Next World Order

In 2002 conservative strategists of president G. Bush Sr. government continued under G.W. Bush what they thought of as Clinton’s unfinished business => i.e., building the foundations of a global imperial U.S. foreign and military policy

So called "Defense Strategy for the 1990s" was commissioned in 1993 by Defense Sec. Cheney. Involved were Rumsfeld, Wolfowitz, Perle, Powell, Rice, Libby, Haass, Edelman and others who are now in high ranking government positions

Other hawkish regional “experts” on Middle East region are Pollack, B. Lewis, F. Ajami, Ch.Hill, RM Gerecht

Their goal is the development & maintenance of U.S. “one-power” status => U.S. should prevent any other nation or alliance becoming a great power for the indefinite future-if necessary by force. Tenor: Scepticism about equal partnerships and lack of trust in friends & alliances

September 11, 2001 terrorist threat and Iraq’s assumed accumulation of weapons of mass destruction (nuclear, biological, chemical) was occasion to launch a new, aggressive U.S. foreign policy b/c it reduced the public’s resistance for U.S. military involvement overseas & increased “tolerance” to accept 30,000 dead U.S. soldiers in an Iraq war

Steps taken toward unilateral hegemony:

1999: Non-ratification of Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty
2001: Non-signature of Kyoto “Global Warming” Treaty
2001: Non-signature of Biological & Chemical Weapons & Anti-Landmine Treaties
2002: Unilateral abrogation of Anti-Ballistic Missile treaty and building of a National Missiles Defense system
2002: Non-signature of International Criminal Court membership
2002: New U.S. posture to use nuclear weapons in first-strike and for tactical purposes
2002: Use of torture, assassination, detention without trial (“Patriot Act”)
2002: Advocacy of limits of sovereignty for other nations except U.S. Paradigm of global “regime change” (=replacing governments by force; redrawing of regional maps, preemptive military strikes in “self-defense”)
2003: Alliance with countries who oppose terrorism & WMD’s and support free trade, market, and democracy. Others are “axis of evil”
2003: Irrelevance of UN resolutions and vetoes for U.S. foreign policy actions

“Project for the New American Century”

Security system: Bipolar Cold War vs. Unipolar 21st Century
Strategic goal: Contain Soviet Union vs. Preserve PaxAmericana
Main military mission(s): Deter Soviet expansionism vs. Secure and expand zones of democratic peace; deter rise of new great-power competitor; defend key regions; exploit transformation of war
Main military threat(s): Potential global war across many theaters vs. Potential theater wars spread across globe
Focus of strategic competition: Europe vs. East Asia

“Pax Americana” Strategy

U.S. Hegemony—Law of Strongest
Unilateralism—with UN only if in U.S. national interest
National U.S. interest supersede international treaties and international law
Power politics
No other superpower except U.S.—no competition
Changing alliances with satellite states
Pre-emptive wars, US military => cavalry on the new American frontier
Control of trade routes and world resources (oil)
US controls WMD of other nations or keeps them at bay with “missile shield”

Alternative Global Strategy
- Partnership & Alliances
- Multilateralism
- Globally Binding Treaties
- Universal Human Rights as yardstick
- Fair Trade
- Democracy
- United Nations

Post-Cold War Geopolitics

Cold war= state of permanent national insecurity b/c of technoscientific terror of mutually assured thermonuclear destruction (MAD)
Current WMD arsenal: 8 states possess 32,000 nukes with 40,000 megatons destructive capacity=416,000 times Hiroshima-sized bombs
Israel (100+), India (60+) & Pakistan (25?) did not sign non-proliferation treaty
Poor states/non-state actors atomic bomb are biological and chemical weapons
Traditional geopolitics => great power politics, “us versus them” thinking
Critical geopolitics => challenges state-centrism, chauvinism & Social Darwinism of definition of “national interest & security.” Articulates perspectives of peace movements, human rights activists, environmental orgs

Matrix of Three Geopolitical Periods
1. Inter-imperialist rivalry 1879-1945/Conflict b/w great powers/UK navy. Electric, telegraph, radio, phone, radar/Capitalist modernizations. Struggle for markets/Imperialist, Darwinist, Civilization hierarchies
2. Cold War 1945-91/Conflict b/w superpowers/Nuclear weapons, communic & entertainment/Capitalism vs. Soviet socialism/Free world vs. totalitarianism/Liberation vs. imperialism

Characteristics of Geopolitical Discourses
- Geopolitical discourses are championed by coalitions of powerful interest groups within dominant state and across allied states
- Supported by “iron triangle” of conservative politicians (with an exclusivist ideology), military institutions & powerful corporations/defense contractors
- Discourses monopolize definition and interpretations of “threats”, “national security” and “national interest”. Suppression of damaging knowledge, i.e. pollution by defense agencies in the name of “protection”
- Discourses use simplifications & self-generated fear (Example: communist conspiracy vs. “free” world, civilization vs evil empire/terrorists, “us” vs. “them”)

Relationship between US and Russia, its former adversary
- U.S. hyperpower with its military-industrial complex faces Russian demodernizing power in decline.
- Russia’s disintegrating WMD infrastructure is a source of danger (proliferation, blackmail,
 chaos, catastrophic accidents)

- Both nuclear forces remain on hair-trigger alert status
- U.S. funds Cooperative Threat Reduction Program to aid disarmament & denuclearization in Soviet Union successor states

World Risk Society (Beck)

- Complex technoscientific systems and borderless global threats
  - Socioenvironmental (AIDS, BSE, global warming, toxic pollution, genetical engineering)
  - Politicoeconomic (crime, narcotraffic, cyberattacks, global terrorism)
  - Catastrophic threats (nuclear energy accidents, proliferation of WMDs)
- Manufactured, self-generated uncertainties like nuclear energy, hazardous chemicals, genetic engineering b/c of
  - Decay and disintegration (Russia)
  - Uncritical embrace and modernization (U.S.)

Alternative Collective Common Security System

- Mutual security systems on global level
- International regulatory accords and agreements beyond state-centric and territorial view (“homeland security”, “national security state”)
- Support of sustainable future initiatives on all levels
- Critical assessment of technological solutions instead of faith in technology as salvation
- Critical assessment of belief in unilateral national security & protection against global threats & risks

Questions and Tasks

- What alternative world order scenarios of the State Department or the Department of Defense could you imagine?
- What principles should guide U.S. foreign policy? Why or why not?
- Has the world become a more or less dangerous place after the end of the Cold War?
- What are the challenges of globalization? What can the U.S. do? Does the U.S. need allies and alliances?