

Chapter 1 : definitions - What is the difference between a nation and a state? - Politics Stack Exchange

The words nation and state are sometimes used as synonyms. Sometimes, state is used as a synonym for nation or country, but nation and state have their own respective identities. A nation can be defined as group of people who are bound together into a single body, through history, customs, value.

What is the Difference Between a State and a Nation? Although the terms Although they do not refer to the same things, the words "nation" and "country" are often intertwined. Introduction When the word state is mentioned, many people will relate it to a nation, or even consider the two words as synonyms. Although many people think they are the same, the words nation and state are entirely different from one another. Territory A state is comprised of four elements: If one element is absent, it disqualifies the area from being called a state. However, a nation can be defined as a population who shares a similar culture and ideals. A nation is formed as a result of a common race, religion, language, territory, history, culture or political aspirations. These elements are not essential and are ever-changing. Political and Social Organization "State" is a politic term and refers to an area that is organized for the security of people. It is a legal entity with human actions. Although a state can be multinational, a nation can not be multinational. This means that two or more nations can be within a single state. However, two nations cannot be one which makes a nation very distinct from a state. Present day multinational states include: A state has police power and individuals who disobey are punished. A state is a political organization and it orders, coerces and punishes. A nation is backed by spiritual, emotional and moral power and it appeals to its citizens and persuades them. It is a unity rather than a political organization. Conclusion It is clearly evident that although a nation and a state sound the same, the two terms are vastly different. The individual functionalities and attributes of a state and a nation can be used to differentiate the two terms. This page was last updated on August 1,

Chapter 2 : The Difference Between a State, Nation, and Country - JamiiForums

A nation appeals, the State orders; a nation persuades, a State coerces; and a nation boycotts, the State punishes. State is a political organisation, while the nation is a unity. State and nation do not have the same boundaries, and yet there is a tendency for a nation and state to be one.

Nation is a large body of people united by common origin, history, culture, ethnicity, or language. The main difference between state and nation is that state is a political and legal entity whereas nation is a socio-cultural entity. What is a State A state is a territory considered as an organized political community under one government. A state has four main elements: A state also has fixed geographical boundaries. It is also not dependent or subordinate to any other state; it has an independent governance system. The population of the state may be made up of more than one nation. A state which is only populated by one nation is known as a nation state. But the population of many sovereign states in the world is made up of more than one nation. A state can be created with a conscious effort. For example, after , Pakistan was created as an independent state. A state has both political and legal power. Therefore, it can also create and impose laws. Nation state is a form of political entity in which a group of people who share the same history, traditions, or language live in a particular area under one government. What is a Nation Nation is a large body of people united by common origin, history, culture, ethnicity , or language. Nation is a cultural-political community. A nation is formed by factors like common race, common language, common culture, common history, common territory, etc. But none of these are absolute essentials. For example, a nation can survive without a territory, but love for a common territory may unite the nation. The elements that result in a nation are not always constant. Nation is always the result of evolution. It is also possible for two or more nations to exist within a single State. Nation is not a legal entity. It is the strong bond between people and common elements like ethnicity, language, and descent that keeps the nation together. Difference Between State and Nation Definition State is an independent political entity with fixed geographic boundaries. Reference State refers to a territory. Nation refers to a group of people. Territory State has a fixed territory. Type State is a political and legal entity. Nation is a socio-cultural entity. Origins State can be created consciously. Nation cannot be created consciously. Stability State is not as stable as a nation since it is a created concept. Nation is more stable than a state. Home State can be home to more than one nation. People belonging to different nations can live in different states. Sovereignty State cannot exist without sovereignty. Nation can exist without sovereignty. Unity State is united by laws and regulations. Nation is united by bonds and shared histories.

Chapter 3 : The Risk of Nation-State Conflict - by Walter Russell Mead

State vs Nation. State and nation are two of the most confused words irrespective of there being a clear difference between both. It is common to see people and even leaders invariably referring to their countries as nation or State.

Sometimes, state is used as a synonym for nation or country, but nation and state have their own respective identities. A nation can be defined as group of people who are bound together into a single body, through history, customs, value, language, culture, tradition, art and religion. On the contrary, a state can be defined as a patch of land with a sovereign government. A nation can be defined as a politico-cultural entity, which is identified by its unique character and collective rights. On the other hand, a state can be defined as a politico-judicial entity, which is identified by its sovereign rights. Well, the states together form a nation. However, a state will have a separate political entity within a nation. Though the states have their own rules, and can also bring in new laws, they must adhere to the national laws. The states cannot frame laws that is of no interest to the nation. A nation can be referred to as the holder of sovereignty, that has a big role in developing the fundamental norms of a state. A nation will have a constitution, whereas a state will not have a separate constitution. The policies pertaining to national interest are taken by the government at the national level, but the state governments cannot formulate such policies. A state is sometimes used as a synonym for nation or country. States together, form a nation. On the contrary, a state can be defined as a politico-judicial entity, which is identified by its sovereign rights. A nation can be defined as group of people who are bound together into a single body, through history, customs, value, language, culture, tradition, art and religion. A state can be defined as a patch of land with a sovereign government. A nation can be referred to as the holder of sovereignty. Policies pertaining to national interest are taken by the government at the national level, but the state governments cannot formulate such policies. If you like this article or our site. Please spread the word.

Chapter 4 : Difference Between Nation and State | Difference Between

A nation is an aggregate of people united by descent, history, culture or language, inhabiting a particular country or territory. A state is a nation or territory with an organized political community under one government. There are many differences between what is considered a state and what is.

What is the difference between state and nation? The accepted definition of a state was supplied by Max Weber in his book *Politics as a Vocation*: An empire does not have borders as it chooses to continually advance them. A state does not necessarily rule a people with a common culture, it is merely a political concept. Examples of a state: Examples of a nation: Countries where the social concept of "nation" coincides with the political concept of "state" are called nation-state. Examples of a nation-state: The difference between a state and a nation? A nation refers to a country which is defined by boundaries on a map, is self governing with their own laws and customs. A state is a smaller area within a nation. There may be many states which together comprise the nation. Also, the word state can mean nation in some cases. State, just the 1 in question. What is the difference between nation and nation state? A nation refers to a single ethnic community of people who share a common identity and usually a common origin, while a nation state may be multi-cultural and is defined as a group of people united in the political and legal structure of the State. A state is usually a political division of a nation. State executive branches only have authority through the state. The national executive branch has authority over state executive branches and it can enforce laws. Nation is more on ethnic concept while states is more on legal concept. What is the difference between the national law and the state law? State law are those laws enforceable only within the state in which they were enacted and were enacted by State government. A nation is some big place with a bunch of states or countries in it and a state is in a country like the US or somethin like that -anonymous Share to: What is the difference between a State park and a National park? State parks are managed by state governments, i. Montana, Virginia, or Florida. National parks are managed by the federal government, the United States. As such, they usually have somewhat different laws and policies that govern them and how people can use the parks.

Chapter 5 : What is the Difference Between a State and a Nation? - calendrierdelascience.com

Sometimes a nation can have a political entity and constitute a state, then it will be called a nation-state, that is, the territory of the state corresponds to the geographical territory of the same nation, as it is the case of France, for example.

Overview[edit] In the modern era, nation-building referred to the efforts of newly independent nations, notably the nations of Africa but also in the Balkans , [9] [10] to redefine the populace of territories that had been carved out by colonial powers or empires without regard to ethnic, religious, or other boundaries. This sometimes resulted in their near-disintegration, such as the attempt by Biafra to secede from Nigeria in , or the continuing demand of the Somali people in the Ogaden region of Ethiopia for complete independence. In Asia, the division of British India into India and Pakistan was in part due to ethnic differences, which might have been aided by other factors like colonial mismanagement of the situation. The Rwandan genocide as well as the recurrent problems experienced by the Sudan can also be related to a lack of ethnic, religious, or racial cohesion within the nation. It has often proved difficult to unite states with similar ethnic but different colonial backgrounds. Whereas some consider Cameroon to be an example of success, fractures are emerging in the form of the Anglophone problem. Failures like Senegambia Confederation demonstrate the problems of uniting Francophone and Anglophone territories. Nation-building versus state-building[edit] Traditionally, there has been some confusion between the use of the term nation-building and that of state-building the terms are sometimes used interchangeably in North America. Both have fairly narrow and different definitions in political science, the former referring to national identity, the latter to infrastructure and the institutions of the state. The debate has been clouded further by the existence of two very different schools of thought on state-building. The first prevalent in the media portrays state-building as an interventionist action by foreign countries. The second more academic in origin and increasingly accepted by international institutions sees state-building as an indigenous process. The confusion over terminology has meant that more recently, nation-building has come to be used in a completely different context, with reference to what has been succinctly described by its proponents as "the use of armed force in the aftermath of a conflict to underpin an enduring transition to democracy". Nationalism, Globalism and State-Terrorism. London and New York: Towards a Theory of Abstract Community. See also James, Paul Literacy, Nationalism, and the Communist Collapse. The Politics of Nation-Building: Making Co-Nationals, Refugees, and Minorities. Nation building in comparative contexts New paperback print. States and Non-State Actors in Conflict , eds. Adria Lawrence and Erica Chenoweth. Retrieved 27 June Third-party State-building in Occupied Territories". Nation-Building ", Atlantic Monthly. Beyond Afghanistan and Iraq [Online-Ausg.

Chapter 6 : Difference Between State and Nation | Definitions, Comparisons

The idea of a nation and a state being the same thing ("Nation-state") is fairly new in modern politics [1] (it came about as one of the consequences/results of Peace of Westphalia, which ended the year-war in Europe, when the concept of "Westphalian sovereignty" was introduced).

Some of the major differences between state and nation are as follows: In common usage, the terms State and Nation are often used as synonyms. Each modern state is a Nation State; nevertheless there exist some important distinctions between the State and the Nation. Points of Difference between State and Nation: The elements of State and Nation are different: The State has four elements—population, territory, government, and sovereignty. In the absence of even one element, a State cannot be really a State. A state is always characterised by all these four elements. On the contrary, a nation is a group of people who have a strong sense of unity and common consciousness. Common territory, common race, common religion, common language, common history, common culture and common political aspirations are the elements which help the formation of a nation, and yet none of these is an absolutely essential element. The elements which go to build a nation keep on changing. State is a Political Organisation while Nation is a social, cultural, psychological, emotional and political unity: The State is a political organisation which fulfills the security and welfare needs of its people. It is concerned with external human actions. It is a legal entity. On the other hand, a Nation is a united unit of population which is full of emotional, spiritual and psychological bonds. A nation has little to do with the physical needs of the people. Possession of a Definite Territory is essential for the State but not for a Nation: It is essential for each State to possess a fixed territory. It is the physical element of the State. State is a territorial entity. But for a nation territory is not an essential requirement. A nation can survive even without a fixed territory. Love of a common motherland acts as a source of unity. For example, before the Jews were a nation even though they had no fixed territory of their own. When, in , they secured a definite and defined territory, they established the State of Israel. Sovereignty is essential for State but not for Nation: Sovereignty is an essential element of the State. It is the soul of the State. In the absence of sovereignty, the State loses its existence. It is the element of sovereignty which makes the state different from all other associations of the people. It is not essential for a nation to possess sovereignty. The basic requirement of a nation is the strong bonds of emotional unity among its people which develop due to several common social cultural elements. Before , India was a nation but not a State because it did not have sovereignty. After her independence in , India became a State because after the end of British imperial rule it became a sovereign entity. However, each nation always aspires to be sovereign and independent of the control of every other nation. Nation can be wider than the State: The State is limited to a fixed territory. Its boundaries can increase or decrease but the process of change is always very complex. However a nation may or may not remain within the bounds of a fixed territory. Nation is a community based on common ethnicity, history and traditions and aspirations. Obviously its boundaries can easily extend beyond the boundaries of the State. For example in a way the French nation extends even to Belgium, Switzerland and Italy because people in these countries belong to the same race to which the French claim to belong. There can be two or more Nationalities living in one State: There can be two or more than two nations within a single State. Most of the modern states are multinational states. Nation is more stable than State: A nation is more stable than the State. When sovereignty ends, the State dies, but not the nation. A nation can survive even without sovereignty. For example, after their defeat in the World War II, both Germany and Japan lost their sovereign statuses and outside powers began to control them. They ceased to exist as States. But as nations they continued to live as nations, which after some months regained their sovereign statuses and became sovereign independent states. A State can be created while a Nation is always the result of evolution: A State can be created with the conscious endeavors of the people. Physical elements play an important role in the birth of a State. But Germans remained emotionally as one nation. In Pakistan was created out of India as a separate State. A nation is a unity of the people which emerges slowly and steadily. No special efforts go into the making of a nation. The State uses police power force for preserving its unity and integrity, the Nation is bound by strong cultural and historical links: State

has police power. Those who dare to disobey it are punished by the state. A nation does not have police power or force or coercive power. It is backed by moral, emotional and spiritual power. A nation survives on the power of sense of unity of the people. A nation appeals, the State orders; a nation persuades, a States coerces; and a nation boycotts, the State punishes. State is a political organisation, while the nation is a unity. State and nation do not have the same boundaries, and yet there is a tendency for a nation and state to be one. Most of the nations today stand organised into different states. Most of the modern States are multinational States. The modern state is called a nation-state because all the nationalities living in one state stand integrated into one nation. A state continuously pursues the objective of national- integration. The State tries to secure this objective by securing a willing blending of the majority nationality and all the minority nationalities, through collective living, sharing of all the ups and the downs in common and development of strong emotional, spiritual and psychological bonds. Unity in diversity or more really, unity in plurality stands accepted as the guiding principle by all the modern civilised multinational states like India, USA, Russia, China, Britain and others.

Chapter 7 : What is the difference between a state and a nation

Nation state is a form of political entity in which a group of people who share the same history, traditions, or language live in a particular area under one government. What is a Nation Nation is a large body of people united by common origin, history, culture, ethnicity, or language.

December 4, The world is made up of a mosaic of states, almost , but there are many more nations. How is it possible? It must be understood that the concepts of nation and state are indeed two different concepts, although the two terms are sometimes used to designate the same concept. In this article we will explain to you what the difference between State and Nation is in order to better understand the world around you. You may also be interested in: State A state is a political concept that refers to a sovereign social, economic, and political organization, formed by institutions that regulate the life of a community on a territory delimited by borders. In international law, for a state to be recognized as such, it must therefore respect three conditions: A state is often referred to as a country, because their meanings are very similar. In some cases, "country" can also designate regions or provinces of variable dimensions that are not states. Examples of this are the Basque country a region within the Spanish state , as it is a region with traditional and natural borders. S Constitution at all times. On one side, the National government has the following powers: To coin money Keep an eye on both interstate and overseas trade. On the other side, each of the states have the following powers: To ratify amendments Legislate on public safety and health Legislate on education. Nation The term "Nation" is not legally recognized, and its definition may vary according to geographical areas. As a rule, a nation refers to a population living in the same territory and united by the same history, culture, language or ethnic origin. Sometimes a nation can have a political entity and constitute a state, then it will be called a nation-state, that is, the territory of the state corresponds to the geographical territory of the same nation, as it is the case of France, for example. However, a Nation is not always synonymous of state, and there are nations without states, and states in which several nations cohabit. We will describe several cases below: The Kurdish nation is a stateless nation. The geographical territory of this nation straddles four countries: Iraq, Iran, Syria and Turkey. In all four countries, the Kurdish nation shares the same language, culture and religion. In Europe there are many nations that are not state-owned, and although they possess a degree of autonomy and sovereignty, they are an integral part of other states: There are states composed of several nations, such as the United Kingdom, composed of the English, Welsh, Scottish and Irish nation take a look at our article on the difference between England, Great Britain and the United Kingdom for more information , or Belgium composed of the Walloon and Flemish nation. A state can officially recognize the existence of one or more nations within it, as is the case in Canada, which officially recognizes that Quebecois form a nation in their own right within the state of Canada, though it has no obligation to do so. A nation is not recognized by international law. If you want to read similar articles to What is the Difference between Nation and State, we recommend you visit our Learning category.

A nation-state is a cultural group (a nation) that is also a state (and may, in addition, be a sovereign state). The word country can be used to mean the same thing as state, sovereign state, or nation-state.

Search research, experts, topics, or events Open search Walter Russell Mead His testimony begins at I want to thank the honorable Chair and distinguished Members of this important Committee for inviting me to speak and for affording me an opportunity to offer what help I can contribute to your important work. In my testimony this morning I will offer first a quick overview of the world situation as we look forward into the new century and then present an analysis of current and likely future developments in three regions of particular interest to the United States as they reflect on the question of the nature of the future conflicts for which the United States ought to prepare. While my testimony will deal largely with the possibilities for conflict, it is important to note here that the permanent and overriding goal of American policy is and should remain the promotion of peace. This country does not prepare for war because we are warlike and welcome war; Americans have learned over the centuries that in order to preserve peace it is necessary to inform ourselves about the dangers we face and, in consultation with likeminded states, to make the necessary preparations for defense. Introduction and Overview While it is difficult to see into the future at all and impossible to make detailed predictions, everything we know about history and human development suggests that the 21st century is unlikely to be a quiet time in international relations. As the preeminent world power, one with global interests and concerns, the United States is going to have to navigate the next stage in world history deftly. For the foreseeable future, the United States must work for peace without neglecting the necessary preparations to be ready if our efforts for peace do not succeed. The rapid pace of economic, technological, and social change around the world puts increasing pressure on existing states and political structures. That is likely to lead to enhanced tension and conflict within many states as well as between and among states. The relationship between accelerating social and economic change on the one hand and growing risks of war is not new. At the outset of the industrial revolution, European powers began to struggle to keep up with the rapid technological development going on in their societies, and with the attending social forces. They were not, on the whole, all that successful at avoiding bloodshed and political upheaval in their responses. At the same time as the industrial revolution was providing Europe with untold wealth and the tools to project power around the globe, it also began to tear at the political and societal seams of European society. As the industrial revolution swept east and south from its original base in northwestern Europe, ethnic and religious conflicts developed and ultimately broke up the large multi-ethnic and multi-religious empires of central and eastern Europe and the Middle East Ottoman, Austro-Hungarian, German, Russian in a mix of catastrophic war, genocide and ethnic cleansing that lasted from roughly to Those conflicts including both the Kurdish struggle and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict continue today, but a new wave of sectarian and ethnic tensions stretching east to west from Pakistan to Algeria, and north to south from Crimea to Kenya is taking shape today. While it is not inevitable that the tragic history of 19th and 20th century Europe and the Middle East will be repeated in this zone, the parallels are more than troubling, and wars in Syria and elsewhere underscore the seriousness of the situation in this explosive region. Well beyond this zone of conflict, rapid demographic change like that taking place in countries such as China and India can lead and in the past has led to greater internal tension and conflict even when economies are growing and living standards are rising. Mass urbanization is a revolutionary process that involves great cultural and social change. In China alone, urbanization has been a driving force behind the lifting of hundreds of millions of people out of extreme poverty, but urbanization has lifted them at the same time into a new political consciousness and is creating new sources of tension within China and, consequentially, in the region around it. In fact, quite the opposite happens as societies move from pre-modern to modern conditions; people gain the time, educational background and security to turn their attentions to political and social desires. At the same time, because state policies matter more to people living in modernizing economies and in urban areas than to illiterate farmers in traditional rural societies, city dwellers tend to be more politicized than peasants, and demand more from their

rulers. Various societies are reacting to mass urbanization in different ways, and they are at different stages in the process. China is in the climactic phases of a dramatic shift while India is still at a relatively early stage with massive movements to the city still to come. In the Islamic world, urbanization has been one key driver of radicalism, as ex-peasants struggle with the conditions of city life. These internal developments are likely to create challenging conditions for diplomats and foreign policy makers. Again using the European example, rulers have often found nationalism to be an effective means of building domestic social cohesion and stability in these times of great stress and rapid urbanization, but nationalist passion has consequences for foreign policy. Nationalism, and its embrace by rulers and policymakers in Europe up through World War Two even in non-democratic polities pushed leaders toward policies that made war more likely. Similar pressures are at work today in emerging powers like India and China today – to say nothing of Pakistan, Vietnam and, for somewhat different reasons, Japan. There is another way in which domestic change and economic development poses challenges for the maintenance of international peace. When rapid technological change hits major world societies, changes in the balance of global power often follow. The rise of China depended on developments in technology and management that allowed for global supply chains in a multitude of industries. In the next century we should be prepared to see more nations grow in terms international power due to technological modernization, and we should also be prepared to see other nations fall behind – as, at present, we see in the European Union. The rise and fall of great powers is a destabilizing force in world politics, and the 21st century will see the emergence of new powers as well as the decline of existing ones. There is a third reason why ages like ours of rapid change and development pose significant risks of war. In the 21st century, however, such developments as cyberwar make it much more difficult for potential adversaries to understand the balance of forces and the true risks of war. At the outset of World War One, the local quarrel between Austria-Hungary and Serbia was allowed to grow into a catastrophic global conflict in large part because diplomats and policy makers did not fully understand the implications of rail technology for military strategy and, therefore, for decisions about war and peace once one power started to mobilize its forces. As new methods of cyberwar along with new weapon systems and new ways of waging war proliferate, policy makers in the 21st century could be blindsided as well. There is a fourth way in which rapid technological change tends to destabilize international politics. It enables small powers and even non-state actors to wield greater destructive force than ever before. The development of nuclear weapons by small states like North Korea and scientific laggards like Pakistan is a likely foretaste of the future. And it is not just nuclear weapons that are getting easier and cheaper to make. Chemical, cyber, and ultimately biological weapons will place the kind of destructive power once limited to great powers in the hands of small, potentially quite irresponsible states, as well as of non-state actors. Such developments will be harder to track and arms control agreements respecting them will be harder to verify than nuclear weapons have been. We will be less sure who has these weapons, and the reality that states without large populations, land masses or even economies can generate or host non-state actors who generate weapons of strategic destructiveness will complicate the work of diplomats and policy makers in the interesting century that lies ahead. However, the same rapid change that destabilizes international politics has made and will make the task of international economic management significantly more challenging. It is not only that the international economy is developing both financial and trade linkages that challenge the ability of policy makers to develop effective policies to stabilize the international financial and economic systems. It is also the case that technological advances are steadily transforming financial markets, speeding up the pace of trading, allowing for the development of increasingly complex financial instruments and trading strategies that collectively produce new kinds of risk that both market participants and regulators struggle to understand. Economic theory and economic policy tools are likely to lag behind the new economic realities that will be created in the coming years and decades; this will be an added factor that tends to destabilize international politics. For the foreseeable future, these realities are not problems to be solved; they are features of national and international life which must be coped with. We are in a longterm period of great risk and potential instability in world affairs. None of this means that great power war is inevitable, and there are many factors that mitigate the dangers noted above. However, if we are to avoid war we must take the full measure of the challenges we

face, and it is the responsibility of this Committee to oversee and to assist the activity of some of the most critical agencies of the United States government responsible for assessing the risks around us. Regional Review In the next section of my testimony, I offer a quick overview of the situation in three regions of critical interest to the United States: Asia, Europe and the Middle East. Asia No world region has benefited as profoundly from the era of global stability since as Asia, but paradoxically, no world region today presents as many risks of great power conflict as the regions of East and South Asia. Leaders in the U. While Asia as presents many extremely heartening features “ it is on the whole an area of rapid economic and social development with democracy taking root in many countries “ unresolved rivalries and a changing balance of power present significant dangers as well. China as a rising power is frankly revisionist, though it also has many reasons to cooperate with the United States and receives many benefits from the existing world order. As China runs up against the boundaries imposed on its older, weaker self, it is tempted to use its newfound power to seize what it wants. In its territorial waters and to a lesser extent its long land border with India, China has chosen to heighten in a complicated region. By making the Nine Dash line a centerpiece of patriotic education at home and national policy abroad even as it significantly and steadily increases its military spending, China has destabilized the geopolitical situation in its region and cast a shadow over some of the most important sea lanes in the world. Securing all of the territory inside the Nine Dash Line would involve pushing out other claimants including Vietnam, Brunei, Malaysia, Indonesia, Taiwan and the Philippines. Chinese naval vessels have too frequently harassed and even rammed official and unofficial ships from other nations, with serious political consequences. In Vietnam, the anti-China riots that broke out when Beijing placed an oil rig in its territorial waters turned deadly. Japan now seems well launched on a policy of greater defense readiness and diplomatic activism aimed at reviving both the perception and the reality of Japanese power in the region. One should not underestimate the potential effects on the regional political climate and the balance of power. In the 21st century technology is likely to be a more important element of national power than the ability to field large infantry divisions. Japan may have an aging and war-averse population, but drones, robots and many other emerging new weapons have the potential to change the nature of warfare in ways that would redound considerably to the advantage of technologically sophisticated nations like Japan. Not all recent geopolitical news from Asia predicts a bleak future. Just this week, China and Japan announced an accord on the territorial dispute issue that looks like it will seriously reduce the dangerous tensions. Short term fluctuations in the relationship will continue, and it will be in the American interest to promote good relations between these uneasy neighbors. However, Japan-China relations are likely to be a significant source of tension for some time to come. The relationship between China and India is likely to develop into one of the most important and perhaps challenging bilateral relationships in the world, and it is also something of a contradiction. Overall, both East and South Asia, which may increasingly fuse into a single geopolitical theater, are likely to see military buildups and unresolved great power rivalries extending well into the future. War is not inevitable, but cannot be ruled out, and using diplomatic and military tools, backed by strong intelligence capabilities, to protect the peace of this vital region is almost certainly going to be an American concern for decades to come. This short overview has concentrated only on great power politics in this volatile region. Problems of religious extremism, ethnic and sectarian conflict and the question of North Korea are also part of the picture and add to the risks that we face. North Korea presents at once one of the most straightforward and also one of the most difficult challenges for U. It is a nuclear rogue state, economically desperate and fully totalitarian. Kim Jong Un has proved to be just as dangerous and dictatorial as his father. We know that Pyongyang has a missile program and a nuclear program. Unsettlingly, the top U. Europe In Europe, the United States faces two separate but interconnected problems: The European Union has been substantially weakened by the immense costs of its ill-advised currency union; these economic difficulties have led and will lead to further cuts in military spending and have substantially undermined the effectiveness of both NATO and the European Union. The wealth and stability of western Europe played a decisive role in the Cold War competition between the U. In addition, European diplomatic efforts, human rights policies, and foreign aid generally served both to legitimize and supplement American efforts in much of the world. Unfortunately, for some time to come we must expect that while Europe will in many respects remain a

valuable source of support and an indispensable partner, its capacity for leadership will be diminished. An inward-focused Europe with tight budgets and a long list of internal issues to settle and mutual grievances to hash out is unlikely to provide as much help even in its neighborhood as Americans would ideally wish. Russia, like China, is a revisionist power that acts under a sense of grievance against what many there see as an unjust world order. It is a much weaker country than China, but in almost every way its revisionist agenda is farther along. Its state power is concentrated almost exclusively in the hands of Vladimir Putin, who has said that he sees the breakup of the Soviet Union as the greatest historical tragedy of the 20th century. Only on the theory that the Soviet Union was surrounded by hostile and predatory enemies could the Soviet leadership justify the political and economic sacrifices they imposed on their subjects. In Ukraine as in Georgia, Putin has found that a territorial campaign abroad can strengthen his position abroad and at home. The West does not seem to have made up its mind even today whether it can or will help Ukraine. At the level of rhetoric, officials denounce Russian aggression and express sympathy for Ukraine, but seem not to have reached a consensus over the kind of steps that would be necessary to give Ukraine a chance against its stronger, wealthier and better administered neighbor. Thanks more to the *deus ex machina* of lower oil prices than to sanctions or other official action, the Russian economy is coming under pressure. Under the circumstances, however, that is more likely to confirm Putin on his course of hostility to the West than to induce a change of heart. Economic weakness will lead Putin to double down on control of the political process, and both the economic pain and the limits on freedom that he will now need to impose on the people will make the path of national mobilization against perceived foreign enemies even more essential to the survival of the regime.

Chapter 9 : What is the difference between a state and a nation?

A Nation-State is the idea of a homogenous nation governed by its own sovereign state—where each state contains one nation. This idea is almost never achieved.