

Who holds the power in this world?

1. Traditional power ...

Foreign policy has traditionally been power politics. It was about "imposing your own will" on another country; according to Max Weber's definition of "power". The means to implement one's own ideas were realpolitik, rationale and war. This policy was based primarily on military strength.

The great theorist of realpolitik, Hans J. Morgenthau, has shown in detail the fundamental elements of the power of a state: geography and the expansion of a country; Mineral resources and economic strength; Degree of industrialization and the possibility of expanding military armaments. As far as today's world is concerned, the following picture emerges:

- Military expenditure in 2018 (in billion U.S. dollars): United States 700; China 250; Saudi Arabia 68; India 67; France 64; Russia 61; (Austria 3). So the US spent as much on armaments as all the other major countries put together. NATO, the U.S.-led defense alliance spends \$ 1,000 billion annually on armaments and keeps 3 million soldiers under arms.
- Gross National Product (GDP) in 2017 (in billion U.S. dollars): USA 19,390; People's Republic of China 12,000; Japan 4900; Germany 3685; Great Britain 2625; India 2611 (Austria 417 million). The EU countries together had a GDP of \$ 17,580 billion; in terms of purchasing power parity, the People's Republic of China already had the largest gross national product in 2017. Above all, New York is the center of financial capitalism, which gives the United States the opportunity to operate worldwide.
- The world's most populous countries are (in millions in 2016): People's Republic of China 1386; India 1329; USA 324; Indonesia 260; Brazil 206; Pakistan 203. How much the traditional ideas of power and greatness still shape our way of thinking can be seen from the fact that even today those are called the "Great ones" in history, who conquered countries and defeated their enemies in bloody battles; from Alexander the Great to Charlemagne; from Julius Caesar to Napoleon.

2. ... in a divided world.

Today, as far as power thinking in foreign policy is concerned, we live in a divided world: for some, especially for the United States, military power is still the basis of their foreign policy. For other countries, particularly in Europe, promoting the well-being of people has also become the goal of international relations.

2.1. "American exceptionalism"

The belief in "American exceptionalism" is a characteristic of American foreign policy. America is a chosen nation, destined to lead and rule the world. This conviction was already deeply rooted in the thinking of the founding fathers and is based on Puritan, Calvinist thinking. George W. Bush was not the first to speak of an "axis of evil". Already in 1656, Oliver Cromwell declared the fight against the "axis of evil" to be a crucial task for England; and found that the struggle for God is congruent with that for English interests. At that time the enemies were the Pope in Rome and the Catholic Habsburgs. Today, the United States' foreign policy elite is convinced that the international order must be led and controlled by the United States as the "indispensable nation". This requires military strength, because "Foreign Policy without the backing of the Military, is like a base-ball game without a base-ball bat". This also means that the USA does not want to be bound by international treaties or international organizations; and that the sovereignty of one's own country must definitely be defended.

This belief of the United States in its own mission was repeatedly confirmed: America emerged as the clear winner in the Cold War. Since then, the area of influence in Europe alone has been expanded from East Germany to Georgia; and from Albania to Estonia by 1.5 million km² and 150 million people. And in the age of globalization, the shift of spheres of influence is probably more important than that of borders. One thing is important: America always needs an enemy. Because the good-ones can only present their virtues if evil also exists.

Today, "Putin" is so totally attributed to this role of evil by Western propaganda that even the Russian opposition has already complained that the Russian president would be known as a superhuman. Enemies must always be searched for: there is a "Committee on the present danger" in Washington, whose task is to track down possible enemies of the United States all over the world. Former presidential advisor

Stephen K. Bannon is a driving force in this group. He now portrays China as the great enemy that needs to be fought. And that there is no shortage of enemies, you can also see in the fact that the USA is involved in a dozen wars around the world today.

2.2. Revolution in European diplomacy

Europe took a different path after the Second World War. The “revolution in European diplomacy” initially caused the Western European countries to fundamentally change the goal and means of their foreign policy with the establishment of the Council of Europe: since then, traditional power politics have no longer shaped European diplomacy; promoting the welfare of the people became also a maxim of international relations.

For centuries it was the primary goal of a ruler or his state to appear powerful in the international community. Nowadays, the European welfare states are concerned with increasing the standard of living of citizens through international relations; Human rights, democracy and the rule of law became the foundations of foreign policy in European countries. Confrontation was replaced by cooperation; "War" by "Welfare". This revolution did not take place in the United States. On the contrary: after the victory in the Cold War, the United States turned away from the basic principle that the "balance of powers" should guarantee peace and security. They wanted to seize the “unique opportunity” (“unipolar moment”) and claim sole leadership in the world.

This results in the following situation: although today all states still call their international relations “foreign policy”, there is a huge difference: some still rely on military means to implement their foreign policy; others, like the European welfare states, no longer. It is a classic case of how the same term name can have different contents.

3. Why is the world changing?

During the past decades, for example, since the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, the world has changed politically, economically and socio-politically in a dramatic way. If one looks at the creative forces that have brought about these changes, one can see that traditional power factors played only a minor role or no role at all; on the other

hand, the power of fate and chance were decisive; the power of the brave; the markets and even the myths were very important.

- The fall of the Berlin Wall is a prime example of how the “power of the brave” can triumph over “powerlessness of the powerful”. With 170,000 Stasi employees and informants, the GDR probably had one of the best organized repression apparatuses in the world. Nevertheless, courageous opposition figures risked resistance at high personal risk; and the call "We want change" eventually became a slogan of the demonstrating masses. The economic crisis in the GDR, the creeping disintegration of the state and power apparatus there also played a role in this, as did the attractiveness of the lifestyle in West Germany, from general living standards to pop music and blue jeans among young people.

- The Soviet Union as a superpower has collapsed, even though the state apparatus had over millions of soldiers; over 60,000 tanks; had nuclear warheads and long-range missiles. Certainly it also played a role that the reality of everyday life was only an illusion of the official ideology; that the planned economy was not able to come anywhere near the standard of living in the West; and that in the multi-national empire national thinking could not be overcome. Civil rights activists like Andrej Sakharov or Alexander Ginsburg kept the upper hand; Alexander Solzhenitsyn's influence must also be mentioned in this context.

The Solidarnosc trade union movement in Poland; Nelson Mandela and Aung San Suu Kyi are further examples of how entire systems can be changed by the “power of the brave”.

The power of the markets in the context of globalization, in connection with technology and communication, has led to the fact that globalization has created a new world economic order. Initially, there were political decisions that led to parts of the economy being privatized and deregulated in the 1980s. But it was then the market forces that led to the creation of global competition in key areas. State monopolies previously protected were dismantled; In China alone, steel production rose from 46 million t in 1985 to 738 million t just 30 years later. The winners were those who could prevail worldwide; Losers those who could not keep up with this dynamic, for example in traditional industries. Donald Trump's efforts to turn the wheel show how difficult it is for politicians to influence this development.

The economic and financial crisis in 2008 also showed that events were primarily determined by the markets and that politics had the greatest difficulty in reacting; that governments were just about able to mitigate the crises.

- Another phenomenon that has a decisive impact on international relations and that has an impact on domestic politics in many countries is the migration movement. There are now numerous studies on why millions of people are leaving their homes to find a better future in North America or Europe. The wars in the Middle East, political and social conflicts, high crime rates and corrupt governments are just as many reasons as lack of educational opportunities; high unemployment, high population growth or already noticeable effects of climate change.

Another important factor is that the population of Africa will double from the current 1 billion by the middle of this century; while Europe's population is expected to shrink by 31 million; and constitute only 5.7% of the world's population in 2100. In addition, people in Europe are getting older, while the proportion of young people in African countries is increasing.

Our question is: Why is the world changing? Even if different analyzes give different answers, one thing can be said: there was no governmental power behind these very decisive developments; there were hardly any programs to be implemented. Global migration and even individual attempts to slow down migration or to contain it by walls can hardly be successful, as long as total dissatisfaction, combined with high expectations, determines people's thinking in the countries of origin.

- The rise of Islamic fundamentalism over the past few decades also raises the question of how far this development has been planned or at least made possible by political decisions? How far were religious or political groups initiative? The fundamental goals of fundamentalism are the return to primal Islam and the fight against foreign infiltration. It is about breaking the line between secular and spiritual authority. In addition, this movement has an expansionist component: the Islamic legal order, the Islamic world order, should rule all over the world.

The ideologies such as nationalism, socialism or pan-Arabism, which were temporarily adopted by the West, disappointed people in the Arab world. This is why their own roots, Islam, were rediscovered. It was this combination of religious conviction and political will that gave Islamic fundamentalism its special power.

If the United States then tried to take advantage of this religious dynamic by supporting a fundamentalist terrorist network in Afghanistan in the fight against the Soviet Union,

then it must be seen as a "cunning of history", if America only a few years later started the global "war against terror".

- Which forces and which powers have brought about the social and cultural changes concerning the role of state and society today; of faith and church? Our social environment very different from a few years ago; and the new role models of man and woman have decisively changed the acceptance of various interpersonal relationships or job profiles.

The power of minorities and initiatives by the cultural avant-garde probably played a role here, as did the willingness of young people to bring about social change, even if this involved risks. The political power has often been limited to not preventing this change or setting framework conditions for it afterwards.

On the other hand, global information systems have made a major contribution to global engagement for new ideas and ideals; that global standards are set, the non-compliance of which can be shown; or whose violation is denounced internationally. In any case, it is interesting that the term "modern" first prevailed in art and culture, where new contents and new forms of expression were found before mass production in industry and modern warfare began. Later, "post-modernism" became established in art, and society became an information society.

In general, one can say the following about developments in recent decades: "Power" is not an absolute term, but, as General Stanley McChrystal explains in his book "Leaders", depends on the "arrangement among stakeholders"; in other words, on the type of exercise of power as well as on those affected; from the overall system as well as from the expectations of the people concerned. When TIME shows the Egyptian footballer Mohamed Salah, who plays for Liverpool, on the front page of his 2019 edition of "The 100 Most Influential People"; and then in addition to Donald Trump also names the writer Marlon James and the Puerto Rican singer Ozuna, this corresponds entirely to the picture that shows who exercises power and influence today.

4. The global superiority of the USA

4.1. The will to power

The United States has the will to exercise power. After the collapse of the Soviet Union and after the victory in the First Gulf War, American President George Bush (father)

declared that a "new world order" had emerged. What was actually new? The United States recognized the unique opportunity to lead the world alone in the new situation; to decide alone when and where military force can be used; if possible, with the consent of the United Nations, if necessary, even without it.

Francis Fukuyama spoke of the "end of history", that is, the ultimate victory of American ideas about democracy and a market economy. But there was another major innovation: if the treatment of one's own citizens was previously an "internal matter" of every state, the UN has now determined for the first time that the abuse of a state's own citizens can "pose a threat to peace". This granted the United States the right to control security zones in Iraq, a sovereign state, with "Operation Provide Comfort", that is, to intervene at will.

In the "Defense Planning Guidance", under Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney in 1992, it was determined that "the United States' political and military mission is to prevent a military force from emerging anywhere in the world that could jeopardize American leadership". This was to establish US military dominance for the future.

Under President Bill Clinton, military interventions under the slogans "Liberal Interventionism" and "Humanitarian Actions" in Bosnia, Kosovo and Haiti were further expanded. It also succeeded in finding a new task for NATO. Under the motto of defending "American values", the US could intervene wherever American interests were concerned. In doing so, there was largely agreement between "liberal internationalists" and "neo-conservatives". Democratic institutions and liberal values should be anchored around the world. Because, according to the official statement, democracies would not wage wars against each other. Anyway; the USA was thus given the opportunity to intervene worldwide; if necessary, to create governments in their own likeness through "regime change".

4.2. Wars always and everywhere

The September 11, 2001 attacks further militarized American foreign policy. Over the next seven years, the US defense budget increased by 80%. Of the 1.6 million American soldiers, 500,000 are stationed abroad today; on 800 military bases in 172 countries. The United States has 50 formal allies on every continent; while in comparison China may have one, namely North Korea.

The invasion of Afghanistan took place in 2001 to punish the country for sheltering Al Qaeda terrorists. Then followed in 2003 the invasion of Iraq; participation in the fighting in Libya, Syria and Yemen in subsequent years. US special forces are also in Niger and Somalia; as well as in Mali, Thailand, Jordan and other areas of the world. In 2017, 37,813 U.S. soldiers served on secret missions (New York Times October 2017). There are 40,000 US troops stationed in Japan; in South Korea 24,000; in Germany 36,000; in the UK 8300; 1400 in Turkey, 6500 in Bahrain and 3000 in Qatar.

One thing is also significant: when President Trump decided to withdraw US troops from only one of these war zones, namely from Syria, he was criticized by large sections of public opinion as "irresponsible" and as an "isolationist".

The "National Security Strategy" (NSS) of September 2002 forms an essential basis for the "fight against terrorism" and the associated worldwide engagement. It states that the USA does not hesitate to act alone and preventively in the fight against terrorism. Preventive wars became an official part of the American military strategy.

The "Revolution in Military Affairs" also helped to strengthen belief in the insurmountability of the US armed forces. Accordingly, technological progress has increased the destructive power of weapons so decisively that neither in the world nor in space could anyone oppose the US military power. In fact, under President Bush (son), the United States set up a "CYBERCOM" military command, which had already carried out over 200 cyber attacks in 2011.

Russia was held responsible for cyber attacks against targets in Estonia and Georgia years ago. Books have been written about Putin's new "cyber armies". The Chinese are repeatedly accused of engaging in industrial espionage via cyber attacks. In general, one can assume that at a time when information systems are crucial to life in peace and war, a lot of energy is used to destroy them in an emergency. Even under President Obama, the United States has massively expanded the military use of drones. As early as 2013, the U.S. Armed Forces had 11,000 drones that killed 8,000 people, including a significant number of civilians, despite the alleged accuracy. So if the goal of a drone operation is to covertly and remotely control enemies, then this has certainly been achieved. How far this can also suppress terrorism is a completely different question.

In any case, it can be assumed that, in terms of military strength, the United States has no equivalent opponent on the ground, in the air, in water and in space, both with classic weapons and with modern robots.

4.3. "Ersatz"- Wars

If the United States uses other means besides armed power to enforce its will, it is because wars are expensive and unpopular the longer they last; and are obviously difficult to win despite military superiority. Various forms of "substitute wars" were therefore developed in the form of judicial imperialism, the economic wars and the propaganda wars.

4.3.1. "Might is right"

According to the motto "might is right", the US practices worldwide judicial imperialism. Even if sanctions have been imposed by Washington in violation of international law, those who do not comply are persecuted. If cross-border money transfers are made in dollars, the U.S. judiciary has the right to investigate. In December 2018, the chief financial officer of the Chinese technology group Huawei was arrested in Canada at the request of the US judiciary; Austria is required to deliver a previously undamaged Ukrainian CEO, Dmytro Firtasch; Top officials from the world football association FIFA were arrested in Switzerland for extradition to the United States.

On the other hand, major international treaties are not recognized by the United States: they have never ratified the KYOTO agreement; never recognized the International Criminal Court; and have unilaterally withdrawn from the nuclear *deal* that was concluded between the international community and Iran. Anyone who opposes American interests must be punished. If necessary, they also rely on laws from the 18th century, such as the "Alien Tort Claims Act" of 1789, as well as on sanctions that they have arbitrarily imposed yourself.

4.3.2. Economic wars

This is also the attitude underlying the economic wars. The important thing is that most of the time it is about more than economic issues, even if these are already very important: the total value of the US goods trade with China in 2018 was \$ 660 billion, with \$ 120 billion on exports and \$ 540 billion were imported goods. Past US administrations have criticized China for not adhering to WTO rules; copying inventions and manipulating their own currency in order to achieve trade advantages.

For the United States, its own economic strength has always been part of "national security". If China is now in the process of expanding huge infrastructure projects worldwide as part of the "New Silk Road", then this shows that the economic war with the USA is also about future geopolitical dominance. For this reason it can be explained that the 25 US intelligence agencies are not only involved in the "war on terror", as it is officially called, but also to provide American companies with the information they need against foreign competition. At least that's what the French media reported.

Even if the United States is not as dominant economically as it is militarily and Chinese GDP will only overtake the American one by 2030, the United States is still the world leader in "Research & Development". The rapidly growing government debt, which was only 35% of GDP in 2000 but will reach 100% in 2023, is likely to affect US leadership, as well as dwindling trust in the country's political institutions. After all, America is much better positioned in terms of power politics than Britain, the world's leading power at the time of the First World War: England was then the third largest military power; with the fourth largest GDP; was nevertheless able to play a global leadership role.

In any case, the goal of the current economic war with China and the measures against Europe is not only to enable American companies to sell their products freely. It is about the leadership role in the global economy and how the economic balance of power will be redistributed in the future. The efforts of the BRIC countries (Brazil, Russia, India, China) to create an alternative monetary system to weaken the role of the dollar in a future world monetary system should also be seen in this context.

4.3.3. Propaganda war

In an information society like ours, advertising plays a major role. In this sense, it can be assumed that all countries, but especially the great powers, are promoting their interests and ideological positions. Different views are propagandistically presented, which leads to propaganda wars again and again. Since the secret services are also involved, it is often not clear what normal reporting is or which messages are being directed and consciously controlled. Sometimes it only becomes clear after a while how far the real conditions have differed from the official representations.

For example, the United States initially denied responsibility in numerous international incidents: from shooting down the U-2 reconnaissance plane; to the "Gulf of Tonkin" incident; to the weapons of mass destruction in Iraq that never existed. It is crucial that

the United States did not dismantle its propaganda machine after the end of the Cold War, but rather expanded it. It is also essential that leading Western media, in spite of all the criticism that is repeatedly used, take an offensive line against competitors: "Putin wants a new world order", one reads again and again, although the power base of the Russian president is only a fraction of that of the West. "China is arming", even though the Chinese military budget is barely a third of the American one. Saddam Hussein was portrayed as "a threat to world peace"; however, his army was defeated in a few days during the Second Gulf War.

At the same time, the US is portrayed as a "benevolent leader"; their military interventions therefore serve "peace" and the "stability of a region". Whatever the reality, it is difficult to believe in objective reporting in such representations.

The power of language or the chosen words plays a significant role in this. If you want to get to the reality of American foreign policy, you first have to penetrate a fog of idealistic phrases. The policy of President Woodrow Wilson, who led the United States into World War I, is portrayed as absolutely idealistic. After still leading his campaign in 1916 to keep his country out of the war in Europe, he sent US troops "to end all wars"; and "to make the world safe for democracy", as the official justification was called. In fact, it was about saving the war credits that would have been lost had England been defeated.

Even today, the US spends \$ 2 billion annually on "democracy promotion". This is likely to include spending on preparing the "colour revolutions" as well as helping to overthrow those governments that Washington is not approving of. How far is propaganda when "more armament" is equated with "more security"; or if higher armaments expenditures are equated with "assuming more responsibility"? If it can be read again and again that "NATO must be saved" because it is essential for world peace, this may well be the author's conviction, but it is also propaganda.

Of course, other countries also have their propaganda facilities: Russia Today (RT), the Russian television station, is repeatedly accused of being Putin's mouthpiece. In fact, RT is more a platform for critical minds from the West, who do not necessarily share the officially represented opinions with regard to politics, economy and society. And the People's Republic of China has an extensive network of Confucius Institutes worldwide, whose task is to promote the Chinese language and culture.

But the USA also has a huge advantage in this area because the US media are more respected worldwide than everyone else; because the US culture scene and

Hollywood are formative; and because the young Chinese flock to American universities to study there and not the other way around.

5. New framework conditions for the exercise of power

If the United States has succeeded, above all militarily, but also economically, in building a global superiority that has probably not existed since the Roman Empire, then the question arises why America still cannot succeed to enforce its will worldwide unconditionally.

One of the main reasons is that the conditions under which power can be exercised have changed dramatically, both domestically and internationally. The education and information revolution had the effect of making it more difficult to enforce a political will. There are new dimensions of security and power; as well as a “revolution in NON-military affairs”. In addition, the large number of new players has led to the breakdown of the states' monopoly on power.

5.1. The education and information revolution

Never before in history has so many young people been given access to school education and training. As a result, people became more confident and critical; politics is questioned; one is no longer ready to simply accept the will of others. The information revolution has reinforced this tendency.

Developments and events that were previously accepted or had to be accepted are now facing resistance. This applies not only to major events such as wars and military operations, but also concerns environmental protection, development aid, security and human rights.

Since the Enlightenment, it has been one of the European educational ideals to explain the development of the world and to promote the possibilities of rational transformation in the sense of progress. It was hoped that these expectations would be met above all within the framework of the nation state. The international community is now increasingly asked to act in this way. The educational revolution has increased the interest of many people to participate in it; at the same time, power politics are critically questioned and viewed with suspicion.

The educational revolution has also strengthened the power of “soft power”: people can see which lifestyle is the most attractive for them; which role models they want to follow. The information revolution has made it possible to see what is going on in the most remote corners of the world. This creates a feeling of consternation, sometimes of shared responsibility. International relations are no longer just about relations between states and governments; the fate of people has also become part of foreign policy. Rulers must take this into account. It became much more difficult to legitimize the exercise of power.

5.2. New dimensions of security and power

For 1000 years, international security was a military security. A strong army was to ensure that one country could not be attacked or oppressed by another. In this sense, power was above all military power: the one who had the stronger troops or who knew better how to use them was able to impose his will on the other.

So if international security was 90% military security for the longest time, international security today is only 10% military-based; accordingly, power is now only 10% military power.

What has changed? While the issue of intergovernmental security used to be about one crucial question: who is the stronger? International security today encompasses many aspects - practically all areas that affect citizens in the welfare state: the welfare state has acquired an international dimension; from security of living conditions up to security of currency; from health safety to environmental protection; from guaranteeing human rights to education and training. Today it is about "human security", that is, people should feel comfortable and safe in a wide variety of areas of life.

How do you want to solve these security issues through armed conflict? These different aspects of security require international cooperation and mutual trust, otherwise they cannot be resolved. Even those developments that are primarily determined by markets and technologies, even if they pose a threat, can hardly be solved militarily.

Similarly, the structure of power has also changed: today there are a large number of players, far beyond the state actors, who exercise power. Countless NGOs, corporations, the media, and even private actors have stepped on the scene and have thus led to a fragmentation of power.

5.3. *The revolution in "NON-military Affairs"*

Entire libraries were written about the "Revolution in military Affairs", that is, that modern technology has revolutionized warfare; that modern weapons have achieved unprecedented precision and power; so that, in particular, the US armed forces are able to conquer the whole world and beyond.

All of that may be true. But at the same time, the environment in which wars are waged has changed dramatically:

- For centuries, war and the use of force have been the norm in international relations and have been accepted. Wars were the "extension of politics by other means". Not today; international law prohibits the use of violence. There are numerous treaties that prohibit war and the United Nations constitution prohibits the use of violence. Only self-defense and military operations approved by the UN Security Council are permitted.

Waging war means killing and destroying. Nothing changed about that. What is new today is that the world is watching. The influence of the mass media, which report directly on combat operations, can hardly be overestimated. If people in their living room can watch how killing takes place on the battlefield or how entire areas are destroyed, then it will be more difficult for any army command to deploy troops at will.

- On July 1, 2002, the International Criminal Court (ICC) started its work. Recognized by 123 countries around the world, this court punishes crimes against humanity, war crimes and genocide. International criminal courts for the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda had already been set up to punish offenses committed during the conflicts in these countries. Even though some powers, such as the United States, China, and Russia, do not recognize the ICC, a large part of the international community through its establishment has shown that wars and war crimes are no longer a normal part of international relations.

It is also not insignificant that the attitude to heroism has changed. Since time immemorial it has been considered "beautiful and glorious to die in the field of honor". During the First World War, the commanding English general spoke of a "glorious day" when his country had 60,000 victims in the first 12 hours of the Somme offensive. Today, even professional armies have to do everything possible to avoid victims in their own ranks. And the "field of honor" has largely shifted from the battlefield to the soccer field.

In any case, it has become much more difficult to wage wars and win battles. This is not only shown by the decades of wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. The “war on terror” can hardly be described as a great success either, as there are now four times as many Islamic terrorists as in September 2001 (as the New York Times reported in November 2018). But how can you actually disenchant utopias that are directed towards the hereafter? How can you give support and home to someone who is uprooted?

Obviously, it is hardly possible to achieve these goals by military means. It is therefore incomprehensible that at a time when most threats are non-military, armed violence is still seen as the solution to the problems. How else would it be possible for NATO to require that member states spend on arms at 2% of GDP? Because one thing has become clear in recent years: even a military victory does not mean that the given political problems will be solved.

5.4. The new players

The new division of power in international relations has taken place to a very decisive extent because, in addition to the existing actors, the nation states, new players have appeared on the scene. They succeeded in mobilizing new political thinking and implementing it in such a way that existing structures could not withstand the pressure. Of these new players, the NON governmental organizations (NGOs); the old and the new media; as well as the multinational corporations.

The number of NGOs has increased almost immeasurably in recent years. Based on the student movement in 1968, awareness increased that the world should no longer be accepted as it is. Organizations such as Amnesty International in the field of human rights; Green Peace in the environmental field or Oxfam for development aid show that they can achieve a lot, often in cooperation with the media. The Olympic Committee is able to give states legitimacy and prestige; and FIFA organizes soccer tournaments that are watched by millions of people around the world.

In many areas, NGOs have succeeded in filling in the space that exists between citizens and governments, which has led to the claim to represent a new international “civil society”.

- Old and new media also play a new role in international relations because they have managed to establish a global radius of action. CNN, Al-Jazeera, France 24 and RT not only report worldwide, they are also able to mobilize public opinion in various places

around the world. Forums were created with which international events can be followed, commented on and controlled “live”.

There is also one more thing: TV appearances create legitimacy. Heads of government previously announced their policies to national parliaments, but now everything is waiting for press conferences to be informed about sanctions, wars or peace talks. It goes so far that it has already been said that what is not on CNN does not exist in international events.

The new media like mobile phones; Facebook or Twitter have given millions of people the opportunity not only to follow and comment on international events, but also to publicly demonstrate their own opinions of how this happened in an impressive way during the “Arab Spring”. It has also been seen very clearly that it is easier to organize resistance using the new networks than to build new political structures or to find a majority for them.

While there have been revolutions in former generations, today there is a multitude of protest movements worldwide, from the "yellow vests" in France to the mass exodus in Venezuela; from the overthrow of the president in Algeria to that in Sudan. Some places have made headlines as places of protest: Tahrir Square in Cairo; Azadi in Tehran or the Maidan in Kiev. The communication made possible by the new media made the mobilization of the masses much easier.

In the age of new media, everyone can feel like an expert, a referee, even an actor in the field of international relations. George Clooney, Princess Diana and Bernard-Henry Lévy have demonstrated this in an impressive way. It has been shown, however, that it is easier to declare South Sudan to be independent than to set it up as a functioning state; or initiate NATO bombing in Libya rather than preventing chaos there.

- The multinational corporations have not only contributed to the unification of the world market, they have also emerged as new players in international relations. Their power is greater than that of many states, because they are the ones who determine the rules of the game, from the choice of location to tax policy. The order of magnitude shows the market value that individual groups achieved in 2018: Apple \$ 913 billion; Amazon 842; Google 815; Microsoft 775; Facebook 572; in comparison, Coca-Cola was worth \$ 189 billion on the stock exchange.

In any case, it can be said that the new players have significantly changed the essence of the exercise of power: it is no longer enough to convince states or their governments, where their interests are; it is more about convincing people and citizens. The number

of those involved in decision-making has grown dramatically; likewise the number of those who have to be convinced that political decisions are correct. In addition, you don't have to be a citizen of a major power to live in prosperity. Why then go to war and conquer other countries, even if smaller communities can succeed in creating wealth. In any case, all of these developments have contributed to containing the omnipotence of the United States. Many people no longer want to accept that a "hegemon" sets rules for the rest of the world that he does not abide by.

6. Is there a big war?

In the National Security Strategy presented by Washington in December 2017, the United States was not only portrayed as a guarantor of the international order, but also as a country that has been "a force of good" throughout its history. Russia and China, on the other hand, are seen as hostile states, because they seek to reorganize the international order. Because the United States not only want to maintain the sole, global claim to leadership, they are also opposed to other countries, pursuing their own interests, even in their immediate neighbourhood. Because, as Secretary of State Hillary Clinton once said, "the time of national spheres of interest is over"; what sounds like irony from the mouth of the representative of a country that maintains hundreds of military bases around the world.

Now China has become an economic power over the past few decades, which is quite willing to use its influence also in terms of power politics. President Xi Jinping's favorite project, the Belt and Road Initiative, may initially seem like a great vision. In fact, Beijing spends billions of dollars on infrastructure projects, ports and economic cooperation, of course also to expand its political power.

From Washington, Chinese politics is viewed as a revisionist undertaking that endangers the existing order and thus peace. A key factor supporting this stance: those voices, both in science and in public opinion, who believe that this development can only result in a war between the United States and China. Graham Alistair's book "Destined for War" (without a question mark) became a bestseller, referring to the "Thucydides trap". The Greek historian said 2500 years ago that war must inevitably arise between an emerging power and an existing supremacy, as was the case between Athens and Sparta.

But John Mearsheimer also speaks in his book "The Tragedy of Great Power Politics" that "destructive rivalry" is inevitable between major powers. And Samuel P. Huntington dedicates the last chapter of his book "The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order" to war.

This view is repeatedly supported in the media, often combined with the call to increase armaments expenditure. One often refers to historical examples, as if humanity had learned nothing in centuries and millennia. In April 2019, for example, an article appeared in the New York Times under the heading "Resembling the French at Agincourt". Reference is made to the battle of 1415 that we know from Shakespeare and in which the French lost because they were not up to the new technology of the English, the "longbow". Clear conclusion: America needs to arm more in order to win the coming wars.

In Europe, traditional power thinking has been overcome and foreign policy has also been aligned with the well-being of citizens. The big question is whether this development will be possible on other continents, particularly in America.

(*) Dr. Wendelin Etmayer; former Member of the National Council; former ambassador to Finland / Estonia; Canada / Jamaica; at the Council of Europe;
www.wendelinettmayer.at