

# **Realist Resilience IN THE Post Covid International Landscape: Power Security AND State Centric Dynamics**

Pemala Bhutia<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1\*</sup>Assistant Professor, Gargi College, University OF Delhi.

**Citation:** Pemala Bhutia et al. (2022), Realist Resilience IN THE Post Covid International Landscape: Power Security AND State Centric Dynamics, Educational Administration: Theory and Practice, 28(4), 233-241  
Doi: 10.53555/kuey.v28i4.6739

## **ARTICLE INFO**

## **ABSTRACT**

Following the Covid-19 pandemic, the dominant viewpoint among experts in international politics is that of realism, which places significant emphasis on the dominance of established power structures and the propensity of governments to act in their own self-interest. Yet, a clear explication is elusive due to the intricate nature of modern-day global affairs. In an effort to offer a thorough comprehension of global politics in the aftermath of the pandemic, this essay employs three prominent theories in the field of International Relations, including realism. This article delineates three discernible attributes that have defined the global landscape throughout the Covid-19 pandemic era: nationalistic ambitions and conflicts. This conclusion posits that inter-perspective collaboration is a more advantageous approach than theoretical exclusivism and argumentation for comprehending international politics.

**Keywords:** International Politics, Global, Landscape, Pandemic, Covid-19.

## **Introduction**

Numerous analysts in the field of international politics believe that the Covid-19 pandemic had the capacity to profoundly alter the global political landscape of the 21st century. [1] The vast majority of the industry experts that we surveyed expressed pessimism on the future of international politics in the aftermath of the outbreak. According to what Fareed Zakaria has noticed, Covid-19 is a global disease that paradoxically causes societies everywhere to draw inside. [2,3] In order to "huddle, close their borders, and devise their plans for resilience and recovery" in the face of pain and suffering, economic distress, and displacement, leaders have abandoned the notion of international cooperation. According to the World Economic Forum, attempts to foster global peace have also stopped in recent years. [4,5] This finding comes as no surprise. During the course of the Covid-19 outbreak, which spanned the time period from January 2020 to April 2021, several reports of violent pandemic-related incidents were filed in 158 different nations. [6,7] Political violence is on the increase in a number of countries, despite Antonio Guterres's plea for a global ceasefire in the face of a pandemic. [8] This demand came from the Secretary-General of the United Nations. In other countries, the political leaders are taking advantage of the pandemic to further their own agendas, which has led to an increase in politically driven violence in countries that are already predisposed to conflict.[9]

The perspective shared by the vast majority of Western experts is one of pessimism. [10,11] In the edition of Foreign Affairs magazine that was published in July-August 2020, there were many pieces that presented a bleak outlook on the future of world affairs as a consequence of the Covid-19 outbreak. Francis Fukuyama claimed that nationalism and isolationism are on the rise. [12] The already growing wave of anti-immigrant sentiment and attacks on the free international order would be exacerbated by the outbreak of a pandemic, making the situation even direr. As nationalism takes hold, the chance of conflict breaking out between countries will increase. Since the pandemic draws attention to the failings of the global community, the predicament that we find ourselves in today has become much worse. [13] One of the issues is that the United Nations, and in particular the World Health Organization and the United Nations Security Council, have not evolved into a global collective instrument to combat the disease. [14] When things get to be this horrible, the last thing people want to do is depend on multilateralism but rather on their own government. During the Covid-19 crisis, the United States and China, in particular, missed an opportunity to seize the lead role by not taking the initiative.[15,16]

Several specialists feel that the international system is more stable than the majority of people know, contrary to the pessimistic judgment that was presented before. [17] Barry Posen have an article published in the issue of Foreign Affairs that comes out in April 2020 predicting that the COVID-19 pandemic would actually result in more peace rather than conflict. The argument rests on the idea that the only time governments would participate in military combat is when they are certain of their capacity to emerge victorious from the fight. [18,19] According to Posen, many countries, especially big ones, have spent their resources to the point that they feel they have no choice but to face the potential of violence as a consequence of the pandemic. This is particularly true for nations that have had rapid population growth. It is very improbable that big nations would go to war with one another years after a pandemic has ended. [20] According to Daniel Drezner, even if the Covid-19 pandemic has wrecked devastation on countries all over the world, it will have very little to no influence on the international system as a whole. There will be no impact on the transmission of power anywhere in the globe due to the outbreak. As a result, the outbreak will help to maintain the current state of affairs.[21]

These two points of view more accurately portrays the way international politics function in the midst of a pandemic. This study focuses on the examination of international relations during the Covid-19 outbreak that occurred in 2020–2021. This paper contends that the opinions of either the optimistic or pessimistic camp are not reflected in the global status quo during the epidemic. [22]

Throughout the course of the pandemic, the core features that are distinctive of international relations, namely conflict and collaboration, remained the same. These two qualities do not compete with one another but rather complement and bolster one another's strengths. [23,24] It will be illustrated here that conflict and cooperation are coexisting factors, despite the disastrous impact that the pandemic has had on a number of countries. "Because of this, it is impossible to get an accurate picture of reality by relying just on a single perspective. In this study, we use three important approaches to international relations (IR) research: constructivism, realism, and institutional theory. This article presents a more in-depth study of global politics during a pandemic rather than focusing on a single solution from a single point of view." [25]

While national governments are now trying to deal with the pandemic's aftermath, they will eventually be able to start the recovery process. The OECD has provided assistance in two ways: by addressing urgent problems and by proposing a strategy for dealing with the longer-term difficulties the epidemic highlighted. [26,27] In the short-term, this includes pinpointing the hardest-hit communities and activities, weighing the pros and cons of potential solutions, and stressing the inevitability of compromises among health, economic, social, and other priorities. Long-term policy success requires a strategy that accounts for the systemic causes and effects of severe shocks. [28] The Covid-19 issue also demonstrates the need of having backup plans and supplies on hand for case the system is disrupted by unforeseen events. Moreover, the pandemic emphasizes the need for strengthened international cooperation based on evidence, to tackle systemic threats and help avert systemic collapse, given the interdependence of economic and social systems. The failure to recognize and effectively handle the complexities of global systems and issues may have far-reaching effects.[29]

## Review of literature

**Keohane RO, (2022) [30]** International phenomena, which may represent either conflict or collaboration, need a multidisciplinary and multilevel study. Competition among nations as significant players pursue their interests is central to a realist view of international relations, whereas the harmonious ties of pluralist actors are more central to a liberal one. Theories have developed as a result of the urge to find patterns, and they are a reflection of the search for a grand theory that can account for all observable occurrences. International relations theories "borrow" assumptions from one another and give feedback for the reconstruction of these theories via their criticisms of one another.

**Mearsheimer JJ. (2021) [31]** Keep in mind that the disease that hit Athens (431-404 BC) and lasted for more than three years is a pivotal moment in Thucydides' chronicle of the Peloponnesian War. Based on what we know now, the virus may have killed as much as a third of Athens' population, including renowned leaders like Pericles. This obviously diminished Athens' long-term dominance potential. The realism paradigm holds that the characteristics of humans have significant implications for the conduct of international relations. Sinful, interested, egocentric, aggressive, and always after power: that's what people are like at their core, according to realist academics. In particular, the views of Carr and Morgenthau are central to classical realism, which uses human nature to understand international interactions. In order to think about international outcomes, it is necessary to comprehend the objective rules that control human nature. As long as these regulations are disregarded, IR will remain a mystery. By nature, people are essentially bad, full of ego and fervour. Leading postwar realists include Morgenthau and Niebuhr, who use human nature to explain international relations. They argue that states, like people, are prone to destructive behaviours like self-interestedness and aggressiveness. nations consistently strive to improve their strength and capacities to the point where they can subjugate other nations.

**Mc Neil D. (2020) [32]** It is in the interest of governments to cooperate, and realists acknowledge that this may be facilitated by norms and institutions. "However, realists also caution that international cooperation is frequently precarious because nations worry that others may not adhere by their obligations, fear that cooperation would benefit others more than it advantages them, or seek to avoid incurring a disproportionate

share of the costs.” Realists in the field of foreign affairs argue that if the pandemic does not immediately diminish or eliminated permanently, it will support the rising movement toward deglobalization.

### Research methodology

In order to provide a comprehensive picture of the international political scene during the age of the Covid-19 epidemic, this research paper employs a main techniques in the study of IR, namely realism and resilience. There is a complimentary difference in perspective between the two methods. Thus, a preference for one method will result in a less complete image of the world, with consequences for the development of generalized policies. This study argues that a thorough comprehension of the realities of international relations is necessary for decision-making at the governmental level, especially in the fight against the Covid-19 pandemic. Therefore, it is important to consider how these three perspectives contribute to our understanding of the world.

### Results

The study of international relations is dominated by the realist viewpoint. International relations (IR) scholars are generally identified with the realist school of thought, which views international politics as synonymous with conflict, war, and rivalry among great countries in the military sphere. Typically, realists have a state-centric perspective of international players. Regardless of the happenings inside its own borders, the state remains a unified whole. Power is the state's ultimate objective. The field of international relations is mostly influenced by the realist perspective. International relations (IR) experts are commonly associated with the realist school of thought, which perceives international politics as being characterized by conflict, war, and competition among powerful nations in the military domain. Realists generally use a state-centric viewpoint when analyzing international actors. Irrespective of internal events, the state remains a cohesive entity. Furthermore, the state is inconsequential as the actions of states influence the dynamics of international relations. In this scenario, the acts taken by the state are both beneficial to itself and rational, one's own safety and well-being. Regardless of their political beliefs, big and small nations alike prioritize safety. Realists argue that international politics is characterized by anarchy since there is no supranational body with the power to impose policies on individual states. To ensure the state's continued existence, it must thrive under these conditions. When acting in the national interest, the state, according to realists, has no need to act morally. The foundation of realism is supported by three fundamental pillars. Firstly, it is important to note that the nation-state holds a central role in global politics. They clarified that international relations encompass the interactions exclusively between sovereign states. Realists recognize the existence of non-state entities, such as multinational corporations (MNCs), international organizations, transnational non-governmental organizations (NGOs), terrorist groups, and influential individuals. However, realists underestimate the significant influence that these individuals and non state actors have on shaping global politics. Furthermore, the state pursues power solely for its own benefit. Realists used military vocabulary as the benchmark for defining power. A nation with a robust military will exhibit greater resilience against global volatility. The economy has a part, but its significance lies solely in its ability to strengthen military might. Furthermore, war and peace are basic and fundamental aspects of international relations. When one country clashes with another, it is perceived by realists as an inevitable occurrence in world politics that cannot be prevented. Realists contend that states must consistently prepare for such unforeseen events as they are unavoidable.

#### • Protecting the Homeland: A Realist Look at the Pandemic

Conflict, distrust, and violence are normal features of international politics, realists believe. This is now an accepted part of diplomatic practice. Competition and warfare between nations did not abate when the globe was threatened by the Covid-19 outbreak. Realists ignore the pleas of the international community to put a stop to the war and focus instead on rebuilding society after the devastating pandemic. Political subjection to a global morality, according to realists, is unrealistic. Realists argue that states should not base their policies on universal standards of morality and ethics.

The clash between the United States and China as global powers serves as a prime example of the realism perspective in the post-pandemic era. In the present time, the conflict between the two dominant forces is based largely on conspiracy theories rather than concrete proof. One party may have magnified the dispute regarding the Covid-19 pandemic between the United States and China in order to showcase a prejudiced stance toward the other. Initially, the United States attributed the outbreak of the war to China and Russia on the grounds that they disseminated false information regarding the pandemic. China was even implicated by the United States in the global health crisis. The epidemic is attributed to a laboratory breach in the Wuhan region of China, as stated by the United States. The United States president, Donald Trump, stated that the Wuhan Institute of Virology presented irrefutable evidence of the coronavirus. In response to the allegations, China labelled the United States afflicted with a "political virus," an allusion to influential individuals in the United States who advocate for antagonism between their nation and China. "The power is attempting to incite a new cold war between the two nations," stated Wang Yi, the foreign minister of China. In addition to the catastrophic coronavirus outbreak, a political virus is currently wreaking havoc across the United States. Additionally, the Chinese government asserted that U.S. investigations into the origins of the coronavirus are

being politicised.

The United States' rivals include both Iran and China. At first, Iran blamed the United States for spreading the coronavirus. "According to a tweet by the Iranian Student News Agency (ISNA), the commander of the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps, Major General Hossein Salami, said that the coronavirus was the result of a biological invasion by the United States. There was no response from the United States." Nonetheless, the United States maintains its economic sanctions on Iran. Iran acknowledges that overcoming the epidemic is difficult because of the sanctions. "The Iranian leadership pleaded with the United States to lift sanctions when Joe Biden succeeded Donald Trump as president. The government of Joe Biden, however, shows no signs of being persuaded by Iran's plea. After the inauguration of Joe Biden as president, the Iranian leadership urged a reconsideration of the sanctions imposed by the United States. However, it seems that the administration headed by Joe Biden remains unmoved by Iran's entreaty.

The price of crude oil has been a subject of disagreement between Saudi Arabia and Russia, which was worsened by the outbreak. The reduction in crude oil output by Saudi Arabia, with the aim of increasing prices, had a crucial role in the emergence of the war. The pandemic has adversely affected the country's economy, hence necessitating this measure. Saudi Arabia employs oil as a strategic instrument in its foreign policy. Conversely, Russia opposed this plan due to concerns about a decrease in oil exports. Due to the decline in Russia's oil production, the United States is increasingly appealing as an oil producer for Russia. Russia is strongly committed to maintaining a high level of its own oil output due to its opposition to the United States having a dominant position in the global oil market. According to Russia, both the United States and Russia stand to benefit from the predicted reduction in oil production by Saudi Arabia. As a kind of revenge for Russia's decision not to purchase, Saudi Arabia provided significant price reductions to its oil consumers. "In order to attract Chinese customers, price reductions of \$6–\$7 per barrel would be made available, and production might go up by as much as 2 million barrels per day. The objective of this strategy is to penetrate the Russian oil market and seize a larger part of the Russian market from the nation. If Saudi Arabia is willing to negotiate, Russia will increase the amount of pressure it puts on the United States to reduce oil production." Russia will exert its will on the rest of the world with the help of this newly discovered advantage. Saudi Arabia, on the other hand, will not put its national interests or its connections to the United States in any kind of jeopardy for the sake of any short-term advantage.

The reactions of countries to individuals from other nations, in addition to the disagreements that occur between nations, present a realistic picture of the world during times of epidemics in the past. When it comes to formulating public policy, realists will always place the safety and well-being of the nation as their first priority. The conduct of countries during a pandemic is an excellent instance of the realist dictum about the inapplicability of global morality and ethics. This dictum states that morality and ethics cannot be applied on a worldwide scale. In the face of a very hazardous situation brought on by the spread of the Covid-19 virus, governments have made the decision to behave in a self-serving manner by closing their borders. When the COVID-19 outbreak struck, almost every nation in the globe locked its borders. The danger of transmission may be decreased by imposing restrictions on the movement of people to and from other countries. In spite of the fact that the European Union (EU) is often considered to be the "friendliest" zone for immigrants, its borders have been closed.

The European Union came to the conclusion that "all travel between non-European countries and EU countries will be suspended" in March of 2020, which was when the first pandemic wave arrived. Travel restrictions in Australia are among the most stringent of any country in the world. Since the first pandemic wave, Australia has been placed under quarantine, and this state will continue until 2022 at the earliest. This strategy is also being used in its close geographic neighbor, New Zealand. In contrast to Australia, New Zealand intends to begin the process of liberalizing its immigration policies from the beginning of 2022. "Both the United States of America and Canada have made the decision to stop allowing new people to enter their countries. Walls, according to Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau, are a "sustainable measure will keep people in both of our countries safe" because they remove the possibility of terrorist acts taking place over the border. After the second wave of the outbreak, several governments went so far as to forbid their nationals from other nations from entering their country. Indonesia is an example of such a nation. After the spread of the Delta variant of the Covid-19 viral mutation in Indonesia, the immigration of citizens from that country was restricted in six different countries, including Singapore, the United Arab Emirates, Saudi Arabia, Oman, the European Union, and Hong Kong.

The responses of states towards foreign individuals, as well as the conflicts that arise between nations, provide an accurate portrayal of the global scenario during historical epidemics. When it comes to devising public policy, realists consistently prioritize the safety and well-being of the nation above all else. The behavior of nations during a pandemic serves as a compelling example of the realist principle that global morality and ethics are not applicable. This aphorism asserts that morals and ethics are not universally applicable. Amidst the highly perilous circumstances caused by the rapid transmission of the Covid-19 virus, nations have opted to prioritize their own interests by implementing border closures. Upon the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, nearly every country worldwide implemented border closures. Imposing restrictions on international travel can reduce the risk of transmission. Despite being often regarded as the most hospitable region, the European Union (EU) has recently implemented more stringent border controls.

The growth of "vaccine nationalism" is another example of the "realist world," in which states are self-centered



and reject international rules of conduct. This phenomenon has been attributed to the increase of anti-vaccine sentiment in recent years. During a pandemic, vaccines are a very important resource for a country. If the threat of war requires a country to strengthen its military, then the threat of a pandemic requires the nation to protect its supply of vaccinations. As a result, nations work hard to secure immunization supply for their respective populations. As an example, the European Union (EU) announced in March 2021 that it would no longer ship vaccines manufactured by Oxford-AstraZeneca to the United Kingdom and Ireland. The availability of vaccines was abundant in regions such as North America, Europe, Australia, and New Zealand, but it was limited in regions such as South Asia, Africa, and South America. According to research conducted by the Economic Intelligence Unit there may not be sufficient vaccinations until the year 2024. According to CNBC, the world's wealthiest countries have gotten the lion's share of the 700 million doses of immunization that have been distributed. This indicates that one prosperous country out of every four will be vaccinated against the disease.

Meanwhile, the immunization rate for individuals residing in underdeveloped nations is only one in every 500 people. The implementation of a "vaccine embargo" policy, which entails the prohibition of vaccine sales to foreign nations, remains a significant element fueling the growth of vaccine nationalism. Indonesia is one of the nations that might be affected by this policy originating from India. In March 2021, India, the second-largest producer of vaccines globally, halted the shipment of the AstraZeneca vaccine due to the worsening Covid-19 situation in the country. China holds the title of being the world's largest manufacturer of vaccines. Consequently, Indonesia lost 11.7 million vaccine doses.

#### • Using tactics and policies that promote resilience in the face of pandemics such as the Covid-19 virus and others

How should we handle the significant shock that Covid-19 exerts on international markets, social activities, and government, in addition to the health care system? How can we mitigate the systemic consequences that strain different spheres of international commerce and government, as well as the individual and collective behavioural effects of fear that may induce large slowdowns in economic activity? There are two major concepts and approaches that might be used by different parties. Until recently, it was commonly believed that if it is not possible to completely prevent or avoid a hazard, then efforts should be made to greatly reduce its effects thereafter. The fundamental attractiveness of conventional risk management resides in its ability to attenuate undesirable risks through financial measures before they escalate beyond control.

"However, such options may be ineffective at protecting economic and social systems and calming perturbations in today's world of rapid feedback loops and increasingly nested systems where cascading failures are inevitable, or they may be prohibitively expensive to implement to the extent needed to assure policymakers and other stakeholders of adequate protection. All too frequently, people mistakenly believe that risk management entails running an organization with as few employees as possible to maximize efficiency." Without any kind of redundancy, a system is very susceptible to failure and has almost no resilience to shocks. The second tactic is to harden your system against randomness, uncertainty, and other forms of volatility. Instead of focusing on the ability of system operators to prevent, avoid, tolerate, and absorb shocks, resilience looks to recover and adapt quickly once they occur. "In this way of thinking, the limitless variety of potential risks is acknowledged, as is the difficulty of effectively anticipating and assessing them, much alone fully comprehending their effects. Recognizing that huge disruptions are possible and will occur, resilience emphasizes the need of vital systems having the capacity for recovery and adaptation, and even taking use of new or disclosed possibilities after the crisis to strengthen the system via wider systemic changes. Climate change is a potential future shock multiplier for events like pandemics."

The Covid epidemic presents an opportunity for us to more effectively address challenges like as global warming. This phenomenon is commonly referred to as "progressing forward" instead of "reverting back." The modern world is characterized by increased complexity and dynamism, with interconnection between systems being a key factor that influences it. This phenomenon has greatly benefited a significant proportion of the worldwide population and is the outcome of both widespread economic prospects and global political interconnections. Reducing global interdependence in response to the Covid-19 epidemic will not enhance the safety of nations or global markets against future systemic hazards. Instead, the world after the Covid-19 pandemic necessitates a shift towards prioritizing the development of resilience within the global economic system. This entails designing institutions that can aid in recovery and adaptation after experiencing disruptions. The Covid epidemic presents an opportunity for us to more effectively address challenges like as global warming. This phenomenon is commonly referred to as "progressing forward" instead of "reverting back." The modern world is characterized by increased complexity and dynamism, with interconnection between systems being a key factor that influences it. This phenomenon has greatly benefited a significant proportion of the worldwide population and is the outcome of both widespread economic prospects and global political interconnections. Reducing global interdependence in response to the Covid-19 epidemic will not enhance the safety of nations or global markets against future systemic hazards. However, the post-Covid-19 world requires a change in focus towards prioritizing the enhancement of resilience within the global economic system. This involves creating institutions that can assist in the process of recovering and adapting after encountering interruptions.

To efficiently handle epidemics and other systemic risks, it is crucial to integrate measures that are based on both risk assessment and resilience. The uncertainties that are most likely to impact resilience can be recognized through the process of risk management, which is driven by the necessity for resilience. However, the resilience being discussed here does not align with the standard definition provided by the OECD. The OECD defines resilience as the capacity to endure setbacks and return to pre-crisis levels of prosperity. Contemporary civilizations recognize that the systemic dangers they encounter are difficult to simulate and frequently too intricate to address with traditional risk assessment techniques, which overly prioritize the resilience and strength of a system. The present focus of the resilience movement is the ability of a system to anticipate, absorb, recover from, and adjust to various systemic hazards. Redundancy by design serves an adaptive purpose, much like buffers play a protective role and slack serves psychological and organizational functions.

#### • **Evaluating the Function of the Realist Theory and Nation-States in the International System**

State governments have a crucial impact on international affairs, and their actions have significant and widespread implications. In order to completely comprehend international relations, it is crucial to have a solid understanding of the role of nation-states, and realist theories offer valuable advice in this regard. Realism, a widely accepted perspective in the field of international relations, posits that governments are the primary actors and are primarily motivated by self-interest and the pursuit of power. Advocates of this perspective argue that the global system lacks a centralized authority to enforce regulations and norms among various nations, resulting in an anarchic state. Consequently, governments actively seek power and prioritize their own interests, driven by concerns about their survival and protection.

Within this context, the processes that revolve around states are particularly prominent. The security dilemma, characterized by governments enhancing their military capabilities to safeguard their national security, is underscored by the realist approach. Consequently, other nations usually respond by escalating their own military capabilities due to apprehension, resulting in a chain reaction. This intense competition arises from the realism concept of self-reliance and the continuous quest for comparative superiority. Furthermore, the concept of power equilibrium is fundamental to the ideology of realism. States strive to either preserve or alter this balance in order to protect their own interests. The COVID-19 outbreak has affected the resource allocation and strategic alliances of states, which they use to enhance their position in the international system. The outbreak has also underscored the pragmatic concept that governments would prioritize actions that safeguard their national interests, encompassing safety, prosperity, and territorial sovereignty. State-level goals during and after the pandemic have focused on securing access to vaccinations, managing vital resources, and exerting territorial authority. The pandemic has demonstrated how governments can collaborate on matters such as vaccine distribution while still engaging in competition for medical supplies and influence, highlighting the interaction of state-centric dynamics amid a global catastrophe.

#### • **Examining the Effects of the Pandemic on World Power Dynamics**

The onset of the COVID-19 pandemic has had extensive repercussions on the global power dynamics, changing the manner in which nations engage with one another and exert their influence. The epidemic has profoundly reshaped the global power dynamics by introducing numerous new challenges, opportunities, and competitions among nations. The phenomenon has exerted a substantial influence on the behavior of nations, particularly in relation to the competition for resources, diplomatic tactics, and strategic partnerships.

The competition among countries for vital resources such as medical supplies, personal protective equipment (PPE), and immunizations has intensified because to the ongoing pandemic. This intense competition is in line with the realist perspective that countries are driven to safeguard their population and national interests through the acquisition of strategic resources. Due to the pandemic, vaccine diplomacy has arisen, wherein governments utilize their vaccine supplies and distribution to acquire political influence in foreign nations. This geopolitical maneuvering exemplifies the realist perspective that governments are willing to go to any lengths to enhance their power and influence in the global stage.

Geopolitical tensions have escalated in major nations such as the United States, China, and Russia due to the outbreak. These debates are a manifestation of the realist perspective that emphasizes the competition between major powers, where all governments strive for either maintaining their dominant position or expanding their area of control. As countries reassess their strategic objectives and seek new alliances to strengthen their power and security, the epidemic has also resulted in significant alterations to international alliances and partnerships.

Studying power dynamics in the post-Covid period helps us understand how realism theories contribute to our understanding of state-centric behavior and the intricate interplay of power politics on the global stage. As nations grapple with the ongoing challenges and consequences of the epidemic, these processes will evolve and ultimately influence the future of the international system.

#### **Discussion**

The concept of theory in the subject of international relations might be likened to a set of lenses that we use to observe and comprehend the complex world around us. Just like how various lenses alter the color of what we see, the theories we use shape our experience of the world. Similar to different lenses that change our view of

the world, these concepts can be compared to separate lenses. The ultimate outcome is dictated by the lens or viewpoint through which we examine the world.

Steve Smith's statement vividly underscores the significance of theory in our comprehension of international relations. He asserts that any analysis of international relations must be grounded in theory. The theoretical framework that underpins our observations and the interpretations we give them enables us to comprehend and derive significance from them. It aids in comprehending the tumultuous and constantly evolving global landscape by offering a structured framework for understanding it.

The intricate and multifaceted nature of international relations cannot be comprehended from a singular perspective or elucidated by a solitary theory. A singular viewpoint, like to a solitary lens, is insufficient to fully comprehend the intricate and constantly evolving global system of interconnections. Consequently, over time, various conflicting ideologies have emerged, each introducing a novel perspective. Although these views may seem contradictory, they play a crucial role in clarifying each other.

Stephen Waltz puts it succinctly when he says, "each conflicting perspective provides an important picture of world politics." Our understanding of the international arena is deepened and enriched by this variety of ideas. As with looking at the world through a single, monochromatic lens, our comprehension would be limited if we relied on just one hypothesis. By combining insights from several schools of thought, we may get a more thorough and comprehensive understanding of international relations in all its complexities. [33]

If combined with foresight and resiliency, systems thinking are the most potent weapon at our disposal for achieving this goal. Systems theory demonstrates that crises are inherent to complex systems like healthcare and financial markets. All systems, even the ones that politicians are attempting to regulate, are doomed to collapse at some point in the future. Therefore, preparedness is required, despite the fact that doing so may not seem financially prudent prior to the occurrence of a catastrophe. The argument that risks can only be seen in retrospect does not hold up to examination. What has transpired is consistent with the results of major simulation exercises conducted in OECD nations that properly forecast the potential course of a crisis like Covid-19 but were either ignored or not acted upon in sufficient detail. Financial systems are an example of an intangible sector where resilient solutions might be considered a safe bet. The current financial crisis was predicted by many, and experts have pointed to debt as a significant role in system vulnerability. [34]

A systems-based approach to policymaking would acknowledge that, while we can't predict what will set off the next crisis, we can anticipate that certain factors will increase the likelihood and severity of the next crisis, and that there are better policy options than waiting for it to occur and then paying for bailouts. In conclusion, the OECD's frequent recommendations to "break down silos" are consistent with a systems perspective. As we can see, a health crisis does not stay a health crisis for very long. Rapid propagation to what seem to be unrelated systems is possible. In a world where a change in a Chinese province's ecology may cause an economic disaster throughout the globe, we must forgo our linear, compartmentalized approach to policymaking in favor of pragmatic cooperation on a local to global scale. [35]

## Conclusion

This paper adopts a pragmatic perspective on the global situation during the Covid-19 pandemic. Realists present a pessimistic and unfavorable view of the world by emphasizing the relentless pursuit of national interests by states. World politics in the post-pandemic era cannot be comprehended through any of these three perspectives. Many outsiders' opinions diverge from reality, yet this is not accurate. It highlights the need of maintaining a receptive mindset when seeking to understand the world in the aftermath of the epidemic. This paper has demonstrated that the current portrayal of the world consists of both conflicts and self-interested attitudes of states, as well as collaborative endeavors that are mutually beneficial, and a readiness to assist those who are in need. All three of these qualities demonstrate the presence of realism and resistant perspectives. Nevertheless, this does not inherently signify an imminent condition of anarchy or conflict; rather, it signifies a pragmatic response to a complex and interconnected environment.

## \*\*\*\*\*References\*\*\*\*\*

1. Antara News (2021). Selandia Baru bantuRp15miliaruntukresponsCOVID-19diIndonesia. <https://www.antaranews.com/berita/2281406/selandia-baru-bantu-rp15-miliar-untuk-respons-covid-19-di-indonesia>
2. Bakeer, A.H. (2020). Arab Saudi kalahperangminyak;mungkinjugaakankehilangansatu-satunyasekutubaratnya. <https://www.aa.com.tr/id/berita-analisis/analisis-arab-saudi-kalah-perang-minyak-mungkin-juga-akan-kehilangan-satu-satunya-sekutubaratnya/1812671>
3. BBC Indonesia (2021). Vaksin Covid:Israel sepakatbertukarvaksindenganKorselsetelahbatal kirimke Palestina. <https://www.bbc.com/indonesia/dunia-57744631>
4. Blanc, J., and Brown, F. (2020). Conflictzones in the time of Coronavirus:war and war by other means. <https://carnegieendowment.org/2020/12/17/conflict-zones-in-time-of-coronavirus-war-and-war-by-other-means-pub-83462>
5. CNN Indonesia (2020). RI sumbang Rp.176 M bantu negara miskin lawanCorona. <https://www.cnnindonesia.com/ekonomi/20200920131438-532-548579/ri-sumbang>

- rp176-m-bantu-negara-miskin-lawan-corona
6. Detik (2021). Menlu RI-Korea Selatan kerjasamanya kembangkan vaksin-obat Corona. <https://news.detik.com/berita/d-5619675/menlu-ri-korea-selatan-kerja-sama-kembangkan-vaksin-obat-corona>
7. Drezner, D. (2020). The song remains the same: international relations after Covid-19. *International Organization*, 74(2), 18-35. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818320000351>
8. Dunne, T., and Schmidt, B. (2019). Realism. Dalam: J. Baylis, S. Smith and P. Owens (eds.), *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations* (pp. 100-125).
9. European Union (2021). Rome Declaration. [https://global-health-summit.europa.eu/rome-declaration\\_en](https://global-health-summit.europa.eu/rome-declaration_en)
10. Fenton-Harvey, J. (2021). 'Nasionalisme vaksin' makin menguat di Eropa. <https://www.aa.com.tr/id/berita-analisis/nasionalisme-vaksin-makin-menguat-di-eropa/2185013>
11. Finnemore, M. (2016). *National Interests in International Society*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
12. Fleming, S. (2021). Report: Covid-19 made the world less peaceful. <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2021/06/covid19-world-peace-index-2021/>
13. Fukuyama, F. (2020). The pandemic and political order. *Foreign Affairs*, 99(4), 26-32.
14. Government of Canada (2021). Canada's aid and development assistance in response to the COVID 19 pandemic. [https://www.international.gc.ca/world-monde/issues\\_development-enjeux\\_developpement/global\\_health-sante\\_mondiale/response\\_covid-19\\_reponse.aspx?lang=eng](https://www.international.gc.ca/world-monde/issues_development-enjeux_developpement/global_health-sante_mondiale/response_covid-19_reponse.aspx?lang=eng)
15. Keohane, R., and Martin, L. (1995). The promise of institutionalist theory. *International Security*, 20(1), 39-51. DOI: 10.2307/2539214
16. Kompas (2020). AS tuduh China dan Rusia berkoordinasi dalam konspirasi pandemi virus Corona. <https://www.kompas.com/global/read/2020/05/09/094553170/as-tuduh-china-dan-rusia-berkoordinasi-dalam-konspirasi-pandemi-virus?page=all>
17. Liputan6 (2020). Jadi pusat pandemi virus Corona, Eropa akan tutup seluruh perbatasan. <https://www.liputan6.com/global/read/4204501/jadi-pusat-pandemi-virus-corona-eropa-akan-tutup-seluruh-perbatasan>
18. March, J., and Olsen, J. (2018). Logic of appropriateness. ARENA Working Paper No. 9. [https://www.sv.uio.no/arena/english/research/publications/arena-working-papers/2001-2010/2004/wp04\\_9.pdf](https://www.sv.uio.no/arena/english/research/publications/arena-working-papers/2001-2010/2004/wp04_9.pdf)
19. Medcom (2020). Kanada beribantuan Covid-19 senilai Rp. 12,5 miliar untuk Indonesia. <https://www.medcom.id/internasional/asia-pasifik/Rb10y41N-kanada-beri-bantuan-covid-19-senilai-rp12-5-miliar-untuk-indonesia>
20. Media Indonesia (2021). Indonesia berhibah alat kesehatan kepada India. <https://mediaindonesia.com/internasional/404746/indonesia-beri-hibah-alat-kesehatan-kepada-india>
21. Moravcsik, A. (2020). Taking preferences seriously: a liberal theory of international politics. *International Organization*, 51(4), 513-553. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1162/002081897550447>
22. Mustasilta, K. (2020). From bad to worse? the impact(s) of Covid-19 on conflict dynamics. <https://www.iss.europa.eu/sites/default/files/EUISSFiles/Brief%2013%20Covid%20and%20conflict.pdf>
23. Okezone (2020). Pandemi virus Corona, AS-Kanada perpanjang tutup perbatasan. <https://news.okezone.com/read/2020/05/20/18/2216996/pandemi-virus-corona-as-kanada-perpanjang-tutup-perbatasan>
24. Posen, B. (2020). Do pandemics promote peace? <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/china/2020-04-23/do-pandemics-promote-peace>
25. Republika Online (2021). Kanada termasuk negara paling dermawan di dunia dalam bantuan penanganan Covid-19. <https://dunia.rmol.id/read/2021/05/08/487196/kanada-termasuk-negara-paling-dermawan-di-dunia-dalam-bantuan-penanganan-covid-19>
26. Rosyidin, M. (2015). *The Power of Ideas: Konstruktivisme dalam Studi Hubungan Internasional*. Yogyakarta: Tiara Wacana.
27. Rosyidin, M. (2020). *Teori Hubungan Internasional: Dari Perspektif Klasik Sampai Non-Barat*. Depok: Rajagrafindo.
28. Sindo News (2020). Indonesia-Australia kerjasa dalam penelitian Covid-19. <https://international.sindonews.com/read/101974/40/indonesia-australia-kerjasama-dalam-penelitian-covid-19-1594804067>
29. Smith, S. (2017). Introduction: diversity and disciplinarity in international relations theory. Dalam: T. Dunne,
30. Keohane RO, Nye JS. (2022) Power and interdependence. *Survival*, 15(4):158-165.
31. Mearsheimer JJ. (2021) The false promise of international institutions. *International Organization*, 1st edition, Taylor and Francis Group, United States, pp. 237-282.
32. Mc Neil D. (2020) The coronavirus in America: The year ahead. *The New York Times*, 2020.



33. M. Kurki and S. Smith (2019.), *International Relations Theory: Discipline and Diversity*, 3rd edn (pp.1-12). Clarendon: Oxford University Press.
34. Tempo (2021). Kewalahan lawan COVID-19, Iran minta Amerika akhir sanksi. <https://dunia.tempo.co/read/1426927/kewalahan-lawan-covid-19-iran-minta-amerika-akhiri-sanksinya/full&view=ok>
35. Tribun News (2021). Selandia Baru tutup perbatasan hingga awal 2022. <https://www.tribunnews.com/internasional/2021/08/11/selandia-baru-tutup-perbatasan-hingga-awal-2022>