking of the earlier focus on low military spending and active international participation for norms change. The strategy today is driven by a peaceful rise approach using economic and institutional means although internal violence and increasing intolerance are threatening that process. The inability to settle two lingering border conflicts has cast shadow on India's claim for peaceful change in the region and beyond.

Brazil and South Africa are holding on to non-hegemonic strategies, non-nuclear policies, and support for regional institutions. But internally they remain two of the most violent societies in the world and weak economic growth and high levels of inequality may produce more violence and turbulence in the years ahead.

The first three cases show that countries can initiate strategies of peaceful change, but they need not sustain them. Our attention needs to be focused on not only achieving peaceful change, but how to sustain it, similar to peace building in war-torn societies. What institutional and normative changes can be built that will sustain peaceful change in the long run?

Conclusions: The Need for Statecraft for Peaceful Change
What are the elements that can effectively bring about peaceful change? What can sustain them? Ignoring power politics is a mistake. But balance of power and deterrence are not the sole, nor the only dependable answers today as balances can be broken through clever strategies. Ignoring institutions and liberal norms and ideas is also a mistake. How do we combine them in an effective statecraft for change without war?

Can our discipline become the lead source of ideas for peaceful change, or are we going to leave this element to a narrow group of politicians, their advisors and diplomats alone many of whom often lack deep vision or historical understanding? The current low-quality debates among U.S. presidential candidates attest to this point.

The need for strategies for peaceful change is growing in a complex, globalized world, and are we prepared for that? If we are not, will we end up similar to the early 20th century generation who slid themselves into war in their "March of Folly" as Barbara Tuchman powerfully puts it? IR as a discipline needs to rise up to this fundamental challenge more than anything else today.

Thank you.