

Build Thrive Clash Grab Hoard

George Butler

Abstract

This paper is involved in looking at the structure of contemporary forms of power. The paper is split into three areas Hard Power, Economic Power and Soft power.

Hard Power establishes the background of the political organisation of military power from Westphalia to the modern day. It follows the formation of the state system through to the formation of the UN and on to the present day U.S. hegemony. I looked at terrorism, the effects of the pre-emptive strike doctrine and how the Iraq war has effected international norms.

Economic Power looks at how economic power can be used strategically and positively looking at the formation of present day market based economics from Smith to the IMF and World bank.

I have examined how market fundamentalism has become the dominant form of economics through globalisation and how this ideology is sustained.

I have looked in more detail at the attempt to push market based economics on developing countries such as Russia and Argentina and how it is driven by ideologues.

Soft power looks at the polarisation of cultures, democracy and civil society and how the communications revolution has effected the expressions of soft power. I have looked at the rising growth of non-state actors and civil society in opposition to the current legal and political structure of the nation state system, moving towards the idea of human security.

Title: Build Thrive Clash Grab Hoard

Contents:	Introduction
Page	
1	Aims
1	Relevance
2	Methodology
2	Theoretical Framework

Chapter One

Page	
3	Hard Power
3	The governance of Hard Power

4	Multi-Polar Power Politics & UN intervention
4	Collective Security
5	Sovereignty
6	Human Rights and Globalisation
7	US Hegemony
8	The New Unilateralism
9	The Iraq Conflict 2003
9	The Route to War
10	Post War
12	Terrorism
13	Pre-Emptive Strike Doctrine
13	The Future
14	References and foot notes

Chapter Two

Page

17	Economic Power
17	Strategic Economic Power
18	Positive Economic Power
18	The Development of Neo-Liberalism
20	Sustaining the Ideology
21	Economic World Crises
22	Market Fundamentalism and Globalisation
24-	References and foot notes

Chapter Three

Page

28	Soft Power
28	Soft Power Definition
29	The Information Age
32	Polarised Cultures
35	Democracy?

36	Democracy and Civil Society
39	Networking
40	Human Security
43	References and Footnotes

Conclusion and Bibliography

Page

48	Conclusion
51	Bibliography

Aims

The widening gap between the emergent interdependence in civil society, economics, culture and human rights and the legal/political structure of the nation-state system has exposed the inadequacy of the traditional security paradigm for generating an international consensus on order, security and justice. All three sources of power military, economic, and soft remain relevant in creating a secure world and through this paper I aim to outline the current world situation and how this could be improved.

What is the status of Hard, Economic and Soft power? How can these different forms of power be harnessed towards a better future?

Relevance

There have been numerous conflicts in the last 20 years. The past century has been the most violent in human history. Wars have involved civilian casualties at an increasing rate and since the 1970s terrorism has been an increasing threat throughout the world. The World Trade Tower and Pentagon attacks in New York City and Washington, DC, on September 11th 2001 have been the most significant. Since these attacks there has been an aggressive unilateralist stance adopted by the U.S. government, who have declared a 'War against Terrorism'. This has heightened the world security situation and civil society has organised looking towards a better way to manage world security.

Methodology

I will research my paper using primary and secondary sources from books the internet, and journals.

Theoretical Framework

In international relations there are three main areas of theory, the Realists Pluralists and Globalists.

Realists focus on the concepts of power and are interested in the balance of power between nation states.

Pluralists have the view that non-state actors are important and international organisations separate from government have more importance in this interconnected world.

The Globalist perspective is relatively new on the scene and stresses the importance of the big picture within which states and other entities interact globally.

My paper will be referring to all three areas of theory looking at the importance of hard power exercised through the sovereign state system (Realists). I will look at the importance of how states , societies and other non-state actors act within the world capitalist system (Globalist) but I will mainly be looking at the importance of non-state actors and there effects on international relations exercised through soft power. (Pluralist)

Chapter One

Hard Power

Hard Power is a concept mainly used in Chinese strategic thought, it refers to national power which comes from military and diplomatic means. It is used in contrast to soft power. **1.**

Nye and Keohane see that "Hard Power is usually expressed through military force. It is the power to get people to do what you want through coercion. Hard power has always been important in violent conflict. Hard power is the ability to get others to do what they otherwise would not do through threats or rewards. Whether by economic carrots or military sticks, the ability to coax or coerce has long been the central element of power". **2** (1998)

The Governance of Hard Power

Hard Power has mainly been exercised between nation states since the signing of the

the Peace Treaty of Westphalia in 1684. This initiated international diplomacy and marked the beginning of the modern system of nation-states. Subsequently, wars were fought not for reasons of religion, but focused on reasons of state sovereignty. **3** This was an important change in the development of the sovereign state. Up until the end of the First World War the state was in control of waging war and peace. Armies got bigger and the global reach of weapons technology improved. The League of Nations was set up after WWI as a better way of managing international disputes which could now have global consequences. **4** The UN replaced the League of Nations in 1942 to co-ordinate Nations' opposition to Hitler. The UN charter was signed by 50 nations and came into force in October 1945 after WW2. **5**

Multi-Polar Power Politics & UN Intervention

The cold war ended as abruptly as it had begun with the signing of the Charter of Paris in November 1990, and bringing to an end the Russian / US stalemate following the collapse of the 'peoples democracies'. **6** The end of a Russian military counterbalance upset realist ideas of a balance of power among states. Former US President Nixon thought "It is when one nation becomes infinitely more powerful in relation to its potential competitors that the danger of war arises". **7** The bi-polar balance of power had sustained relative peace throughout the world and the end of the cold war led to an explosion of multi-polar power politics. Power was more regional and disorganised which led to the breakaway of states from the USSR. Regional conflicts such as the Kosovo/Serb war resulted after the break-up of the former Yugoslavia. In the post-cold war era smaller 'contained' conflicts with ethnic, religious or economic roots have proliferated. "Of the 61 major armed conflicts fought between 1989 and 1998, only three were between states—the rest were civil". **8** This has led to the enlargement of NATO and UN peace keeping operations.

Collective Security

NATO, formed in 1949, was set up to discourage an attack by the Soviet Union on the non-communist nations of Western Europe. NATO is involved in organising collective security. **9** Thompson sees collective security as "a method of managing the power relations of nation states through a partially centralised system of security arrangements where the maintenance and enforcement of peace is vested in an international body". **10** There is a general move towards collective security between nation states and this kind of regional security is happening in Europe with the

formation of the Organisation for the Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) and in other countries with the formation in Asia of the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN), in Africa of the Organisation of African Unity (OAU), in Latin America with the Organisation of American States (OAS). **11** The UN has tended to organise collective security at a global level and is trying to set up its collective security function . There has been a steady rise in UN peace keeping operations around the world with an understanding that peace cannot be achieved unilaterally. The EU has its own ideas for global security, as it sees NATO dominated by US command. Europe sees its self more aligned with the idea of a Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and a parallel European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP). **12** The concept of common security came from the Palme Commission, when it published the 1982 report of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues. Common security means security with, rather than security against the adversary. Common security adopts the idea of non-provocative defence and non-offensive defence. **13** The plan to form a CFSP has suffered a severe set back with the advent of the Iraq war, along with the open differences and split between France, Germany and Russia against the US, UK and Spain. The whole structure of global collective security is under threat and the EU common security plan in doubt.

Sovereignty

The world's major countries have redefined the sovereign character of the nation state, including their own. Marks notes that "The post-cold war world has segued into what might be called the post-Westphalian world". **14** In Iraq in 1991 the UN sanctioned intervention in a nation state to enforce no-fly zones as a means of protecting the Kurds from the Iraqi state. **15** The UN also needed a new resolution to authorise the use of force to intervene in the Yugoslavian conflict and the UN Security Council approved Resolution 1244 in 1999. This set a new precedent in authorising force against a nation state using human rights laws. Marks sees that "The actions taken by NATO and others in Kosovo were partially motivated and justified by the growing belief in many countries that humanitarian and human-rights considerations were the legitimate concern of the international community"

The 1992 UN Declaration of the Rights of Persons belonging to National, Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities gave legitimacy to these interventions. **16** These examples highlight an important precedent marking a big change in the organisation of world order and are a precursor of how future interventions and wars would be exercised.

Human Rights and Globalisation

Now that human rights have been treated as having greater weight than national laws and have triggered military action, some commentators have reached the conclusion that international law, with its enlarging normative scope, extending writ and growing institutionalisation, exemplifies the phenomenon of globalisation. **17** Human rights laws are taking power away from the nation state and are passing it to international bodies like the UN, the OSCE in Europe and others. But Nye thinks there are problems, "The UN is torn between the strict Westphalian interpretation of state sovereignty and the rise of international humanitarian and human rights law that sets limits on what leaders can do to their citizens". **18** This is true and the UN does need to be reformed to deal with today's security issues and decide how it is to wield its power. Because of this lack of clarity in the UN's mandate and growing frustration with the legal and political structure of the nation state-based system, NGOs and human rights organisations are playing a larger part in global politics and have come together to defend human rights internationally.

US Hegemony

The world is more interconnected, but without a rival there has been a strengthening of US hegemony and military power. The administration of President George W. Bush is requesting \$396.1 billion for the military in fiscal year 2003 (\$379.3 billion for the Defence Department and \$16.8 billion for the nuclear weapons functions of the Department of Energy). This is \$45.5 billion above current levels, an increase of 13 percent. It is also 15 percent above the cold war average. **19** The increase means the US is spending more on defence than the next 15 biggest-spending countries put together. **20** When President Eisenhower warned of the dangers of the military industrial complex in 1961, he voiced concerns of many who feared the corruption of American democracy and the American way of life from the unrelenting preparation for war. **21**

The siege mentality in the United States today and the media portrayal of a united front against terror is used by the government to rally support for defence spending on projects like the missile defence system which is expected to cost over 100 billion dollars. The missile defence system is sold to the public as a conventional defence system but is seen by many as a Trojan horse for the militarisation of space. **22** In this post September 11th/Iraqi war siege culture, laws are being changed, human rights abused and military projects passed in name of self defence, that would not, in other times, have been allowed.

The New Unilateralism

The 'War on Terror' began after the September 11th World Trade tower attacks and pushed ideas regarding intervention in sovereign states one step further. The US interpreted article 51 of the UN "allowing for self defence of your country if it suffers an armed attack" as justification for attacking Al Qaeda in Afghanistan. This created heated debate world-wide about international law and whether the US had suffered an armed attack as interpreted under article 51. The problem with article 51 was its ability to deal with a asymmetric terrorist attack, rather than an conventional armed attack between states. International opinion was spilt, some went with the US attack and saw it as a fair interpretation of article 51. Others did not think "the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security," (which is also part of article 51) and thought the attack was illegal. **23** The removal of the Taliban and displacement of Bin Laden and his combatants following the attack on Afghanistan, US attention turned to Iraq. The US claimed an Iraqi link to Al Qaeda and a weapons of mass destruction program. The Bush camp worried that containment was giving time for Saddam Hussein to rearm and the US vice president Dick Cheney warned "The argument comes down to this: Yes Saddam is as dangerous as we say he is. We just need to let him get stronger before we do anything about it," **24** pointing out the folly of giving time for Iraq to develop its own nuclear bomb and not attacking Iraq now. This was highlighted by the fact that North Korea had managed to blackmail the US into talks because it had a nuclear bomb. After numerous UN resolutions and in spite of the five permanent members of the security council not agreeing to go to war, the US and UK coalition attacked anyway. The fact that the US government adopted the pre-emptive strike doctrine and Bush-Blair unilateralism have together put in to question the established framework of international law and the UN system. Some see this as a dangerous geopolitical conjuncture which has swept aside all accountability to international law. **25** The Bush camp would see this as a price worth paying as "Given the goals of rogue states and terrorists, the US can no longer rely on a reactive posture." **26**

The Iraq Conflict 2003

George W Bush in the State of the Union address, 29th January 2003 outlined the perceived danger of Saddam Hussein: "Today, the gravest danger in the war on terror, the gravest danger facing America and the world, is outlaw regimes that seek and possess nuclear,

chemical, and biological weapons. These regimes could use such weapons for blackmail, terror, and mass murder...” **27**

The Route to War

Bush and Blair launched a pre-emptive attack against Iraq. The main reason for going to war was based on intelligence suggesting that Saddam Hussein had large amounts of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMDs) and a developing nuclear weapons program, with uranium from Niger, and the ability to launch WMDs within 45 minutes. Tony Blair, speaking to the House of Commons, 18th March 2003 said “Iraq continues to deny that it has any WMD, though no serious intelligence service anywhere in the world believes them”. **28** The justification was also mixed up with the argument that the war was morally right as Saddam Hussein was a terrible dictator who had for many years murdered his own people including terrible attacks on the Kurds and Marsh Arabs by chemical weapons. The reasons were enough to convince Bush and Blair that there was enough justification for war even though they failed to get a UN resolution. US Deputy Defence Secretary Paul Wolfowitz, has said that while there were many reasons to go to war, the Bush administration chose to focus on weapons of mass destruction because it was the one issue behind which all factions could unite. **29** Some see this as an admission by the US that they were going to go to war anyway but wanted as many people on their side to make it look legitimate.

People wonder why the US decided so adamantly to invade Iraq now? The UN inspectors were doing their job. Sanctions had kept the country contained and Iraq was not considered a threat to its neighbours. Why attack now without international consensus? It seems as if the reason was driven solely by hawks in the US administration. The Bush ideologues think installing a democratic market-based economy in the region will help towards global security. Vice President Cheney wants to install “a government that is democratic and pluralistic...where the human rights of every ethnic and religious group are recognised and protected” **30** In fact this is their plan for other states which are undemocratic and are a potential threat to the US. They see that installing a market-based democratic government in the Middle East will be a wake up call for other Islamic governments in the region. Critics say it is impossible to export US democracy but the Bush camp says look at Japan and Germany which both developed democracies with the help of the U.S.

Post War

The war happened and was over very quickly. Iraq was plunged into chaos, looting and lawlessness. The problem now is that no weapons of mass destruction (WMD) have been found, Saddam Hussein is on the run and Iraq continues in chaos. The intelligence that helped convince the world that war was the only way to deal with Iraq has proven to be unreliable and there have been accusations of claims about WMD of being over-dramatised by both the US and UK. There is growing disquiet of the reasons for war and what it has achieved. Following the suicide of Dr Kelly a prominent weapons inspector who informed a BBC journalist about the shaky evidence for the fact that chemical weapons could be launched in 45min, the Hutton inquiry was set up. The Hutton Inquiry is exposing the British government's deliberations in the build-up to war. We do not yet know what the outcome will be but so far it is suggesting that the evidence they used in prosecuting the war against Iraq was thin on the ground. The US does not have an established post-war reconstruction plan. Paul Bremer the current US governor of Iraq has set up a governing council consisting of members representing the religious make-up of Iraq but the members were chosen by the American administration and there is no set time for proper elections and the establishment of a proper democratic Iraqi government. The Iraqi council meetings are held in secret and all decisions made by the council can be overturned by the US authority. People wonder if democracy will ever be established in Iraq. Sceptics mention the other invasions of sovereign states carried out by the Americans where democracy has failed to materialise. This includes invasions in Iran (1953), Chile (1973), Afghanistan (1980s), Nicaragua (1980s), Grenada (1983), Panama (1989), Somalia (1993), and Haiti (1994). **31** The US powers in Iraq plan to privatise the economy and oil assets which has further convinced critics that the war was about oil. The US is seizing the chance to impose market fundamentalism on Iraq. George Bush has said that he envisions a "US-Middle East free-trade area" within 10 years, "replacing corruption and self dealing with free markets". **32** Ironically the US administration is rapidly selling contracts to firms that have close links to the Pentagon and is attracting accusations of cronyism. It seems that every area of reconstruction will have to be with American equipment and companies. Recently a Bahrain mobile phone company managed to get a service up and running but the Americans ordered the system shut down because the Bahrain operating company, by opening its service so early, was supposedly not giving other bidders a fair chance at the contract. Those other companies are largely American. **33** Also the hospitals are only allowed to have equipment which complies with US standards, thus meaning only US equipment will be supplied. Amnesty International has protested and says any decisions about the future economy of Iraq must be made by the Iraqis themselves.

Terrorism

Bush and Blair stressed the importance of the war in Iraq in helping to rid the world of terrorists. A parliamentary report in the UK has warned that the war may have done the opposite and increased the risk of terrorism. The House of Commons Foreign Affairs Committee said. "The war in Iraq might in fact have impeded the war against Al Qaeda. Our witnesses were concerned that it might have enhanced the appeal of Al Qaeda to Muslims living in the Gulf region and elsewhere." **34** US military power is essential to global stability and is a critical part of the response to terrorism. But the metaphor of war should not blind Americans to the fact that suppressing terrorism will take years of patient, unspectacular civilian co-operation with other countries in areas such as intelligence sharing, police work, tracing financial flows, and border controls. **35** Shaking our fists at those who use terror does not really engage us in a pre-emptive or preventive strategy. In order to do that, we must address their sense of being excluded from the rules, excluded from legitimacy; we must, in effect, help them to become legitimate. **36** This is where soft power comes into play.

Pre-Emptive Strike Doctrine

The pre-emptive strike doctrine has created a grab for nuclear technology. Countries that feel threatened especially those on George W. Bush's Axis of Evil list are trying hard to ensure they have nuclear weapons so if the US decides to invade they will have some bargaining power. Iran and North Korea both have Nuclear programs. Countries that don't have a nuclear program but feel the heat from Washington are considering whether they should acquire a nuclear deterrent. Countries that do have nuclear missiles like China might feel the US is a threat to them and launch a pre-emptive attack, already North Korea has threatened the use of an pre-emptive attack "The United States says that after Iraq, we are next", said the deputy director Ri Pyong-gap, "but we have our own countermeasures. Pre-emptive attacks are not the exclusive right of the US." **37** Now the US has condoned such a policy it had better watch its back.

The Future

Commentators on Iraq are confused at the moment. They are critical of the US being in Iraq and the way they are running the occupation, but at the same time think that if the US left it would be far worse. It looks as if the US will be in Iraq for a long while and lets hope Iraq can be brought into order and harmony. "The war is supposed to be over, but every day we hear of

another soldier getting killed," a US sergeant told the Post. "Saddam isn't in power anymore. The locals want us to leave. Why are we still here?" **38** Experts predict the need for a US presence in Iraq for at least several years, if not a decade or more. **39**

The pre-emptive strike doctrine adopted by the U.S., the attack on Afghanistan, the continuing occupation of Iraq, U.S. sword rattling for potentially more state interventions and the heightened possibilities of future terrorist attacks, has put the world in a highly un-secure state of mind and has exposed us all to the new realities of our global vulnerability.

References and Footnotes

1. Wikipedia encyclopedia www.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hard_power
2. Nye and Keohane "Power and Interdependence in the Information Age" pg4
3. Wikipedia encyclopedia www.wikipedia.org/wiki/Treaty_of_Westphalia
4. The League of Nations was an international organisation established on January 25, 1919 by part I of the Treaty of Versailles, founded with the intentions of reducing armaments, settling disputes between countries and maintaining living conditions. This was largely motivated by the bloodshed during World War I. While the League failed to prevent World War II, it was successful in dealing with minor conflicts throughout the 1920s. The League held its first meeting on January 10, 1920 and on the same day ratified the Treaty of Versailles thus officially ending World War I. The League formally dissolved itself on April 18, 1946 and transferred its mission to the United Nations.
5. Nato Handbook www.nato.int/docu/handbook/2001/hb1501.htm
6. Held & McGrew et al 'Global Transformations' Polity (1999) pg 99
7. Nixon quoted in James Chace and Nicholas Rizopoulos, (1999) "Towards a New concert of Nations: An American perspective" World policy Journal fall.
www.worldpolicy.org/journal/chace_rizo.html
8. Regional Human Security Centre www.id.gov.jo/human/introduction/introduction.html
- 9 "North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) is a military alliance consisting of the United States, Canada, Belgium, Canada, Czech Rep, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherland, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States. Formed in 1949, NATO was set up largely to discourage an attack by the Soviet Union on the non-communist nations of Western Europe. After World War II ended in 1945, an intense rivalry developed between Communist countries, led by the Soviet Union, and non-communist nations, led by the United States. This rivalry became known as the Cold

War. In 1955, the Soviet Union and Communist nations of Eastern Europe formed their own military alliance to oppose NATO. The Soviet-led alliance was called the Warsaw Pact. In forming NATO, each member country agreed to treat an attack on any other member as an attack on itself. http://members.tripod.com/more_tra/1e_nato_txt.htm

10 Thompson k (1968) 'Collective Security' International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, Vols. 1 and 2 p. 565.

11. Held & McGrew et al 'Global Transformations' Polity (1999) pg125

12.Palmer Repairing The Damage: European Disunity and Global Crisis. The European Policy Centre.

www.theepc.net/challenge/challenge_detail.asp?SEC=challenge&SUBSEC=issue&SUBSUBSEC=&SUBSUBSUBSEC=&REFID=1084.

13.Geoffrey Wiseman, *Common Security and Non-Provocative Defence: Alternative Approaches to the Security Dilemma* (Canberra: Peace Research Centre, 1989).

14.Marks E (2000)'From Post Cold War to Post Westphalia'

15. Held & McGrew, et al 'Global Transformations' Polity (1999) p 70

16. Ibid p 69-70

17. Held & McGrew et al 'Global Transformations' Polity (1999) pg 70

18. Nye J (2003) 'U.S. Power and Strategy After Iraq'

www.ksg.harvard.edu/news/opeds/2003/nye_usiraq_foraffairs_070103.htm

19. Highlights of the FY'03 Budget Request www.cdi.org/issues/budget/FY03Highlights-pr.cfm

20 Alcorn G (2002)'Shocked into a different world'

www.theage.com.au/articles/2002/03/10/1015365756307.html

21. Held & McGrew et al 'Global Transformations' Polity (1999) pg. 147

22. Bruce Gagnon 'Missile Defense is a Trojan Horse'October 2001

www.thirdworldtraveler.com/Militarization_Space/MissileDefense_TrojanHorse.html

23. Schiffman H (2001):The Legal Basis for the War in Afghanistan

www.internationallawhelp.com/Forum/messages/60.html

24. Kaplan & Kristol (2003) The War Over Iraq. pg 80

25. Reclaim people's security From national security to global security: Counter-terrorism in Asia and Europe www.tni.org/reports/altreg/peoplesecurity.pdf

26. . Kaplan & Kristol (2003) The War Over Iraq. pg 79

27. In quotes: Reasons for the Iraq war

http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/middle_east/2948068.stm

- 28.** In quotes: Reasons for the Iraq war
http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/middle_east/2948068.stm
- 29.** July Vanity Fair [http:// news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/middle_east/2948068.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/middle_east/2948068.stm)
- 30.** Kaplan & Kristol (2003) The War Over Iraq. San Francisco. Encounter Books p 99
- 31.** Ten Reasons to Oppose War Against Iraq www.kciraqtaskforce.org/
- 32.** Vulliamy & Islam (Sunday June 29, 2003) And now for the really big guns War is one thing, but can Iraq survive full-on assault by Wall Street? The Observer
<http://observer.guardian.co.uk/Print/0,3858,4701185,00.html>
- 33** Fisk R, (2003) Iraq Isn't Working The Independent
www.occupationwatch.org/article.php?id=310
- 34.** Iraq war (2003) Iraq war failed to make UK safer - report
www.casi.org.uk/discuss/2003/msg03776.html
- 35** Nye J (2003) 'U.S. Power and Strategy After Iraq'
www.ksg.harvard.edu/news/opeds/2003/nye_usiraq_foraffairs_070103.htm
- 36.** A Program of The Democracy Collaborative at The University of Maryland
June 2–4, 2002 Berlin, Germany International Roundtable II Report Globalisation, Terrorism, and Democracy pg 19
- 37.** Watts J(Thursday February 6, 2003)N Korea threatens US with first strike
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/korea/article/0,2763,889679,00.html>
- 38.** Jim Lobe (June 24, 2003)Post-war Iraq: Quagmire or Master Plan?
<http://www.alternet.org/story.html?StoryID=16254>
- 39.** Crocker BN et al (March 25, 2003) Post-War Iraq: Are We Ready?
http://www.csis.org/features/030325_postwarIraq.pdf

Chapter Two

Economic Power

In this chapter I will examine the rise of economic power and market fundamentalism as espoused by the US and western countries. I will explain how it developed and is sustained.

Strategic Economic Power

Strategic economic power can be delivered through sanctions, the withholding of aid, trade tariffs and other mechanisms.

Nye sees that “Economic power has become more important than in the past both because of the relative increase in costliness of force and because economic objectives loom large in the values of post-industrial societies”. p8 (2003) **1**

One way the US wields strategic economic power is through allocation of Free Trade Agreements (FTA). FTAs are only given to countries that support its foreign policy. It has 13 criteria to assess a country’s suitability to participate in an FTA. The Bush administration has a “long memory” regarding what it sees as other countries’ transgressions. The US will therefore not offer an FTA to New Zealand, which has refused to let nuclear powered vessels enter its waters. **2** This will not affect New Zealand as much as it could other countries who would perhaps fall in line and support all aspects of US foreign policy rather than risk some kind of economic sanction. In the War on Terror the Bush administration has deployed a variety of economic tools such as preferential trade measures, the removal of existing sanctions coupled with loans to reward allies, and new sanctions to intimidate adversaries. In this war, sanctions policy is being used both as a stick and a carrot. **3**

Positive Economic Power

Aspects of economic globalisation have been for the good and not all economic power is about coercion.

Boulding sees two forms of soft power: exchange power, associated with bargaining and the compromising approach ‘do what I want and I will do what you want’. Exchanges are invitations to trade beneficial actions or goods. The economic system is the primary example of an exchange system. **4** Globalisation has brought wealth, information, technology, medicine, travel and many positive benefits to the world. It could be seen that interconnectedness through globalisation helps to make the world more peaceful as our relationships become symbiotic and rely on positive world exchanges.

The Development of Neo-Liberalism

After the end of the cold war, the dropping of Marxist ideology and the rapid liberalisation of Russian and former Soviet block economies gave the exponents of neo-liberal economics the green light for global dominance. Neo-liberal globalisation is centred around the ideas of Adam Smith (1723-1790), David Ricardo (1772-1823) and Friedrich Hayek (1889 -1992). **5** Smith put forward the idea of the invisible hand that guided a harmonious system of natural laws. Ricardo's Theory of Comparative Advantage argued that the advantages of specialisation and trade outweighed the constraints of social considerations providing an argument to end government regulation of markets. John Maynard Keynes (1883-1946) saw that the markets were no good at dealing with unemployment and after WW2 Keynesian economic theory was employed to create a mixed economy as an expression of political pluralism, resulting in state interventions that led toward the social welfare state. **6** Keynes' idea for the IMF was that it would create economic stability for the world and facilitate the expansion and balanced growth of international trade. It was meant to control a system of fixed exchange rates and stop countries devaluing their currencies to get a competitive edge over their neighbours. It was to help countries exchange currencies and facilitate global trade and be a lender of last resort, loaning money to countries suffering cash flow problems. **7** The World Bank was set up to lend money to wrecked economies after WW2 so they could invest in infrastructure projects such as roads, airports, schools and other forms of social infrastructure. The WTO was introduced to govern the rules of international trade and for example, to prevent countries having un-competitive trade barriers.

With slow growth in the economy in the 60s-70s led the neo-liberals to convince that Keynes' ideas had not worked and that deregulation as advocated by Hayek could solve the problems. Hayek said that socialism necessarily led to fascism as central planning overrode individual preferences in economic and social life. **8** Milton Friedman brought into life the ideas of Hayek and market deregulation. **9** Ronald Regan and Margaret Thatcher, fans of Hayek, introduced a sea change in policy coming through the 'Washington Consensus'. The Washington Consensus was a name economist John Williamson gave in 1989 to a list of ten policy recommendations for countries willing to reform their economies; **10** tariff barriers were removed and the global market progressively deregulated. Now the goal was monetarism and privatisation and the dismantling of the Welfare State. **11**

This has continued since then and the policies of the IMF and World Bank have tried to apply the 'Washington consensus' to developing economies with disastrous effects. Neo-liberal

globalisations aims are economic growth, free trade, free markets and the reduction of government regulation. Neo-liberal ideas based on market fundamentalism are the dominant form of economic theory in the world today; it is the cause of both pain and gain for the people of the world.

Sustaining the Ideology

Neo-liberal, market fundamental capitalism has expanded into an ideology that defines market liberalisation as the inevitable path of globalisation. Steger thinks 'Neo-liberal globalists encourage the general public to uncritically accept the world-wide spread of free-market and unregulated, capitalism'.¹³ This is done through conditioned power delivered through persuasion, education and socialisation to accepted values and propaganda interpreting the realm of public versus private, constructing reality, withholding fundamental information needed to make intelligent decisions, manipulation, and even deception, all aimed at shaping preference formation. ¹⁴ Added to this is the continual portrayal in the media that business and money bring power and happiness. Business and wealth are portrayed as society's objective and risk-taking businessmen working to the 'Who dares Wins' mantra are seen as necessary – it is admirable to achieve what you want even if it is at the expense of the environment and due process. Figureheads like the Royal Family in England condone excessive privilege as a norm, sanctioning the gap between the rich and poor, the rich and starving. People are conditioned to associate wealth with power, accepting their position in society and not questioning the status quo. Greed and personal gain are the norms of the 21st century.

Neo-liberalism is perpetuated by conditioned power through the international rise of MBA courses. Sklair sees the 'transformation in the way in which big business works around the world is attached to the tremendous growth in business education with a global focus, notably International MBAs, (Masters of Business Administration) since the 1960s, particularly in the US and Europe, but increasingly all over the world. ¹⁵ The modern educational system, especially economics education, as well as the mass media, train people to accept the goals and purposes of the business world.

Economic World Crises

There have been a raft of economic crisis in the past decade from East Asia in 1997 to Russia in 1998 and Argentina in 2001. In 1998 after steaming head on into market liberalisation under the advice from the IMF the Russian economy suffered a crisis . ¹⁶

It was debated whether the liberalisation process to a market economy should have been taken slowly, or rapidly as backed by the US and IMF. The US/IMF view won over. There was concern that if transition was too slow there could be a backlash and a rejection of market ideology. The fast approach did not take into account the dramatic social changes that would affect Russian society with the introduction of global capitalism.

‘Global integration is an ongoing, historical process, some theorists have presented it as a primarily economic process, with ideology and culture given a subordinate role, giving rise to a theory that relies on statistical analyses that neglect the powerful social impact of these changes’. **17** In Argentina 2001 the economy collapsed because of bad domestic policies exacerbated by the IMF. **18**

Argentina had been the darling of the international community and had been heaped with praise for its firm following of IMF policies. Both Russia and Argentina had opened their capital markets to unregulated flows, both privatised their industries and both cut back on social spending, a formula commonly used by the IMF based on market fundamentalism.

Market Fundamentalism and Globalisation

There are different forms of capitalism but the US model of market fundamentalism, with pressure from the **G719** group of countries is pushed on the world through the IMF and WTO. Having international organisations like the WTO and IMF, even though they attract much criticism, is an attempt to manage the global economy for the benefit of all. This is coming under attack through the unilateral policies of the present US government. Bush’s economic policy is very protectionist and he has imposed tariffs on imports of steel and given huge subsidies to American farmers along with other un-competitive moves. In 2001, the US Commodity Credit Corporation spent \$4bn subsidising the income of cotton producers. The world market value of the cotton crop was slightly over \$3bn, **20** this is an obvious example of unfair advantage to American cotton producers through subsidies, it had led critics to see the Bush government as having a protectionist stance to the US economy but imposing free trade on everyone else. The US was involved in setting up the World Trade Organisation but now sees it as a hindrance. This is because the US has lost a number of rulings at the WTO. The US sees the WTO as threatening US interests and putting pressure on market values. The US would like to see unfettered free markets. Environmentalists and other protesters on the other hand have for years seen the WTO rulings as unfair and stacked against the poor. The US belief in the markets was demonstrated in a plan by the CIA to predict future terrorist attacks using a system based on market principles. A San Diego company is working with the

Pentagon on a futures market that would allow anonymous speculators to bet on assassinations and terrorist attacks. In the US senate it was also suggested that terrorists themselves could take part because the identities of the traders will be unknown. **21** The plan has been scrapped as it was thought it might encourage terrorists to plan and carry out attacks which would influence investments they had made in the stock market. Others say people could influence the stock market like this anyway and that this kind of system has been used for predicting elections, with success.

The IMF and World Bank have as much faith in the markets as the CIA and impose market fundamentalism with the same confidence on countries in transition and development. The way that Russia tried to implement a market economy followed textbook economics, trying to replace Marxism with free markets. But successful capitalism is underpinned by institutions providing legal and regulatory frameworks to govern transactions and repayments etc, along with some form of social security system in the case of unemployment. These did not exist in Russia and led to Mafia based capitalism and oligarchies.

As explained the IMF was supposed to create economic stability for the world, to facilitate the expansion and balanced growth of international trade through restrained fiscal policy.

Instead the IMF consistently violates its original mandate of providing stability by pushing for the complete removal of controls and demanding massive and rapid privatisation. **22** The countries which survived the worst aspects of the world economic crisis, making a quicker recovery are the ones who ignored the IMF's advice. The US is effectively in control of the IMF. Under IMF rules, each member bears votes in accordance with a quota that is assessed roughly in proportion to its share of the world economy. The US carries 17.4 percent of IMF voting power, while states with tiny economies carry a fraction of 1 percent. **23** With such control people have been led to believe the US is pursuing these policies through the IMF to undermine economies, making profits for its banks and companies, keeping itself in a dominant economic position.

Bush's unilateralism goes against the current system of globalisation and interconnectedness of the world economies. Not playing by the rules and sidelining the institutions that are here to keep the system running for the benefit of all, the Bush government is undermining global capitalism. Bush is making enemies with other capitalists who believe in the unity of capital, who don't think that the way you handle these things is by smashing all opposition, but would prefer to co-opt it. They are extremely worried that this is Samson pulling down the house. **24**

References and Footnotes

1. Nye 'The Paradox of American Power'
2. Zoellick (2003) Zoellick Says FTA Candidates Must Support U.S. Foreign Policy
www.ourworldisnotforsale.org/newsandupdates/26.htm
3. Hufbauer & Schott (2001) 'Using Sanctions to Fight Terrorism' Barbara Oegg Institute for International Economics www.iie.com/publications/pb/pb01-11.htm
4. History of Conflict Resolution www.brad.ac.uk/acad/confres/dislearn/unit1.html
5. Wikipedia Encyclopedia http://www.wikipedia.org/wiki/Friedrich_von_Hayek
6. Manfred Steger (2003) 'Globalism: The New Market Ideology'
7. Peat D Nature and Ethics From Adam Smith to Enron
www.paricenter.com/library/papers/peat23.php
8. Wikipedia Encyclopedia www.wikipedia.org/wiki/Friedrich_von_Hayek
9. Friedman was the undying enemy of Keynesian economics. He widely publicised what he considered to be a need to return to the "unseen hand" of the market to cure the "stagflation" of the time. His ideas were exactly what the right-wing rich elite's needed in an economic theory. It was simple, easy to understand, superficially reasonable and logical, and above all else, suited their need for an economic theory, which, if implemented, would enable them to accumulate wealth and thereby transfer its accompanying power to themselves. It suited their desire for revenge and their greed and avarice beautifully. Friedman very quickly became their darling. Paul Samuelson, Friedman's long-time rival and the principal advocate of careful regulation of business and government intervention in the market in the Keynesian mould, tirelessly warned of the anti-egalitarian dangers of Friedman's approach, but amidst the propaganda, he was largely forgotten, even though it was his ideas that had not only prevented a return to business cycles, but had created a vast middle class in America in just a couple of decades following world war II.
<http://www.bidstrup.com/economics.htm>
10. Williamson's ten prescriptions reflecting his interpretation of the Washington consensus in the early 1990s were: 1] Fiscal discipline, 2] Redirect public expenditure, 3] Tax reform, 4] Financial liberalisation, 5] Adopt a single, competitive exchange rate, 6] Trade liberalisation 7] Eliminate barriers to foreign direct investment 8] Privatisise state owned enterprises 9] Deregulate market entry and competition 10] Ensure secure property rights.
11. Peat D Nature and Ethics From Adam Smith to Enron
www.paricenter.com/library/papers/peat23.php

12. . Kevin Watkins 'Trade hypocrisy: the problem with Robert Zoellick'

www.opendemocracy.net/debates/article-7-30-860.jsp

13. Manfred Steger (2003) 'Globalism: The New Market Ideology'

14. Galbraith J (2002) Power and the Useful (Political) Economist: Southern Political Science Association November http://www2.gasou.edu/spsa/Papers_PDF/Waligorski.pdf.

15. Sklair (2000) 'The Transnational Capitalist Class'

16. The Russia transition to a market economy started with the freeing of prices which led to hyper inflation and the removal of savings to pay for the higher prices of goods. Because of this to curb the inflation there was a tightening of monetary policy and the raising interest rates. While most of the prices had been freed some of the important ones like oil and gas were kept low. This led to people buying the cheap oil in Russia and selling for a profit in western countries. Instead of making money by creating new enterprises, they got rich from a new form of entrepreneurship, exploiting mistaken government policies. The crisis in East Asia and the falling in demand of oil from Russia led to a huge fall in oil prices in 1998 to 45% lower than average prices in 1997. This led to loss of revenue from tax and sales to the government. Oil was set to fall below the price of production and it was clear that the currency would have to devalue. The IMF feared devaluation thinking it would lead to more hyperinflation and they propped up the rouble with billions of dollars. The attempts to rescue the rouble failed after the IMF had spent 28.4 billion trying to stop the rouble from devaluing. By January 1999 the rouble had declined in real effective terms by more than 45% from its July 1998 level. The IMF was worried that devaluation of the rouble would set off a round of inflation. Its insistence on Russia maintaining an overvalued currency and its supporting that with billions of dollars of loans ultimately crushed the economy. The stabilisation/liberalisation/privatisation program was of course not a growth program. It was intended to set the preconditions for growth. Instead it set the conditions for decline. The IMF had encouraged the government to open its capital accounts, allowing a free

flow of capital. The policy was supposed to make the country more attractive for foreign investors, but it was virtually a one-way door that facilitated a rush of money out of the country

Stiglitz J (2002) Globalization and its Discontents London Penguin

17. Manfred Steger (2003) 'Globalism: The New Market Ideology'

18. Argentina. With IMF tutoring Argentina privatised state-owned enterprises down to electricity and water and threw open Argentina's manufacturing and commodities markets to unrestricted trade; and opened their country's capital markets to unrestricted inflows of

foreign currencies. The peso was pegged to the dollar at a rate of one-to-one – with the tacit approval of the IMF. Foreign firms and massive amounts of foreign direct investment (at least \$156 billion) flowed into Argentina, resulting in positive economic growth rates from 1991 through 1994. In December of 1994, however, the Mexican peso crisis caused jitters, the so-called “tequila effect,” among investors in Latin America. Foreign capital flowed out of the region. Also, the government had sold off large state assets under the IMF privatisation conditions, often to foreign firms that sent profits out of the country. Further, as the value of the dollar rose against other currencies, so too did the peso. This made Argentina’s exports much more expensive even as the Latin American region experienced a slowdown. Export earnings sank like a stone. The result: a spiralling downturn that ended in a four-year recession. The recession was made worse in the late 1990’s by the Asian financial crises, as well as by financial crises in Brazil, Mexico, Russia and Turkey. Classic “capital flight” ensued as Argentina’s foreign investors and wealthy elite’s sent their funds out of the country, sequestering their money in U.S. and European banks and investment houses. Sadly, the government of Argentina went right on borrowing in order to prop up the currency board, maintain the peso’s peg to the dollar, and service previously incurred debt. From 1998 through mid-2001, the IMF and European creditors, gravely worried about their own portfolios, arranged \$22 billion in further loans and lines of credit, with the IMF again insisting, counter to economic theory, on austerity measures to balance the budget by slashing domestic spending. On 21 August 2001 the IMF recommended an \$8 billion increase to an earlier \$14 billion stand-by loan for Argentina. The BBC’s Lourdes Heredia reported from Buenos Aires on November 25 (1) that the government would post a \$7.8 billion dollar deficit in 2001, \$1.3 billion higher than the limit agreed in August; (2) that an IMF mission had arrived to examine the government’s accounts; and (3) that a \$1.264 billion loan disbursement “Argentina desperately needs” to balance its budget was in jeopardy. Despite previous 2001 loans and loan agreements, and with total sovereign debt at \$132 billion, on the 5th of December 2001 the IMF pulled the trigger by withholding the \$1.264 billion disbursement. This step was taken because austerity measures imposed by the government – measures originally insisted on by the IMF – were not austere enough. (Nor were IMF oversight and supervision severe enough.) The government had, in fact, overspent. Yet the hard truth is that the IMF denied Argentina a mere \$1.264 billion – which would have all but balanced the budget – and thereby brought down the economy and the government.

www.zmag.org/content/print_article.cfm?itemID=2641§ionID=42

- 19.** The G& countries are the U.S. , Japan, Germany, Canada, Italy, France, and UK. Today the G-7 typically meets together with Russia (the G-8)
- 20.** Kevin Watkins 'Trade hypocrisy: the problem with Robert Zoellick'
www.opendemocracy.net/debates/article-7-30-860.jsp
- 21.** "Invest in Mideast futures" <http://www.casi.org.uk/discuss/2003/msg03740.html>
- 22.** Govindu V (2003) Home truths on market fundamentalism
<http://indiatgether.org/2003/jun/rww-stiglitz.htm>
- 23 .** Cobban (2000) No globalization without representation
<http://search.csmonitor.com/durable/2000/03/09/p11s1.htm>
- 24.** Wallerstein I, 'U.S. Weakness and the Struggle for Hegemony'
www.monthlyreview.org/0703wallerstein.htm

Chapter Three

Soft Power

In Chapter Two I looked at the current vogue for unilateralism within Hard Power and the blanket imposition of market fundamentalism; in Chapter 1

I looked at the rise of economic power and market fundamentalism. Both current ideas are based on producing competitive behaviour and are not very subtle instruments for nurturing global harmony.

In this chapter I will highlight cultural splits between the two most important movements: Islamic fundamentalism and Christian market-based fundamentalism. I will examine how the diverse voice of civil society has increased through new communications technology which is organising and putting forward alternatives for global governance, looking towards a greater equilibrium between military, economic, and Soft Power .

Soft Power Definition

Soft Power is a concept within contemporary Chinese political thinking and refers to power which comes from economic or cultural means. It is the opposite of Hard Power. **1**

Vice President of Taiwan Lu Hsiu-lien expressed the view that “Soft Power consists of five key elements: democracy, human rights, peace, love, and high technological progress, which are intimately intertwined. Soft power makes use of mercy and wisdom to fight against injustice and authoritarianism. It is constructive and generous.” (2002) **2**

Her list of five elements is interesting and highlights why Soft Power has more importance in today's world: giving a voice to democracy, human rights, peace and love, through powerful international communications equipment; this enables more people to have a voice and puts world governments and international organisations under greater scrutiny.

These ideas are expanded on by Nye who sees 'Soft Power as a way of setting the agenda and attracting people with the power of your culture, respect for democracy and your principles. A country's Soft Power, openness, prosperity and similar values that persuade and attract rather than coerce others are as important and influential as its Hard Power, military force and economic leverage. p8(2002) **3**

But is it really as simple as that? Can the US really win people over with its ideas and culture? Do all groups agree with American values and culture? Are they as universal and democratic as the US would like to think?

The Information Age

Nye thinks Soft Power in the global information age will increase in importance because Soft Power rests on credibility. The trust people can put in the information you give out is where power lies in the information age. Countries that will gain Soft Power are:

- 1) Where dominant culture and ideas are closer to prevailing global norms, (which emphasise liberalism, pluralism and autonomy).
- 2) With access to multiple channels of communication and thus more influence over how issues are framed.
- 3) Whose credibility is enhanced by their domestic and international performance.

These dimensions of power in an information age suggest the growing importance of soft power in the mix of power resources and a strong advantage to the United States (2002) **4**

Liberalism, pluralism and autonomy are all good things to aspire to but the idea of a dominant culture raises the issue of cultural imperialism. The question of cultural imperialism is a complex one and given the length of this chapter, I will merely summarise some of the main arguments.

Wallerstein sees that core states in general, and the hegemonic state when one exists in particular, seek to reinforce the advantages of their producers and to legitimise their role in

the interstate system by imposing their cultural dominance on the world. To some extent, this occurs in the form of language, religion and mores, but more importantly it occurs in the form of seeking to impose modes of thought and analysis, including in particular the paradigms that inform philosophy and the sciences/social sciences. **5** Sisci thinks “It seems clear that the projection of values, ie soft power, can be accurately described as ‘soft war’, and this kind of war was in fact waged by America during the Cold War years. (2002) **6** Others see it just as the realpolitik of the business world “it is in the economic and political interests of the United States to ensure that if the world is moving toward a common language, it be English; that if the world is moving toward common telecommunications, safety, and quality standards, they be American” **7** But is it really so benign?

Apart from the homogenising increase of the same restaurant all over the world, Ritzer’s ‘MacDonaldization’ theory is concerned with the adaptation of the principles of the fast-food restaurant: increased efficiency, calculability, quantity before quality, predictability and control, by indigenous cultures as dominating more and more aspects of culture and societies. McDonaldization is another word for rationalisation - the invention of the production line and standardisation of production. **8** This example of cultural imperialism is changing the way people live, work, eat and think. This weakens part of the benefits of Soft Power and the benign cultural influence as seen by Nye.

Edward Said argues that one culture’s power to influence another is intimately connected to the strength or weakness of its economic and military power. Said thinks cultural imperialism has been operating at both the conscious and the unconscious level, providing images of what ‘good’ life means and seeking to shape people’s identities. (1985) **9**

The British Council is involved with promoting British culture abroad through public diplomacy and this attracts people to the UK and its values. The mix of our Anglo Saxon and Celtic cultures along with the multiculturalism in our big cities makes the UK diverse and interesting. Our popular culture, music, comedy, arts and theatre is known worldwide.

Leonard sees “Relationship building through public diplomacy programmes takes place over a period of time and is about building relationships between all members of societies. This is carried out through student exchanges, cultural programmes, conferences and training building real and virtual networks”. (2002) **10** Educating people about each other’s cultures and countries helps to foster global understanding. But public diplomacy gets a lot of attention for its cultural imperialism and is often labelled as propaganda.

Taylor, commenting on the programmes run by the British Council thinks, “one can, of course, debate whether this is a form of international propaganda on behalf of the value

systems of the countries conducting it. But if the objective is to inform, educate and entertain on the assumption that greater mutual understanding will result, then it can only be argued that this is propaganda on behalf of peace". (2002) **11**

There are competing ideas which want our attention be they religious , political, philosophical or cultural. Cultures mix and evolve but through history there has been attempts of imposing cultures to further the economic plans of western powers. This has led, in some areas, to a mistrust of Western motives for cultural interaction. Increasing competition within the world through capitalist economics has led to a to polarisation of cultures. What is needed is more understanding of the differences and needs in societies that have become so polarised and at odds with each other.

Polarised Cultures

The world seems polarised between two main groups based on religion and culture.

Fukuyama wrote in *The End of History*, that with the end of the cold war, meta narratives were dead, the cold war was the last major conflict, market economics had won out and eventually the whole world would naturally become a liberal democracy driven by market forces. Critics say his views are ethnocentric and he failed to take account of Islam which is a thriving meta-narrative. He also misses the point of terrorists who are "not part of the liberal project....it is precisely this project that they oppose, not least because of the kinds of Islamic regimes that liberalism promotes and supports." **12** The Saudi Arabian House of Al-Saud backed by America has received criticism from Bin Laden through his statement of a '*Declaration of war against Americans occupying the land of the two holy places*' for its support of America and its social policies. **13**

Huntington wrote the *Clash of Civilisations* in response to Fukuyama. Huntington sees the next wars as a clash of civilisations, Islam vs the west. "The great divisions among humankind and the dominating source of conflict will be cultural. Nation states will remain the most powerful actors in world affairs, but the principal conflicts of global politics will occur between nations and groups of different civilisations. The clash of civilisations will dominate global politics. The fault lines between civilisations will be the battle lines of the future". **14** Critics of Huntington see his civilisations fractured within themselves and do not see potential wars as opposing civilisations.

Barber sees conflict between two trends in world politics that he called 'Jihad' and 'McWorld'. He sees a clash between an extreme fundamentalist religion and unregulated consumer capitalism: the first "rooted in race holds out the grim prospect of a re-tribalisation of large

swathes of humankind ...in which culture is pitted against culture...a Jihad...against modernity itself". The second is "a busy portrait of on rushing economic, technological, and ecological forces that demand integration and uniformity...one McWorld tied together by communications, information, entertainment, and commerce". **15**

Barber's ideas are closer to the world we live in today with the polarisation of Christian market fundamentalism and opposing Islamic fundamentalist terrorism, with Bin Laden criticising the US for pulling out of the Kyoto treaty, an agreement for reducing greenhouse gasses along with wanting the Americans to leave the holy land of Mecca. It is the polarisation of these two cultural extremes which are hindering the move to a peaceful form of globalisation. He notes "Jihad and the forces of McWorld operate with equal strength in opposite directions, the one driven by parochial hatreds, the other by universalising markets". **16**

This can be seen in harsh light of day in the problems post the war in Iraq. The US went into Iraq to try and establish a market-based economy in the Middle East, to shore up supplies of oil to keep global markets running and take away their dependence on Saudi Arabia.

But can America's values be transferred to another country?

Sisci thinks not and thinks "America must come to grips with the fact that its values can't be easily transplanted, and recognise that total victory in the soft war can backfire". (2002) **17**

What he means here is the U.S. has been too successful in its portrayal of the American dream which others feel they can never acquire, a culture which has become too dominant and a threat to their own indigenous culture. He goes on to say: "The danger of creating a desire that cannot be satisfied - whether desire for a certain product or a certain civilisation - is the backlash that will follow: waves of protest and dissatisfaction that will translate into a wish to return to one's own history." (2002) **18**

This is what seems to be happening in Iraq which has become the destination to vent your desire for Jihad. The post-war occupation has been hampered by a range of different suspects operating through a classic terrorist war and sabotage. There are Saddam loyalists, outside Islamic Jihad's, Al Qaeda, Iraqi nationalists and the people of Iraq. Post war Iraq is the ideal arena for Islamic militants from different factions who have the ideal target with low levels of security occupying a Muslim country. It is turning into a battlefield for the main two extremes of culture, ideologue against ideologue.

This is what Soft Power has to tackle and win over - people who do not respect your culture in any way and are adamantly opposed to it. This is where Soft Power, although a great force for good, on its own is too weak. There is in the world a growing group of maligned and

disenfranchised people who see the US as the infidel, not solely on religious grounds but also for practical political reasons to do with issues such as the environment and economics. A lot of people around the world were happy to see the US get a bloody nose on September 11th and hoped it would bring them closer to the international community, realise our shared global interdependence and the need to strengthen our democracy and listen to more of the diverse voices. This has not happened and the polarisation continues.

Democracy?

The Algerian activist Nadia Leila Aissaoui says “If democracy is the right to speak out and be heard, as a voice and not just a number then I am a democrat. But if democracy is the freedom to choose between Coca-Cola and Pepsi, Levi's and Nike, BBC or CNN, McDonald's and Pizza Hut, then... I don't want to be a democrat.” **19**

This comment on whether free markets really bring democracy is backed up by Barber who sees that “neither McWorld nor Jihad is remotely democratic in impulse. Neither needs democracy; neither promotes democracy”. **20** Free markets operate in some of the most totalitarian regimes like Singapore and Pakistan. Free markets do not necessarily bring democracy but a removal of power from the people in the work place, who then get to express their rights and freedoms through shopping. On the other hand perhaps this is what people want more than the right to vote - the freedom to have the luxuries of the west.

Though there are many different forms of democracy, “in one way or another, democratic governance is participatory, consultative, transparent and publicly accountable. By one mechanism or another, democratic governance rests on the consent of the governed”. **21** Yet liberal democracies in the western world are under strain as people are failing to come out and vote. The difference between political parties is hard to see and people feel disenfranchised by the political process. In the last round of American elections 100 million didn't bother to vote out of a population of 281 million. **22**

Most states in the world are members of the IMF and World Bank but the voting system means that members with the largest shares, the rich countries, have more voting power, than poor countries. The veto of the five permanent members of the Security Council at the UN is also not conducive to democratic principles. There has been a reaction to this through the growing groups of people who are organising to oppose this undemocratic, market driven form of globalisation.

Democracy and Civil Society

The World Social Forum agreed its charter in São Paulo, Brazil on April 9, 2001. The World Social Forum is an open meeting place where groups and movements of civil society opposed to neo-liberalism and a world dominated by capital or by any form of imperialism, but engaged in building a planetary society centred on the person, come together to pursue their thinking, to debate ideas democratically, to formulate proposals, share their experiences freely and network for effective action. **23**

Although the democratic process is present in the process of the Forum there is still a problem with its democratic credentials. At the centre of initiative and decision making within the Forum has been the Brazilian Organising Committee (OC) and the International Council (IC). Neither is subject to the principles of participatory or even representative democracy, nor accountable to their respective communities. **24**

However, there is a problem of accountability for the whole civil society movement and NGOs. NGOs wield significant power but have usually been set up without any form of democratic accountability. A recent report by One World Trust/Charter 99 *Power without Accountability* was published in January 2003. It is the first report of its kind to compare the accountability of intergovernmental organisations (IGOs), transnational corporations (TNCs) and international NGOs. **25** It found that NGOs have good governance but bad levels of accountability.

NGO Watch is a website run by the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research (AEI) and the Federalist Society for Law and Public Policy Studies. These organisations are from the right of US government and they set up the website to “bring clarity and accountability to the burgeoning world of NGOs.” **26** Some see this as a rightwing backlash against NGOs. Raj Patel, policy analyst at the California-based NGO, Food First, points out, “The American Enterprise Institute is an NGO itself and it is supported by the most powerful corporations on the planet. They are accountable only to their board, which includes Motorola, American Express and Exxon Mobil.” **27**

NGOs may not be democratically elected but neither are the WTO, IMF and other powerful organisations within the business community which have direct access to governments and are consulted and invited to international government forums. Civil society has the right to listened to as well as big business. The problem is with democracy itself. These groups NGOs etc came about in reaction to what is being done in the name of liberal democracy. These groups can only advise and do not set policy and make decisions about military intervention, or ultimately nuclear attack like government's can. The whole point of these groups is that

they are independent and are not part of any political party. They do wield Soft Power but it is up to the governments of the day to listen or not.

With the globalising of political space, people do not feel represented by national politics. It is questionable whether 'democratic' governments any longer have the ability to deal with global issues and properly represent the needs of the people, as demonstrated with the attack on Iraq. National politics and territorial spaces now co-exist and interrelate with global spaces. **28**

To counter-balance this extending globalisation and as a reaction to the need for more global accountability, civil society has been able to react by increasing the voice of ordinary people through readily accessible communication systems, particularly the internet and mobile phones. Civil society uses social and political pluralism, but of a modular ad hoc kind which does not stifle individuality, while at the same time acting as a countervailing force to the centre. **29**

Civil society is an expression of free will which can add to democracy through educating people about global issues and fight as a advocate for under-represented groups. Civil society is composed of a wide range of campaigning groups which highlight government policy and bring some kind of transparency to governance. Civil society can bring credibility and trust to the government of the day by acting as a check on its behaviour.

The number of people attending the World Social Forum has grown every year, suggesting a need for debate. The first World Social Forum 2001 attracted 5,000 delegates and thousands of Brazilian activists. In 2002 there were over 12,000 delegates from 123 countries and tens of thousands participants. In 2003 the forum had 20,000 official delegates and 100, 000 participants. **30**

But this form of political movement itself needs some form of check or accountability. Anybody can start an NGO and solicit public funds for their cause - which could have racist or other anti-social aims. NGOs might also undermine legitimate democratic government and muddy the waters of decision making with too many ideas and causes leading to weak institutions. There is also a danger that NGOs may come to share ideas with those they were originally critical of. For example, current ideas to marry entrepreneurial spirit and business skills in non-profit social enterprise could easily cross over into privatisation through the back door; if such companies supply services which should becoming from the NHS for example.

Networking

Because of its low cost, internet networking has played a great part in prompting and organising the multitude of groups that attend the World Social Forum (WSF) and other demonstrations and events. Networks distribute influence and power across traditional boundaries, allowing powerful interest groups to form and re-form rapidly. **31**

‘Flash mobs’ are the latest craze on the internet. Big crowds of strangers suddenly materialise at a predetermined location, perform a series of actions and then melt away. **32**

This is the power of a network being used to perform a kind of happening. The actions people carry out are neither violent nor political – so far; but it shows the potential that exists to organise groups into action and has been used by the anti-globalisation movement. People can now bypass traditional intermediaries whose power revolved around the control of information including national governments, the diplomatic corps, transnational corporations, and news organisations, among others. **33** This great liberator of communication power and unwanted censorship is forcing governments around the world to open up their own media channels. This of course is only having an effect in the countries and among people with access to computers and telephones and is not available to all, but in general it is having a liberating effect and information sources have multiplied from NGOs, academics, international journalists, and others.

This is where Soft Power and legitimacy with world opinion lies. People are putting their trust in other organisations away from governments and state power. Boris Trajkovski, president of the Republic of Macedonia thinks “Power in the global information society depends less on territory, military power and natural resources. Rather, information technology and institutional flexibility have gained importance in international relations. The power of knowledge, beliefs and ideas are the main tools of political actors in the efforts to achieve their goals.” **34** Of course this is only true when some kind of international law is followed and there is international stability. It cannot stop terrorism or acts of hard power outside of the normal remit of international law. Millions of people protested against the war in Iraq but still it went ahead. But if the UN system had worked the war might not have happened, and if it was sanctioned by the UN it would have happened with international backing and more legitimacy. The UN needs to be reformed and international law strengthened. But civil society and other non-state actors need to be given some legitimacy and a framework where they can come together. This could happen through the UN and human security.

Human Security

Shanthi Kalathil notes that “the information revolution has helped create a multi-centric, fragmented world, in which the concept of sovereignty has retreated in favour of a territorial, neo-medieval system of overlapping jurisdictions and loyalties.” **35**

The internet is a useful tool in helping people co-ordinate a pluralistic meeting of individuals and groups free to express ideas through arranging different forums and online communities. But what is needed is a universal idea all likeminded groups and individuals can agree to promote.

The concept described as ‘Human Security’ is one way to provide a framework within which states, international organisations and NGOs can come together under a common aim and heading. By concentrating on the individual and community, human security shares similar emphasis and similarity of purpose to civil society. ‘Human security’ also recognises that security issues from the environment to war are global and need the co-ordinated participation of nation states through organisations like the UN.

The phrase ‘human security’ is most commonly associated with the 1994 UNDP Human Development Report, an attempt to capture the post-Cold War peace dividend and redirect those resources towards the development agenda. The definition advanced in the report was extremely ambitious. Human security was defined as the summation of seven distinct dimensions of security: economic, food, health, environmental, personal, community and political. By focusing on people and highlighting non-traditional threats, the UNDP made an important contribution to post-cold war thinking about security. **36**

The central focus of the human security agenda is the threat to citizens posed by conflict, involuntary movement of peoples, extremist social movements, transnational crime, and environmental change. **37** Proponents of the broad concept of human security note correctly that many millions more people are killed by endemic hunger and disease each year than by armed conflicts, terrorism and other forms of criminal violence. **38**

There are different concepts of human security but most agree that the focus should be the individual or community, rather than the state. It is this focus that distinguishes human security from national security. **39** Non-state actors are highly involved in human security. In the case of failed states, they are the only actors who are present. **40** Groups such as the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) or Oxfam act as relief agencies when governments are unable or unwilling to respond to emergency needs; NGOs such as the Community of San Egidio facilitate negotiations between warring parties, and media efforts aim to rebuild peace, such as Radio Ijambo in Rwanda. They are less subject to complaints of

outside interference or breaches of sovereignty. In short, these actors are often more flexible than state actors especially in internal conflict situations. **41**

Building human security requires both short term humanitarian action and longer term strategies for building peace and promoting sustainable development. Human security is on the agenda and is a way of looking at the causes of conflict and addressing them. Some 1.2 billion people worldwide struggle to survive on \$1 day or less. **42** 1.2 billion people lack access to safe drinking water and 2.9 billion have inadequate access to sanitation. About 150 million children are malnourished, and more than 10 million children under 5 will die in 2001 alone. At least 150 million people are unemployed and 900 million are "underemployed"-contending with inadequate incomes despite long hours of backbreaking work. **43**

There is a lot of work for human security to do but at the moment human security budgets are dwarfed in size by the amounts spent on military budgets.

There have been calls for a Global Marshall Plan for the world and an increase in aid budgets. **44** But what is crucial to the implementation of human security is the International Criminal Court (ICC) and ending the culture of impunity.

On the 14th of May, 2003, 89 countries ratified the Rome Statute and established the International Criminal Court. **45** This was a significant gesture to global peace and the first line from the preamble of the Rome Statute reads:

"The States Parties to this Statute are conscious that all peoples are united by common bonds, their cultures pieced together in a shared heritage, and concerned that this delicate mosaic may be shattered at any time..." **46** This sounds great and the ICC is supporting the UN charter giving the UN some legal clout for the first time. Supporters of human security see the ICC as essential for global accountability.

The US did not sign the Rome Statute and is not party to the ICC. Its argument is 'as it is world's only superpower, it is more vulnerable than other countries to attempts by "hostile" countries to pick up American service men and women and try to indict them in the ICC'. **47** Some see the ICC's 'vague statutory language, capable of expansion to include conduct well beyond that which is considered to be within the customary reach of "genocide," "war crimes," and "crimes against humanity."

Supporters point out that the ICC jurisdiction is used as a last resort when "a nation state is unwilling or incapable of exercising legal action against an act of genocide or a crime against humanity, as defined in the treaty" and that it will not infringe on domestic law if it is used. **48**

The debate will continue but the US not supporting the ICC seriously weakens its strength and if the court finds someone guilty of a war crime, president Bush for example, who is going to enforce the ruling.?

There are problems of implementation and enforcing rulings along with problems of legitimacy if the world's most powerful nation will not sign the statute, but perhaps the ICC is the only way forward if we believe in the universality of human rights and want a better way of managing world conflicts in an equitable manner in the interdependent global world.

References and Footnotes

1. Wikipedia encyclopedia www.wikipedia.org/wiki/Soft_power
2. Vice President Lu Hsiu-lien (2002) 'Soft Power Changes the World', WFWP
3. Nye, J. (2002) 'The Paradox of American Power' Oxford University Press.
4. Ibid p69
5. Viotti P. ed cit . p 372 (1999) International Relations Theory. Realism, Pluralism, Globalism and beyond Allyn and Bacon
- 6 . Sisci, F. (March 15, 2002) 'Risky business: Exporting the American dream'
7. Rothkop, D. (1997) 'In Praise of Cultural Imperialism? Effects of Globalization on Culture'. *Foreign Policy* www.globalpolicy.org/globaliz/cultural/globcult.htm
8. Ritzer G (2001) Explorations in the Sociology of Consumption. London Sage
- 9 Said, E. (1985). ' Orientalism: Western Concepts of the Orient', Harmondsworth, Penguin
10. Mark Leonard et al (2002) 'Why public diplomacy?' The Foreign Policy Centre
11. Taylor, P. Professor of International Communications at the University of Leeds, UK
12. Smith, S. 'The End of the Unipolar Moment: September 11 and the Future of World Order'
13. Burke, J. (2003) 'Al-Qaeda: Casting a Shadow of Terror'
14. Samuel P. Huntington (1993) 'The Clash of Civilisations' Foreign Affairs. Summer from the Academic Index (database on UTCAT system)
www.alamut.com/subj/economics/misc/clash.html
15. Barber, B. (1996) p 4 'Jihad vs. McWorld: How Globalism and Tribalism are Reshaping the World'. Ballantine
16. Ibid
17. Sisci, F. (March 15, 2002) 'Risky business: Exporting the American Dream'
18. Ibid
- 19 Richard Swift (2000) 'Democracy is that all there is?'
www.thirdworldtraveler.com/Democracy/Demo_IsThatAll_ItIs.html

- 20** Barber, B. (1992) 'Jihad vs. McWorld', The Atlantic Online
www.theatlantic.com/politics/foreign/barberf.htm
- 21.** Scholte, J. (2001) 'Civil Society and Democracy in Global Governance', CSGR Working Paper No. 65/01
- 22** (2000) 'Democracy, The Facts' New Internationalist 324
- 23**(2002)What the World Social Forum is. <http://www.forumsocialmundial.org.br/main>
- 24.** Waterman, P. (2003) 'World Social Forum: the secret of fire'
www.opendemocracy.net/debates/article-3-33-1293.jsp
- 25.** Burall (2003)'NGO Accountability - Yes, But Not on These Terms'
www.oneworld.net/article/view/65302/1
- 26.** Klein, N. (2003) 'Bush to NGOs: Watch Your Mouths'
www.rabble.ca/columnists_full.shtml
- 27.** Ibid
- 28.** Scholte, J. (2001) 'Civil Society and Democracy in Global Governance' CSGR Working Paper No. 65/01
- 29.** Geller, E. (1994) 'Conditions of Liberty Civil Society and its Rivals'. London, Hamish Hamilton
- 30.** Teivainen, T. (2003) 'World Social Forum: what should it be when it grows up?'
<http://opendemocracy.net/debates/article-6-91-1342.jsp>
- 31.** Metz, J. 'Network Diplomacy' www.ceip.org/files/publications/network_diplomacy.asp
- 32.** Leander Kahney (2003) 'Be mob happy' The Guardian
www.guardian.co.uk/online/story/0,3605,1013317,00.html
- 33** Bollier, D. (2003) 'The Rise of Netpolitik - How the Internet Is Changing International Politics and Diplomacy' A Report of the Eleventh Annual Aspen Institute Roundtable on Information Technology
- 34.** Ibid
- 35.** Ibid
- 36.** While the term 'human security' may be of recent origin, since the founding of the International Committee of the Red Cross in the 1860s - a doctrine based on the security of people has been gathering momentum. Core elements of this doctrine were formalised in the 1940s in the UN Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and the Geneva Conventions.
<http://www.summit-americas.org/Canada/HumanSecurity-english.htm>

37. Axworthy, L. (1999) Safety for People in a Changing World Human Security:
<http://www.summit-americas.org/Canada/HumanSecurity-english.htm>
38. Canadian Consortium on Human Security <http://www.humansecurity.info/about.htm#HS>
39. Mack and Dewitt (2002) CCHS and Human Security,
www.humansecuritybulletin.info/archive/en_v1i2/editorial.htm
40. Ibid
41. Bruderlein 'The Role of Non-State Actors in Building Human Security', The Case of Armed Groups in Intra-State Wars www.humansecuritynetwork.org/docs/report_may2000_2-e.php
- 42 **Below \$1 a day** is the percentage of the population living on less than \$1.08 a day at 1993 international prices (equivalent to \$1 in 1985 prices, adjusted for purchasing power parity (PPP) using rates from the Penn World Tables)."Poverty rates are comparable across countries, but as a result of revisions in PPP exchange rates, they cannot be compared with poverty rates reported previously for individual countries. International comparisons of poverty data entail both conceptual and practical problems. Different countries have different definitions of poverty, and consistent comparisons between countries can be difficult. Local poverty lines tend to have higher purchasing power in rich countries, where more generous standards are used than in poor countries. Is it reasonable to treat two people with the same standard of living in terms of their command over commodities differently because one happens to live in a better-off country? Can we hold the real value of the poverty line constant across countries, just as we do when making comparisons over time? Poverty measures based on an international poverty line attempt to do this. The commonly used \$1 a day standard, measured in 1985 international prices and adjusted to local currency using purchasing power parities (PPPs), was chosen for the World Bank's World Development Report 1990: Poverty because it is typical of the poverty lines in low-income countries. PPP exchange rates, such as those from the Penn World Tables or the World Bank, are used because they take into account the local prices of goods and services not traded internationally. But PPP rates were designed not for making international poverty comparisons but for comparing aggregates from national accounts. As a result, there is no certainty that an international poverty line measures the same degree of need or deprivation across countries." <http://www.worldbank.org/data/countrydata/ictnotes.htm>
43. Bell & Renner (2001) 'A New Marshall Plan? Advancing Human Security and Controlling Terrorism' www.worldwatch.org/press/news/2001/10/09
44. The Marshall Plan was a rational effort by the United States aimed at reducing the hunger, homelessness, sickness, unemployment, and political restlessness of the 270 million people

in sixteen nations in West Europe at the end of the Second World War. Marshall Plan funds were not mainly directed toward feeding individuals or building individual houses, schools, or factories, but at strengthening the economic superstructure (particularly the iron-steel and power industries). The program cost the American taxpayers \$11,820,700,000 (plus \$1,505,100,000 in loans that were repaid) over four years and worked because it was aimed at aiding a well-educated, industrialised people temporarily down but not out. The Marshall Plan significantly magnified their own efforts and reduced the suffering and time West Europe took to recover from the war. The program--whose official title was "European Recovery Program"--aimed at:

- 1) increasing production;
- 2) expanding European foreign trade;
- 3) facilitating European economic co-operation and integration; and
- 4) controlling inflation, which was the program's chief failure.

www.marshallfoundation.org/about_gcm/marshall_plan.htm#summary

45. Human rights watch ICC Rome Statute www.hrw.org/campaigns/icc/ratifications.htm

46. The States Parties to this Statute,

Conscious that all peoples are united by common bonds, their cultures pieced together in a shared heritage, and concerned that this delicate mosaic may be shattered at any time,
Mindful that during this century millions of children, women and men have been victims of unimaginable atrocities that deeply shock the conscience of humanity,
Recognising that such grave crimes threaten the peace, security and well-being of the world,
Affirming that the most serious crimes of concern to the international community as a whole must not go unpunished and that their effective prosecution must be ensured by taking measures at the national level and by enhancing international co-operation,
Determined to put an end to impunity for the perpetrators of these crimes and thus to contribute to the prevention of such crimes,
Recalling that it is the duty of every State to exercise its criminal jurisdiction over those responsible for international crimes,
Reaffirming the Purposes and Principles of the Charter of the United Nations, and in particular that all States shall refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations,
Emphasising in this connection that nothing in this Statute shall be taken as authorising any State Party to intervene in an armed conflict or in the internal affairs of any State,

Determined to these ends and for the sake of present and future generations, to establish an independent permanent International Criminal Court in relationship with the United Nations system, with jurisdiction over the most serious crimes of concern to the international community as a whole,

Emphasising that the International Criminal Court established under this Statute shall be complementary to national criminal jurisdictions,

Resolved to guarantee lasting respect for and the enforcement of international justice,

www.un.org/law/icc/statute/romeofra.htm

47. Dempsey J (2002)US Seeks Separate Deals on ICC To Protect Troops Financial Times
<http://www.globalpolicy.org/intljustice/icc/2002/0730deal.htm>

48 Jacob (2003)Taking It Global Discussions

www.takingitglobal.org/discuss/showthread.php?threadid=3046

Conclusion

Hard and Economic Power are not very subtle instruments for world peace. Soft Power is more holistic and important. Communications technology has given a voice to a more diverse group of the world population than ever before through the internet. There is power in attracting others by your cultures and values. Countries increase their soft power through their international and domestic behaviour. The U.S. and UK are losing their soft power rapidly with their brash international intervention in Iraq.

Dominant cultures imposing their ideas and modes of thought are not always so benign and can have hidden objectives. It can be seen that a kind of Soft War is in progress. Countries are being led to adopt western processes, such as processes of production leading to standardisation and the homogenisation of cultures worldwide.

Public diplomacy and relationship building are good ideas and need to be encouraged, as long as it is remembered that they are about understanding cultures rather than imposing your own ideas on others. Ultimately there needs to be more understanding of the terrorists' aims and a more moderate approach away from the ongoing polarisation of cultures. The U.S. military budget of \$400, billion spent on public diplomacy and infrastructure projects would create a fairer more harmonious interesting world.

Terrorists need to be brought into the fold with as much dialogue as possible, we need to understand their concerns which are not all based on religious fanaticism but are often because of real mundane problems with the environment, economics and need.

At the moment there is little attempt to understand. 'You're either with us or against us' said President Bush, describing the 'War against Terror' as good Vs evil. The world is not that black and white. The US and its lackeys under the current administration are the biggest block to a peaceful egalitarian world. Bush though has done us all a favour by being so blatant, he has exposed some true credentials and aims of the U.S. Bush is setting it up nicely for a backlash against these extreme right wing ideas.

The US should realise it is difficult to transfer its values, should question whether people want them anyway and should be more aware that democracy has to come from below, not imposed from above.

Western governments need to listen to the people and involve civil society more in the decision making process. Civil society has a right to express its view and the culture of idolising big business needs to change to take on board more local, community ideas. Global issues affect us all and national governments cannot fight wars when they like or pollute the ozone with impunity.

There is a big problem in mistrust of governments at the moment who are out of touch with the people, civil society can give them more legitimacy and make their actions more transparent.

Civil society is doing a good job and the WSF is a great meeting place but these different factions need to come together under one aim. The problem with all the expression of ideas is the lack of a core argument to challenge the status quo. The power of networking via the internet is freeing up information and making it possible to have a non-culturally specific forum for people to express their ideas. Nation states are not going to disappear and civil society is not going to replace national governments. All these factions can work together on an holistic plan for the world around a human rights agenda backed up by the ICC creating human security.

The future lies in co-operation, multilateralism and understanding. The old fashioned economic and security paradigms are not working and a pragmatic movement is needed to challenge the current U.S. dominance through networking, soft power and a common aim through Human Security.

Bibliography

Books

Barber (1996) Jihad vs. McWorld: How Globalism and Tribalism Are Reshaping the World: Ballantine

Burke J (2003) Al-Qaeda: Casting a Shadow of Terror. New York: I.B.Tauris

Held & McGrew et al (ed) (1999) 'Global Transformations' Cambridge: Polity

Kaplan & Kristol (2003) The War Over Iraq. San Francisco. Encounter Books

Leonard M et al (2002) Public Diplomacy. London. The Foreign Policy Centre

Nye J (2002) 'The Paradox of American Power' Why the worlds only Superpower Can't Go it Alone, New York: Oxford University Press.

Ritzer G (2001) Explorations in the Sociology of Consumption. London Sage

Said,E.(1985).Orientalism: Western Concepts of the Orient, Harmondsworth: Penguin

Thompson K, (1968) 'Collective Security' International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences,Vols. 1 and 2

Viotti P ed (1999) International Relations Theory. Realism, Pluralism, Globalism and beyond Allyn and Bacon.

Wiseman G,(1989) Common Security and Non-Provocative Defence: Alternative Approaches to the Security Dilemma Canberra: Peace Research Centre .

Internet

Alcorn G (2002)'Shocked into a different world'
www.theage.com.au/articles/2002/03/10/1015365756307.html

Barber (1992) Jihad VS. Mcworld The Atlantic Online
www.theatlantic.com/politics/foreign/barberf.htm

Bollier D et al (2003) THE RISE OF NETPOLITIK How the Internet Is Changing International Politics and Diplomacy A Report of the Eleventh Annual Aspen Institute Roundtable on Information Technology

Boulding K (1978) *Ecodynamics: A New Theory of Societal Evolution*, Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications,).
www.colorado.edu/conflict/peace/example/boul7525.htm

Boulding K The History of Conflict Resolution
www.bradford.ac.uk/acad/confres/dislearn/unit2.html

Bruce Gagnon 'Missile Defense is a Trojan Horse'October 2001
www.thirdworldtraveler.com/Militarization_Space/MissileDefense_TrojanHorse.html

Burall (2003) NGO Accountability - Yes, But Not on These Terms
www.oneworld.net/article/view/65302/1/

Cobban (2000) No globalization without representation
<http://search.csmonitor.com/durable/2000/03/09/p11s1.htm>

Crocker BN et al (March 25, 2003) Post-War Iraq: Are We Ready?
http://www.csis.org/features/030325_postwarIraq.pdf

Galbraith J (2002)Power and the Useful (Political) Economist: Southern Political Science Association November http://www2.gasou.edu/spsa/Papers_PDF/Waligorski.pdf.

Germany International Roundtable II Report (June 2–4, 2002) *Globalisation, Terrorism, and Democracy* A Program of The Democracy Collaborative at The University of Maryland Berlin, pg 19

Gladius and Kaldor (2002) The State of Global Civil Society: Before and after September 11th
www.lse.ac.uk/Depts/global/Yearbook/PDF/PDF2002/GCS2002%20pages%20%5B01%5D%20.pdf

Govindu V (2003) Home truths on market fundamentalism
<http://indiatgether.org/2003/jun/rvw-stiglitz.htm>

Fisk R, (2003) Iraq Isn't Working The Independent
www.occupationwatch.org/article.php?id=310

Henderson C (2002) Stone Dogs and War
www.opendemocracy.net/themes/article-6-777.jsp

Highlights of the FY'03 Budget Request www.cdi.org/issues/budget/FY03Highlights-pr.cfm

History of Conflict Resolution www.brad.ac.uk/acad/confres/dislearn/unit1.html

Hufbauer & Schott (2001) 'Using Sanctions to Fight Terrorism' Barbara Oegg Institute for International Economics www.iese.com/publications/pb/pb01-11.htm

Huntington S (1993) The Clash of Civilizations Foreign Affairs. Summer from the Academic Index (database on UTCAT system)

"Invest in Mideast futures" <http://www.casi.org.uk/discuss/2003/msg03740.html>

Iraq war (2003) Iraq war failed to make UK safer - report
www.casi.org.uk/discuss/2003/msg03776.html

Jim Lobe (June 24, 2003) Post-war Iraq: Quagmire or Master Plan?
<http://www.alternet.org/story.html?StoryID=16254>

Keohane R and Nye J (1998) "Power and Interdependence in the Information Age" pg4
www.ksg.harvard.edu/prg/nye/power.pdf

Klein N (2003) Bush to NGOs: Watch Your Mouths
www.rabble.ca/columnists_full.shtml?x=22893

Marks E (2002) 'From Post Cold War to Post Westphalia'
www.unc.edu/depts/diplomat/AD_Issues/amdipl_14/marks_westph.html

Nato Handbook www.nato.int/docu/handbook/2001/hb1501.htm

Nye J (2003) 'U.S. Power and Strategy After Iraq'
www.ksg.harvard.edu/news/opeds/2003/nye_usiraq_foraffairs_070103.htm

Palmer Repairing The Damage: European Disunity and Global Crisis. The European Policy Centre.
www.theepc.net/challenge/challenge_detail.asp?SEC=challenge&SUBSEC=issue&SUBSUBSEC=&SUBSUBSUBSEC=&REFID=1084.

Peat D Nature and Ethics From Adam Smith to Enron
www.paricenter.com/library/papers/peat23.php

Regional Human Security Centre www.id.gov.jo/human/introduction/introduction.html

Rothkopf D (1997) In Praise of Cultural Imperialism? Effects of Globalization on Culture
Foreign Policy www.globalpolicy.org/globaliz/cultural/globcult.htm

Ten Reasons to Oppose War Against Iraq www.kciraqtaskforce.org/

The History of Conflict Resolution Kenneth Boulding
www.bradford.ac.uk/acad/confres/dislearn/unit2.html

Schiffman H (2001):The Legal Basis for the War in Afghanistan
www.internationallawhelp.com/Forum/messages/60.html

Scholte J (2001) "Civil Society and Democracy in Global Governance" CSGR Working Paper
No. 65/01 Centre for the Study of Globalisation and Regionalisation <http://www.csgr.org>

Sisci, F (March 15, 2002) Risky business: Exporting the American dream
Asia Times Online <http://www.atimes.com/china/DC15Ad01.html>

Sklair L (2000) 'The Transnational Capitalist Class'
[www.lse.ac.uk/collections/globalDimensions/globalisation/theTransnationalCapitalistClass
AndTheDiscourseOfGlobalization/Default.htm](http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/globalDimensions/globalisation/theTransnationalCapitalistClassAndTheDiscourseOfGlobalization/Default.htm)

Smith S (2001) The End of the Unipolar Moment: September 11 and the Future of World Order
Department of International Politics University of Wales, Aberystwyth
<http://users.aber.ac.uk/cjm/globalsecurity/1unipolar.htm>

Steger M (2003) 'Globalism: The New Market Ideology' reviewed by Teresa Walker pg 2 . Ibid 6

Swift R (2000) Democracy is that all there is?
www.thirdworldtraveler.com/Democracy/Demo_IsThatAll_ItIs.html

Taylor P Professor of International Communications at the University of Leeds, UK
<http://www2.britishcouncil.org/history/history-why/history-why-cultural-imperialism.htm>

Vice President Lu Hsiu-lien (2002) SOFT POWER CHANGES THE WORLD WFWP conference
in the USA
www.president.gov.tw/1_vice_president/e_speeches910318.html

Vulliamy & Islam (Sunday June 29, 2003) And now for the really big guns War is one thing, but
can Iraq survive full-on assault by Wall Street? The Observer
<http://observer.guardian.co.uk/Print/0,3858,4701185,00.html>

Wallerstein I, 'U.S. Weakness and the Struggle for Hegemony'
www.monthlyreview.org/0703wallerstein.htm

What the World Social Forum is. (2002)
http://www.forumsocialmundial.org.br/main.asp?id_menu=19&cd_language=2

Waterman P (2003) World Social Forum: the secret of fire
www.opendemocracy.net/debates/article-3-33-1293.jsp

Watkins K 'Trade hypocrisy: the problem with Robert Zoellick'
www.opendemocracy.net/debates/article-7-30-860.jsp

Watts J (February 6, 2003)N Korea threatens US with first strike
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/korea/article/0,2763,889679,00.html>

Wolfowitz P (July 2003) Vanity Fair
[http:// news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/middle_east/2948068.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/middle_east/2948068.stm)

Zoellick (2003) Zoellick Says FTA Candidates Must Support U.S. Foreign Policy
www.ourworldisnotforsale.org/newsandupdates/26.htm

Journals

Author, A.N. (YEAR of periodical issue in which article appeared) "Full title of article", *Full Title of Journal*, Volume No.

Nixon quoted in James Chace and Nicholas Rizopoulos, (1999) "Towards a New concert of Nations: An American perspective" World policy Journal fall.
www.worldpolicy.org/journal/chace_rizo.html

Magazines

New Internationalist (2000) Democracy The Facts New Internationalist 324