

Received: March 2023

Accepted: December 2023

DOI: 10.7862/rz.2023.hss.83

Krzysztof SUROWIEC¹Petro MATEICHYK²

THE POWER STATUS OF ASIAN AND PACIFIC REGION STATES ON THE BASIS OF SYNTHETIC POWER MEASURES FROM 1992 TO 2022

This paper presents power status in Asia and the Pacific region states – an issue that has a major impact on the international security of countries. To illustrate this, the study takes the period after the end of the Cold War, from 1992 to 2022. The purpose of the paper is to characterize the power status of the Asian and Pacific region countries based on synthetic power measures, adopting the powermetrics model of Professor Mirosław Sułek to calculate the power of states. The analysis proves that the most important role in international security is played by the countries known as superpowers and world powers, whose power enables the implementation of relevant strategic goals, especially in such an important region as Asia and the Pacific. In the coming decades, there is a high probability that China will gain the status of a superpower, while the US must fight to maintain its global position among the rapidly developing countries of the Asia-Pacific region, which in the game for power may take away some of Washington's current advantage.

Keywords: security, power status, powermetrics, Asia and the Pacific.

1. INTRODUCTION

Around the Pacific and in Asia, countries located there are currently in a constant fight for power and resources in order to be able to influence other political entities to an even greater extent and become richer. The 21st century is to belong to Asia, especially China and India. The first symptoms of this can already be seen in the field of economic power or the broadly understood economy. The United States still retains its great position, although its power has been diminished in recent decades. Strong countries strive to become different types of powers, and this path culminates in becoming a superpower in a unipolar system of forces, which currently seems to be a very difficult task. The shift in focus from the Atlantic to the Pacific and Southeast Asia has accelerated the arms race in the region, and increased competition and the potential for conflict. Apart from Europe, Brazil, the Middle East and some African countries, the largest and very powerful countries

¹ Krzysztof Surowiec, Rzeszów University of Technology, Poland; e-mail: ks@prz.edu.pl (corresponding author). ORCID: 0000-0002-6298-2260.

² Petro Mateichyk, National Transport University, Kyiv, Ukraine; e-mail: pmateichyk@gmail.com. ORCID: 0009-0001-5384-7964.

in the world are located in Asia and the Pacific: the USA, China, Russia, India, Japan, and Indonesia. Other countries also aspire to the role of active participants in international relations in this area due to their economic, military or geopolitical strength (Singapore, South Korea, Canada). India, although it does not border the Pacific, has a great influence on the policy in this area. The term Pacific region appeared in Poland for the first time thanks to Edward Haliżak in an article from 1985: “The Pacific region in international relations” (Jarczewska, Zajączkowski [red. nauk.] 2016), and replaced the term “Far East”, which had pejorative colonial associations.

The purpose of the paper is to characterize the superpower status of Asia-Pacific countries based on synthetic power measures from 1992 to 2022. The subject of the research covered the currently most important region of the world, i.e. the Pacific countries lying on both sides of it, along with India, which also have great aspirations and are connected to this region.

The article consists of four parts: the first concerns the concept of the power status; the second and third shows the model of synthetic power measures used by Professor Sułek and the calculation of power measures of the countries of Asia and the Pacific region; the last part focuses on the characteristics of the power status of the countries and its changes in the post-Cold War period in 1992–2022. The article also includes an introduction and the summary.

2. THE CONCEPT OF POWER STATUS AND ITS IMPORTANCE IN CONTEMPORARY INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

From the beginning of the existence of states, the concept of power status in the form of hegemony or empire was known. Despite the passage of thousands of years in science, this concept has not yet been properly defined. Currently, it is recognized that the main players in the world are the superpowers, among all participants in international relations. Colloquially, it is believed that superpowers are large and strong states, although these criteria of the power status have changed over the centuries. Science grades this term into great powers, superpowers or hyperpowers. The criteria of great power include, among others, economic, military, cultural, political, population, geographical, and psychological factors. They are called sectoral power bases (Bógdał-Brzezińska, 2010; Sułek, 2013).

Power status determines the actions of states playing a dominant role in the international environment. According to Ron Böhler, a superpower is a sovereign state that is recognized as having the ability and expertise to exert influence on a global scale (Böhler, 2017). Historically, the status of superpowers was recognized during the Congress of Vienna of 1814–1815 and in the post-Napoleonic era, when the most important states known as the “Concert of Europe³” claimed the right to jointly enforce post-war treaties. John Mearsheimer defines great powers as those that “have sufficient military resources to mount a serious fight in a conventional war against the most powerful state in the world” (Mearsheimer, 2001). In the 20th century, Kenneth Waltz, as a representative of neorealists, recognized the scale of the real influence exerted on the international system. The criteria of great power were also expanded to include economic foundations and soft power. Military power and its influence on superpower status slowly began to lose importance (Waltz, 1979). Thanks to Joseph Nye, after the collapse of the bipolar system

³ After first use in 1856 after the Peace of Paris.

after 1991, soft power was recognized as the main factor influencing the modern power status (Nye, 2007).

The power of the state and international recognition have a significant impact on the characteristics of the power status. However, in each era there are relative and qualitative changes in the powers, which are not predictable to a greater extent. According to Danielski, power relations in the last two hundred years have always emerged after great wars, mainly on the basis of winning coalitions (Danielski, 1983). There are two levels of power: actual and formal. In the second sense, a state is recognized by others, gaining an appropriate status. This is mainly done by granting specific powers in significant international organizations (UN, G7). The actual fact is that a country can win a great war, although there are also countries that could not win a great war, and their influence on other countries is significant. Related to these assumptions is the issue of hegemonic wars. Harold Sprout and Margaret Sprout also believed that a state's ability to win a great war confirmed its power status (Sprout, M., Sprout, H., 1966). However, the loss of the power status does not deprive a given country of its actual power. This status is manifested in the actions of the state, i.e. in foreign policy, which covers the entire world for the superpowers.

3. POWERMETRICS MODEL BY M. SUŁEK

Power and business connections play a decisive role in international relations. Quantitative methods of analyzing the power of actors in international relations are beginning to play an increasingly important role. The science dealing with such measurement is called powermetrics. As an auxiliary discipline of geopolitics, powermetrics not only measures power, but also serves to model and simulate the international balance of power (Sułek, 2001; Sułek, 2013). A synthetic assessment of the balance of power in quantitative terms shows two categories of power: general and military, and economic (general) power consists of economic results (gross domestic product), demographic factors (population) and spatial components (territory area). Military power consists of military-economic factors (military expenditure, which is part of GDP), demographic-military factors (number of active service soldiers) and spatial factors (territory area). Geopolitical power is calculated as the arithmetic mean of economic power (overall) and double military power (the role of the military factor in shaping the current balance of power was appreciated). We divide the obtained data regarding the factors indicated above by the appropriate global values, and enter the obtained fractional values into the formula. After performing the operation, we will receive the power of countries as a fraction of the world power. In international relations, the most important feature is the balance of power, according to the main thesis of Raymond Aron (Aron, 1995). Also important in this discipline is Bertrand Russell's thesis that "the fundamental concept of social science is power, in the same sense that energy is the fundamental concept of physics" (Russell, 2001). The struggle for power is characterized by a zero-sum game, which means that the increase in power of some countries can only take place at the expense of other countries. Estimating the power of states by measuring indicators allows for the assessment of the international balance of power in the Asia-Pacific region.

- $P_e = PKB^{0,652} \times L^{0,217} \times a^{0,109}$
- $P_w = W^{0,652} \times S^{0,217} \times a^{0,109}$
- $P_g = \frac{P_e + (2 \cdot P_w)}{3}$

Symbols: P_e – economic power (general),
 P_w – military power,
 P_g – geopolitical power,
 PKB – gross domestic product,
 L – population,
 a – territory,
 W – military expenditure,
 S – number of soldiers in active service.

We can multiply the obtained results by any numbers, if we multiply them by 100, we will get the results as a percentage of the world's power (then the world's power = 100). In our case, it will be more convenient to multiply them by 1000 (then the power of the world = 1000), millimirs (abbreviation mM), i.e. thousandths of the world power. The statistical base of the article is based on data from the World Bank and The Military Balance. The monetary components in the formulas are based on current prices in US dollars.

4. DYNAMICS OF CHANGES IN POWER INDICATORS IN ASIA AND THE PACIFIC REGION

In the last thirty years, after the Cold War, great geopolitical changes have taken place in the world related to the collapse of the bipolar system and the USSR, as well as the acceleration of globalization on an unimaginable scale. Countries in Asia and the Pacific region especially benefited from the latter. First Japan after 1953, then South Korea, Taiwan, Singapore, India and, most of all, China. They joined the old powers and rich countries such as the USA, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. In the 21st century, other countries around the Pacific have also significantly improved their economic status: Indonesia, Thailand, Vietnam, Mexico and the Philippines, trying to benefit from the economic transformations of the modern world. Only Russia is experiencing a decline in economic importance due to its war in Ukraine from February 2022, just as it happened after 1991 during President Yeltsin's term. During the period under study, there were major shifts in the regional balance of power. East Asia and the Pacific came first at the expense of Europe and Central Asia. North America as a whole remained in third place. South Asia is also growing stronger at the expense of Africa and the Middle East.

Calculations of overall, military and geopolitical power for Asia and the Pacific region are presented in Table 1–3 (Surowiec, 2023).

The economic/general power of the countries in the Asia-Pacific region presented in Table 1 mostly indicates increases from 1992 to 2022 (Sulek, 2016). Japan, however, recorded a spectacular decline from 68.53 mM in 1992 to 28.33 mM in 2022 in the world share. However, the greatest increase in absolute and percentage power was recorded by China, from 37.35 mM in 1992 to 167.93 in 2022, i.e. its power increased 4.5 times, while in terms of percentages the increase was 350%! India also strengthened its position in the world, its power increased by 97% from 24.4 mM in 1992 to 46.10 mM in 2022. Russia's overall power at that time changed its shares quite significantly, falling since 1992 from level 26.74 to 17.40 mM. This was the lowest share of Moscow's power in the period under study, from then on it increased – to the peak in 2012 (34.31 mM). However, in the following years, Russia's power decreased to the level of 21.31 mM in 2022 (Białoskórski, 2018). The level of US power ranged during the period under study from 180.72 mM

Table 1. The general (economic) power of the countries of the Asia-Pacific region in mM, i.e. world = 1000

State	1992	1997	2002	2007	2012	2017	2022
Australia	12.29	12.83	11.28	13.14	16.74	14.48	14.12
China	37.35	54.78	67.33	85.04	126.44	152.14	167.93
Philippines	3.83	4.47	3.94	4.24	5.05	5.60	5.67
India	24.40	26.98	29.20	36.80	40.70	49.26	46.10
Indonesia	9.62	11.72	10.32	12.39	17.16	17.52	16.21
Japan	68.53	64.14	56.70	42.53	43.58	34.97	28.33
Canada	20.76	19.12	19.68	21.57	21.03	18.69	16.92
South Korea	9.90	11.60	11.51	12.25	10.93	12.04	10.86
Mexico	16.12	17.25	21.48	18.82	17.43	16.24	14.70
New Zealand	1.58	1.85	1.73	1.99	1.97	2.10	1.88
Russia	26.74	20.96	17.40	29.03	34.31	25.85	21.31
Singapore	0.44	0.60	0.54	0.60	0.71	0.75	1.46
Thailand	5.90	6.18	5.35	5.91	6.50	6.72	5.78
Taiwan	5.56	5.85	5.50	4.68	4.46	4.71	4.80
The USA	159.63	165.00	180.72	154.53	140.34	150.19	154.52
Vietnam	1.21	2.02	2.25	2.69	3.50	4.43	5.09
world	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000

Source: own research.

(18% of world power) in 2002 to 140.34 mM (14%) in 2012, which was influenced by the effects of the 2008 crisis. In 2022 The total power of the USA was 154.52 mM. In 2022, the overall powers of the US and China together accounted for one-third of the world's power. The emerging new balance of power is characterized by the US losing global leadership to China (Allison, 2018), and the increasing power of Eastern countries. China's power is currently based on its demographic and spatial potential (Stevens, 2021), while the US's is based on its economic and military potential. In the Asia-Pacific region, based on calculations, we are dealing with a US-China bipolar system. On a global scale, the EU as a whole is also considered to be a great economic power, hence with this assumption we are dealing with a tripolar system (Sulek, 2014).

Table 2 shows the military power of the countries of Asia and the Pacific region.

The USA was ranked first among the surveyed countries in Asia and the Pacific region. Their military power from 1992 until now has exceeded one-fifth of the world's share. In 1992, the USA recorded its largest share, as much as 255 mM, or 25.5%. This is a huge advantage over other countries. Only China, by strengthening its military potential, in 2022 had a military power half that of the United States. Despite this, since 1992 their military strength has increased 3.4 times. India also more than doubled its position in this regard, from 18.62 mM in 1992 to 41.60 mM in 2020. Among most other countries in the Asia-Pacific region, there have been uneven and slight increases in military power, in particular in Australia, the Philippines, Indonesia, South Korea, Mexico, New Zealand, Singapore and Vietnam. Japan, on the other hand, lost 36% of its power in the analyzed range from 27.19 mM in 1992 to 17.85 mM in 2022, the decline also affected Canada, Thailand and

Table 2. Military power of the countries of Asia and the Pacific region in mM, i.e. world = 1000

State	1992	1997	2002	2007	2012	2017	2022
Australia	9.74	9.96	9.07	11.31	12.22	13.03	14.51
China	33.43	39.06	56.54	63.23	90.59	115.20	115.22
Philippines	2.26	3.01	2.35	2.42	2.58	3.25	3.754
India	18.62	25.46	28.50	32.83	36.54	48.66	41.15
Indonesia	4.91	7.54	4.05	5.58	7.28	9.03	7.95
Japan	27.19	28.49	26.20	19.64	21.07	17.95	17.85
Canada	14.003	10.78	10.17	12.13	11.08	12.19	12.40
South Korea	14.38	15.91	14.46	16.67	14.80	17.10	17.12
Mexico	4.33	4.82	5.80	5.58	5.74	5.43	5.19
New Zealand	1.18	1.36	1.02	1.18	1.10	1.20	1.48
Russia	68.64	38.54	29.27	46.16	55.83	50.84	47.16
Singapore	0.79	1.50	1.37	1.31	1.30	1.25	2.58
Thailand	5.70	6.08	4.06	4.65	5.17	5.79	5.25
Taiwan	11.37	11.52	9.14	6.38	5.42	5.14	6.25
The USA	255.18	218.83	239.52	240.39	222.94	206.71	225.22
Vietnam	1.66	2.97	0.77	2.95	3.69	4.92	5.25
world	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000

Source: own research.

Taiwan. Russia is also a country that has experienced a significant decline in military power (Sulek, Białoskórski, 2018). In 1992, its global share was 68.64 mM, it was the highest indicator in the period under study, later it decreased to the lowest level in 2002 – 29.27 mM. However, in the following years there was a rebound of the trend and further increases, which were stopped after another peak in 2012 (55.83 mM). In 2022, Russia's share in world power was 47.16 mM (4.7%). On the basis of military power, a unipolar system was created in the studied region of the world, with the USA having a great advantage over other countries, including China.

Geopolitical power combines the general and military power of states, providing even more objective data on the real position of a given state in the balance of power. Without a developed military power, it is impossible to build a strong geopolitical power. Table 3 presents the power of the countries in the Asia-Pacific region from 1992 to 2022.

The strongest geopolitical power in the years 1992–2022 was the USA, from 223.33 mM to 201.65 mM (a decrease of 22%). However, they did not maintain a constant trend in this respect; years of increasing power were separated by years of decline. The second country that significantly improved its results and ranks second in the Asia-Pacific region is China. Their geopolitical power increased by 3.8 times, from 34.74 mM in 1992 to 132.79 mM in 2022. India also strengthened its position in this respect, its power increase was 100% between 1992 and 2022. Spectacular Japan recorded a decline from 40.97 mM to 21.34 mM in 2020. The situation is similar with Russia, which lost 16.1 mM, or 29.5% of its geopolitical power. from 1992 to 2022. The balance of power in the Asia-Pacific

Table 3. Geopolitical power of countries in the Asia-Pacific region in mM, i.e. world = 1000

State	1992	1997	2002	2007	2012	2017	2022
Australia	10.59	10.92	9.81	11.92	13.73	13.51	14.38
China	34.74	44.30	60.13	70.50	102.54	127.51	132.79
Philippines	2.78	3.50	2.88	3.03	3.41	4.02	4.39
India	20.54	25.97	28.74	34.15	37.93	48.86	42.80
Indonesia	6.480	8.93	6.14	7.85	10.58	11.86	10.70
Japan	40.97	40.38	36.37	27.27	28.57	23.62	21.34
Canada	16.25	13.56	13.34	15.27	14.40	14.35	13.91
South Korea	12.88	14.47	13.47	15.20	13.51	15.41	15.03
Mexico	8.26	8.96	11.03	9.99	9.63	9.03	8.36
New Zealand	1.32	1.52	1.26	1.45	1.39	1.50	1.61
Russia	54.67	32.68	25.31	40.45	48.66	42.51	38.54
Singapore	0.68	1.20	1.10	1.07	1.11	1.08	2.21
Thailand	5.77	6.11	4.50	5.07	5.61	6.10	5.43
Taiwan ¹	9.43	9.63	7.92	5.81	5.10	5.00	5.77
The USA	223.33	200.88	219.92	211.77	195.41	187.87	201.65
Vietnam	1.51	2.65	1.26	2.86	3.63	4.76	5.20
world	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000

Source: own research

region in terms of geopolitical power is characterized by a significant advantage of the USA over other entities, including China. Other countries do not play a major role in this respect.

5. POWER STATUS OF THE STATES OF THE ASIA-PACIFIC REGION ACCORDING TO PROFESSOR SULEK'S CRITERIA

The adoption of synthetic power measures allows ranking countries according to the adopted ranges marking the classification of powers. The advantage of this is the use of qualitative and quantitative factors. Unfortunately, there is no common division of countries according to their power; the article uses the classification created by Professor Sułek, according to which: the SM superpower (has over 18% of the world's power), the World's world power MŚ (12–18% of the world's power), the great power of the WM (7–12% of world power), regional power MR (3–7% of world power), local power ML (1–3% of world power), small power MM (0.1–1% of world power), microstate (less than 0,1% of the world's power) (Białoskórski, Kiczma, Sułek, 2018). The power status of states of Asia and the Pacific region are presented in tables 7, 8 and 9.

Table 7 presents power status based on the general power; only the USA met the superpower criterion in the analyzed period in 2002. In the remaining five-year years, being a world power. In the case of China, the observed results show the growing power of this country, from a regional power to a great power and, since 2012, a global power, just like the USA. Therefore, international relations in the Asia-Pacific region can be described as bipolar, taking into account overall power. Among the remaining countries, only Japan and, since 2012, India have met the criteria of a regional power. Russia played the same role only in 2012.

The criteria of the power status based on military power (Table 8) indicate the hegemonic position of the USA as a superpower, which has never fallen below this level in the period under study. Only China has managed to achieve great power status since 2012, and in 2020 it became a world power. Among other countries, Russia and India have gained the status of a regional power due to their expanded military potential.

Power status based on military power is associated with the so-called militarization rates. They were also calculated on the basis of synthetic power measures of Professor Sułek's model. Three types of militarization of countries in Asia and the Pacific region are presented in tables 4, 5 and 6.

In addition to the basic measures of state power, there are derived measures that describe a given country to an even greater extent and place it in a specific place in the international hierarchy. Such measures include, among others: parameter of militarization of states. Defined as q – a dimensionless quantity, it is the ratio of military power to economic/general power:

$$q = \frac{P_w}{P_e}$$

It also determines the mobilization of funds that have been allocated for military purposes. In this case, the values for the world are equal to 1. Countries with militarization greater than 1 are above the world average, and those with less than 1 are below the average.

We count militarization in three forms: economic militarization – m_e (general) as the share of military power in the economic (general) power), militarization of GDP as the share of military expenditure in GDP in and demographic militarization as the share of the number of active-duty soldiers in the general population (with appropriate power exponents – according to the model). We treat countries with militarization greater than 1 as highly militarized, and countries with a militarization score below 1 as weakly militarized (Białoskórski, Kiczma, Sułek, 2019).

The high level of GDP militarization relative to demographic militarization indicates that the state maintains small and professional armed forces, but at a high level of equipment and training. In the opposite situation, we usually deal with a large army, mainly conscripted, less equipped and trained.

Table 4 presents the economic militarization rates (ME) of countries in Asia and the Pacific region in 1992, 2007 and 2022.

Economic militarization indicators (m_e) (Table 4) of the countries of Asia and the Pacific region indicate that the first four places in 1992 were: Russia – as many as 2,567, Taiwan, Singapore, the USA (all others above 1.5); in 2007 – Singapore 2,192, Russia, the USA, Taiwan; in 2022 – Russia 2,213, Singapore, South Korea, the USA. The lowest rates at this time were achieved by Mexico, Indonesia, Japan and the Philippines. The high level of militarization in the case of Russia and the USA indicated the active foreign and military policy pursued by these countries in the world, including interventions in other countries. In the case of Taiwan, Singapore and South Korea. high militarization indicates threats to these countries from others and the need to have armed forces adequate to the threat.

Table 4. Indicators of militarization of the economy (m_e) Asia and the Pacific countries in 1992, 2007 and 2022

State/ m_e	1992	State/ m_e	2007	State/ m_e	2022
Russia	2.567	Singapore	1.454	Russia	2.213
Taiwan	2.044	Russia	1.341	Singapore	1.772
Singapore	1.786	The USA	1.279	South Korea	1.576
The USA	1.599	Taiwan	1.036	The USA	1.458
South Korea	1.452	South Korea	1.021	Taiwan	1.302
Vietnam	1.373	Vietnam	1.005	Vietnam	1.032
Thailand	0.967	India	1.001	Australia	1.027
China	0.895	Australia	0.930	Thailand	0.909
Australia	0.793	Thailand	0.838	India	0.893
India	0.763	China	0.703	New Zealand	0.783
New Zealand	0.750	New Zealand	0.686	Canada	0.733
Canada	0.675	Philippines	0.671	China	0.686
Philippines	0.590	Canada	0.650	Philippines	0.663
Indonesia	0.511	Japan	0.537	Japan	0.630
Japan	0.397	Indonesia	0.490	Indonesia	0.490
Mexico	0.269	Mexico	0.321	Mexico	0.353

Source: own research.

Table 5 presents the GDP militarization rates of countries in Asia and the Pacific in 1992, 2007 and 2022.

Table 5. Indicators of militarization GDP (m_{GDP}) of countries in the Asia-Pacific region in 1992, 2007 and 2022

State/ m_{PKB}	1992	State/ m_{PKB}	2007	State/ m_{PKB}	2022
Russia	2.046	The USA	1.454	Russia	1.726
Taiwan	1.526	Singapore	1.341	Singapore	1.356
The USA	1.432	Russia	1.279	The USA	1.320
Singapore	1.333	Taiwan	1.036	South Korea	1.161
Vietnam	1.108	South Korea	1.021	India	1.093
South Korea	1.087	India	1.005	Australia	1.057
China	0.998	Vietnam	1.001	Taiwan	1.050
India	0.984	Australia	0.930	Vietnam	0.902
Thailand	0.950	China	0.838	New Zealand	0.855
Australia	0.818	Thailand	0.703	Canada	0.804
New Zealand	0.812	Philippines	0.686	Thailand	0.790
Canada	0.742	New Zealand	0.671	China	0.782
Philippines	0.734	Canada	0.650	Philippines	0.778
Indonesia	0.647	Japan	0.537	Japan	0.671
Japan	0.476	Indonesia	0.490	Indonesia	0.559
Mexico	0.320	Mexico	0.321	Mexico	0.389

Source: own research.

The militarization indicators of GDP (mGDP) (Table 5) of the countries in the study region show that the highest positions were achieved in 1992 – Russia 2,046, Taiwan, USA, Singapore; in 2007 – the USA 1,454, Singapore, Russia, Taiwan; in 2022 – Russia 1,726, Singapore, the USA, South Korea. Mexico, Indonesia and Japan again achieved the lowest GDP militarization.

Table 6 presents the rates of demographic militarization of countries in Asia and the Pacific region in 1992, 2007 and 2022.

Table 6. Demogr. militarization indicators. (ma) countries in the Asia-Pacific region in 1992, 2007 and 2022

State/ma	1992	State/ma	2007	State/ma	2022
Singapore	1.340	Singapore	1.634	South Korea	1.357
Taiwan	1.339	South Korea	1.333	Singapore	1.307
South Korea	1.337	Taiwan	1.315	Russia	1.283
Russia	1.254	Roussia	1.243	Taiwan	1.239
Vietnam	1.239	Thailand	1.119	Thailand	1.151
The USA	1.117	Vietnam	1.097	Vietnam	1.147
Tailand	1.018	The USA	1.070	The USA	1.105
Australia	0.969	Australia	0.925	Australia	0.972
New Zealand	0.923	Mexico	0.923	Japan	0.939
Canada	0.908	Indonesia	0.914	New Zealand	0.916
China	0.897	China	0.888	Canada	0.912
Mexico	0.839	India	0.887	Mexico	0.909
Japna	0.834	New Zealand	0.883	China	0.877
Philippines	0.804	Canada	0.866	Indonezsia	0.877
Indonesia	0.789	Japan	0.860	Philippines	0.851
India	0.776	Philippines	0.834	India	0.817

Source: own research.

Demographic militarization indicators (md) of countries in Asia and the Pacific region (Table 6) show that the highest among the surveyed countries in 1992 were: Singapore 1,340, Taiwan, South Korea, Russia; in 2007: Singapore 1,634, South Korea, Taiwan and Russia; in 2022 South Korea 1,357, Singapore, Russia, Taiwan.

The power status of the countries of the Asia-Pacific region based on geopolitical power is presented in table 9. Similarly to the basis of military power, only the USA has an unshakable position as a superpower. Among the remaining countries, only China has the status of a world power, and India and Russia, due to their great military power, maintain the level of a regional power according to the adopted criteria. Table 9 also shows the decline in the importance of Japan in recent decades, as a result of which the country lost its position as a regional power in favor of a local one.

The presented results make us aware of the possibility of China gaining the status of a superpower in the coming decades, while the US must fight to maintain its global position, with the rapidly developing countries of the Asia-Pacific region, which in the game for power may take away some of Washington's current advantage.

6. CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of the paper was to characterize the power status of Asia-Pacific countries based on synthetic power measures based on Professor Sułek's model. Synthetic criteria of great power allow one to classify countries based on power measures into appropriate ranges. Based on its economic power in the period under study, the USA had the status of a world power in the years 1992–2001 and from 2012 to 2022. Only in the years 2002–2006 did it achieve the status of a superpower. The main competitor of the USA in the Pacific region - China, achieved the status of a world power in 2012, having previously been a great power and a regional power. It was only in 2007 that India became a regional power. Russia, however, had the status of a regional power only in the years 2012–2016, and was a local power between those years.

Based on its military power, the USA was a superpower throughout the entire period, which only confirmed the leading role of this country in guaranteeing international security. None of the other countries in the Pacific region achieved such status or the role of a world power during the period under study. Only China has had the status of a great power in this respect since 2012. India and Russia also have a strong position in this respect, which we can describe as regional powers since 2007 in terms of superpowers based on military power.

In terms of measures of geopolitical power, the USA has had the status of a superpower throughout the period, while China has become a world power since 2017. Among the remaining countries, only India and Russia have had the status of regional powers in this respect since 2007.

Research on the power status and the position of states allows us to achieve not only cognitive goals, but also contribute to making better decisions, for example in the field of security strategies of individual states.

REFERENCES

- Allison, G. (2018). *Skazani na wojnę? Czy Ameryka i Chiny unikną pułapki Tukidydesa?* Bielsko-Biała.
- Aron, R. (1995). *Pokój i wojna między narodami (teoria)*. Warszawa.
- Białoskórski, R. (2018). *The Geostrategic Position of Russian Federation. A Powermetric Study*. Siedlce.
- Białoskórski, R., Kiczma, Ł., Sułek, M. (2018). *Międzynarodowy układ sił w procesie zmian. Raport potęgometryczny*. Warszawa.
- (2019). *Potęga państw 2019. Rankingi potęgometryczne*. Warszawa.
- Böhler, R. (2017). *What is a Great Power? A Concept and Its Meaning for Understanding International Relations, Bod Third Party Titles*. GRIN Verlag, Munich.
- Bógdał-Brzezińska, A. (2010). *Mocarstwość w teorii stosunków międzynarodowych* [w:] Sułek, M., Symonides, J., red., *Państwo w teorii i praktyce stosunków międzynarodowych*. Warszawa: Wyd. Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.
- Danielski, J. (1983). *Pojęcie „mocarstwości” w stosunkach międzynarodowych* [w:] Bodnar, A., Szczepański, W.J., red., *Stosunki międzynarodowe. Problemy badań i teorii*. Warszawa: PWN.
- Jarczewska, A., Zajączkowski J. [red.] (2016). *Region Azji i Pacyfiku w latach 1985–2015*. Warszawa: Wyd. Scholar.
- Mearsheimer, J. (2001). *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

- Nye, J.S. (2007). *Soft power*. Wydawnictwa Akademickie i Profesjonalne. Warszawa.
- Russell, B. (2001). *Władza. Nowa analiza społeczna*, Kądzielski, M., Gołębiowski, R. (przekład). Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza.
- Sprout, M. & H. (1966). *Foundation of International Politics*. Princeton–Toronto–London–NY.
- Stevens, F.M.S. (2021). *China's long march to national rejuvenation: toward a Neo-Imperial order in East Asia?* „Asian Security”, Vol. 17, No. 1.
- Sułek, M. (2001). *Podstawy potęgonomii i potęgometrii (Foundations of powernomics and powermetrics)*. Kielce, rozdział IV.
- (2013). *Potęga państw. Modele i zastosowania*. Warszawa: Wyd. Rambler.
- (2014). *USA, Chiny, UE – trzy bieguny w globalnym układzie sił*, „Rocznik Strategiczny” 2013/14. Warszawa.
- (2016). *Dynamika zmian parametrów potęgi państw regionu Azji i Pacyfiku 1985–2015* [w:] Jarczewska A., Zajączkowski J., red., *Region Azji i Pacyfiku w latach 1985–2015*. Warszawa.
- Sułek, M., Białoskórski, R. (2018). *Geostrategiczna pozycja Rosji w świetle badań potęgometrycznych* [w:] Niedbała, M., Stempień, M., red., *Polska – Rosja. Kryzysy, konflikty, wyzwania*. Warszawa–Siedlce: Oficyna Wydawnicza RYTM.
- Surowiec, K. (2023). *Potęga państw regionu Azji i Pacyfiku w latach 1992–2020* [w:] Popławski, D., red., *Studia nad potęgą państw. Księga dedykowana Profesorowi Mirosławowi Sulkowski*. Warszawa.
- Waltz, K. (1979), *Theory of International Politics*. New York.

ATTACHMENT

Table 7. Power status of countries in the Asia-Pacific region based on the general power

State	1992	1997	2002	2007	2012	2017	2022
Australia	ML	ML	ML	ML	ML	ML	ML
China	MR	MR	MR	WM	MŚ	MŚ	MŚ
Philippines	MM	MM	MM	MM	MM	MM	MM
India	ML	ML	ML	MR	MR	MR	MR
Indonesia	MM	ML	ML	ML	ML	ML	ML
Japan	MR	MR	MR	MR	MR	MR	ML
Canada	ML	ML	ML	ML	ML	ML	ML
South Korea	MM	ML	ML	ML	ML	ML	ML
Mexico	ML	ML	ML	ML	ML	ML	ML
New Zealand	MM	MM	MM	MM	MM	MM	MM
Russia	ML	ML	ML	ML	MR	ML	ML
Singapore	-	-	-	-	-	-	MM
Thailand	MM	MM	MM	MM	MM	MM	MM
Taiwan	MM	MM	MM	MM	MM	MM	MM
The USA	MŚ	MŚ	SM	MŚ	MŚ	MŚ	MŚ
Vietnam	MM	MM	MM	MM	MM	MM	MM

Source: own research.

Table 8. Power status of countries in the Asia-Pacific region based on the military power

State	1992	1997	2002	2007	2012	2017	2022
Australia	MM	MM	MM	ML	ML	ML	ML
China	MR	MR	MR	MR	WM	WM	WM
Philippines	MM	MM	MM	MM	MM	MM	MM
India	ML	ML	ML	MR	MR	MR	MR
Indonesia	MM	MM	MM	MM	MM	MM	MM
Japan	ML	ML	ML	ML	ML	ML	ML
Canada	ML	ML	ML	ML	ML	ML	ML
South Korea	ML	ML	ML	ML	ML	ML	ML
Mexico	MM	MM	MM	MM	MM	MM	MM
New Zealand	MM	MM	MM	MM	MM	MM	MM
Russia	MR	MR	ML	MR	MR	MR	MR
Singapore	-	MM	MM	MM	MM	MM	MM
Thailand	MM	MM	MM	MM	MM	MM	MM
Taiwan	ML	ML	MM	MM	MM	MM	MM
The USA	SM	SM	SM	SM	SM	SM	SM
Vietnam	MM	MM	-	MM	MM	MM	MM

Source: own research.

Table 9. Power status of countries in the Asia-Pacific region based on the geopolitical power

State	1992	1997	2002	2007	2012	2017	2022
Australia	ML	ML	MM	ML	ML	ML	ML
China	MR	MR	MR	WM	WM	MŚ	MŚ
Philippines	MM	MM	MM	MM	MM	MM	MM
India	ML	ML	ML	MR	MR	MR	MR
Indonesia	MM	MM	MM	MM	ML	ML	ML
Japan	MR	MR	MR	ML	ML	ML	ML
Canada	ML	ML	ML	ML	ML	ML	ML
South Korea	ML	ML	ML	ML	ML	ML	ML
Mexico	MM	MM	ML	MM	MM	MM	MM
New Zealand	MM	MM	MM	MM	MM	MM	MM
Russia	MR	MR	ML	MR	MR	MR	MR
Singapore	-	MM	MM	MM	MM	MM	MM
Tajlandia	MM	MM	MM	MM	MM	MM	MM
Tajwan	MM	MM	MM	MM	MM	MM	MM
USA	SM	SM	SM	SM	SM	SM	SM
Wietnam	MM	MM	MM	MM	MM	MM	MM

Source: own research.

