

*Mearsheimer's view - No amount of power is enough. In this context, Mearsheimer comes closer to Morgenthau. For both the scholars power is an end in itself. According to Mearsheimer USA should aspire for hegemony rather than balance. USA should not allow any country to gain balance of power vis-a-vis USA. The only guarantee of security is hegemony. According to Mearsheimer, **nations are not security maximizers, they are power maximizers.** China is acquiring power not for its security but for establishing its domination. He also believes that 'offence is the best defence.'*

He suggests that the history shows that the countries which have taken offensive actions have generally won the war rather than those who have defensive approach. Hence USA should go for offensive rather than defensive approach towards China.

Mearsheimer does not support Kenneth Waltz view that nations will form counter-coalitions in case country wants to become hegemon. He suggests that in such situations nations may prefer 'Bandwagoning'.

Criticism of Structural Realism

Domestic politics is not taken into consideration at all. Neorealists argue that the structure of international system does not give any scope for domestic politics.

System level explanation cannot help explain issues like foreign policy decision making (if realism is held true, there is little scope for decision making or even deliberation), political culture etc.

Realists focus too much on security issues. This focus limits analytical instruments to explain only economic relations.

The role of non-state actors is undermined.

The end of cold war and structural reconfiguration of international system has brought strong conceptual challenge to neorealist theory.

Neo Classical Realism

The basic difference between structural realist and neo-classical realist is that the neo-classical realist even include actor level analysis along with structure level analysis.

What does it imply?

It is true that the structures of international politics constrains the choices and hence foreign policies show continuity. Yet we cannot ignore the role of actors or personality factors in shaping foreign policy. Actors do make a difference. e.g. there is bound to be a difference if Nehru is shaping the foreign policy or Indira Gandhi. Hence if foreign policies reflect continuity, they also reflect change.