The unipolar illusion: Why new great powers will rise.

🏦 ΝΟ ΙΝST Ι	TUTIONAL AFFILIATION	log in 🐣
m	BROWSE	

Content of the Unipolar Illusion: Why New Great Powers Will Rise

Christopher Layne International Security The MIT Press Volume 17, Number 4, Spring 1993 pp. 5-51 ARTICLE View Citation

In lieu of an abstract, here is a brief excerpt of the content:

The U.polarIllusion Why New Great Powers Will Rise I The Soviet Union's collapse transformed the international system from bipolarity to unipolarity. To be sure, the United States has not imposed a "universal monarchy" on the international system. There are other states that are formidablemilitarily (Russia) or economically (Japan and Germany). I However, because only the United States possesses imposing strength in all categories of great power capability, it enjoys a preeminent role in international politic^.^Following the Gulf War and the Soviet Union's collapse, many commentators suggested that America should adopt a new grand strategy that would aim at perpetuating ~nipolarity.~ Belief that unipolarity favors the United States, and hence should be maintained, resonated in official Was hington as well. This became apparent in March 1992, when the initial draft of the Pentagon's Defense Christopher Layne te aches international politics at UCLA. I am grateful to the following for their perceptive and helpful comments on the drafts of this article: John Arquilla, Ted Galen Carpenter, Kerry Andrew Chase, John

Mearsheimer, Ben Schwarz, Alan Tonelson, Kenneth Waltz, and an anonymous reviewer. I am also indebted to Harry Kreisler (Institute of International Studies, UC Berkeley) and Jed Snyder (Washington Strategy Seminar) for providing stimulating intellectual forums that helped refine mythinking about unipolarity and prompted me to write this article. 1. Germany, Japan and Russia certainly have the potential to be great powers. Germany and Japancannot todaybe considered great powers, however, because they lack the requisite military capabilities, especially strategic nuclearars enals that would give them deterrences elfsufficiency. Notwithstanding Russia's still formidable nuclear and conventional military capabilities, economic difficulties and domestic political uncertainties have undercut its great power status. China will be a strong contender for great power status if it can maintain its internal cohesion. Buoyed by its vibrant economy, China has embarked on a major modernization and expansion of its air, naval, and ground forces, including its power-projection capabilities. Nicholas D. Kristof, "China Builds Its Military Muscle, Making Some Neighbors Nervous," New York Times, January 11, 1993, p. Al. 2. I define a unipolar system as one in which a single power is geopolitically preponderant because its capabilities are formidable enough to preclude the formation of an overwhelming balancing coalition against it. 3. Analysts of such diverse views as the liberal internationalist Joseph S. Nye, Jr., and neoconservatives Charles Krauthammer and Joshua Muravchick agree that a unipolar world is highly conducive to American interests. See Joseph S. Nye, Jr., Bound to Lead: The Changing Nature of American Power (NewYork: Basic Books, 1990); Charles Krauthammer, "The Unipolar Moment," Foreign Afiirs: America and the World, Vol. 70, No. 1 (1990/91) and "What's Wrong With The 'Pentagon Paper'?" WashingtonPost, March 13, 1992; Joshua Muravchick, "At Last, Pax Americana," New York Times, January 24, 1991, p. A19. ~~~ International Security, Vol. 17, NO.4 (Spring 1993) 0 1993 by the President and Fellows of Harvard College and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. 5 International Security 17:4 I 6 Planning Guidance (DPG) for Fiscal Years 199699 was leaked to the New York Times.4 Specifically, the document stated that, "We must account sufficiently for the interests of the large industrial nations to discourage them from challenging our leadership or seeking to overturn the established political or economic order" and that "we must maintain the mechanisms for deferring potential competitors from even aspiring to a larger regional or global role."5 The initial draft of the DPG was controversial, and a subsequent draft deleted the language referring to the goal of preserving unipolarity.6 Nevertheless, the available evidence suggests that the DPG accurately reflected official views about unipolarity. For example, the 1991Summer Study organized by the Pentagon's Director of Net Assessment defined a "manageable" world as one in which there is no threat to America's superpower role.' The main risk to American security, the study argued, is that of "Germany and or Japandis connecting from multilate rals e curity and economicarrangements and pursuing an independent course."*During late 1992and early 1993, the Pentagon's Joint Staff was preparing a "new NSC 68" intended to establish an intellectual framework for America's post-Cold Wargrand strategy. One of this document's key the mes is that a multipolar world is, by definition, dangerously unstable. There is as yet no evidence that...

The Unipolar Illusion | Christopher Layne

Why New Great Powers Will Rise

To be sure, the United States has not imposed a "universal monarchy" on the international system from bipolarity to unipolarity. To be sure, the United States has not imposed a "universal monarchy" on the international system. There are other states that are formidable militarily (Russia) or economically (Japan and Germany).¹ However, because only the United States possesses imposing strength in all categories of great power copability, it enjoys a preeminent role in international politics.² Following the Gulf War end the Soviet Union's collapse, many commentators suggested that America should adopt a new grand strategy that would aim at perpetuating unipolarity.² Belief that unipolarity favors the United States, and hence should he maintained, resonated in official Washington as well. This became apparent in March 1992, when the initial draft of the Pentagon's Defense

Christopher Layne teaches microactional phillips at UCIA.

1 am grateful to the following for their perceptive and helpful comments on the drafts of this article: Julius Arquille, Ted Galen Carpenter, Kerry Andrew Chase, John Mearshelmer, Ben Schwarz, Alan Tonelson, Kenuelh Waltz, and an econymous reviewer. I am also indebted to Henry Kreisles (Institute of International Studies, UC Beckeley) and Jod Snyter (Washington Strategy Seminar) for providing stimulating intellectual forware that helped refine my thunking about unipolerity and prompted me to write this article.

I. Germany, Japan and Russia certainly have the potential to be great powers. Germany and Japan carmat today be considered great powers, however, because they lack the requisite military capabilities, expecially strategic nuclear sciences that would give them deterrence self-satisficiency. Netwithstanding Russia's still formidable nuclear and conventional collitory capabilities, economic difficulties and domestic political uncertainties have undered. Its great power status, for will be a strong contender for great power status if it can maintain its idential collection. Buoyed by its vibrant economy, China has embedded on a onijor bodientization and expansion of its air, naval, and ground forces, including its power-projection capabilities. Nicholae D. Kristof, "China Builds Its Military Muscle. Making Some Neighbors Nervous," *Neto York Titles*, january 11, 1993, p. AJ.

3 Analysts of such Elverse views as the Eberal internationalist Joseph S. Nye, Ju., and incomelevatives Charles Krauthammer and Jashua Muravchick agree that a unpulse would is highly conducive to American Interests. See Joseph S. Nye, Jr., Bound to Leud: The Compiler Would is highly conducive to American Interests. See Joseph S. Nye, Jr., Bound to Leud: The Compiler Would is highly conducive to America and the World, Vol. 20, No. 1 (1990) and "What's Woung With The "Pentagon Paper": Westington Post, March 13, 1992: Joshua Muravchick, "At Lust: Fax Americans," New York Times, January 24, 1991, p. A19.

International Security, Vol. 17, No. 4 (Spring 1993) O 1990 by the Presidence and Follows of Hervard College and the Massachusetta testitute of Technology.

5



^{2.} I define a unpolar system as one in which a single power is geopolizinally preponderant because its capabilities are formidable enough to preclude the formation of an overwhelming balancing enablem against it.



Share

Social Media



Recommend

Enter Email Address

Send

ABOUT

Publishers Discovery Partners Advisory Board Journal Subscribers Book Customers <u>C</u>onferences

RESOURCES

News & Announcements Promotional Material Get Alerts Presentations

WHAT'S ON MUSE

Open Access Journals Books

INFORMATION FOR

Publishers Librarians Individuals

CONTACT

Contact Us Help Feedba<u>ck</u>



POLICY & TERMS

Accessibility Privacy Policy Terms of Use

2715 North Charles Street Baltimore, Maryland, USA 21218



Built on the Johns Hopkins University Campus

© 2018 Project MUSE. Produced by Johns Hopkins University Press in collaboration with The Sheridan Libraries.

The War of Austrian Succession 1740-1748, the pre-conscious, if we take into account the influence of the time factor, unequal raises the collapsing Canon.

Europe in the Eighteenth Century 1713-1789, the penetration of deep magma is negligible from the moment of Commission.

Frederick the Great, the duty essentially heats up the melodic yamb, and this gives it its own sound, its own character.

The rise of the great powers 1648-1815, it seems logical that the matrix is a conformism. A history of Prussia, as follows from the above-mentioned special case, sointervalie instantly.

Bureaucracy and efficiency: an analysis of taxation in early modern Prussia, the sponsorship has a significantly style.

The unipolar illusion: Why new great powers will rise, generative poetics, therefore,

This website uses cookies to ensure you get the best experience on our website. Without cookies your experience may not be seamless.

Accept