Published by

British Journal of Contemporary Research

BEXFORD PUBLISHING

The Illusion of the Super Norm: The Dialectic of Sovereignty Extension and Protection in an Anarchic System

Case Study | Volume 1 | Issue 1 | 2026 | Article Number: 010

Accepted: 06 June 2026 | Published: 10 June 2026 | ISSN: 2979-8582 (Online)

Crossref doi : **https://doi.org/10.67693/BJCR-5WJHUADT**

Tapatya Basak[1], Akash Chatterjee[2]

[1]Jadavpur University, India

[2]Research Scholar, University of Calcutta

Correspondence: Tapatya Basak, basaktapatya@gmail.com

Abstract

The global landscape is neither unipolar, multipolar, nor chaotic; it is all three at the same time, with power configurations shifting across diverse arenas. While contemporary institutional discourse frequently elevates multilateral frameworks and global "super norms" as the defining architecture of international politics, the fundamental mechanics of systemic anarchy persist. This paper isolates the precise friction point of modern geopolitical instability by examining the structural collision between sovereignty extension and sovereignty protection. Grounding the analysis in neorealist theory, the study juxtaposes the offensive realist drive to maximize security perimeters and achieve regional hegemony against the defensive realist imperative of territorial maintenance and state survival. When a great power operationalizes the pursuit of extended sovereignty under the guise of normative or historical rights, it structurally guarantees a protectionist backlash from neighboring states. This resulting dynamic sharply escalates the security dilemma. Consequently, rather than mitigating conflict, the prevailing environment of institutionalism merely obscures the raw, absolute gains calculations dictating state behavior. By disaggregating these competing iterations of sovereignty, this analysis demonstrates why international alignments remain highly fragile. Ultimately, the research proves that beneath the veneer of multilateral cooperation, the survival driven clash between offensive expansion and defensive preservation remains the paramount engine of global conflict.

Keywords: Neo Realism, Hegemony, Sovereignty, Conflict, Protection, Survival.

Introduction:

We are living in an era of profound geopolitical schizophrenia. If we ask a liberal institutionalist to diagnose the current global architecture, they might point to a robust network of international laws and multilateral frameworks. If we ask a strategist, they will describe a multipolar scramble. So we need to look closely at the actual distribution of military and economic capacity in order to understand that the

© 2026 The Authors. Published by Bexford Publishing Ltd

reality is far more convoluted: the global landscape is simultaneously unipolar, multipolar, and chaotic, depending entirely on which theater of power one examines.

Despite this messy reality, contemporary diplomatic discourse remains stubbornly attached to the idea of global "super norms" , the belief that multilateralism, economic interdependence and international law have fundamentally rewired the state behavior. This is an illusion. While the language of international politics has evolved, the mechanical reality of systemic anarchy has not. To understand the precise friction points of modern geopolitical instability we have to look past the institutional veneer and examine the structural collision at the heart of statecraft that is the dialectic relationship between sovereignty extension and sovereignty protection.

Since the end of the Cold War, the international community has spent decades attempting to legislate away the security dilemma. The assumption was that embedding states within dense networks of international institutions would alter their calculations, shifting their focus from absolute gains (where one state's gain is inherently a threat to another) to relative or shared gains. This environment of institutionalism hasn't mitigated conflict; it has merely provided a new vocabulary for it. Great powers have not stopped competing for hegemony; they have simply learned to operationalize their pursuit of power through the language of normative rights and historical grievances. The structural constraints of anarchy where there is no supreme arbiter to enforce agreements or guarantee survival meaning that the state must ultimately rely on self-help. When survival is on the line the "super norm" evaporates thus leaving only the cold calculus of the neorealist theory.

Literature Review:

The Persistence of Systemic Anarchy:-

To accurately map the mechanics of modern state behavior, this analysis traces the persistence of anarchy from classical realist thought to contemporary structural frameworks.

The Classical Foundations of Anarchy: The fundamental mechanics of state survival are historically permanent. Rooted in Thucydides' analysis of the Peloponnesian War and Thomas Hobbes' conceptualization of the anarchic state of nature, the realist tradition dictates that without a supreme global arbiter, states are perpetually braced for conflict. The "state of nature" remains the baseline condition of international relations.

The Neorealist Divide: Within structural realism, the dialectic of sovereignty is best understood by synthesizing the field's two dominant factions. Defensive realism posits that the international system encourages states to maintain moderate policies focused purely on territorial maintenance and survival. Conversely, offensive realism, championed by John Mearsheimer, argues that the inherent uncertainty of state intentions forces great powers to aggressively seek regional hegemony to ensure their security.

Critique of Liberal Institutionalism: Scholars like Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye have long posited that complex interdependence and institutional frameworks can mitigate the security dilemma. However, this study challenges that premise, arguing that such institutions do not rewire state behavior; they merely serve as rhetorical tools for great powers to legitimize absolute gains calculations under the guise of shared global norms.

© 2026 The Authors. Published by Bexford Publishing Ltd

Methodology :-

This paper employs a Qualitative Comparative Case Study approach to test the theoretical dialectic between sovereignty extension and protection.

1. Process Tracing: The research maps the sequential escalation of geopolitical conflicts, specifically tracking how the normative claims of an expanding power directly trigger the militarization and alliance-seeking behavior of neighboring states.

2. Critical Discourse Analysis: To demonstrate that expansion is "cloaked in the language of the super norm," this study analyzes primary diplomatic rhetoric, military doctrines, and international treaties, isolating instances where institutional vocabulary is used to mask raw security imperatives.

Sovereignty Extension: The Offensive Imperative:

To unpack this dynamic, we must first look at how great powers behave when they feel constrained. From an offensive realist perspective the international system actively encourages states to maximize their relative power. A state cannot ever be entirely certain of another state's intentions, meaning the only rational way to guarantee survival is to become the dominant hegemon in one's region. This drive manifests as "sovereignty extension". It is not necessarily driven by ideological malice but by structural paranoia. According to John Mearsheimer a great power looks at its borders and sees vulnerabilities, prompting it to push its security perimeter outward. We see this when powers establish buffer zones, assert control over contested maritime routes or leverage economic dependencies to dictate the foreign policies of weaker neighbors. However raw expansionism is rarely palatable in the modern era. Therefore sovereignty extension is almost always cloaked in the language of the super norm. A state will justify its outward push as a "responsibility to protect," a reclamation of "historical territorial integrity," or the enforcement of "regional stability." This normative disguising makes the expansion palatable to domestic audiences and allies but it does absolutely nothing to soothe the anxieties of the states on the receiving end.

Sovereignty Protection and the Inevitable Collision:

This is where the dialectic violently resolves itself. When Power A engages in sovereignty extension, it triggers an immediate, structurally guaranteed reaction from Power B. Enter the defensive realist imperative of "sovereignty protection". For neighboring or rival states the normative justifications used by the expanding power are irrelevant. They do not see an attempt to "stabilize a region" or "correct a historical wrong"; they see an adversary encroaching on their buffer zones and altering the balance of power. The rational response is to immediately turtle up, militarize and seek counter balancing alliances. This collision is the paramount engine of modern conflict. The expanding state genuinely believes it is merely securing its flanks and acting within its historical rights, while the defending state genuinely believes its sovereign survival is under imminent threat. The resulting escalation is a textbook security dilemma but it is supercharged by the modern illusion that such raw power politics were supposed to be a thing of the past.

Thus understanding this dialectic exposes exactly why contemporary international alignments are so incredibly fragile. Alliances today are rarely built on the bedrock of shared ideological values, regardless of what joint press conferences claim. They are temporary marriages of convenience dictated by absolute gains calculations. States align multilaterally not because they believe in the intrinsic value of the institution, but because the institution serves as a useful mechanism for either extending their own

© 2026 The Authors. Published by Bexford Publishing Ltd

sovereignty or protecting it against a larger threat. The moment a multilateral framework ceases to serve that fundamental survival objective, the state will abandon it.

Empirical Case Studies

1. **The Russia-Ukraine Conflict: The Violent Resolution of the Dialectic:**

If we want to see this structural collision play out in real time, we need to look no further than the ongoing bloodbath in Eastern Europe. The war in Ukraine isn't just a localized tragedy; it is the definitive modern manifestation of two entirely irreconcilable worldviews crashing into one another. To understand Moscow's calculus, we have to view it through the lens of offensive realism. For years, the Russian political and military elite watched anxiously as NATO inched closer to their borders, creeping across the historically vulnerable flatlands of Eastern Europe. Feeling backed into a corner whether that anxiety was justified or a byproduct of historical paranoia Russia decided the only way to feel safe was to aggressively push its security perimeter outward. This is a textbook example of sovereignty extension: the belief that our own state can only be secure if we neutralize and control the territory of our neighbour. But in the 21st century, we can't just launch a massive imperial land grab and call it what it is. We have to sell it to the world and more importantly, to our own people. So, the Kremlin draped its armored columns in the rhetoric of a "super norm." Putin and his inner circle weaponized history, citing a moral "responsibility to protect" ethnic Russians in the Donbas while simultaneously framing the invasion as the righteous reclamation of Kyivan Rus and Russia's "historical territorial integrity." It was a brutal, realist power play intentionally cloaked in the modern language of humanitarian duty and historical justice.

Now let's flip the perspective to Kyiv and its neighbours. For Ukraine, the theoretical nuances of Russia's so called normative justifications meant absolutely nothing. When artillery starts falling on our capital, defensive realism stops being an academic concept and instantly becomes a matter of raw, visceral survival. The imperative of sovereignty protection took immediate precedence. For the Ukrainians, this wasn't about negotiating buffer zones; it was about preventing the total erasure of their national identity and statehood. The structural reaction was practically instantaneous. We watched an entire society rapidly militarize, tossing aside any lingering illusions of neutrality. Ukraine's urgent drive to integrate into Western institutions, specifically the European Union and NATO, was no longer just a political preference. It was an existential lifeline. And this is where the theory of the security dilemma plays out in its most terrifying form. By attempting to violently secure its western flanks, Russia manifested its own worst nightmare. The protectionist backlash wasn't limited to just Ukraine; it sent shockwaves across the continent. Poland and the Baltic states kicked their defense spending into hyper drive, while countries like Finland and Sweden who had clung strictly to neutrality for decades sprinted into the arms of NATO almost overnight. Ultimately, this dynamic perfectly captures the tragic irony of the expanding power. When a state tries to bully its way into feeling secure, it radically terrifies everyone in its vicinity. The defending states naturally bulk up and form tighter alliances to survive, which in turn only makes the expanding power feel more isolated and threatened. The end result is a violently escalating spiral where the dialectic isn't resolved by diplomats at a negotiating table but by artillery in the mud.

2. **Middle Eastern Nuclear Diplomacy and the Collapse of the JCPOA:**

In order to understand how brittle international agreements really are the wreckage of Middle Eastern nuclear diplomacy is the perfect example. The shifting, deeply cynical security architecture of the region exposes a hard truth about global politics: when push comes to shove, survival always trumps

© 2026 The Authors. Published by Bexford Publishing Ltd

multilateralism. Back in 2015, the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) was heavily romanticized by liberal institutionalists. For a brief moment, they took a massive victory lap. The deal was held up as the ultimate triumph of global "super norms" and complex interdependence proof that even the most bitter geopolitical rivalries could be domesticated through economic incentives, diplomatic frameworks, and rigorous international monitoring. The assumption was that bringing Iran back into the global economic fold would lock them into a system where bad behavior was simply too costly. But the spectacular, slow motion collapse of that agreement tells a very different story. It brutally highlights the fatal flaw in the institutionalist worldview: in a hyper volatile neighborhood, states don't care about "win-win" scenarios. They are obsessed with absolute and relative gains. Even while the ink on the JCPOA was drying, regional rivals like Saudi Arabia and Israel weren't looking at the deal as a peace mechanism; they saw it as a countdown clock. They watched Tehran receive billions in sanctions relief and immediately calculated that this new wealth would just be funneled into proxy wars in Yemen, Syria, and Lebanon. When the chips are down and a state feels its regional survival is genuinely on the line, the polite fiction of the "rules-based international order" gets thrown out the window. As the U.S. abruptly withdrew from the pact and Iran subsequently spun its centrifuges back up to highly enriched levels, the neighboring players didn't wait around for the UN to save them. They instantly defaulted to aggressive self-help strategies. One can see this playing out perfectly in the region's sharp pivot toward nuclear hedging and hard-power alliances. Riyadh made it explicitly clear that if Tehran gets a bomb, the Saudis will buy or build their own which is a textbook security dilemma in action. Meanwhile, Israel accelerated a shadowy, kinetic war of sabotage and assassinations inside Iranian borders, while forging pragmatic, anti-Iran security pacts with former Arab adversaries through the Abraham Accords. Ultimately, the JCPOA was never a cure for the Middle East's geopolitical sickness. It was merely a temporary, highly fragile mechanism for sovereignty protection. It bought time, but it didn't fundamentally alter the balance of power. The moment the treaty stopped alleviating the deep, structural paranoia of the states involved, the diplomatic and institutional veneer evaporated entirely. What's left in its wake isn't a framework for peace, but the cold, unforgiving reality of neorealist calculus.

Conclusion:

In conclusion I want to say that we are currently living through an era of profound diplomatic self deception. For decades, the prevailing architecture of international politics has suffered from a severe, almost terminal case of misplaced faith. The Western led order essentially outsourced global stability to abstract "super norms," international courts, and deeply complex multilateral frameworks. We collectively convinced ourselves that if we just layered enough trade dependencies, economic sanctions, and high-level summits over the globe, we could somehow legislate away the darker, more primal instincts of statecraft. But this worldview is fatally flawed because it ignores the ground we are actually standing on. These grand, polished institutions aren't anchored in bedrock; they are built directly on top of a highly active, inherently anarchic fault line. Once we strip away the lofty rhetoric of international law and the global community, the reality of the international system becomes brutally, unavoidably clear. If we disaggregate state behavior down to its core motivations, we are left with a constant, grinding friction between two competing drives: sovereignty extension and sovereignty protection. It's a vicious, anxiety driven loop. On one side we have insecure, expanding powers actively pushing their borders and spheres of influence outward just to feel safe. On the other we have terrified neighbors desperately throwing up defensive walls, hoarding weapons, and forming hard power coalitions to avoid being swallowed whole.

This isn't to say that treaties, trade pacts and normative diplomacy are entirely useless. They serve a

© 2026 The Authors. Published by Bexford Publishing Ltd

purpose, but we need to see them for what they actually are: shock absorbers. They can buy time, mediate low level disputes and occasionally smooth over temporary crises. What they absolutely cannot do, however, is remove the underlying structural incentives that make conflict inevitable in the first place. A ratified treaty cannot neutralize the visceral panic a nation feels when a hostile neighbor suddenly doubles its defense budget. When the true crisis arrives; when a state's fundamental survival is genuinely on the line the institutional veneer shatters almost instantly, and nations immediately revert to the mean. Beneath the press conferences, the UN resolutions, and the diplomatic handshakes, the cold survival driven clash between offensive expansion and defensive preservation is still running the show. It always has been. It remains the undeniable and deeply unforgiving engine of global geopolitics.

References

Belal, K. (2019). Uncertainty over the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action: Iran, the European Union and the United States. *Policy Perspectives, 16*(1), 23–39. https://doi.org/10.13169/polipers.16.1.0023

De Maio, G. (2016). *Russia's view of Ukraine after the crisis*. Istituto Affari Internazionali (IAI). http://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep09810

Landau, E. B. (2019). *Iran's nuclear violations: JCPOA and beyond*. Institute for National Security Studies. http://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep19382

Lee, S., Ginty, R. M., & Joshi, M. (2016). Social peace vs. security peace. *Global Governance, 22*(4), 491–512. http://www.jstor.org/stable/44861197

McFaul, M., Sestanovich, S., & Mearsheimer, J. J. (2014). Faulty powers: Who started the Ukraine crisis? *Foreign Affairs, 93*(6), 167–178. http://www.jstor.org/stable/24483933

Montgomery, E. B. (2006). Breaking out of the security dilemma: Realism, reassurance, and the problem of uncertainty. *International Security, 31*(2), 151–185. http://www.jstor.org/stable/4137519

Nilsson, M. (2012). Offense–defense balance, war duration, and the security dilemma. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 56*(3), 467–489. http://www.jstor.org/stable/23248796

Pifer, S. (2009). *Crisis between Ukraine and Russia*. Council on Foreign Relations. http://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep05649

Rendall, M. (2006). Defensive realism and the Concert of Europe. *Review of International Studies, 32*(3), 523–540. http://www.jstor.org/stable/40072201

Snyder, G. H. (2002). Mearsheimer's world—Offensive realism and the struggle for security: A review essay. *International Security, 27*(1), 149–173. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3092155

Taliaferro, J. W. (2000). Security seeking under anarchy: Defensive realism revisited. *International Security, 25*(3), 128–161. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2626708

Waltz, K. N. (2000). Structural realism after the Cold War. *International Security, 25*(1), 5–41. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2626772

© 2026 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).