

Global Government Notes

Alex Horne

Week 2

LaForge & Slaughter

- The authors' "solution" to bad governance is a dictatorship of the international bourgeoisie
- Want non-state actors (civil society technocrats) to take over the role of a national state.
- why?
 - Because power can no longer be assumed. They've only ever inherited it, but Trump has proven that they can't rely on democracy to win power
 - lacking a road map to acquiring power, the answer is to reassemble the state outside of democratic control
- Foreign Affairs is bad, do not read anything published by the Council on Foreign Relations

Duerr

- right off the bat, he's adopting the "Cold War was a Battle of ideas" framework. This tells you everything you need to know – he already implicitly sides with either Fukuyama or Huntington
 - The revisionist thesis – that the Cold War was a resource battle – is never given any thought. Indeed, there is no non-western author discussed among these three
- Fukuyama:
 - "Democratic Peace Theory" is fucking stupid
 - The so-called "democracies" which weren't at war with each other from 1815 to 1914 could scarcely be called democracies
 - * They were dictatorships of the national, rather than international, bourgeoisie and occasionally of an absolutist monarch
 - * Total control of boss over worker
 - * Racial violence in European Colonies
 - * Gender Discrimination
 - * Why were these so-called democracies at peace? Because it made good business for some
 - * What Cause the world wars then? Certainly not anything Fukuyama's interested in, but here's my answer: The existence of Germany as a united State at all. Made the Concert of Europe unstable no matter what.
 - Now, the largest arena of conflict isn't between nations but within them, even as the overall violence of all war decreases

- last, most war-fighting occurs w/in immature democracies, but only because the lack of strong democratic institutions is a *desirable* condition for global capital. In other words: It's not an accident!
- The Arab spring was the nail in coffin for End of History – the legacy of Colonialism was a good predictor of how things went
 - * And in US-Aligned states, the Arab Spring was *crushed*
 - * Again, Wahabbism and Political Islam is a deliberate artificial creation of Western Foreign Policy
- Huntington:
 - First, his rhetoric lends itself to ethno-nationalist sentiments which have no place in scientific conversations, let alone polite society
 - Why the sudden re-emergence of “civilisation” as a unifying force? Because at the end of history, all that is left is **CULTURE WAR**
 - So if Huntington is right at all, it's because all structural questions have been rule out, as Fukuyama said
 - So what happens when the material basis of the mode of production is forced to change from climate change? He doesn't have a fucking answer!
 - His theory only makes sense for the last 20 years, and if right now is the dawn of the “post-9/11” world, then I doubt his ideas will have any legs
 - Also, wtf even is “western” civ? How much of these civilisational identities are just accidents of decolonisation in the last 100 years?
 - * Again, Wahabbism and Political Islam is a deliberate artificial creation of Western Foreign Policy
- At no point does **anyone** mention climate change
- This is a stupid debate and it is not worth having