

ETHNO-DEMOGRAPHIC DIMENSIONS OF NATIONAL POWER

*Marian Ninov**, *Valeri Nikolov*

NDC “G. S. Rakovski”, Sofia
Bulgaria

* Corresponding Author, e-mail: ninov64@abv.bg

Abstract: There is a substantiated need for a more differentiated approach in assessing the population as an element of national power. Proposed is the use of coefficients reflecting the alignment of different ethnicities and diasporas with the goals of the state-forming ethnicity in the national state. Particular attention is paid to the role of diasporas in this regard.

Key words: national power, population, state-forming ethnicity, diaspora.

1. INTRODUCTION

In matters of national power, the Doctrine for the Armed Forces of the Republic of Bulgaria adheres to the views of its Euro-Atlantic allies and above all the United States. According to it, national power means the strategic effect that the state can create in a specific environment to achieve a desired goal. In international relations, national power is expressed in the state's ability to purposefully change the condition of another state or to resist such influence [1]. According to this doctrine of the Armed Forces, the instruments of national power that the state uses to achieve national goals/interests are: diplomatic; informative; military; economic.

It is noteworthy that in the doctrine of the Bulgarian armed forces, national power is associated with the capabilities of the state, not the nation. This problem is not new and has been ascertained by other Bulgarian researchers of the issues of national security and national power, who recognize the not entirely correct approach of equating a state and a nation. It is true that a nation is usually associated with a state, and this is perfectly correct if that nation is political, as, for example, the American nation is. It is a different matter if a given nation has a predominantly one ethnic base and it is formed within the framework of a nation-state with a significant leading ethnic group, which can be called state-forming. In the latter case, there are many examples where this ethnic group creates other states as a nation-builder, or is part of nations and states of other nation-builder ethnic groups. In this regard, the Balkans are currently an emblematic example of duplicated states. In such cases, the concepts of national security and national power go beyond the boundaries of a specific state and should be interpreted, defined and implemented in the correct way, which means to delineate as precisely as possible the spatial borders of the nation, in which its power is generated through its ethno-elements

available within these borders. However, the question arises of the contribution of the various components of the state-forming ethnicity of a nation-state, if it is dispersed in other states as well, as it is in not a few cases.

2. RELATED WORKS

According to the well-known and recognized concepts of Hans Morgenthau, national power is the basis for the positioning of any state in international relations, and the policy pursued by the state is a reflection of its attempts to increase national power. The goal is to create the best possible positions and conditions to protect national security by having sufficient capabilities to deal with new and unknown security challenges and threats [2].

Most modern definitions of national power come from the US NATO Military Terminology Group: "National power is defined as the sum of all resources available to a nation in the pursuit of national objectives" – definition since 2001 [3].

It is widely accepted that national power is realized through four instruments, so called DIME - Diplomacy, Information, Military, and Economic. The content of these instruments is summarized in Table „Instruments of National Power“ [4]. The effectiveness of the instruments of national power depends on the various elements of national power invested in them, which are generally subdivided into "natural" - geography, resources, population, and "social" - economic, political, military, psychological, informational [4].

Table 1

Instruments of National Power			
D Diplomatic	I Informational	M Military	E Economic
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Embassies/ Ambassadors ▪ Recognition ▪ Negotiations ▪ Treaties ▪ Policies ▪ International forums 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Military information ▪ Public diplomacy ▪ Public affairs ▪ Communications resources ▪ International forums ▪ Spokespersons, timing, media and venues for announcements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Military operations ▪ Engagement, Security Coop, Deterrence ▪ Show of force ▪ Military technology ▪ Size, composition of force 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Trade policies ▪ Fiscal and monetary policies ▪ Embargoes ▪ Tariffs ▪ Assistance

Emphasis on the multi-vector nature of the concept of national power, including its social dimension, can be found in the works of the Turkish researcher and politician Ahmed Davutoğlu [5].

As already noted, national security is closely related to national power and highly dependent on it. Despite the precise outlines of the problem, however, it is not clear what kind of security should be guaranteed by national power. In many cases, national and state security are equated, and this should not be the case. As a rule, experts from the security sector in a country put the emphasis on the security of the state and the use of the levers of the state to achieve it, as in the case of the problem under consideration in the Doctrine of the Armed Forces in the Republic of Bulgaria. At the same time, however, Bulgarian theoretical thought has reached the need for national security to have a broader content, taking into account ethno-national characteristics. According to one of the well-established security theorists in Bulgaria, Dimitar Yonchev, "... there can be no question of the synonymous use of the terms "state security" and "national security", and that "... the national state has the leading responsibility for creating and maintaining of national security [6]. Another authoritative theorist such as Nikolay Slatinski (professor at the National Defense College in Bulgaria) believes that the national security strategy must, among other priorities, guarantee "... preservation of the Bulgarian character of our country...", and that in relation to the Bulgarians abroad must "... integrate and reintegrate them ..." [7].

3. NATIONAL POWER AS A FUNCTION OF POPULATION

Taking into account the content of the instruments of national power, as well as the totality of its natural and social elements, the significant role of the population in a country/nation is revealed. It has meaning both as a "natural" element, i.e. as number, sex, and age, and with respect to all the "social" elements of national power. Also, the four instruments of power are a function of the qualities and ambitions of that population. It is no accident that the authors of the article "All the Elements of National Power" conclude that: "Surely the most powerful elements of our strength as a nation is the American people—all of them." [8]

The authoritative Turkish researcher and politician Ahmed Davutoğlu in his work "*Strategic Depth*" derives formula (1) for the power of a given state [5]. Davutoğlu's arguments for the proposed formula are justified by the dynamic changes that have occurred since the end of the Cold War, which is why "the instruments of power of individual states should not be considered as single quantities isolated from each other, but as having acquired new functions and interrelated dynamic parameters" [5].

$$StP = (PE + VE) \times (SW \times SP \times PW) = \{(h + gl + p + c) + (ep + tc + mc)\} \times (SW \times SP \times PW) \quad (1)$$

where:

StP – state power (in fact national power);

Permanent elements – PE

where:

h – history;

gl – geographical location;

p – population;

c– culture.

Variable elements - VE

where:

ep – economic potential;

tc – technological capacity;

mc – military capabilities;

SW – *strategic worldview*;SP – *strategic planning*;PW – *political will*.

With a careful and broad analysis of the dimensions in Davutoğlu's formula, one can find embedded in one or another of them all the elements of national power, including the instruments of power. Among the permanent elements of the state's power is the population, reflected by the value "p".

As already noted, the population of a country has a multi-vector influence on its power, to the extent that if one excludes the geographical position and natural endowments of the country, then everything else depends on its characteristics such as number, gender, age, culture, including education, outlook, religion, morality. And here, in no way should the ethnic picture of the population be omitted, especially if it is a question of the so-called national states, built on the basis of the characteristics of the most numerous ethnic group, i.e. the state-forming one.

On 09/28/2023, an express survey was conducted using the method of content analysis regarding the presence of the ethnic element in the concept of "state". The definitions of country in English, Bulgarian and Russian, which appeared in the first five places in the Google search engine, were subjected to a content analysis. The result was that in all three languages only one of the five definitions mentioned the ethnic characteristics of the concept of state. It is also worth noting the different profile of origin of these definitions in the different languages. In all three languages, there was a definition from Wikipedia, but in English, those from popular dictionaries prevailed, in Bulgarian - from university publications, and in Russian - from school education. Despite this wide profile of origin of the definitions of the concept of the state, only in 20% of the cases the ethnic element was present, as already noted.

Regardless of the relatively low presence of the ethnic element in the definitions of the concept of state, the fact must be taken into account that Bulgarian theoretical thought, both now and in the last century, connected ethnicity with the state. Of course, this is not accidental, as the Bulgarian state is a nation state and is located in a region of classical nation states, the contradictions between which are often linked to ethnic issues and are often resolved with bloody wars.

According to the Bulgarian lawyer and researcher Lachezar Dachev [9], the state is a "historically determined power-legal form of self-organization of a separate ethno-social community". According to him, "the natural course of the progressive development of the ethno-social organism is its successive transition from a tribe to a people and from a people to a nation"[9]. The formation of an ethno-social community is the result of the unity and interaction of the spheres of manifestation of ethnicity -

ethno-evolutionary processes and collectivity, which is the unifying link. "*The state is an organized specific ethno-social community*" [9] whose essence "*is characterized, on the one hand, by the historical type of ethnos - tribe, people, nation and the ongoing ethnic processes. On the other hand, the ethno-social organism characterizes the state through its social structure and corresponding type of collectivity with which it achieves social sufficiency*" [9]. Therefore, the ethno-social community is the basis of the formation of a given state, and it goes without saying that the appearance of the state will correspond mostly to the culture and ambitions of the leading ethnic group - be it numerically or due to economic or historical circumstances.

Another authoritative Bulgarian jurist from the first half of the last century (i.e. in the period of the politically leading national issue in global terms) Lubomir Vladikin analysed in detail the relationship between people-nationality-nation. For him, the leading term for the population of a country is the people, which is a public-legal concept and therefore defines it as a formal community. According to Vladikin the concept of a nation is meta-legal and it is not a subject of law, but of sociology or scientific policy - the nation is a cultural-historical community that does not need to fall within the borders of a single state. The people, according to Vladikin [10], is the sum of all subjects/citizens of a country, including those who temporarily reside abroad. In scientific terms, Vladikin believes that the nation includes: "three different concepts - population (statistical concept), nationality (cultural concept) and subjection (legal concept)". In the scope of the concept of "Bulgarian people", he examines:

- the people who inhabit Bulgaria, together with temporarily residing foreigners, as well as the Bulgarians who are temporarily abroad;
- Bulgarians as an ethnic category, which also includes compatriots outside the state borders of Bulgaria;
- the subjects of the Bulgarian state, in which case temporary resident foreigners are excluded, but Bulgarian subjects or citizens abroad are included.

Although Vladikin uses the concept of people, instead of nation, it is clear from his concepts that the citizens of a country, making up its population, may include different ethnicities besides the leading one (in this case - the Bulgarian one), but also includes compatriots in this population of the main ethnic group outside the borders of the nation-state.

Nowadays the right of interplay between the ethnic groups abroad, the so-called "diasporas", and the state-forming ethnic group of the national state, is also regulated in a certain sense in the Framework Convention for the Protection of the Rights of National Minorities [11]. In it, this right is considered as a subject primarily of the domestic legislation of the States Parties to the Convention.

From the point of view of the right of the national state to consider and attract its diasporas according to its interests, we can consider the positions of two of the prominent representatives of the Copenhagen School in the field of security - Barry Buzan and Ole Weaver. According to them, identity (*ethnic - author's note*) "given its conservative nature, challenges, and changes can always be characterized as threats to it, because "we will no longer be us". Thus, the abilities to maintain and reproduce a language, a set of behavioral customs, or a concept of ethnic purity can be defined as survival" [12]. These findings of Buzan are particularly valid for most modern nation-states, where the state-

forming people/ethnicity constitutes the state according to its interests and uses it as an instrument of ethnic/societal security.

4. DIASPORA IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

The diaspora is able to influence the foreign policy of both the receiving country and the country of origin. Diaspora representatives can agree with the foreign policy of their country of origin and support it to varying degrees with organized and targeted actions within the host country. The motives for their attitude towards the politics of the host country or ethnic homeland may be determined by its historical experience as well as from the current political and social positioning in the recipient country and the nature of its relations with the mother country.

The Russian contemporary diaspora researcher I. D. Loshkariov puts forward in his work *"The Role of Diasporas in the Current World Politics"* [13] the thesis that diasporas exist autonomously and participate in transnational interactions as non-state actors. The Russian school in terms of studying the role of the diaspora deserves special attention, insofar as Russian foreign policy is focused on actively using the Russian diasporas, starting from Transnistria through the Caucasus and the Baltics to Ukraine. According to Loshkariov, the activity for the participation of diasporas in transnational interactions is particularly high in the following cases: when the status of the diaspora in the recipient country is unsatisfactory; upon the maturation of prerequisites for changing the relations between the host country and the country of origin; in conditions of acute socio-political crisis in the country of origin. Diasporas achieve their goals at the global, regional and national level mainly through the influence of state institutions. At the same time, the latter applies both to the host country and to the country of origin.

Modern national diasporas are not similar to each other in terms of organization, numbers and socio-political activity. International experience shows that when planning the policy of bilateral interaction (state - diaspora) it is important to take into account not only the quantitative and/or structural characteristics of diasporas, but also their qualitative constituents, i.e. their readiness to react to the state initiatives of both the host country and the historical homeland.

5. ETHNO-DIFFERENTIATION OF THE POPULATION AS AN ELEMENT OF NATIONAL POWER

First, it should be noted that, apart from Davutoğlu's formula, there are quite a few indices of national power, and in most of them the population is considered as an independent quantity, and in some cases differentiated. For example, The Composite Index of National Capability (CINC) conceived by J. David Singer in 1963 uses total population and urban population [14].

From what was stated in the previous sections, there are logical grounds for the quantity "P", i.e. the population of a country in formula (1), to be broken down into several components from an ethnic point of view for greater correctness. In this differentiation, the numbers of the state-forming ethnicity and of other ethnic groups in this nation-state, as well as the corresponding diasporas in other countries, must be taken into account. In such a case, the formula would take the following form:

$$P = P_{stetn} + P_{etn1} + P_{etn2} + \dots + P_{etnN} + P_{d1} + P_{d2} + \dots + P_{dM} \quad (2)$$

where: P_{stetn} reflects the state-forming ethnicity; P_{etnN} reflects different ethnic groups in the state; P_{dM} reflects the various diasporas of the state-forming ethnicity.

Formula (2) differentiates the population according to ethnicity as an element of national power, but presented in this way it is unlikely to be completely correct. However, it should be borne in mind that the average representatives of one or another ethnic group or of one or another diaspora would hardly correspond to the weight of the average representative of the state-forming ethnic group. This necessitates the introduction of correction coefficients and then formula (2) would be:

$$P = P_{stetn} + k_1 P_{etn1} + k_2 P_{etn2} + \dots + k_N P_{etnN} + q_1 P_{d1} + q_2 P_{d2} + \dots + q_M P_{dM} \quad (3)$$

where: “ k_N ” are coefficients with values between 0 and 1, describing to what extent the average statistical representatives of the relevant minority ethnic group are in the same direction as those of the state-forming ethnic group; “ q_M ” are coefficients with values between 0 and 1, describing how much the average representatives of the respective diaspora are aligned with those of the state-forming ethnic group.

It should be borne in mind that the coefficients k_N and q_M are multifaceted and dynamic, changing both over time and in relation to specific events affecting the security of the nation and the state. The representatives of the different ethnicities in the state or of the different diasporas would react in different ways to different threats. At the same time, there are relatively constant components concerning these coefficients, such as the degree of spoken and written knowledge of the official language, economic and political integration, the absence of religious differences or oppositions, as well as socio-cultural ones. In any case, the determination of these coefficients requires a thorough and multispectral analysis, including experts from various fields - sociologists, cultural scientists, ethnologists, political scientists, etc., including representatives of the intelligence community.

6. CONCLUSION

The presented discussion points to the need for a more in-depth study of the ethnic characteristics of the "population" element when determining the national power of a state, as of particular interest in this regard are the coefficients for one-way relations with the state-forming ethnic group. This would contribute to the more adequate implementation of both defense policies and the pursuit of certain national interests. A negative example of the latter is Russia's "special military operation" in Ukraine in February 2023, where miscalculation of the behavior of Ukraine's multi-ethnic population led to its initial failure.

REFERENCES

- [1] *Doctrine of the armed forces of the Republic of Bulgaria*. Issue (A), November 2017 (in Bulgarian), https://www.mod.bg/bg/doc/strategicheski/20171211_Doktrina_VS.pdf
- [2] Morgenthau, H. *Politics among nations: The struggle for power and peace*. 5th ed., New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1978, pp. 4-15.
- [3] Instruments of national power. in *US NATO Military Terminology Group, 2010= (2010). JP I (02) "Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms", 2001 (As amended through 31 July 2010) (PDF)*. Pentagon, Washington: Joint Chiefs of Staff, US Department of Defense. p. 229. Archived from [the original \(PDF\)](#) on March 10, 2010. Retrieved 19 September 2010.
- [4] <https://www.thelightningpress.com/the-instruments-of-national-power/>, 21.08.2023.
- [5] Davutoglu, A. Strategic Depth. (in Bulgarian), ed. "East-West", 2015, p.32.
- [6] Yonchev, D. A. Security levels. (in Bulgarian), *publishing house of New Bulgarian University*, 2008, p. 209.
- [7] Slatinski, N. The five levels of security. (in Bulgarian), *Military publishing house*, 2010, p. 209.
- [8] Miclaucic, M., Pearl, I. All the elements of national power. *Prism*, vol. 6, no. 1, 2016, p.3, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26470426> , 21.08.2023.
- [9] Dachev, L. Learning about the state. (in Bulgarian), ed. "Svida", 2001, p.53
- [10] Vladikin, L. General doctrine of the state. (in Bulgarian), "Bulreal 2000", pp. 291-292
- [11] Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities. (in Bulgarian), <https://nccedi.government.bg/bg/node/186>, art. 17 and 18, 27.06.2023.
- [12] Buzan B., Wæve, O., Wilde, J. Security a new framework for analysis. (ISBN 1-55587-603-X), p. 24.
- [13] Loshkariov I.D. The Role of diasporas in the current world politics. *MGIMO Review of International Relations*. Vol. 41, no.2, 2015, pp.120-126. (in Russian). <https://doi.org/10.24833/2071-8160-2015-2-41-120-126>
- [14] *National power*. Wikipedia. Available at: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_power.

Information about the authors:

Marian Draganov Ninov has a PhD in military-political security and is an associate professor at NDC "G. S. Rakovski", Sofia. His scientific interests are ultimately focused in the field of International security on the Balkans, Security in the virtual space, and in the field of Social psychology, in the context of strategic social communications. He is the author of a number of publications in all of these fields, as well as others relating to military problematics.

Valeri Dimitrov Nikolov is an ex diplomat, PhD student at NDC "G. S. Rakovski", Sofia. His scientific interests are ultimately focused on the field of national security in the context of the problems of the Bulgarian historical communities abroad.

Manuscript received on 12 September 2023