

1: United States presidential transition - Wikipedia

Power transition theory is a theory about the cyclical nature of war, in relation to the power in international relations. The theory was first published in by its creator, A.F.K. Organski, in his textbook, World Politics ().

Process[edit] For much of American history, presidential transitions were carried out without very much advance planning or even cooperation from the sitting chief executive. Eisenhower after the election , inviting him to the White House and ordering federal agencies to assist the new administration with the transition. Kennedy funded his own transition just like his predecessors, and engaged in extensive transition planning on domestic and foreign policy issues, but did not meet with Eisenhower until January 6, , two months after the election. Specifically, the act directs the Administrator of General Services to provide facilities, funding of approximately five million dollars, access to government services, and support for a transition team, and to provide training and orientation of new government personnel and other procedures to ensure an orderly transition. Candidate Mitt Romney established a transition team in June after some preparatory work in April and May , which was before he became the Republican Party nominee. Barack Obama followed a similar timeline for establishing his transition team in . During the most recent presidential election cycle, in , Donald Trump began assembling his transition team in May, after he became the presumptive Republican nominee. His fall campaign opponent, Hillary Clinton , lagged behind in this regard, not forming a team until August, which was after she became the Democratic Party nominee. On the day after the most recent election, November 9, , outgoing president Barack Obama made a statement from the Rose Garden of the White House in which he announced that he had spoken the previous evening with apparent election winner Donald Trump and formally invited him to the White House for discussions to ensure "that there is a successful transition between our presidencies". Obama said he had instructed his staff to "follow the example" of the George W. Bush administration in , whom he said could "not have been more professional or more gracious in making sure we had a smooth transition". During this time, the transition team must handle the influx of campaign staff and additional personnel into daily operations and prepare to take over the functions of government. Please help improve this article by checking for citation inaccuracies. December Learn how and when to remove this template message Perhaps the most notable transition in US history was the " transition from the administration of James Buchanan to the terms of Abraham Lincoln. Buchanan held the opinion that states did not have the right to secede, but that it was also illegal for the Federal government to go to war to stop them. Between the election on November 6, and inauguration on March 4, , seven states seceded and conflict between secessionist and federal forces began, leading to the American Civil War between the Northern and Southern states. In the election , disputes over 20 electoral votes in four states, along with numerous claims of vote fraud, sparked an intense political battle and effectively invalidated the election. This constitutional crisis was resolved only 2 days before the scheduled inauguration, through the so-called Compromise of . President Hoover and President-elect Roosevelt riding together to the United States Capitol prior to the March 4, presidential inauguration. Roosevelt administration , was also a difficult transition period. While Hoover had little good to say about his successor, there was little he could do. The transition between Bill Clinton and George W. Bush , was shortened by several weeks due to the Florida recount crisis that was only ended after the Supreme Court handed down its ruling in Bush v. Gore , which made Bush the president-elect. On a more petty level, it was marred by accusations of "damage, theft, vandalism and pranks". This was described by some as a "new inaugural tradition spawned by the Internet-age". Not only were emails and photos removed from the environment at the . Included in these records was more than 80 terabytes of data, more than million emails and 4 million photos.

2: Africa Has Mixed Record on Peaceful Power Transitions

Power Transition Power transition is set in motion by the rise of a previously underdeveloped big nation, dissatisfied with the existing international system and its powerful stakeholders.

According to this theory, the spread of industrialization to different nations at different times and at differing rates provides the key to understanding the fundamental patterns of contemporary international relations. Stages of power transition An industrializing nation undergoes a number of changes as it modernizes its economy. Typically, such a nation not only increases its wealth and its industrial strength but also grows in population and improves the efficiency of its political institutions. Since economic development, population size, social mobility, and political mobilization are among the major determinants of national power, an industrializing nation also increases its power, i. The economy is primarily subsistence agriculture. Productivity and living standards are low, technical skills are few, and capital is extremely scarce. Governmental institutions are inefficient, and national unity is often, though not always, slight. Countries in this stage are often ruled by foreign conquerors or by small aristocracies; the common people participate little in national government except to pay taxes. The human and material resources of such a nation are largely unorganized and only partly used; and the power of such a nation is slight compared to that of any industrial nation, although of course it may be greater than that of some other underdeveloped country. The power of a preindustrial nation is largely potential, to be realized when and if it modernizes its economy and its government. For a nation with a large population, however, the size of its potential power may be great indeed. India, for example, by industrializing fully, would become one of the most powerful nations on earth; and other nations, recognizing this potential, grant India today some of the deference due to the power she may have tomorrow. Fundamental changes take place during this stage. Economic modernization brings higher productivity, increased national income, and higher living standards. Political modernization brings a larger and more efficient government bureaucracy and increases the control of the central government over the nation. The general public is more affected by governmental action and participates more in governmental activities, and nationalistic sentiment often reaches a high pitch. Population size generally increases rapidly, for modern conditions reduce the death rate sharply. Industrialization, urbanization, secularization, and other related changes alter the whole fabric of national life. The speed of this gain in power and the degree to which it upsets the international community depend in large part upon the size of the nation and upon the speed with which it industrializes. The Soviet Union provides a good example of a nation in the stage of transitional growth in power, although it is now at the end of this stage. Its rapid industrialization and concomitant rise in power have changed the whole focus of international relations in the mid-twentieth century. Nations in this stage continue to change and to grow in wealth, efficiency, and size, but at a slower rate. At least, this has been the experience of the Western nations that have already reached power maturity. Presumably, the rate of economic advance will also slacken in the Soviet Union and eventually in China and other nations as they reach this point, but only the future can supply proof of this. With power maturity the internal characteristics that give a nation power do not disappear, but in a race where everyone is running forward one may lose simply by slowing down. Power, after all, is relative, not absolute. Nations in the third stage lose relative power as other nations in the stage of transitional growth close the gap between them. The effects of automation may give a further burst of power to nations in the stage of power maturity and allow them to maintain their power superiority longer than would otherwise be the case, but in the end automation will destroy the nation-state and open the way to new and different forms of political organization. Effects on the distribution of power Had the entire world industrialized at the same time and at the same speed, there would have been great changes in international relations but no necessary major shifts in the distribution of power among nations. However, the industrial revolution, which began in England two hundred years ago and spread slowly through the West, has only recently swept into eastern Europe and Asia and has still to reach the majority of nations in the world. The result has been that first one nation and then another has experienced a sudden spurt in power, as in a race where one runner after another goes into a brief sprint. These sudden

sprints keep upsetting the distribution of power in the world, threatening the established international order and disturbing world peace. Increased power is constantly passing into the hands of nations who use it to challenge the existing leaders of the international community. Sometimes, as during most of the nineteenth century, there is only one international order. At other times, as at present, there may be two or more competing international orders. The dominant international order is headed by the most powerful single nation on earth, formerly England, today the United States. In the years since the industrial revolution the rule of the dominant nation has been challenged by one newly industrialized nation after another. Sometimes the challenge has come from within the dominant international order, as when the United States took over world leadership from England. Sometimes it has come from the leader of a competing international order, as in the cases of Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union. A recurring pattern can be seen in which new nations industrialize and experience an accompanying rapid growth in power only to find themselves dissatisfied with the place granted to them by the world leaders who industrialized ahead of them. When peaceful bids for a redistribution of wealth and power prove inadequate, past challengers have turned to war. In the past one hundred years major wars have been started by challengers as they approached, but before they reached, equal power with those they challenged. Peace, then, is most assured when the dominant nation and its allies enjoy a huge preponderance of power over any possible challenger. War is most likely when the power of a challenger and its allies approaches equality with that of the world leaders who support the status quo. Evaluation The major limitation of the concept of power transition is that it refers to a period extending roughly from a time in the future one may guess about when world-wide industrialization has been achieved. It does not apply to the years before, when no nation was industrial, nor does it apply to a future in which all nations will possess highly developed economies. However, it is clear that differential industrialization has created vast differences in the power of nations since the industrial revolution. There no longer exist many nations of roughly equal power, and it is no longer possible to balance power by shifting alliances. In the last two hundred years the usual state of affairs has been a vast preponderance of power in the hands of one leading nation. At most there have occasionally been two leading nations of almost equal power. Modern nations are not free to make and break alliances at will for power considerations for example, to balance world power, because economic and military interdependence have tied nations together into international orders whose membership they cannot leave without great domestic as well as international changes. Furthermore, balance of power situations, historically, have not aided the maintenance of peace. On the contrary, the greatest wars of modern history have occurred precisely at times when a challenging nation or coalition of nations has most nearly reached equal power with the leaders of the dominant international order. The great century of Pax Britannica from to amply illustrates that peace comes with preponderant power, not with a balance of power. By proceeding from this basic assumption the theory of the power transition seems to explain some major developments in contemporary international politics far better than the outdated formulation of balance of power.

3: "Power Transitions and International Institutions: China's Creation of " by Liam Gennari

The End of the Ming Dynasty. Power transitions theories often begin with Thucydides, who wrote over 2,000 years ago that "What made war inevitable was the growth of Athenian Power and the fear which this caused in Sparta." 77.

We will discuss power transition theory in comparison to balance of power theory, discuss the main characteristics of the theory, and examine the contributions of power transition theory to understanding global issues. What is Power Transition Theory? Power transition theory is a theory in international relations that examines the relations between states in the international system. Power transition theory was first argued in the late 1950s by Organski. This theory focuses on the hierarchical nature of states in the international system. Power transition theorists examine the order of power in the international system, and how states are either satisfied or dissatisfied with the distribution of power. The state on top dictates the resources and conditions based on its power. Other states below it can then decide if they are satisfied or not satisfied with the power. Those satisfied do not challenge the major power. However, a rising power unsatisfied with the current rules of the game, and existing resource structures might be the conditions that could lead to conflict. If states under the major power are satisfied, then they help ensure peace and stability. But, being dissatisfied alone is not enough for conflict. They must have the power to actually credibly challenge the major power. So, the biggest concern for a major international war is when a dissatisfied state rises in power to directly challenge the main power. In this section, we shall compare power transition theory with balance of power theory, discussing any commonalities, and also examine differences in each respective theory of international relations. Balance of power theory has been one of the most popular international relations theories with regards to explaining conflict. The discussion on what balance of power means has existed for many years (Hass, ; Sheehan,). Similarly, Mearsheimer suggests that bipolarity allows states to read each other with clarity, compared to a multipolar system where states may misread the power capabilities of one another. At the unit level, Waltz also argues that a main reason for peace during a balance of power is due to nuclear capabilities. With both two opposing powers having nuclear capabilities, Waltz argues that the costs of conflict due to nuclear weapons are greatly increased, and thus the reason why peace is more likely to occur. Similar arguments of nuclear deterrence and peace in a bi-polar system have been argued by others such as Mearsheimer. DiCicco and Levy set out the main hard core assumptions of the Power Transition research program as compared to the Balance of Power hard core assumptions. Similarly to balance of power and neo-realism, the power transition research program assumes that states are the main actors in the international system. They also agree that leaders of states are rational actors. This differs from the neo-realist position that states operate under anarchy, and that no one state sets the rules or structure of the international system. A second major difference in the hard core assumptions of power transition and the balance of power lies in the expected actions of a state. DiCicco and Levy thus explain that even though power transition theorists still maintain some of the realist assumptions such as rationality of actors, and the importance of the foreign policy of a state without examining domestic politics, because of this belief in a hierarchical structure belief of power transition theorists, along with the assumption that a satisfied rising power will not change the structure of the international system is a clear distinction from original balance of power theory, and thus deserving of its own research program. Stemming from this, another difference that seems to separate power transition theory and balance of power theoretically is the logical action of the rising state given the assumptions of how states operate. Since neo-realists work from an assumption that states minimally want to preserve their survival (Waltz,), then the power transition theorists must account for the fact that a rising state that risks to challenge the dominant power for a change in the status quo must do so knowing that there is a chance albeit a small chance that losing could entail the loss of the rising power as a state. From a neo-realist assumption, it seems that a state would not be willing to challenge the dominant power if there was a chance that losing may lead to the end of the state, since the main objective is to survive. This hard core assumption is very different from a power transition theorist who seems to have to accept that a rising state does at some point possibly take that risk of survival for changing the status quo. This is not necessary an issue for the power transition position, but

it does seem to suggest a further shift in the hard core assumptions, and yet another reason why power transition belongs as its own research program from balance of power. Therefore, in order to examine which research program seems to be more valid in explaining conflict and thus progressive, we must examine the empirical evidence set forth by scholars. Organski and Kugler, after briefly defining variables such as power and satisfaction find in their analysis that dyads are more likely to go to war with one another at around parity. Since the original work of Organski and Organski and Kugler, there have been a number of empirical tests done by scholars to test the hypotheses of balance of power and power transition theory. Kugler and Lemke give an excellent summary of the evolution of the power transition literature since the original work of Organski Moul, in his empirical examination of power transition, looks at the time period from and also finds support for the power transition theory. Further studies have expanded the protective belt of power transition theory by expanding the generalizability of power transition. Lemke and Werner in their analysis of power transition and balance of power, make a new contribution to the field of conflict studies that adds to the explanatory power of power transition. Therefore, examining the timing of conflict in South American regional hierarchies they found that in fact conflict is much more likely when parity exists between a rising regional state towards the regional power and when the rising power is increasing the size of its military— an operationalization of dissatisfaction. They warn us however to be careful of their findings since they only examined a few cases. Measuring Power Transition Theory While we have seen a large amount of research supporting the power transition research program, there are also measurement issues that need to be addressed when dealing with empirical tests of power transition. Therefore, results supporting power transition theory seem to be robust with various measurements of power. Danilovic and Clare point out however that this issue is more serious than mere validity of operationalizing a status quo variable. They argue that there is a lack of clarity on a theoretical conceptualization of what would cause a rising state to be satisfied or dissatisfied with the system set forth by the dominant power. This theory seems to be consistent with work that suggests great power states do often engage in conflict over outside regions, even if they are geographically distant from the said major power state Taliaferro, Extensions of Power Transition Theory Thus, not only have we seen a large amount of empirical support for power transition theory—with various robustness checks of variable measurements, but extensions of power transition theory have also shown to further progress the research program. In fact, there have been a number of extensions of power transition studies testing hypotheses in the protective belt in Benson, a. Swaminathan also extends the application of power transition theory by using it to examine when domestic democratic transitions occur in South America, and finds that fighting is most likely to occur between the government and the opposition when they are roughly at equal strength and when the opposition is least satisfied Zagare examines power transition and argues for a unification with perfect deterrence theory. Conclusion Today, there are continued conversations about the role of power transition theory in explaining international relations. Amongst other international issues, power transition theory is applied to the rising power of China, and the relationship with the United States Morrissey, ; Lai, However, this is not to say that there are no critiques of power transition theory. No state has achieved a position that allowed it for any extended period to order the international system to suit its interests at the expense of the other major powers. Power transitions are more often the results of wars, rather than the causes of them. Wars between rising and dominant powers are infrequent and are not waged by either side primarily in the effort to defend or revise the international order in their favor. Others, writing more recently, have also suggested that power transition theory is incorrect on calling conflict after changes in power between countries Harris, Extending the Bounds of Power Transition Theory. Global Power Transitions and Regional Interests. Problems with Power Transition Theory: Beyond the Vanishing Disparities Thesis. A Retrospective and Prospective Evaluation. Handbook of War Studies. December, pages International Relations, 23, No. Lessons from the Past: Power Transitions and the Future of U. Time, Power, and Democratic Transitions. The Journal of Conflict Resolution, Vol.

The year has seen encouraging instances of peaceful power transition in Africa, which as a whole has made impressive if uneven strides toward democracy in the last 50 years.

5: Power Transitions: Strategies For the 21st Century - Google Books

Power transition theorists examine the order of power in the international system, and how states are either satisfied or dissatisfied with the distribution of www.enganchecubano.com state on top dictates the resources and conditions based on its power.

6: Power Transition Theory - International Relations - Oxford Bibliographies

By integrating power transition theory and national policy, this title explores emerging issues in world politics in the 21st century, including proliferation and deterrence, the international political economy, regional hierarchies, and the role of alliances.

7: PowerPoint Transitions

Power transition theory (PTT) has had a progressive research program for more than half a century. In spite of this, one of its key concepts, satisfaction, has remained undertheorized. A compelling theory explaining why growth would make some states dissatisfied in the context of power transitions and others satisfied has not been articulated.

8: Add, change, or remove transitions between slides - Office Support

Power Transition Theory warns that this period of change at the top of the international hierarchy will be a moment of great danger, as China will likely be dissatisfied with the world order that the United States has created.

9: Power in Transition: The Peaceful Change of International Order - United Nations University

Power transition theory is a structural and dynamic approach to world politics. Although due to its focus on power relationships it is sometimes associated with the realist school (see the Oxford Bibliographies article on Realism), it differs in terms of its dynamic description of the international.

Golden grains from lifes harvest field Atlas of breast disease The da vinci code kickass Interlude : a day in a connected life String theory volume 2 Economic survey of pakistan 2011 12 Trial of Elvira Barney Report on Hydrographic survey of Antarctica by XVI Indian Scientific 2002 jaguar s type owners manual Newnes Spanish Dictionary Jan Fabre, Artist: Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, May 30, 1887 Coordination of NIH research efforts: Three case studies Can economic growth be sustained? Dicho y hecho 9th edition Somewhere Between Houston and El Paso By dog sled for Byrd The Lancasterian system of instruction in the schools of New York city Finding the right thing to do Psychological theory of entrepreneurship Equal Pay in Employment Act Rrb question paper 2013 with answers Victorian philosophy. Biographical sketches of distinguished Indians Java network programming 3rd edition A Babys Guide to Motherhood Asian regionalism Neurological and musculoskeletal system medications 3. An Independent ForeignPolicy. 24 The Bishops address at the opening of the general conference in adjourned session at Napanee, January 9th High Pressure Elk Hunting Beauty is beyond skin deep Call to greatness. Style shift as facework: the use of plain and masu forms in faculty meetings Naomi Geyer Church As Politeia The Brass Bed and Other Stories Irish Republican Army Handbook Lives Lived Large Occupational goal setting with children and families The Second World War, Vol. 5