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- Can Leadership theory help?
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Power and hegemonic control

• Niccolo Macchiavelli: Power is like a centaur: half man, half beast
  A mix of

  – *hard* power (force, coercion) and
  – *soft* power (persuasion, consent)
A map of power relations
(John Scott: Power (2001:16))

1. Elementary forms of power

Corrective influence
Force
Manipulation

Persuasive influence
Signification
Legitimation

2. Developed forms of power:

Domination through constraint
Coercion
(lions)
Inducement
(foxes)

Domination through discursive formation
Expertise
(owls)
Command
(bears)
Power continuum

Consensual power---------Conflictive power

Power to                        Power over
(act in concert)                 (rule)

Parsons, Arendt, Barnes -------- Lukes, Bachrach, Wrong
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Conflict over</th>
<th>Legitimacy</th>
<th>Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Social Order</td>
<td>Regime of truth</td>
<td>‘Naturalising’ Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Rules of the Game (regime)</td>
<td>Procedures and standards</td>
<td>To set the rules and the agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Outcome of the Game</td>
<td>Acceptability of outcome</td>
<td>To win the game</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No war, no peace?

Water wars

- Didn’t happen

- ‘Hydro-conflict always related to/proxy for something else

Water peace

Regimes remain limited

Very few multilateral

Regimes easy to dodge/cancel
Ancient Greeks:

Empire (coercion)

↔

- Hegemony (power and knowledge) as **desirable** relationship of mutual autonomy in everyone’s interest
- Hegemon decides who is a friend, who is an enemy

↔

Unregulated power (anarchy)
Haugaard’s Hegemonies
(2006:8)

• Classical Imperial

Positive
Leader of allies pursuing common interests

Negative
• Imperial use of alliance to its own ends

• Gramscian

Positive
– Hegemony is embodiment of proletarian rule

Negative
• Socialised, globalising Cultural norms
Hegemony is politically silent

- ‘Hegemony at its most effective is mute; ideology invites argument’ (Comaroff and Comaroff 1992: 29).

- What is silent is beyond politics
- Politicisatio = imagining alternatives (Guzzini)
**Parsing Hegemonic challenge:**
offensive and defensive Realism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crisis</th>
<th>Offensive Realism</th>
<th>Defensive Realism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initiator</td>
<td>Responds to hostile actions (however, aggressive political rhetoric may aggravate situation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Modernization/Weapons Buildup</td>
<td>Immediate, rapid buildup with a goal of utilizing all resources to maximize power potential</td>
<td>Goal to modernize to parity or near-parity levels with nearest strategic competitor—aims to create a credible minimum deterrent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Social Policy</td>
<td>Suppress domestic opposition without responding to international objections</td>
<td>Control internal dissent to the point that state can appear unified in its policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Rhetoric</td>
<td>Open, aggressive, unclear intentions</td>
<td>Clearly defined policies and objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Territory</td>
<td>Blind projection of power to acquire more territory as projection potential permits</td>
<td>Target area viewed as defensive perimeter within which the state will project its power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Organizations (IOs)</td>
<td>Global and/or regional rivalries, cooperation and involvement in IOs difficult as power projection will decrease trust of IO members</td>
<td>Regional rivalries, large-scale participation in IOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance Formation</td>
<td>Offensive alliance possible: after-effect of an offensive realist on its former allies threaten relative gains obtained</td>
<td>Will only engage in regional alliances if they play into potential for regional hegemony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Policy</td>
<td>Pirating, economic sabotage, exploitation of cheap domestic labor</td>
<td>Champion regional resources in large-scale, global trade cooperation and trade organizations, exploit cheap domestic labor to an extent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Countering hegemony

Three types:

- Hegemonic challenge
- Counterhegemony
- Ahegemony
Counterhegemony – a contradiction in terms?

- In neo-Realism in IR, counterhegemony does not exist, only ‘hegemonic challenge’, which can lead to an epoch of nonhegemony

- *Hegemonic challenge* is not the same thing as counterhegemony: in Gramscian analysis, counterhegemony involves a coherent alliance and ideology to unseat the ‘Prince’ (hegemonic actor/s)

- *Nonhegemony* is not the same thing as *ahegemony*, which only exists in critical (postpositivist) theory.
Couterhegemony

• Shallow conflict - replace hegemon by another
• Deep conflict - replace one order by another

• Internally – consciousness
  ‘to know oneself is to be oneself (...) to free oneself from a state of chaos’, development of a personality (understanding & feeling), capture and construct a particular reality

• Externally – self-organisation
So what, then, is a-hegemony?

Resistance to the hegemon?

- One hegemon or coalition replaces another
- Comes from outside or from the center of power

Resistance to the order/regime?

Ahegemony: overcoming the narrative common to hegemony and counterhegemony; extending the boundary of the possible cosmopolitan citizenship.

- critical social movements

(us – them)

We = the global we
On Leadership…

• Hegemony has a bad ring, leadership has a good ring. ..
• Linguistically it is the same thing…
• Let us see how the literature on leadership can be squared with that on hegemony
The Army says:

- Leadership is influencing people -- by providing purpose, direction, and motivation -- while operating to accomplish the mission and improving the organization."
Leadership styles

Hegemony = guidance, leadership, to explore new territory

There are nicer and nastier ways of exerting control

The question remains whether the observed ‘nicer’ (refined) ways of exerting control are less exploitative than the blunt ways!
Leadership styles
(after Likert)

• Authoritarian: power concentration, penalties
  – Exploitative
• Paternalistic: directed inwards (supplies needs)
  – Benevolent
• Participative: power delegation, consultation, information sharing, incentives
• Delegative: relative autonomy
• Free reign: laissez faire, autonomy

- The ladder of Participation (sharing power)
  Is similar to the Likert sliding scale of modes of leadership …
  – But how about ‘unobtrusive surveillance’?
### Arnstein ladder of participation (power sharing)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Varying degrees of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Citizen Control</td>
<td>Stakeholders handle the entire job of planning, policymaking and managing a programme.</td>
<td>Citizen power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Delegated Power</td>
<td>Citizens holding a clear majority of seats on committees with delegated powers to make decisions. Public now has the power to assure accountability of the programme to them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>Power is in fact redistributed through negotiation between citizens and power holders. Planning and decision-making responsibilities are shared e.g. through joint committees.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Placation</td>
<td>For example, co-option of handpicked 'worthies' onto committees. It allows citizens to advise or plan ad infinitum but retains for power holders the right to judge the legitimacy or feasibility of the advice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>Attitude surveys, neighbourhood meetings and public enquiries.</td>
<td>Varying degrees of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Informing</td>
<td>A most important first step to legitimate participation. But too frequently the emphasis is on a one way flow of information. No channel for feedback.</td>
<td>tokenism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Therapy</td>
<td>Both are non-participatory. The aim is to ‘cure’ or educate the participants. The proposed plan is best and the job of participation is to achieve public support by public relations.</td>
<td>Non-participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Manipulation</td>
<td>Non-participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Governance = Hegemony at home: is government first among equals?

- State increasingly presents itself as such:
  … facilitator, coordinator, mediator, acting secretary…

In practice, government still has the ‘means of coercion’ at its disposal and can decide….

Strategy of co-optation/persuasion
- ’Selling’ rather than ‘imposing’ policy
On Cooperative security
## Types of security complex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>raw anarchy</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hobbesian</strong></td>
<td>From fighting to détente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securitisation</td>
<td>There is never enough security</td>
<td>Securitised (conflict)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all actors have to fend for themselves and expect others to do likewise;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>a mature anarchy</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lockeian</strong></td>
<td>From détente to learning and institution-building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with some common regimes</td>
<td>Contest over security as a scarce resource</td>
<td>Desecuritised (negative peace)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politicisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shared rules, and institutions for governing an issue-area in International Relations,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>security community</strong></td>
<td><strong>Kantian</strong></td>
<td>Integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal politics</td>
<td>Security is not an issue</td>
<td>Asecurity (positive peace)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where war (violence) has become an unthinkable way of resolving conflicts between states</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# From empire to integration?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Empire</th>
<th>Hegemony</th>
<th>Integration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Power aspect</strong></td>
<td>Coercion</td>
<td>Coercion</td>
<td>Consent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy</strong></td>
<td>Colonising periphery</td>
<td>Colonising nature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Turkey</strong></td>
<td>at home</td>
<td>Ottoman Empire</td>
<td>State of emergency, unification policy, repression of dissent, fear of terrorism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abroad</td>
<td></td>
<td>Damming rivers unilaterally, fear of ‘unruly neighbourhood’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Egypt</strong></td>
<td>at home</td>
<td>(British) Empire</td>
<td>State of Emergency, unification policy, repression of dissent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abroad</td>
<td></td>
<td>Foreclosure of upstream development (Colonial treaty) Threat to neighbours, interference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Third International Workshop on Hydro-Hegemony, LSE, May 2007*
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From war to peace?

• Regional Security complex analysis (Buzan 1991) identifies the nature of relations between security-interdependent states in a region as
  – anarchic
  – some regimes
  – integrated

Buzan and Waever highlight similarities with Wendt’s classification of Hobbesian, Lockeian and Kantian ‘cultures’ in IR (see next)
# 3 Cultures in International Society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hobbes</th>
<th>Locke</th>
<th>Kant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kill or be killed</td>
<td>Kill or be killed</td>
<td>Live and let live</td>
<td>Love thy neighbour as thou lovest thyself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worst case scenario</td>
<td>Worst case scenario</td>
<td>Rationality; utility maximisation</td>
<td>Friendship precedes rationality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you want peace, prepare for war</td>
<td>If you want peace, prepare for war</td>
<td>War will decline</td>
<td>Military strength is unimportant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No rules apply; don’t trust anyone</td>
<td>No rules apply; don’t trust anyone</td>
<td>Rules apply, even in war</td>
<td>War rules are needless; any conflict can be solved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Four modes of security provision  
(Warner, forthcoming)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dominant Form</th>
<th>Thinker</th>
<th>Who speaks security?</th>
<th>Coping through</th>
<th>Associated with:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protect</td>
<td>Securitisation</td>
<td>Hobbes, Waltz</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>Hammer, One-size-fits-all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unity, closure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage, Survey</td>
<td>Risk management</td>
<td>Foucault, Aradau</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Hegemony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contest</td>
<td>Politicisation,</td>
<td>Booth</td>
<td>Two, Three</td>
<td>Resistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>emancipation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn, Adapt</td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Habermas, Holling</td>
<td>Multi (dialogue)</td>
<td>Sponge Resilience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mesjasz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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