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Abstract

This article first presents theories that justify concentration of power. In the field of political philosophy, Hobbes’s theory argues in favor of concentration of power in the hand of a monarch in order to prevent the state of nature. In the field of theories of international relations, power preponderance theory argues that power preponderance of one country prevents international wars. Consequently, both theories actually justify American hegemony arguing that hegemony is not just in the interest of the USA but also in the interest of the world peace. However, this article claims that check and balance is important not just in domestic politics but in international relations as well.
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The main purpose of this article is to show that American hegemony and theory which justifies this hegemony (power preponderance theory) have their origins in Hobbes’s political theory. In a way, the USA became a “king of the world” in Hobbesian term (though not a “legal king”). The second aim of this article is to overcome the differences between the main sub-disciplines of political science: political theory, domestic politics, comparative politics and international relations. This article will try to make a comprehensive evaluation whether concentration of power in domestic and international arena is desirable or not.

The first section of the article presents the most important elements of Hobbes’s ‘theory. The second section presents the power preponderance theory. The third section shows the magnitude of American hegemony over the world. The fourth section shows how the power preponderance theory actually justifies American hegemony with similar arguments which Hobbes used to justify monarchy. This section also presents criticism of Hobbesian way of thinking, presented in the power preponderance theory. The main conclusion is that the power preponderance may produce peace but such peace is primarily in the interests of a hegemon rather than in the interest of the entire world community.

1. **Hobbes’s theory: why is the concentration of power desirable?**

**1.1 Sources of power**

According to Hobbes (1992, 62), the goal of every person is to have as much power as possible because power enables future apparent good. “The POWER of a Man, (to take it Universally,) is his present means, to obtain some future apparent Good. And is either Originall, or Instrumentall." Original (natural power) consists of strength, form, prudence, arts, eloquence, liberality, nobility. Instrumental power is based on the organic power and serves to further maximize the power. Instrumental power consists of wealth, reputation, popularity, success, affability, nobility, eloquence, physical appearance, knowledge and working craftsmanship. The power of the individual is always insignificant to the power of society. Therefore, an association with the other individuals creates a political power. Hence, friendship creates power. Furthermore, a possession of servants produces power. Political power is the most important because the power of a ruler is equal to the sum of power of all individual citizens.

**1.2 The state of nature**

For Hobbes, the state of nature is one in which there is no state, i.e. a condition in which there is a constant war of all against all. The war, in the state of nature, is a consequence of unlimited use of natural justice by every person. The state of nature is characterized by a persistent insecurity. The economy is based on a robbery because no one has a guarantee that one will possess that what one produces. As everyone wants to augment his/her power, everyone is constantly forced to fight because by crashing power of others one increases his/her own power. In that case there is no society and every person should take care of himself/herself.

In the state of nature the war is omnipresent due to the absence of the state. There is no civil law that would impose the execution of natural law. There is also no right except a comprehensive natural right to do everything that a person considers necessary for the preservation of his/her own life. Therefore, the words such as righteousness or sin can have no meaning in the state of nature because there are no regulations that would decide what is just and what is not. Sin exists only in the social order in which good and evil are defined by law.

In short, Hobbes considers the state of nature as a bad form of society and tries to find the order that can prevent the state of nature.

**1.3 Hobbes’s theory about the relationship between political power and the type of government**

For Hobbes, monarchy is the best guarantee that people will not return to the state of nature. Arguments for this statement are the following. Each person tries to accumulate as much power as possible. “The Passions that most of all cause the differences of Wit, are principally, the more or lesse Desire of Power, of Riches, of Knowledge, and of Honour. All which may be reduced to the first, that is Desire of Power. For Riches, Knowledge and Honour are but severall sorts of Power (Hobbes 1992, 53).“ Power of one person is limited by the power of another. In order to increase his/her own power, a person should strive to conquer the other people. In the state of nature, not only do people try to protect their own power but they also try to enhance it. Since no one wants to voluntarily relinquish his/her own power, conflict and war of all against all is inevitable. The mutual warfare decreases a joint power and threatens the life of every man. Since the instinct for survival is the strongest instinct, the person tries to find a way to ensure his/her own life, but this is impossible in the state of nature. Therefore, people try to create the state where their lives would be protected and safe. The state increases the power of each individual because the individual is no longer threatened by other people. People’s power is multiplied in associations. The community as a whole (and each individual as well) has more power when the individual powers are united than when they are in conflict with each other. If two equal forces act in opposite directions, their combined forces will be equal to zero. However, if they act in the same direction, their combined force will be equal to the sum of these two forces. This is the reason why people try to unite their powers. For, the biggest power is the one that comes from organizing the people. Hence, a reason motivates people to abandon the state of nature, and to organize the state. Thus, the interest - not the love of other people - forces people to associate with each other.

There are three types of commonwealth in which people can associate themselves - monarchy, [aristocracy](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Aristocracy) and democracy. According to Hobbes, monarchy is the best solution. He quotes six reasons why a monarchy is better solution than aristocracy and democracy. For this analysis, the fourth reason is the most important: “a Monarch cannot disagree with himselfe, out of envy, or interest; but an Assembly may; and that to such a height, as may produce a Civill Warre (Hobbes 1992, 132). “ In other words, the probability for the outbreak of a civil war (and for the return to the state of nature) is the lowest in a monarchy. Since the state of nature is the worst thing that may happen to people, a type of commonwealth which reduces the probability for a civil war to the lowest possible level is the best type of commonwealth. This type of commonwealth is monarchy – a strong undivided government.

Monarch's power is unlimited. Only he has the right to legislate, take care of their execution and make a judgment. His power is equal to the sum of the powers of his citizens since only the ruler has the power and the right. The monarch judges what is right and what is wrong. The greatest crime is to resist monarch’s will and to initiate a rebellion because it can restore the state of nature. The obligation of obedience to the monarch lasts as long as he guarantees safety of his people. “The Obligation of Subjects to the Soveraign is understood to last as long, and no longer, than the power lasteth, by which he is able to protect them. For the right men have by Nature to protect themselves, when none else can protect them, can by no Covenant be relinquished (Hobbes 1992, 153).” In other words, if the monarch could no longer guarantee the safety the individual is no longer obliged to obey. The individual deprived himself of all freedom he had in the natural state in order to ensure the highest value – security of his life. If monarch is not able to ensure personal safety, an individual is not obliged to be obedient any more. Monarchy should be able to protect individuals both from foreign threat and from threats inside the commonwealth.

It has already been explained why Hobbes prefers monarchy to aristocracy and democracy. However, Hobbes considers all of these three forms of state (democracy, aristocracy, and monarchy) as equal. Nevertheless, his preference for monarchy is a consequence of his theory of sovereignty in accordance with which the power in any form of state is absolute. The separation of powers is unthinkable for Hobbes since, in his opinion, it calls into question the unity of the state and, therefore, the preservation of a civil status. In this regard, when it comes to concentration of power/authority, the difference between the various forms of state is quite secondary to the difference between the state and non-state political formations. In other words, Hobbes is not only and primarily an advocate of concentration of power/authority because he is a supporter of the monarchy, but because he (as well as Bodin[[2]](#footnote-2)) is an advocate of state absolutism which, regardless of the specific form of the state, excludes the possibility of separation of power. Hobbes also excludes the external legal constraints on authorities in the form of the constitution. Hence, the entire Hobbes’s discussion about the relationship between power and the type of government can be summarized in one sentence: people should relinquish all their individual powers to monarch in order to prevent the state of nature and, along with it, to secure their lives.

**1.4 Hobbes and international relations theories**

Is it possible to apply Hobbes’s theory on international relations? According to Hobbes, states relate one to each other the same way as individuals relate in the state of nature. However, in the state, peace is based on legal regulation. In contrast, relationship (and peace) between states is based on the balance of power. Furthermore, according to Hobbes, a king comes to power on the basis of social contract (legally). In contrast, no country rules the world legally. In short, it seems that it is difficult to apply Hobbes’s theory of state on international relations.

However, in spite of many differences between domestic and international realm, there are many similarities between them. First, the logic of power/force is also present inside a state. People respect a legal order because they know that disrespect of this order would produce the state of nature but this respect is also based on the real balance of power. So, the king establishes the legal order as a result of people’s will but also as a result of his military supremacy.

Similarly, during the course of history, a military supremacy of certain states has produced certain order in the international relations. *Pax Romana, Pax Britanica and Pax Americana* are the obvious examples of this order. At modern times, international law, which is a consequence of this order, is established.[[3]](#footnote-3) And, even though a classical world police does not exist, it is interesting that the international law is frequently even more respected than domestic laws. For example, over the last 25 years, there were more civil wars than international wars.[[4]](#footnote-4) Obviously, borders are more respected (and this is a fundamental element of international law) than the constitutional orders inside states. In other words, the differences between domestic politics and international politics do exist but these differences are not of a magnitude that prevents application of Hobbes’s theory on the analysis of international relations.

As a matter of fact, it is very difficult to find any textbook about international relations theories that does not include Hobbes’s theory.[[5]](#footnote-5) Obviously, authors of these textbooks think that Hobbes’s theory is relevant for the analysis of international relations. But, what is even more important, the most prominent scholars of international relations do include Hobbes’s theory as a part of their own analyses. According to Hoffman (1965, 27), “the ‘Hobbesian situation’ must be our starting point [for international relations theories – M.A.].” According to founder of the realist theory, “the essence of international politics is identical with its domestic counterpart. Both international and domestic politics are struggle for power, modified only by the different conditions under which this struggle takes place in the domestic and in the international spheres.”[[6]](#footnote-6) The most prominent experts of international relations theories, such as Kennan’s and Walzer’s,[[7]](#footnote-7) have similar opinions about the influence of Hobbes on international relations theories. Even the most recent analyses of Hobbes’s political theory also treat Hobbes not only as a theoretician of domestic politics but also as a theoretician of international relations.[[8]](#footnote-8) Naticchia (2013, 242) calls this view “Hobbesian realism in international relations.”

To summarize, Hobbes’s theory is an important part of the international relations theories. Accordingly, the next section explains connections between Hobbes’s theory and a modern theory of international relations – the power preponderance theory.

1. Power preponderance theory

Hobbes’s theory was a predecessor of a modern theory of international relations and that is the power preponderance theory.[[9]](#footnote-9) According to this theory, peace is best secured if a country has huge relative power preponderance (as monarch should have, according to Hobbes, inside a state). The strongest country establishes the rules and these rules produce peace. To use Hobbs’s terms, a hegemonic country becomes a sovereign and this sovereign guarantees peace (though, this hegemony is not legal one). In other words, hegemony produces peace. In contrast, the absence of a hegemon produces anarchy and anarchy causes war (just like the absence of a sovereign inside a country produces civil war). The hegemon establishes hierarchy and order. The hegemon is usually a victor from the previous major war. Peace lasts as long as the hegemon is able to keep hierarchy, rules and order. Furthermore, peace lasts as long as the hegemon is powerful enough to punish those who do not obey the international order. In this case a weaker state would not dare to challenge a stronger state and the stronger state would not have the reason to use force because the weaker state would obey demands of its stronger counterpart.

Originally, the power preponderance theory tried to explain behavior of great powers and the origin of major wars. According to Lemke and Kugler (1996, 8), “as long as the dominant country remains preponderant over the other countries in the international system, peace is maintained… because weak obey the strong with few exceptions.” In contrast, likelihood of war is the highest under condition of power parity because in this case “both sides see a prospect for victory (Geller and Singer 1998, 69).” Accordingly, a shift toward equality of power increases the likelihood of war.

Power preponderance theory is frequently connected with the hegemonic stability theory which claims that a dominant country establishes the “rules of the game” in international relations.[[10]](#footnote-10) Other countries follow these rules because they are not powerful enough to challenge the existing order. However, when one country establishes the power parity with a hegemon, war is likely to happen because “victory and defeat reestablish an unambiguous hierarchy of prestige concurrent with the new distribution of power (Lemke and Kugler 1996, 9).” It is more likely that a challenger will initiate war because the challenger is not satisfied with the existing order. However, the hegemon may also initiate a preventive war in order to secure its dominant position.

1. American hegemony

Power preponderance theory actually justifies American hegemony over the world. For, if power preponderance causes peace, it is not just the interest of the USA but also the interest of the entire world to have American military preponderance and, consequently, American hegemony over the world. This is the reason why the power preponderance theory is so popular in American political science. But, do we really live in the age of American military preponderance and American hegemony?

Military preponderance of the USA is really apparent and impressive. This can be seen in the fact that the USA spends on just a little bit less than all other countries in the world combined on the military.[[11]](#footnote-11) The USA Navy is more powerful than all the navies of the world combined together. In fact, only the USA has truly blue-water navy and only the USA and France (1) have nuclear-powered aircraft carriers. Furthermore, the USA has naval bases around the world. As a result, the USA controls all the oceans in the world.

It is not just the navy that is so superior. The USA air-forces are probably stronger than all other air-forces in the world combined. Very few countries can do anything above 5,000 meters against the USA warplanes. American precision-guided weaponry can hit any target on the earth. The USA has 100 military satellites. They surveil any movement on the ground. Since American satellites show movements on the ground, American enemies practically cannot move their weaponry without the risk of being destroyed. Moreover, the USA has capability to destroy the satellites of other countries.

The USA has military bases in 36 countries, which means that American troops are present around the world. These military bases control access to the most important region of the world, including the regions with the highest percentage of oil production and reserves of oil (Persian Gulf). Furthermore, as a result of NATO expansion, American troops are now on Russian borders. Petrograd can be hit by artillery. In short, the USA is prepared for war in any part of the Globe.

American power preponderance is apparent not just in share numbers of weaponry. The USA military spends more than all other countries in the world combined on research and development. Furthermore, after WWII, almost all of the most important technological inventions were discovered in the USA (nuclear energy, computers, the Internet, robots) and 75 percent of Nobel-prize winners live and work in the USA. Culturally, the USA dominates in the world. The English language is lingua franca and American movies shape world's weltanschauung (perceptions of the world). American music is listened to around the globe. Last but not least, American universities are the most prestigious ones in the world. In short, the USA is the most powerful country in history.

Is American hegemony beneficial for the entire world? According to Wohlforth (2008), the answer is positive because a unipolar world is both peaceful and stable. Consequently, the USA should protect its hegemony because this is good for both the USA and the world. American hegemony prevents an arms race and a great global war. No country can miscalculate the balance of power and challenge the USA. In short, the USA is a “benevolent” hegemon that does not use its power just for self-gains. Therefore, according to Owen (2008), only illiberal states fear from the power of the USA. In short, many American authors claim that American hegemony is good not just for the USA but for the entire world. To return to the beginning of this article, Hobbesian world, in which the USA became – *mutatis mutandis* - a “world monarch”, is in the interest of the world because the overwhelming power of the USA establishes international rules of the game and secures peace (just like the monarch inside a country prevents a civil war).

1. Criticism of Hobbes, power preponderance theory and American hegemony

The first thing which is important to note is that these three above mentioned terms are strongly connected. The power preponderance theory is, actually, a transposition of Hobbesian theory to the international realm (excluding legality of the order). Furthermore, the power preponderance theory is actually a justification of American hegemony. Therefore, this section will first start with criticism of Hobbes’s theory or, more precisely, it will present Spinoza’s theory about the solution for the state of nature.

4.1 Spinoza versus Hobbes

Hobbes and Spinoza were, in a way, the predecessors of modern discourse about preconditions for peace. However, very similar arguments they used are also used in modern discussions about the advantages of unipolar and multipolar world and in discussions between proponents and critics of the power preponderance theory.

Hobbes’s and Spinoza's initial premises are very similar. Both establish their theories of the state on the analysis of the state of nature. Both conclude that it is necessary to establish the state in order to escape from the state of nature. Both come to very similar conclusions about human nature, state of nature, and about the necessity of the state. Their theories of the state, however, differ significantly. For Hobbes, the state cannot be based on the bare power. Power is necessary but not a sufficient precondition for the existence of the state. Therefore, Hobbes argues in favor of legal order but also in favor of concentration of power in the hand of monarch and Spinoza argues in favor of diffusion of power in the state.

Spinoza (1677) claims that, in the state of nature, everyone has as many rights as power. He does not address in detail the sources of power of the individual (like Hobbes). However, from the whole *Treatise*, it is evident that he finds that the foundation of power is based on military power, military force at the disposal of an individual, group or state. Therefore, Spinoza analyzes how to organize a military force in order to preserve the good order of the state. Hence, this section will focus on the following question: what is the relationship of power in the state of nature and what should be the balance of power in Spinoza’s ideal state?

Spinoza's first premise (1677, 2) is that the debate about the form of government should be based on real human nature rather than on the basis of discussion of what men should be. “[Philosophers] conceive of men, not as they are, but as they themselves would like them to be… they have never conceived a theory of politics, which could be turned to use, but such as might be taken for a chimera, or might have been formed in Utopia.” And real human nature is based on desire for power because everybody has as much right as one has power. Obviously, Spinoza and Hobbes have very similar opinions about the human nature. Furthermore, there are also not so many differences between them in the analysis of the state of nature. In addition, they both agree that only the state can eliminate the state of nature. However, the difference between the two authors is in the analysis of, using the modern terms, the value of power balance inside the state. According to Spinoza, power is important not just in the state of nature but also inside a state.

The reasons are the following:

1. Even inside the state, everybody has as much right as one has power. One who relinquishes one’s power also relinquishes one’s rights.
2. If a ruler has absolute power, he/she may jeopardize the rights of citizens, including the basic rights such as the right on life and security.
3. There is no guaranty that sovereign will not behave in the same manner, toward his citizen, as they behaved among themselves in the state of nature. Even if absolute power of sovereign means peace, it may produce slavery. “If slavery, barbarism, and desolation are to be called peace, men can have no worse misfortune (Spinoza, 1677, 18).”

Therefore, Spinoza concludes: „From all which it follows, that the more absolutely the commonwealth's right is transferred to the king, the less independent he is, and the more unhappy is the condition of his subjects (Spinoza, 1677, 19).“ Since might produces right, the monarch’s power should be limited. Since military power is the most important one, this power should not be concentrated just in the hand of sovereign but it should be dispersed. What does it mean? It means that all the citizens should be armed. “The militia must be formed out of citizens alone, none being exempt, and of no others. And, therefore, all are to be bound to have arms… The militia ought to be composed of the citizens only, and none of them to be exempted. For an armed man is more independent than an unarmed (Spinoza, 1677, 19 and 28).” Only armed citizens can protect themselves from power abuse on behalf of a monarch. If people are armed they may remove a monarch from power if he became a tyrant. Furthermore, if people are armed, monarch will have to obey laws and he will have to respect citizens’ rights. In a word, Spinoza tries to find a political system that would prevent the return in the state of nature but also one that would prevent tyranny as well.

So, what are the main differences between Hobbes and Spinoza? The main aim of Hobbes’s book is to find a political system that would prevent civil war, which he experienced during his life. Therefore, he experienced all the sufferings brought by the state of anarchy or, to use Hobbes’s term, by the state of nature. Therefore, he wanted to find a system that gives the strongest guaranties against the return to the state of nature. And he found this system. Legal order and full concentration of power in the hand of a sovereign are, most likely, the best way to prevent anarchy. However, such a system does not prevent the power abuse on behalf of this sovereign. Spinoza noticed this problem and, therefore, he tried to propose a system that may prevent both: the state of nature but also the monarch’s power abuse. For Spinoza, a dispersion of power is essential, especially the dispersion of military power. Therefore, for Spinoza, it is essential that citizens are armed and that military power is based on the citizens’ militia rather than on mercenaries. To use the modern terms, the balance of power is the best guarantee against power abuse. However, the balance of power produces risk of anarchy and the return to the state of nature. Nevertheless, this risk is worth taking because otherwise there would be a very high risk that a monarchy could become a tyranny which is not less dangerous than the state of nature. Or, in Locks words (1823: 145): “This is to think that men are so foolish that they take care to avoid what mischiefs may be done them by polecats or foxes, but are content, nay, think it safety, to be devoured by lions.“

* 1. **Criticism of power preponderance theory**

In contrast to the power preponderance theory, the balance of power theory[[12]](#footnote-12) argues that the balance of power produces peace. Equality of power[[13]](#footnote-13) destroys the possibility of easy victory and, therefore, no country will risk initiating conflict. War is prevented when the cost of aggression is high and benefits of going to war low. If a defender has strong military, the cost of aggression becomes too high and benefits become too low. Therefore, the balance of power secures peace most, since no country has favorable odds that the aggression will produce more benefits than costs.

Hence, a power advantage motivates a more powerful country to attack. In other words, power preponderance motivates territorial expansion because only military power of one’s own country prevents the use of military power of another country. According to Mearsheimer (2001, 19), “power inequalities invite war, because they increase an aggressor’s prospectus for victory on the battlefield.” Consequently, all countries in the world would be insecure under the hegemony because the hegemon may use its military power to achieve its own goals. In hegemony, the biggest threat for peace is the aggression committed by the hegemon.

**4.3 Criticism of American hegemony**

It is important to note that the political scientists frequently have different criteria when they write about comparative politics and when they write about international relations. In comparative politics, balance of power (or check and balance) is considered as a prerequisite for democracy. For example, according to Madison (1996, 42), “the accumulation of all powers… must justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny.”

However, in international politics, power preponderance and American hegemony are considered desirable not just for the USA but also for the world (see above). Therefore, Ish-Shalom (2007, 551) concludes,

The internal contradiction is evident… If one wish to build domestic checks and balances to prevent concentrated power, one should aspire to similar precautionary mechanism globally, ensuring that no single power can rule without prudence-reducing restrains. After all, prudence of Lord Acton's warning that “power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupt absolutely” applies globally as well domestically.

Indeed, American neoconservatives firmly advocate against gun control inside the USA. One of the arguments in favor of gun rights is that citizen’s possession of arms enables security against tyranny.[[14]](#footnote-14) So, if inside the USA - with all the democratic institutions that enable checks and balances – the possession of arms is important for the protection against tyranny of American government, what can be a protection against tyranny of American government worldwide but military might of other countries?

According to Ikenberry (2008), other countries should not be afraid of American hegemony because of the following reasons. First, the USA is a democracy and, therefore, American democratic institutions prevent American power abuse worldwide. Second, the USA is a member of the UN and NATO, and American foreign policy is constrained by these institutions. Furthermore, other countries have benefits from the USA hegemony because this hegemony enables free trade and peace.

However, during the last fifteen years, the USA has not respected the international institutions, especially not the UN. Moreover, the USA abandoned the Kyoto accord on global warming and rejected the participation in the International Criminal Court. The USA pulled out of the Antiballistic Missile treaty. According to the National Security Strategy, the USA now asserts that it has the right to attack and conquer sovereign countries that pose no threat, and to do so without the international support. The USA has adopted a doctrine of preemptive war that challenges the norm of territorial integrity.[[15]](#footnote-15)

Neither American democratic institutions nor the UN and NATO prevented American aggression on Iraq. The Iraqi War (2003-) bluntly showed all the negative consequences of Hobbesian world (though without legal order comparable with domestic legal order), American power preponderance and American hegemony. This aggression also showed that the USA uses its power for self-gain rather than for the well-being of the world and it showed that military preponderance does not guaranty peace.[[16]](#footnote-16)

The USA power preponderance and hegemony actually enabled American aggression on Iraq. What are the consequences? Burnham et al (2006) argue that toll of post-invasion excess deaths is 650,000 people. Stiglitz (2008, 138) estimates that, by the year 2010, the total number of Iraqi deaths exceeded a million, and number of injured would exceeded two million. Furthermore, 4.6 million people (one out of seven Iraqis) had been uprooted from their homes (Stiglitz, 2008, 133).

It was not just Iraq who was a victim of American hegemony and American power preponderance. American allies were also, in a way, victims because they were forced to participate in aggression on Iraq. According to Chomsky (2003, 131), “support for a war carried out ‘unilaterally by America and its allies’ did not rise above 11 percent in any [European] country.” In other words, European countries attacked Iraq, claiming to do it in order to bring democracy in this country, ignoring the will of 90 percent of the people in their own countries. Why did they do it? Because the USA forced them to participate in the Iraqi War (2003-). According to Tripp (2004),

during May 2003, a case claiming U.S. troops committed crimes in Iraq had been entered in a Belgian court on behalf of ten Iraqis against General Tommy Franks. In response, Bush officials threatened Belgium with economic punishment, including withholding NATO funds and/or moving NATO headquarters out of Brussels, if the case progressed. Belgium's courts promptly responded to U.S. economic threats by throwing the Franks case out, and later, by July 2003, Belgium's government announced it would change the controversial law that allowed its courts to try allegations of crimes committed during war that did not occur in Belgium nor directly involve Belgians.

Above mentioned cases show that, in a way, even American allies live under American “dictatorship”, not to mention countries that are considered as American enemies. Therefore, Ish-Shalom concludes that we live in a world of “international Hobbesian reality and dictatorial neoconservative empire (p. 554).”

To return to Spinoza once again, monarch himself can be equally dangerous as the state of nature. Or, in terms of international relations theories, even if American hegemony brings peace, American power abuse can be even more dangerous than world anarchy in which balance of power prevents wars.

So, Iraq and Afghanistan showed that power preponderance and hegemony do not guarantee peace. However, even if they did guarantee peace, it would not be necessarily desirable to have the hegemony. The hegemony may cause democracy inside a country to become meaningless. For, if democratically elected officials obey the orders of a hegemon rather than the will of citizens, than there is no much use of democracy. Furthermore, peace could be based on a sheer fear. To illustrate, communist dictatorships were relatively peaceful. According to Antić (2010, 132**)**, communist countries experienced less civil wars on their territories than other types of dictatorship, they also experienced less civil wars than any other types of democracy (presidential, semipresidential, parliamentary). In a way, communist dictatorships were a fulfillment of Hobbesian world. The full concentration of power prevented anarchy and civil wars and this concentration of power was based on legal order. Does it mean that communist dictatorship is better than democracy? And what is the difference between communist dictatorship inside a country and a hegemony on a world scale? Maybe both can prevent wars but there are, for sure, many other dependent variables with which one can assess desirability of concentration of power. In short, just as the checks and balances prevent the abuse of power inside a country, balance of power prevents the abuse of power on the world scale.

1. **Conclusion**

This article unites discussions about Hobbesian theory, the power preponderance theory and American hegemony. Why? Because all three theories have one thing in common: they argue in favor of concentration of power. For Hobbes, concentration of power in monarch’s hand prevents the return into the state of nature (or anarchy). The power preponderance theory argues that an overwhelming military superiority of one country (a unipolar world) is the best guarantee for the world’s peace. Proponents of American hegemony argue that this hegemony is not just in the interest of the USA but also in the interest of the entire world because this hegemony enables peace and world commerce. In short, American military preponderance and hegemony is, in a way, a fulfillment of Hobbesian monarchy at the world scale (though without legal ground). Absolute monarchy prevents civil war and American hegemony prevents international wars.

However, this article also presents criticism of Hobbes, the power preponderance theory and American hegemony. Spinoza showed that the concentration of power in the hand of monarch (if people are unarmed) may cause monarch’s power abuse. Danger from this abuse is not lower than danger of the state of nature. The balance of power theory argues that power preponderance enables aggression on behalf of the most powerful country on militarily inferior countries. American aggression on Iraq was the prime example of this situation. Furthermore, hegemony is not just dangerous for peace, it is dangerous in itself. For, if other countries must obey orders, fearing military power of a hegemon, they are not free. Peace, under the system of world’s hegemony, even if it exists, is similar to the peace based on dictatorship inside a country. In both cases peace is not a sufficient justification for the submission of people or the entire nations. In short, Spinoza’s theory, the balance of power theory, and multipolarity may produce a higher risk for civil and interstate wars. However, they are prerequisites for democracy inside a state and a relative national equality in the international realm.
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Sažetak

Ovaj članak prvo izlaže teorije koje zagovaraju koncentraciju moći. U području političke filozofije to je Hobbes-ova teorija koja zagovara koncentraciju moći u rukama monarha, zasnovanu na pravu, kako bi se spriječio povrat u prirodno stanje. U području teorija o međunarodnim odnosima to je teorija nadmoći koja tvrdi da nadmoć jedne države smanjuje vjerojatnost izbijanja ratova. Obje teorije, *de facto*, idu u prilog američke hegemonije jer iz njih proizlazi da ta hegemonija nije samo u interesu SAD nego i u interesu svjetskog mira. Međutim, ovaj članak tvrdi da je sistem ravnoteže i kontrole (checks and balances) važan ne samo unutar države nego i u međunarodnim odnosima.

Ključne riječi: Hobbes, teorija nadmoći, hegemonija SAD, Spinoza, ravnoteža snaga, ravnoteža i kontrola
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