

Cooperation Among Democracies in War and Peace

By H. Eric Schockman, PhD

This paper will examine two sub contextual questions within the overall topic of cooperation among democracies:

- (1) To what extent should such cooperation be based on lasting principles or on present interests? And:
- (2) What should young people be taught about such cooperative endeavors as NATO, the European Union, and the United Nations?

Exploring Global Citizenship After September 11th

The assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand in 1914 not only started World War I, but heralded the onset of intense globalization, trade protectionism, re-nationalization of territorial boundaries and greater immigration restrictions. Relative “peace” between wars did not diminish global economic forces but essentially aroused the wrath (perhaps envy) of those who needed a symbolic target like the World Trade Center’s Twin Towers to make a conspicuous display of a counter model of world order. The common consensus, especially amongst the world’s democracies, was that “our world changed on September 11th.” Perhaps it was a loss of our collective innocence as democratic nations saw impregnable fortresses crumble. For the United States, aside from the bombing of Pearl Harbor and the British army burning the White House in 1814, it had been nearly two hundred years since an attack on American soil. Democracy, as one keen observer once said, is humility in the exercise of power, not hubris. How is it then that the export of globalization got melded into the export of democracy that Woodrow Wilson was convinced would be the cornerstone of a perpetual state of peace?

With the collapse of communism, wasn't liberal democracy to reign supreme or as Francis Fukuyama posited as the "end of history?" How can we fashion a new pedagogy to comprehend the inherent conflicts of globalization and aid in the democratic reconstruction of education after 9/11?

It is impossible to truly define "globalization," or as the Economist described it, "the most abused word of the 21st century" (Chanda, 2002). But developing a critical theory of globalization is essential to the centrality it now holds in democratic societies and ultimately is critical to educators as we struggle to advance the notion of global citizenship. To better advance this hypothesis, I favor Douglas Kellner's terminology of distinguishing between "globalization from above" and "globalization from below" (Kellner, 2005). Kellner presents globalization as conflicting and contradictory. It is not a monolithic juggernaut of progress or domination but is open to resistance, redirection, transformation and democratic intervention. His diction depicts "globalization from above" as a parcel of corporate capitalism and the capitalist state which does or does not promote democratization. Juxtapose this with "globalization from below" signified by the integration of marginalized individuals and social movements which seek institutional transformation to further democratization and social justice. Viewed from this perspective, modern day war (aka terrorism) and peace is co-dependent on the globalizing forces that promote democracy or stifle it. Benjamin Barber's Jihad vs. McWorld contrasts the "PaxAmericana" of commercialized, homogenized networks of supranational organizations that manipulate power and influence governments and the economies of the second and third world. From this perspective, then, who is the real "axis of evil"? Taking Barber one step further, it would be easy to assume that the

Jihadists and others see “globalization from above” as controlled by an “unholy trinity”: the International Monetary Fund; the World Bank; and the World Trade Organization. Without going into a deeper analysis of each supranational institution, suffice to say Thomas Friedman’s metaphor of a “golden straight jacket” would serve as a good organizational tool for terrorists. Elements would include:

- Making the private sector drive economic growth
- Shrinking state government and privatizing state-owned industries
- Keeping a low rate of inflation
- Maintaining a balanced budget
- Cutting tariffs on imports
- Removing restrictions on foreign investments
- Deregulating the economy (Friedman, 1999, 105).

What Friedman calls the “Lexus” – is postmodernity, affluence, conspicuous consumption: an amalgam of top-down corporate capitalist domination forces that perhaps secondarily think of democratizing elements for global peace and security. On the other hand the “Olive Tree” – is premodern, traditionalist societies that have symbols like roots, stable communities and an anti-neoimperialistic philosophy.

The peril for the “hearts and minds” of the future global citizen is that education has faulted in transmitting knowledge transfer as well as the economic rewards of prosperity.

“Globalization from below” is the whiplash to the corporate-driven global powers. It consists of a strong participatory civil society passionately fighting for social causes on a global scale. Keck and Sikkink describe these forces as “transnational advocacy networks” (1998, 1). Thus there is a vast potential to shape and mold globalization in the right direction and effect positive democratic change and equitable global distribution. Hardt and Negri describe it as “multitudes within empires...[that]

produces cooperation, communication, forms of life and and social relationships” (Hardt and Negri, 2004, 339). These networks of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) can use the by-product tools of globalization (like Twitter in Iran’s recent “elections”) to forge grassroots movements to impact directional change from the bottom-up. This of course begs the overarching question: can transnational citizen groups be undemocratic? Of course they can. But this is both the challenge and opportunity for global education to break down barriers and construct new democratic paradigms (both within existing nation-states and within supranational organizations). Departing sound education à la Dewey of the critical aspects of citizen participation and a pedagogy undergirth in the ethos of democratic principles is the best inoculation to anarchy, terrorism and war. But it is not traditional classroom learning alone that John Dewey recommends as a way to create democratic culture and citizenship (Dewey, 1916). Dewey thought of schools as “embryo communities.” Active inquiry and careful development of analytical reasoning around vital problems of today were to be a basis for Dewey’s nurturing of traditional academic teaching. But early on Dewey advances the thesis that this does not do enough to provide a better human experience in democratic citizenship modeling. Dewey argues for outside the classroom experimental service-learning, linking students with real world experiences. Grounding a sound moral education in applied application would give students not only a “spirit of service,” but also enhance their democratic decision-making understanding and reasoning. What Dewey seems to suggest is that so little democracy takes place in these embryonic school communities that those who spend the most time in schools have the least opportunity to experience the full continuum of democratic citizenship growth.

Advancing Dewey one step further, Paulo Freire takes on traditional teacher-centered pedagogy as unacceptable to full civic education. “Liberation pedagogy” is when knowledge comes only from invention and reinvention. Like Dewey, Freire believes that perpetual inquiry in the world is a mark of all free human beings. The power is to be used by people to liberate themselves from oppression. This pedagogy to end oppression, according to Freire, “must be forged *with*, not *for*, the oppressed” (Freire, 1970, 48: emphasis in original). Freire’s laboratory was working with illiterate adult peasants in South America, but his work has applications as well to schools and school-aged youth. It is a pedagogy for all: including the oppressors and the oppressed.

Dewey and Freire create a valuable praxis for us between learning and “activism,” being in full reflective participation with the conditions in the field. I shall return later to this theme and how it underscores my main theoretical perspective, but suffice to say in a nutshell cooperation among democracies pertaining to a sustained peace or the terrorist realities of a post 9-11 world cannot be examined in a vacuum. War and peace are not some controlled “Realpolitik” exclusive to the elite club of democratic nation-states. Starting with a rationalist theory of war, our focus should shift to *non*-democratic regimes and underdeveloped societies. Indeed as Charles Lipson’s analysis has advanced, democracies almost never fight wars against each other (Lipson, 2003). “Democratic peace” has been exhaustively tested in the field of international politics. Democracies are no pussy-cats or paper-tigers – they often go to war but very seldom against each other. Lipson suggests from a perspective of neo-Realism that democracies are distinct in sustaining cooperation in a “contracting advantage” as mutually reliable partners – from military allies and trading partners. Last I checked, Al-Queda had no “contracting

arrangement” with any democratic state. If therefore we want to advance civic education, our understanding of supranational organizations, and the critical issues of war and peace – we need to probe more deeply into how “globalization from below” is truly manifested.

Deontological vs. Teleological: An International Moral Order?

The philosophy of history à la Hegel would suggest that there are some universal principles “in the exhibition of the spirit” (or traces of a “whole”) in human understanding of the “process of working out the knowledge of that which is potential.” But how might mortals such as ourselves know the “spirit” (rational and necessitated will of God)? To develop the spirit requires an effort to work out the knowledge of “that which is potential.” What did Hegel mean? We must know practice to find spirit.

Thus maintaining a focus on the practice of the moral order (instead of focus on the current value structures, or current trendy interests) we maintain a perspective that avoids the dangers of defining things “like the way they are.” Values should reflect a reconciliation of changing human needs within a lasting and fundamental moral order (universal law). This is much in the same vein as Dwight Waldo’s concept of “higher law.” It is too easy, in the pursuit of the holy grail of what constitutes a state of perpetual peace, to fall victim to “ethical relativism” (à la Dewey). Moral order can change, but must be applied to something beyond the individual and the state.

So should cooperation among democracies (and the way we subsequently study and teach about it) be based on deontological reasoning? My answer is yes. A good decision (be it on the individual or national level) is one in which reason guides the actor

to make a consideration of respect for other rational beings. Immanuel Kant suggests that the highest universal rule that should guide human actions is the “categorical imperative.” This grows out of the shared sense of a larger moral order – or the imagining of an “original position.” Plato’s “Allegory of the Cave” comes close to metaphorically witnessing a more perfect social order that lies behind a “veil of ignorance.” Can universal principles like equality, freedom, liberty and the “pursuit of happiness” cause moral rigidity when applied to our post 9-11 world? Or should we abandon any *a priori* justifications and instead judge not the intrinsic value of what *is* “good,” but ultimately whether from a teleological perspective whether the *outcomes* it produces are judged “good” or “bad” (consequentialism). Perhaps even more profound: should we apply deontological and/or teleological analysis to the forces of globalization from the top and/or from the bottom?

Kant’s moral theory argues that human beings should always treat all others as ends in themselves, not as a means to an end. What is interesting in the Kantian approach to global citizenship, Kant considers both the role of individual within a state and the duty moral individuals have in obeying universal imperatives. Thus we have two loyalties: a good state governed by the rule of law – probably not a full participatory democracy – but something like a good ‘republic.’ In this first moral republican order we act as free agents, engage in public discourse, elect representatives who elevate the public ethos, and if necessary go fight for the state – but only in what Kant believes is a “just war.” The second loyalty is to moral universalism – meaning there is a moral obligation to work for world peace and the harmony of distributive capitalistic ends, even if the goal is unattainable. “We must simply act as if it really could come about” (Kant, 1991). In

Kant's Perpetual Peace he suggests a 'mechanism of nature' (something like Adam Smith's invisible hand) that promotes human dignity, but history is not moving towards an 'inevitable goal.' Hence Kant is unsure of a perpetual peace, but even the sliver of possible existence means that it is our moral duty to work toward social justice and world peace. Kant saw the need for an international global ethic. Why? Because "a human being is worthy of respect simply by virtue of being alive. And the worthiness extends without borders to encompass every individual, ignoring all particularities" (Kingwell, 200, 52). Kant's universal aspirations were very pragmatic in retrospect, without negation of the nation-state, that later would lead to such supranational or transnational entities as the United Nations. He certainly did not follow the ideas of the Dutch theologian Erasmus, who attacked national identities as "very stupid labels" that only breed disunity. He wrote, "My own wish is to be a citizen of the world, to be a fellow-citizen to all men" (Carter, 2001, 19-20).

Kant sets up an impressive theoretical basis for the evolution of something we now call "moral rights," later enshrined in the preamble to the United Nations Charter in phrases such as "dignity and worth of the human person," or "better standards of life in larger freedom."

Kantian principles (and to a large extent the Enlightenment) were instrumental in the formation of Jürgen Habermas' "dialogic communities" (Habermas, 1999, 58). While rejecting the concept of some metaphysical system, Habermas focuses us instead on the concept of "deliberative democracy."

As a product of modernity and rational discourse universalism is still the centrality of our collective aspirations. There must be a common political culture

emerging from a civil society across national borders. Pushing us there are global communications and a global consciousness fomented for example by the “agitation” of transnational agents – like the non-government organizations (NGOs) that forged global responsibilities and common bonds. The U.N.’s Declaration of Human Rights and perhaps soon an International Food Security Treaty (guaranteeing citizens of all nations the *right* to food security) are manifestation of this deontological moral order.

We could have gone down a different path towards war and peace:

Teleologically-speaking the realist school of international relations since 1945 rebuts that a stable peace can be achieved amidst the conflicting nature of politics between nation-states with often opposing views. This draws of course on the Hobbesian concept of anarchy and a perpetual tendency to war in a state of nature where no sovereign power exists to impose order. In this hypothetical state of nature, lawlessness and violence could only be overcome by some imperial sovereign. Absent that, order could be maintained according to the realist by some “balance of power,” or as critics call it more of a “balance of terror.” Hobbes would be in great company with Machiavelli as the “ends justify the means.” Machiavellian Realpolitik is the ruthless pursuit of national expansion and power, as well as the subordination of a higher individual order.

Ironically, this stream of realism has gotten us into a more unstable world order as violent revolutions, totalitarian regimes and terrorist cells have blossomed at the altar of humanistic ends. But the decline of the nation-state as a deliverer of well-being, economic prosperity and exclusive identity has given rise to a new vacuum (and possible hope) that the NGO transnational community has been filling. As “globalization from below” takes greater hold, our pedagogy must shift as well – both in focus and relativity.

The study of what makes better democracies – ergo a more lasting peace – is not solely in the organizational charts of the European Union or NATO. Rather our focus should be on civic education of civic society. Pedagogy in this sense should not be simply teaching methods or rote memorizing that rely on a teacher-centered or didactic form of education. Rather pedagogical strategy should shift to Dewey’s “extern-ships” – moving students into the real world of the thriving NGO transnational arena – where truly the action is. An antiseptic study of supra-organizations like the United Nations is devoid of finding its “categorical imperative” without a sub-analysis of transnational grass-roots actors and their universal appeal for global consciousness. It could also help blunt the negative forces of “globalization from above” and reduce a new generation of potential terrorists and the dangers of wars.

Ending Hunger: The United Nations Millennium Development Goal #1.

In 2000, close to 150 world leaders met at the Millennium Summit of the United Nations. Those leaders endorsed a set of goals that were built upon a belief in “certain fundamental values” – like shared responsibility, equity and human dignity. The declaration put “globalization from below” as its focal point:

We believe that the central challenge we face today is to ensure that globalization becomes a positive force for all the world’s people. For while globalization offers greater opportunities, at present its benefits are very unevenly shared, while its costs are unevenly distributed (United Nations Millennium Declaration 2000).

While there are eight Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), I wish to focus on the very basic – feeding the world’s stomachs – very much in a Maslowian hierarchy of needs.

Because if we can't keep people alive, they will never be "self-actualized." So MDG #1 is simple: halve the portion of the world's people who suffer from hunger and those whose income is less than \$1 a day, by 2015.

Here's the challenge: The World Bank's latest estimates show that 1.4 billion people in developing countries were living in extreme poverty in 2005. Recent increases in the price of food had a direct and adverse effect on the poor and are expected to push an estimated 100 million people into absolute poverty and hunger. Every year more than 10 million children die of hunger and preventable diseases – that's over 30,000 per day and one every 3 seconds (United Nations, 2008).

Fragile democracies are feeling the pressure of food insecurity. There were "food riots" in over 30 nations last year. The World Food Program plans to feed 73 million people globally, including as many as 3 million people each day in Darfur and the refugees in Chad. Even though the proportion of people worldwide suffering from malnutrition and hunger has *fallen* since the early 1990s, the number of people lacking access to food has risen. A "perfect storm" of realities has struck: global food stocks are at historic lows; cataclysmic climate shifts devastated harvests in many parts of the world; high oil prices increase the cost of transporting food and fertilizer; and some experts say the rise of biofuels (corn-based) has diverted food stocks to gas trucks.

Ban Ki-Moon, the United Nations secretary general, has stated recently that while the recovery may be showing positive economic trends, the global financial crisis is slamming some of the "working poor" and forcing them into poverty and food insecurity. In a report, "Voices of the Vulnerable," he outlines some of the grim realities:

- As many as 222 million workers run the risk of joining the ranks of the working poor, earning less than \$1.25 a day.

- Remittance flows which reached \$328 billion in 2008, will drop by 7.3 percent in 2009.
- Hunger rates are up in every region of the world (Ban Ki-Moon, 2009).

The United Nations aims to inspire national governments, to reconcile their interests with championing certain “unalienable rights” for the common good that reaches across an interdependent world. The reality has been that national governments can not (or have not) done this work alone. Strengthening of the transnational public space and civil society has been pushed and channeled through the “people power” of transnational advocacy groups.

Doing transnational advocacy work means more than providing charity and humanitarian relief, not a criticism implied of those mainly involved in providing food and relief. They play a vital role in keeping people alive in the moment. We must move past this old modality and think of transnational advocacy as a new paradigm promoting social justice. Having global responsibility for anyone’s suffering, social justice is heavily influenced by Judeo-Christian theology. Advocacy is empowerment from the bottom up, challenging the prevailing status quo through protest and political lobbying. Asking the profound questions, such as: why is there malnutrition and hunger in the world when there are indeed abundant food supplies to feed the entire globe? Advocacy is education as well – developing a moral literature in which to express an outrage at perceived social injustices and imbalances. Educating global citizens to analyze, conducting research, raising the political awareness index, working in alliances and coalitions, speaking for those who have no voice or have been silenced – these are broad duties and responsibilities of educational institutions in the 21st century. Global citizenship in nonacademic discourse, then, amounts to a fundamentally different

phenomenon than simply projecting the model of national citizenship into the international arena. It means civic engagement and moral obligations – like ending world hunger. It means reframing the socialization process and altering a state of mind. It means erasing the distinctions between “us” and “them;” not by being a passive bystander, but by putting actions to work as a stakeholder. It means engagement with “globalization from above” as consumers of products that can alter the bottom-line for more greedy, self-indulged corporations.

Finally, it means making *more relevant* the work and mission of supranational organizations like the U.N. The terrorist attacks have given even more credence to universal structures, but they must be pushed to live up to their lofty ambitions. As the U.N. Charter states, it was “to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war,” “to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights,” “to establish conditions under which justice...can be maintained,” and “to promote social progress and better standards of life...” (United Nations, 1945).

Beyond the organizational processes and structures that serve in peacekeeping, economic development, disease prevention, disarmament, and environmental protection – there must be “people power” to grapple with the intended and unintended forces of globalization. Hungry people make good recruits for suicide bombers and terrorist propaganda. One of the first actions U.S. Secretary of State Clinton put into the diplomatic arsenal to combat the new global threats was the pledge to cut in half by 2015 the hunger index existing today (much in alignment with MDG #1). Forming partnerships with civil society NGOs to develop participatory, pro-poor, urban and rural

development strategies can only produce more beneficial results not only for our interests but also for those on the bottom of the totem pole.

References

- Barber, Benjamin. *Jihad vs. McWorld*. New York: Ballantine Books, 1996.
- Carter, April. *The Political Theory of Global Citizenship*. New York: Routledge, 2001.
- Chanda, Nayan. *Coming Together: Globalization Means Reconnecting the Human Community*. Yale Global Online, 2002. <<http://yaleglobal.yale.edu/about/essay.jsp>>
- Dewey, John. *Democracy and Education*. Mineola, NY: Dover Publications, 2004 [1916].
- Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum, 2006 [1970].
- Friedman, Thomas L. *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*. New York: Anchor Books, 1999.
- Haberman, Jürgen. "The European Nation-State and the Presures of Globalization." *New Left Review* 235 (1999).
- Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri. *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*. New York: Penguin, 2004.
- Kant, Immanuel. "Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch." *Kant: Political Writings*. Ed. Hans Reiss. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Keck, Margaret E., and Kathryn Sikkink. *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1998.
- Kellner, Douglas. "The Conflicts of Globalization and Restructuring Education." *Education, Globalization, and the State in the Age of Terrorism*. Ed. Michael A. Peters. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers, 2005.
- Ki-moon, Ban. "U.N. Chief Says Working Poor Still Suffer." *New York Times* 18 Sept. 2009, A9.
- Kingwell, Mark. *The World We Want: Restoring Citizenship in a Fractured Age*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2000.
- Lipson, Charles. *Reliable Partners: How Democracies Have Made A Separate Peace*. New Jersey: Princeton UP, 2003.
- United Nations. *1945 Charter*. <www.un.org/documents/charter>
- United Nations. *Millennium Development*. 2000. <www.un.org/millennium/declaration>.

United Nations. *Millennium Development Goal #1*. 2008. <www.endpoverty2015.org/goals/end-hunger>