



Citizens for
Global Solutions

MINNESOTA

www.globalsolutionsmn.org

Newsletter
March 2010

OUR VISION:

We envision a future in which countries work together to abolish war, protect our rights and freedoms, and solve the problems facing humanity that no country can solve alone. This vision requires effective democratic global institutions that will apply the rule of law while respecting the diversity and autonomy of national and local communities.

OUR MISSION:

We are a membership organization working to build political will in the United States to achieve our vision. We do this by educating Americans about our global interdependence, communicating global concerns to public officials, and developing proposals to create, reform and strengthen international institutions such as the United Nations.

CONFRONTING FUTURE TERROR

Claude Buettner, President, MN Chapter, CGS

Philip Bobbitt's thought-provoking book, *Terror and Consent, The Wars for the Twenty-first Century* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2008), is a difficult read. But its morbid subject challenges the reader to plod forward. The author, an accomplished historian, provides us with an exhaustive treatment of the unexpected pressures on the current system of sovereign nation states that has been the dominant form of political organization since the 1648 Peace of Westphalia.

Much of the book systematically examines and questions many commonly held beliefs on the nature of the new terrorism that is evolving in parallel with changes in the nation state. Among these is the dubious assumption that terror is only a means and not an end. Bobbitt contends that the strategic thinking of our political leaders and the general public has lagged behind the reality that **strengthened international law ought to be a natural consequence of the current nation state's inability to guarantee the security of its people.** We are now on the cusp of a historic shift towards international law, not because that will magically seem self-evidently legitimate, but because the nation states' current legitimacy will become more self-evidently degraded as countries evolve towards what Bobbitt refers to as "market states" (a term of his own devising).

Succinctly, Bobbitt defines a market state as one based on "*the emerging constitutional order that promises to maximize the opportunity of its people, tending to privatize many state activities and making representative governments more responsible to consumers.*" He devotes a whole chapter to describe this concept in detail. "*The constitutional order of the State,*" he argues, "*is determined by the unique grounds on which the State claims legitimate power.*" He then traces the historical evolution of princely states, which flourished in the sixteenth century, into nation states, which emerged in the second half of the nineteenth century bringing with them industrialized "total" war.

Bobbitt contends that the territorial nation state is now giving way to the *non-territorial* market state whose legitimacy erodes because of the inability of the nation state to assure the security of its citizens. This weakness is tied to the nexus of global industry and communications coupled with the technology of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) escaping into the black market. (But Bobbitt never adequately explains how the emerging market state would be better suited to ensure safety from WMD.) (cont. on p 2)

As evidence of the emerging market state, Bobbitt cites the trend of federal government departments and agencies to outsource the majority of their work, becoming in effect contract management agencies. NASA and the Department of Energy, for example, spend up to 80% of their budgets on contractors, while the Department of Defense uses contractors as never before, even for the provision of helicopters and armored vehicles.

Additionally, Bobbitt cites an experiment suggested by New York Mayor Michael Bloomberg in “Opportunity NYC” (<http://opportunitynyc.org/>), based on a successful Mexican rural poverty elimination program. It advocates flat rate payments for people in return for specific behaviors such as graduating from high school, maintaining health insurance, obtaining health screenings, etc. “*This sort of conditional cash transfer, in contrast to welfare rights,*” says Bobbitt, “*is characteristic of the market state.*” (Think about this as you follow the unfolding of the current debate on health care reform.)

Opposed to market states of *consent*, however, we can also anticipate market states of *terror* that have a vested interest in creating fear and disruption so as to intimidate in order to retain and enhance their power.

Key issues set forth by Bobbitt:

- “*We must reform our ideas about terrorism, war, and the war aim if we are to win the wars of the twenty-first century in order to preserve states of consent and prevent the triumph of states of terror.*”
- “*The changes in warfare and terrorism are both a consequence and a driver of the change in the constitutional order.*”
- Al Qaeda is only a herald of the larger phenomenon of twenty-first century terrorism.
- Terrorists in this century will mimic their enemy, the newly evolved market states of consent: decentralized, devolved, dependent on outsourcing and privatized. (Terrorists acts may be carried out by disaffected luddites at odds with modernity; but terrorist strategists are adept in their uses of the Internet, cell phones and video for global communications in all its forms.)
- Alliances matter and can be one of our chief advantages in confronting states of terror.
- “*...the twentieth century triad of deterrence, containment, and arms control regimes must now give way to twenty-first century strategies of preclusion.*”
- “*There is, at present, no more important question before the world because failure to resolve the issue of legitimate action to preclude terror will frustrate not only our efforts against global terrorism but also success in avoiding regional and global epidemics, and great power confrontation.*”

Many paths lead to the conclusion that the institutions of global governance that are currently evolving above the nation-state level must be made more secure and legitimate. For some it is a religious conviction extrapolated from the dictum, “*Thou shall not kill.*” For others it is the cold logic of the sweep of history towards larger scales of social organization. For still others it is clammy fear of another dark age should there be another world war among global powers in an age of nuclear weapons. More recently, for some it is the belief that civilization could end with a whimper rather than with a bang as unchecked environmental degradation makes “things fall apart.” Much in *Terror and Consent* will disturb global governance adherents of all persuasions; but it’s worth studying to help make sense of a disorderly world in transition.

CIVIL SOCIETY TO THE RESCUE

Joe Schwartzberg, CGS Board Member

President Buettner’s review of *Terror and Consent*, above, paints a pretty scary picture of future global governance. But other authors are gazing into crystal balls quite different from Bobbitt’s. One, whose vision I find quite appealing is John Trent, a World Federalist, a

Fellow in the Centre on Global Governance at the University of Ottawa, and a past Secretary General of the International Political Science Association. Trent’s vision is set forth in a work entitled *Modernizing the United Nations System: Civil Society’s* (cont. on. p. 4)

THIRD THURSDAY GLOBAL ISSUES FORUM

Free and open to the public.

Where? Hennepin Avenue United Methodist Church,
511 Groveland Avenue, Minneapolis (at Lyndale & Hennepin). Park in church lot.

Thursday, March 18, 7:00 – 9:00 pm.

TSAR PUTIN: THE RISE OF RUSSIAN AUTOCRACY

In the wake of Russia's failed experiment with democracy in the 1990s, Yeltsin's successor, Vladimir Putin, has forged a political culture synthesizing the autocratic and nationalist elements of the Tsarist and Soviet traditions. Above all else, he has restored in the executive office – first as President, now and Prime Minister – the traditions of Russian autocracy as the cornerstone of the state. His personalization of power has even extended to the fostering of a “cult of personality” in the Stalinist style. In foreign affairs, Putin's priorities fall upon, first of all, the re-assertion that the core lands of the former Soviet Union are “a sphere of Russian's special interest” and, secondly, the restitution of Russia as a global power.

Presenter: Professor Nick Hayes. A professor of history, Hayes holds the University Chair in Critical Thinking at Saint John's University. He is a frequent and popular commentator on international affairs for public television and radio and a contributing writer for MinnPost.com (www.minnpost.com/nickhayes). His book, *And One Fine Morning Memories of My Father* (<http://employees.csbsju.edu/nhayes/memoir.htm>) will be published this March. He is currently working on a book of his essays on Russia from the Brezhnev era to the present. Among his scholarly awards are grants from the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Ford Foundation, and the Fulbright Foundation.

Thursday, April 15, 7:00 – 9:00 p.m.

THE RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT (R2P): NO MORE RWANDAS? NO MORE HAITIS?

In 2005 the UN adopted a new international norm, the “responsibility to protect,” stipulating that sovereignty gives a state not only rights, but also the responsibility to protect its people against war crimes, crimes against humanity, genocide and ethnic cleansing. When a state is unable or unwilling to fulfill this responsibility, the international community has an obligation to help. If offers of help are rejected, the UN may intervene, with the use of force as a last resort. Some have argued that the R2P concept should be expanded to cover situations such as the one now faced in Haiti. But, because of lingering sovereignty concerns, no R2P intervention has yet been authorized. What, then, are the chances that R2P will become a full-fledged norm? Will it ever be more than mere words?

Presenter: Professor Michael Barnett. An internationally recognized scholar, Barnett holds the Harold Stassen Chair of International Relations at the Humphrey Institute at the University of Minnesota. He is best known for his writing on IR theory, the Middle East, the UN, humanitarian action and security communities. Among his books are the following: the award-winning *Confronting the Costs of War* (1992), *Dialogues in Arab Politics* (1998), *Eyewitness to Genocide: The United Nations and Rwanda* (2002), *Rules for the World: International Organizations in World Politics* (2004, winner of multiple awards), and *Humanitarianism in Question: Politics, Power and Ethics* (co-edited with Tom Weiss, 2008).

DO YOU WANT A PIECE OF THE ACTION?

Citizens for Global Solutions is always on the look-out for thoughtful individuals to help shape its outreach to the community and further the Vision and Mission noted below our masthead on page one. If you would like to be considered as a member of the CGS Board, please contact our President, Claude Buettner by phone, at 952-934-6100 or by e-mail at claudio101@comcast.net and tell him a little about yourself.

(cont. from p. 2) *Moving from International Relations to Global Governance* (Opladen, Germany: Barbara Budrich, 2007). Like Bobbitt, Trent believes that we have a tall constitutional order on our hands. He holds out little hope however, that the impetus for bringing about the radical reforms that our globalized world so desperately needs will come from States acting in accordance with the traditional (and outmoded) norms of the Westphalian system. Nor does Trent believe that the sclerotic UN system can muster the will to reform itself. Rather, he sees civil society, acting through “strategic coalitions” of international non-governmental organizations (INGOs), in concert with a limited number of progressive State partners (think Canada or the Nordic bloc) as our principal hope. He cites as examples of what might be done, the worldwide NGO coalition (more than 2,000 organizations in all), which proved so effective in gaining support for the International Criminal Court, an effort led by Bill Pace, CEO of the World Federalist Movement; the International Campaign to Ban Landmines, led by Nobel Peace Prize Laureate Jody Williams; the coalition that led to the 1987 Montreal Protocol for the protection of the earth’s

endangered ozone layer; and the constructive roles played by civil society organizations in global conferences such as those on the environment in Rio de Janeiro (1992), on population in Cairo (1994), on women (in Beijing in 1995, the 4th of its kind), etc.

While the foregoing achievements may seem small, given the magnitude of the tasks at hand, the coordination of global civil society is a relatively new undertaking. INGOs are proliferating at an exponential rate and more than 250,000 already exist. Some of them command financial resources greater than those of the UN agencies they seek to influence; and their resources of skill, dedication and creativity are only beginning to be harnessed effectively. Thanks to the Internet, INGOs are now able to interact as never before. What the UN can and should do is to engage NGOs more effectively. Some steps in this direction have already been taken. In my forthcoming book, *Designs for a Workable World*, I will be proposing strategies for more effective coalition building and for institutionalizing mutual UN-civic society engagement.

Citizens for Global Solutions

(formerly the World Federalist Association)
17350 West 67th Street Circle
Eden Prairie, MN
55346

www.globalsolutionsmn.org

You have no idea of how we work with civil society and the NGOs. They can lead and say things that I cannot say. There are times we don’t like what they say or do, and times when they don’t like what we say or do and there are moments when they are ahead of us. They can lead and say things I cannot say. We cannot operate in the field without our essential partners, the NGOs. **Kofi Annan**, BBC interview, 15 September 2005 (quoted by Trent, see above)

It is not because it is difficult that we are afraid to act; it is because we are afraid to act that it is difficult. **Seneca**