

**NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY & UNIVERSAL CHALLENGES:  
CHOICES FOR THE WORLD AFTER IRAQ**

**CONFERENCE RECORD  
AS NOTED BY THE TEAM OF RAPPORTEURS:**

**ALEX EVANS  
MARIA IVANOVA  
EDUARDO VIOLA  
JAN MORTIER**

- KEY: (F) = Full text of this speech available in Section 6**  
**(E) = Extended remarks from this speaker included as a background document in Appendix 2**  
**(B) = Briefing document provided by this speaker available in Appendix 1**

# OPENING PLENARY SESSION

WEDNESDAY 18 JUNE 2003

## WELCOMING REMARKS

### **Georges Berthoin**

*Honorary Chairman, Jean Monnet Association; European Chair, Trilateral Commission, 1975-92*

- The EU was initially considered a madman's dream after WWII, so it is worth retaining an optimistic perspective in the current situation
- Most countries lack a clear definition of both their 'national interest' and their identity: it would be helpful for the global agenda if they were clearer on these points. It would be helpful if each UN member government were to form a working group to address this.
- National sovereignty remains the central challenge in the way of addressing global problems: we need a means of managing globalisation.

## SPEAKERS

### **Pierre Defraigne (F)**

*DG Trade, European Commission*

- We should remember that the EU was not designed from scratch; rather, it evolved through a process of sometimes tortuous negotiations
- The EU differs from the US in important respects that could make it a more useful model to follow at global level or in other regions:
  - Its design is replicable, whilst that of the US is probably not;
  - The EU does not run a large deficit, hence implicitly borrowing from other countries;
  - It places more emphasis on sustainable development (in terms of both environment and equity)
- On an EU Common Security and Foreign Policy (CFSP), a breakthrough may come sooner than anticipated: the EU is waking up to the potential economies of scale in defence spending that it could realise through pooling its resources to a greater degree

### **HE Jeremy Kinsman**

*Canadian Ambassador to the European Union*

- The EU was founded on a tide of genuine idealism; this is perhaps less evident in today's EU; but the new entrant countries may reinvigorate it
- Politicians in Brussels are perhaps better at making the case for their member states than they are at making the case for the EU at home
- Investment is more important than trade in fostering transatlantic interdependence
- Africa needs to become more of a priority: failed states are more dangerous than rogue states, and with the prospect of 40m orphans in 2010, Africa is at high risk

### **David Keene**

*Chairman, American Conservative Union*

- The current tension in the US between a desire to stand alone and a drive to engage with the world is not new: George Washington warned of "entangling alliances", whilst Woodrow Wilson's Presidency was hallmarked by a belief in America's ability to reshape the world for the better
- Americans want to be both (a) liked, and (b) left alone
- The key objective of US foreign policy is (and should be) the pursuit of "the just interests of the nation"
- Of particular importance is America's willingness to fight to protect its core values, such as liberty over equality, equality of opportunity rather than outcome, individual over group rights, populism over elitism and free markets over state planning

## DISCUSSION

**Hazel Henderson** questioned why more OPEC exporters were not redenominating oil exports in euros rather than dollars, and noted that Iraq is to date the only country that actually has redenominated its exports into euros

**Tim Garden** agreed strongly that European sovereignty will increasingly be pooled as the cost of military outlays rise: the EU's \$140bn defence spending could be made to go much further

**Andrei Piontkovksy** argued that the real question over war on Iraq (which he supported) was whether it increased regional stability and quality of life for Iraqis; this is the real issue, rather than abstract considerations over an "international system" that defies definition

**Oliver Sparrow** emphasised the importance of a solid sense of individual and social identity as a prerequisite for building successful and robust institutions

**Halle Hansen** suggested that "American values" (as defined by David Keene) should be used a reference point when considering poverty in the world and in the US, and also suggested that US industrial success in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries may have been built on protection rather than liberalisation

**Martin Rocholl** noted that the problem of unsustainable consumption of global resources raised a question about whether the US should be permitted to continue its current high levels of per capita consumption

**Robert Madelin** noted that sustainable development was seen as an essentially Northern issue, and regarded with some distrust by developing countries

**Agni Arvanitis Vlavianos** argued that defence should be reconceived as a way to protect life and that technology should be used to protect the environment, and emphasised the need for a co-operative approach

## SPEAKER

**Pat Cox (F)**

*President, European Parliament*

- Arguably we are not in a "post-Iraq": we are still in the thick of it and it will take time to resolve
- Afghanistan also remains sensitive, especially after the recent deaths of German peacekeepers in Kabul
- Whilst military doctrines are being reconsidered (e.g. pre-emption), the world should also pay closer attention to the question of reconstruction following military conflicts
- The EU spends less than half the proportion of GNP on military expenditure than the US, but for just a tenth of the benefit: economies of scale should be maximised between EU countries
- The EU should avoid a position where (partly as a result of its lower military capacity), it follows the US in to theatres after fighting has ended in an arrangement whereby "one cooks and the other cleans up"
- The EU should in its relationship with the US favour alliance over allegiance

## DISCUSSION

**Terrance Tehranian** said the politicians need to address the arms trade issue and its drain on the resources of developing countries. The call for more effective European defence within means available will inevitably also lead to increased efforts for exporting arms.

**Helle Dale** wanted to hear more about the need for respecting each others' values which is often not happening.

**Pat Cox** responded by saying the more we do to build a common foreign and defence policy, the more capable we will be to address the issue of the arms trade. He noted that among the worse killing fields in decades were the situations in Rwanda and the Congo where the weapon of mass destruction was the machete. He noted that a move toward a single arms industry could indeed also lead to looking for more exports of arms.

On the need to respect each others' values he spoke of the difference in the EU and US approaches to privacy in data, where the US approach emphasised more consumers rights and the EU approach emphasised more citizens' rights. We need to recognise the US concern for increased security but also to ensure that measures are warranted and proportional. He concluded by saying that an under-utilised

aspect of the transatlantic relationship is the legislative part. EU-US summits should also involve dialogue between elected legislators.

### **Anders Wijkman MEP**

*Vice-President, GLOBE International*

- National and EU legislators are too often sidelined from issues above the national level; yet examples such as the GLOBE environmental network of Parliamentarians show that they have a role to play
- A proposal for an 'e-Parliament' would link Parliaments by creating a register of all democratically elected representatives, and then set up task groups to work on specific issues. Such a group already exists on climate change, and another is being set up on HIV.
- The UN systems needs not only better financing but also radical reform. Key focus areas are:
  - Governance: management boards need to be smaller and more manageable
  - Staff appointments should be on merit rather than politics
  - Interagency tensions and turf wars are highly problematic
  - The UN's management culture is bureaucratic, inflexible and top-down
  - Transparency must also be improved
- Kofi Annan has been excellent for the UN, but needs more support

### **Olivier Giscard d'Estaing**

*Founder and Chairman, INSEAD; Chairman of the Committee for a World Parliament*

- The UN Economic and Social Committee (ECOSOC) should be expanded to include civil society, business, unions and so on
- The UN should include a Parliamentary Assembly of elected representatives that focus exclusively on global issues
- World taxes would enable expenditure on global issues: examples could include:
  - A tax on oil production (a tax of \$1 / barrel could create annual revenues of \$50-70bn / year)
  - A tax on arms exports, to be paid by the purchasing country
  - A tax on intercontinental transportation

## **BUSINESS PANEL**

### **Alpesh Chokshi**

*Senior Vice-President, American Express Corporation*

- Henry Kissinger had noted that September 11 may have marked the start of a process of 'privatization of foreign policy'
- September 11 also prompted businesses to internalise security much more into core business planning; American Express spending on security has doubled since the attack. Companies with "American" in their name felt a new sense of vulnerability.
- Creating islands of prosperity, such as in the case of the Indian IT industry, was a welcome product of globalisation

### **Clare Cowan**

*Chair and CEO, Venture Exchange Network*

- Since Iraq, expectations of CEOs have shifted: as a CEO of a Canadian medium sized business, Ms Cowan had found her views on the issue questioned by American colleagues
- This was an example in microcosm of a deep business issue between the US and Canada; 100 Canadian CEOs flew to Washington before the conflict to attempt to build bridges following Canadian opposition to the war
- Business would find it useful to have a forum to inform and challenge them on geopolitical issues

**Erik Jonnaert**

*Director, Corporate External Relations, EMEA, Procter & Gamble*

- Companies used to be run entirely on country lines; this is no longer the case, as some functions become centralised at global level (such as R&D), whilst other functions (such as marketing) become ever more localised
  - Sustainable development has become an increasing priority (as well as a source of brand differentiation) for many companies
  - Important to have a clear vision of objectives before setting out on devising new processes and institutions; people should be at the centre of that vision. This is particularly true with public affairs.
  - Transatlantic tension is of particular importance to companies like P&G.
-

# 1648 – THE POST-WESTPHALIAN STATE SYSTEM AND UNIVERSAL CHALLENGES

THURSDAY 19 JUNE 2003

## INTRODUCTION

**Gareth Evans (F)**

*President, International Crisis Group; Foreign Minister, Australia, 1988-96*

- Westphalian state system refers to the principles in the treaty of Westphalia designed to ensure stability and peace in Europe. The core notion of the treaty is that sovereign states are equal and independent. This concept is a founding principle in the UN charter, thus prohibiting the UN from intervening without the express consent of the nation in question.
- Traditional state sovereignty is now changing dramatically. Competition between state sovereignty and individual sovereignty is emerging.
- The post-Westphalian system acknowledges that sovereignty is a limited notion:
  - Increasing restrictions and constraints (criminal process, standards)
  - Moral limits on states limits of action (humanitarian intervention – necessary to intervene in affairs of other states)
  - Increasing significance of suprastate actors (regional organizations like EU, other institutions of international governance)
  - Increasing significance of sub-state actors (civil society)
  - Globalization – binding all this together – more interdependence accelerates the significance of other actors
- The post-Westphalian system has now seen its high water mark, however. Sovereignty is being reasserted as in the case of the US.
- Universal challenges are at the heart of problem of governance. These are a bundle of problems that are not territorially confined such as movement of people, goods, and capital; problems affecting many states simultaneously; and problems beyond capacity of any one state to address, such as international terrorism, narcotics trafficking, pandemics and environmental degradation
- The task is to resolve these challenges within constraints posed by the post-Westphalian system, which is an imperfect alternative to the sovereign state system. International solutions necessary but we do not have the system that can produce such solutions. The problem is compounded by the US opposition to many international organizations.
- Options for solutions include:
  - Reverting to a system of pure sovereignty – logical but not practically achievable as it would involve the tearing up of legal regimes and disbanding of institutions, which would exacerbate the problems;
  - Moving to pure internationalism – perhaps practicable at regional level but not globally;
  - Balance of power / multipolar approach – unachievable for foreseeable future as currently there is no military rival to the US; or
  - Cooperative multilateralism – the most promising solution.
- Every problem requires a particular strategy. However, a crucial political strategy of general application is to rethink the idea of national interest. This is not only security and economics but also the need to be seen as “good / cooperative international citizen.” Cooperation breeds cooperation (tit-for-tat strategy). This is a basic principle of human relationships throughout history but not applied effectively to international relations.

## SPEAKERS

**Donald Devine (F)**

*Grewcock Professor of American Values, Bellevue University; Director, US OPM, 1981-85*

- The Westphalian system did not prove successful in attaining its goal of peace and stability. A series of wars ensued after 1648.

- The real problem confronting the world is the stunning nature of difference between European and American point of view on how the world works:
  - Dramatic difference in views on the size and scope of government.
  - Economies of scale are seen in Europe as a reason for developing large institutions – questionable concept; does it apply at all to government.
  - UN not popular with US right of center forces; does not work and not likely to be reformed – therefore multilateral solutions involving the UN will not work.
  - Environment – there are solutions based on property rights, not large international organizations.
- A reality that must be addressed is the inability of international organizations (and of states) to govern other states. Treaty regimes do not function well – the powerful states that don't want to join, don't do so.
- “As if” solution – US needs to look at the world as if there were a balance of power.

### **Lloyd Axworthy (F)**

*Liu Centre, University of British Columbia; Minister of Foreign Affairs, Canada, 1996-2000*

- Security has transcended the nation state and become an individual concern in the post-Westphalian system. Individuals are now targeted *because* they are innocent citizens. This dynamic alters dramatically the requirements on the state.
- Sovereignty could be defined as the ability of a state to protect its citizens. When a government cannot protect, intervention – or abrogation of sovereignty – is justified.
- Landmine treaty – an example of a global product – a standard attained through a global process of active civil society engagement and pressure.
- US founded on a rule of law. It has been a beacon but is now destroying rule of law internationally through its opposition to key international institutions such as the International Criminal Court. The Court for the first time in history mandates that individuals be held accountable and not hide behind states.
- Failed states are the breeding grounds of terrorism. The most effective antidote to terrorism is to go into the incubators.
- Most national governments do not act as global citizens. Need more effective domestic system for an effective global system.

## **DISCUSSION**

**Prince El Hassan Bin Talal of Jordan** argued that we have a law of war but not of peace. We live in a world of hubs and spokes. Exercising governance rather than government. How soon will the US turn to statesmanship and identify with “we the people?”

**Juan De Castro** suggested that “it doesn't work” just doesn't work as an approach. Need to find ways to make things work. Sharing values is critical for building a new understanding. Worry about sharing an understanding between US and EU – politicians losing touch with reality. People are becoming customers and are profoundly affected by advertisement. Apathy is rampant and inability to act reinforced.

**Hans-Peter Duerr** observed that life is a constructive process, not only a competitive one. How can we really let the people make up their mind and not let them speak their mind? We are a global system – like the human body – with differences but working in synergy and synchrony. People have become disempowered customers. To please a customer, one appeals to income – in a democracy, the needs of people should be central. Keep alive all the cultures in the world, same as biological diversity.

**Oliver Sparrow** remarked that game theory and prisoner's dilemma are at the centre of the governance question. Nation states remain agents and take action. However, it is difficult to couple individual electorates and international affairs. How can we capture the need for diversity? How can we create intelligent discussion and not just a consumer's response? Need three fundamental components of trust that recur at all levels of human interaction: a model for what is going on (transparency of agency, information, knowledge); reciprocity (extend the trust of those claiming to be trustworthy); and sanctions

**Yannis Kinnas** argued the importance of an assessment of basic needs and how they are met. Need to give more attention to satisfying them. Globalisation might be an opportunity.

**Bernard Lietaer** said his key question to Americans was the following: was American empire a desirable concept for Americans as opposed to just for the American corporations that are funding

electoral campaigns. For Europeans, the key question was whether American empire was acceptable, and if not, what could be done about it.

**Wouter Veening** noted that climate change is a universal challenge. While the Kyoto protocol is flawed, what would be an alternative strategy to the treaty approach?

**Andrei Piontkovsky** noted that the system of international law is axiomatic. Principles – national right to self-determination, right to self-defence. Contradictions between these principles. The problem is conceptual – we have no organized system of international law. But a legalistic solution is not one we should strive for; politics will always be a part of any solution.

---

# 1948 – EUROPE AND AMERICA AT CRITICAL MOMENTS: LESSONS FOR THE WORLD

THURSDAY 19<sup>TH</sup> JUNE 2003

## INTRODUCTION

**Peter Goldmark (F)**

*Former Chair and CEO, International Herald Tribune*

- Eight key moments in history since 1948:
  1. Berlin Airlift, 1949: a projection of industrial, logistical and moral authority; the Berlin Wall was the equivalent for the USSR
  2. Korean War: multilateral, but following a unilateral decision by the US to intervene (only chance and ineptitude prevented a Soviet veto in the Security Council)
  3. The 1956 Hungarian revolt, as well as the 20<sup>th</sup> Party Congress in the USSR which marked the start of de-Stalinisation
  4. Suez, also in 1956: the first example of the US imposing its will unilaterally, on France, the UK and Israel
  5. The Helsinki Accords in the mid-1970s: a move towards the definition of universal human rights
  6. The emergence of global civil society in a multilateral context, on issues such as landmines, environment and the ICC
  7. November 1989: the fall of the Wall, and subsequent EU expansion eastwards
  8. September 11: whilst WMD were not used, the date will be seen in retrospect as the emergence in earnest of a new form of global terrorism that will in time use WMD
- The US must learn to be a super-partner rather than a super-power
- The EU, meanwhile, is the most daring adventure in human co-operation anywhere in the world
- A shift in the moral centre of gravity has taken place, from the US to the EU; though it may not recognise it, Europe now holds the moral balance of power

## SPEAKERS

**David Calleo**

*Dean Acheson Professor and Director of European Studies, Johns Hopkins University*

- 1948 marked the start of EU postwar recovery, the Marshall Plan, and the beginning of EU integration (e.g. OEEC, which became the OECD, and the European Payments Union)
- There are rival views of history in this period. Was the US Europe's saviour, or a facilitator for Europe's existing dreams? Was European integration functionalist (as in the Monnet worldview), or Gaullist (in which nation states were the real repositories of power)?
- In each case, both views hold part of the truth; although the Gaullist view was also superior in that it was able to make sense of geopolitical trends more easily. The functionalist view was prone to introspection, which worked only so long as there were no major external instabilities. The start and end of the Cold War marked such moments.
- Roosevelt was sceptical of Europe, whilst Churchill was more enthusiastic; but the Cold War shifted circumstances so that fear of the USSR played a role in prompting the Marshall Plan
- The system was not bipolar but tripolar: Western Europe was able to free ride on the US, but also (through indirect effects of the Cold War) on the USSR
- Following the end of the Cold War, the EU needs to be able to stand on its own, especially in military terms – not as a competitor to the US, but based on a realisation that any successful partnership will be based on a balance of power; without this, there is a risk of resentment on both sides

## **Armand Clesse**

*Director, Luxembourg Institute for European and International Studies*

- In 1948 Europe was dejected and disempowered, whilst the US was a rising power. This imbalance was institutionalised and has never been properly addressed.
- European efforts at strategic unity have failed in the past (c.f. the European Defence Community). By 1954, Europe had given up any attempt to become a world power in favour of the more modest goal of a single market.
- Integration has failed to reverse the decline of Europe; the US, for its part, has bet successfully on European disunity (and UK slavishness)
- The US is now an “autistic megalosaurus”, with the objective of “world domination”; the EU, meanwhile, is a “faceless, volatile, frail, hapless political eunuch”. The EU’s fundamental spinelessness became even clearer over Iraq.
- The next EU Intergovernmental Conference will remedy none of these basic problems
- Both sides lack reason, foresight and courage to change the present situation

## **COMMENT**

### **Reginald Dale**

*Editor, European Affairs*

- Before 1948, wars had always been endemic in Europe. This had two results: (1) the EU finds it difficult to relate to the level of shock in the US at being made vulnerable, and (2) it is hard for the US to understand the extent of Europe’s achievement in effecting 50 years of peace
- Allegations of a US strategy of divide and rule are irrelevant; Europe has divided itself
- Digs at the US (such as “autistic”) do not foster helpful debate
- Whilst values differ between EU and US (e.g. over the death penalty or Guantanamo Bay), interests do not: both have stake in a stable, peaceful world with liberal trade, investment and energy flows, both fear terrorism, crime, environmental degradation and disease, and both have a stake in assisting the developing world
- Fear of global governance in the US may be based in part on an Anglo-Saxon suspicion of utopias

## **DISCUSSION**

**Tom Spencer** noted that since 9/11 life has been difficult for people who love America

**Donald Devine** noted that Donald Rumsfeld is *not* a neo-conservative, but simply a conservative. Kristol and Kagan have conceded that neo-conservatism has no mass constituency.

**Martin Konecny** questioned David Calleo’s argument that the EU required military power to improve its relationship with the US, noting that most commentators believe the opposite

**Maria Ivanova** noted that three themes – partnership, power and interests – seemed to be emerging, and suggested the need for a better definition of different types of power

**Peter Goldmark** said that the country that aspired to be the Athens of the world was turning into the Sparta of the world. Europe had a chance to define the next global agenda, as Jean-François Rischard would illustrate in the next session.

---

# EFFECTIVE RESPONSES TO UNIVERSAL CHALLENGES

THURSDAY 19TH JUNE 2003

## INTRODUCTION

**Maria Livanos Cattau**

*Secretary General, International Chamber of Commerce*

- Several key questions frame the contemporary debate on global governance: Are multilateral agreements and international organizations exercising a new form of governance? Is it a reality or illusion that power is transferred from government to business? Do different challenges require different approaches?
- Business has responded to global challenges in a predominantly technical but rather effective manner. Voluntary agreements on uniform codes and practices, alternative dispute resolution, and arbitration have been developed and led the way to the establishment of more formal international agreements. The basis of the effectiveness of the business approach has been *common interests*.
- The economic world is running on the basis of accumulation of consensual practices. Improved institutional structures are necessary to facilitate such exchanges and the application of commonly agreed rules.
- States have in fact gained a great deal of strength and are much better equipped to respond than ever before. Sovereignty should now be defined as the ability to enter into contractual agreements and actively shape them. New sharing of power among states based on mutual consent has emerged. However, only the strong states can enter into such agreements. A key question therefore is how to deal with the problem of failed states?

## SPEAKER

**Jean-François Rischard**

*Vice-President for Europe, World Bank*

- “Global problem-solving” is a term preferable to “global governance.”
- Two big forces of change – population dynamics and new world economy – have produced a dangerous gap between problems and the ability of existing institutions to respond.
- 20 urgent global issues need to be solved in the next 20 years, including global warming, deforestation, biodiversity loss, fisheries depletion, water shortages, poverty, financial stability, information age taxation among others. These issues fall into three key categories:
  - sharing our planet: global commons
  - sharing our humanity: global commitment
  - sharing our rulebook: global regulation
- The current system is not up to the task of addressing these concerns and new institutional mechanisms are necessary. A world government, while an intellectually appealing concept, is not a feasible political option.
- Possible approaches include the creation of G-20 type groupings, new diplomacy emphasizing substance over politics and coupled with expanded aid, and Global Issue Networks.
- Global Issue Networks will be networks convened by an international organization to address a specific global concern. Parties will include governments, international civil society, and business. The networks’ creation and operation involves two main stages:
  - a norm-producing process based on expertise, interest, and transparency;
  - implementation of the norms produced through the creation of reputation effects;
- They will also create an additional source of legitimacy through expertise pooling that is issue-specific as well as cross-border.

## PANEL

### **Helle Dale**

*Deputy Director, Heritage Foundation*

- Specific problems should have specific solutions. International concerns therefore need to be disaggregated into something more manageable. International organizations produce more paper and confusion than effective responses.

### **Sascha Müller-Kraenner (B)**

*Director (Europe & North America), Heinrich Boll Foundation*

- Cooperative method in a new multilateral setting is necessary to address the problems that globalization and accelerating interdependence are presenting. Therefore, what we need is not less America, but more Europe.
- There is a set of universal values that could provide the basis for forming longer-term reliable alliances rather than problem-based coalitions which face the serious problems of legitimacy and efficiency.
- Congruence of interests would require a much longer timeframe. A first step could be the political decision to overcome differences, much like the German-French decision to do so after World War II. The WTO dynamics provides another example where differences in regulatory philosophies are overcome through agreement on the need for a common set of rules.
- Threat assessment and prioritization of risks will be critical. A much more rigorous discussion on what the most urgent of the 20 global issues are is necessary.

### **Guy Ryder**

*International Confederation of Free Trade Unions*

- There is currently a disconnection between areas in which citizens act and the global level at which an increasing number of issues have to be addressed.
- Labor issues present a global concern. Globalization is most directly experienced through work. Worker and employer interests have much common ground and an international social dialogue is necessary.
- Governance is an appropriate term and should not be unmentionable.
- Democracy needs to be taken into account in relation to Global Issue Networks. It involves participation, hierarchy, and thus entails certain slowness. A worrying aspect of the Global Issue Networks is the possible favoritism of people “worthy” of participation and the lack of representativeness.
- We do want more global institutions as powerful as the WTO. But a serious problem is the hierarchization of international organizations which has led to policy paralysis at the global level.

## DISCUSSION

**Ilari Rantakari** provided information on the 2002 Helsinki conference and the Helsinki Process in follow up to the conference. The Finnish government was supporting efforts to bring together governments, business and civil society, including especially those from the South, to discuss the issues of globalisation and democracy. After the first conference in 2002, thematic groups were being set up on finance for development, global problem solving, human security and global governance. They would report findings and recommendations to a second conference in future. More information was available on [www.helsinkiconference.fi](http://www.helsinkiconference.fi). The kinds of issues and approaches discussed by Jean-François Rischard were very much at the heart of this work.

**Tony Baldry** said we had in place the Millennium development goals, the Cancun WTO aspirations and the ICC. We needed to uphold and implement these targets and develop these institutions rather than convening more UN-type conferences to set new goals.

**Susan Nycum** was pleased with the discussion had moved beyond EU-US relations and begun to focus on global problems as so well presented by Jean-François Rischard. His list should form the agenda for a future meeting of this or a similar group of participants.

---

# THE AFTERMATH OF WAR

THURSDAY 19<sup>TH</sup> JUNE 2003

## INTRODUCTION

### His Royal Highness Prince El Hassan Bin Talal of Jordan

- The world has three sets of unfinished business in the Middle East: Iraq, Afghanistan and Palestine. Yet the citizens of all of these countries fear that they will have no say in their futures.
- The Iraqi Body Count (IBC) campaign suggests that the death toll of civilians in Iraq is at least 5,500, and possibly as high as 10,000; whilst \$50-200bn was spent on the war, \$100bn would provide healthcare in Iraq for four years
- CARE aid parcels have required repackaging because of the poor perception of the US presence: in a recent poll, 64% of Iraqis saw the US as an occupying power
- Despite the risks of 'imperial overstretch', another issue is that hard power is more expensive than soft power: there is too little evidence of bottom-up / hearts and minds strategies on the ground
- Religious sites need to be elevated in order to effect a successful separation of religious and state institutions; governance is closer to the public than government
- The Middle East is a homogenous region only in name; reform of the Arab League and other regional organisations is important. The process of 'repellence' defined by Mary Kaldor of the London School of Economics is a bigger factor than cosmopolitanism.

## SPEAKERS

### Tim Garden (B)

*Visiting Professor, Centre for Defence Studies, King's College, London*

- More consideration needs to be given to the type of military that is needed in today's security environment. The Cold War threat was easy to define, albeit very dangerous given the nuclear 'hair trigger'.
- Today, many activities require a military, but there is much less coherence about what sort of military is implied. Whilst total risks are lower than during the Cold War – with military spending as a proportion of GNP consequently lower too – the number of tasks, and the number of people needed, has increased.
- In a military view we are not 'after Iraq' – nor after Afghanistan, Kosovo or even Bosnia. Other tense situations include Israel / Palestine, N. Korea, India / China, India / Pakistan and Indonesia.
- We cannot address all of these tasks with our current militaries. The US is under-resourced for post-conflict management. More co-operation is needed between countries' forces, and not just between US and EU forces (many peacekeepers are from countries such as Jordan).
- The US has at least made clear its National Security Strategy (published 2002); the EU could usefully produce an equivalent document, as could other regions.

### Macgregor Knox (E)

*Stevenson Professor of International History, London School of Economics*

- The present situation is not an aftermath – not in the sense of 'mopping up', but due to:
  1. The revival since 9/11 of the American tradition of 'total war'
  2. The threats are not going away
  3. The most obvious response is to eliminate the threats
- The US was made by war, especially the Civil War, in which 1 in 5 Confederate soldiers died. The objectives in that war were 'total' for both sides: not just military victory, but a complete refashioning of society.
- This concept of total war lay dormant even during World War 1, but was revived during and after World War 2, for instance in the social transformation objectives of the Marshall Plan

- In today's war against terror, containment is dead and deterrence irrelevant; so (again) a reconstruction of societies harbouring terrorists is called for. War is the only real remedy to totalitarian regimes.
- The only real option for states and regions such as the EU is to 'smother the US in affection and support'; other options, such as resistance, hostility or flight do not apply

## COMMENT

### **Mervat Badawi**

*Director, Arab Fund for Economic and Social Development, Kuwait*

- Regime change in Iraq has deepened the crisis
- The decision to overrule Iraqi sovereignty despite the lack of a Security Council resolution marks a new unilateral world order
- Condoleeza Rice has made clear that US foreign policy proceeds from the "firm ground of national interest"
- Arab states need assurance that they will not be invaded too
- There are certainly global values: the Koran and New and Old Testaments are 95% syncretic
- The US must commit to a democratic Palestine: this would be the single most constructive action it could take in the Middle East

## DISCUSSION

**Roger Hayes** emphasised the new importance of civil society and suggested the need to identify horizontal NGO or business pressure points.

**Don Beck** noted an apparent Hegelian dialectic of thesis and antithesis and questioned the absence of a synthesis, and added that there should be no prizes for forecasting rain, only prizes for building the ark. He added that Jean-François Rischard's presentations should be seen as a "tipping point" for the whole conference.

---

# MODELS OF GLOBAL GOVERNANCE AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO US POWER

FRIDAY 20TH JUNE 2003

## INTRODUCTION

**Gareth Evans (F)**

*President, International Crisis Group; Foreign Minister, Australia, 1988-96*

- There is a consensus that the current global governance system is inadequate and incomplete. It has imperfect structures – (e.g. the UN Security Council), imperfect processes (e.g. the utterly ad hoc nature of peacekeeping and enforcement) and imperfect commitment by states (e.g. to peacebuilding). The way forward is cooperative multilateralism with various strategies.
- The international structure built or greatly influenced by the US. At present, only US can muster responses that are required and only it has the resources.
- The US choice is to choose to stay top dog on the block or create a world in which we will be comfortable living when no longer top dog (Clinton)
- At present, the US is talking like Athens but behaving like Sparta (defense expenditure is \$400 bn, with the Iraq operation \$40bn; \$38 is spent on defence by the US for every \$1 on aid, as compared to an industrialised country average of \$7 on defence to \$1 in aid). Preemption has been elevated from an option to a defining doctrine of American strategy.
- The US should rethink the concept of national interest; engage in more empathy and sensitive language; and think more about how US appears to others.
- What rest of the world should also show more empathy; understand post 9/11 reality; realise that there is always tension between opposites in the US; and engage with the US by resisting and responding. Above all, the rest of the world should stay critically engaged and not retreat to grumbling self-righteousness or the arrogance of impotence

## SPEAKER

**Jim Garrison (F)**

*President, State of the World Forum*

- The world is today fundamentally different from when the invasion began. We are in effect experiencing an ‘eclipse’ in what we knew about the way the world operates.
- The invasion of Iraq had very little to do with Saddam Hussein. The real reason was the attack of 9/11 – the US needed to “go into the Arab world and clobber someone”
- The invasion brought into focus two bifurcated sets of facts: the overwhelming military superiority of the United States, and the fact that the US is currently significantly out of step with the larger world community
- As with all great powers, a paradoxical antimony lies at the heart of US power. On the one hand it is a beacon of light and idealism; yet in another way there is also the corruption wrought by acquisition of power, which acts inevitably as a gateway to the dark ‘shadow’ side
- US empire has been a long-standing project: US policymakers were discussing the objective of world dominion in the 1870s. Now, US power is unprecedented in history: it has more than a million troops and five global military commands; it is the driver of world trade and commerce; and it is securing control of the Fertile Crescent.
- Given that empires rise and fall, there is the obvious question of how long the US will last before it too falls. The US has already reached its zenith.
- Rome set the record (1,000 years): the longest period of good governance in the history of the world. Three things came together effectively: Roman legions at highest level of effectiveness, commerce under universalized Roman law, and robust institutions perceived as just and fair. Durable power was ensured through consistent stewardship, in particular during an 80 year period spanning five emperors’ terms, finishing with the end of the reign of Marcus Aurelius.
- US empire has coincided with the effective privatisation of foreign policy through the emergence of super-empowered individuals. The US has become the strongest nation just

when power is moving beyond nation states. The US is thus gaining power at the same time as it is losing influence.

- Current US foreign policy can usefully be compared with 50 years ago. Truman and Roosevelt were engaged in a vast war against the 'ultimate terrorist', but they had also built the international system (e.g. the Bretton Woods institutions).
- The other superpower besides the US is the world public. Iraq was the first modern war to be argued before the court of international public opinion and debated in the Security Council *before* the first shot was fired: this is a good for democracy. That the US should have gone to war despite having failed to win its case in these fora is highly significant.
- If America rises to the challenge of global leadership, the light of America's founding may produce a global renaissance. At present, however, America is in the grip of its dark side, having lost its way. But it is only a matter of time before the US returns to its light side; the international community can help by standing firm on the need to re-evaluate sovereignty in a communitarian context.

## COMMENTARY

### David Keene

*Chairman, American Conservative Union*

- Discussion in the conference is not clear on whether sovereignty was bad (an obstacle to addressing universal challenges) or good (Iraq being violated by the United States). Why is no-one cheering the destruction of a monster?
- Jim Garrison is inconsistent in cheering the Marshall Plan but regarding other interventions as unjustified. The US did not seek imperial power in 1917, nor when it arrived in Europe in 1941; the 'dark side' of the US was not a defining feature in the history of the last century.
- There are two groups in the world: those who want to raise their families in peace, and those who want to tell the first group what to do.
- 'Civil society' was not remotely a new phenomenon, and that anyone in doubt should return to their de Tocqueville.

### Nabil Ayad (E)

*Director, Diplomatic Academy of London, University of Westminster*

- Jim Garrison is wrong to suggest that there was any sign of the US learning about the limits of military power.

### Alfredo Toro-Hardy (B)

*Venezuelan Ambassador to the EU; author, "The Age of Villages: the Small Village versus the Global Village"*

- Bill Clinton emphasised soft power
- More recently Bush has been systematically dismantling multilateral institutions step-by-step, even though in many cases it was the US that had led the construction of these institutions.

### Andrei Piontkovsky

*Director, Centre for Strategic Studies, Moscow*

- From a Russian perspective and having been a schoolboy during Truman's Presidency, he read all of Jim Garrison's comments in *Pravda*, which echoed the language of exploitation and US imperialism.
- Garrison's worldview is even more simplistic than President Bush's: where is Osama bin Laden in Garrison's model?
- He himself – a long-standing anti-communist – and President Putin, a former communist, both agree on the need for partnership with the US

## **Alistair Campbell**

*Advisor, Venture Exchange Network, Toronto*

- Georges Berthoin is right that the key question for nation-states is how to define their national interest. The Chinese government is very clear on this: their objective is to re-create a strong China, because their eclipse during the last 300 years is no more than a blip.
- China feels a mixture of admiration and envy towards the US. The concept of surrendering sovereignty is anathema to China, although it subscribes to the ethos of the UN, which it can use for its own purposes.
- Whilst China recognises the need to comply with international norms in order to secure foreign direct investment, it is not at all sure that liberal democracy is superior to its own system. China also worries that the price of Western consumerism is a loss of self-sufficiency.

## **DISCUSSION**

**Yale Ferguson** was uncomfortable with the suggestion of a divide in values between US and EU, and indeed with the idea of national values *per se*. He suggested that the discussion was really over policies and style rather than values (**B**)

**Eduardo Viola** queried why, if Iraq had really politicised public opinion, this had not translated to the ballot box (for example in Spain, where Aznar's party did well in elections shortly after the war in Iraq despite massive opposition to military action).

**Oliver Grimm** concurred in wondering why so many people opposed to the war in Iraq had not expressed their concerns and anger more in the ballot box. Was this because of lack of information, numbing by the mass media, lack of alternatives from opposition or what?

**Peter Luff** expressed outrage at suggestions by Blair and Bush that those opposed to the war on the basis that alternative options had not been exhausted were in some way sympathetic to Saddam Hussein

**Kathryn Williams** suggested that soft power applies to companies as well as states, and that lip service can be the beginning of change

**Agni Arvanitis Vlavianos** spoke of the need for greater cooperation, focussing policies more on saving the planet. Our common enemies are the depletion of the ozone layer, the pollution of the oceans and the degradation of soil. We need to look with more humility at our common problems and take up our common responsibilities for solving global issues.

**Jacob von Uexkull** was concerned that economic globalisation was equated with democratisation and asked why US domination of the world economy should be considered democratic. What kind of sovereignty was there when the World Bank and the IMF dictated economic policy in developing countries. He mentioned that when calling for the revival of the UN Trusteeship Council to be a trusteeship for the global commons, diplomats' first response was to ask him what the US government thought of the idea.

**Donald Devine** suggested that conservative opinion in the US was not as monolithic as some speakers were suggesting: within the American Conservative Union, for instance, David Keene had supported war in Iraq, whilst Devine had opposed it.

**Hazel Henderson** suggested that US economic power was eroding. It had a \$400bn deficit, representing 5 per cent of GDP; a nil savings rate; massive unfunded pension liabilities; and Treasury Bill interest rates approaching zero per cent. At present, countries holding dollars effectively have no choice but to recycle their dollars into Treasury Bills. It therefore made sense for developing countries to diversify their currency reserves into euros; having two competing global reserve currencies would be a positive development. Henderson suggested that it would make sense to peg the dollar and the euro within a trading range in order to maximise stability.

**Juan de Costa** suggested that *all* ethical values were useful, be they capitalist, anarchist or whatever. It would be welcome, he suggested, if Israelis could admire Palestinians for their values and vice versa; diversity itself should be admired.

**Alan Buckley** said the American Dream is actually the European Dream, as Europeans came to America to realise their dreams. He spoke of his own ancestors in America who were involved in both discrimination (Puritans who discriminated against Quakers) and seeking opportunities (as in the Californian gold rush). Given the similar histories in America and Europe – involving both problems and seeking opportunities – we needed to work together in search of the best ideas to benefit all.

**Bertrand de la Chapelle** spoke of how responsibility increases with increasing power. He said new forms of governance must be multi-stakeholder and that the US civil society is helping to create global

governance, which would evolve faster in cyberspace than in any other sphere. Just as the UK did not work to prevent European integration even though it did not take part in the beginning, others should not now try to prevent the emergence of global governance mechanisms. The state and the Church working to prevent reform in France led to the French Revolution.

---

# 2003 – SOVEREIGNTY AND UNIVERSAL CHALLENGES: TOGETHER OR APART?

FRIDAY 20TH JUNE 2003

## INTRODUCTION

**Hugo Paemen (B)**

*Former EU Head of Mission, Washington DC*

- Respect for sovereignty crucial to any international endeavour, but times have changed: the concept of sovereignty has never lived up to expectations.
- There is a potential conflict between asymmetric development between increasing economic interdependence and the sovereign state. Well managed economic and technical interdependence is more likely to produce stability and peace.
- The world is undergoing a transition from an international to a global world (Kofi Annan)

## OPENING DIALOGUE:

**Georges Berthoin**

*Honorary Chairman, Jean Monnet Association; European Chair, Trilateral Commission, 1975-92*

- The Secretary General of the UN should have the power to make proposals in the common interest, akin to the power of the European Commission to propose policy.
- If a Security Council member then uses its veto to block such a proposal, it should be called to account for the use of its veto before the UN General Assembly, and possibly also any future elected assembly within the UN. Public opinion would hence have a place in the process.

**His Royal Highness Prince El Hassan Bin Talal of Jordan**

- The utility of international conferences on ‘moving mountains’, such as last year’s World Summit on Sustainable Development, was not clear
- There is a need to agree ways of sharing regional commons and global commons.

## DISCUSSION

**Alex Evans** underlined the current crisis of legitimacy being faced by many institutions, from Parliaments and supranational institutions to businesses and civil society organisations; a recent WEF survey had found that armies were now the most trusted institutions in 30+ countries. Young people were particularly reluctant to trust institutions. Addressing this crisis of trust should be a top priority, Evans suggested; as a result he was wary of proposals such as Berthoin’s for unelected *fonctionnaires* to be charged with the identification and pursuit of the public interest.

**Armand Clesse** expressed concerns about plans for the Patriot Act II which could deprive people of their citizenship and could not understand why there wasn’t a world outcry against the situation in Guantanamo Bay, where people have to live in cages. He compared the conditions to that of a concentration camp.

**Jacob von Uexkull** said the challenges we are facing are threefold – the danger of cultural collapse, economic collapse and environmental collapse – and that these could happen on a global scale. He said that when civilisation faces such challenges there is a need to find the right institutions to help such as a future council consisting of a wide range of people from the great and wise to youth representatives.

**Christian de Fouloy** said that comparing the US administration to Nazis served no good in efforts to improve the EU-US dialogue.

**Don Beck** suggested an order of priority in which habitat / planet should come first in priority, followed next by memetics: the question of how cultures are formed and defined. It was pointless, he argued, for participants to come to the conference and engage in ‘meme warfare’ and stereotyping.

**Halle Hansen** argued that Africa had received insufficient attention during the conference, and that this was the missing link.

## **CLOSING DIALOGUE: (F)**

### **R. James Woolsey**

*Director of Central Intelligence, 1993-95; Partner and Vice President, Booz Allen Hamilton Inc.*

- Recent history has seen a move from the Enlightenment worldview of Newton to the systems and complexity theory of Poincarre. Cause and effect have become blurred; non-linear unpredictability has become a feature of international relations. As a result, many old concepts – unilateralism versus multilateralism, sovereignty and so on – have become outdated.
- There are now two major negative interactive effects or crises:
  - Malignant problems such as the recent strikes in the US shipping industry that create cascading effects throughout economies, or alternatively issues such as global warming, through which Sports Utility Vehicles in the US have effects in Bangladesh; and
  - Malevolent problems such as dirty bombs: this challenge could for example lead to inspection of all containers inbound to the US, causing great delays and economic effects of international impact. Malevolent problems are hence intentional impacts, whereas malignant problems are caused unintentionally as by-products of other actions.
- The EU is arguably better at understanding malignant problems, whilst the US is better at malevolent problems, not least due to the impacts of 9/11. Networks that can work well in peacetime can become easy targets during conflict (e.g. electricity transformers in utility networks).
- The US is now engaged in a very long war. Dealing with Iraq, Libya, Sudan, Syria, Iran *et al.* will take decades. The global Islamist movement is the most serious adversary that the US faces; the war against it will not be just military, just as the Cold War was not a uniquely military undertaking.
- Democracy is the central tool for peace and disarmament. Democracies tend not to attack one another. In the Middle East, there are just two democracies: Turkey and Israel; all other states are either weak or predatory. Yet it is racist to assume that Muslim countries are unable to implement democracies: the thesis is in any case disproved by Indonesia, Bangladesh, Turkey, Bahrain, Mali, Senegal and others. Sceptical voices also argued in the past that Russians, Taiwanese and even Catholics could not adapt to democracy. Countries should either be with the US on their push for democracy, or otherwise be nervous.

### **Tom Spencer**

*Visiting Professor of Global Governance, University of Surrey; Director, ECPA*

- Spencer agreed with the malignant / malevolent categorisation as well as with Woolsey's emphasis on complexity as an important feature of current international relations.
- A recent book by Fareed Zacharia, the editor of Newsweek, suggested that democracy alone was not enough, however; assurance of good governance is also required, or liberty may be diminished. Indeed, moves to open up politics in Washington DC had the unintentional effect of opening it up to lobbies and dollars: the internal evolution of the US political system had destroyed its integrity.
- Ideas are essential to US politics; the 'black arts' of spin are ultimately about manipulating and marketing ideas. Thanks to the transparency of American political culture, the aims, objectives and strategies of organisations such as the Project for a New American Century or the American Enterprise Institute are open to all who wish to know.
- These texts set out clearly a logical programme for disruption of multilateral institutions by the US. The horror of 9/11 was used brilliantly in pursuit of these goals. Shock and awe diplomacy was being used around the world to maintain hegemony; and this was being done with intelligence and sophistication (c.f. for instance the excellent marketing of Robert Kagan's ideas in Europe). The US deliberately plays on European enjoyment of an expertly marketed image of 'US naivete'; Rumsfeld is far from the 'bumbling yokel' that Europeans like to see him as.
- However, whilst it is legitimate for the US to oppose the International Criminal Court, it is not for the US to prevent other countries from pursuing this goal. Similarly, whilst it is legitimate for the US to withdraw support from the EU, it is not acceptable for the US to send diplomats to disrupt the EU.

- The world should engage in particular with three issues:
  1. **Terrorism:** 9/11 was one of the great intelligence failures of all time. *The Age of Sacred Terror*, by the National Security Council's former head and deputy head of terrorism, describes how the authors resigned as a result of being unable to persuade the political establishment to take Al Qaeda seriously. This was in turn the result of a post-Cold War bureaucratic fight between the Air Force and other armed services over NMD and rogue state missiles – not over terrorists and dirty bombs.
  2. **Environment:** John McNeill in *Something New Under the Sun* points out that the most significant novelty of the C20th was the impact on the environment traceable to the security anxiety of the great powers. Militaries wanted large populations in the context of 'fifty year wars'. Whilst the threat of dirty bombs was real, the threat of nuclear catastrophe was even more serious.
  3. **Migration:** Imperial patterns that can be seen in the case of the US and EU demonstrate power being pushed out, and then pressure of immigration subsequently being pushed back in the other direction. This dynamic can be seen in the cases of France, Britain, Spain, Portugal and the US. Both the EU and the US have been argued to be turning into two nations: one secular, rich, old and feeble, and the other poor, young, robust and Islamic or Latino.
- It is critical to recognise that in politics and international relations, we have a tendency to focus on the challenges that we think we can control rather than the challenges that actually face us.

### James Woolsey

- Fareed Zacharia takes blemishes and interprets them as a trend. At the same time, it is true that the Balkans moved too quickly to democracy; it is important to embed the rule of law first. However, it should be noted that it was the Babylonian emperor Hammurabi who devised the rule of law: the coalition in Iraq is not building on sand.
- The US is not an empire. If it was, why would it have withdrawn its troops at Turkish or Saudi objections? How could Emperors Clinton and Nixon have been impeached?
- The doctrine of pre-emption is tightly defined in the US National Security Strategy. Countries targeted under the doctrine must be dictatorships; have or be developing Weapons of Mass Destruction; and have links to terrorism. Burma, for example, would not qualify under these criteria.
- It can be difficult for people to understand the US in the post 9/11 environment. It should be borne in mind that to America, the attack was on a scale equivalent to Pearl Harbour.

### Tom Spencer

- Perception is in its way a kind of reality; and the rest of the world's perception of the US is exactly what Woolsey suggests the US does *not* intend to be its message. On pre-emption, Iraq fulfilled only the first of the three criteria set out by Woolsey. America *looks* nervous, humiliated and (consequently) aggressive.
- The level of anti-French sentiment in the US is surely deliberate undermining of the EU. Tony Blair used this as cover for his flank and in order to play the domestic agenda. A new willingness to trample on old taboos is visible; and part of the impact of 9/11 may have been the removal of old taboos on the exercise of power.
- However, this is pretty unacceptable, in much the same way as it was unacceptable that much of Europe was portrayed as anti-Semitic two years ago for criticising Israeli foreign policy.
- Osama bin Laden might well be pleased at progress towards meeting his objectives: the Atlantic alliance has been disrupted, American troops have been withdrawn from Saudi, recruitment to Al Qaeda has increased, and the Middle East is further towards being radicalised.
- In essence, therefore, our response to 9/11 fails the most basic and important test: that of effectiveness.

## **James Woolsey**

- Al Qaeda has been badly damaged, especially by Afghanistan. Both Afghanistan and Iraq have moved towards democracy, which is bad news for Al Qaeda, even though these moves will take time and effort. As Ronald Reagan once said, “you ain’t seen nothing yet”. The best way to undermine Al Qaeda is not just through military action but also intelligence, law and undermining ideology. There is certainly no reason for Al Qaeda to feel happy.
- As to infringements on US liberty, this is an ‘anvil that laughs at many broken hammers’. Lincoln suspended habeas corpus; and each time liberties have been rescinded, they have come back. “In God we trust, but for everyone else, there’s checks and balances.”
- It was not just Tony Blair and George W Bush who believe that Saddam Hussein had chemical and biological weapons in the late 1990s and up to the start of war; so did Hans Blix (as he said to the Guardian 5 days before this conference); Chirac said substantially the same thing; and Saddam himself admitted having 8,500 litres of anthrax. The question is hence not whether the WMD existed until recently, but where they are. 8,500 litres of anthrax in powder form can be concealed in four and a half suitcases.
- Saddam Hussein certainly sheltered terrorists, as can be seen from the case of Abu Nidal. Connections have also been established between Saddam and suicide bombers in Israel. Some Al Qaeda operatives sheltered in Iraq following Afghanistan; and there was also a training camp South-West of Baghdad where fundamentalists had been taught to hijack airlines using short knives.

## **CLOSE OF THE CONFERENCE**

### **Georges Berthoin (F)**

*Honorary Chairman, Jean Monnet Association; Honorary Chairman, Trilateral Commission, 1975-92*

---