

# POLITICAL REFLECTION MAGAZINE

April • May • June • 2021

ISSN: 2042-888X

Vol. VII No. II • Issue 27

## Interview with Professor Luis Tome

Future of NATO:  
Significant Insights  
from 2021 Meeting of  
NATO Ministries of  
Foreign Affairs

*by Dr Rahman Dag*

A Discussion on the Regulation of Violence in  
International Relations

*by Professor Vladimir Mikhaylovich Kapitsy &  
Ebru Birinci*

Shifting the Clausewitzian Paradigm from  
Battlefield to Political Arena

*by Dr Marco Marsili*

Beyond Formal Dinners: EU-India Security  
Cooperation in an Age of Chinese Belligerence

*by Archishman Goswami*

European Union's Uncertain Future  
The State of Romanian-Russian Relations and the  
Importance of a Bilateral Dialogue

*by Adrian Pogacian*

The Primacy of EU Law over French Law:  
EU Law Takes Precedence over National Law?

*by Dr Sharifullah Dorani*

International Think-tank [www.cesran.org](http://www.cesran.org)  
Consultancy  
Research Institute

CESRAN International is headquartered in the UK  
CESRAN International is a member of the United Nations Academic Impact (UNAI)

**CESRAN International** is a think-tank specialising on international relations in general, and global peace, conflict and development related issues and challenges.

The main business objective/function is that we provide expertise at an international level to a wide range of policy making actors such as national governments and international organisations. CESRAN with its provisions of academic and semi-academic publications, journals and a fully-functioning website has already become a focal point of expertise on strategic research and analysis with regards to global security and peace. The Centre is particularly unique in being able to bring together wide variety of expertise from different countries and academic disciplines.

The main activities that CESRAN undertakes are providing consultancy services and advice to public and private enterprises, organising international conferences and publishing academic material.

Some of CESRAN's current publications are:

- The Rest: Journal of Politics and Development (biannual, peer reviewed)  
[www.therestjournal.com](http://www.therestjournal.com)
- Journal of Conflict Transformation and Security (biannual, peer reviewed)
- Political Reflection Magazine (quarterly) [www.politicalreflectionmagazine.com](http://www.politicalreflectionmagazine.com)
- CESRAN Paper Series
- CESRAN Policy Brief
- Turkey Focus Policy Brief

CESRAN International also organises an annual international conference since 2014, called **International Conference on Eurasian Politics and Society (IEPAS)**  
[www.eurasianpoliticsandsociety.org](http://www.eurasianpoliticsandsociety.org)

- **Ranked among the top 150 International think tanks**

**Chairman:** *Dr Ozgur Tufekci*  
**Executive Editor:** *Dr Rahman Dag*

**South Asian Studies | Editor:** *Dr Sharifullah Dorani*  
**American Foreign Policy | Editor:** *Dr Mark Meirowitz*  
**Applied Economics | Editor:** *Dr Hakan Uslu*  
**Middle Eastern Studies | Editor:** *Dr Rahman Dag*  
**Interview Editor:** *Ebru Birinci*  
**Interview Editor:** *Dr Emrah Atar*  
**Assistant Editor:** *Ruhullah Afshar*  
**Assistant Editor:** *Oguzhan Cakir*  
**Assistant Editor:** *Rukiye Patan*

**Submissions:**

To submit articles or opinion, please email:

**Rahman.dag@cesran.org**

or

**editors@cesran.org**

**Note:**

The ideal **PR** article length is from **1000** to **2000** words.

©2021

by

the Centre for Strategic Research and Analysis

All rights reserved. Political Reflection and its logo are trademarks of the Centre for Strategic Research and Analysis, which bears no responsibility for the editorial content; the views expressed in the articles are those of the authors. No part of this publication may be reproduced in any form without permission in writing from the publisher.

VOL. 7 - NO. 2

APRIL  
MAY  
JUNE  
2021

# POLITICAL REFLECTION

e-ISSN: 2042-888X

**“ADVANCING DIVERSITY”**

## Contents

- 05 - 09 **World News**  
*by Ebru Birinci*
- A Discussion on the Regulation of Violence in International Relations** 12 - 16  
*by Professor Vladimir Mikhaylovich Kapitsy & Ebru Birinci*
- Interview with Professor Luis Tome Future of NATO: Significant Insights from 2021 Meeting of NATO Ministries of Foreign Affairs** 28 - 34  
*by Dr Rahman Dag*
- European Union's Uncertain Future The State of Romanian-Russian Relations and the Importance of a Bilateral Dialogue** 42 - 45  
*by Adrian Pogacian*
- 19 - 25 **Shifting the Clausewitzian Paradigm from Battlefield to Political Arena**  
*by Dr Marco Marsili*
- 36 - 40 **Beyond Formal Dinners: EU-India Security Cooperation in an Age of Chinese Belligerence**  
*by Archishman Goswami*
- 48 - 56 **The Primacy of EU Law over French Law: EU Law Takes Precedence over National Law?**  
*by Dr Sharifullah Dorani*

# A Discussion on the Regulation of Violence in International Relations

Vladimir Mikhaylovich Kapitsyn\* & Ebru Birinci\*\*  
kapizin@yandex.ru & ebrubirinci@windowslive.com

**T**he problems of regulation in international relations (IR) have been discussed in foundational studies, such as those of N. Machiavelli, G. Grotius, F. Suarez, T. Hobbes, C. Montesquieu, I. Kant. Montesquieu, exploring the spirit of the law, asked about the regulators operating in areas higher than the laws of the state, about "the relations of justice that preceded the positive law that established them."<sup>1</sup> In the XX and XXI centuries, this topic was developed more intensively in political philosophy (K. Schmitt, J. Maritain, J. Rawls, A. S. Panarin, F. Fukuyama), political science, and sociology of international relations (R. Aron, N. Luhmann, I. Wallerstein, H. Bull, P. A. Tsygankov, A. Etzioni).

The purpose of the article is to substantiate the significance of the *hierarchy* of regulators of violence by identifying the main regulation formats. From the standpoint of functional and system analysis, the authors examine the optimality of the hierarchy format established by the great powers to develop other formats: international law and world politics. This facilitates the emergence of a paradigmatic explanation of the "load-bearing structures" of IR, in which the regulators of violence are formatted.<sup>2</sup>

To put it in N. Luhmann's terms, the desire to use selective agreements between states (authoritative collective agreements) to limit contingencies (withdrawals from agreements, violation of agreements) leads to an understanding of the possibilities of interaction between power balances and hierarchy. A hierarchical system of IR regulators has been emerging. Many IR concepts are based on the regulation of violence, expressed through "balance of power," "restrictions on the resort to force," "mutually balancing coalitions," "restrictions on concentrated power," "binding institutions"<sup>3</sup>, "levelling vulnerability"<sup>4</sup>. But balances do not abolish hierarchies; they can be thoroughly combined with the latter, integrating into hierarchical structures at such levels of regulation of the balance of forces:

\* Professor of  
Political Science,  
Lomonosov  
Moscow State  
University (Russia)

\*\* PhD Candidate,  
Lomonosov  
Moscow State  
University (Russia)

---

<sup>1</sup> Aron R. *Etapy razvitiya sotsiologicheskoy mysli* (Main Currents in Sociological Thought). M.: Progress, 1993. p. 65. [In Russian]

<sup>2</sup> *Gibridizatsiya mirovoy i vneshney politiki v svete sotsiologii mezhdunarodnykh otnosheniy* (Hybridization of world and foreign policy in the light of the sociology of international relations) Ed. P. A. Tsygankov. M.: Goryachaya liniya-Telekom, 2017. p. 19. [In Russian]

<sup>3</sup> Inkenberry J. *After Victory. After Victory: Institutions, Strategic Restraint, and the Rebuilding of Order after Major Wars*. Princeton, NJ, 2001. P. 24.

<sup>4</sup> Kirton J. *Model' upravleniya «Gruppy dvadtsati»* (G20 governance model). *Vestnik mezhdunarodnykh organizatsiy*. 2013. No. 3. p. 5–30. [In Russian]

- 1) "agreements of the great powers";
- 2) lower the level of "conventions of international law";
- 3) even lower is the level of "bilateral and multilateral agreements of other states" (world politics).

The research hypothesis is as follows: it is precisely this hierarchy that can act as a guarantee of a relatively stable state of the IR. Moreover, inner hierarchies are possible within these levels. For example, at the first level, a hierarchical superstructure, "the balance of forces of nuclear superpowers" appeared; at the third level, there are hierarchical dependencies: regional powers - satellite states - "falling" states - unrecognized states.

We consider "load-bearing structures" (formats) of regulation as subordinate subsystems of the hierarchy in the IR. The hierarchy of regulatory formats allows them to complement and insure each other, although they differ in terms of the modes of selective agreements and restrictions on contingencies. Of particular importance is the supreme power format of regulation, which we conditionally call "authoritative agreements of powers." For Hobbes, "the international sphere was ... the sphere of purely political relations between sovereigns: having no natural-eternal law above themselves, states formed a new order of regulated war."<sup>5</sup> Control was exercised by a limited circle of rulers. The world order, according to S. Shakhilov, is "rules established by the victors"<sup>6</sup>, which refers us to examples of authoritative selective agreements (the Westphalian Peace, the "Concert of European Powers", the Yalta-Potsdam Order), as well as examples of contingencies, for example, within the framework of the Versailles-Washington peace and the Washington-Malta world order after the Cold War."

An essential role in the stability of the Yalta-Potsdam world order was played by the balances of the "authoritative agreements of the great powers" format (mostly the nuclear parity of the superpowers), which stimulated the coordination of national and common interests in world politics with the help of international legal acts. The confrontation and interaction between NATO and the Warsaw Pact, bilateral agreements between the US and the USSR maintained the balance of power between the superpowers and their alliances. And this made it possible to preserve the hierarchy of formats as an acceptable "framework" for the functioning of international law and world politics. The doctrines of "detente" and "shuttle diplomacy" by G. Kissinger, the theory of G. Tunkin about "peaceful coexistence of two world systems" helped to reduce the severity of the confrontation between the USA and the USSR.

The balances of power are the result of authoritative selective agreements that contain contingents. This led to the establishment of rules, primarily by the most potent powers (superpowers), based on the applied violence

<sup>5</sup> *Filippov A.F.* Sotsiologiya i kosmos. Suverenitet gosudarstva i suverenost' sotsial'nogo (Sociology and space. State sovereignty and social sovereignty). Sotsiologos. 1. M., 1991. p. 263. [In Russian]

<sup>6</sup> *Shakhilov S. S.* Mirovoy poryadok: problemy transformatsii (World Order: Problems of Transformation). Mezhdunarodnaya zhizn'. 2016. No. 9. P. 113. [In Russian]

results and the capacities of "deferred" violence. This ensured the formation of normative structures that quickly emerged concerning situations and were more stable than other formats (agreements of powers, or "world order").

The Peace of Westphalia gave actual examples of the "world order" as a setting for authoritative selective reconciliation, establishing the status of sovereign states and their mutual responsibility for maintaining peace and regulating wars. The Congress of Vienna refined the authoritative selective negotiation system provided by treaties and delayed violence from the five powers. The Crimean War shook this format; nevertheless, it survived.

The Treaty of Versailles, conversely, undermined the "spirit of Westphalia," increasing anarchy, destroying the system of "deferred violence" in Europe. D. Lloyd George wrote in 1923: "Only one thing can be said with certainty about these treaties: they will plunge the cause of the European world into an even more precarious and unstable position. A world plucked out by triumphant force from a defeated enemy is never a good world."<sup>7</sup> It was not possible to establish a hierarchy of formats for regulating violence since the "world order" format (authoritative selective agreements) was disavowed by the contradictory actions of the USA, Great Britain, and France. At the level of the "world order," the balance of powers was demolished, the collective security system turned out to be not authoritative, the functioning of the "international law" format was undermined, and the national egoism of states was curbed in the "world politics" format. The Yalta-Potsdam world order as a whole restored the principles of Westphalia until the end of the 1980s.

After World War II, international relations were well-organized with coalitions of states that took into account changing national interests. Under the aegis of the balance of the superpowers, international relations came to a state of equilibrium. Players in the international arena made a clear choice of alliances, clearly defining their interests. The Non-Aligned Movement was active. The international relations remained anarchic, but clear coalitions maintained the balance of power before getting to "war of all against all." The strategic contract of the United States with European countries promised economic tutelage, non-use of military force and protection from attacks by third countries, and joining the OECD.<sup>8</sup> The Marshall Plan, as an economic aid program, helped to draw most of the protected states into NATO. Those, in turn, agreed not to create alliances between themselves opposing the United States. International relations were consolidated by international legal substitutes (OECD, Bretton Woods system, IMF, World Bank). Doing so, the United States created a system of selective coordination, formed an Atlantic centre ("pole") of power, coordinated with the centre of power formed by the USSR.

---

<sup>7</sup> Lloyd George D. *Yevropeyskiy khaos* (European chaos). M.: Yurayt, 2019. p. 7. [In Russian]

<sup>8</sup> North D., Wallis J., Weingast B. *Nasiliye i sotsial'nyye poryadki. Kontseptual'nyye ramki dlya interpretatsii pis'mennoy istorii chelovechestva* (Violence and Social Orders. A conceptual framework for the interpretation of written human history). M.: Gaidar Institute, 2011. p. 237. [In Russian]

It is not easy to achieve authoritative selective agreements, despite the narrow circle of great powers, but they establish a hierarchy that gives relative predictability and durability of international regulations. Indeed, contingents at the level of this format are becoming the most painful, for example, the introduction of Soviet troops into Afghanistan, and in the 2010s, the US withdrawal from the ABM and INF treaties and the agreement of Group of 5+1 on Iran. The structure of the "world order" "includes the existence of centres power, the number of which forms one or another configuration (polarity), and the measure of hierarchy in the distribution of military, economic, cultural and ideological power." The structure of the "world order" "includes the existence of centres of power, the number of which forms one or another configuration (polarity), and the measure of hierarchy in the distribution of military, economic, cultural and ideological power." The "world order" format is a *subsystem of authoritative selective agreements between world leaders (with a strong potential for deferred violence) that support global and, to a certain extent, regional balances of powers (threats) to prevent and resolve large-scale and most dangerous contingents leading to armed conflicts*. This format establishes a hierarchy of legitimate supranational violence by leading powers relative to other states.

The regulation of violence at the level of the world order reflects not only military confrontations but also the economic confrontation of powers, their cultural and informational mutual influence. In financial and economic terms, the balance of power in the Yalta-Potsdam format was "undermined" by the Bretton Woods institutions and then the Jamaican Accords, which influenced the reserve currency supply under the control of the US Federal Reserve System. Nevertheless, in the post-war period, the two superpowers created conditions for authoritative selective agreements and for limiting dangerous contingents. The world community was kept from slipping into a large-scale war.

At the end of the 20th century and in the 21st century, the balance of the superpowers and the hierarchy was undermined. Hybridization of the "defence system as a system of leading states" took place. The negative consequences can be explained using different theory-methods. Institutionalists note that with the end of the confrontation between the USSR and the United States in the post-Soviet space and outside it, innovations of Western countries (open-access institutions) were introduced. However, there was no critical material and methodological support for innovations. Several states had not yet approached the thresholds allowing for Western-style reforms, taking into account their socio-cultural codes and controlling violence, which generated destructive disorder.

Previously, the hierarchy of the bipolar world order held back such hasty innovations. With the destruction of bipolar world order, for example, in Russia, Moldova, Armenia, Ukraine, reforms led to the shutdown of deferred violence mechanisms. With the elimination of the "load-bearing structure" (authoritative agreements of powers), the politicization of

international law intensified, in particular, with the help of the principle of the priority of human rights over the sovereignty of states, the engagement of political rights to the detriment of economic and social ones. Such destabilizers as global financial crises, "colour revolutions", and the migration crisis of 2015 appeared. The world community turned out to be incapable of authoritative selective agreements regarding the threats of a pandemic.

*“Quarterly News-Magazine”*

# POLITICAL REFLECTION

## CALL FOR CONTRIBUTION

*Published by CESRAN International*

### **Political Reflection**

welcomes contributions

from scholars, students, and professionals

in all aspects of international relations, politics, and political economy.

- Articles submitted should be original contributions and should not be under consideration for any other publication at the same time.
- Articles for the Magazine should be submitted via email to the following addresses:

**Rahman.dag@cesran.org | editors@cesran.org**

- Author's name, title and full address with a brief biographical note should be typed on a separate sheet.
- The ideal **PR** article length is from **1000** to **2000** words.
- **Political Reflection Magazine adheres to the CESRAN Harvard reference style.** View the guidelines below to ensure your manuscript conforms to the reference style. <https://therestjournal.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/Reference-Style.pdf>
- If a submitted article is selected for publication, its copyright will be transferred to **Centre for Strategic Research and Analysis (CESRAN Int.)**. Published papers can be cited by giving the necessary bibliographical information. For re-publication of any article in full-text permission must be sought from the editors.
- Authors bear responsibility for their contributions. Statements of fact or opinion appearing in **Political Reflection Magazine** are solely those of the authors and do not imply endorsement by the Magazine or the **CESRAN Int.**

**The Eurasian Politics and Society Conference** is organised with funding raised by registration fees and support of the following partners:

**CESRAN International**

**Universidade Autónoma de Lisboa**

**OBSERVARE**

**The Rest: Journal of Politics and Development**

**JANUS.NET, e-journal of International Relations**

**Political Reflection Magazine**

**Journal of Conflict Transformation and Security**

UNIVERSIDADE  
AUTÓNOMA  
DE LISBOA



**cesran** international  
CENTRE FOR STRATEGIC RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS - CESRAN



**OBSERVARE**  
Observatório de Relações Exteriores  
UNIVERSIDADE AUTÓNOMA DE LISBOA



**KARADENİZ  
TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY**  
Centre for Strategic Research

CSR

**cei** \_iscte

**Centro de Estudos  
Internacionais**



**NECMETTİN  
ERBAKAN  
UNIVERSITY**

