Empire, Hegemony, Hyperpower? Management of late-Westphalian International Environment

Empire and Hegemony are among the crucial notions of science of international relations. Many scholars were investigating those concepts, and attempted to define them and estimate whether they retain explanatory value in contemporary situation of accelerated evolution of international system. Within the system governed by anarchy, those two prepositions were considered partial resolution to destructive tendencies generated within the international environment. Albeit those resolutions seem similar, their application required different conditions in order to become effective. Every mentioned above system is a complex and adequate answer to challenge posed by different set of features and variables generated by particular iteration of international system. The question remains: preconditions to occurrence of which system will be generated by late-Westphalian and subsequent generation of international environment? Contemporary iteration projects many individual characteristics, with regards to complexity, globalization and historical acceleration. One of the possible solutions to this issue is recently introduced concept of Hyperpower, which could be positioned as a system in between those mentioned above. However its creation embraces new quality of international relations not yet encountered during course of history. This paper will be dedicated to investigating this concept and its usefulness for scientific analysis of contemporary international relations. Hyperpower embraces geopolitics and transnational in equal measures. It is product of so-called “virtualization of state” and encompass tools for effective interaction in both spheres of international environment. It is generally much more passive system than mentioned above. Its activation consumes astounding amount of resources. Therefore its primary application is in most cases passive, strictly limited to the shaping of the perception of remaining elements of international system.
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Introduction

One of the fundamental tenets of Westphalian international environment is the notion of sovereignty⁴. It is still unclear what exactly it could be, but

---

entirety of academic community associated with the international relations agree, that this is inseparably connected with statehood, thus each international Actor is equipped in similar quantity of similar quality of this asset. However, as it was proven since the beginning on 20th Century, nation states tend to differ, when it comes to their place and role within the framework. The differences between the size and modes of operations within the community of nation states drive to development of third debate on international relations, between the neorealists and neoliberals. Although both sides were basing on different assumption, the role of surrounding environment, which was understood as a dominant factor which shape and formed internal structures and its functions.

Therefore different strata of nation state were identified and examined. However, the main research objective of this paper is the investigation the top strata of the Actors, mostly derived from nation states category. During history, in most cases this strata was occupied by singular entity, which was labeled differently: Empire or Hegemony. The next question is aimed at identification of differences between those terms, supplemented with the clarification of conditions which promotes coalescence and development of certain forms of political entity overarching entire international system. The final question will be addressing the future of this structure: whether future, post-Westphalian international will require similar institution. And if so, how it could look like.

One of the possibilities only recently developed concept of a hyperpower. At first glance it strongly resemblance to the notion of superpower, relating mainly to a specific category of the extremely potent state. However, this idea defines a new quality of international environment, introducing different set of constructs and fulfilling different set of functions than classical, Westphalian international institutions. The analysis will focus on three variables: national component, transnational component and functions. First, it is the role of the national component, which is the nation-state, one of the most potent examples of category of superpower or world power. Nowadays, the role of the center of a Hyperpower is strongly gripped by United States of America. Second, it is the role of the transnational component in the form of a network of transnational connections between the hyperpower's center and other elements of the international environment. Third, it is also the function of the hyperpower in the international environment, as well as its role and contribution to the transformation of the Westphalian international environment into the next-generation international environment.

Two research hypotheses will be subjected to verification. The first will refer to the nature of a Hyperpower, which in its structure includes the construction of a complete balance between the tools of shaping international geopolitical reality and shaping transnational social reality. The second relates


to the basic mechanism of the functioning of the Hyperpower in the international reality. Unlike the previous forms, it is a clearly passive, shaping the perception of other participants in international relations rather than actively formatting actual international relations. To supplement this hypotheses will be determination whether any of mentioned entities will be attractive enough to be recreated within the framework of post-Westphalian international environment. This assessment will be based on scenario method, as their need to be based on relatively low level of certainty.

The structure of paper will be composed of four, connected parts. First part will embrace the nature of the evolution of International Relations system which could be labeled as late-Westphalian. Particularly important will be issues of continuity and change, which are recreating and reforming paths for the future development and modifying probabilities of future recreation of known forms of International System management hub. Second part will be dedicated to the first period of development of International Relations, when the highest authority in the global environment was labeled as an Empire. This node was based on two-layered foundations: overwhelming military advantage over remaining international Actors. Second is the universal and not-questioned recognition for legitimacy of an Empire. Title may be confusing as it was used several times during the history, with varied composition, which in turned disrupted clear definitions. Third part will embrace the second period of development of International Relations, when the highest authority was labeled as a Hegemony. This concept was created in situation where there is not possible to acquire military superiority over remaining elements of the system, but the mantle of Hegemony is achieved only by set of skills and capabilities. Those who excel among rivals, will be granted this post. In other words, this place is given temporarily and conditionality, and Actor which starts to decaying as a wielder of Hegemony, it will be tested and eventually replaced in a contest known as Hegemonic War.²

International Environment: change and continuity

Since the last decade of the 20th Century, international relations scholars are engaged in debates concerning the growing urgency of redefinition of the scope, structures and functions of the international environment. This situation was created mainly thanks to changes occurring within the deep undercurrents of civilization – so called megatrends.⁵ Observed change embraces transition

---

⁵The term was introduced to science of international relations by John Naisbitt. Currently, it is used to describe universal tendencies that shape the international order at the highest social level (civilization). Different researchers identify and name different megatrends: J. Naisbitt distinguishes 10 of them, P. Kennedy - 7, National Defense Council report (Global Trends 2015) - 7, H. McRae - 5; M. Perczyński - 4, and J. Pajestka - 2. On the other hand, B. Balcerowicz distinguished 6 megatrends: globalization, IT revolution, uneven demographic explosion, threats to the natural environment, systemic transformation - in the economic (capitalism) and
from classical form of international environment known as Westphalian, existing since 1648. The predominant feature is dualism present in every aspect of social relations, for instance between the national and international law. As the next generation of the international environment is taking shape, this dualism is slowly modified to the point where both orders will overlap and interpenetrate themselves. A manifestation of this phenomenon may be the emergence of numerous, ephemeral forms of political and social organizations functioning at the intersection of both spheres. Area of activity of those Actors – formal and semi-formal – will be a number of mechanisms, legal, political and social, enabling external interference in the national constitutional order.

The classical Westphalian international environment is fixed on three basic foundations. First is foremost in the structure of international community stemming from the nation-state, as a single Actor category with undisputed Power in two important dimensions. One is the undisputed supremacy within the geopolitical sphere of International Relations, represented by skillful and effective application of military assets. In fact, some commentators claim, that nation state is army framed with the government. It was used directly toward the Kingdom of Prussia in 18th Century, but it could be extended toward all nation-states. Representatives of this category whenever it was recognized by other of its kind, predominantly due to force of arms. The other is social legitimacy, basing not only on rational and politics association but also emotional investments in forming bonds between the nation and individual citizens. This process was greatly improved by French Revolution, especially due to surging demands for manpower. In consequence, connecting the military power with social legitimacy created cornerstone for International Relations, from which other forms on international community are stemming: non-governmental organization, multinational corporations and international organizations. However, their existence and well-being was completely dependent on the collective will of nation-state.

Second issue is the split within the global entity due to omnipotence of nation-state, which could be described as a dichotomy between what is within the borders of nation-state and what is beyond them. Former space is political (democratization) domains - and also the clash of civilizations. More: B. Balcerowicz, Pokój i nie-pokój. Na progu XXI wieku, Warsaw 2002, p. 85 – 118.


Where some states have an army, the Prussian Army has a state” quote attributed to Voltaire.


Ph. G. Cerny, Rethinking World Politics. A Theory of Transnational Neopluralism, Oxford 2010, s. 64 – 84.
associated with pacification, order, hierarchy and non-violent modes of communication. Latter on the other hand is associated with chaos, disorder, anarchy, and modes of communication supplemented with violence, in a form of wars and coercion. Between those spheres, there is a national border, sealed and protected, carefully designed and constantly watched by government agencies located on both sides. At the peak of Westphalian international environment people, goods and information, were carefully examined and permitted, by issuing various documents to access internal, national space. Furthermore, quite frequently this permission was limited or canceled entirely.\footnote{Ch. Shaw, \textit{Friendship under lock and key: the Soviet Central Asian border, 1918–34}, “Central Asian Survey”, 2011, nr 30(3-4), s. 331 – 348.}

Third issue are the institutions responsible for managing and maintaining cohesion of whole system. Those are embracing various set of mechanisms, stretching form international law to the concert of Powers. The most important of those is balance of Power, which could be understood as an internal mechanism which require every rise of certain nations to be counter by other entities or coalitions of thereof.\footnote{M. Sheehan, \textit{The Balance of Power: History and Theory}, London, New York 1996.} It was particularly visible during the Napoleonic Wars, when sudden rise is prominence of French Empire trigger creation of seven coalitions, which eventually arrest this ascendancy and dispersed this excess of power between remaining Actors of European International Subsystem. What those institution have in common, is the fact that they are constructed according to three important principles. First and foremost, they are dedicated only to support relations between nation-states. At the core of every institution lies presumption that establishing fully developed intrastate relations is extremely burdening, especially when it comes to mutual distrust and cultural differences. Therefore, they were responsible to tackle those obstacles, for instance with application of diplomacy.\footnote{G. R. Berridge, \textit{Diplomacy: Theory and Practice}, New York 2015.} Second, despite limiting role of violence within their framework, violence in itself was also considered to be viable institution for International System, particularly in form of war, at least till 1945, when it was eventually banned.\footnote{Article 2.4 \textit{UN Charter signed on June 26}, 1945, URL: https://www.un.org/en/about-us/un-charter/full-text, [accesss: 31.07.2021].} And third, despite beneficial impact on national performance, there is no compulsion to participate within them. The sovereignty, the ultimate right of nation-state to participate in any form of international cooperation was the most important principle. And it allowed the nation state to opt-out every initiative that defy their objectives.

This construction was slowly evolving since the second half of 20\textsuperscript{th} Century. Primary driver of this change was the complex network of mentioned above civilizational megatrends. In this particular perspective, their could be identified two separate megatrends: demographics and technology. Former roughly shapes the quantitative parameters of International Environment, primarily depending number of people present within the system. Latter – designs the qualitative parameters of International Environment. Both of them
are to some extent intertwined, like for instance in the issue of literacy\textsuperscript{17}, which assess capacity of individuals and social groups to efficiently operate contemporary technology. When it comes to change and continuity, which stirred the debate about need to redesign International Relations, there could be observed three fundamental changes which are being unfolded within the human civilization, stemming from changes within those megatrends. First and foremost is reversal of demographic explosion\textsuperscript{18}. This means that influx of new society members is getting severely limited. In the case of developed nations it is limited only to immigration, which could be in time limited by spread of this effect to entire world. Main consequence is developing by nation state sensitivity to loses, especially connected with battle casualties and collateral damages. Second, is the societal diversification on the scale of globe and on a scale of individual nations. This phenomena occurred because of national awakening identified and described by Zbigniew Brzeziński\textsuperscript{19}, which is focused primarily on activity of national and sub-national entities within the framework of International Relations. This in turn makes mobilization of national assets much more difficult and challenging. Third factor is drastic rise in accessibility of advanced technologies of data processing and communication not only among various national agencies, but also within the societies and individuals\textsuperscript{20}. Which means that geopolitical social space, dominated by nation states is supplemented with transnational social space\textsuperscript{21}, which empowers non-state entities which became equal to nation states, at least to extent.

Those changes are causing and accelerating deterioration of institutions of Westphalian International Environment. Question about what will replace them? This paper limits the scope of its investigation only toward possible paths of evolution of central hub of International Management, which stems between Pre-Westphalian concept of Empire and Westphalian concept of Hegemony. However due to uniqueness of constantly designed and constructed International Environment in order is to offer possible solution of new quality – combining features associated with both notions – Hyperpower.

\textsuperscript{17}UIS Data Centre, UNESCO, \textit{Adult literacy rate, population 15+ years (both sexes, female, male)}, August 2015, URL: http://data.uis.unesco.org/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=EDULIT_DS &popupcustomise=true&lang=en# [access: 1.02.2016].
\textsuperscript{21}Pietraś, \textit{Przestrzeń transnarodowa jako poziom analizy w nauce o stosunkach międzynarodowych [in:] Pozioamy analizy stosunków międzynarodowych. Tom 1}, E. Haliżyak, M. Pietraś (eds), Warsaw 2013, p. 93 – 131.
Pre-Westphalian: Empire: law and military

Chronologically first in those concepts is a concept of central management hub for International Relations is the notion of the Empire. However, that is a cause a challenge, because it was used for some many cases within the framework of history and political sciences, the term is distorted and to some extent biased. Therefore, before there could be conducted full analysis of the term, there is a need to clarify the definitions. First of all, there need to be made a clear, that during history of political institutions, empire was used frequently to described various political entities. Stretching from Summer and Assyrian Empire, through Roman, Chinese and Byzantine Empire, Aztec and Inca Empire, Indian Empire, British, French, Spanish or Russian Empire to recently investigated idea of American Empire. There need to be stated one important feature: empire is used in at least three separate meanings.

First of those is understanding of Empire as a particularly strong entity of political nature and expansive tendencies. It may be observed primarily in the opening phases of pre-Westphalian International Environment when proto-political entities were longing for more assets and prestige. However lack of management skills and uniquely recognized procedures usually prevented establishing more coherent entities. Most visible and known could be Persian Empire, Athenian Empire, through proto-Maximilian Empire, through proto-European Empire, and Empire of Alexander the Great.

Second way to explain the term is application of socioeconomic context of 19th Century, when developed economies of Western Europe seek of new markets and resources to feed industrial and military complex and they found those commodities in colonies. This issue was particularly interesting for followers of Marxism theory of International Relations. Within this subcategory, we can identify colonial empires of Great Britain (both of them), France, Netherlands, Spain, Portugal.

Third possible application of Empire is in cultural or universal terms. This entity was applied only twice in the history. One of those examples was Roman Empire, which existed between 27 BC and 476 AD and Chinese Empire, which existed between 2070 BC and 1911 AD. Only this strand of Empires will be subjected to analysis within this paper, mainly because only those entities were functioning as a central management hub for international system.

Both entities, despite few obvious differences display three identical features, when it comes to their internal mechanisms. First and foremost it is

22The greatest of them was Persian Empire ruled by Achamenid Dynasty.
23Officially labeled as a Delian League. This organization was closest to transformation into unified Actor between 454 – 404 BC.
25First British Colonial Empire (1707 – 1783) was focused on North America. Second British Colonial Empire (1783 – 1945) was constructed in Asia and Africa.
that they encompass whole known world. Beyond their limits lies only
territories deemed not worth of conquering. In most cases the imperial borders
were leaning on barren and inhospitable lands, with only scarce human
settlements, devoid of serious political structures. In most cases, those people
were called barbarians, which is term designated to determined lower social
and cultural status when compared to imperial subjects. But the primary
designate of Empire is that it politically embrace whole International System,
and do not leave any significant entity beyond its framework. This is also a
distinction from Aztec and Inca Empires of Latin America. Since their
establishment and constitution as a dominant political faction in their
respective International Relations Systems was coupled with arrival of
expeditions from Europe. Which meant, that albeit fragile and distant,
connection was coined to region of space beyond their military reach. Thus
conquering whole known world became purely impossible. And influence of
newly discovered part of the globe became their undoing.\footnote{P. Leon, \textit{The Discovery and Conquest of Peru, Chronicles of the New World Encounter} (trans. A. P. Cook, N. D. Cook), Durham 1998.}

Second feature is closely connected with the former one. It is the fact, that
universal Empire has at its disposal overwhelming military advantage over
remaining political elements of the International Environment. However,
some obvious connotations, this capabilities are not associated with skills and
technologies, but – what could be seen in history of Chinese Empire –
associated with the capacity to recreate military capabilities, suffering even
catastrophic damages in quantitative and qualitative dimensions. And still
being able to conduct military operations. That lies as a foundation for imperial
success in pre-Westphalian International Environment. The armed forces of the
pre-Westphalian Empire were makers of a long line of triumphs and victories,
defeating every enemy within as well as without. In fact, in too many cases
application of military force was primary and sole response of imperial
government. Even defeat on a battlefield, as happened to Rome in Teutoburg
Forest in 9 AD\footnote{J. Seidman, \textit{Remembering the Teutoburg Forest: Monventa in Annals}, “Ramus”, 2014, nr 43(1), p. 94 – 114.} or Mongol conquest of China in 1279 AD\footnote{J. Dardess, \textit{Ming T'ai-tsu on the Yüan: An Autocrat's Assessment of the Mongol Dynasty}, “Bulletin of Sung and Yüan Studies”, 1978, nr 14, p. 6 – 11.}, which were
particularly humiliating, did not deplete Empires of their resources, allowing
them to resume daily operations within considerable schedule.

Third feature of Empire is it legitimacy. It was recognized by every
entity within its framework as a value in itself, not only entitled to undertake
certain activities, even against national interests of them but also beneficial
factor which need to be supported in existence. This legitimacy was clearly
visible in the years after its collapse in continuous attempts to revive it in some
form and shape. The primarily factor of legitimacy is acceptance of structures
and mechanisms of imperial provenience, particularly those engaged in
developing of communication network (postal institutions, universal
language)\textsuperscript{31}, law: internal and international and institutions responsible for conflict management and prevention\textsuperscript{32}. What is particularly evident, level of integration of both Empires enabled application of physical violence, in most cases in a form of armed forces incursions, such as quelling the rebellions.

The notion of Empire was so popular, that idea of reviving Empire shined throughout history. It was undertaken in every historical epoch, mainly in Europe, but recently also on other continents, such as Latin America\textsuperscript{33}. However, none of them successful, mainly due to the reasons which will be mentioned in next paragraph. What need to be addressed in this place is the chance of successful reintroduction of Empire to post-Westphalian International Environment, especially, that from time to time scholar tend to associate term Empire with particular nation states, such as United States\textsuperscript{34}. However, the direct recreation of classical Empire even in refurbished state is hardly likely. It is due to three features of contemporary International Relations. First of all, there is very little probability of create so overwhelming military advantage, as it is necessary to the existence of Empire proper, particularly in a dimension of vulnerability of losses\textsuperscript{35}. In fact, classical Empires were able to recreate themselves on a brink of complete collapse, regaining operational capabilities within brief period of time\textsuperscript{36}. In case of United State, there could be observed a developed vulnerability to losses, as well as within their own manpower\textsuperscript{37} as collateral damage to the opposition forces\textsuperscript{38} and civilian casualties. A vulnerability which could cause complete change of national objectives and abandoning whole swaths of space of particular value to this nation state. Second, the classical imperial structure of government does not possess analytical capacity suited to manage contemporary issues, which are much more diversified in any imaginable dimension and much more turmoiled, especially when it comes to slow but steady joining two spaces of policy: national and international, which creates new and ephemeral forms, which are created in droves only for short period of time. The complexity of contemporary International Environment is supplemented with growing


\textsuperscript{33}Empire of Brazil (1822 – 1889).


\textsuperscript{36}It was particular evident during Punic War, when Rome between disaster in Battle of Cannae (216 BC) and decisive victory in Battle of Zama (202 BC). Complete recovery of military capabilities in 14 years.

\textsuperscript{37}In Vietnam War United States deemed crippling losses at level of 58.281 military casualties and 303.644 wounded.

transnational social space which provides classical statehood capacities to smaller entities, even single individuals. And third feature is the collapse of legitimacy within International Environment. It was caused by diversification and fracturing of existing international structures and growing cacophony of voices and actions, basing on different often contradicting cultures. Therefore possibility of unison acceptance and compliance with universal authority is insignificant. Summarizing, Empire was very potent and durable management hub for International Environment. It was the longest existing though, inspiring constant attempts to reinstate some form of imperial rule. However none of them were successful. Future, what could be projected in term of changes within the International Environment, will not created conditions which should be more favorable to this kind of Actor. Therefore this will not be the construction which could be implemented.

Westphalian: Hegemony: functionality

Second construction which were designed and tested within the framework of global International System was the Hegemony. It was associated with the second generation of International Environment, which is labeled a Westphalian, and as well has at least two separate meanings. First, which is associated with Chinese School of International Relations, and is resembling the Empire, in a manner of unifying brutal strength with cultural legitimacy. What differentiate it form Empire is totalitarianism of the term. The Hegemony is entitled and encouraged to enact complete control over any social activity, and severely punishing the disobedience. Thus Hegemony resemble Western notion for totalitarianism. Articulation of this assumption was one of the primary concerns within the negotiations between US and China in 1970s. Second understanding of the notion is stemming from research conducted by George Modelski and long cycle theory. In this context, Hegemony may be understood as a function of power distribution within the International System. In this case, Hegemony is set of functions assigned to the Actor which displayed greatest potential and skill of application those assets within the International Relation. What was more important, in most cases, acquiring mantle of Hegemony heavily relied on innovation, like for instance, in case of Great Britain, their supremacy relied on creating a credible and extremely effective financial system.

---

The Hegemony which will be analyzed within framework of this paper is wrapped around the Modelski concept. It is very different from Empire, and among Actors analyzed within this paper could be seen as opposition to the Empire. It could be perceived within analyzing of particularly evident features of Hegemony. First and foremost feature of Hegemony is that it is intricately temporary. It is designated even within the Modelski theory, which embraces idea of decay and collapse the Hegemony whenever distribution of power in International Environment changes, mainly due to technological progress. Therefore Hegemony is in most cases elusive and limited attribute of nation state. Comparing: in a four centuries of existence of Roman Empire, there were at least five cycles of Hegemony, which benefitted four states recognized as Hegemony. And accompanying the change is a Hegemonic War, which can be defined as a particular war embracing significant portion of International System, serving to achieve extended objectives, even aiming at internal transfiguration of participants and was approaching the intensity described by ideal of clausewitzian ideal war.

Second feature of Hegemony was narrow margin of military supremacy. There is a need to underline that it was created in a system of geopolitical entities possessing similar capabilities to effectively resist external military pressures. Therefore every edge the Hegemony may possess was not as significant or permanent as Empire was. Furthermore, difference of Power potential and resources were not significant, which meant that resilience of Hegemony was much less noticeable that during epoch of Empire. The more cooperative stance of operation was adopted. Hegemony very rarely decided to operate individually. Instead, its function was pronounced in igniting cooperative activities, for instance in a form of multilateral conferences or alliances. It was essential to acquire resources in order to boost Hegemony capacities in order to obtain mutual goal. The best example is the series of anti-french coalitions formed in year between 1789 – 1815 and Triple Entente (focused around Hegemony) and Triple Alliance (focused around contender).

Third issue of Hegemony is that only legitimacy it possess is based on its efficiency. When Empire was recognized legally as a central entity by remaining participants of International System, the Hegemony is recognized only because it is useful to remaining elements of International System. And because of diversification of Actor structure means that meeting expectation of all and every other nation state is extremely hard if possible. And without military edge to quell discontent Actors, will means that there is significant minority of nation states discontent with Hegemony and its performance. Furthermore, this aggregation of contenders and dissidents it constantly

\[\text{Footnotes:}\]
\[43\text{ According to George Modelski and David Kondratieff, those nations were: Portugal, Netherlands, United Kingdom (twice) and United States.}\]
\[44\text{ Burak Gülboy, Redefining the First World War within the context of Clausewitz's "absolute war" dystopia, "Perceptions", 2015, nr 20(2/3), p. 7 – 22.}\]
\[46\text{ Ibidem.}\]
fluctuating. For instance, during Napoleonic Wars, the France was primary contender for Britains Hegemony, whereas a hundred years later, this place was occupied by Germany. That means, Hegemony, contrary to Empire was forced to manage rivals located within the system, not on the peripheries.

The notion of Hegemony was characteristic to Westphalian International Environment, which originated in European International Subsystem. Not surprisingly, there were no non-European nation state which acquired this title. The last nation state bearing mantle of Hegemony is United States. The question arises whether it will be last in the line of Hegemonies, or whether it will be replace by next successor, for instance China\textsuperscript{47}, after protracted hegemonic war. This question is still open as for it addresses prospects and forecasts for the future which is still to happen and being verified. However, expanding evolutionary tendencies of continuity and change labeled as late-Westphalian International Environment, and drawn into the post-Westphalian International Environment, there need to be mentioned that despite probability to repeat hegemonic cycle at least one more time are bigger than recreation of Empire, but are low enough to justify seeking for new kind of institution to replace Hegemony. There are three main reasons to justify this statement. First and foremost is diversification and specialization of international Actors, which limits in terms of quantity and quality of available resources. Despite absolute gain in terms of national capabilities the sheer size and complexity of International Relations, coupled with drastic rise of costs of application of classical tools of Power (limitation of available manpower to be the most important cause of this situation) meant that Hegemony will be more limited that it was in past. Second feature is the rise of transnational social space, which require completely different set of capacities to operate and manage efficiently. And with translating additional sectors of social activity, means that managing of International Relations will require serious redefinition of managing hub. Third feature which limit probability of resurgence of this kind of Actors effectiveness is resurgence of non-European entities. This means, that unofficial community of interests and values shared by Europeans and community of understanding of International System is effectively broken. Therefore internal complexity of management hub need to be bolster beyond capacity of singular Actor.

Summarizing, Hegemony was very flexible but temporarily management hub for International Environment. It was subjected to constant cycles of decay and renewal intersected with major crises labeled as Hegemonic War. But it does not means that this post was attractive enough for international Actors to compete for its occupation. Future, what could be projected in term of changes within the International Environment, will not created conditions which should be more favorable to this kind of Actor. Therefore this will not be the construction which could be implemented.

Post-Westphalian: Hyperpower: unification of geopolitical and transnational space

Most scientists dealing with the issue of defining the term Hyperpower, emphasize two dimensions of the phenomenon. First, it is its quantitative nature. There is still debate in the scientific community as to whether the United States meets the requirements for holding this position in the international system\(^48\). Most of them are variables of quantitative nature, which are visible mainly in the economic and military spheres. Second, it is also its role in international relations, which is derivative of functions fulfilled by United States for rest of global community. There could be identified at least two opposing opinions. On the one hand, there is statement made by Andrew Bacevich\(^49\), who sees the United States of America as a threat not only to stability and world peace. On the other extreme, the concepts of Salvatore Babones and George Friedmann can be pointed out, who emphasize the need to play the role of a global power in order to effectively protect national interests and a favorable balance of power in the international environment.

Most Western scholars seem to agree that Hyperpowership is based on the conjunction of the three spheres of activity of the subject in the international environment. First, there are military capabilities\(^50\). Paradoxically, what distinguishes the military capabilities of the Hyperpower is not the extremely effective ability to use military force, but a sufficiently developed potential in this field that even defeat on the battlefield can contribute to the achievement of political goals set in the government's strategy. Second, it is also an economic position. In most cases, this dimension is understood as exercising political control over a significant segment of the global economy, most often expressed as a percentage of gross global production. However, as in the previous point, the economic dimension of hyperpowerhood is visible above all in qualitative participation in the world economy. And also by drawing on the so-called hegemonic rent\(^51\), i. e. additional income generated from managing the world economy.

Third, it is the realm of culture. The sphere of culture should be divided into two sub-spheres. The first relates to the legitimacy of a superpower as a norm-creating entity shaping the principles and mechanisms regulating international reality. The second is undoubtedly the cultural mimicry of the lifestyle of a hyperpower society. This mimicry covers three basic ranges. Firstly, it is the sphere of values and philosophical and, to some extent,


\(^{50}\) The entire operation was carried out between January 17\(^{th}\) and February 28\(^{th}\), 1991. Operation Desert Storm officially ended on November 30\(^{th}\), 1995.

\(^{51}\) The concept is quite vague and defined differently by various scholars. In most cases hegemonic rent means additional profits obtained by exercising the function of a hegemony. Although in the scientific community there can be met various dimensions of the above rent, ranging from the political domination of the system, which means the possibility of initiation and implementation of complex political projects.
religious systems, which are internationalized into the international and 
transnational space, and thus recombined within individual political units, 
partially resembling them, but in most cases leading to grotesque effects. 
Secondly, it is the sphere of codes of higher culture, or rather the tools 
necessary for their effective reading. In the case of a hyperpower, this 
knowledge is more widely distributed, which makes it possible to read and 
internalize the message on a much larger scale within the mimicry of lifestyle. 
Third, it is also a question of popular culture, related to issues such as fashion, 
entertainment and consumer behavior. It is an element of culture almost 
completely devoid of a national context, it is extremely easy to decode and 
mimicry, but in practice its reproduction is related to the perception of the 
source of mass culture.

In the context of considerations on the subject of Hyperpower, the key 
becomes the answer to the question about the nature of the subject 
corresponding to the Hyperpower criterion, and more specifically with regard 
to the continuity of the internal category of the state. Paradoxically, it can be 
said that hyperpower is a category that is located above the state and between 
Hegemony and Empire. As a result, it is deprived of a large part of mechanisms 
supporting expansion to the limits of the known world, on the other hand, its 
position and internal mechanisms distinguish a country belonging to this 
category from others, even the largest. In essence, the Hyperpower is the whole 
system in which the superpower is located, but it goes beyond its own borders 
and reaches almost every corner of the Earth, using formal and informal 
networks of transnational connections, supported by state and non-state 
participants in international relations. Unlike an Empire, which is able to 
operate in an active phase in an international environment, a Hyperpower is 
mostly a passive entity, the activation of which consumes enormous amounts of 
resources and, as a process, is rarely successful. In the case of the hyperpower 
of the United States, its activation has happened twice in contemporary history. 
For the first time, during the United Nations' intervention during the war in 
Korea in 1950-1953. The second time happened during the First Gulf War in 

As a result, existence of hyperpower made possible carrying out complex 
and sophisticated political and military operations efficiently and effectively 
without overburdening the nation – state located in the center of the 
Hyperpower. Despite this, in most of the remaining cases, the United States did 
not make efforts to mobilize majority, if not every connection of this system, as 
was the case with point campaigns in Latin America, such as in Panama.

Either their efforts ended in failure, a spectacular example of which was the

52 W. W. Stueck, Rethinking the Korean War: A New Diplomatic and Strategic History, Princeton 2002.
53 This operation was a response to the occupation of Kuwait by the Iraqi army (August 2nd - 4th, 1991).
55 Ibidem, p. 41-60.
Second Gulf War, started in 2003\textsuperscript{56}, or they were unable to effectively use the accumulated potential, which was the case with the Vietnam War in 1955-1975\textsuperscript{57}. Thus hyperpower in most instances remains passive, as its activation requires additional portions of resources, skills of central government and reception of other Actors of international community.

The potential of a Hyperpower can be projected within the contemporary international environment in three major ways: sanction, coordination, and indoctrination. The first feature is typical of historical systems. It assumes the possibility of assessing the activity of other entities and taking action in the event of their inadmissibility in order to compel those entities to adapt desired course of action. However, unlike the previous ones, which were relying predominantly on plain and obvious coercion, the application of sanctions requires different strategies and tools, sometimes more tagret, and less obvious. Hyperpower acts rather as a homeostat\textsuperscript{58}, concerned with unending quest to balance simultaneously deteriorating and developing system. In the context of the application of sanctions by a hyperpower depends on the efficient functioning of the network of transnational connections, which are the bypassing classical tools available to a superpower.

The second level of Power projection is coordination of various activities and initiatives which take place within the contemporary international system. This is a derivative of the shift along the axis of authority that shapes the quantum field of the manifestation of Power in the late-Westphalian international environment. As a result, the role of the central Actor of the Hyperpower is changing. From a center that gives orders - and forces obedience - the Hyperpower becomes a center for harmonizing international activities and initiatives. This function arises from the theory of “benign hegemony” coined and developed by Bob Catley\textsuperscript{59}. In its context, arising from the theory of hegemony, the United States stands out from the historical powers by two features: gentleness and self-limitation\textsuperscript{60}, especially in the dimension of the use of means of violence. However, most analysts of the phenomenon point

\textsuperscript{56}Despite designating the international forces occupying Iraq after 2003 as a coalition, it was disproportionately smaller and therefore more asymmetric than the corresponding coalition formed in 1990. The largest nations, apart from the United States, are Great Britain (second-tier power) as well as Poland and Spain (medium-sized nations).


\textsuperscript{58}According to the dictionary a homeostat is: "a cybernetic machine constituting a system composed of a series of regulators imitating homeostasis". On the other hand, homeostasis is: "the ability of a living organism to maintain a relatively constant state of equilibrium, for example blood composition or temperature, through appropriate coordination and regulation of life processes". Słownik Języka Polskiego PWN. Tom 1: A-K, Warsaw 1983.


out that this feature of the United States appeared only in the last thirty years, marked by a high degree of pacification of the international environment.\(^{61}\)

The third feature of the hyperpower system is the indoctrination of the subordinate participants of the system, which means virtually any other international Actor. This mechanism is based predominantly on Ian Manners idea of *normative Power*.\(^{62}\) According to the theory of George Modelski,\(^{63}\) the Hegemony displays the possibility of binding norms and values of the entire global system towards its own national interests and perspectives. As the hegemonic system evolves into a Hyperpower, this capacity only gains in importance and is consequently developed. This particular mechanism is related to the evolution of the environment and a thorough reconfiguration and expansion of the critical infrastructure network,\(^{64}\) which is the main soft Power projection channel and almost exclusively responsible for the application of sanctions and shaping the preferences of the normative Power application. In the current configuration, it utilizes extensive channels of expressing respect and legitimacy, and is displayed with conjunction with a rather specific system of sanctions, primarily in the social dimension, with particular emphasis on the most effective of the entire range, i. e. name and shame, which assumes ridiculing the trespasser.\(^{65}\)

Summarizing, Hyperpower in relatively new and untested concept for a management hub for International Environment. It reflects duality of contemporary International System between geopolitical and transnational social spaces. But it is not as active as both mention above, therefore it will be more difficult to spot and analyze its activity. It will rather influence perception of other participants and create opportunities rather than actively operate into International Relations.

**Conclusion**

Summarizing the considerations about the nature of Hyperpower, there need to be mentioned that this construction is derived from both former centers for International System management: Empire and Hegemony. And this communion is supplemented and altered with changes stemming from changes within two civilization megatrends: demographic and technological. That

\(^{61}\)Ibidem, p. 41.


means that Hyperpower is new quality in International Relations. However, what is important, this system displays two serious challenges for researches. First, it is not completed, despite the fact, that it was constructed since the 1945 – willingly and unwillingly. Its primary features still are fluent enough to be reconstructed. Other parts are being constantly added to framework offering new capabilities which must be analyzed, like Internet surveillance and big data analysis. Second, it is predominantly passive especially compared to Empire and Hegemony, thus empirical data to analyze it is scarce. The research need to be done basing on indirect approach and diversified sources.

Having said that, the biggest novelty of Hyperpower is the fact, that is is constructed with capacity to operate within the geopolitical space and transnational social space. Therefore, despite association it with the United States, it is extending in every direction beyond its borders. It is constructed from various semi-independent entities such as transnational corporations and non-governmental organization sharing objectives and responsibilities and supplementing their function in International System. However only rarely they are operating in unison to achieve clear and visible objectives. In most cases this system is shaping perception of other members of international community. Those are what is the main focus of three basic functions of Hyperpower: sanction, coordination and indoctrination. Despite those flaws, among three mentioned Actors – Empire, Hegemony and Hyperpower – the latter is the most probable to manage the International System in the post-Westphalian iteration.
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