

Global Government Notes

Alex Horne

Week 2

LaForge & Slaughter

Anne-Marie Slaughter was Director of Policy under Clinton in the First Obama Admin. She then served on the Board of Directors for such wonderful corporations as McDonald's and Citigroup

- 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

Slaughter (2003)

Infuriatingly banal. Lays the groundwork for her more recent piece. Beneath comment.

Lake, Anarchy

Begins by saying that the NATO alliance was not hierarchical. Sure, in a purely technical, limited sense. But there was a clear preeminence which the US enjoyed and other members of the alliance banked on, especially after the Suez crisis.

On pp 16, Figure 2: Think of the “O” curves as “the potential damage an opportunist other could inflict” and the “G” curves are “the necessary cost in treasure to deter that opportunism.” The nought-curves are actual Damage and Deterrence, but lacking perfect information, the prime curves represent

self-assessment by states, which are necessarily imperfect and therefore err on the side of caution, ie, greater potential damage. The intersection of the O and G curves is the optimal location for a dyad of partners, in a purely economic sense.

As you can see, at the extremes of either end of the x-axis, costs climb substantially; there are diminishing marginal returns for complete anarchy and complete hierarchy. This stands to reason: completely owning another territory's security policy is expensive. Importantly, the junior partner in any pair will have its political interests warped. This is because a polity's natural impulse to sovereignty – or perhaps belief in popular sovereignty – will chafe as its security policy is co-opted or dictated to it by an outsider. The efficient use of its resources towards security will be distorted (no such thing as comparative advantage in an imperial relationship).

Lake uses the US Federal Constitution as the example of a contract that is hierarchically organised but which finds a way to keep the junior partners vested in the future of the relationship – through participation in a parliament, a binding court for adjudication of claims, and so on. Thus, the dominant partner (understood in retrospect to be the Federal State itself) can buy participation of potentially sovereign juniors to work as a single security unit. Barring institutional buy-in, coercion can be used to enforce a hierarchy, typically because a senior partner has to *want* to be coerced by a junior (because let's face it, what are they gonna do about it?). Coercion isn't necessarily cheaper, however, and often coercive relations suffer blowback.

It begs to be asked then: whence imperialism? If there's enough money to be made via full subjugation, or another enemy's opportunism requires preemptive conquest, thence imperialism.