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**Introduction**

 Power is both slippery and elusive concept in the study of Political Science. In the international system these concepts of power, authority and force can be used as a successful approach. Some scholarships, in this regard, have claimed that these concepts can be used to analyze the global phenomenon in international relations. While some have defined these concepts as a means to end, and others as military forces of the states. Hans Morgenthau, the leading supporter of power views all the politics as a struggle for power (Holsti 1964). He further says that human nature as an instinct to acquire power and dominate others. Once they acquired power, the next step is to use it. Now they are moving towards dominating others by creating a security dilemma. As the process of securitization and de-securitization are interlinked. Security of one state or an individual is insecurity of others.

**Discussion**

 Morgenthau, however, failed the concept for further examination. For example, he implies that power is the major policy goals behind any political action. In this regard, Woodrow Wilson criticizes this by saying that there is a difference between ‘power politics' and other forms of power. Moreover, he further discusses the relationship between a nation's socio-political institutions and their way of conducting foreign relations. Democracies, usually do not go for use force as they have tolerance, morality, and justice. While in contemporary international politics, some scholars view power in terms of physical asset that nations keep.

 Previously, the states and governments did not possess foreign policy instruments, therefore, they had to rely on the violence and use of force were the most significant tactics. But at many places, violence was the only means to influence others. While the current advancement in technology and military affairs became an alternative to the use of force. They form the alliance to counter threats.

 David Lake views authority as “equal form of power as it is easier to acquire compliance by obligating others (Lake 2013). As the actors on the global stage are bound together in a divergent relationship. Therefore, the authority has significant importance in contemporary international politics. The observation of the concepts: power, authority, and force are difficult today because finding asymmetries are hard as they are everywhere (Hurd 1999). Yet, power is the glue that joins ideational factors and interests with policy outcomes. On the other hand, DNI Krasner overtly rejects the assumption that the use of force can be explained by interest in terms of US involvement between two world wars (Lake 2013). He claims that these were the sociological and historical results of the US experience. David Easton also views this interaction in sociological perspective where authorities are binding to allocate norms and values and implement these values. As the political system has no capacity to permit all the demands in the system (Evans 1970).

 Consent, however, is different from other forms of social influence, because it involves the process of coordination and bargaining. While the use of force, coercion, and bargaining offers threats of punishment and rewards. Moreover, Krasner views ‘consent’ as a fiction and international law has been understood as the basis of consent. In addition, the international organization both expressly and implicitly based on the approach of consent. Besides, he does not reject the notion of ‘structure realism', that defines the structure as hierarchical in nature. He also did not deny the role of treaties in international politics as ‘Pareto-improving', and there are regimes that have been affecting the international system. Therefore, international law is functional only sociologically and sovereignty as a state personality as a fundamental unit of observation in this anarchic international system.
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