### Current world order reflects US principles

#### Current world order due to American influence; decline would lead to a different world

Kagan 2012 (Robert , senior fellow in foreign policy at the Brookings Institution and a columnist for The Washington Post. The myth of American decline. January 11, 2012 http://www.tnr.com/article/politics/magazine/99521/america­world­power­declinism)

Note: At the State of the Union on January 26, President Barack Obama argued, "Anyone who tells you that America is in decline or that our influence has waned, doesn't know what they're talking about." According to a Foreign Policy report, the president had read and been influenced by the TNR article below, discussing it at length in an off­the­record meeting on the afternoon of the speech. I. Is the United States in decline, as so many seem to believe these days? Or are Americans in danger of committing pre­emptive superpower suicide out of a misplaced fear of their own declining power? A great deal depends on the answer to these questions. The present world order—characterized by an unprecedented number of democratic nations; a greater global prosperity, even with the current crisis, than the world has ever known; and a long peace among great powers—reflects American principles and preferences, and was built and ￼preserved by American power in all its political, economic, and military dimensions. If American power declines, this world order will decline with it. It will be replaced by some other kind of order, reflecting the desires and the qualities of other world powers. Or perhaps it will simply collapse, as the European world order collapsed in the first half of the twentieth century. The belief, held by many, that even with diminished American power “the underlying foundations of the liberal international order will survive and thrive,” as the political scientist G. John Ikenberry has argued, is a pleasant illusion. American decline, if it is real, will mean a different world for everyone.

### Multiple challenges exist

#### Challenges exist; must examine several indicators to determine actual decline

Kagan 2012 (Robert , senior fellow in foreign policy at the Brookings Institution and a columnist for The Washington Post. The myth of American decline. January 11, 2012 http://www.tnr.com/article/politics/magazine/99521/america­world­power­declinism)

But how real is it? Much of the commentary on American decline these days rests on rather loose analysis, on impressions that the United States has lost its way, that it has abandoned the virtues that made it successful in the past, that it lacks the will to address the problems it faces. Americans look at other nations whose economies are now in better shape than their own, and seem to have the dynamism that America once had, and they lament, as in the title of Thomas Friedman’s latest book, that “that used to be us.” The perception of decline today is certainly understandable, given the dismal economic situation since 2008 and the nation’s large fiscal deficits, which, combined with the continuing growth of the Chinese, Indian, Brazilian, Turkish, and other economies, seem to portend a significant and irreversible shift in global economic power. Some of the pessimism is also due to the belief that the United States has lost favor, and therefore influence, in much of the world, because of its various responses to the attacks of September 11. The detainment facilities at Guantánamo, the use of torture against suspected terrorists, and the widely condemned invasion of Iraq in 2003 have all tarnished the American “brand” and put a dent in America’s “soft power”—its ability to attract others to its point of view. There have been the difficult wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, which many argue proved the limits of military power, stretched the United States beyond its capacities, and weakened the nation at its core. Some compare the United States to the British Empire at the end of the nineteenth century, with the Iraq and Afghanistan wars serving as the equivalent of Britain’s difficult and demoralizing Boer War. With this broad perception of decline as the backdrop, every failure of the United States to get its way in the world tends to reinforce the impression. Arabs and Israelis refuse to make peace, despite American entreaties. Iran and North Korea defy American demands that they cease their nuclear weapons programs. China refuses to let its currency rise. Ferment in the Arab world spins out of America’s control. Every day, it seems, brings more evidence that the time has passed when the United States could lead the world and get others to do its bidding. Powerful as this sense of decline may be, however, it deserves a more rigorous examination. Measuring changes in a nation’s relative power is a tricky business, but there are some basic indicators: the size and the influence of its economy relative to that of other powers; the magnitude of military power compared with that of potential adversaries; the degree of political influence it wields in the international system—all of which make up what the Chinese call “comprehensive national power.” And there is the matter of time. Judgments based on only a few years’ evidence are problematic. A great power’s decline is the product of fundamental changes in the international distribution of various forms of power that usually occur over longer stretches of time. Great powers rarely decline suddenly. A war may bring them down, but even that is usually a symptom, and a culmination, of a longer process. The decline of the British Empire, for instance, occurred over several decades. In 1870, the British share of global manufacturing was over 30 percent. In 1900, it was 20 percent. By 1910, it was under 15 percent—well below the rising United States, which had climbed over the same period from more than 20 percent to more than 25 percent; and also less than Germany, which had lagged far behind Britain throughout the nineteenth century but had caught and surpassed it in the first decade of the twentieth century. Over the course of that period, the British navy went from unchallenged master of the seas to sharing control of the oceans with rising naval powers. In 1883, Britain possessed more battleships than all the other powers combined. By 1897, its dominance had been eclipsed. British officials considered their navy “completely outclassed” in the Western hemisphere by the United States, in East Asia by Japan, and even close to home by the combined navies of Russia and France—and that was before the threatening growth of the German navy. These were clear­cut, measurable, steady declines in two of the most important measures of power over the course of a half­century.

### U.S. Hegemony Still Strong: Economy

#### Economic measures indicate that US still has economic hegemony
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SOME OF THE ARGUMENTS for America’s relative decline these days would be more potent if they had not appeared only in the wake of the financial crisis of 2008. Just as one swallow does not make a spring, one recession, or even a severe economic crisis, need not mean the beginning of the end of a great power. The United States suffered deep and prolonged economic crises in the 1890s, the 1930s, and the 1970s. In each case, it rebounded in the following decade and actually ended up in a stronger position relative to other powers than before the crisis. The 1910s, the 1940s, and the 1980s were all high points of American global power and influence. Less than a decade ago, most observers spoke not of America’s decline but of its enduring primacy. In 2002, the historian Paul Kennedy, who in the late 1980s had written a much­discussed book on “the rise and fall of the great powers,” America included, declared that never in history had there been such a great “disparity of power” as between the United States and the rest of the world. Ikenberry agreed that “no other great power” had held “such formidable advantages in military, economic, technological, cultural, or political capabilities.... The preeminence of American power” was “unprecedented.” In 2004, the pundit Fareed Zakaria described the United States as enjoying a “comprehensive uni­polarity” unlike anything seen since Rome. But a mere four years later Zakaria was writing about the “post­American world” and “the rise of the rest,” and Kennedy was discoursing again upon the inevitability of American decline. Did the fundamentals of America’s relative power shift so dramatically in just a few short years? The answer is no. Let’s start with the basic indicators. In economic terms, and even despite the current years of recession and slow growth, America’s position in the world has not changed. Its share of the world’s GDP has held remarkably steady, not only over the past decade but over the past four decades. In 1969, the United States produced roughly a quarter of the world’s economic output. Today it still produces roughly a quarter, and it remains not only the largest but also the richest economy in the world. People are rightly mesmerized by the rise of China, India, and other Asian nations whose share of the global economy has been climbing steadily, but this has so far come almost entirely at the expense of Europe and Japan, which have had a declining share of the global economy. ￼Optimists about China’s development predict that it will overtake the United States as the largest economy in the world sometime in the next two decades. This could mean that the United States will face an increasing challenge to its economic position in the future. But the sheer size of an economy is not by itself a good measure of overall power within the international system. If it were, then early nineteenth­century China, with what was then the world’s largest economy, would have been the predominant power instead of the prostrate victim of smaller European nations. Even if China does reach this pinnacle again—and Chinese leaders face significant obstacles to sustaining the country’s growth indefinitely—it will still remain far behind both the United States and Europe in terms of per capita GDP.

### U.S. Hegemony Still Strong: Military

#### US military unmatched; maintaining hard power now
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Military capacity matters, too, as early nineteenth­century China learned and Chinese leaders know today. As Yan Xuetong recently noted, “military strength underpins hegemony.” Here the United States remains unmatched. It is far and away the most powerful nation the world has ever known, and there has been no decline in America’s relative military capacity—at least not yet. Americans currently spend less than $600 billion a year on defense, more than the rest of the other great powers combined. (This figure does not include the deployment in Iraq, which is ending, or the combat forces in Afghanistan, which are likely to diminish steadily over the next couple of years.) They do so, moreover, while consuming a little less than 4 percent of GDP annually—a higher percentage than the other great powers, but in historical terms lower than the 10 percent of GDP that the United States spent on defense in the mid­1950s and the 7 percent it spent in the late 1980s. The superior expenditures underestimate America’s actual superiority in military capability. American land and air forces are equipped with the most advanced weaponry, and are the most experienced in actual combat. They would defeat any competitor in a head­to­head battle. American naval power remains predominant in every region of the world. By these military and economic measures, at least, the United States today is not remotely like Britain circa 1900, when that empire’s relative decline began to become apparent. It is more like Britain circa 1870, when the empire was at the height of its power. It is possible to imagine a time when this might no longer be the case, but that moment has not yet arrived.

### Rise of the rest doesn’t threaten US hegemony

#### The increase of economic power by other nations only complements US soft power

Kagan 2012 (Robert , senior fellow in foreign policy at the Brookings Institution and a columnist for The Washington Post. The myth of American decline. January 11, 2012 http://www.tnr.com/article/politics/magazine/99521/america­world­power­declinism)

BUT WHAT ABOUT the “rise of the rest”—the increasing economic clout of nations like China, India, Brazil, and Turkey? Doesn’t that cut into American power and influence? The answer is, it depends. The fact that other nations in the world are enjoying periods of high growth does not mean that America’s position as the predominant power is declining, or even that “the rest” are catching up in terms of overall power and influence. Brazil’s share of global GDP was a little over 2 percent in 1990 and remains a little over 2 percent today. Turkey’s share was under 1 percent in 1990 and is still under 1 percent today. People, and especially businesspeople, are naturally excited about these emerging markets, but just because a nation is an attractive investment opportunity does not mean it is a rising great power. Wealth matters in international politics, but there is no simple correlation between economic growth and international influence. It is not clear that a richer India today wields greater influence on the global stage than a poorer India did in the 1950s under Nehru, when it was the leader of the Non­Aligned Movement, or that Turkey, for all the independence and flash of Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, really wields more influence than it did a decade ago. As for the effect of these growing economies on the position of the United States, it all depends on who is doing the growing. The problem for the British Empire at the beginning of the twentieth century was not its substantial decline relative to the United States, a generally friendly power whose interests did not fundamentally conflict with Britain’s. Even in the Western hemisphere, British trade increased as it ceded dominance to the United States. The problem was Britain’s decline relative to Germany, which aimed for supremacy on the European continent, and sought to compete with Britain on the high seas, and in both respects posed a threat to Britain’s core security. In the case of the United States, the dramatic and rapid rise of the German and Japanese economies during the Cold War reduced American primacy in the world much more than the more recent “rise of the rest.” America’s share of the world’s GDP, nearly 50 percent after World War II, fell to roughly 25 percent by the early 1970s, where it has remained ever since. But that “rise of the rest” did not weaken the United States. If anything, it strengthened it. Germany and Japan were and are close democratic allies, key pillars of the American world order. The growth of their economies actually shifted the balance irretrievably against the Soviet bloc and helped bring about its demise. When gauging the impact of the growing economies of other countries today, one has to make the same kinds of calculations. Does the growth of the Brazilian economy, or of the Indian economy, diminish American global power? Both nations are friendly, and India is increasingly a strategic partner of the United States. If America’s future competitor in the world is likely to be China, then a ￼richer and more powerful India will be an asset, not a liability, to the United States. Overall, the fact that Brazil, India, Turkey, and South Africa are enjoying a period of economic growth—which may or may not last indefinitely—is either irrelevant to America’s strategic position or of benefit to it. At present, only the growth of China’s economy can be said to have implications for American power in the future, and only insofar as the Chinese translate enough of their growing economic strength into military strength.

### True Hegemony has been a myth

#### Historically and empirically, the US has not always been able to influence others; we have “lost” our hegemony before
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IF THE UNITED STATES is not suffering decline in these basic measures of power, isn’t it true that its influence has diminished, that it is having a harder time getting its way in the world? The almost universal assumption is that the United States has indeed lost influence. Whatever the explanation may be—American decline, the “rise of the rest,” the apparent failure of the American capitalist model, the dysfunctional nature of American politics, the increasing complexity of the international system—it is broadly accepted that the United States can no longer shape the world to suit its interests and ideals as it once did. Every day seems to bring more proof, as things happen in the world that seem both contrary to American interests and beyond American control. And of course it is true that the United States is not able to get what it wants much of the time. But then it never could. Much of today’s impressions about declining American influence are based on a nostalgic fallacy: that there was once a time when the United States could shape the whole world to suit its desires, and could get other nations to do what it wanted them to do, and, as the political scientist Stephen M. Walt put it, “manage the politics, economics and security arrangements for nearly the entire globe.” If we are to gauge America’s relative position today, it is important to recognize that this image of the past is an illusion. There never was such a time. We tend to think back on the early years of the Cold War as a moment of complete American global dominance. They were nothing of the sort. The United States did accomplish extraordinary things in that era: the Marshall Plan, the NATO alliance, the United Nations, and the Bretton Woods economic system all shaped the world we know today. Yet for every great achievement in the early Cold War, there was at least one equally monumental setback. During the Truman years, there was the triumph of the Communist Revolution in China in 1949, which American officials regarded as a disaster for American interests in the region and which did indeed prove costly; if nothing else, it was a major factor in spurring North Korea to attack the South in 1950. But as Dean Acheson concluded, “the ominous result of the civil war in China” had proved “beyond the control of the ... United States,” the product of “forces which this country tried to influence but could not.” A year later came the unanticipated and unprepared­for North Korean attack on South Korea, and America’s intervention, which, after more than 35,000 American dead and almost 100,000 wounded, left the situation almost exactly as it had been before the war. In 1949, there came perhaps the worst news of all: the Soviet acquisition of the atomic bomb and the end of the nuclear monopoly on which American military strategy and defense budgeting had been predicated. A year later, NSC­68, the famous strategy document, warned of the growing gap between America’s military strength and its global strategic commitments. If current trends continued, it declared, the result would be “a serious decline in the strength of the free world relative to the Soviet Union and its satellites.” The “integrity and vitality of our system,” the document stated, was “in greater jeopardy than ever before in our history.” Douglas MacArthur, giving the keynote address at the Republican National Convention in 1952, lamented the “alarming change in the balance of world power,” “the rising burden of our fiscal commitments,” the ascendant power of the Soviet Union, “and our own relative decline.” In 1957, the Gaither Commission reported that the Russian economy was growing at a much faster pace than that of the United States and that by 1959 Russia would be able to hit American soil with one hundred intercontinental ballistic missiles, prompting Sam Rayburn, the speaker of the House, to ask, “What good are a sound economy and a balanced budget if we lose our national lives and Russian rubles become the coin of the land?” Nor was the United States always able to persuade others, even its closest allies, to do what it wanted, or to refrain from doing what it did not want. In 1949, Acheson tried and failed to prevent European allies, including the British, from recognizing Communist China. In 1954, the Eisenhower administration failed to get its way at the Geneva Conference on Vietnam and refused to sign the final accords. Two years later it tried to prevent the British, the French, and the Israelis from invading Egypt over the closure of the Suez Canal, only to see them launch an invasion without so much as a heads­up to Washington. When the United States confronted China over the islands of Quemoy and Matsu, the Eisenhower administration tried and failed to get a show of support from European allies, prompting John Foster Dulles to fear that NATO was “beginning to fall apart.” By the late 1950s, Mao believed the ￼United States was a superpower in decline, “afraid of taking on new involvements in the Third World and increasingly incapable of maintaining its hegemony over the capitalist countries.”

### True Economic Hegemony has been a myth

#### US cultural and economic influence has been inconsistent at best
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BUT WHAT ABOUT “soft power”? Wasn’t it true, as the political scientist Joseph S. Nye Jr. has argued, that the United States used to be able to “get what it wanted in the world” because of the “values expressed” by American culture as reflected through television, movies, and music, and because of the attractiveness of America’s domestic and foreign policies? These elements of soft power made other peoples around the world want to follow the United States, “admiring its values, emulating its example, aspiring to its level of prosperity and openness.” Again, the historical truth is more complicated. During the first three decades after World War II, great portions of the world neither admired the United States nor sought to emulate it, and were not especially pleased at the way it conducted itself in international affairs. Yes, American media were spreading American culture, but they were spreading images that were not always flattering. In the 1950s the world could watch televised images of Joseph McCarthy and the hunt for Communists in the State Department and Hollywood. American movies depicted the suffocating capitalist conformism of the new American corporate culture. Best­selling novels such as The Ugly American painted a picture of American bullying and boorishness. There were the battles over segregation in the 1950s and 1960s, the globally transmitted images of whites spitting at black schoolchildren and police setting their dogs on black demonstrators. (That “used to be us,” too.) The racism of America was practically “ruining” the American global image, Dulles feared, especially in the so­called Third World. In the late 1960s and early 1970s came the Watts riots, the assassinations of Martin Luther King Jr. and Robert Kennedy, the shootings at Kent State, and then the government­shaking scandal of Watergate. These were not the kinds of images likely to endear the United States to the world, no matter how many Jerry Lewis and Woody Allen movies were playing in Parisian cinemas. Nor did much of the world find American foreign policy especially attractive during these years. Eisenhower yearned “to get some of the people in these down­trodden countries to like us instead of hating us,” but the CIA­orchestrated overthrows of Mohammed Mossadegh in Iran and Jacobo Arbenz in Guatemala did not help. In 1957, demonstrators attacked the vice president’s motorcade in Venezuela, shouting, “Go away, Nixon!” “Out, dog!” “We won’t forget Guatemala!” In 1960, Khrushchev humiliated Eisenhower by canceling a summit when an American spy plane was shot down over Russia. Later that year, on his way to a “goodwill” visit in Tokyo, Eisenhower had to turn back in mid­flight when the Japanese government warned it could not guarantee his security against students protesting American “imperialism.” Eisenhower’s Democratic successors fared little better. John F. Kennedy and his wife were beloved for a time, but America’s glow faded after his assassination. Lyndon Johnson’s invasion of the Dominican Republic in 1965 was widely condemned not only in Latin America but also by European allies. De Gaulle warned American officials that the United States, like “all countries that had overwhelming power,” had come “to believe that force would solve everything” and would soon learn this was “not the case.” And then, of course, came Vietnam—the destruction, the scenes of napalm, the My Lai massacre, the secret incursion into Cambodia, the bombing of Hanoi, and the general perception of a Western colonialist superpower pounding a small but defiant Third World country into submission. When Johnson’s vice president, Hubert Humphrey, visited West Berlin in 1967, the American cultural center was attacked, thousands of students protested American policies, and rumors swirled of assassination attempts. In 1968, when millions of Europe’s youth took to the streets, they were not expressing their admiration for American culture. Nor were the great majority of nations around the world trying to emulate the American system. In the first decades of the Cold War, many were attracted to the state­controlled economies of the Soviet Union and China, which seemed to promise growth without the messy problems of democracy. The economies of the Soviet bloc had growth rates as high as those in the West throughout much of this period, largely due to a state­directed surge in heavy industry. According to Allen Dulles, the CIA director, many leaders in the Third World believed that the Soviet system “might have more to offer in the way of quick results than the U.S. system.” Dictators such as Egypt’s Nasser and Indonesia’s Sukarno found the state­dominated model especially attractive, but so did India’s Nehru. Leaders of the emerging Non­Aligned Movement—Nehru, Nasser, Tito, Sukarno, Nkrumah—expressed little admiration for American ways. After the death of Stalin, moreover, both the Soviet Union and China engaged in hot competition to win over the Third World, ￼taking “goodwill tours” and providing aid programs of their own. Eisenhower reflected that “the new Communist line of sweetness and light was perhaps more dangerous than their propaganda in Stalin’s time.” The Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson administrations worried constantly about the leftward tilt of all these nations, and lavished development aid on them in the hope of winning hearts and minds. They found that the aid, while eagerly accepted, guaranteed neither allegiance nor appreciation. One result of Third World animosity was that the United States steadily lost influence at the United Nations after 1960. Once the place where the American war in Korea was legitimized, from the 1960s until the end of the Cold War the U.N. General Assembly became a forum for constant expressions of anti­Americanism. In the late 1960s, Henry Kissinger despaired of the future. The “increased fragmentation of power, the greater diffusion of political activity, and the more complicated patterns of international conflict and alignment,” he wrote to Nixon, had sharply reduced the capacity of both superpowers to influence “the actions of other governments.” And things only seemed to get more difficult as the 1970s unfolded. The United States withdrew from Vietnam in defeat, and the world watched the first­ever resignation of an American president mired in scandal. And then, perhaps as significant as all the rest, world oil prices went through the roof.

### The past few decades demonstrate resilience in US hegemony

#### Empirically, US has overcome past challenges; has not affected their overall hegemony

Kagan 2012 (Robert , senior fellow in foreign policy at the Brookings Institution and a columnist for The Washington Post. The myth of American decline. January 11, 2012 http://www.tnr.com/article/politics/magazine/99521/america­world­power­declinism)

THE LAST PROBLEM pointed to a significant new difficulty: the inability of the United States to wield influence effectively in the Middle East. Today people point to America’s failure to bring Israelis and Palestinians to a negotiated settlement, or to manage the tumultuous Arab Awakening, as a sign of weakness and decline. But in 1973 the United States could not even prevent the major powers in the Middle East from engaging in all­out war. When Egypt and Syria launched their surprise attack on Israel, it was a surprise to Washington as well. The United States eventually had to go on nuclear alert to deter Soviet intervention in the conflict. The war led to the oil embargo, the establishment of OPEC as a major force in world affairs, and the sudden revelation that, as historian Daniel Yergin put it, “the United States itself was now, finally, vulnerable.” The “world’s foremost superpower” had been “thrown on the defensive, humiliated, by a handful of small nations.” Many Americans “feared that the end of an era was at hand.” In the 1970s, the dramatic rise in oil prices, coupled with American economic policies during the Vietnam War, led the American economy into a severe crisis. Gross national product fell by 6 percent between 1973 and 1975. Unemployment doubled from 4.5 percent to 9 percent. The American people suffered through gas lines and the new economic phenomenon of stagflation, combining a stagnant economy with high inflation. The American economy went through three recessions between 1973 and 1982. The “energy crisis” was to Americans then what the “fiscal crisis” is today. In his first televised address to the nation, Jimmy Carter called it “the greatest challenge our country will face during our lifetimes.” It was especially humiliating that the crisis was driven in part by two close American allies, the Saudi royal family and the Shah of Iran. As Carter recalled in his memoirs, the American people “deeply resented that the greatest nation on earth was being jerked around by a few desert states.” The low point came in 1979, when the Shah was overthrown, the radical Islamic revolution led by Ayatollah Khomeini came to power, and fifty­two Americans were taken hostage and held for more than a year. The hostage crisis, as Yergin has observed, “transmitted a powerful message: that the shift of power in the world oil market in the 1970s was only part of a larger drama that was taking place in global politics. The United States and the West, it seemed to say, were truly in decline, on the defensive, and, it appeared, unable to do anything to protect their interests, whether economic or political.” IF ONE WANTED to make a case for American decline, the 1970s would have been the time to do it; and many did. The United States, Kissinger believed, had evidently “passed its historic high point like so many earlier civilizations.... Every civilization that has ever existed has ultimately collapsed. History is a tale of efforts that failed.” It was in the 1970s that the American economy lost its overwhelming primacy, when the American trade surplus began to turn into a trade deficit, when spending on entitlements and social welfare programs ballooned, when American gold and monetary reserves were depleted. With economic difficulties came political and strategic insecurity. First came the belief that the tide of history was with the Soviet Union. Soviet leaders themselves believed the “correlation of forces” favored communism; the American defeat and withdrawal from Vietnam led Soviet officials, for the first time, to believe they might actually “win” in the long Cold War struggle. A decade later, in 1987, Paul Kennedy depicted both superpowers as suffering from “imperial overstretch,” but suggested that it was entirely possible that the United States would be the first to collapse, following a long historical tradition of exhausted and bankrupt empires. ￼It had crippled itself by spending too much on defense and taking on too many far­flung global responsibilities. But within two years the Berlin Wall fell, and two years after that the Soviet Union collapsed. The decline turned out to be taking place elsewhere. THEN THERE WAS the miracle economy of Japan. A “rise of the rest” began in the late 1970s and continued over the next decade and a half, as Japan, along with the other “Asian tigers,” South Korea, Singapore, and Taiwan, seemed about to eclipse the United States economically. In 1989, the journalist James Fallows argued that the Japanese state­directed economy was plainly superior to the more laissez­faire capitalism of the United States and was destined to surpass it. Japan was to be the next superpower. While the United States had bankrupted itself fighting the Cold War, the Japanese had been busy taking all the marbles. As the analyst Chalmers Johnson put it in 1995, “The Cold War is over, and Japan won.” Even as Johnson typed those words, the Japanese economy was spiraling downward into a period of stagnation from which it has still not recovered. With the Soviet Union gone and China yet to demonstrate the staying power of its economic boom, the United States suddenly appeared to be the world’s “sole superpower.” Yet even then it was remarkable how unsuccessful the United States was in dealing with many serious global problems. The Americans won the Gulf War, expanded NATO eastward, eventually brought peace to the Balkans, after much bloodshed, and, through most of the 1990s, led much of the world to embrace the “Washington consensus” on economics—but some of these successes began to unravel, and were matched by equally significant failures. The Washington consensus began to collapse with the Asian financial crisis of 1997, where American prescriptions were widely regarded as mistaken and damaging. The United States failed to stop or even significantly to retard the nuclear weapons programs of North Korea and Iran, despite repeatedly declaring its intention to do so. The sanctions regime imposed against Saddam Hussein’s Iraq was both futile and, by the end of the decade, collapsing. The United States, and the world, did nothing to prevent the genocide in Rwanda, partly because a year earlier the United States had been driven out of Somalia after a failed military intervention. One of the most important endeavors of the United States in the 1990s was the effort to support a transition in post­Soviet Russia to democracy and free­market capitalism. But despite providing billions of dollars and endless amounts of advice and expertise, the United States found events in Russia once again to be beyond its control. Nor were American leaders, even in the supposed heyday of global predominance, any more successful in solving the Israeli­ Palestinian problem than they are today. Even with a booming economy and a well­liked president earnestly working to achieve a settlement, the Clinton administration came up empty­handed. As the former Middle East peace negotiator Aaron David Miller recounts, Bill Clinton “cared more about and invested more time and energy in Arab­Israeli peace over a longer period of time than any of his predecessors,” and was admired and appreciated by both Israelis and Palestinians—and yet he held “three summits within six months and fail[ed] at every one.” Clinton’s term ended with the collapse of peace talks and the beginning of the second Palestinian intifada. Even popularity was elusive in the 1990s. In 1999, Samuel P. Huntington labeled America the “lonely superpower,” widely hated across the globe for its “intrusive, interventionist, exploitative, unilateralist, hegemonic, hypocritical” behavior. The French foreign minister decried the “hyperpower” and openly yearned for a “multipolar” world in which the United States would no longer be dominant. A British diplomat told Huntington: “One reads about the world’s desire for American leadership only in the United States. Everywhere else one reads about American arrogance and unilateralism.” THIS WAS NONSENSE, of course. Contrary to the British diplomat’s claim, many other countries did look to the United States for leadership, and for protection and support, in the 1990s and throughout the Cold War. The point is not that America always lacked global influence. From World War II onward, the United States was indeed the predominant power in the world. It wielded enormous influence, more than any great power since Rome, and it accomplished much. But it was not omnipotent—far from it. If we are to gauge accurately whether the United States is currently in decline, we need to have a reasonable baseline from which to measure. To compare American influence today with a mythical past of overwhelming dominance can only mislead us.

### US still a strong hegemon

####  The number of successes must be measured against the overall quality of the successes; US still has strong influence

Kagan 2012 (Robert , senior fellow in foreign policy at the Brookings Institution and a columnist for The Washington Post. The myth of American decline. January 11, 2012 http://www.tnr.com/article/politics/magazine/99521/america­world­power­declinism)

Today the United States lacks the ability to have its way on many issues, but this has not prevented it from enjoying just as much success, and suffering just as much failure, as in the past. For all the controversy, the United States has been more successful in Iraq ￼than it was in Vietnam. It has been just as incapable of containing Iranian nuclear ambitions as it was in the 1990s, but it has, through the efforts of two administrations, established a more effective global counter­proliferation network. Its efforts to root out and destroy Al Qaeda have been remarkably successful, especially when compared with the failures to destroy terrorist networks and stop terrorist attacks in the 1990s—failures that culminated in the attacks of September 11. The ability to employ drones is an advance over the types of weaponry—cruise missiles and air strikes—that were used to target terrorists and facilities in previous decades. Meanwhile America’s alliances in Europe remain healthy; it is certainly not America’s fault that Europe itself seems weaker than it once was. American alliances in Asia have arguably grown stronger over the past few years, and the United States has been able to strengthen relations with India that had previously been strained. So the record is mixed, but it has always been mixed. There have been moments when the United States was more influential than today and moments when it was less influential. The exertion of influence has always been a struggle, which may explain why, in every single decade since the end of World War II, Americans have worried about their declining influence and looked nervously as other powers seemed to be rising at their expense. The difficulties in shaping the international environment in any era are immense. Few powers even attempt it, and even the strongest rarely achieve all or even most of their goals. Foreign policy is like hitting a baseball: if you fail 70 percent of the time, you go to the Hall of Fame.

### China is a unique threat but can be contained

#### Allies assist US in keeping China in check; will not threaten US hegemony

Kagan 2012 (Robert , senior fellow in foreign policy at the Brookings Institution and a columnist for The Washington Post. The myth of American decline. January 11, 2012 http://www.tnr.com/article/politics/magazine/99521/america­world­power­declinism)

The challenges today are great, and the rise of China is the most obvious of them. But they are not greater than the challenges the United States faced during the Cold War. Only in retrospect can the Cold War seem easy. Americans at the end of World War II faced a major strategic crisis. The Soviet Union, if only by virtue of its size and location, seemed to threaten vital strategic centers in Europe, the Middle East, and East Asia. In all these regions, it confronted nations devastated and prostrate from the war. To meet this challenge, the United States had to project its own power, which was great but limited, into each of those regions. It had to form alliances with local powers, some of them former enemies, and provide them with economic, political, and military assistance to help them stand on their own feet and resist Soviet pressure. In the Cold War, the Soviets wielded influence and put pressure on American interests merely by standing still, while the United States had to scramble. It is worth recalling that this strategy of “containment,” now hallowed by its apparent success, struck some influential observers at the time as entirely unworkable. Walter Lippmann attacked it as “misconceived,” based on “hope,” conceding the “strategic initiative” to the Soviets while the United States exhausted its resources trying to establish “satellite states, puppet governments” that were weak, ineffective, and unreliable. Today, in the case of China, the situation is reversed. Although China is and will be much richer, and will wield greater economic influence in the world than the Soviet Union ever did, its geostrategic position is more difficult. World War II left China in a comparatively weak position from which it has been working hard to recover ever since. Several of its neighbors are strong nations with close ties to the United States. It will have a hard time becoming a regional hegemon so long as Taiwan remains independent and strategically tied to the United States, and so long as strong regional powers such as Japan, Korea, and Australia continue to host American troops and bases. China would need at least a few allies to have any chance of pushing the United States out of its strongholds in the western Pacific, but right now it is the United States that has the allies. It is the United States that has its troops deployed in forward bases. It is the United States that currently enjoys naval predominance in the key waters and waterways through which China must trade. Altogether, China’s task as a rising great power, which is to push the United States out of its present position, is much harder than America’s task, which is only to hold on to what it has.

### US military is not overstretched

#### Per capita military deployment not as great as in the past; no basis for doubt that is expressed

Kagan 2012 (Robert , senior fellow in foreign policy at the Brookings Institution and a columnist for The Washington Post. The myth of American decline. January 11, 2012 http://www.tnr.com/article/politics/magazine/99521/america­world­power­declinism)

Can the United States do that? In their pessimistic mood today, some Americans doubt that it can. Indeed, they doubt whether the United States can afford to continue playing in any part of the world the predominant role that it has played in the past. Some argue that while Paul Kennedy’s warning of imperial overstretch may not have been correct in 1987, it accurately describes America’s current predicament. The fiscal crisis, the deadlocked political system, the various maladies of American society (including wage stagnation and income inequality), the weaknesses of the educational system, the deteriorating infrastructure—all of these are cited these days as reasons why the United States needs to retrench internationally, to pull back from some overseas commitments, to focus on “nation building at home” rather than try to keep shaping the world as it has in the past. ￼AGAIN, THESE common assumptions require some examination. For one thing, how “overstretched” is the United States? The answer, in historical terms, is not nearly as much as people imagine. Consider the straightforward matter of the number of troops that the United States deploys overseas. To listen to the debate today, one might imagine there were more American troops committed abroad than ever before. But that is not remotely the case. In 1953, the United States had almost one million troops deployed overseas—325,000 in combat in Korea and more than 600,000 stationed in Europe, Asia, and elsewhere. In 1968, it had over one million troops on foreign soil—537,000 in Vietnam and another half million stationed elsewhere. By contrast, in the summer of 2011, at the height of America’s deployments in its two wars, there were about 200,000 troops deployed in combat in Iraq and Afghanistan combined, and another roughly 160,000 troops stationed in Europe and East Asia. Altogether, and including other forces stationed around the world, there were about 500,000 troops deployed overseas. This was lower even than the peacetime deployments of the Cold War. In 1957, for instance, there were over 750,000 troops deployed overseas. Only in the decade between the breakup of the Soviet empire and the attacks of September 11 was the number of deployed forces overseas lower than it is today. The comparison is even more striking if one takes into account the growth of the American population. When the United States had one million troops deployed overseas in 1953, the total American population was only 160 million. Today, when there are half a million troops deployed overseas, the American population is 313 million. The country is twice as large, with half as many troops deployed as fifty years ago.

### Economic cost of hegemony overestimated

#### Military spending insignificant part of GDP; cost of losing hegemony outweighs

Kagan 2012 (Robert , senior fellow in foreign policy at the Brookings Institution and a columnist for The Washington Post. The myth of American decline. January 11, 2012 http://www.tnr.com/article/politics/magazine/99521/america­world­power­declinism)

What about the financial expense? Many seem to believe that the cost of these deployments, and of the armed forces generally, is a major contributor to the soaring fiscal deficits that threaten the solvency of the national economy. But this is not the case, either. As the former budget czar Alice Rivlin has observed, the scary projections of future deficits are not “caused by rising defense spending,” much less by spending on foreign assistance. The runaway deficits projected for the coming years are mostly the result of ballooning entitlement spending. Even the most draconian cuts in the defense budget would produce annual savings of only $50 billion to $100 billion, a small fraction—between 4 and 8 percent—of the $1.5 trillion in annual deficits the United States is facing. In 2002, when Paul Kennedy was marveling at America’s ability to remain “the world’s single superpower on the cheap,” the United States was spending about 3.4 percent of GDP on defense. Today it is spending a little under 4 percent, and in years to come, that is likely to head lower again—still “cheap” by historical standards. The cost of remaining the world’s predominant power is not prohibitive. If we are serious about this exercise in accounting, moreover, the costs of maintaining this position cannot be measured without considering the costs of losing it. Some of the costs of reducing the American role in the world are, of course, unquantifiable. What is it worth to Americans to live in a world dominated by democracies rather than by autocracies? But some of the potential costs could be measured, if anyone cared to try. If the decline of American military power produced an unraveling of the international economic order that American power has helped sustain; if trade routes and waterways ceased to be as secure, because the U.S. Navy was no longer able to defend them; if regional wars broke out among great powers because they were no longer constrained by the American superpower; if American allies were attacked because the United States appeared unable to come to their defense; if the generally free and open nature of the international system became less so—if all this came to pass, there would be measurable costs. And it is not too far­fetched to imagine that these costs would be far greater than the savings gained by cutting the defense and foreign aid budgets by $100 billion a year. You can save money by buying a used car without a warranty and without certain safety features, but what happens when you get into an accident? American military strength reduces the risk of accidents by deterring conflict, and lowers the price of the accidents that occur by reducing the chance of losing. These savings need to be part of the calculation, too. As a simple matter of dollars and cents, it may be a lot cheaper to preserve the current level of American involvement in the world than to reduce it.

### Must work to guarantee hegemony works

#### The American political and economic system able to meet demands; empirically proven

Kagan 2012 (Robert , senior fellow in foreign policy at the Brookings Institution and a columnist for The Washington Post. The myth of American decline. January 11, 2012 http://www.tnr.com/article/politics/magazine/99521/america­world­power­declinism)

PERHAPS THE GREATEST concern underlying the declinist mood at large in the country today is not really whether the United States can afford to continue playing its role in the world. It is whether the Americans are capable of solving any of their most pressing economic and social problems. As many statesmen and commentators have asked, can Americans do what needs to be done to compete effectively in the twenty­first­century world? The only honest answer is, who knows? If American history is any guide, however, there is at least some reason to be hopeful. Americans have experienced this unease before, and many previous generations have also felt this sense of lost vigor and lost virtue: ￼as long ago as 1788, Patrick Henry lamented the nation’s fall from past glory, “when the American spirit was in its youth.” There have been many times over the past two centuries when the political system was dysfunctional, hopelessly gridlocked, and seemingly unable to find solutions to crushing national problems—from slavery and then Reconstruction, to the dislocations of industrialization at the end of the nineteenth century and the crisis of social welfare during the Great Depression, to the confusions and paranoia of the early Cold War years. Anyone who honestly recalls the 1970s, with Watergate, Vietnam, stagflation, and the energy crisis, cannot really believe that our present difficulties are unrivaled. Success in the past does not guarantee success in the future. But one thing does seem clear from the historical evidence: the American system, for all its often stultifying qualities, has also shown a greater capacity to adapt and recover from difficulties than many other nations, including its geopolitical competitors. This undoubtedly has something to do with the relative freedom of American society, which rewards innovators, often outside the existing power structure, for producing new ways of doing things; and with the relatively open political system of America, which allows movements to gain steam and to influence the behavior of the political establishment. The American system is slow and clunky in part because the Founders designed it that way, with a federal structure, checks and balances, and a written Constitution and Bill of Rights—but the system also possesses a remarkable ability to undertake changes just when the steam kettle looks about to blow its lid. There are occasional “critical elections” that allow transformations to occur, providing new political solutions to old and apparently insoluble problems. Of course, there are no guarantees: the political system could not resolve the problem of slavery without war. But on many big issues throughout their history, Americans have found a way of achieving and implementing a national consensus. When Paul Kennedy was marveling at the continuing success of the American superpower back in 2002, he noted that one of the main reasons had been the ability of Americans to overcome what had appeared to him in 1987 as an insoluble long­term economic crisis. American businessmen and politicians “reacted strongly to the debate about ‘decline’ by taking action: cutting costs, making companies leaner and meaner, investing in newer technologies, promoting a communications revolution, trimming government deficits, all of which helped to produce significant year­on­year advances in productivity.” It is possible to imagine that Americans may rise to this latest economic challenge as well.

### Other nations will also have problems

#### Other nations will have issues; may not be able to challenge

Kagan 2012 (Robert , senior fellow in foreign policy at the Brookings Institution and a columnist for The Washington Post. The myth of American decline. January 11, 2012 http://www.tnr.com/article/politics/magazine/99521/america­world­power­declinism)

It is also reasonable to expect that other nations will, as in the past, run into difficulties of their own. None of the nations currently enjoying economic miracles is without problems. Brazil, India, Turkey, and Russia all have bumpy histories that suggest the route ahead will not be one of simple and smooth ascent. There is a real question whether the autocratic model of China, which can be so effective in making some strategic decisions about the economy in the short term, can over the long run be flexible enough to permit adaptation to a changing international economic, political, and strategic environment. In sum: it may be more than good fortune that has allowed the United States in the past to come through crises and emerge stronger and healthier than other nations while its various competitors have faltered. And it may be more than just wishful thinking to believe that it may do so again.

### Must not be complacent about hegemony

#### Current world order is fragile; must not allow for US decline to maintain the current world order

Kagan 2012 (Robert , senior fellow in foreign policy at the Brookings Institution and a columnist for The Washington Post. The myth of American decline. January 11, 2012 http://www.tnr.com/article/politics/magazine/99521/america­world­power­declinism)

BUT THERE IS a danger. It is that in the meantime, while the nation continues to struggle, Americans may convince themselves that decline is indeed inevitable, or that the United States can take a time­out from its global responsibilities while it gets its own house in order. To many Americans, accepting decline may provide a welcome escape from the moral and material burdens that have weighed on them since World War II. Many may unconsciously yearn to return to the way things were in 1900, when the United States was rich, powerful, and not responsible for world order. The underlying assumption of such a course is that the present world order will more or less persist without American power, or at least with much less of it; or that others can pick up the slack; or simply that the benefits of the world order are permanent and require no special exertion by anyone. Unfortunately, the present world order—with its widespread freedoms, its general prosperity, and its absence of great power conflict—is as fragile as it is unique. Preserving it has been a struggle in every decade, and will remain a struggle in the decades to come. Preserving the present world order requires constant American leadership and constant American commitment. In the end, the decision is in the hands of Americans. Decline, as Charles Krauthammer has observed, is a choice. It is not an inevitable fate—at least not yet. Empires and great powers rise and fall, and the only question is when. But the when does matter.

### Entering an age of entropy or constant change

#### Both pessimists and optimists are wrong; world is entering a state of flux and change that is natural; wars will occur, but will not be nuclear

￼

Schweller 2011 (Randall, professor of political science at Ohio State University

Emerging Powers in an Age of Disorder, Global Governance; Jul-Sep2011, Vol. 17 Issue 3, p285- 297, 13p)

THE DRAMATIC RISE OF CHINA AND INDIA AMONG OTHERS HAS SET THE STAGE for a fundamental rethinking of world politics in an age of the waning domi-nance of US power as a force for remaking the world in its own image. While Pax Americana is not yet teetering on the edge of collapse, the consensus opin- ion is that the relative decline of the United States is probably irreversible and its unipolar moment will soon give way to something new. A “return to multi- polarity” is one way of describing this shift. It tells us that several great pow- ers will emerge to challenge US primacy. That is all. The more important question is: What sort of global order will emerge on the other side of the tran- sition from unipolarity to multipolarity? Will it be one of peace and plenty or conflict and scarcity? On this issue, experts are divided into two camps, pes- simists and optimists.Pessimists believe that the coming multipolar world—like the one that held sway over international politics from 1648 to 1945—will be permeated by problems of insecurity, rivalry, arms races, nationalism, and fierce compe- tition for scarce resources.1 Embedding their arguments in examinations of historical power shifts, such as those provoked by the rise of Napoleonic France or the unification of Germany in 1871, they predict that the United States and China will soon engage in an intense security competition with con- siderable potential for war. This “great-power conflict” forecast is grounded in the assumption that history unfolds in repeating cycles of global war that de- stroy the old international order and replace it with a new one. Consistent with the “time’s cycle” metaphor of history, time has no direction; apparent motions are merely stages of ever-present and never-changing cycles. The future, therefore, will resemble the past. In contrast, optimists see a smooth evolutionary transition from unipolar- ity to multipolarity, as the great powers, old and new, find ways to build and jointly manage a new global architecture that preserves the essential features of the existing liberal order.2 For them, multipolarity implies multilateralism. Embracing principles and practices of restraint, accommodation, reciprocity, and cooperation, the great powers will work in concert to establish mutually acknowledged roles and responsibilities to comanage an evolving but stable international order that benefits all of them. The return of multipolarity will usher in a new age of liberal peace, prosperity, and progress built on the rule of law. Swords will be beaten into ploughshares, and a harmony of interests will reign among the states and peoples of the world. It is a vision of “great- power concert,” grounded in the assumption that history moves forward in a progressive direction—one consistent with the “time’s arrow” metaphor of historical direction.3 I argue that the prediction of great-power conflict is overly pessimistic, whereas the expectation of a great-power concert is too hopeful. Fears that China’s rise will incite war with the United States are unwarranted. The de- structiveness of nuclear weapons and the benefits of economic globalization have made war among the great powers unthinkable. The cycle of hegemonic war and change has been replaced by a perpetual peace, just as liberals claim. Ironically, this is precisely why optimists are too sanguine about the future. In- ternational order—particularly one that is legitimate, efficient, and dynamic— requires periodic global wars, roughly every 100 years or so. Otherwise, inertia and decay set in. Hegel pointed this out in 1821: “War is not to be re- garded as an absolute evil. Just as the blowing of the winds preserves the sea from foulness which would be the result of a long calm, so also corruption in nations would be the result of prolonged, let alone ‘perpetual,’ peace.”4 Whether domestic or international, political systems undisturbed by war can- not cleanse and renew themselves; like still seas, they become foul. This is the essential logic of the second law of thermodynamics or en- tropy, which asserts that a closed system’s total energy consists of two sepa- rate parts: energy that is available for work (useful or free energy) and energy that is unavailable for work (useless or bound energy). Thermodynamic en- tropy measures the disorganization in a system. Over time, the energy con- tained in a closed system becomes distributed in the most probable pattern with all individual particles engaged in random, disordered motion. As colli- sions cause bodies to exchange heat, this “most probable pattern” is a state of equal energy among particles. Taken to its logical extreme, entropy is a one- way path to destruction, for the second law dooms the earth to thermodynamic “heat-death.” Outside the domain of physics, entropy appears as a commonsense statis- tical law of probability, positing that events with a high frequency occur more often than events with low frequency. Closed systems proceed from initial states of low probability (order) to end states of highest probability (disorder). Once maximum entropy is reached, the system stays there forever, never re- turning to its initial state. The law of increasing entropy means that order in the universe is being relentlessly replaced by increasing disorder. This general formulation of the concept is known as information entropy. Using information entropy as a metaphor of historical movement, the world is neither going to hell nor being delivered to the promised land. It is, instead, heading for a place akin to a perpetual state of purgatory—a chaotic realm of unknowable complexity and increasing disorder. We are entering what might be called an “age of entropy,” an apt metaphor (but just a metaphor, nonetheless) because it captures the flattening and chaotic nature of the world as well as the rise of bounded power, similar to useless energy. Suc- cumbing to the unstemmable tide of increasing entropy, world politics is being subsumed by the forces of randomness and enervation, wearing away its order, variety, and dynamism. Let us call this “time’s entropy.”5

### Major theories of loss of hegemony disagree

#### Three major theories of hegemonic decline disagree because of differences in underlying assumptions; must look to empirical examples to legitimize theories

Schweller 2011 (Randall, professor of political science at Ohio State University

Emerging Powers in an Age of Disorder, Global Governance; Jul-Sep2011, Vol. 17 Issue 3, p285- 297, 13p)

World Politics in the Age of Entropy All three models—great-power conflict, great-power concert, and time’s entropy—expect concentrated power to diffuse over time. They disagree, however, about the likely consequences of deconcentrated power. The great- power conflict model sees it triggering a systemwide war among the great powers. The great-power concert scenario expects the current order to be pre- served by means of multilateral bargains and common understandings among the great powers. In contrast, time’s entropy predicts a dysfunctional world muddling through on automatic pilot; its old architecture becoming creakier and more resistant to change. New rules and arrangements will be simply piled on top of old ones. And because there will be no locus of international authority to adjudicate among competing claims or to decide which rules, norms, and principles should predominate,order will become increasingly scarce. The Roles of Emerging Powers: Spoilers, Supporters, or Shirkers The reason why the models disagree over the consequences of power diffu- sion is that they make very different assumptions about the interests and roles of emerging powers. Great-power conflict assumes that emerging pow- ers will be spoilers; great-power concert sees them as supporters; and time’s entropy assumes that emerging powers are conflicted states that may play all three roles—spoiler, supporter, or shirker—depending on the issue and the audience.

### Great power conflict theory flawed

#### Emerging powers will not invite conflict; not in their best interest to do so

Schweller 2011 (Randall, professor of political science at Ohio State University

Emerging Powers in an Age of Disorder, Global Governance; Jul-Sep2011, Vol. 17 Issue 3, p285- 297, 13p)

Great-power Conflict: Emerging Powers as Spoilers According to the great-power conflict model, rising powers are invariably spoilers, hell-bent on revising the international order. It is an assumption rooted in power transition theory, the core logic behind “hegemonic-war cycle” notions of system change.6 In brief, the theory goes as follows. Given the law of uneven growth among states, a gap emerges over time between the actual distribution of power in the system and its distribution of prestige (or reputation for power), throwing the system into disequilibrium and causing persistent instability. To peacefully restore system equilibrium, the waning hegemon must cede influence to the rising challenger to the point where the latter’s prestige matches its actual power.7 In theory, this process of appease- ment should solve the problem without resort to war. In practice, it rarely works because: (1) satisfying a rising power’s legitimate demands often means compromising the stability of the existing international order as well as the se- curity and vital interests of the declining hegemon and its allies; (2) the rising power advances illegitimate grievances; (3) concessions increase the rising challenger’s actual power, which encourages it to demand more concessions. For the declining hegemon, such a process of granting one concession after an- other to its rival and peer competitor amounts to little more than death on the installment plan. When bargaining fails to resolve the system crisis, hegemonic war breaks out because either: (1) the rising challenger perceives that its demands have not been met and, given its newfound relative power, the benefits of war now outweigh the costs; or (2) the declining hegemon believes that war is in- evitable and better fought now than later so it initiates a preventive war against the rising challenger. Regardless of who initiates it, the war will be one of un- limited means and scope to decide who designs and controls the postwar order.8 The main driver of the theory is the emergence of a rising challenger— one dissatisfied not only with its place in the established order, but with the le- gitimacy of the order itself. The insatiable revisionism of the rising challenger triggers persistent crises that eventually ignite a hegemonic war. Yet the logic behind this “spoiler” assumption is quite murky and, frankly, somewhat illogical. By definition, rising powers are doing better than everyone else under the current order. It is not obvious, therefore, why they (of all states) would seek to spoil the established order; why they would choose an enormously costly global war of uncertain outcome to overthrow an order that has demonstrably worked for them, only to replace it with an untested one that they (and no one else) must pay the costs to start up and manage. What are they so dissatisfied about that they are willing to risk all the gains that they have made to this point and will make in the future? The theory attributes their revisionist aims and general dissatisfaction with the status quo to the disjuncture between actual power and prestige. But prestige matters most when powerful states have se- rious material conflicts of interests, disagreements over the rules of the game, and expectations that their differences will be settled by fighting. Such con- flicts and expectations are largely absent today and do not appear fated to emerge in the future.

### Power conflict theory empirically incorrect

#### Power conflict theory assumes that new hegemon will not only embrace the prestige of the new position, but accept responsibilities as well; US empirically disproves, and China not likely to assume responsible role

Schweller 2011 (Randall, professor of political science at Ohio State University

Emerging Powers in an Age of Disorder, Global Governance; Jul-Sep2011, Vol. 17 Issue 3, p285- 297, 13p)

Moreover, with prestige comes international responsibilities and obliga- tions. Yet the great-power conflict model does not recognize this trade-off. Consequently, it expects all rising powers to demand prestige commensurate with their relative growth in capabilities. After all, if gains in prestige come without a price, as the model assumes, rising powers have nothing to lose by demanding more of it. Consider the last time that hegemonic leadership changed hands. A de- clining Britain—one gravely imperiled by threats in Europe and elsewhere and too weak to both defend its interests and manage the international system— grudgingly decided that it was time to pass the baton of global leadership to the United States. The handoff was dropped, however, because the United States demanded unparalleled prestige, but was unwilling to pay the price of increased global responsibilities and obligations associated with an exalted po- sition in the international pecking order. It took the attack by Japan at Pearl Harbor to bring the United States out of its isolationist shell. In the immediate postwar period (1945–1952), the United States emerged as a reluctant hege- mon, grudgingly assuming leadership because it was the only victor able to construct a new global order. Even then, the United States dreamed of creat- ing a third pole in Europe so it could return to the womb of the Western Hemi- sphere. It was the failure of this plan and the emergence of a powerful nonliberal enemy, not an appetite for prestige, that finally drove the United States to manage its half of the international order. Roughly the same problem exists today. The United States complains that China wants the privileges of power, but not the responsibilities that top dogs are obligated to perform. To many Western observers, China appears as a shirker that must be coerced into taking appropriate actions when global crises arise. But the United States only assumed global responsibilities many years after it became the most powerful state on Earth, when it produced almost one- half of the world’s total economic output—a relative power position that China is not even close to achieving at this stage in its development. Why, then, should Washington, DC, or anyone else expect China, which produces roughly 8 percent of the world’s total economic output, to make substantial contribu- tions to global governance?

### Great power concert theory flawed

#### Great power concert assumes that emerging powers and existing hegemon will cooperate for a smooth transition; the transition will fail because the emerging powers will not want the social or financial responsibility

Schweller 2011 (Randall, professor of political science at Ohio State University

Emerging Powers in an Age of Disorder, Global Governance; Jul-Sep2011, Vol. 17 Issue 3, p285- 297, 13p)

Great-power Concert: Emerging Powers as Supporters Liberals believe that the transition from unipolarity to multipolarity will unfold smoothly because the world is primed for peace: great-power security is plen- tiful, territory is devalued, and a robust liberal consensus exists among the es- tablished powers—one ensconced in a thick ensemble of global institutions that put strict limits on the returns to power. Operating within this benign interna- tional setting, the emerging poles will be driven more by the prospect of max- imizing their own absolute gains than by fear of relative losses or the temptation to make gains at each other’s expense. A restored global balance will arise, therefore, without traditional “hard” balancing in the system’s core. Con- sistent with these propositions, the great-power concert model assumes that emerging powers will be supporters—so-called responsible stakeholders—of the Western liberal order. There are two problems with this assumption. First, integrating new powers within existing international institutions is trickier than the model assumes. Rising non-Western powers do not always share the US view on global governance; it is unreasonable to expect them to adopt wholesale the principles, norms, and rules of an inherited Western order. And even when the basic interests of the established and emerging powers align, their priorities may differ. For example, both China and the United States would like to see North Korea’s nuclear program dismantled. But Washington places a high priority on this objective whereas Beijing de- sires first and foremost to maintain good relations with Pyongyang. The bot- tom line is that principled differences and mismatched priorities between established and emerging powers, and between emerging powers themselves, suggest that multipolarity does not necessarily imply cooperative and suc- cessful multilateralism.9 Second, “catching up” requires the rising state to focus most of its ener- gies on internal matters such as promoting sustainable economic and social de- velopment, redressing the domestic imbalances caused by dramatic and sudden economic growth, and managing the often dangerous socioeconomic dislocations associated with rapid urbanization of the population. Because ac- cepting costly international commitments can jeopardize these domestic plans and demands, rising powers are reluctant to actively support the established order. They would prefer, instead, that the declining hegemon pay the costs of order while they ride free. To the extent that free-riding incentives prevail, the established and emerging powers are less likely to comanage the international system than to clash over the questions: Who has responsibilities for what? What is a fair contribution to the collective good? Who decides whether a global initiative is a collective good? Tensions can be expected to mount in the system’s core, as the declining hegemon cajoles rising powers to accept more of the responsibilities for meeting global challenges while they, in turn, de- mand greater voice and representation but shirk their fair share of global bur- dens. Meanwhile, the process of power diffusion will continue to flatten the world, producing a more balanced multipolarity with no single dominant power capable of providing global order. Frustrated by the shirking of its peer competitors and seeking to arrest its own decline, the hegemon will eventually retrench from its global commitments, leaving no state or group of states in charge of the international order or whatever remains of it. The system will then be on automatic pilot.

### China will play both role of supporter and spoiler

#### China emerging role as world leader is a confusing one; may never realize true potential

Schweller 2011 (Randall, professor of political science at Ohio State University

Emerging Powers in an Age of Disorder, Global Governance; Jul-Sep2011, Vol. 17 Issue 3, p285- 297, 13p)

Time’s Entropy: Emerging Powers as Conflicted States Unlike the other models, time’s entropy does not assume one dominant role for emerging powers. Rather, it sees rising powers as conflicted states with multi- ple identities, variously adopting all three roles—supporters, spoilers, and shirkers—depending on the particular issue and the targeted audience (e.g., domestic, regional, South-South, or global). Consider China and the issue of what it means to become a “responsi- ble” international stakeholder. Many Chinese analysts argue (consistent with the shirker role) that it is still a developing country and does not have the ca- pabilities to become fully engaged in global governance. Others are down- right suspicious of global governance, viewing it as a trap laid by the West to retard and restrain China’s growth by tying it down with overseas commit- ments and bleeding it white with foreign entanglements unrelated to its na- tional interests. If this view gains ascendance, it means we will soon see a different Chinese policy—one signaling that China is starting to embrace the role of spoiler. The official view, delivered by Foreign Minister Yang Jiechi in a 2010 speech before 300 leading diplomats and several senior US offi- cials, is that: A more developed China will undertake more international responsibilities and will never pursue interests at the expense of others. We know full well that in this interdependent world, China’s future is closely linked to that of the world. Our own interests and those of others are best served when we work together to expand common interests, share responsibilities, and seek win-win outcomes. This is why focusing on its own development, China is undertaking more and more international responsibilities commensurate with its strength and status.10 Here, China sounds comfortable with the role of supporter and happy to contribute to global governance, which serves its own interests as well as those of the international community. In the same speech, however, Yang assertively declares—in terms more consistent with a spoiler than a supporter—that China is getting stronger on the international stage; that the United States was violating international law by a proposed $6.4 billion arms sale to Taiwan, calling it a “violation of the code of conduct among nations” and threatening for the first time retaliatory sanctions on US firms that supply arms; that China’s television and radio news service contains “more solid” and reliable news than Western media; and that China is not ready to address sanctions on Iran’s nuclear program.11 The truth is that China, like the other emerging powers, does not yet have a fixed role or identity, which may explain why there is no official Chinese Communist Party (CCP) document that lays out a grand strategy for China’s future. China, like most of the emerging powers, is a conflicted state with a po- litical discourse grounded in several ideological strands: (1) conservative pragmatism—the dominant ideology among China’s ruling elites, but one that lacks programmatic ideas to guide policy and political action; (2) national- ism—fueled by the media and growing tensions between China and the West over human rights and China’s rising power, nationalism has become the dom- inant ideology among the Chinese masses; (3) the new left—a minor ideolog- ical force championed by neo-Marxist and neo-Maoist academics; and (4) liberalism—a marginalized ideology, but one that remains, over the long run, the most serious threat to the CCP regime because it is the most coherent and programmatic of all the competing ideologies in China. Moreover, China’s continued rise, like those of the other emerging pow- ers, is not a given. Without fundamental political reforms, China may succumb to the limits of developmental autocracy—what Minxin Pei calls a “trapped transition” wherein the neoauthoritarian regime exhausts its political and eco- nomic vitality, undermining state capacity, heightening social tension, and threatening regime collapse. Unless it breaks with its authoritarian past, it is quite possible that “China may not only fail to fully realize its potential, but also descend into a long-term stagnation.”12

### India will play supporter role

#### India has several visions; the one most likely to survive is the one that places it in a supporting role for US hegemony and multi-polarity

Schweller 2011 (Randall, professor of political science at Ohio State University

Emerging Powers in an Age of Disorder, Global Governance; Jul-Sep2011, Vol. 17 Issue 3, p285- 297, 13p)

India: The Likely Supporter Like China, India has several competing visions of its role in the international system: (1) moralists—a Nehruvian vision that sees India serving as a moral exemplar of principled action in world politics, striving to make the interna- tional order more egalitarian in both distributive and political terms; (2) Hindu nationalists—who want to resurrect the glory of India by cultivating national strength, which, they believe, is rooted not only in military and economic de- velopment but ultimately in the noble and heroic virtues of Hindu society; (3) realists—who want India to develop its military and economic capabilities, es- pecially a credible second-strike nuclear capability and conventional forces with the capacity to project force beyond the subcontinent; and (4) liberals— who, desiring India to become a great commercial power once again, empha- size interdependence fostered by globalization as the key to a prosperous India, which should model itself more on postwar Europe than contemporary China or the United States.13 These four visions have strikingly different views of the existing interna- tional order. Only the liberal vision, which seeks reform but not wholesale re- vision of the inherited Western order, is entirely consistent with a supporter or stakeholder role. The moralist vision represents the most revisionist critique of the existing order, which it views as fundamentally unjust in terms of its prin- ciples and means (its reliance on military power rather than peaceful moral suasion). That said, there is a growing consensus in India that the moralist vi- sion has failed. Conversely, the Hindu nationalists and realists want India to do whatever it takes to become a leading great power. With respect to the ex- isting international order, they are only contingently revisionist, finding them- selves at odds with just the aspects of the current order that complicate India’s rise (e.g., nuclear nonproliferation).14 While these visions will wax and wane with circumstances, India appears as the most likely junior partner of the United States and strongest candidate to play a supporter role within an emerg- ing multipolar, but still liberal, international order.

### Brazil in the role of spoiler

#### Brazil will work with other countries to challenge US dominance; less likely to cooperate in the future

Schweller 2011 (Randall, professor of political science at Ohio State University

Emerging Powers in an Age of Disorder, Global Governance; Jul-Sep2011, Vol. 17 Issue 3, p285- 297, 13p)

Brazil: The Rising Spoiler Brazil accounts for over 50 percent of South America’s wealth, population, ter- ritory, and military budgets, making it more relatively powerful in its region than China, India, and Germany are in theirs. Over the past fifteen years, Brazil has moved from the fourteenth to the seventh position in the world economy. Though it is thriving within the current international order, Brazil is nonetheless the most revisionist of all the emerging powers. Consider Brazil’s foreign policies over the past decade. In 2001, it turned down George W. Bush’s offer of a position in an extended Group of 7, claim- ing that the price for a seat at the top table was too high. Since 2000, Brazil’s foreign minister has visited the Middle East twenty-four times, arguing that the United States is no longer the “indispensable nation” in the region. With respect to nuclear proliferation, Brazil sees the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) regime as a “politically driven tool in the hands of the United States to selectively ‘lay down the law’ on weaker states.”15 Brasilia asks: Why should Iran be punished for its civilian enrichment technology whereas Israel, which has bombs in the basement, and India, which has chosen to cri- tique and remain outside the NPT regime, get big rewards from Washington, DC? Indeed, Brazilian elites do not describe the Western global order in terms of multilateralism and inclusion, but rather as an imposed order ruled by pow- erful Anglo-Saxon states, which use international institutions and arbitrarily enforced rules to control weaker, non-Western states. Global hierarchy, in their eyes, is less a function of material power than of race. Little wonder, at the height of the 2008 global financial crisis, Brazilian president, Luiz Inacio Lula da Silva declared: “This crisis was created by white men with blue eyes.” He went on to say that he had never met a black banker.16 In March 2010, US secretary of state Hillary Clinton, concerned over the budding relationship between Brazil and Iran, visited Brasilia, seeking support for stronger sanctions on Iran’s nuclear program in what was billed as an ef- fort to forge ties with a country that is increasingly emerging as a recognized global power and fellow democracy. The rhetoric of partnership came easier than the reality, however. Brazil’s foreign minister Celso Amorim and Presi- dent Lula refused to condemn activities that they believe any rising power has the right to engage in. Few were surprised by the outcome. Brazil has consistently preferred a diplomatic approach to sanctions (which it sees as a step toward military force) and has demanded proof that Iran is constructing a weapon and not simply working on mastering peaceful nuclear technologies. More generally, relations between Washington and Brasilia have been strained in recent years. In addi- tion to tensions over Iran, especially after Iranian president Mahmoud Ah- madinejad was warmly welcomed in Brasilia in November 2009, the US-Brazil relationship has fallen victim to disagreements over Honduras, mil- itary bases in Colombia, and the World Trade Organization cotton dispute, coloring Washington’s perceptions of Brazil as more of an emerging rival than a true partner. The larger and more ominous message is that Brazil and the other leading democracies of the South and East—Mexico, South Africa, India, and Indonesia among them—are ready to flex their muscles and show the world that they will no longer routinely comply with US or European desires. “We will not simply bow down to the evolving consensus if we do not agree,” de- clared Brazil’s foreign minister.17 The repercussions go well beyond support for sanctions against Iran in the Security Council. Two years ago, Washington was abuzz with the prospects for a “league of democracies” that would support US global lead- ership. In the aftermath of Cyclone Nargis that devastated Myanmar, how- ever, a rift opened between the democracies of the advanced North and West, which supported intervention on humanitarian grounds, and the democracies of the South and East, which lined up behind China’s call for defending state sovereignty. Indeed, political autonomy from the United States and Europe has become a common theme among the emerging countries of Brazil, Russia, India, and China (BRIC)—all of whom dream of becoming au- tonomous global players, which means cutting their umbilical cords to the West. Brazil’s grand strategy consists of South-South alliances and agree- ments with nontraditional partners (e.g., China, the Asia Pacific, Africa, East- ern Europe, and the Middle East) to avoid asymmetric external relations with powerful countries—especially the United States, for which Brazil harbors the same resentments that many Latin Americans have for the exercise of US power in their region. This rebellious spirit was evident in the Doha Round of trade talks and in the ongoing climate change negotiations where Brazil and the other emerging democracies of the South and East have been more re- ceptive to Beijing’s than Washington’s positions. In a surprise agreement announced on 16 May 2010, Iran agreed to ship its low-enriched uranium to Turkey, complicating the Barack Obama adminis- tration’s efforts to ratify international sanctions against Iran. Under the new deal, negotiated at a three-way meeting that included Brazilian president Lulu and Turkish prime minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan, Iran would ship 2,640 pounds of low-enriched uranium to Turkey for storage. In exchange, after one year, Iran would be eligible to receive 265 pounds of material enriched in France and Russia. An Iranian foreign ministry spokesman said that the coun- try would continue to enrich uranium on its own. Iran’s apparent cooperation with the new agreement makes it less likely that Russia and China will support tougher sanctions against Iran in the UN Security Council and puts President Obama in the awkward position of potentially rejecting a deal that is nearly identical to one he negotiated months earlier. Instead of showcasing the deter- mination of the “international community,” the Obama administration’s drive for sanctions against Iran has run into a BRIC wall precisely because it looks like a Euro-Atlantic initiative. Efforts for a new, stronger sanctions resolution against Iran are hitting not only the expected resistance from China and Rus- sia, but reluctance on the part of Turkey and India whose private sectors show little enthusiasm for severing commercial relations with Tehran.18

### New multipolarity will be peaceful

#### New multipolarity different from past challenges; little common interests will reduce conflicts with one another

Conclusion Let me end on a hopeful note. When India, China, Brazil, the European Union, Russia, Japan, and possibly Turkey join the United States as members of the great-power club, we will have entered the first truly global epoch of world politics. Past international systems that contained several great powers were merely regional European systems, not global ones. Europe was the core; everything else was considered the periphery. True, Japan and the United States eventually became poles, but they were minor players that arrived late in the game. Europe was center court, where the top players competed with each other. Compared with past multipolar systems, the global nature of the coming world will afford the great powers more space to maneuver without stepping on each other’s toes, making it relatively easy for them to carve out mutually exclusive spheres of influence. Colliding territorial interests will be a less fre- quent and intense problem than it was under old-style multipolarity. Related to the unique global character of the coming world, future great powers will be much larger than past ones under European-style multipolarity. In terms of territory and population, India and China dwarf France, Prussia or Germany, Britain, Italy, and Austria-Hungary. Only Russia and the United States—the two continental-sized flank states—were comparable in size to India and China today, and they quickly outstripped their European counter- parts to become superpowers after World War II. The supersized nature of the coming great powers will produce a qualita- tive change in their expected behaviors. Unlike past great powers, they will not need more territory or population to compete with each other; there will be no imperial temptations for them to resist. Rather, the key to realizing their po- tential power will be internal growth and consolidation—processes best facil- itated by a quiescent international setting.

### Violence since WWII has decreased

#### Claims stating that violence is significant are erroneous; violence trends have been decreasing since WWII; US hegemony and democracies are reasons

Russett 2010 (Bruce, professor of international relations at Yale University, Peace in the Twenty-First Century? CURRENT HISTORY • January 2010, AS)

￼One of the least-recognized global trends shows of the past 60 years is a decline in the number and especially the severity of violent conflicts between and within states. Daily news reports may seem to cast doubt on this trend’s existence, but data collected by researchers on conflict, violence, and war clearly show that it is real. Certainly, when it comes to conflict, no one should be nostalgic for the supposed good old days of the cold war. Thanks to some mixture of intelligence and luck, no civilization-ending nuclear war occurred. Still, we are reminded in a recent book by Michael Dobbs—One Minute to Midnight: Kennedy, Khrushchev, and Castro on the Brink of Nuclear War—how close we came. At the height of the Cuban Missile Crisis, the United States reached the highest level of war readiness short of nuclear war itself. During the cold war era, moreover, the Soviet Union and the United States, along with their allies and proxies, managed to kill millions of people—mostly in very poor countries. Yet even these conflicts inflicted considerably fewer fatali- ties than did earlier wars in the twentieth century. (Indeed, even the conflicts left over from World War II—chiefly the Greek and Chinese civil wars—left a record of casualties subsequently exceeded only by the Korean War.) Figure 1 on the next page shows the huge decline in deaths overall, in both civil and international wars, since 1946. A longer-term perspective is even more striking, since it takes into account the two world wars, which set the past century’s records for fatalities. Figure 2 on page 13 shows that during World War II the average person’s risk of dying in battle over the whole world was close to 0.3 percent—about 50 times higher than in any of the most recent 15 years. This longer view makes it clear that the decline in war-related deaths starting with the end of the cold war is not just a temporary spike downward. What if we extend our view beyond battle deaths to consider one-sided, organized, deliberate killings of civilians? Even when we take into account slaughters like the Cambodian and Rwandan genocides, the evidence tracks well with a bumpy but nonetheless steady and very sharp decline in fatalities since the horrors of World War II. Or how about global terrorism? In fact, despite the publicity that terrorism attracts, it produces relatively low numbers of deaths. Many fatalities often counted among the recent victims of terror- ism are already included under wars in Figure 1, in Afghanistan and especially Iraq. When these deaths are not double-counted, the worldwide total of fatalities from terrorism since 2000 has held steady at about 5,000 a year. This represents less than 10 percent of the Figure 1 totals since 2000. It is a blip not even discernible in Figure 2. In short, something extraordinary has happened. We cannot know for certain, of course, that the decline in war deaths will continue. The trend might even be reversed, perhaps if a few really big terrorist attacks take place. Even so, it would take an enormous increase in carnage to match either World War II’s death toll or what we barely escaped in the cold war. And in the meantime, some other extraordinary things have occurred in recent decades—economic and political developments that, it is plausible to argue, have made a huge contribution to reducing organized violence, and may help hold it down in the future. ￼￼One of these developments is a rise in income levels and living standards around most of the world. Greater prosperity makes people less des- perate and increases the costs of engaging in conflict. Where poverty is greatest (Africa), so is political violence. This fact alone does not prove a causal connection, but the theory and the evidence for such a connection are very strong. Another possibility is that American hegemony has tamped down the ability and willingness of others to embark on large-scale violence. Maybe. We have certainly witnessed a short-term relation- ship between the end of the bipolar, cold war era and a decline in warfare. But the causal attribution between these two developments is questionable because the downward trend in war dates back to the end of World War II.

### Democracy key factor for peace

#### Democracies reduce violence because they have to be accountable to their constituents

Russett 2010 (Bruce, professor of international relations at Yale University, Peace in the Twenty-First Century? CURRENT HISTORY • January 2010, AS)

The democracy dividend

I am inclined to give stronger credit for the decline in warfare to factors identified by Immanuel Kant, the eighteenth century philoso- pher who was one of history’s greatest internation- al relations theorists. The title of his famous essay, Perpetual Peace, may sound squishy and naïve, but the work’s substance is solid.

Kant was not just a theorist. He was a keen observer of governments, and of individual behav- ior. As a professor at the University of Königsberg, he taught anthropology and geography, among other subjects, and knew a lot about human behavior in many cultures. He lived in a trading city on the Baltic Sea that had once been a member of the Hanseatic League, an alliance of republics and other city-states.

Kant’s ambition was to identify the circum- stances under which peace might be secured— without establishing a world government, which he regarded as likely to become a “soulless tyr- anny.” So he was not a utopian thinker, but one who, in his own words, wanted to establish the conditions under which devils would act like angels because it was in their interest to do so. He did not expect to change devils’ ways of thinking, just their incentives.

Kant identified three key characteristics that led countries to maintain peace, especially peace with similar countries: democracy (characterized by representative government, with separation of powers), commerce, and intergovernmental orga- nizations (IGOs) and international law. Effectively these are the key elements of what we now call globalization. In recent decades they have been growing in the world—and have done so at the same time that the number and severity of armed conflicts have been declining. This is good news. First, see Figure 3, on the spread of democracy and the relative decline of dictatorships (autocracies). In the 1940s, dictatorships outnumbered democracies in the world, but now more than half of all countries are democratic. The rest are either dictatorships or in a middle group called “anocracies,” featuring mixed forms of government, often with weak central authorities. Why does this trend matter in terms of international security? Because democracies, though they are not necessarily peaceful in general, are peaceful toward each other. Considerable evidence supports this assertion, and several plausible explanations for it are avail- able. Different analysts favor different explana- tions, and as with most social phenomena, more than one influence probably operates. Perhaps the best explanation is that democratic leaders, or their parties, have to face reelection contests. If they fight long wars that are costly to a broad population—especially wars of choice rather than in self- defense against attack—they risk defeat at the polls. The leaders of any two democracies operate under the same electoral constraint, and they know this of each other.

In addition, democracies generally are good war fighters; they win most of￼￼￼ their wars, including nearly 90 percent of those they initiate. They are

often effective at mobilizing resources and motivating their populations. Opposing leaders know this about each other too. There are exceptions to all this, of course—peace between democracies is not an iron law. But it is a strong generalization about what is likely to happen.

Dictators, by contrast, can stay in power even if they lose wars, by repressing the populace and paying off cronies and security forces. They can even lose an unnecessary war and not be overthrown by their subjects. Iraq’s Saddam Hussein managed this twice, once after losing the war he started with Iran and again after losing the first Gulf War, which followed his invasion of Kuwait.

### Economic interdependence is key to peace

#### Commerce reduces violence because of need to maintain trade partners; intergovernmental organizations are key to such cooperation

Russett 2010 (Bruce, professor of international relations at Yale University, Peace in the Twenty-First Century? CURRENT HISTORY • January 2010, AS)

The inTerdependence effecT

Commerce, like democracy, also promotes peace. Trade and other commercial exchanges (such as investment) build economic interests in other countries. The greater the proportion of a country’s gross domestic product that is accounted for by trade, the greater the interest of its population and leaders in maintain- ing orderly commerce.

And leaders and populations are especially concerned about maintaining peace with other trading countries. They do not want to destroy trading part- ners’ export markets or their own imports, on which both partners depend. It is no coincidence that the number and severity of mili￼tary conflicts declined sharply in recent decades as international trade grew in importance.

The same point can be made about the proliferation, during this same period, of intergovernmental organizations and international rules. IGOs do many things, among them settling diplomatic disputes before they get to the point of war or near-war. They also help establish and protect democratic governments by supervising and mon- itoring elections, setting up new media for free expression, and encouraging the development of independent police and legal systems.

The United Nations has become very impor- tant in these areas, but so have many regional, specialized IGOs, in which most of the member governments are democracies. These include the European Union, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Organization of American States, and Mercosur. (After the overthrow of dicta- tors in several South American countries, new democratic leaders started Mercosur in 1991 as a free trade zone and mutual protection society.)

￼￼ These regional ￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼ organizations make membership in their groups conditional on being democratic, having free markets, and settling border disputes. Consequently, business groups and societal elites that stand to gain from admission of their states have greater leverage to make their governments adopt democratic norms and institutions, as has happened in Turkey.

Figure 4 shows the growth of the three “global- ization” influences relative to their 1965 levels. The democracy trend is gleaned from Polity data, a set of coded information regarding characteris- tics of governments that is widely used in political science research. The Polity data rate countries on a 21-point scale from most dictatorial to most democratic. As more countries have achieved freedom and more dictatorships have fallen, the average democracy score has risen by 60 percent. Meanwhile, despite a dip during the cold war, the average country’s trade-to-GDP ratio (the “eco- nomic openness” factor) is up by about 50 per- cent. And its number of IGO memberships is up by over 80 percent. So the world system has become more democratic, more commercially integrated, and more institutionalized.

Two more points should be made about IGOs. First, recent years have seen a marked rise in UN peacekeeping activity. The number of UN peace- keepers jumped from about 10,000 in 1991 to 90,000 in 2008. Most of these missions began during and especially after civil wars. They have aimed to stabilize peace settlements by demobilizing opposing armed forces, building economies and administrative and legal institutions, and pro- moting democratic elections. Not all these efforts have succeeded, but many have.

Second, member- ship in IGOs whose member states are democratic has risen over the years much more dramatically than it has for IGOs in general. These organizations help maintain democracy and stability among their members, and membership in them is about 15 times greater than it was in 1973. This is because new groups have been founded, old ones have expanded, and democratic rule has spread and consolidated in many countries. So this particular class of IGOs is especially important to the spread of peace.

### Empirical data proves democracy claims

#### Studies indicate that democracy, trade, and IGO membership are key factors in reducing violence

Russett 2010 (Bruce, professor of international relations at Yale University, Peace in the Twenty-First Century? CURRENT HISTORY • January 2010, AS)

SomeThing’S happening here The Kantian influences matter not just because Kant said so, of course, but because strong empirical evidence suggests that they do. Although scholars disagree about certain aspects of conflict and peace, it is clear that something big has been happening here. I will note here just one part of the evidence. I have spent much of two decades, along with a lot of other people who have provided help and criticism (criticism is actually a form of help), looking at who fought whom in every year from 1885 to 2001. This is a very large set of information, entailing nearly half a million potential cases (pairs of countries). We have asked which pairs of countries fought each other, which pairs did not fight, and what their characteristics were. The project is much like what epidemiologists do when they study large databases to identify risk factors for cancer or heart disease (smoking, bad diet, lack of exercise, environmental poisons, genetic endowment, and so on). They try to isolate the independent influence of each of these factors—that is, how the risk of disease is affected if one factor changes while the rest are held con- stant. An example would be to discern the effect of giving up smoking without improving diet or exercise. By doing this, medical researchers can give pretty good advice about how to lower our risk of disease. It is up to the patient to decide whether to take that advice. Along with other scholars, I have followed much the same procedure in studying international conflicts. The table on this page, Figure 5, shows how we identify changes in the risk of what we call a “fatal militarized dispute” (that is, a mili- tary conflict in which at least one person is killed). The same sort of analysis has been performed for wars with more than 1,000 people killed, and the results are quite similar. The table proceeds from a baseline risk of con- flict between an average pair of countries. That risk is less than one-half of 1 percent per year. The table goes on to show how the risk changes if, for example, two countries are allied, or both countries place in the top 10 percent of the Polity democracy scale, or have sizeable mutual trade, or are mem- bers of the same IGOs. Under such circumstances, how are the chances of fatal conflict affected? Formal alliances do not help much, it turns out. Allies are almost as likely to fight each other as are countries not allied with each other. (Examples include Hungary and Czechoslovakia versus the Soviet Union during the cold war, and China versus the Soviet Union in the 1960s.) Differences in relative power that are strong enough to create deterrence do matter. But for deterrence to make a significant difference, one state has to be much, much stronger than the other. This is not something that can be readily changed in a significant way. Thus, for example, even if China continues to post high rates of growth in economic strength and military capac- ity, decades will pass before US-Chinese relations will be affected in a major way. But the data show that three other factors— the Kantian influences—make a big difference, especially when all three act together. Moreover, these three influences—democracy, trade, and IGO membership—are mutually reinforcing. They create a system of feedback loops that increasingly fosters peace. The triangle in Figure 6 illustrates all the links—from the corners to the center, back to the corners, and around the sides. Everything is con- nected. Democracy, trade, and IGOs flourish best in peacetime. They strengthen each other. And once the system gets going, it builds on itself. This is not to say that it cannot be reversed. But it builds powerful forces within and among coun- tries not to slip back. ￼This process has worked in many parts of the world. The clearest case is the EU, but we see it among economically advanced countries gener- ally, and for some poor countries as well. South America is an example, most notably among Argentina, Brazil, and Chile. Before the triad of democracy, commerce, and IGO membership took root in the region, these countries had been long-term rivals engaged in wars, near-wars, and arms races (including, in the case of Argentina and Brazil, a competition to develop nuclear arms capability).

### Countries outside influence can’t be forced into democracy

#### Countries not meeting three factors still are deterred from violence; encouraging membership in IGO’s best action to take

Russett 2010 (Bruce, professor of international relations at Yale University, Peace in the Twenty-First Century? CURRENT HISTORY • January 2010, AS)

ouTSide The TenT Of course, some parts of the world are not part of this Kantian system. Some countries are at least potential threats to their neighbors, and to Americans. And yet, even these countries may be restrained by the norms and practices of the Kantian states. Our research has found that states embedded in the Kantian triangle have witnessed a great reduction in conflict—but even states outside the triangle are influenced by increases in the average level of Kantian ties for the system as a whole. Peoples the world over want human rights and economic improvement. Traders and investors want peaceful, stable growth in their markets. As a result, autocratic governments may have to make concessions to stay in power. Some countries must be deterred, and some- times fought. Afghanistan under the Taliban dis- played none of the Kantian characteristics: It was economically and politically isolated and certainly not democratic. It provided a haven for Al Qaeda to plan its attacks on the United States. Invading Afghanistan was the right decision, though pros- pects for stable democracy there are not bright. But this is not an argument for invading other countries in general, nor for invading countries in order to establish democracy. Building democ- racy by imposing force from the outside is a long, costly, and high-risk job. Most such efforts fail. Germany and Japan after World War II are exceptions, but those countries were very different from Afghanistan or Iraq. In fact, democratizing Iraq was only one minor motive for the invasion of that country, and the war was bungled. Nothing in our research sug- gests that this episode is a precedent worth repeat- ing in the name of spreading democracy. What our research has shown is this: Democratization, growing economic interdepen- dence, and an increasingly dense network of IGOs each produces a great reduction in the risk of violent conflict between countries that share these characteristics. Together, the three links create a powerful self-reinforcing system for peaceful rela- tions. Some improvement along even one of these dimensions is better than none. The evidence suggests that democratic states- men and international groups acting on these findings should focus on what is possible. They should rely on deterrence, peaceful change, and continuing economic integration to improve countries that do not already share the Kantian characteristics. Democracy, trade, and international organiza- tions and norms are not the only influences driv- ing the decline in war. They have not brought an end to war, and probably will not. Yet they have been powerful factors in greatly reducing war across much of the world. Human affairs do not progress in a nice linear advance, but rather by ups and downs. The Kantian peace project—gradually integrating more nations more firmly into the system—may be stalled for the moment, in part because of resistance in the Middle East. But it still shows a reasonable way forward for the long run.

### US hegemony detrimental to others

#### US empire ignores the need to treat persons humanely; operating in a utilitarian manner causes us to destroy the Other

LaMothe 2010 (Ryan Williams, St. Meinrad School of Theology, IN e-mail: rlamothe@saintmeinrad.edu A Pastoral Analysis of the Three Pillars of U.S. Hegemony—“Free Market” Capitalism, Militarism, and Exceptionalism Pastoral Psychol (2011) 60:179–193 DOI 10.1007/s11089-010-0302-Published online: 13 July 2010 # Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2010 http://rd.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11089-010-0302-y)

￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼Historical analyses are important, yet a pastoral analysis of empire neither begins with a nation’s use of vast military and economic powers in influencing world events nor with the narratives of the victors, but rather with the devastating consequences for those who find themselves in the crosshairs of the empire. In other words, a pastoral analysis privileges those who suffer, seeking to assess the various roots and sources of alienation, oppression, and marginalization for the sake of offering possible remedies. In this article, I offer a pastoral analysis of the three interrelated pillars of U.S. hegemony, namely, “free market” capitalism, militarism, and exceptionalism. My claims are that these pillars 1) were and are integral to the rise and maintenance of the U.S. Empire or the U.S. as hyperpower, 2) while beneficial to some U.S. citizens (as well as Western Europeans) and accidentally to other peoples, have significant and extensive detrimental and long-term consequences for other peoples, and 3) represent fundamentally and profoundly flawed systems vis-à-vis creating social policies and programs that involve the common good or foster community. In addition, I argue that the fusion of symbol systems—free market capitalism, militarism, and exceptionalism—give rise to the interpretation of the Other in functional or utilitarian ways and is inherently flawed and dangerous, because these systems lead to controlling, manipulating, using, or destroying the Other. Only when these semiotic systems are subordinate to religious or humanistic symbol systems, which elevate the personhood of the Other and promote a good enough society that fosters diverse communities, can their effects be mitigated. I begin with a brief depiction of how I understand and employ pastoral analysis. In particular, I define pastoral analyses and describe the interpretive frameworks used in making my claims, conclusions, and suggestions. I then briefly depict some characteristics and consequences of each pillar. For the purpose of discussion, I separate the pillars, though I wish to stress that they are mutually reinforcing and interconnected. This is followed by a critique of these systems, using the pastoral framework outlined in the first section. I conclude with a list of possible responses, given the results of the analysis. Before beginning, I wish to offer a couple of clarifying comments. First, academicians are often careful to avoid straying beyond the bounds of their disciplines. Academic humility and recognition of one’s limitations are important, but they may inadvertently keep people from exploring, using, commenting about, and critiquing that which is not in their field. To restrict oneself to an area of expertise narrows the conversational space and the possibility of encountering perspectives and insights gleaned from other disciplines. This said, let me confess the obvious: I am not a historian, economist, or military expert, though I am, like other U.S. citizens, caught up in the vicissitudes of history, the economy, and the military and national security industrial complexes. This participation does not afford me any particular expertise or insight, but it does impel me to attempt to assess—relying on scholars familiar with these areas— the situation and to add a pastoral theological perspective. I am impelled, more particularly, not only because I am a citizen of an empire, but, more importantly, because, as a pastoral theologian and psychotherapist I seek to listen to, understand, and respond to the various sources of human suffering and our complicity in it. Second, the U.S. economic and military systems are deeply complex phenomena, which I cannot hope to address in sufficient explanatory detail. Notwithstanding this complexity, general outlines of these systems can be portrayed in sufficient detail to highlight both their consequences and shortcomings.

### Pastoral analysis is a mechanism for resistance

#### Pastoral analysis goes beyond its religious origins to frame persons as individuals with worth; it establishes a moral framework in which to view and determine the validity of our actions
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What is a pastoral analysis Niebuhr (1963) believed that ethics begins with this question: what is happening? In my view, whether one is dealing with a dying patient, a family dealing with alcoholism, or a community in conflict, this question is the starting point for pastoral assessments and interventions. A pastoral analysis, then, begins with the question, “what is going on?” This question, of course, presupposes the questioner’s methods and his/her use of various hermeneutic frameworks and their concomitant meanings, biases, values, beliefs, etc. that are employed to answer the question. Before identifying and depicting the frameworks I use, I offer some general comments about the theological values that undergird my understanding of pastoral analysis, whether that analysis is in relation to an individual or to macro structures that affect large groups of people. ￼In general, pastoral theologians and ministers, throughout history, have sought to understand the sources of human suffering and to devise ways to cure or ameliorate suffering, as well as offer solace and hope to individuals, families, communities, or the larger society (Clebsh and Jaekle 1983; Reiger 2003). The general framework for understanding the sources of suffering and remedies centers on the theological concepts of sin and salvation/redemption (Holifield 1983). Ideally, the intention to use theological interpretive frameworks was and is the aim of privileging the voices of the suffering and alienated, whether this has been understood in terms of the individual or family or larger society. Privileging the voices of those who suffer does not mean that pastoral ministers have avoided or neglected more routine needs and desires, such as witnessing a marriage, baptizing children, etc. Nevertheless, across the pastoral care traditions, there is a consistent concern and interest to understand and respond care-fully to people’s suffering. This intention and attention has resulted in the development of pastoral methods and accompanying technologies of care, which have typically fallen into five categories, namely, healing, guiding, sustaining, reconciling (Clebsh and Jaekle 1983), and resisting (Ramsay 1998). Given this, pastoral analysis differs from historical or sociological analyses, precisely because its mission is to understand the sources of human suffering for the sake of a) alleviating unnecessary, meaningless burdens placed on vulnerable people, b) sustaining people when hope for cure is not possible, c) assisting people to resist situations that are oppressive and assisting the oppressors to confess and reform (Gutierrez 1973; Sobrino 1993), d) reconciling, when prudent, people who have experienced various forms of alienation, and e) guiding people toward just, life-giving relations. In this endeavor, pastoral analyses, during the last two centuries, have included non-theological frameworks in interpreting situations. That is, pastoral theologians and caregivers have also relied extensively on the human sciences for understanding sources of human suffering and strategic responses. While pastoral analysis includes the human sciences, its aim is not simply and solely critical understanding or explication of psychological motivations, social dynamics, or historical forces. Rather, the goals of pastoral analysis, which are shaped by theological aims, are to provide opportunities for a) taking accountability for how we may contribute to suffering, b) change or conversion, c) healing and reconciliation, and d) solace and hope. There is, then, an ethical core in the use of theological and human science perspectives. We are obliged to analyze critically situations for the sake of aiding those who suffer; we are obliged to stand in solidarity with those who are marginalized, oppressed, or victimized by religious, social, political, and economic policies and programs (Reiger 2003); we are obliged to confront and challenge those individuals who alienate and marginalize others in their attempts to secure and rely on systems of power, privilege, and prestige. This article follows the tradition of privileging the voices of those who suffer, though I will attend more to the macro-socioeconomic consequences that give rise to large-scale economic, psychological, physical, and spiritual suffering. The interpretive frameworks utilize to assess and critique the pillars of U.S. hegemony are both theological and philosophical. Implicit in my brief depiction of these lenses is the recognition that other pastoral analyses will offer different perspectives, arriving at different conclusions. Briefly, I rely on the theological notions of imago dei and Kingdom of God, which are interwoven with the personal-communal philosophies of John Macmurray (1957, 1961), Emmanuel Mounier (1952), and Enrique Dussel (1985), as frameworks in analyzing the three pillars. ￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼The idea of imago dei is found in the very beginnings of the Hebrew Bible (Gen 1:26–28). Biblical scholars have extensively explored the meanings associated with image and likeness of God (Miller 1972; Middleton 2004). Naturally, the meaning of imago dei is often shaped by current social-cultural struggles and concerns, such as the marginalization of women (Radford-Ruether 1991). My purpose is not to provide an exegesis of this concept, but rather to use the metaphor in light of traditional and philosophical perspectives that emphasize human equality, dignity, and freedom (Macmurray 1961; Mounier 1952). This said, two questions emerge from the notion of imago dei: what does it mean to be created in the image of God and what does it mean to have a likeness with regard to God? In the Bible and the Judeo-Christian traditions, God is consistently portrayed as a) mystery, beyond our ability to apprehend God as God, b) inviolable, c) singular or unique, d) worthy of adoration—that is worthy in Godself, and e) founding relationships (Creator, covenant, etc.). In terms of imago dei, as human beings, our likeness to God means that we experience ourselves as mystery— known and beyond knowing—beyond our abilities to assign categories that would definitively capture who we are (Zizioulas 2006). We are also inviolable, sacred, unique, and valuable in relation to the Creator and each other. That is, we exist and have our being in relation to and for others—we are not monads. As Dussel (1985) writes, “A person...is born from someone, not from something....[and] anterior to all other anteriority is the responsibility for the weak one” (pp. 18, 19). Of course, image and likeness do not denote identity with God. While we are unique, inviolable (inherent dignity as persons), and valued, we know that human beings are bound by existential limitations. These limits evoke anxiety, which may give rise to human actions that entail violence, cruelty, and other forms of alienation and denial of human dignity (Farley 1990). Theologically, we would call this sin or evil, highlighting the reality that human beings often victimize, violate, demean, and depersonalize each other. Nevertheless, despite the reality of sin, the notion of imago dei signifies an ontological reality—a reality that cannot be destroyed by the efforts of human beings to deny, harm or destroy other human beings (Zizioulas 1985). Stated positively, in everyday life imago dei is lived out and partially realized whenever we recognize and treat Others as persons—unique, inviolable, valued, responsive human beings—as-ends-in-themselves-as-persons. We can further understand the notion of imago dei utilizing the philosophical perspective of John Macmurray (1957, 1961). He argued that human beings have the capacity to recognize and intentionally treat another human being as a person—unique, inviolable, valued, agentic subject—personalization. Personalization is, for Macmurray, both a matter of fact and a matter of intention. It is a matter of fact in that we ideally experience the Other as unquestionably a person, while we are unconsciously, omnipotently constructing him/her as a person. This is a paradox. In the moment of recognizing the Other as a person, I experience the Other’s personhood as a matter of fact, while I also am constructing him/her as a person. The idea that we can intentionally and omnipotently construct other human beings as persons is supported by the shadow side of human life. In other words, the prevalence of violence and cruelty toward other human beings throughout history supports Macmurray’s view of both intentionality and creation of personhood. We can just as easily intend and construct the Other as an object to be used, manipulated, or discarded. Macmurray (1949) writes that “whenever one person treats another as an instrument for his use, or as an object for his enjoyment, he denies in practice the other’s essential nature as a person” (pp. 71–72). In those instances, the individual consciously or unconsciously intends to construct the other primarily as an object to be used and, secondarily, at best, as a person. To return to the idea of imago dei, we could say, positively, that we share in the omnipotence of God whenever we construct the Other as a person. Put differently, our likeness to God is manifested in our omnipotent creation of the Other as person. ￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼Yoked to the notion of imago dei is the metaphor Kingdom of God or Kingdom of Heaven. This political metaphor, which has numerous references in the Synoptic Gospels, points to a realm where people will abide with God and with each other in harmony and peace. Citizenship in this kingdom appears to overturn typical human notions of participation and inclusion. For instance, Mt 5:3, 10 mentions poor in spirit and pursuers of righteousness as criteria for citizenship. Later in Mt 25:34–36, care of the vulnerable is necessary for gaining entrance. The Kingdom of Heaven also appears to upend common notions of power and authority. In Mt 18:1–5 and Mt 19:23 (see also Mk 10:25 and Lk 19:25) we note that humility and the absence of acquisitiveness and accumulation of wealth, versus bravado and riches, gain entrance to and participation in this kingdom. In this kingdom, the first shall be last and the last shall be first (Lk 13:30). Another important feature of this metaphor, especially in the Gospel of Luke, is that it points to a present experience of a future reality of the Kingdom of Heaven. Theologians, such as Pannenberg (1969), Moltmann (1996), and Volf (1996), argue that the Kingdom of God is not divorced from the present, but rather reaches into the present, though realized in fragmentary ways. God’s love and justice, for instance, reach into the present political milieu and are partially experienced whenever and wherever human beings act in cooperation with God’s grace— grace that restores and affirms experiences of being a-person-with-other-persons. We can join this political metaphor with Macmurray’s notion of mutual-personal relations and Buber’s (1958) real meetings. For Macmurray (1961), the experience and dignity of being a person are realized and maintained in community, where members omnipotently construct, recognize, and treat each other as persons. “Personality,” Macmurray (1961) writes, “is mutual in its very being....The self only exists in the communion of selves” (p. 78). Community founds personhood. In theological terms, this community signifies the partial presence of the Kingdom of God and God’s being (Zizioulas 2006), wherein people live in relative harmony and peace as fully persons, though only fragmentarily because of sin. God’s being, Zizioulas (1985) wrote, “is identical with an act of communion” (p. 44). These moments of communion, of personal recognition and treatment are real meetings wherein the dignity and freedom of the Other is acknowledged—a just relation. To join the notion of imago dei to Kingdom of God, we could say that we are “like” God whenever we create community, which has its origin in the omnipotent creation and treatment of the Other as person.

### Historical examples prove the capitalism harm

#### US expansion and acquisition of Hawaii and the Philippines proves disregard for individuals in perpetuating capitalism
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Uses and consequences of free market capitalism, militarism, and exceptionalism In brief, capitalism is a complex economic symbol system based on material production and organized as a system of commodity production, services, and exchange. Products, services, and labor, which are inextricably joined to the means of production, are commodified, and this commodification is said to be determined by the market law of supply and demand. The means of production, in capitalism, are privately owned whether by an individual, family, or stockholders (more precisely, legal entities called corporations ￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼that have stockholders). Social relations within this system are constructed primarily in terms of their relation to property, production, and profit (Zaretsky 1973). Profit is the central value and motive that determines decisions vis-à-vis expanding production, seeking larger markets, wages, hiring, etc. In particular, labor and wages are inextricably yoked to material production, services, supply and demand, and, naturally, the overarching aim of securing profit. Free market capitalism was coined to refer to the opening of markets between nations, reducing trade wars, tariffs, and regulations that were viewed as impeding economic exchanges between countries, etc. The idea of “free” or “open” markets means that prices, as well as issues of supply and demand, are determined by the market that exists between countries and not by individual countries seeking to regulate prices or control supply through tariffs and other regulatory mechanisms. Ideally, one might imagine that a free market would involve economic exchange between all countries, which are not limited by governmental constraints vis-à-vis regulations and controls that affect supply and demand. Capitalism, as Weber (1992) noted, has and nurtures a spirit of acquisitiveness and self- interest, seen in individual and collective accumulation of capital and profit. This is not peculiar to capitalism, for it is apparent in pre-capitalistic eras, such as the era of mercantilism in the U.S. prior to the first Industrial Revolution in the 19th century. Ever-expanding markets and the concomitant individual and collective accumulation of wealth were aspects of mercantile imperialism. Spain, Portugal, England and other imperial powers aggressively sought to exploit other peoples and countries to expand their economies and increase their wealth and power. The U.S. was a late arrival, but it, too, sought to expand its mercantile economy through territorial expansion that 1) was supported by the ideology of Manifest Destiny, which involved the violent expropriation of Native American lands and 2) involved a trumped up war with Mexico to gain control over southwestern territories (Zinn 2003). Acquisitiveness and expansion were also seen in the economic and political control of South and Central America, rationalized by the Monroe Doctrine. Thus, capitalism itself cannot be blamed for acquisitiveness or expansionistic aims of nations in general and the U.S. in particular. Nevertheless, the spirit of acquisitiveness, seen in ruthless U.S. expansionism, easily moved from the era of imperialistic mercantilism to the birth of capitalism during the first Industrial Revolution. It may be said that on the cusp of the second industrial revolution, during the late 19th and early 20th centuries, the U.S. was on an expansionism binge that was rationalized by appeals to Christianize and, hence, civilize primitive people (LaMothe 2007). At the close of the 19th century, the U.S. had successfully overthrown the legitimate government of Hawaii (Kinzer 2006), acquired Cuba and the Philippines from Spain (Johnson 2004), and expanded its imperial reach into China. The takeover of Hawaii was clearly motivated by economic greed for more land to plant sugar. As Kinzer noted, “Money rained down on white planters who controlled Hawaii’s economy” (p. 14), though these economic opportunists were not content with the statutes promulgated by the Hawaiian royal family. As an American protectorate, capitalists were able to benefit by low tariffs, amassing considerable wealth. Overthrowing the monarchy and the subsequent annexation of Hawaii gave American capitalists greater leeway in taking land for plantations, leaving many indigenous people in greater poverty. When Cuba was “freed” from Spain, Cubans and Filipinos were initially delighted, because they had been fighting against Spain for their freedoms for years. Euphoria quickly changed to disappointment and anger when they realized that the U.S. was simply stepping in as another colonial power that had no real interest in freedom, but a great deal of interest in and passion for economic control and profit. The Cuban government was forced to pass the Platt Amendment, giving the U.S. ￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼“the right to intervene for the preservation of Cuban independence, the maintenance of government for adequate protection of life, liberty, and individual liberty” (in Zinn 2003, p. 311). The U.S. repeatedly availed itself of this “right” in 1906, 1912, 1917, and 1920, though not to secure freedom for Cubans, but rather to insure economic advantages for U.S. businesses. For instance, as a result of controlling the Cuban government, the United Fruit company “bought 1,900,000 acres of land for about 20 cents an acre” (p. 310). By 1909, U.S. companies, like Bethlehem Steel, controlled “at least 80% of the export of Cuba’s minerals” (p. 310). The Philippines was another exercise in political control for U.S. economic purposes. Prominent Senator Albert Beveridge, for instance, viewed the conquest of the Philippines as a logical step in the economic expansion into the Pacific (pp. 313–314). The Philippines, however, resisted and, as a result, suffered 200,000 casualties before it was drubbed into submission (Kinzer 2006). Each of these instances represents the spirit of acquisitiveness that was present in mercantile imperialism and given full bloom in capitalistic expansionism during the industrial revolutions of the 19th and early 20th centuries.

### 20th Century actions prove harm of capitalism

#### US sponsored movements perpetuated their own interests as the expense of the Other
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It might appear that, by the middle of the 20th century, the U.S. had lost its taste for territorial expansion. The U.S., for instance, returned the Philippines to self-rule in 1946. After WWII, the U.S. enacted the Marshall Plan to rebuild a devastated Europe and helped Japan develop a new democratic constitution. While these are examples of the absence of territorial expansionism, acquisitiveness remained and remains prevalent in U.S. policies and programs aimed at rebuilding economies that would benefit U.S. markets. Territorial expansion declined, but acquisitiveness remained, in different forms and methods (Zinn 1998). Instead of direct military confrontation in taking over governments, the U.S. opted to control markets to their advantage, as well as to exert economic and political pressure to gain influence over particular nations’ markets. For instance, the Philippines gained self- rule after WWII, but the U.S. retained very significant economic and political influence over a corrupt, non-democratic Philippine government. The U.S. also used other methods of gaining economic advantage and control. For example, at the end of WWII, the U.S. led the way in establishing the International Monetary Fund (IMF), which was created to oversee “the international monetary system to ensure exchange rate stability and encouraging members to eliminate exchange restrictions that hinder trade.”1 The IMF, notwithstanding its accidental benefits to other peoples, typifies an ostensibly beneficiary action for other countries, which in reality provides U.S. control over markets. The U.S. also began seducing government leaders who were friendly to U.S. economic and political policies and goals with offers of military equipment and training that would insure their own political power. When accepted, the U.S. gained control by keeping government leaders dependent on the U.S. for military aid and training. The most effective and insidious method of gaining economic and political control, Klein (2007) wrote, was the use of shock treatment, which became the favored means of gaining economic power. In her carefully researched book, The Shock Doctrine, Klein provides numerous examples of U.S. “experts” undermining the legitimate authority of governments, creating drastic political and economic instability to implement, over a short period of time, laws and regulations that favored “free” market capitalism. These U.S. and indigenous economic experts, having been trained at the University of Chicago and Berkeley, worked with U.S. government officials and officials in the targeted country to create social, economic, political, and cultural chaos and shock to force enactment of economic policies that would benefit U.S. companies. One example will illustrate the method that was used in relation to ￼numerous countries (e.g., Bolivia, Argentina, Brazil, Russia, Poland, and China). Chile was one of the first countries to experience shock treatment, which included a stunning, violent coup, the trauma of economic instability, and the horrors of state sanctioned violence, torture, and repression. Prior to the 1973 military coup in Chile, the U.S. spent years training the Chilean military, which included inculcating a hatred for communists and socialists (Klein 2007, p. 92). As this was occurring, U.S. advisors and U.S.-trained Chilean economic advisors (known as the “Chicago Boys,” because they were educated at the University of Chicago in Milton Friedman’s version of capitalism, p. 86) sought to educate members of the military who opposed and detested Allende’s democratic elected socialist government. Pinochet eventually planned and executed a violent revolt of a popularly elected leader. This was quickly followed by nationwide draconian measures to stamp out opposition. Instead of the slow and messy process of democracy in effecting changes in the economic system, Friedman and his disciples, who coached Pinochet, believed that the creation of chaos was the opportune moment to implement drastic economic “reforms.” People in shock, they reasoned, would not protest these changes. The method was to 1) initiate a violent coup that would stun citizens, 2) use harsh measures against any opposition, and 3) implement economic regulations that were capitalistic (pp. 91–120). As Klein points out, the Chicago Boys, as well as U.S. governmental leaders who supported Pinochet, were not interested in the fact that prior to the coup unemployment was 3% or that under Allende the economy was expanding. They were not concerned that Allende was a democratically elected leader or that free speech was alive and well in Chile. Rather, they were moved by a capitalistic ideology that ignored the concerns, needs, and suffering of the Chilean people, though their rhetoric seemed to suggest the opposite. The overwhelming evidence, however, shows that instead of concern for the Chilean people, they were blinded by their own ideology, indifferent to the suffering of the Chilean people (except those few in power and those with wealth), and rapaciously opportunistic. Consider that, after the first year of Pinochet’s dictatorial rule, the economy had contracted 15% and unemployment was at 20%. The year before, the economy was expanding and unemployment was at 3%. Dire economic conditions would exist for decades, though, of course, not for the very rich nor for U.S. corporations. The ideological blind eye, indifference, and opportunism of the Chicago Boys, U.S. corporations, and other U.S. officials toward the economic problems that followed in the wake of shock treatment is certainly indictment enough. Worse, however, was the complete disregard of the human cost—a dramatic rise in poverty, the disappearance of thousands of citizens, the torture and killing of thousands of citizens, and the loss of freedoms and civil rights. This method of shock treatment, which Klein explains in great detail, occurred in many other countries during the late 20th century, representing a shift from a colonial imperialism of the 19th and early 20th centuries to postcolonial state sponsored capitalistic hegemony. Behind this change was the manifest evangelical drive to “offer” the glories of free market capitalism to nations that exhibited other types of economies (e.g., democratic socialism). The U.S., in its attempts to expand and maintain economic hegemony, denied or overlooked a nation’s lack of democracy, as well as the rise in human rights abuses committed by client states. Instead of controlling and administering large swaths of territory, as previous imperialist empires did (Lundestad 1990), the U.S. gained control over the economic and political milieus of particular nations, through the shock doctrine method and others (e.g., IMF and World Bank) all of which caused a great suffering. Imperialism, in whatever guise, Dussel (1985) noted, “cannot afford to lose the political control it exercises over peripheral countries, because it would lose markets that yield enormous profits” (pp. 75–76).

### Economic hegemony perpetuates military hegemony

￼￼US has empirically used the military to expand its economic hegemony; they have often done so at the expense of the Other
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U.S. economic hegemony cannot be separated from its handmaiden, U.S. militarism, which has served to protect and advance U.S. political and economic interests and expansion since the early 19th century. Militarism, Johnson (2004) argued, is the “phenomenon by which a nation’s armed services come to put their institutional preservation ahead of achieving national security or even a commitment to the integrity of the governmental structure of which they are a part” (p. 23). Johnson also asserts that militarism and U.S. imperialism are Siamese twins (p. 187). There are two important features here. First, militarism entails “the assumption by a nation’s armed forces of numerous tasks that should be reserved for civilians” (p. 24). Second, militarism, throughout history, is inextricably joined to imperialism, which in the case of the U.S. in the 20th century is the pursuit of U.S. economic hegemony without occupation of other nations. A third aspect of militarism in the U.S. is discussed by Bacevich (2005). He wrote: Americans in our time have fallen prey to militarism, manifesting itself in a romanticized view of soldiers, a tendency to see military power as the truest measure of national greatness, and outsized expectations regarding the efficacy of force. To a degree without precedent in U.S. history, Americans have come to define the nation’s strength and well-being in terms of military preparedness, military actions, and the fostering of (or nostalgia for) military ideals. (p. 2) Militarism, according to Bacevich, Johnson, and others (Caroll 2006; Chomsky 2004, 2005), is a necessary leg in the U.S.’ attempts to expand its territory or extend its political and economic interests. In the words of Dussel (1985), “Military art, the science of violence, is the ultimate and most precise essence of the praxis of imperialist domination” (p. 72). The long history of U.S. militarism, with all its various manifestations, entails an equally long trail of exploitation, torture, murder, and other forms of subjugation. Even in those few instances where military occupation served as a stabilizing influence in some countries (Germany and Japan), U.S. economic interests have been a central motivation for action and the effects of other military occupations have been mixed or downright failures (South Korea, Vietnam, Iraq, Haiti, to name a few—see Johnson 1999). This said, militarism’s role in U.S. expansionism has created more suffering for peoples than it has alleviated. Consider, the military force and terror used to take and control large tracts of territory previously occupied by First Nations peoples. The Mexican-American War was instigated by the U.S. to annex Texas, but also to pave the way to the West Coast for American settlers and entrepreneurs (Zinn 2003, pp. 152–169). Military excursions in the Caribbean and Central America secured U.S. corporate interests, depriving local populations (except for a small percentage of the elite) natural and economic resources. Consider General Smedley Butler, winner of two Congressional Medals of Honor, who called himself a “gangster for capitalism” (Bacevich 2008, p. 142). General Butler, reflecting on his years in the U.S. military, remarked: I spent 33 years and 4 months in active military service....And during that period I spent most of my time as a high-class muscle-man for big business, for Wall Street, and the bankers....Thus, I helped make Mexico and especially Tampico safe for American oil interests in 1914. I helped make Haiti and Cuba a decent place for National City Bank boys to collect revenues in. I helped in the raping of a half a dozen Central American republics for the benefit of Wall Street....In China I helped to see Standard Oil went its way unmolested. (quoted in Johnson 2004, p. 169) This highly decorated general clearly understood the essential link between U.S. economic expansionism and militarism.

### Hegemony perpetuates US exceptionalism

#### Capitalism and militarism are tools used to exploit others in the name of the divine right of the US; US leaders use the divinity of the US cause to inflict harm on others, justifying their causes as moral ones
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￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼The devastation wrought by U.S. free market imperialism, either through territorial or market expansion and control, is ineluctably joined to militarism, which together are supported by and give rise to American exceptionalism. As Americans, we highlight U.S. benevolence and the economic benefits that result from countries opting for free market economies. We extol U.S. motivations for intervening in other countries, proclaiming we come in peace and offer democracy. No other nation in history, we proclaim, is as rich, as democratic, or as militarily powerful. American exceptionalism, deeply rooted in American history and mythos, is a key feature of U.S. pride and uncritical praise, blinding citizens to the suffering that results from military excursions and economic hegemony. Writing in the 19th century, Alexis de Tocqueville wrote, If I say to an American that the country he lives in is a fine one, aye he replies and there is none its equal in the world. If I applaud the freedom its inhabitants enjoy, he answers “freedom is a fine thing but few nations are worthy of it.” If I remark on the purity of morals that distinguishes the United States he declares “I can imagine that a stranger who has witnessed the corruption which prevails in other nations would be astonished at the difference.” At length I leave him to a contemplation of himself. But he returns to the charge and does not desist until he has got me to repeat all I have been saying. It is impossible to conceive of a more troublesome and garrulous patriotism. (in Niebuhr 2008, p. 28) This garrulous pride or American exceptionalism is supported by the religious-mythic narratives, civic rituals (e.g., elections), monuments, and cultural rites (e.g., sports events) that proclaim America’s special role in the world and in history. The roots of this exceptionalism are evident in Jefferson’s proclamation of the U.S. as an empire of liberty, which later is expressed in the idea of Manifest Destiny and in the Monroe Doctrine. In the 19th and 20th centuries, religious and political discourses were interwoven in American society. In the 19th century, for example, Catherine Beecher believed that the mission of the United States was to demonstrate “to the world the beneficent influences of Christianity, when carried into every social, civil, and political institution” (in Kaplan 2002, p. 29). On the political stage, this was echoed by Senator Beveridge of Indiana, who believed that the United States had a moral “duty to bring Christianity and civilization to ‘savage and senile’ peoples” (Johnson 2004, p. 43). A similar evangelical strain was evident in Woodrow Wilson’s “hyperidealistic, sentimental, and ahistorical idea that what should be sought was a world democracy based on the American example and led by the United States” (p. 51). More recently, Ronald Reagan continued this legacy, saying, “I have always believed that this anointed land was set apart in an uncommon way, that a divine plan placed this great continent here between two oceans to be found by people from every corner of the earth who have a special love of faith and freedom” (quoted in Lundestad 1990, p. 17). Similarly, Bill Clinton viewed the end of the Cold War as “the fullness of time” and the U.S. as an “indispensable nation” (Bacevich 2002). Finally, the triumphalism of George W. Bush’s administration and his moral justification for military interventions in the Middle East and elsewhere (Ryn 2003) were the most recent illustrations of an exceptionalism that provides the social support for economic and political hegemony. I wish to make clear that American exceptionalism is linked to U.S. capitalism (we are the richest nation on earth) and militarism (we are the most powerful nation in history). These three strands have been and are very dangerous, at least for those who are deemed to be a threat. A 21st century example of this is seen in George Bush’s comments about American values, which he used to justify violence. “These (American values) are God- given values. These aren’t United States-created values.” “We will export death and ￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼violence to the four corners of the earth in defense of our great nation” (George W. Bush quoted in Ryn 2003, p. 7). This deadly mix of grandiosity and violence is not unique to George Bush or Dick Cheney and it is a mix that appears to be commonly accepted by many Americans. As Dussel (1985) remarked, “When a political system attains central power, geopolitically, economically, and militarily speaking, it divinizes itself....Once it is divined, who dares to blaspheme the dignity of the absolute state?” (p. 96). Divinization is just another word for grandiose exceptionalism. Free market fundamentalism, militarism, and exceptionalism are the three legs of U.S. expansion and pursuit of hegemony. While they have taken on different forms and methods, these three pillars were and are integral to U.S. hegemony. The consequences of our hegemonic interventions are, understandably, wrapped in and warped by patriotism, the beliefs in U.S. benevolence, altruism, and innocence, which serve to hide the wake of human suffering. When confronted with devastation of our interventions, we point to successes, hiding our own excesses, screening the pleasure of our greed, and denying our stunning indifference toward those who suffer the consequences of our continuous imperial meddling in the lives of other peoples.

### Pillars of hegemony are flawed

#### Must recognize the flaws of hegemony to change the pillars of power; these pillars naturally create competition which objectifies the Other in a competitive rather than a manner promoting cooperation and community
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Fundamental flaws in the pillars of hegemony After reading the above, one might conclude that I am against capitalism and the military and in favor of isolationism and a new, yet unstated, economic system. My response is threefold. First, criticism does not necessarily mean rejection. Second, I am not quite so naïve as to believe that capitalism can be replaced with a system that does not have its own flaws. Third, I am not so callow as to believe that a military can be disbanded, though certainly we can find ways to reduce sharply the U.S. military and military industrial and national security complexes. This said, I find capitalism, militarism, and exceptionalism to be fundamentally flawed symbol systems that currently dominate public opinion and policy decisions. A solution, however unlikely, involves first, recognizing these flaws, second, attempting to subordinate these symbol systems to an ethos that values the lives of all other human beings equally, and third, establishing aims for the development and support of diverse communities. Let me first explain briefly why I believe these symbol systems are fundamentally flawed and then depict how we, as individual citizens, can mitigate these flaws. Capitalism and the military are complex symbol systems that view the world in terms of conflict and gaining economic or military advantages over others—the competitor or the enemy. The Other is constructed primarily as foe, obstacle, competitor, consumer or source of profit. Together, capitalism and military symbols systems emphasize the seedier side of human life—aggression, zero sum games, materialism, selfishness, and self-centeredness. These worldviews are not without their truth, for human beings are quite capable of deception, greed, and violence. When these symbol systems are in ascendancy, they also tend to construct and confirm the very reality that they express. I construct and recognize the Other as someone to defeat economically or militarily and I act in such a way as to make this a reality. The Other is an enemy—omnipotently constructed—and I act toward him/her as such. The Other may be constructed as a consumer and voila!—s/he becomes an object of marketing. In each instance, the Other is an object to be defeated or manipulated or controlled. Thus, a functional ruthlessness or indifference vis-à-vis the Other is embedded in and supported by these symbol systems that, if unrestrained, results in greater conflict, violence, greed, and other forms of objectification. Consider, for instance, the ￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼numerous laws and regulations that are aimed to protect consumers, as well as the history of The Hague and Geneva conventions, which provide rules of warfare to protect citizens and captured soldiers. These checks were, and are, in place precisely because there is a tacit acknowledgement that these symbol systems lead to and form associations that do not contribute to the recognition and treatment of Others as persons—unique, inviolable, responsive human beings. Put another way, the construction of legal protections implies that these systems are not conducive to establishing and maintaining community or other mutual-personal forms of association. Using the pastoral perspective offered above, these symbol systems are devoid of a central or foundational symbol(s) that challenges people to recognize and treat Other human beings as persons. Their ethics instead involve constructing the Other as foe, competitor, or consumer—objectifying and depersonalizing the Other. From a Christian perspective, these systems are empty of any concept that resembles or parallels the Christian notions of imago dei or Kingdom of God. These symbol systems, from a Macmurrian perspective, support an impersonal attitude whereby the Other, at best, is recognized as an object and, secondarily, as a person. At worse, the Other is simply an object to be exploited, contained, or destroyed. Without this notion of humanity embedded in these symbol systems, there can be no construction of a personal reality nor can there be a functioning and vital community. In other words, the reality these symbol systems create is not one of the personal Other, except in non-intentional instances when my military comrade or business partner is recognized and treated as a friend. Clearly, these symbol systems create a social reality, but it is not a communal reality, because the principles of unity are power, profit, and control, rather than personhood and community.

### Capitalism & militarism reject community

#### Capitalism, militarism, and exceptionalism create a framework in which individuals are used as objects to perpetuate an American society; this framework rejects the core of community, forcing us to lose the values that make us and others human
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It can be argued that capitalism and militarism are social entities that exist, in their own way, for the sake of the survival of society—a particular type of society. In terms of capitalism, the consumer society that is created, supported, and protected. This capitalistic society fosters acquisitiveness, greed, entitlement, and indifference (sometimes guilt) and not an ethos of constructing and treating the Other as a person. Militarism, as noted above, aims to protect U.S. society, in general, and capitalistic society, in particular. Both systems function in relation to the larger society, but neither system is conducive to or aimed at building community, which, from Christian (Kingdom of God) and Macmurray’s perspectives, is the very function of a good society. Any notion of community such as the Christian symbol of the Kingdom of God—a diverse community partially experienced in the present—is absent in these symbol systems. In Macmurray’s view, “Every community is then a society; but not every society is a community” (p. 146). Society and the forms of association that constitute it are necessary in that the society ideally exists “for the life of personal relationships. Personal life does not exist for society” (1957, p. 59). Community, then, “is prior to society” (1949, p. 37), because “it is communal life that fulfills and completes the life of that self who, without community, would be alienated, isolated, lonely, and valueless...the individual can only become fully real within the mutuality of community” (1961, p. xvii, emphasis added). Society, then, is subordinate to and exists for community, though this is not the case when militarism and capitalism are dominant in a society. Indeed, to the extent that society highlights or glorifies capitalism and militarism it is a failed society, because community is, at best, accidental. Thus, militarism and capitalism, at their core, lack any ideals or motivations for community. Put differently, they create forms of association that are functional and social, not communal, except accidentally. These two symbol systems are also especially devastating for those who exist outside U.S. society (or those constructed as aliens within U.S. society). In my view, the dominance of capitalism and militarism in U.S. society ￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼undermines community, because 1) there is no core symbol for personhood (principle of unity) and 2) they distort the proper function and aim of society by having society serve these two systems and not community. U.S. exceptionalism, while very different from capitalism and militarism in terms of function and aim, is not necessarily lacking in the notion of personhood and community. The religious idea of the chosen people is a form of exceptionalism that highlights the personhood and community of a particular people. Of course, in the history of Judeo- Christian religions, there have been many instances of violence and abuse of those who were deemed not to be the chosen, but these instances always conflicted with the core symbol of imago dei—a symbol that should, ideally, undermine any version of Judeo- Christian exceptionalism. Whether secular or religious, exceptionalism is inherently problematic because those who are not chosen, those who are not in my exceptional group, are, more often than not, constructed as something less than full persons. Of course, there are instances when the stranger is welcomed, but by and large, individuals and nations who see themselves as exceptional tend to act in ways toward the Other that exhibit less than mutual-personal associations. U.S. exceptionalism, when combined with capitalism and militarism, makes for a heady brew of nationalistic pride that often results in constructing non-U.S. people as inferior. At best, the inferior peoples are pitied and, at worse, they become objects to be exploited, evangelized, or destroyed. A cursory glance at U.S. history provides numerous illustrations of the construction of the alien Other as inferior and U.S. citizens as superior.

### Must begin with individual action as the alternative

#### Resistance to capitalism, militarism, and exceptionalism must begin with individual action; embracing a new ethic will change the framework by which we make decisions; we must call on decision makers to adopt the same framework
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Implicit in this critique of these intertwined symbol systems is a solution, though I am not sanguine that this will be carried out in the larger society. In short, these symbol systems must be subordinated to religious or humanistic symbol systems that have, at their core, the notion of the Other as a person and the corresponding idea of a community of persons who respectfully treat strangers or non-members as full persons. Let me suggest that this begins with individuals who attempt to make moral decisions at their work, in their social relations, and in their community. For instance, being a soldier does not necessarily mean treating the Other as simply and solely an enemy. Lao-Tzu (2007), for instance, wrote, “His enemies are not demons, but human beings like himself. He does not wish them personal harm. Nor does he rejoice in victory. How could he rejoice in victory and delight in the slaughter of men? He enters a battle gravely, with sorrow and great compassion, as if he were attending a funeral.” A business person can consider whether his/her actions lead to the treatment of people as objects. Does the business person place profits over persons or is the dignity of persons a part of his/her approach? The business person can also consider how his/her company contributes to building and maintaining local communities. As a citizen, I can become aware of and resist the calls to see myself and our country as exceptional. I can protest political and military policies and programs that harm people from other countries or that lead to the marginalization and harm of U.S. residents (e.g., 48 million Americans without healthcare and the maltreatment of legal and illegal aliens). As an elected official, one can reduce the influence of money from corporations and reorient policies that facilitate community and not corporate profits. Of course, subordinating these symbol systems to core symbols that highlight the inherent dignity of the Other as person and the necessity of community raises difficulties and challenges. For instance, it might undermine one’s resolve to gain advantage over the Other, to be acquisitive vis-à-vis the Other, or destroy the Other. We may have to acknowledge that low cost for us often incurs high social costs for others. We may have to handle the tensions, uncertainties, ambiguities, and complexities that result from making personhood and community central to our way of thinking and acting toward Others. If our enemy is truly a person, we have to deal with guilt and sadness in his/her destruction. We may be obliged to account for our participation and help repair the damage done by war. If the Other is a person first and consumer second, we have to refuse selling (or at the very least warn people) products, here and overseas, that we know contribute to physical or psychological harm. We have to deal with the ambiguities and complexities of determining how our companies contribute to society at large or community in particular. As citizens, we have to confront a sense of helplessness that comes from recognizing that much of what takes place in our nation’s capital is out of our control, yet still facing the fact that as citizens we share some responsibility for the harm that results from the three pillars of hegemony—capitalism, militarism, and exceptionalism—pillars that provide security for us and uncertainty and fear in other peoples. As faith communities, we need to confront our complicity in past and present U.S. policies and programs that have had dire consequences for many peoples. After confessing guilt, we need to unite service and justice in the realistic hope of working toward helping the marginalized and oppressed. Perhaps the greatest challenge in subordinating these three systems (capitalism, militarism, and exceptionalism) to the personal and communal is, first, develop a critical and constructive approach to our present and past government policies and programs, second, resolve to address, in whatever way we can, systemic injustices, and, third, insure that our methods clearly foster personhood and community. ￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼￼Conclusion Todorov (1999) in his intriguing book, The Conquest of America, depicts the hermeneutical clash between Spaniards and Amerindians. The Other was encountered, constructed, and rejected, which proves that possessing a symbol system that has as its core the notion of imago dei does not insure the Other will not be interpreted as less than a person. This said, it is one thing to have core symbols that are distorted or denied vis-à-vis the Other, but it is altogether another problem to possess and use symbol systems that are devoid of symbols that ethically demand treatment of Others as persons. I have argued that the fusion of symbol systems—free market capitalism, militarism, and exceptionalism—led to and helps maintain U.S. hegemony in the 19th, 20th, and 21st centuries. This hegemony resulted and results in painful consequences for other peoples—peoples who were interpreted in functional or utilitarian ways, making it easier to think of ways to control, manipulate, use, or destroy them. If we are to move toward greater peace, we must find ways to subordinate these semiotic systems to religious or humanistic symbol systems that elevate the personhood of the Other and promote a good enough society that fosters diverse communities.