

Balance of Power: A Theoretical explanation and Its Relevance in Contemporary Era.

Rizwan Naseer*
Musarat Amin**

South Asian region is crucial due to its geopolitics in international system. But before drawing attention to South Asian region and its geopolitics we should bear in mind that during cold war era there were only two super powers who divided the world into two rival camps, Communist and capitalist. Both the superpowers engaged in intense competition to rule the world. They had the capability to destroy their enemies and even each other, they had nuclear arsenals that's the reason cold war remain cold war and could not turn into hot war, South Asia is significant in its geopolitics that there are two nuclear powers in South Asia. South Asia is geopolitically and geo strategically important due to unique location. Starting from Russia to downward China, India and Pakistan are four nuclear powers, whereas North Korea and Iran are suspected of possessing nuclear capability if not, then sooner they will be having nuclear bomb. One shares border with the other nuclear actor¹. Security factor is very crucial in this nuclear armed belt where states with inimical track record are dealing with each other. India had been engaged with Pakistan in two full fledged wars (1965, 1971) and several armed clashes (1948, 1984 and 1999) which despite huge human and capital costs remained unsuccessful in resolving disputes. Now the nuclear weapons have enhanced risk of catastrophic war in subcontinent. Any event of war can escalate into a nuclear war between India-Pakistan. If such an undesirable mishap occurs then neighboring states won't be in a position to save them from effects of nuclear war. But the balance of power theorists see nuclearization of the region ripe for maintenance of peace

*PhD Candidate, Institute of international Studies (IIS), Jilin University Changchun, P.R China. Lecturer International Relations, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur Pakistan.

** PhD Candidate, Institute of international Studies (IIS), Jilin University Changchun, P.R China.

¹ Russia a nuclear armed state and a former superpower shares border with China, China shares border with India, Pakistan and North Korea, While Iran shares border with Pakistan. Historically India-China had fought war on territorial dispute. The same between Pakistan and India, China and USSR also did not have amicable relations and Pakistan and Russia were also unfriendly and engaged in Afghan war. Now the nuclear belt makes it unique in the world on one hand but on the other side it's the most dangerous region of the world where four nuclear powers of the world are living in proximity.

between nuclear armed states. If the 'Balance of Power' is maintained in the region it may create an environment of mutual deterrence. As cold war between United States and Soviet Union remained a cold war due to Quasi Balance of Power between nuclear powers. Both the superpowers had realized that if war erupts will be collective death of both the nations. In case of India and Pakistan its quite obvious that whenever the balance of power in the region got disturbed there happened a war between Pakistan and India. China as a biggest stake holder in Asia, after the demise of USSR, plays a vital role in the maintenance of Balance of power in the region.

Theories explain events; analyze their happenings, present causes and effects of international events (war and peace). Theories help to make predictions about possible outcome of circumstances. No theory in the field of international relations is universal to explain all the events in a precise manner but some are more applicable in some specific case and others less.

Jack Donnelly describes 'Theory' as an artful abstraction which averts our attention from goofing up with ambiguous details. Theory precisely directs our attention at the case study, which is of great significance in academia. Theoretical mechanism makes explanations crystal clear and complements understanding about the case study at hand.²

Applicability of Realism Theory in Contemporary Times

In recent times, 'Realism' as a school of thought is severely criticized due to its pessimism. Liberal scholars call contemporary time as "End of History". Proponents of 'Democratic Peace Theory' and other opposing theories to Realism cast doubt upon the contemporary applicability of Realism in World Politics. Other contending theories of liberal school of thought challenge applicability of realism in contemporary times of globalization. Those who declare realism as superannuated theory must take into account Huntington's analysis of great division of nations in post cold war on the basis of culture and prediction of clash of civilization. Recent War between West and Anti-West or Anti-Liberal forces contemplates that contemporary international politics

² Scott Burchill, Andrew Linklater, Richard Devetak, Jack Donnelly, Matthew Paterson, Christian Reus-Smit and Jacqui True, (2005), *Theories of International Relations* (3rd edition), Palgrave Macmillan, New York, p30

can be meticulously explained through prism of realism.³US war against terror still going on and there is no end in sight. United States even today freely intervenes in internal affairs of other nations in the name of democracy or human rights. By misusing the concept of national security, United States has tramped down international law just to invade Iraq. Presence of United States' military forces across globe and their active operations make realism highly relevant in contemporary world politics. I personally winnow out idealistic and fragile logic of 'Democratic Peace Theory' 'that war amongst democracies is less likely than non-democracies. Suppose if all the nations in this world go democratic, would the conflict come to an end? Conflict is inevitable among states but the chances of escalation can be minimized by various strategies. During a conference on peace, sponsored by the 'Institute of Peace Washington' in 1990, two diametrically opposing views came fore. Carl Gershman, President of National Endowment for Democracy, made an argument in support of 'Democratic Peace Theory', "It should be self evident that democratically organized societies will behave more peacefully and responsibly in its foreign relations."In a counter-argument by, Eugene Rostow(former director of Arms Control and Disarmament Agency) replied, the notion that liberal democratic states do not go to war is the latest in a long series of myths which idealistic people have sought to save them from war."⁴

Idealists employ one size fits all approach to justify their standpoint which is frail and impractical approach in a world with diverse cultures, religions, norms and values.

Liberalists rule out relevance of realism in age of globalization. They declare balance of power a theory of past among bellicose states. Answering to the skeptics of realist school of thought, proponents of this theory argue that balance of power dynamics is still actively operating in world politics with its varying degrees. Realists maintain that balance of power hangs in despite operational liberal forces. They are of the view as relative power capabilities keep on changing

³ Anti West and anti-liberal forces is indeed a chip of the same block. Their challenge to Western values and armed struggle reflects that there are other stronger forces besides liberalism. The event of 9/11 has transformed recent history and caused a paradigm shift in international relations.

⁴ Joseph S. Nye, Jr. (2002), *Understanding International Conflicts: An introduction to Theory and History*, Longman, New York, p47

and U.S. hegemony will invite power balancing when it becomes too threatening for other major states' interests and it's only a matter of time because hegemony can never stay permanent.⁵

But one thing should bear in mind that even today, state is a core actor in international relations, borders still matter, sovereignty is exercised by state internally and externally, war and armed conflicts still persist and most importantly 'National Interest' is still supreme for nation-states and they don't compromise on their national interests which reflects that the above mentioned axioms have their relevance in contemporary international politics.

Morgenthau one of the pioneer realists, highlights significance of realist approach in international relations to him "The concept of interest can be defined in terms of power" and "to define interest in terms of power is universally applicable, Interests are dynamics". International morality does not occupy elated position in hierarchic structure of international society that's why "universal moral principles cannot be applied to state policies. An individual can claim that justice be done even the world perish, but states cannot say that."⁶

International relations scholars had been trying hard to figure out the basic reason of war. Their extensive studies had been dealing with human nature and declared it a major reason of war. Men wherever they live, cannot live in an absolute peace, so conflict amongst them is inevitable. Kenneth Waltz augmented Morgenthau's argument about causes of war. He says that the reasons that often times cause war are found in human nature. War is the outcome of selfish behavior, misguided and aggressive impulse, and foolish actions and policies. He describes the other causes of war as 'secondary' and need to be understand in the context of these basic causes of war,⁷ another notion that made an attempt to make it clear that why states cannot live in an absolute peace is due to anarchy.

This World is anarchic and almost all the states are sovereign actors and there is no central authority in international society of states which could regulate relations among them. All the

⁵ T.V Paul,(2004),*Balance of Power Theory and Practice in 21st Century*(Edited), Stanford University Press,California,p2

⁶ Renowned six principles of Power Politics by Hans J Morgenthau, Three of them are explaining more relevancies to the topic. Hans J Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*(Revised by Kenneth W Thompson)(1992),Peking University Press Beijing,p5

⁷ Kenneth Waltz, *Man the State and War; A theoretical Analysis*,(2001), Columbia University Press, New York,P16

states operate in international system of states as autonomous actors. They are independent in their decision making, formulation of policies and implementation of laws. They enjoy the legality of using force against those elements that could endanger its security and integrity. Every state does have her respective national interest and each state struggles to maximize its power in the anarchical global system to protect and promote their national interest. States don't compromise their national interest rather promote it through various means. If some states do not acquire sufficient power, they can be more prone to become subservient to other powerful states and their will, ultimately, lose their sovereignty, security and prosperity. Anarchical structure, therefore, pushes states to increase their power, because security and survival cannot be dissociate from power maximization. Consequently, the competition for power enhancement becomes a natural state of affair in world politics.⁸

States remain engaged in a constant struggle to achieve a satisfied level of security against internal and external threats. As Pakistan and India both, had been trying to achieve a satisfied level of struggle against each other and any external threat. Kenneth Waltz writes that the state conducts its affairs in an uncertain situation and remains in a constant fear of being attacked by other rival states. Due to uncertainty, some states may use force any-time to endanger the survival of others, so all the states must be prepared to face such a surprise attack or live at the mercy of their militarily more powerful neighbors. As Pakistan's integrity was threatened by India immediately after independence and consequently weaker (economically and militarily) Pakistan depended on United States and cultivated friendly ties with China to seek economic, military and diplomatic aid from allied states. Waltz maintains that among states, the state of nature is a state of war. This does not mean that war occurs all the times but in the sense that such an uncertain situation can lead states to war and war may break out anytime. Conflict (minor, major) among individuals and states is inevitable⁹.

The notion of security has been at the heart of international affairs for centuries. If historical wars are taken into account (the Peloponnesian war, Thirty years war, and the First and Second World Wars), it helps us to frame that how the world politics is conceptualized. Security, indeed,

⁸ Paul.op.cit.p4

⁹ Kenneth N Waltz,(1979), *Theory of International Politics*, Addison-Wesley Publishing company,California,p102

doesn't have any structure, but it depends upon the actors how do they view and define it. The way one secures oneself may not have the same effects for others. One fact is indisputable that every state in the world desires to be secure from internal and external threats, for that reason they pursue the objective by enhancing their military power.¹⁰

Waltz terms international system as self help system in which each of the state is struggling to acquire the means to protect itself against possible threats to its integrity. In such an uncertain situation states' cooperation is stymied by anarchy and mutual distrust. States balk to cooperate with other states in economic and security realms. He further elaborates that if there is the possibility of cooperation between or among states they don't commit hurriedly and ask the question who will gain more rather will both of us gain? If one state is gaining more than other, the state with fewer shares will feel insecure that other will use disproportionate gain to implement such a policy which could endanger former's interest. In short the obstruction in the way of cooperation does not inherent to either party but a sense of insecurity about other's malign future intentions impede cooperation among states.¹¹

Balance of Power as a concept

The concept of balance of power is considered as one of the oldest and fundamental concept in the field of international relations.¹² International relations theorists had been defining balance of power differently to highlight its significance and relevance in international politics, as David Hume declared balance of power as scientific law due to its significance in international politics. Glenn Snyder highlighted balance of power as a core theoretical concept in international relations. Hans Morgenthau called balance of power as "iron law of politics" and Henry Kissinger, regarded balance of power as more an art than a science.¹³ Significance and relevance

¹⁰ M J Williams, The coming revolution in foreign affairs,(2008), *International Affairs*,Vol84,No4,p.1110

¹¹ Waltz,op.cit.,p105

¹² Paul,op.cit.,p29

¹³ Ibid.p29

of balance of power even in contemporary times cannot be ignored, though it was a fashionable trend among states in historical times.

Power is unevenly distributed among states in international system of states. Therefore, some of the states are powerful and others are comparatively weak. There is no instrument to measure power of states, though power is always measured in relative terms. States, especially small and weaker states, often cannot achieve security on their own. So they have to depend upon other states for enhancing their security. This way smaller state, by concluding alliances with other powerful (friendly) states try to attain balance of power against a powerful adversary or a threatening state. The term 'Balance of Power' refers to the general concept of one or more states' power being used to balance that of another state or group of states¹⁴.

Strategies to maintain Balance of power

The concept of balance of power ideally ensures that power is distributed in such a way that no single state or entity is able to dominate the remaining states or entities. Objective characteristics such as relative military power and economic resources determine the distribution of capabilities and hence play a central role in establishing which states occupy the positions of major powers. Major Powers keep strategy of balancing as topmost priority in security realm because a successful balancing strategy ensures peace and it is a precondition of the preservation of the state system.¹⁵

Cold war presented precise example of balance of power between United States and Soviet Union. Both the states had developed WMDs (Weapons of Mass Destruction) and made alliances with other states to extend their influence across globe. United States formed NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) and Soviet Union concluded WARSA Pact.¹⁶ There was a condition of Quasi balancing between them that shunned them from engaging into any direct

¹⁴ Goldstein S.Joshua,(2005),*International Relations*(6th Edition). Peking University Press,Peking,p77

¹⁵ Liselotte Odgaard,(2007), *The Balance of Power in Asia Pacific Security: US-China Policies on Regional Order*, Taylor and Francis, New York,p25

¹⁶ NATO was formed by United States and its West European Allies to combat threat of Communism and to counter United States military might with her Western allies Soviet Union concluded Warsaw pact to maintain a power balance between them.

clash that could escalate into nuclear catastrophe. Scholars pinpoint the reason of about balance between both powers as a chief reason of de-escalation.

States adopt multiple strategies to strengthen their power comparative to other competitive actors. The study of international relations is diverse in nature that's why states can't rely or depend permanently on others to secure their national interest. Most reliable strategy to balance against any threat is internal balancing. The reason is, every state watches her interest and can sacrifice others' interest whether they are friends or enemies.

There is a famous proverb to highlight diverse nature of international relations study. **“There is no permanent friend or permanent enemy in international politics but permanent interests, a friend of today may be the enemy of tomorrow and enemy of today may be the friend of tomorrow”**

The above cited quote explains Pakistan-United States relationship nicely. The nascent state of Pakistan was looking for its security against India and decided to join United States' bloc. Despite being the member of US sponsored security pacts in Asia US could not provide any security against India during 1965, 1971 wars. The war of 1971 proved catastrophic for Pakistan and resulted in dismemberment of East Pakistan (Bangladesh today). Similarly United States and China were enemies during cold war and fought Korean War against each other but later on with Kissinger's secret visit to Beijing in July 1971 both the states improved their ties to end rivalry and set in new era of relationship.

As there is no permanent friend in international politics, therefore states prefer to adopt a policy of internal balancing to consolidate their defense, which sounds more reliable for a state than any other ally.

Internal Balancing

States carve out various strategies to keep a check on external threats. Threatened states could also adopt the internal balancing strategy of building up weapons, that is, to obtain countervailing capabilities and thereby attempt to balance the rising power's military strength which can pose serious threats to its security in future. The key means of internal balancing by which states balance one another are, building up arms through internal production. This trend

was more in fashion during 18th century. States had been quite busy in making stronger armies, well equipped with latest weapons to cope with enemies in the battlefield. But this trend of balancing was not efficacious in enhancing security of the state. Whatever the quality of weapons one could produce and strengthen its military power but when enemy was in a position to attack from various sides with the help of their allied states then it was hard to defend against two or more states. However states realized that internal balancing is crucial but not sufficient to avert external aggression.

Pakistan and India two rival states in South Asia also adopted internal balancing as a first strategy to secure national integrity, but limited resources on both sides compelled them to see other substitutes. Both the rival states in South Asia could not rely heavily upon internal resources due to limited internal resources and depended on external factor to enhance and strengthen their security against each other. Additionally, cold war provided golden opportunity to find friends with great powers. United States and Soviet Union were also looking for allies to extend their areas of influence.

Alliance formation strategy to strengthen power

Second best option for any state is to reach a balancing position against strong rival which means to rely upon external resources. It may include arms aid from friendly states against a common threat. Alliances with other friendly states can strengthen weaker state's defense. That's why states reach alliances with other states to balance against a common threat. Advocates of 'Balance of Power theory' put forward that peace is generally preserved when equilibrium of power exists among great powers. Power parity among states helps preventing war because no actor can expect victory.¹⁷

Cold war between United States and Soviet Union remained a cold war and could not be a hot war; the reason was quasi balance of power between both the rival states. If war could have broken out between United States and Soviet Union, it would have been a surely mutual destruction. Whenever the balance of power exists between rival states it helps preventing full-fledged war as no actor expects victory as was the case during cold war.

¹⁷ Wrtiz, Op.Cit.P4

In case of Pakistan and India both the states for securing their borders against each other did not rely only on internal power resources but gathered strength by external power resources. For this purpose, cold war proved a golden opportunity for both the actors in South Asia. Due to their insufficient power to contain any external threat both concluded alliances. Pakistan joined Western Camp and signed US sponsored Security Pacts SEATO and CENTO (South East Asian Treaty Organization & Central Treaty Organization) to enhance its power relative to India while India did not declare alliance to any great power and took huge benefit from both (US & USSR). This reflects that Pakistan and India remained engaged in internal and external balancing to deter against each other.

Balancing strategy is exercised by the big powers and small states alike. According to realist paradigm when leading states in the anarchic international system of states, use their resources to pursue their security objectives, other major powers struggle to keep a check on rising power of other states who may pose a threat to their interest in future. Realist's argument is that "Power is checked most effectively by counterbalancing strategy." Even major powers don't feel secure from other major or rising powers; they feel threat from other major or rising powers to their security. They think that other powers may endanger their security when they assume relatively more power. The basic axiom of balance-of-power theory is that great powers will develop and mobilize military capabilities sufficient to constrain the most powerful among them. Though the theory has been formulated in many ways over the centuries, the "key proffer" of almost all versions of the theory "is that states tend to balance against threats of hegemony over the system." Therefore, the theory posits that once a state reaches at or near the top of the international heap in resources of power, its relative enhancement of power invites more and more counterbalancing from other competitive actors. In case of South Asian balance of power politics it's easy to determine how states remained engaged in maintaining balance of power. China tested her nuclear device in 1964, which gave her an edge over India in neighborhood. India followed nuclear policy and maintained nuclear balance in 1974. But with declaration of Indian nuclear bomb, Pakistan felt threatened from India and followed nuclear pathway too and succeeded in May 28, 1998. This behavior reflects that states readily struggle to maintain balance of power if some other state assume relatively more power.

‘Balance of Power Theory’ predicts that states try to prevent the rise of a ‘hegemon’. A handful of the scholars, who disapprove ‘Balance of Power Theory’, sound out that contemporary world structure is unipolar, with United States as the strongest power (economically, politically, and militarily) and there is no counterbalancing to US hegemony in sight. The remarkable change in alliances since the demise of the Soviet Union has been the expansion of NATO, and the other thing is Pentagon has increased defense spending dramatically to equip military with technologically advanced weaponry to updated military might. Consequently, the other great powers have not tended to constrain the United States might by allying together and no counter hegemonic coalition has taken place, and none is in the offing. No major power has initiated an attempt to balance increased U.S. military power through their internal spending.¹⁸

The scenario presented by the group of scholars seems to be vague. It’s been very short time that United States started enjoying status of unipolarity but it does not mean that no power would dare to counterbalance US hegemony in the coming decades. Because of US declined popularity and rise of other powers like China, Russia and European Union, reflects that in the coming decades US may face counterbalance by other major powers, as history is the witness that even vast and mighty empires declined and were overtaken by other rising powers.

Chris Brown and Kristen Ainley note that according to realist paradigm two institutions play a key role in preserving order, i.e. Balance of power and war. The argument that balance of power yield order seems to be reasonable but to say war may prove source of order sounds unreasonable and contrary to common sense. Though the idea that war can bring order seems to be irrational but indeed it does as a political instrument. The idea, war helps preserving balance is contrary to the assumption that balance of power helps in preventing war. War, sometimes as a part of balance of power is a mechanism for preserving a state of equilibrium. Secondly conflict resolving mechanism brings about a change. Briefly, war consolidates the concept of balance of power and completes it as well. Proponents of this theory maintain that balance of power could not stand as an operating institution in international relations without war. War played a central

¹⁸ Stephen G Brooks, William C Wohlforth,(2008),*World out of Balance, International relations and challenge of American Primacy*, Princeton University Press, New Jersey,p22-23

role in world history, sometimes to achieve a balancing position. Proponents of this theory hold that the institutions, war and balance of power stand together and collapse together.¹⁹

The idea put forward by Chris Brown and Kristen Ainly seems to be attractive but it's irrational too. War as a political instrument works to bring about order and it complements and completes balance of power does not seem to be feasible in contemporary times. To address ambiguity in the minds of some who have misunderstood war as an instrument to preserve balance of power, should bear one thing in their mind that in contemporary time the nature of war has undergone a paradigm shift with the advent of nuclear weapons. Nuclear age, with the involvement of nuclear actors has transformed nature of war. Now war is deadliest than ever before. Any war between the nuclear rivals can prove a collective death.

Realizing this horrified scenario, Pakistan and India stayed away from war after balance of terror. Kargil crisis emerged but cooled down after exchange of threats and could not escalate into full-fledged war crucial stage in South Asian nuclear politics came when Indian Parliament was attacked by Kashmir based militants and India directly blamed Pakistan and held her responsible for attack. Both the rival states mobilized their forces and after exchange of threats the tension dissolved.

Balance of Power; historically experienced and practiced

Theory of Balance of Power exists since centuries. States had been exercising this strategy to balance against external threats. Sometimes two powers/states had been adopting this strategy to balance against each other and sometimes more than two powers had been taking part in establishing balance against common threat. **Hedley Bull** distinguishes between simple balance of power and complex balance of power.

Simple Balance of Power:

In simple balance of power there are two powers/states required to establish a kind of parity between them. In simple balance of power strategy, states rely on intrinsic strength as had been

¹⁹ Chris Brown, Kristen Ainley,(2005), *Understanding International Relations 3rd Edition*, Palgrave MacMillan, New York,p97

the trend during 18th century population and territory was viewed as an element to balance against. During 19th century concept shifted from population and territory to industry and military strength but in the 20th century technologically advanced and well equipped with modern weapons military stood as an element of power. During sixteenth and seventeenth century, clash of France and Hapsburg Spain/Austria can be cited as instance of Simple Balance of Power. Another example of simple power balancing is Cold War between United States and Soviet Union.²⁰ Balance of power between Pakistan and India has taken shift from simple to complex. Before the active involvement of United States, Soviet Union and China the balance of power between India and Pakistan was simple balance of power.

The complex balance of power

Europe in mid eighteenth century represented the situation of complex balance of power. During that time France and Austria were joined by England, Russia and Prussia.²¹ If we take stock of world politics at the present juncture and examine revival of complex balance of power once again. China as an emerging great power, Japan as a potential economic giant and integration of Western European powers (into a single entity), constitute a complex balance of power scenario. Simple balance of power had been complicated sometimes due to the involvement of other powers in the structure. The reason is, the ability of other powers, in a simple balance of power situation may be flimsy but not zero. During pre-First world war period the act of diplomatic compounding had been of great help in simplifying complex balance of power situation to

²⁰ Cold war was an ideological war between two superpowers, due to the involvement of two players in the maintenance of balance of power, is called simple balance of power. The powers (US, USSR) adopted various strategies to balance against each-other, they made Alliances (US sponsored SEATO, CENTO, NATO) and USSR counterbalanced by concluding WARSAW pact.

²¹ During mid eighteenth century, France and Austria (now detached from Spain) were joined as great powers by England, Russia and Prussia, At that time all major powers were involved in maintaining a situation as balance of power, due to the involvement of more than three, major powers and their further alliances with other major and minor states made the situation complex. That symbolizes a complex balance of power situation.

understand, for example pre-First world war period with active involvement of six-powers constituted a simple division the “Triple Alliance ‘and the “Triple Entente””.²²

The nineteenth-century system was multipolar in nature and dominated by a few great powers, they remained five in number most of the times. Among that group of great powers the leading states were Austria-Hungary, Britain, Prussia/ Germany, Russia and France. Due to their effective power these powerful players were clearly distinguished from other second- and third-rate powers. Their position in the world system was a clear reflection of their economic and military strength. At that time the criteria for acquiring great power status was to possess the capability to engage into armed conflict with other great power with bright chances of victory. In assessing power with a view to establishing balances, statesmen continued to think overwhelmingly in terms of population and territory, the two being related. These great powers wanted to maintain their power position in the system and were combat-ready to smash aspirations of new rising state to the rank of big power. Near the end of the century, Italy wished to be accepted as great power but could not achieve that status equivalent to other great powers, whereas Ottoman Empire was never accepted as part member of European system, though the Treaty of Paris (1956) had described her as part of the Concert of Europe. A band of scholars put forward that the Concert System during 19th century was not a step towards balancing practice rather a move towards international security paradigm. Fay declared that the idea of the ‘Concert of Powers’ was fundamentally different from the balance of power principle during nineteenth-century. The purpose of establishing Concert was to amass harmoniousness and cooperation by act of conciliation and to minimize the propensity of the powers make opposing camps. Nevertheless the above discussed interpretation of concert of powers brushes off the ideals of architects who designed the concert system. They established concert with explicit aim of developing an effective balance of power system.²³

²² Hedley Bull,(2002),*The anarchical Society; A study of Order in World Politics*(3rd Edition), Palgrave, New York,p.97-98

²³ Micheal Sheen, (2005), *The Balance of Power, History and Theory*, Routledge. New York,P122-123

States are not stagnant actor but dynamic to accomplish security objectives even in the time of peace. The advent of nuclear weapons changed security dimensions drastically. During World War II, annihilation of Hiroshima and Nagasaki changed security parameters. The country with mighty armies, air force and navy was unsuccessful if confronting a nuclear armed state as with the case of Japan and America. Every state on the planet came to realize that to ensure their security; they must have a nuclear device to deter enemies and wield power successfully to protect and promote national interest. States, after witnessing Japan's destruction started an endless struggle to acquire this very capability. This security perception triggered arms race among rival states on one side and procurement of nuclear bomb clandestinely.

Integrating Balance of Power with balance of Terror

Now, it is important to make it clear that security analysts have coined a modern term for balance of power among nuclear states is 'Balance of Terror'. It is said to be a shift from conventional balance of power to a nuclear balance of power. Few of the security experts express their dissenting opinion on the very issue and they try to draw a line between both the terms i.e. 'Balance of power' and 'Balance of Terror'.

During 1950 a school of thought put forward that the advent of nuclear technology in international relations has made the notion of conventional balance of power as outdated. According to that school of thought nuclear deterrence works to regulate international hierarchy with different approach. But Snyder made argument in favor of balance of power theory declared it a valid theory to understand contemporary international relations. To him the revolution in military affairs has not dismissed balance of power politics but modified to an extent. Snyder further elaborated balance of power tendency in post 1945 era. According to Snyder, a new system of equilibrium supplanted the Post World War II era, introducing new phraseology "Balance of Terror" in international relations to express balancing behavior between nuclear actors. **Both the systems, Balance of power(pre nuclear age) and balance of terror operate with different principles and were easily separable analytically but what's more important to examine is that they are inextricably amalgamated into a new kind of balance of power in which the old balance of power system adjusts itself to coexist with the new system.** Some

of the scholars assert that the classical balance of power among states came to an end with the outbreak of First World war and the innovative methods marked twentieth century with collective security and balance of terror to manage international system. That is indeed, false analysis about international system from 1945 to 1990, as the era starting from onset of cold war to the end of cold war was marked by the active pursuit of maintain balance of power between Superpowers and their respective allies.²⁴

India and Pakistan from the early years after their independence got engaged in conventional balance. After India obtained nuclear bomb in 1974 and achieved superiority in military power over Pakistan. As a result of asymmetric balance of power, Pakistan felt threatened by Indian might and ultimately in May, 1998 became a 2nd nuclear power in South Asia. Pakistan's nuclearization restored the lost balance of power between India and Pakistan. The purpose to present a brief glimpse of Pakistan and India's shift from conventional balance of power to nuclear balance of power is that both states experienced peace during balance of power position and experienced war or otherwise skirmishes at border whenever balance of power got disturbed between them.

In sum, despite intense scholarly criticism, 'Realism', sticks around dominant theory in the field of international relations. States are continuously engaged in balancing against perceived threats. Balance of power among rival states can ensure relative peace. Cold war could not turn into hot war because of about balance between nuclear superpowers which was followed by policy of détente between them. Similarly India and Pakistan in post nuclear scenario initiated peace process to resolve outstanding issues between them. Indian Prime Minister, Atal Bihari Vajpayee visited Pakistan in Feb, 1999 and inaugurated bus service between New Delhi and Lahore to enhance people to people contacts between the two nations. Attempts to trigger war between India and Pakistan could not succeed but created hypertension. It can be concluded that balance of power, if does not bring peace but reduces the chances of war among rival states.

²⁴ Ibid.P171