# JOURNAL OF POLITICAL INQUIRY

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

## Fall 2017

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

# EDITORIAL BOARD

# 2015 Iran Nuclear Deal Negotiations

*Maria Ali*

## INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW

A historic deal on Iran's nuclear program was said by many to make the world, and especially the Middle East, safer. The deal, called the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), was signed between Tehran and the five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) (United States, United Kingdom, Russia, France and China) plus Germany (P5+1) in July 2015. This "complex and highly technical" 100-page document that "emerged after years of diplomacy and final marathon negotiation sessions by top diplomats" served as a roadmap for the future of Iran's nuclear program.[1] The negotiation success for P5+1 included processes that would stop Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons and setting up a comprehensive inspections regime.[2] On the other hand, Iran would have all sanctions related to its nuclear program lifted while being allowed to continue its enrichment program.[3] Overall, the deal appeared to be victory in terms of global security and for the international community as a whole.

Despite the global optimism though, critics on each side argue that every party in this negotiation deal could have achieved more. Even today, this deal is subject to controversial partisan debates and media coverage. Iranian hardliners continue to "oppose any relaxation in the regime's traditional hostility to the US"[4] US President Donald Trump, is repeatedly calling this agreement "the worst deal I think I've ever seen negotiated" and has threatened to terminate the 2015 Iran nuclear deal if Congress and the US allies fail to amend the agreement in a significant way.[5]

Although media coverage of the negotiations and outcomes of the Iran deal have been extensive, current scholarly literature is limited due to the recentness of these events. This is reasonable given that it has only been two years since the deal was negotiated. Most of the literature consists of scholarly articles evaluating the players and parties involved, their strategies, the negotiation process itself, the impact of sanctions, and the limitation of the inspections and verification process.

Indira Lakshmana of *Politico* and Gareth Porter of *The Nation* both researched and provided lesser-known, behind-the-scenes details of the negotiation process. Porter stated that the biggest revelation was that "the most important and difficult issues were quickly resolved, in large part because of moves by the Obama administration to reconcile the interests of the two sides... and slowed progress in the final stage of the talks, mainly for domestic political reasons."[6] Leo Wiseltier of *The Atlantic* criticized Obama's administration's desire to reach the deal as resulting in a "deferral and a delay."[7] On the opposite side, Trita Parsi, head of a leading Iranian interest group in the US, praised the Iran nuclear deal stating that it was already achieving its goals while calling for the new US

---

[1] Eyder Peralta. "6 Things You Should Know About the Iran Nuclear Deal," *NPR* America, July 14,2015
[2] Ibid
[3] Ibid
[4] Yaroslav Trofimov. "After Nuclear Deal, Iran's Hard-liners Assert Power," *The Wall Street Journal*, Nov 5, 2015
[5] Stephen Collinson. "Trump says Iran violating nuclear agreement threaten to pull out of deal," CNN October 13 2017
[6] Gareth Porter. "Behind The Scenes: How the US and Iran Reached Their Landmark Deal," *The Nation* Sep 5, 2015
[7] Leon Wieselter. "The Iran Deal and the Rut of History"

President to continue to build relationships with Iran.[8]

Most of the differences and disagreements over the deal have roots in years of hostility between the US and Iran. The European side, which has been engaging with Iran since the 1979 revolution, does not seem to have as many problems as the current US government and the Iranian hardliners have on the deal. This paper aims to assess this particular negotiation process as a case study for further investigations in the field, attempting to answer two questions: Was the 2015 Iran Nuclear Deal reached through a *position* or *interest* based negotiation process? And, was this the best deal Iran and P5+1 parties could have achieved in the given circumstances? The following section gives background on the historical events and elements affecting each party's stance.

## BACKGROUND

Given the decades of conflict surrounding the previous failed negotiations, a brief summary of their history is crucial. Iran's nuclear program dates all the way back to 1957 when US President Dwight Eisenhower's administration signed a nuclear cooperation agreement that helped build the five-megawatt Tehran Research Reactor (TRR).[9]

The Iranian parliament ratified the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) in February of 1970 with Shah Reza Pahlavi announcing plans to construct 23 nuclear power plants over the next 20 years. However, the 1979 Iranian Revolution hostage situation at the US embassy in Tehran and changes in Iranian government affected these plans and severely damaged US-Iran relations. The US Department of State responded to these events by adding Iran to the list of state sponsors of terrorism in January of 1984. In 1996, the US Congress passed the Iran Sanctions Act, penalizing foreign investments in Iran's energy sector.

The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) got involved in early 2000s calling for Iran to suspend its uranium enrichment program. In October 2003, Iran agreed to meet IAEA demands, and this was known as the Iran-EU deal. Then, in November of 2004 the additional so-called Paris agreement was reached between France, Germany, and U.K., and Iran agreed to maintain its nuclear program suspension during talks. In 2005, negotiation halted when Iran began producing uranium again. The IAEA adopted a resolution finding Iran in noncompliance of the agreement.

The following decade saw larger United Nations Security Council (UNSC) involvement through resolutions that imposed sanctions on Iran as well as international negotiation efforts. June, 2006 was the first time the P5+1 formed as a negotiating party. They proposed a framework offering incentives for Iran to stop its enrichment program. The first legally binding document making the same demands was *UNSC Resolution 1696*, but Iran rejected this proposal, followed by another unsuccessful attempt, *UNSC Resolution 1747*.

In 2007 and 2008, the carrot and stick approach continued with IAEA discussions, and the UNSC passed *Resolution 1803* imposing sanctions while the P5+1 tried to update incentives packages. President Obama was willing to change President Bush's administration's policy requiring Iran to meet UNSC demands before any negotiations could occur.

In June 2009, President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad was reelected in Iran through a controversial

election that caused massive protests across the country. This meant continuation of the hardline policies and the development of the nuclear program. In response, US Congress and the EU adopted additional sets of sanctions on Iran. During 2011 and 2012, talks between the P5+1 and Iran continued in Geneva, Istanbul, Baghdad, and Moscow, but Iran sustained its enrichment processes.

In 2013, the P5+1 negotiations resumed in Almaty, Kazakhstan with the sides still far apart. The breakthrough came when moderate President Hassan Rouhani was elected in Iran. He also appointed Western-educated and English-speaking Foreign Minister Javad Zarif as the new leader of the negotiation team. In October 2013, negotiation talks resumed in Geneva. Finally, in February 2014, after the P5+1 and Iran met three times in Geneva, the two parties agreed on the agenda and framework to guide the talks reaching the JCPOA.

## 2015 IRAN DEAL NEGOTIATION PROCESS

So, how did the JCPOA negotiation process occur and more importantly, why was it so unique and ultimately successful in terms of reaching the agreement? The parties to the JCPOA negotiations could be split into two formal positional sides. Iran represented itself as a non-nuclear power, negotiating with the P5+1 nations. The IAEA also played a supporting role as the implementer of the regulations that Iran became subject to as a part of this deal.

Each permanent member of the UN Security Council had its own nuclear weapons program and had full capability to engage in nuclear warfare. Germany and Iran were the only parties to the negotiations that did not have this capability. The negotiations might have been more difficult if Iran was negotiating with countries that all had actual nuclear weapons instead of just nuclear programs. The presence of Germany, with support from the EU and the IAEA, gives strength to the call for not seeking nuclear weapons in these debates. After all, countries seek nuclear military capabilities to maximize their power and security in the international system; the fact that a powerful country like Germany stays at such a high position without this capability can embolden the non-proliferation call.

Some argue that the previous sanctions on Iran were successful in the P5+1 goal of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.[10] The economic pressure from the US sanctions, UNSC sanctions, and EU sanctions fostered an environment that induced concessions by the Iranian government in its nuclear energy pursuance to protect its national security interests. Economic needs created the issue linkage necessary to create cooperation between the P5+1 and Iran. Economic interest became the stronger interest of the two for the Iranians, which could have only been achieved through negotiation.

In addition, the election of President Rouhani changed the direction and narrative of the Iranian government's stance on its nuclear program. Unlike his predecessor President Ahmadinejad, Rouhani's rhetoric was focused on economic interests because of the benefit to the Iranian people.[11] Pursuance of nuclear weapons was not replaceable in its direct benefits. Moreover, Rouhani previously served as a nuclear negotiator. His understanding of the scenario created by Iran's nuclear program was fundamentally different from Ahmadinejad's understanding, which saw the nuclear program as a method of increasing Iranian power in the international system. President Rouhani was much more receptive to cooperative diplomacy, and he articulated this by calling for the resumption of talks and prescribing how Iran should conduct its nuclear program. The positional aspect of power that previously existed between the P5+1 and Iran was diminished by changing the issue to that of

---

[10] Zachary Laub." International sanctions on Iran", *council on foreign relations* July 15, 2015
[11] Ali Reza, "Who benefits from Iran Sanctions Belief", *The National Interest* July 2, 2015

economic cooperation between the seven parties.

Relationships between the seven parties had varying levels of strength, creating a complex and dynamic negotiation scenario. As Oye notes, the increase in the number of players in a game made cooperation harder to achieve compared to that of a two-person game. The most famous example of game theory is called the Prisoner's Dilemma, a mixed motive game. There is a clash of interests between the two actors who would be better-off not cooperating. This game shows that instead of attempting to find the best solution for the pair, both parties will try to choose the one that is best for themselves, taking into account the fact that the other might defect. This scenario can also be observed in the JCPOA negotiations as the bilateral economic relations were separate from the positional aspect between the P5+1 and Iran. The US, U.K., and France's relationships with Iran were weak, While Germany, Russia, and China's were stronger because of their economic ties to Iran. These bilateral economic ties provided incentives for cooperation because of the linkage of domestic economic benefits to non-proliferation policy concerns. A split in this interest between the P5+1 could have caused negotiations to fail because the positional aspect relied on the power of sanctions. The P5+1 leverage of power against Iran would have been diminished if one party had rescinded its participation.

President Rouhani's election signaled to the P5+1 that a cooperative effort could be reached if sanctions were lifted for greater transparency. A new channel of communication was created when Iran sent Foreign Minister Javad Zarif to the UN General Assembly to propose the possibility of renewed negotiations under a "new future vision"[12] on September 26 and 27, 2013. Within a month, the P5+1 resumed negotiations to create a framework for "comprehensive agreement" with an "interim confidence boosting measure." Formal meetings in Geneva on November 7, 2013 would start the first rounds of negotiations for the Joint Plan of Action (JPA). The JPA allowed for the necessary time to establish the framework to the JCPOA, while simultaneously allowing Iran to show its commitment for cooperation. The JPA was signed by the P5+1 and Iran on November 24. After additional rounds of negotiations, the P5+1 and Iran established that the JPA would officially be implemented on January 20, 2014. The P5+1 and Iran conducted ten rounds of negotiations before November 18. This round extended talks on negotiation and implemented interim provisions of the JPA. Iran's commitment to the JPA allowed for the JCPOA to be agreed upon on July 14, 2015.

Ultimately, it appeared that cooperative communication was a key difference from the other diplomatic endeavors Iran had had with the P5+1. Previous communications were based on positions, with Iran steadfastly pursuing a nuclear program unaligned with the interests of the UNSC. This positional obstacle was corrected when Rouhani selected Zarif as the lead negotiator representing Iran. Zarif had been formally educated in the West, and had a greater command of English than past diplomats in their careers.[13] The selection of Zarif was a two-pronged communication tactic.

First, the Western formal education provided the necessary perspective to fit Rouhani's narrative that was more accepting of the West. This aided the confidence building measures to satisfy P5+1. Second, the command over English prevented any confusion in translation. As noted in the book *Getting to Yes*, Farsi and English have words that could translate into words that connotatively differ from their denotations. A breakdown in linguistic intent could have created significant obstacles in the understanding. Given that the stakes in this negotiation were economic gains and security for each party, a strategic selection in diplomats that could effectively employ linguistic tactics aligned

---

[12] Ali Alfoneh and Reuel Marc Gerecht. "An Iranian Moderate Exposed," New Republic, January 23, 2014.
[13] Ibid.

with Rouhani's agenda.

Last, although a repeated prisoner's dilemma model would yield similar cooperation, the focus on power in that model is still insufficient to tactically explain the negotiation process that occurred between the P5+1 and Iran. This because the bilateral economic interests would create an N-player breakdown that complicates the model's parameters.[14] The increase in players and their variation in interests creates a prisoner's dilemma that would suggest cooperation to be less likely than what occurred. It would acknowledge the power of cooperation itself in a strategic sense but fail to supply accurate reasoning tactically. Therefore, the tactics of negotiation must be observed in the two-level game sense that balance the domestic and international needs that a negotiator must satisfy during their rounds of talks.[15]

A narrative shift and change in ordinal preferences of interest altered a previously positional structure between the P5+1 and Iran into negotiations where each side could attain interests of mutual international benefit. Positional power structure would fail to observe such a change because of how it frames the scenario into a nuclear power versus non-nuclear power, omitting Germany's alignment with the P5. This would suggest no negotiations would occur, because the capabilities and their consequences were not offset by clear articulated intentions prior to the election of President Rouhani and the JPA's implementation. The two-level game interpretation breaks the positional structure. It not only acknowledges the interest change by each party, but that tactics occur at multiple levels in the negotiation process. When changes in interest are acknowledged by all the parties in a negotiation, it can progress in a manner that positional bargaining fails to achieve. The process of negotiation pursued an approach that was not positional because of how quickly the JPA progressed into the JCPOA after Rouhani's expressed openness to resume negotiations.

## 2015 IRAN DEAL NEGOTIATION SUBSTANCE

However, the substance of the negotiation is just as important as the process itself. Substances address *what* is being negotiated rather than the process, which structures *how* the negotiations should occur. As stated previously, President Rouhani's election allowed for the resumption of the nuclear program negotiations with a higher-level of commitment and renewed importance. The agenda of the nuclear program was to restrict and regulate Iran's nuclear program in exchange for lifting the sanctions imposed by the UNSC and EU. From a P5+1 perspective, the primary concern was to prevent Iran's nuclear program from proliferating nuclear weapon.

While Iran certainly felt the brunt of economic sanctions, Germany, Russia and China each had their own economic interests in Iran that were hindered by the sanctions. The sanctions did induce cooperative behavior but not because of unilateral policy action by Iran. Rather, it was a multilateral rebalancing of interest and recognition that the status quo must change.

Due to the recentness of the JCPOA, we need to allow for more time to understand Iran's real intent to resume the negotiation process and finally reach an agreement. However, preliminary analysis could assume that some of the main reasons for Iran's willingness to get back to the negotiating table were a change in government political leadership and economic hardships from the sanctions, especially in terms of the loss of oil revenue - one of Iran's most lucrative exports. The economic crisis in Iran was a result of sanctions implemented by the US and UNSC. US Treasury

---

[14] Kenneth A. Oye, ed. *Cooperation Under Anarchy*, Princeton University Press, 1986.
[15] Putnam D. Robert, *Diplomacy and domestic politics: the logic of two-level games,* World Peace Foundation, 1998.

Secretary Jacob Lew stated that Iran's economy had been "squeezed between 15 to 20 percent under which cost the country about $160 billion in oil revenue alone."[16] In addition, "more than $100 billion in Iranian assets were held in restricted accounts outside the country."[17]  There was also continued political instability in the country due to protests and crisis marked by the last presidential election. Iran's national interest was to be a regional hegemon. Therefore, it was important for Iran to re-establish economic and trade capabilities. Oil was an important natural resource for the country's economy and due to the embargo, a big budgetary problem. Iranian oil export revenues fell by 26 billion dollars year-over-year in 2012 to just 69 billion dollars.[18] It was a major blow to the country's industry, with oil having accounted for about 80% of total export earnings.[19]

Based on Iran's present economic situation, it could be assumed that the country did not have many options at the time of the negotiations. The country had changed and did not have the same ability to continue economic development as before. Iran needed immediate help, and the nuclear deal could open doors for this development.  Some of the main gains and obligations for Iran in JCPOA negotiations, based on the White House fact sheet, included:[20]

| Gains | Obligations |
| --- | --- |
| Removing all UN SC sanctions | Removing two-thirds of its installed centrifuges and 98% of its stockpile of enriched uranium |
| Lifting all national and regional sanctions | Not using advanced centrifuges to produce enriched uranium for the next decade |
| Maintaining right to continue nuclear research | Developing vigorous, intrusive, and unprecedented transparency measures including inspectors having access to Iran's key nuclear facilities |

Domestic pressure on Iran forced a change in the narrative that embraced the positional style of bargaining. The considerations of domestic needs in Iran shifted the strategy for negotiators at the international level.

While Iran had domestic pressures that brought it to the bargaining table, the US also had to balance its domestic political capital to push the deal forward. The approval of the JCPOA by the US Congress was not a guarantee given the deep partisanship. The Republican Party opposed the nuclear deal in the Senate, proposing a resolution to block the deal from coming to fruition.[21]  The Democratic Party did eventually rally enough support to pass the JCPOA, but at the cost of significant political capital for future democratic agenda.[22] The block of the Republican's resolution ensured that President Obama could sign the deal without a process of veto override occurring[23]. The balance in satisfying domestic-level needs as well as domestic political obstacles further shows the weakness in the

[16] Remarks of Secretary Jacob J. Lew at The Washington Institute for Near East Policy 30th Anniversary Gala, April 29 2015.
[17] Zachary Laub. Council on Foreign Relations, 15 July 2015. Web. 03 Nov. 2015.
[18] Asa Fitch. "Five Basic Facts About the Sanctions on Iran – At A Glance," *The Wall Street Journal*, 17 June 2015.
[19] Ibid.
[20] The Iran Nuclear Deal – What you need to know about the JCPOA (www.whitehouse.gov).
[21] Jennifer Steinhauer. "Democrats Hand Victory To Obama on Iran Nuclear Deal," *The New York Times*, September 10, 2015.
[22] Ibid.
[23] Ibid.

positional theory of negotiation.

So, what was the final outcome of these negotiations? As stated earlier, for Iran, the pressing need was to gain relief from sanctions that increased in severity and had a crippling effect on its resource-dependent economy. In particular, restrictions on its oil and gas exports, its ability to import technology to exploit its energy resources, and being cut off from SWIFT (the financial-messaging system used to transfer money between the world's banks) had taken toll. Iran wanted all sanctions to end from the moment a deal was signed.

According to the agreement reached, Iran would reduce its installed enrichment centrifuges from 19,000 to 6,000, only 5,000 of which would be spinning. Further, Iran's second enrichment facility, which was buried deep within a mountain and thought to be impregnable to conventional air strikes, would cease all enrichment and be turned into a Physics Research Centre. Iran would also not produce or house any fissile material for at least fifteen years, reducing its stockpile of low-enriched uranium from 10,000kg to 300kg for the next fifteen years. The heavy-water reactor at Arak, which would have produced significant quantities of weapons-grade plutonium, would be removed and destroyed. No other heavy-water reactor would be allowed to be built for fifteen years.

All of these undertakings hinged on the assurance that Iran would abide by the new rules. Under the terms of the JCPOA, inspectors from the IAEA would be able to inspect any facility, declared or otherwise, as long as it was deemed to be "suspicious." The agreement also stated that Iran would address the IAEA's concerns about what it called the Possible Military Dimensions of its nuclear program.

## ANALYSIS OF NEGOTIATIONS

So, if this was truly an interest-based-negotiation, was it still the best outcome two parties could achieve? Why was it still one of the most controversial foreign policy issues during the US 2016 presidential election? President Barack Obama argued that "because America negotiated from a position of strength and principle," the deal successfully constrained Iran's ability to develop nuclear weapons and thus strengthened the security of the US A different approach, however, sheds a divergent light on this certainty. Analyzed from the perspective of structural realism, a realist theory of international relations, which postulated that structural constraints, determine the behavior of major players.

According to traditional interpretations of this theory, it would have been more advantageous for the US to pursue a unilateral, competitive policy on the issue instead. Even though the deal limited Iran's nuclear capabilities for fifteen years, it empowered it in other ways. The deal removed international sanctions and enabled Iran to integrate back to the global economy, which was likely to strengthen its relative power regionally and internationally. In addition, the competitors of the US, Russia and China, were likely to benefit from the deal through oil market implications and the ability to engage in arms trade with Iran. While a traditional structural realist approach would conclude that these aspects made the Iranian nuclear deal disadvantageous to the relative power position of the US, an alternative view of the theory could be used to explain the agreement's strategic significance and logic.[24]

The basic assumption in structural realism is that the international system is anarchic, lacking

---

[24] Henrietta Toivanen "The Structural Realist View," April 6, 2016.

ultimate authority and the ability to enforce agreements or order. States act as unitary rational actors and primarily aim to achieve a secure position in the international community. They view each other as "black boxes," with a focus on their external actions, and leave out considerations related to internal characteristics of their competitors, such as governance systems, personalities of decision makers, cultural environments, and local norms. In the traditional structural realist view, the main concerns of states are the relative gains that competing states might achieve, as well as the problem of cheating over agreed rules. This results in a self-help system, where states provide their own security, compete with other states, and only rarely find a path for cooperation.

However, when analyzing the Iran deal in the light of the arguments that Charles Glaser made in his article "Realists as Optimists: Cooperation as Self-Help," it is possible to reach an alternative conclusion.[25] His theory is relevant to the circumstances of the deal, as it focuses on peacetime, defining "cooperation" as coordinated policies that avoid arms races (which the Iran deal aimed to do), and "competition" as unilateral military build-ups and alliance formation. Glaser challenges the traditional view and argued that the basic assumptions of structural realism did not lead inevitably to competition. He stated that "under a wide range of conditions, adversaries could best achieve their security goals through cooperative policies, not competitive ones, and should, therefore, choose cooperation when these conditions prevail." Glaser's analysis introduced three arguments that showed how structural realist assumptions would actually predict state cooperation, rather than competition. Each of these could be applied to the Iran Nuclear Deal, creating a logical framework to support the assumption that the outcome of the deal could be positive for all sides, and particularly to the US.

First, Glaser argued that cooperative policies were an important form of self-help. If an arms race was seen as a risk in the case of Iran, then reciprocal constraint would be beneficial to both sides. Especially if the outcome of the arms race was uncertain, the risk of ending up in a more disadvantageous military position would be a genuine threat. Even if the outcome was certain, the competition could result in technological development that would be even more destructive, leaving all sides more vulnerable if these capabilities were deployed. Lastly, Glaser pointed out that uncertainty about motives could also make cooperation more rational than competition, as "cooperation was valuable if it reduced the adversary's insecurity by reducing the military threat it faces."

In Iran's case, the US and its allies saw the Iranian nuclear threat as a clear security concern and realized the possibility of a nuclear arms race in the Persian Gulf and the Middle East. Despite the superiority of the American military and its ability to support its allies, it was evident that the West did not have complete knowledge of Iran's capabilities. Thus, these countries could not be fully certain of the outcome if a military conflict broke out. Cooperation through the nuclear deal in this case was more advantageous than a competitive approach towards Iran. In this regard, the nuclear agreement diminished the military threat that Iran faces because giving up its nuclear program would eliminate motivation for states to launch an offensive attack against it. Despite uncertainty about Iran's motivations, the agreement created stability and room for cooperation by reducing Iran's insecurity.

Glaser's second argument was that "security was much more closely correlated with mission capabilities than with power." States, in order to increase security, should consider their ability to turn political influence into military mission capability in the context of the current policy options. With these conditions, cooperative options can outweigh competitive ones as more desirable and feasible. In the case of Iran, interviews of American military leaders and the results of war games demonstrated

---

[25] Charles Glaser. "Realists as Optimists: Cooperation as Self-Help," December 18, 2011.

that an attack against Iran would be "a counterproductive failure." The US and other states could have used the rhetoric of keeping military options on the table, but when the issue was considered from a purely military perspective, it was clear that there were limitations to carrying out a successful offensive mission. Thus, arms control and cooperation through the Iran nuclear agreement were the preferable policy options for the US

Glaser's third argument was that military policies could be used as a communication tool and that security-seeking states should certify that "its adversary understood that its motivations were benign,"[26] providing a reason for the competitor state to reassess its motives and intentions. This meant that "countries should sometimes exercise self-restraint and pursue cooperative military policies, because these policies can convince a rational opponent to revise favorably its views of the country's motives." The Iran nuclear deal represented a cooperative policy that gave concessions to Iran and provided an incentive for the country to change its confrontational foreign policy towards the West. Glaser argued that by eventually lifting the arms sanctions, the deal made it possible for Iran to provide for its own defense, which also created regional stability. In addition, cooperation through the nuclear agreement would give the US more flexibility in positioning its military resources, and possibly support the future disentanglement from the region - which might be a part of the US long-term strategy and national interest.

When Glaser's perspective on structural realism was applied to the Iran nuclear deal, it suggested that it was in the interest of the US to cooperate with Iran and other Western powers. In the long term, the deal will strengthen the relative power and security of the US both in the greater Middle East and internationally.

The contrast between traditional and structural realist views helps to explain why the JCPOA continued to be one of the most controversial foreign policy issues of the 2016 campaign for President of the United States. President Obama, valuing diplomacy and cooperation, considered the deal to be among his foremost foreign policy accomplishments. The Democratic Party's candidate in the 2016 US presidential elections publicly backed the deal. In her speech, Hillary Clinton said that "as President, I will take whatever actions are necessary to protect the US and its allies. I will not hesitate to take military action."[27] Clinton cautioned that the deal must "be enforced vigorously, relentlessly." In stark contrast, the Republican then-candidate, Donald Trump, opposed the Iran nuclear deal because he analyzed it from a traditional realist perspective. He has said that he would renegotiate the deal or "dismantle" it. Statements on both sides affirmed that it was US policy to prevent Iran from producing sufficient fissile material for even a single nuclear weapon, and that the US would use all means necessary, including military force, to prevent this. However, the differences were in the approach to achieving that goal.

## CONCLUSION

Nevertheless, it is implied that the Iran deal was an interest-based negotiation as both parties used a principled approach by focusing on common interests instead of prioritizing their own to build up the negotiations and ensure that a win-win situation was formed. In the short term, both parties succeeded and achieved maximum outcomes. Negotiations that were done during Ahmadinejad's presidency were more position-based, and they failed to bear any results until there was a major change of policy. In the position-based negotiations, Iranian delegations would only come to read the

---

[26] Ibid.
[27] Matthew Kroeing. "The American Interest" February 11, 2016.

statements approved at home. Under Rouhani, actual debates and discussions were conducted and interests and vital points were put on the table.

Iran's main interests were to first and foremost lift the oppressive sanctions and have better ties with the western world. P5+1 interests were to stop Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. If Iran continues an enrichment program, its economy will be decimated again by international sanctions, resulting in economic pressure which will make Iran's leaders return to the negotiating table seeking relief. Until then, the world will have one less nuclear power. The previous position of the status quo provided no benefit to any party in the JCPOA, therefore a shift from positional to interest-based bargaining occurred to advance each parties' interests because of the stalemate that positional bargaining had created. Therefore, we can conclude an interest-based negotiation occurred because of the way negotiation rounds progressed towards an economically beneficial deal that was not considered in past rounds.

While it may be too early to evaluate the JCPOA's consequences, there is a larger and more immediate benefit to the negotiations that has occurred. The status quo of a positional bargain creates a "death spiral" effect because it does not foster the necessary elements for states to cooperate. For cooperation to occur in the future, there must be a "shadow of future cooperation" prevalent enough that states acknowledge it as a preferred method of strategy[28]. The articulation of Rouhani's willingness to cooperate casts this shadow, allowing for a more diplomatic, pragmatic, and amicable future for P5+1 and Iranian relations to occur. It not only forges important international relationships but also decreases the possibility of conflict as it allows for the outlets of constructive communication. This prevents miscalculation in power, and negative interpretation of intents that could break the stability and security of the international system.

The JCPOA changed the status quo in a manner that creates the immediate benefit of a positive international environment. While the implementation over time may or may not cause deterioration in relations, the fact that cooperation had occurred suggests that diplomatic solutions are possible. Even when states view the stakes as extremely consequential and dangerous to their own security and interests, a solution is still possible. While the implementation of the deal is yet to be evaluated, the deal can still be viewed as successful. Overarchingly, the Iran deal changed a negative status quo environment that perpetuates the security dilemma into a positive environment that acknowledges relative gains in security for all parties and acknowledges the deeper consequences the former environment has for the international system as a whole.

---

[28] Kenneth A. Oye, ed. *Cooperation Under Anarchy*, Princeton University Press, 1986.

# Is NATO Relevant to American National Security?

*Daniel Kurzyna*

## INTRODUCTION

The post-World War II period altered the landscape of security permanently, as two global wars produced a transition from a multipolar world to one of bipolar peace among great powers. Scholars of international relations, from primarily the realist school, assert that this order, conceived by the establishment of multilateral organizations, offered reliance to states in an aggregation of arenas; from finance with the World Bank, to trade with the World Trade Organization, to union with the United Nations.[1] Nonetheless, some would contend that by far the most critical arbiter of peace derived from the signing of the Washington Treaty, better known as the North Atlantic Treaty in 1949.[2] This treaty conceived upon the globe an effective concept of collective defense and security, which centered on the transatlantic region of the world, and rightfully so; this was the region that produced two world wars that were fraught with carnage, death, and destruction on unprecedented levels. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) changed the nature of international relations as we know it. An alliance treaty signed and ratified by twelve signatories, NATO meets traditional conceptualizations of alliance structure, especially in the range of agreements, not just economic, among sovereign entities. But just how credible is the NATO alliance? Thucydides, who could be considered the father of international relations, once penned, "the only sure basis of an alliance [between equals] is for each party to be equally afraid of the other."[3] With regard to NATO, the fundamental purpose of collective defense was sustained by anxiety, and not necessarily love or stake in the alliance itself.

## IS NATO OBSOLETE?

During the 2016 American presidential elections, the nation, and the entire globe, was thrust into a dialectic where many people were too uncomfortable to participate. Then how appropriate, or in the words of then-Republican nominee Donald J. Trump, obsolete, is NATO and has it approached the end of its existence?[4] Even outside of the realm of the US presidential elections, we observed an excess of protests appear throughout the world in states where nationalist tendencies reared their wicked head, and the moderate victors are tasked with unifying a broken political system. The United Kingdom in the summer of 2016 voted by a rather slender margin to withdraw from the European Union, which put a dent in a project that many deemed as being wholly promising. When Montenegro was on the path of becoming a NATO member, before being ultimately offered accession in June, we saw Montenegrins take to the streets in an attempt to resist, nearly on the level of an insurrection, forfeiting even a sliver of sovereignty for the alliance[5]. Montenegro is a solid example for the answering of the initial question, is NATO relevant to American security? From a geopolitical standpoint, one could argue that the accession of Montenegro into the NATO coalition is a boon to American national security due to its strategic location that holds vital geopolitical interest to NATO, in the case of its access to the Adriatic Sea, and especially the United States, in its rivalry with Russia. The United States and the West have long advocated for western values that uphold freedom, democracy, and human

---

[1] Kenneth N. Waltz, "The Stability of a Bipolar World," in *Daedalus* 93, no. 3 (1964): 881-909. http://www.jstor.org/stable/20026863

[2] NATO, "Founding treaty," NATO, accessed May 01, 2017, http://www.nato.int/cps/iw/natohq/topics_67656.htm.

[3] Thucydides, The Landmark Thucydides: A Comprehensive Guide to the Peloponnesian War, trans. Robert B. Strassler and Richard Crawley (New York: Free Press, 2008), 164.

[4] Michael Gove and Kai Diekmann, "Full transcript of interview with Donald Trump," News | The Times & The Sunday Times, January 16, 2017, accessed May 01, 2017, https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/full-transcript-of-interview-with-donald-trump-5d39sr09d.

[5] http://www.balkaninsight.com/en/article/montenegro-approves-nato-membership-amid-protest-04-28-2017-4Tomovic, Dusica. "Montenegro MPs Back NATO Treaty Despite Protests." *Balkan Insight*, Balkan Insight, 28 Apr. 2017, www.balkaninsight.com/en/article/montenegro-approves-nato-membership-amid-protest-04-28-2017-4.

rights. Nevertheless, I would argue NATO accession of Montenegro is threatening to American national security because it places the United States in a position of potentially triggering a conflict with Russia, chiefly if Russia were to test NATO's propensity for collective defense in regards to Article 5.

## STRUCTURAL CONCEPTUALIZATION OF NATO

Before any relevant discussion, one need examine the structural characteristics of NATO. In the late 1960s, Harlan Cleveland, a former United States Permanent Representative to NATO described it as a "transatlantic bargain."[6] Using this framework, he argued that the alliance was "based firmly on unsentimental calculations of national self-interest on both sides of the Atlantic." However, as Cleveland asserts, it was likewise especially noteworthy to append that "it also depends on some amorphous but vital shared ideas about man, government, and society."[7] It's important to remember that the concept of a collective defense was unique at the time of NATO's founding in 1949. President George Washington once warned that we should avoid permanent foreign partnerships, a warning that the US mostly adhered to until 1949.[8] Former British statesman, Lord Palmerston once declared that "nations have no permanent friends or allies, they only have permanent interests," an assertion challenged by the very persistence of the NATO alliance.[9] Structurally, the NATO alliance is bound by fourteen articles of the original North Atlantic Treaty signed in Washington on April 4, 1949, and subsequently ratified promptly in each respective state. The treaty was modeled on the United Nations Charter, signed on June 25, 1945 by 51 initial signatories. Both treaties are mirrored on the theories of Woodrow Wilson, where the "importance to safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilizations of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law," consolidated the world in a cohesive system.[10] This cohesive consensus among the signatory states in NATO negates the very foundation of alliance theory; theories that have been studied and written on extensively since the Peloponnesian War. Hans Morgenthau, regarded as the father of modern-day realist school of thought, wrote in the renowned *Politics Among Nations*:

> [G]eneral alliances are typically of temporary duration and most prevalent in wartime; for the overriding common interest in winning the war and security through the peace settlement the interest for which the war was waged is bound to yield, once victory is won and the peace treaties are signed, to the traditionally separate and frequently incompatible interests of the individual nations. On the other hand, there exists a correlation between the permanency of an alliance and the limited character it serves; for only such a specific, limited interest is likely to last long enough to provide the foundation for a durable alliance.[11]

Nearly seven decades later, (and nearly three decades after the conclusion of the Cold War), the NATO alliance is still as formidable and efficient as ever. Although the primary purpose that generated the configuration of institutions in NATO, such as its vast civil and military structure, has evolved and improved over the years, it still possesses a robust bureaucracy in Brussels and abroad.[12] NATO has an abundance of independent agencies; an interspersed multinational military command composition;

6 Harlan Cleveland, NATO: The Transatlantic Bargain (New York: Harper & Row, 1970).
7 Stanley R. Sloan, Defense of the West: NATO, the European Union and the Transatlantic Bargain (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016).
8 Washington's Farewell Address, 1796, US Department of State, accessed May 01, 2017, https://history.state.gov/milestones/1784-1800/washington-farewell.
9 Stanley R. Sloan, Permanent Alliance?: NATO and the Transatlantic Bargain from Truman to Obama (New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013).
10 10 NATO, "Founding treaty," NATO, accessed December 08, 2017, https://www.nato.int/nato_static_fl2014/assets/pdf/stock_publications/20120822_nato_treaty_en_light_2009.pdf
11 Hans J. Morgenthau, Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace (New York: Mc Graw Hill, 1993).
12 Stanley R. Sloan, Defense of the West: NATO, the European Union and the Transatlantic Bargain (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016).

and universal standards, doctrine, and procedures.[13] This is what makes NATO novel as an alliance, and why it transcends the test of time; It is an institution more than it is an alliance, which is why it is important that it be studied as such. In the chapter titled "The Mechanisms of NATO Adaptation," within the timely and masterful book *How NATO Adapts* by Seth A. Johnston, he writes: "institutions structure power relations among actors. But institutions may also themselves be actors. The politics of institutional adaptation involve power relations among the members of an institution."[14]

In other words, every individual NATO member-state acts according to its interests, constituents, and laws. However, Johnston demonstrates that this notion contributes to the alliance more than it damages it, as opposed to an inference as viewed by those who believe that NATO is approaching extinction.[15]

## WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF NATO, AND THE LIBERAL WORLD ORDER?
American foreign policy is the principal driver of the plenitude of multilateral institutions, especially in NATO.[16] The North Atlantic Treaty was devised enable the coordination the United States and its European allies to act as a defense against the seeming threat posed by the Soviet Union, and its communist philosophy primarily.[17] At the time, the mutual concerns among NATO members centered on the preservation of democracy and the collapse of communism, which according to Morgenthau undergird the alliance.[18] It's apparent that communism is no longer a clear threat, and this can be taken to mean that NATO has lost its value in the international arena.[19] In Washington, many foreign policy experts continue to promulgate the perception that a Cold War still endures, though, no longer is it a war of ideas, but a war of geopolitics.[20] Albeit, many European capitals seem to believe to the contrary, as captured in the ardent address by former French President Nicolas Sarkozy's at the United Nations General Assembly when serving as President of the European Union:

> Europe does not want war. It does not want a war of civilizations. It does not want a war of religions. It does not want a cold war. Europe wants peace, and peace is always possible when one truly wants it. What Europe is telling Russia is that we want links with Russia, that we want to build a shared future with Russia, we want to be Russia's partner. Why not build a continent-wide common economic space which would unite Europe and Russia?[21]

Following that 2008 speech by Sarkozy, we have examined an uptick of economic interdependence linking European states and Russia, primarily in energy.[22] Geography plays a significant role in the irregularities in foreign policy that emerge from that of Europe and the United States.[23] Our world is fashioned not simply by politics, war, and peace - but also by geography.[24] Our planet's geophysical

---

[13] Ibid.
[14] Seth A. Johnston, How NATO Adapts: Strategy and Organization in the Atlantic Alliance Since 1950 (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2017).
[15] Robert J. Art, "Creating a Disaster: NATO's Open Door Policy," Political Science Quarterly: The Journal of Public and International Affairs 131, no. 2 (Summer 2016): , doi:10.1002/polq.12472.
[16] Walter Russell Mead, Special Providence: American Foreign Policy and How It Changed the World (New York, NY: Routledge, 2002).
[17] Jamie P. Shea, NATO 2000: A Political Agenda for a Political Alliance, ed. Nicholas Sherwen (London: Brassey's, 1990).
[18] Hans J. Morgenthau, Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace (New York: Mc Graw Hill, 1993).
[19] Tom Sauer, "Take It from a European: NATO Is Obsolete," The National Interest, February 22, 2017, accessed May 02, 2017, http://nationalinterest.org/feature/take-it-european-nato-obsolete-19537.
[20] Walter Russell Mead, "The Return of Geopolitics," Foreign Affairs, September 15, 2015, accessed May 07, 2017, https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/china/2014-04-17/return-geopolitics.
[21] Nikolas Sarkozy, "63rd Session of UN General Assembly," United Nations, September 23, 2008, accessed May 03, 2017, http://www.un.org/ga/63/generaldebate/france.shtml.
[22] http://www.gazpromexport.ru/en/statistics/
[23] Tim Marshall, Prisoners of Geography: Ten Maps That Explain Everything About the World (New York, NY: Scribner Book Company, 2016).
[24] Ibid.

configurations have formed conflicts as much as religion, ideology, and other factors we hold dear in sociology. In Robert D. Kaplan's *The Revenge of Geography*, he writes "Europe, as we know from Mackinder, has had its destiny shaped by the influx of Asian hordes. And indeed, in the twenty-first century, Europe will continue to be pivotally influenced by its relations with the East, particularly with Russia."[25] Europe has never begotten the advantageous geographical advantage that the United States benefits from.

**THE ROLE US DOMESTIC POLITICS PLAY IN FOREIGN POLICY**

To elaborate on American national security and the role NATO plays in it, American domestic politics must be addressed. Historically, the US executive and legislative branches have clashed over their constitutional powers to control foreign policy. This has been a battle that ensued on multiple occasions in the court of public opinion, and has contributed to uncertainty among US allies. John Kerry, the 68th United States Secretary of State, once stated, "This open letter by the Republicans to Iran] risks undermining the confidence that foreign governments in thousands of important agreements commit to between the United States and other countries. And it purports to tell the world that if you want to have any confidence in your dealings with America they have to negotiate with 535 members of Congress."[26]

According to the separation of powers affirmed in the Constitution, congressional participation in foreign policy comprises of four powers: (1) the ability to confirm presidential appointments, many of whom affect foreign policy, (2) war powers, specifically in declaring war on another state, (3) the power to regulate commerce, which is remarkably vital in a globalized world, and (4) the power of advice and consent in the establishment of treaties.[27] The type of Congress there is in the sphere of foreign policy, be it supportive, aggressive or strategic, results in different kinds of presidencies. To skirt past some of the powers of the legislative branch in foreign policy, the executive has resorted to several approaches. The four most significant strategies at the President's disposal are: "using executive agreements, issuing signing statements, using unofficial ambassadors, and engaging in undeclared wars."[28] Even with these strategies, and they have varied based on who was the Commander-in-Chief, there have been conflicts between the two branches. There is no greater illustration of this than the hard-fought dispute to get the United States Congress to ratify the North Atlantic Treaty. In 1948, the 33rd President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, and his Secretary of State, George C. Marshall, learned the hard way that domestic politics could put a dent on any foreign policy. In a *Foreign Affairs* piece by Michael Howard titled *NATO at Fifty: An Unhappy Successful Marriage: Security Means Knowing What to Expect*, he wrote:

> States are cold monsters that mate for convenience and self-protection, not love, and this became very clear during the negotiations for the creation of the alliance that dragged throughout 1948. The State Department, both conscious of a Congress still hostile to any further 'entangling alliances' and anxious not to accept the division of Germany and Europe as final, was at first prepared to act as no more than a benevolent godfather to a West European alliance.[29]

[25] Robert D. Kaplan, The Revenge of Geography: What the Map Tells Us About Coming Conflicts and the Battle Against Fate (New York: Random House Trade Paperbacks, 2013).

[26] Michael McAuliff, "John Kerry Hammers GOP Senators' 'Irresponsible' Letter to Iran," The Huffington Post, March 11, 2015, accessed May 03, 2017, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2015/03/11/john-kerry-iran-letter_n_6848562.html.

[27] https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/us-foreign-policy-powers-congress-and-president

[28] Glenn P. Hastedt, American Foreign Policy: Past, Present and Future (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015).

[29] Michael Howard, "NATO at Fifty: An Unhappy Successful Marriage: Security Means Knowing What to Expect," Foreign Affairs, May 23, 1999, accessed May 06, 2017, https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/1999-05-01/nato-fifty-unhappy-successful-marriage-security-means-knowing-what-expect.

## WHAT FUTURE DOES THE ALLIANCE HOLD?

Former Secretary of State, and National Security Advisor, Henry A. Kissinger proposed two solutions for enhancing allied cohesion. Dr. Kissinger stressed the importance of altering the method of consultation, as well as the necessity for a concerted Europe with institutions that predetermine the desire for an effective Atlantic community. There's something to be said about an alliance like NATO concerning its efficacy and endurance to remain compatible in the twenty-first century. First, according to Kissinger, "the internal working of modern government are so complex that they create a variety of obstacles to meaningful consultation [among those in the alliance]," in other words, domestic politics, and more precisely the arena of public estimation, appear to present a substantial dilemma to adherence in an alliance system such as a permanent NATO.[30] Second, while the Atlantic bond is forged by the consensus of member states to preserve freedom, democracy, and primarily a rules-based order, "an alliance of states very unequal in size and strength, differences are almost certain to arise. And they are likely to be intensified because the histories of the states vary widely and because of a technology of unprecedented destructiveness and novelty."[31]

## MAXIMALIST OR MINIMALIST: HOW IMPORTANT IS THE LEADER OF THE FREE WORLD?

In the prevailing international environment and the abundance of unprecedented global challenges that have risen in the world today, US national security policymaking has adapted significantly. NATO has not been nearly as quick to adjust whenever *force majeure* occurred. With the end of the Cold War came complex elements of both US and international security.[32] The constant reappraisal of strategy in an evolving global climate is essential and of immense consequence to policy makers in the United States. Not only is it essential to ensure that the observant society understands precisely the challenges confront the United States, but also that our adversaries discern that we do not follow a one-size-fits-all foreign policy.[33] September 11, 2001 was a turning point in the shift from conventional warfare and state-to-state dynamics of international relations.[34] We were confronted with a new strategic context, hurdles, and possibilities to adjust the accord of diplomacy. No longer was military warfare or nuclear deterrence as pressing as it formerly was; unique challenges of economic security, terrorism, counterinsurgency and homeland security arose.[35] Therefore, what is national security?

National security "refers to the safeguarding of a people, territory, and way of life. It includes protection from physical assault and in that sense, is similar to the term *defense*. However, national security also implies protection, through a variety of means, of a broad array of interests and values."[36]

Traditional US national security encompasses a diversity of issues, mainly originating from the importance of values, public opinion, and some form of ideology. These notions continued among the Atlantic alliance members and were reinforced even further throughout the Cold War's war of ideologies. However, in the post-Cold War era, and even more so in the post-9/11 era, we have seen a progression of American national security policy.[37] The Clinton Administration, albeit assuming a circumspect approach to changing the edifice of the US military, was considerably determined by its

---

[30] Henry A. Kissinger, The Troubled Partnership: A Re-appraisal of the Atlantic Alliance (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1982).
[31] Ibid., [PAGE NUMBER].
[32] Richard K. Betts, American Force: Dangers, Delusions, and Dilemmas in National Security (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2013).
[33] George C. Herring, From Colony to Superpower: US Foreign Relations Since 1776 (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2011).
[34] Ibid.
[35] Ibid.
[36] Amos A. Jordan et al., American National Security (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009).
[37] Amos A. Jordan et al., American National Security (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009).

readiness to deploy armed force in the world.[38] This prompted a policy of humanitarian intervention, particularly in the countries of Somalia, Haiti, Bosnia and Kosovo.[39] In the George W. Bush Administration, before the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, President Bush found it difficult to articulate what US national security policy objectives would signify.[40] Initially, during the campaign trail, "Governor George W. Bush formulated a modest agenda and sought to scale back the foreign policy activism of the Clinton years."[41] His key advisors criticized President Clinton for "failing to prioritize international affairs, for overusing the military to the point that 'thinly stretched armed forces came close to a breaking point,' and for embracing multilateralism at the expense of the US national interest."[42] Barack Obama seemingly held a more status quo viewpoint of foreign policy, with efforts to withdraw the American armed forces from the Middle East.[43] Donald Trump, notwithstanding his campaign bombast of populist and isolationist inclinations, appears to be moving in a similar vein.[44] Nonetheless, words do matter in international politics, and the particular disparagements President Donald Trump declared on the campaign trail had consequences not just for NATO, but also for the liberal world order and US national security policy makers. Which begs the same question that generated the necessity to write this paper, is NATO relevant to American national security?

## THE WILL TO LEAD: HOW INDISPENSABLE IS AMERICA'S ROLE IN THE WORLD?

Plainly put, the answer to the question of whether NATO is relevant to American national security is yes. The foundation of Western hegemony over the globe is the various multilateral institutions that were created to foster trade, ensure democratic freedoms in the world, and preserve peace. The two World Wars that ravaged all of Europe, and contributed to the loss of over one hundred million people influenced the conception of a world order which Henry Kissinger associates with:

> [the] contemporary, now global Westphalian system – what colloquially is called the world community – [which] has striven to curtail the anarchical nature of the world with an extensive network of international legal and organizational structures designed to foster open trade and a stable international finance system, establish accepted principles of resolving international disputes, and set limits on the conduct of wars when they do occur.[45]

American national security is undeniably influenced by organizations like NATO, "not just [because they are] market-oriented democracies but are [also] tied up by alliances," and it is significant to note that it is within US national interests to aid and preserve these partnerships. NATO potency as a military alliance, compounded with that of US primacy, has been so sturdy because it is difficult, and frankly rash, for any powers like China or Russia to directly confront it. Pax Americana, which translates to peace imposed by America, is still highly relevant to today's rapidly changing world.

---

[38] Richard A. Melanson, American Foreign Policy Since the Vietnam War: The Search for Consensus from Richard Nixon to George W. Bush (Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 2005).

[39] Derek H. Chollet, Tod Lindberg, and David Shorr, Bridging the Foreign Policy Divide: Liberals and Conservatives Find Common Ground on 10 Key Global Challenges (New York, NY: Routledge, 2008).

[40] Derek Chollet and James Goldgeier, America Between the Wars: From 11/9 to 9/11 - The Misunderstood Years Between the Fall of the Berlin Wall and the Start of the War on Terror (New York, NY: Public Affairs, 2009).

[41] Amos A. Jordan et al., American National Security (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009).

[42] Ibid.

[43] Mark Landler, "US Troops to Leave Iraq by Year's End, Obama Says," The New York Times, October 21, 2011, accessed May 04, 2017, http://www.nytimes.com/2011/10/22/world/middleeast/president-obama-announces-end-of-war-in-iraq.html.

[44] Josh Siegel, "Trump's First 100 Days on Foreign Policy," The Daily Signal, April 25, 2017, accessed May 04, 2017, http://dailysignal.com/2017/04/25/what-trump-has-done-on-foreign-policy-national-security-in-first-100-days/.

[45] Henry A. Kissinger, World Order (New York, NY: Penguin Books, 2014).

American national security is pegged to alliances like NATO and the EU, and in order to sustain our perception to exist between security, well-being and power as the United States, we must continue to view NATO as a relevant partner. The United States plays an indispensable role in the global fight for freedom, one that utilizes NATO as the vehicle for the completion of our goals, and it is incredibly important that we maintain the will to lead. American national security warrants that crucial decisions are made to define the future of the future world order, and our place in it.[46] If we withdrew from the international community to concentrate solely on nation-building in our own domestic sphere, "then the forces fighting against liberal democracy and our way of life will gain ground, and America will be faced with the prospect of stronger foes, weaker friends, and a less secure world."[47] There are several strong states that can challenge liberal democracy, specifically China, who "has combined authoritarian government with a partially marketized economy,"[48] whilst G. John Ikenberry believes that the fact that today's rising states are mostly large non-Western developing countries gives force to this narrative. The old liberal international order was designed and built in the west. Brazil, China, India, and other fast-emerging states have a different set of cultural, political, and economic experiences, and the see the world through their anti-imperial and anticolonial pasts.[49]

**CONCLUSION**

NATO and American national security are like glove and hand; both coexist with the help of the other and are supplemental. A large number of scholars say American power is in decline. However, the problem with American power in the twenty-first century is not that of decline, but the need for realization that even a hegemon like the United States cannot possibly achieve all of its goals without the help of allies. The twenty-first century presents an increasing number of challenges to the Western liberal order, and it requires the United States to share its efforts with allies and partners to combat them.[50] This point is integral to the notion that NATO remains relevant to American national security. With a rapidly rising China[51] and an ever more assertive Russia[52], we currently need more multilateralism, and not less. The period of American primacy on a unilateral front is over.[53] However, the world still looks to the United States to take the lead on global challenges that confront us all, and this is where the United States should remain steadfast as the world's main superpower. The NATO is relevant to American national security, now more than ever.

---

[46] Ian Bremmer, Superpower: Three Choices for America's Role in the World (New York, NY: Portfolio Penguin, 2016).

[47] Anders Fogh Rasmussen, The Will to Lead: America's Indispensable Role in the Global Fight for Freedom (New York, NY: Broadside, 2016).

[48] Francis Fukuyama, "The Future of History," Foreign Affairs, September 30, 2013, accessed May 06, 2017, https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/2012-01-01/future-history.

[49] G. John Ikenberry, "The Future of the Liberal World Order," Foreign Affairs, April 18, 2011, accessed May 06, 2017, https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/2011-05-01/future-liberal-world-order.

[50] Fareed Zakaria, "Can America Be Fixed?," Foreign Affairs, November 20, 2016, accessed May 07, 2017, https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/2012-12-03/can-america-be-fixed.

[51] Gideon Rachman, Easternization: War and Peace in the Asian Century (New York, NY: Other Press, 2017).

[52] Edward Lucas, The New Cold War: Putin's Russia and the Threat to the West (New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014).

[53] Joseph S. Nye, Jr., "The Future of American Power," Foreign Affairs, November 23, 2016, accessed May 06, 2017, https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/2010-11-01/future-american-power.

# The Worthiness of Citizenship

## The Spontaneous Racism and Myth of the Military Nation in the Public Responses to the Syrian Refugee Crisis in Turkey

*Merisa Sahin*

On July 2nd, 2016, while he was at a public *iftar* in Kilis, a city on the Syrian-Turkish border, Turkish president Recep Tayyip Erdogan declared that he was open to granting citizenship to Syrian asylum seekers. "I believe that within our brothers, there are those who want to become Turkish citizens. Steps have been taken by our Ministry of Interior. By forming an office by our ministry, we will, to the best of our power, help and support them, giving them the opportunity to citizenship."[1] The statement did not go much further than this, suggesting no specific plan for such an important move. Naturally, due to its controversial nature, Erdogan's message was discussed in many contexts, including in the political sphere, in the press, and on social media in the days that followed. The debates were cut short with an attempted coup on July 15, but even within such a short time frame, there were trends emerging in the analysis. In this paper, I will focus on the commentary during the thirteen days between Erdogan's citizenship promise to Syrian asylum seekers and the attempted coup. Examples will be drawn from press articles, personal social media accounts, and political statements.

In most responses to Erdogan's statement during this period, two things are consistent. The first one is spontaneous racism, that is both auto and hetero-referential.[2] The racist reaction that emerged after the citizenship statement was not organized around a common doctrine. There were no demonstrations against the statement, nor were there any attempts at organized opposition. Rather, there were personal accounts with similar arguments. Also, rather than the mainstream anti-immigrant sentiment about "invasion,"[3] these accounts consistently glorified the Turkish nation around the theme of "honor" and "patriotism." In historical context, this translates to "having fought for their land." This narrative automatically degraded Syrian asylum-seekers because of their "cowardice" for having escaped warfare instead of participating in it. The main idea in most of the criticisms toward Erdogan's decision was that it was wrong to naturalize people who "ran away" instead of defending their own country. This is a narrative that also existed in the statements of politicians and the press at the time.

The difference between the state response and the public response in Turkey is also an interesting topic. Derrida notes that there is always tension between state interests and local hospitality ethics.[4] Though this translated as a xenophobic state but with welcoming citizens in many circumstances, the opposite could be said for the Turkey. As mentioned above, while the Turkish state has been following an "open-door" policy since the beginning of the Syrian refugee crisis, the xenophobic response by the public is growing. And this response is similar in every political segment of the country. A majority of voters in every party is against the naturalization of Syrian asylum-seekers. In fact, this is the only thing the voters of all three major parties agree on, and naturalizing Syrian asylum-seekers was one of the few things that Erdogan could not get his followers to support. I argue that this public response developed because national identity formation in Turkey is based on

[1] "Erdoğan'dan Türkiye'deki Suriyelilere vatandaşlık açıklaması." BBC Türkçe, July 3, 2016. Accessed December 10, 2016. http://www.bbc.com/turkce/haberler/2016/07/160703_erdogan_suriyeliler.
[2] Étienne Balibar and Immanuel Maurice Wallerstein, Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities. London: Verso, 1991.
[3] Ghassan Hage, "État de siège: A dying domesticating colonialism?" in American Ethnologist 43, no. 1 (2016): 38-49. doi:10.1111/amet.12261.
[4] Jacques Derrida, On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness. London: Routledge, 2001.

national honor and heroism, or, to put it in Ayse Gul Altinay's words, "the myth of the military nation."[5]

In this paper, I will first look into the refugee policy of the Turkish government (specifically the Justice and Development Party), and consider its differences when compared to its European counterparts and the Turkish opposition parties in historical context. I will also discuss the migration policies of Turkey and the changes the Syrian Civil War instigated. Second, I will examine the responses to the situation by the media, politicians, and the public. I will focus solely on the thirteen days that followed Erdogan's declaration, because on July 15th, an attempted coup took place and the attention on Syrian asylum seekers dropped significantly in all of these segments. I will argue, by using parts of Etienne Balibar's framework of new racism, that the racism that has developed within Turkey over the last three years, and very specifically during the first half of July, 2016, is not a phenomenon that erupted due to a specific crisis, but is a continuation of the national identity formation that has been continuously reproduced in Turkey for the last century. As Balibar suggests, crisis racism is rarely a new phenomenon, rather it is "anchored in structures of very long standing, which are an integral part of what is called national identity."[6] This form of racism, which has been much more visible in Turkey over the past three years, fits the scheme of new racism, which is built on cultural differences rather than an idea of race. Many of the accounts that are featured in this paper illustrate discrimination against Syrian asylum seekers on the grounds that they have a different perspective on warfare than the Turkish do—they escape instead of facing the enemy, and this is not honorable.

I will refrain from using the term "refugee" in the Turkish context, for Turkey applies a "geographical limitation" in the implementation the 1951 Refugee Convention. This means that the term "refugee" is used only for European citizens who seek asylum and nobody else. The Syrians fleeing to Turkey are thus defined in the legal scheme as "asylum-seekers" that are under "temporary protection".[7]

**THE HEGEMONY OF THE JDP AND ITS RESPONSE TO THE SYRIAN CRISIS**

President Erdogan used to lead the Justice and Development Party, which has been in power in Turkey since 2002. Erdogan had to quit the party when he became President because the Turkish system, prior to the 2017 Constitutional referendum, did not allow the president to be attached to a party. Nevertheless, Erdogan's name is still synonymous with the JDP. The JDP has not faced significant competition in the last fifteen years. The party gained over 40 percent of the votes in every election since its second victory in 2007 while the main oppositional party generally receives only about 25 to 30 percent.[8] Because elections have posed no real threat to the JDP since 2002, the party has operated as a hegemonic power with the ability to define most policy agendas.

It is important to note that the JDP is different than both the Islamist political tradition in Turkey and the current right-wing party model in many European countries. The JDP was formed by a young group of politicians lead by Tayyip Erdogan and Abdullah Gul who left the Islamist, extreme right-wing Felicity Party (FP). At its establishment, the JDP presented itself as a moderately conservative party and an advocate of democratic reform, instead of emphasizing its Islamist features

---

[5] Ayşe Gül Altınay, The Myth of the Military Nation: Militarism, Gender, and Education in Turkey. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

[6] Balibar, Race, Nation, Class, 218.

[7] Resmi Gazete, "YABANCILAR VE ULUSLARARASI KORUMA KANUNU" in Resmi Gazete. April 11, 2013. Accessed December 16, 2016. http://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2013/04/20130411-2.htm.

[8] News, BBC. "Turkey election: Ruling AKP regains majority." BBC News. November 02, 2015. Accessed December 14, 2016. http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-34694420.

like its predecessors. It also promised market liberalization, global economic integration and privatization. Such properties were novel for those on the pious side of politics in Turkey, who were never able to integrate capitalism into their political standing. Both the economic and social policies of former Islamist parties were starkly different, emphasizing piety and conservatism. In its initial term between 2002 and 2007, the JDP passed many amendments to the existing legal structure which lead to democratic reforms, the recognition of certain groups that were denied by every government until then, and a general air of liberalization. These changes were partly motivated by the possibility of EU accession, and most of the constitutional changes were suggested by the EU itself. Such policies garnered unprecedented support from the liberal leftist intellectuals for a right-wing pious party.[9] The JDP's efforts during its first two terms towards reconciliation with the Kurdish,[10] Alevi[11] and non-Muslim populations, suggested that the JDP could be a more inclusive party than its competition on either the right or the left sides of the Turkish political spectrum. Gradually, the JDP adopted a more Islamic and Turkish-nationalist stance, halting the reconciliation processes. However, this did not immediately translate into its migration policies, which makes the JDP very different than its European counterparts. The JDP's shift toward a political stance favoring Turco-Islamic elements in its internal policies coincided with the eruption of civil war in Syria, which lead Turkey to host an unprecedented 3.1 million immigrants.[12]

As the party took on a neo-Ottoman foreign policy, which required it to become the powerhouse of the region and started to emphasize the identity of "the Turk" as opposed to "being-from-Turkey" (Türklük, implying a specific ethnicity instead of Türkiyelilik, which is solely based on being a citizen of Turkey), it paradoxically opened its doors to Syrian asylum-seekers. This ended up in the creation of another major ethnic group in Turkey, and the paradigm of Turkish national identity, which, at best, tends to ignore elements that are not Turkish and Sunni Islamic, directed its exclusionary nature towards this new ethnic group as it became increasingly visible.

Its stance toward immigration makes the JDP different than the right-wing parties in Europe. This became visible with the emergence of the Syrian refugee crisis. As exemplified in the Erdogan quote above, the Turkish government followed an "open-door policy" since the beginning of the civil war in Syria. However, the flows have had changing patterns. Until 2013, Syrian asylum-seekers predominantly resided in refugee camps close to the Turkish-Syrian border which were funded by the government and various International NGOs. Yet with the prolonged warfare and the resulting influx of asylum-seekers, the limited capacity of these camps was overwhelmed. This urged many Syrian asylum seekers to move toward larger urban areas including Istanbul, Ankara, and Izmir, beginning in 2013.[13] For many, Turkey was a convenient transit point to the EU, while many others viewed it as the final destination.[14]

[9] Cihan Tuğal, Passive Revolution: Absorbing the Islamic Challenge to Capitalism. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2009.

[10] Cuma Çiçek, "Elimination or integration of pro-Kurdish politics: Limits of the AKP's democratic initiative" in The Kurdish Question in Turkey: New Perspectives on Violence, Representation and Reconciliation, edited by Cengiz Güneş and Welat Zeydanlıoğlu, 245-57. Exeter Studies in Ethno Politics. New York, NY: Routledge, 2014.

[11] Soner, Bayram Ali, and Şule Toktaş, "Alevis and Alevism in the Changing Context of Turkish Politics: The Justice and Development Party's Alevi Opening" in Turkish Studies 12, no. 3 (2011): 419-34. Accessed December 12, 2016. doi:10.1080/14683849.2011.604214.

[12] UNHCR, "Syria Regional Refugee Response." United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. November 30, 2017. Accessed December 8, 2017. http://data.unhcr.org/syrianrefugees/country.php?id=224.

[13] Ahmet İçduygu, Syrian Refugees in Turkey: The Long Road Ahead. Report. April 2015. Accessed December 15, 2016. http://www.migrationpolicy.org/research/syrian-refugees-turkey-long-road-ahead.

[14] Ibid., 5.

**TURKEY'S HISTORY OF IMMIGRATION AND THE CASE OF SYRIA**

The history of immigration to Turkey is one that was stagnant for most of its history. From the initial years of the republic until the 1980s, the migrants Turkey received were predominantly people of Turkish origin who used to live outside of Turkey. This changed in the last four decades with increasing numbers of immigrants from different ethnic groups and nationalities. A significant portion of the migration toward Turkey after the 1980s was irregular, and Turkey did not have sufficient legal regulations that could deal with the situation. The law on refugees was amended in 1994 and once again in 2013, yet still the status of refugee is granted exclusively to Europeans. As a result, Turkey has been reluctant to produce effective immigration politics in response to the new situations.[15] However, this did not constitute a "crisis" until the Syrian civil war with the unprecedented number of people who came over a short time.

Turkey kept an open door to Syrian asylum seekers partly because it was not predicted that the civil war would go on for a long time. However, after ceasefire negotiations failed in 2012, the number of asylum seekers increased rapidly.[16] As of October 2016, Turkey hosts 3.1 million Syrian asylum-seekers, more than any other country currently hosts.[17] Turkey's response aimed for temporary protection of the newly arriving asylum-seekers and upheld the nonrefoulement principle and providing humanitarian assistance. In practice however, these goals were not achieved for all asylum-seekers. The situation was slightly improved by the aid of NGOs, however many asylum-seekers in Turkey today still live in very difficult conditions without jobs, healthcare, or education for their children.

In March 2016, Turkey and the EU struck a deal on the refugee crisis. It required Turkey to secure its borders to keep migrants from going into the EU and to take back the illegal immigrants in Greece who had already used Turkey as a stepping stone. In exchange, Turkey would receive six billion euros in refugee aid to be used to improve conditions for asylum seekers in the country. The EU would also grant Turkey the revival of accession talks and abolish the Schengen visa for Turkish citizens.[18] The deal decreased the number of immigrants that made their way into the EU, however it also gave Erdogan the opportunity to threaten the EU with opening Turkey's borders whenever he was not pleased with the deal. This arrangement ultimately made Turkey the final destination for many Syrian asylum-seekers, although their legal status in Turkey was still temporary.

Many asylum-seekers believe that due to the current situation in Syria, they will never be able to go back to their country. What started out as a temporary escape for many has to become a permanent. Yet, because this is not recognized by the state and they are still in the "asylum-seeker" status, many people in Syria live precarious lives.

**THE PUBLIC RESPONSE**

Syrian asylum-seekers were mostly eager about the citizenship news, but this optimism was not shared by Turkish citizens. While Turkey has suffered from increasing polarization since the

---

[15] İçduygu, Ahmet, and Damla B. Aksel. "Turkish Migration Policies: A Critical Historical Retrospective." Perceptions XVIII, no. 3 (Autumn 2013): 167-90.

[16] İçduygu, Syrian Refugees in Turkey, 6-7.

[17] The European Commission. Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection. "Turkey: Refugee Crisis." News release, September 2016. Accessed December 14, 2016. http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/aid/countries/factsheets/turkey_syrian_crisis_en.pdf.

[18] "Europe's murky deal with Turkey" in The Economist. May 28, 2016. Accessed December 18, 2016. http://www.economist.com/news/europe/21699466-eu-gambling-its-reputation-secure-its-borders-europes-murky-deal-turkey.

beginning of the JDP rule in 2002,[19] the words uttered by President Erdogan managed to unify the very divided population Turkey for the first time in years. According to various polls, around 17 percent of Turkish citizens, from many different political affiliations, support granting citizenship to Syrian asylum seekers.[20] In a survey conducted among JDP voters, most of them strongly stated their disappointment in the President's decision. Most of the concerns they expressed were about the lack of patriotism of Syrians. A middle-aged male voter stated, "I don't want them to become citizens. I vote for the JDP but I do not want this to happen…Syrians have failed to defend their own country and ran away." A male teacher, who defined his political views as "close to the rulers" uttered a similar argument, "I do not think it is right to give away the citizenship of an honorable nation to a people that have escaped war." Another male voter, aged 23, followed the same line of thought, "They have their own country. They should go and take it back. There is a war, but it's because of their leader. Was it easy for us to take back this country? We had to fight for it." Apart from the patriotism argument, this man said he believes the problem has a cultural component too, "I feel very uncomfortable. There are fights everywhere. They are aggressive. They do not even know what to swim in, we are afraid to go to parks. Their culture, everything they have is different."[21] Multiple petitions on change.org were simultaneously started against the decision, all arguing similar points. One of these petitions, called "We do not want Syrians to become citizens, this is not racism, it is standing up for our homeland" claimed that, "The qualified population of Syria stayed in Syria, defended their country and died for it. The ones we have here are those who are devoid of patriotism with no courage to fight…how dare you give away our soil, which was fought for by our founding fathers, to those who cannot even defend their own country?"[22]

Another petition, said "We do not want Syrians to be granted Turkish citizenship!" and has gained 315,000 supporters.[23] Though there were petitions in support of the decision as well, they were rare and had few supporters. In all of the content on change.org by people from Turkey about Syrian refugees, there were over 50 petitions that were anti-Syrian and only two that supported the naturalization of Syrian asylum seekers. Moreover, in other petitions whose concerns were completely unrelated to the Syrian crisis, remarks were still made about both the "cowardice" and the "aggressiveness" of Syrians.

The representations of Syrian asylum-seekers in the press did not improve the public perception either. In the last three years, Syrian asylum seekers have continuously been represented in the Turkish press as aggressors and criminals.[24] According to the data presented by the Media Watch on Hate Speech project, hate speech against Syrian asylum seekers has been rapidly increasing. Since April 2015, Syrians have regularly been one of the five groups targeted most by hate speech in Turkish media, a bias that existed only sporadically for Syrians prior to 2013.[25] Furthermore, the two main

[19] Emre Erdogan, "Turkey: Divided We Stand" in Turkey: Divided We Stand | The German Marshall Fund of the United States. April 12, 2016. Accessed December 15, 2016. http://www.gmfus.org/publications/turkey-divided-we-stand.
[20] Selin Girit, "Suriyelilere vatandaşlığa neden karşı çıkılıyor?" in BBC Türkçe. July 04, 2016. Accessed December 17, 2016. http://www.bbc.com/turkce/turkiye/2016/07/160704_suriyelilere_vatandaslik.
[21] Kevin Doyle, "Suriyelilere vatandaşlık: AKP seçmeni ne diyor?" in BBC Türkçe. July 12, 2016. Accessed December 17, 2016. http://www.bbc.com/turkce/haberler-turkiye-36780544.
[22] Çağrı Kayıkçı, "Cumhurbaşkanı: Suriyelilere vatandaşlık verilmesini istemiyoruz, bu ırkçılık değil vatanına sahip çıkma!" in Change.org. July 2016. Accessed December 20, 2016. https://www.change.org/p/cumhurbaşkanı-suriyelilere-vatandaşlık-verilmesini-istemiyoruz-bu-ırkçılık-değil-vatanına-sahip-çıkma
[23] Mehmet Berke, in "Suriyelilerin T.C Vatandaşlığına Hayır! #SuriyelilerinTCvatandaşlığınaHAYIR." Change.org. July 2016. Accessed December 20, 2016. https://www.change.org/p/suriyelilerin-t-c-vatandaşlığına-hayır-suriyelilerintcvatandaşlığınahayir.
[24] Ali Ekber Ertürk, "Misafirler (!) suç makinesi gibi" in Sözcü Gazetesi. May 15, 2016. Accessed December 19, 2016. http://www.sozcu.com.tr/2016/gundem/misafirler-suc-makinesi-1230634/.
[25] Zeynep Arslan, Pınar Ensari, and Funda Tekin, "Medyada Nefret Söylemi | Zeynep Arslan & Pınar Ensari & Funda Tekin." Interview by Buğra Barçın and Burak Demiryakan. 405, September 10, 2016. Accessed December 14, 2016. http://dortyuzbes.com/medyada-nefret-soylemi-zeynep-

opposition parties, Republican People's Party (centre-left, Kemalist) and Nationalist Action Party (far right, nationalist), both stated that they were against the citizenship scheme. Kilicdaroglu, the leader of the Republican People's Party, stated that the citizenship promise is going to "spoil the social texture of Turkey." He claims that which of the asylum-seekers are terrorists and which are innocent is unknown. He added, that Turkey's being "genetically modified" with this decision.[26] Devlet Bahceli of the extreme-right Nationalist Action Party, on the other hand, made a much stronger statement calling the decision irresponsible, "The Turkish citizenship is not something the President can just decide on. It has a respectability and title to it. No politician can overshadow it. Offering citizenship to millions of Syrians is an obstacle to our national unity. The state is Turkish, the citizens are Turkish, the future is Turkish. All those who try to break the future of the Turk should back off."[27]

The account by Bahceli, the leader of the ultra-right-wing and super-nationalist NAP, is similar to one of Balibar's arguments, "for the nation to be itself, it has to be racially or culturally pure."[28] Bahceli claims that naturalizing Syrian asylum-seekers will break the national unity, and one has to be "worthy" of being Turkish. This is a perfect example of the obscurity of the national identity, for he does not tell what makes people (un)worthy of naturalizing as Turkish citizens.

Many dissidents of Erdogan claimed that his declaration on naturalizing Syrian asylum-seekers was a scheme to gain three million new citizens who would vote for his party. But this argument ignored the agency of the asylum seekers, arguing that all three million of them would automatically vote for Erdogan's JDP because it was the party that naturalized them as Turkish citizens.[29] Ninety-seven percent of RPP voters and 94 percent of NAP voters were against the naturalization project. JDP voters, as demonstrated above, were also mostly against the deal, though with a lower percentage of 78 percent.[30]

All of this happened within a matter of thirteen days as a reaction to a vague statement by the President. Erdogan later on stated that "There are Syrians with very high qualifications" in Turkish territory, however he still did not clarify how the naturalization plan work.[31] The huge backlash to the very vague statement was a great example of how spontaneous racism comes to exist.[32]

A few hours after the statement, the #ÜlkemdeSuriyeliİstemiyorum ("I do not want Syrians in my country") hashtag was started on Twitter and became a global trending topic within a day. Filled with hate speech and racism, many statements on social media outlets were similar to those reported in the press. Many attributed cowardice to the Syrian people, "claiming they should have defended their country" and "they do not deserve to be Turkish citizens because Turks fought for theirs."[33]

arslan-pinar-ensari-funda-tekin/.

[26] Al Jazeera. "Muhalefetten 'Suriyelilere vatandaşlık' tepkisi." Al Jazeera Turk - Ortadoğu, Kafkasya, Balkanlar, Türkiye ve çevresindeki bölgeden son dakika haberleri ve analizler. July 12, 2016. Accessed December 20, 2016. http://www.aljazeera.com.tr/haber/muhalefetten-suriyelilere-vatandaslik-tepkisi.

[27] Habertürk. "MHP Genel Başkanı Devlet Bahçeli'den Suriyelilere vatandaşlık tepkisi: Sorumsuzluktur | Gündem Haberleri." Www.haberturk.com. July 12, 2016. Accessed December 20, 2016. http://www.haberturk.com/gundem/haber/1265391-devlet-bahceliden-suriyelilere-vatandaslik-tepkisi-sorumsuzluktur.

[28] Balibar. Race, Nation, Class. 60.

[29] Kamil Tekin Sürek, "Suriyeli mültecilere vatandaşlık vermek" Evrensel. July 7, 2016. Accessed December 19, 2016. https://www.evrensel.net/yazi/77010/suriyeli-multecilere-vatandaslik-vermek.

[30] Suraj Sharma, "'Vermin, dirty, freeloaders'... Turks turn on Syrians offered citizenship." Middle East Eye. July 13, 2016. Accessed December 19, 2016. http://www.middleeasteye.net/syrians%20citizenship%20turkey%20akp%20erdogan%20racism%20nationalism.

[31] BBC Türkçe. "Erdoğan'dan vatandaşlık açıklaması: Kalifikasyonu çok yüksek Suriyeliler var." BBC Türkçe. July 05, 2016. Accessed December 19, 2016. http://www.bbc.com/turkce/turkiye/2016/07/160705_erdogan_suriyeliler.

[32] Balibar. Race, Nation, Class. 38.

[33] Twitter. https://twitter.com/hashtag/ulkemdesuriyeliistemiyorum.

In all of the aforementioned accounts, we come across a spontaneous form of racism, which is auto-referential in the way that it frames Turks as an "honorable" people who have fought for their land, and hetero-referential in framing Syrians as "cowards" who chose to escape from warfare. This is a form of racism that erupted due to the increase of immigrants in Turkey, simultaneously with many other forms of racism in every country that has been affected by the Syrian refugee crisis.

Yet, it is actually the word crisis that problematizes it all. As mentioned before, Syrians were not a group that were primarily targeted with hate speech in Turkey prior to 2014.[34] However, as Etienne Balibar suggests, the hate speech had roots in the country already. The formation of the Turkish national identity relies on the people's ability to fight. Narratives of never having been colonized and always fighting back have been continuously utilized in politics and in daily life. In schools, every pupil is taught that Turks are a "military nation." The term, coined by Ayse Gul Altinay refers to the continuous reproduction of equation citizenship with being the nation's soldier. The Turkish military is deemed synonymous with the Turkish national identity.[35]

Although the overwhelming power of the military, which was present for the most part of Turkey's history,[36] has been diminished by the JDP government, this certainly does not mean that the "military nation" is also in decay. Narratives of heroism and martyrdom are used widely in the public discourse, reproducing the myth. The nation is built around being a "military nation"—the most important cultural, social and political characteristic[37] that forms the imagined community. Sayings like "Every Turk is born a soldier" are great representations of the general mindset of Turkish nationalism.[38] Turkey's "revolution from above" made sure that the military occupied center stage in the development of a national identity. Starting with the War of Independence, militarism has been a strong feature of Turkish politics.

However, it is not confined to politics. It also intervenes in daily life. Every male Turkish citizen faces compulsory conscription. History and social studies lessons in public schools are taught very militaristically, constantly emphasizing the importance of the army in the establishment of the country. Furthermore, there are compulsory National Security lessons at the high school level, which are taught by military officers, who expect a soldierly attitude during class. This means military salutes at the beginning and the end and a strict form of lecture where the students rarely speak.[39] This is the national identity that Balibar speaks of in the context of the emergence of crisis racism, which is generally independent from class and status identities.[40] Turkishness is defined by military heroism, it has continuously been defined by it since 1923. It is a much stronger narrative than "Turkish hospitality," as the Syrian case illustrates.

The military nation myth is so normalized that it is difficult to pinpoint it, especially as a local who was raised within the educational system and community, but its sudden eruptions as forms of hate speech and racism gives a hint of what the essence of the Turkish national project is. And this essence lies in the roots of what brought all voting bases together in the highly polarized Turkish context. It is in the essence of Turkishness to fight. Welcoming people who "did not fight" and "escaped" into the Turkish nation instead, means an intervention to the essence, which helps to

[34] Arslan, Ensari and Tekin. Medyada Nefret Söylemi.
[35] Altınay, The Myth of the Military Nation, 24.
[36] Ahmad, Feroz, The Making of Modern Turkey. London: Routledge, 1993.
[37] Altınay, The Myth of the Military Nation: Militarism, Gender, and Education in Turkey, 29-31.
[38] Benedict Anderson, Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism. London: Verso, 1991.
[39] Altınay, The Myth of the Military Nation: Militarism, Gender, and Education in Turkey, 161.
[40] Balibar. Race, Nation, Class. 219.

explain the attacks on people who are fleeing a humanitarian tragedy.

Balibar's framework of racism suggests that at times of crisis, certain racisms occur due to historical underlying assumptions. These assumptions, which may not surface until a crisis, may become prevalent once a new group emerges. In the case of Turkey and Syrian asylum seekers, these assumptions had to do with the militaristic identity of the Turkish, and how this self-perceptions conflicts with the image of Syrians fleeing from civil war instead of staying to fight. Asylum-seekers are thus portrayed as cowards as opposed to the "heroic" nation of Turkey, and are not viewed as "worthy of Turkish citizenship" by the public, despite the efforts of an otherwise well-supported government.

## CONCLUSION

I have argued, with the help of Balibar's conceptualization of new racism, that the roots of the discrimination against Syrian asylum-seekers in Turkey lie in Turkey's formation as a military nation. Although government policy has been to let asylum-seekers in for the last three years, this policy was not accepted by the public and caused increasing public antagonism against Syrians and the Turkish government. This is different than what European countries have done in response to the crisis. Turkey kept its doors open to any asylum-seeker and called them guests, although it failed in many instances to provide them with humanitarian assistance. The Turkish public, on the other hand, generally took a stance that is discriminatory toward Syrians. But it is different than the European discriminatory response which tends to reveal itself as a fear of invasion.[41] Instead, Syrian asylum seekers were not seen worthy of being a part of Turkish society because they were thought to have abandoned their country when it was in peril. The buildup of Turkish nationalism is rooted in its militaristic formation, which became the basis of the auto-referential racism toward Syrian asylum seekers. Although in many instances President Erdogan referred to Syrians using signifiers of affinity such as "brothers" or "sisters" he has failed to convince even his own voter base. The angry public response, though he has not laid out a plan proving that a speech he gave at a public iftar dinner is actually becoming a reality, says a lot about the level of discrimination in Turkey. The idea of granting citizenship to asylum-seekers was a mere possibility at the time of the backlash. It still is.

All of these discussions were forgotten at the night of July 15 with military tanks crossing the Bosphorus Bridge. For the first time in Turkish history, the people came out to fight soldiers against a coup d'état. This was unprecedented, even in Turkey which has had its share of military coups (three in 1960, 1971 and 1980, and many attempts in-between and after). I recognize that the valorization of the military shifted after that point, so my analyses on the exaltation of the Turkish military may not hold today in the post-coup Turkish context. However, the military nation argument is one that still applies, for the people who fought against the military were deemed soldiers and martyrs in the press and in political statements by the government, reproducing the military nation identity in a different sphere that is more akin to civil society and spontaneous revolt.

The situation for Syrian asylum-seekers in Turkey today is still precarious. The talk of citizenship has been tabled since the attempted coup, and it is very difficult to make future predictions at this time. However, it seems unlikely that Turkish hospitality will overcome Turkish militarism in the near future.

---

[41] Hage, État de siège, 39.

# Amid the Litani River and the Blue Line
## The case of Lebanon and Analysis of UNIFIL II

*Ana García Soria*

The United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL), which began 40 years ago, and the subsequent UNIFIL II, reborn a decade ago, have epitomized the fragility of Lebanon's political and social architecture.[1] With a renovated mandate since 2006, UNIFIL II still challenges the effectiveness of the United Nations (UN) in terms of peacekeeping operations (PKOs).[2] The complexity of UNIFIL II's mission is embedded in Lebanon's chronic traits of political instability and insecurity—due in part to its confessional system and the ineffectiveness of its political mechanisms of shared power.[3] Sectarian tensions, clashes in border areas, political assassinations, kidnappings, and the impact of refugee flows from Syria continue to ravage Lebanon's sociopolitical reality.[4] The UN PKO in Lebanon finds itself in a turbulent situation, fueled by the weakness of the Lebanese government in preserving its own legitimacy. Three elements coexist, interact, and lead to the current instability of UNIFIL II: the fragility of Lebanon's state the insurgent movement of Hezbollah, and the impact of political interests of foreign powers. Despite the opportunities that have emerged with the PKO intervention, sectarian struggles continue to divide the population, and the interference in Lebanese internal affairs by Syria, Iran, Israel, and Hezbollah, among many others that settle their bilateral disputes over Lebanese territory, further complicates matters.

Empirical and rational debates on UNIFIL II raise concerns over whether the UN should continue to provide support and services in Lebanon, particularly since the last extension of the mandate until August 2018.[5] The aim of this paper, therefore, is to navigate the factors that have led to UNIFIL's creation, how the operation has succeeded or failed to address controversies on both sides of the Blue Line, and what these successes and failures reveal about the future of PKOs in Lebanon. Given the new hostilities orchestrated by Hezbollah since 2006, what are the recurring and future dilemmas related to the Blue Line between Lebanon and Israel?

PKOs are humanitarian aid missions operating at the international level, essentially embodying the fundamental principles that govern the Preamble of the UN Charter: to guarantee international peace and security.[6] The need for peace operations comes from the 1945 collective security system of the UN. This system commits all states to contribute to international peace and prohibits them from resorting to the use of force, barring exceptions such as authorization by the UN Security Council (UNSC). The fall of the Berlin Wall creates a division between first-generation and second-generation of peace operations. This division makes Lebanon's case a unique one worthy of scholarly attention with both generations clearly manifested. The initial UNIFIL emerges as a first-generation type, with

[1] "Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon" (S/2006/560), United Nations. Approved 21 July 2006. Accessed December 12, 2017. http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/2006/560

[2] "United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) Background," United Nations. Last modified 2017. Accessed December 10, 2017. http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/missions/unifil/background.shtml

[3] "Country Reports – Lebanon," IHS Markit, Published February 28, 2017, *Business Source Complete*, EBSCO*host*. Accessed December 12, 2017, http://eds.b.ebscohost.com.proxy.library.nyu.edu/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=3&sid=fa879642-ee6c-488d-9b39-e3383d670d79%40sessionmgr101

[4] "Letter dated 12 March 2012 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council" (S/2015/475), United Nations, Approved March 22, 2012. Accessed December 8, 2017. http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/2015/475

[5] "Middle East" (S/RES/2373), United Nations. Approved August 30, 2017. Accessed December 10, 2017. http://www.securitycouncilreport.org/atf/cf/%7B65BFCF9B-6D27-4E9C-8CD3-CF6E4FF96FF9%7D/s_res_2373.pdf

[6] "Charter of the United Nations and Statute of the International Court of Justice," United Nations, Approved in 1945. Accessed November 28, 2017, https://treaties.un.org/doc/publication/ctc/uncharter.pdf.

the traditional objective of preventing and quelling the escalation of a conflict.[7] The evolution to UNIFIL II exhibits the second-generation features, transforming the PKO into an ambitious mission in which the civilian component, political negotiations, and police bodies are introduced. The uniqueness of this case comes from the spatial dimension of the ongoing conflict, which is channeled through the land, sea, and air spaces of Israel and Lebanon, which is used by both local actors (on either side) and countered by peacekeepers. The singularity UNIFIL II is also due to Europe's behavior as the backbone of the PKO within a turbulent Middle East. Stringent research is required so that the PKO does not lag behind the real conflict in the field.

## BACKGROUND: INTERNATIONALIZATION OF THE CONFLICT

Lebanon's situation operates at three levels: national (conducted by Lebanon's central government and the insurgent group Hezbollah), regional (spawned by Israel, Iran and Syria), and international (tamed by the moral injection of the UN). At the national level, the existence of large coalitions of political parties, the system of mutual veto power, the disproportionate representation of different religious groups, and the segmentation of autonomy have not prevented Lebanon from suffering social and political volatility.[8] At the regional level, an agreement on the delimitation of borders between Israel and Lebanon through the Blue Line, presents an extraordinary complexity, particularly because of the disputes arising from the claims on the Shebaa farms territory.[9] This contested area was occupied by Israel in 1967, during the invasion that took place in the Golan Heights.[10] However, after the Israeli withdrawal from this land in 2000, the Lebanese government made a formal claim on it by defining Lebanon's territory.[11] At the international level, the overwhelming reaction of the global community was concerned with the deterioration of the geopolitical situation in Lebanon. Some states, such as the US, followed Israeli arguments that supported the right of self-defense in the face of the Hezbollah attacks. Other states, such as Iran (whose interests were against those of Israel and the US), condemned the Israeli offensive and criticized its harshness for the attacks, referencing the principle of proportionality abided by Article 51 of the UN Charter.[12]

Since early 1970s, Lebanese territory had become the platform from which Palestinian activists would launch commando actions against Israeli targets and vice versa. After years of aggression and ensuing responses, Israel eventually invaded Lebanon in 1978.[13] The international community responded later that year when the UNSC issued Resolutions 425 and 426, approving the mobilization of Blue Helmets to the front lines of the Arab-Israeli conflict.[14,15] Israel did not abide by the ceasefire

---

[7] Daniel Druckman, Paul C. Stern, Paul Diehl, A. Betts Fetherston, Robert Johansen, William Durch, and Steven Ratner, "Evaluating peacekeeping missions," *Mershon International Studies*, Review 41, no. 1 (1997): 154. http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/222819.pdf

[8] Waleed Hazbun, "The Politics of Insecurity in the Arab World: A View from Beirut," *PS: Political Science & Politics* 50, no. 3 (2017): 656-659.

[9] Greg Breining, "The Thin Blue Line," In Wild Shore: Exploring Lake Superior by Kayak, *University of Minnesota Press,* (2000): 1-4, http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5749/j.ctttv2b0.4.

[10] Frederic C Hof, "A Practical Line: The Line of Withdrawal from Lebanon and Its Potential Applicability to the Golan Heights." *Middle East Journal* 55, no. 1 (2001): 33, http://www.jstor.org/stable/4329580.

[11] "Troop and police contributors archive (1990 - 2016)," United Nations. Last modified 2006. Accessed December 9, 2017. http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/resources/statistics/contributors_archive.shtml

[12] "Charter of the United Nations and Statute of the International Court of Justice," United Nations, Approved in 1945. Accessed November 28, 2017, https://treaties.un.org/doc/publication/ctc/uncharter.pf

[13] "Country Reports – Lebanon," IHS Markit, Published February 28, 2017, *Business Source Complete*, EBSCO*host*. Accessed December 12, 2017, http://eds.b.ebscohost.com.proxy.library.nyu.edu/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=3&sid=fa879642-ee6c-488d-9b39-e3383d670d79%40sessionmgr101

[14] "Israel-Lebanon" (S/RES/425), United Nations, Approved March 19, 1978. Accessed December 12, 2017. http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/425(1978)

[15] "Israel-Lebanon" (S/RES/426), United Nations, Approved March 19, 1978. Accessed December 12, 2017. http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/425(1978)

and invaded Lebanon again in 1982 under Operation Peace for Galilee, leading to the exile of the Palestinian nationalist leader Yasir Arafat and his followers to Tunisia.[16] To the detriment of Lebanon's sovereign power, Israel continued to disrupt the Lebanese Armed Forces (LAF), which held disputed control over southern Lebanon. Following offensives by Israeli forces, Hezbollah militants carried out an incursion into Israeli territory in 2006, killing eight Jewish soldiers and capturing two others in an action that set fire to the latent conflict.[17] The turbulent events led to the 2006 Second Lebanon War, an asymmetric armed confrontation between the Israeli Defense Forces (IDF) and the armed Shiite organization Hezbollah.

## HEZBOLLAH IN THE BLUE LINE

The Islamic Revolution in 1979 strengthened Hezbollah, which had, from 1982, become a leading organization in Lebanon with a military branch linked to Shiite interests intent on challenging Israel. Since 1985, Lebanon has been exposed to the designs of Hezbollah, considered the main operational insurgent movement on Lebanese soil with undisputed military power and social influence in the country.[18] Hezbollah has epitomized the triumph of an insurgent organization by becoming a social movement that has evolved into the form of a state.[19] Iran considers Hezbollah a spearhead in the battle against Israel. The geostrategic location of Lebanon and its turbulent political situation allows the shipment of arms, with Syrian consent, to the Hezbollah units operating on the border of Israel.[20] The group is also characterized by its desire to maintain a chaotic situation so as to disrupt the Lebanese Government's work when outcomes are not favorable. Hezbollah could be considered a movement that emerges in a state (Lebanon), with the help of other states (Syria and Iran), to fight against other states (Israel and the US)[21]. Hezbollah's emergence is, ultimately, a clear nexus between the process of disintegration of Lebanon's state and the privatization of violence within the region--a privatization of violence that has taken place mainly through Hezbollah's insurgent activities within the Blue Line.

The Blue Line border was created in 2000 with the mandate of "confirming Israel's withdrawal from southern Lebanon" and "restoring peace and international security,"[22] thus assisting the government of Lebanon in reestablishing its effective authority in the area.[23,24,25] Yet, the line does not constitute a border in the technical sense of law. The period between 2001-2006 was relatively calm along the Blue Line and UNIFIL troops were reduced to a minimum (200 peacekeepers).[26] However,

[16] Gema Martín Muñoz, "El Conflicto De Oriente Próximo: La Cosecha De Un Año." Política Exterior 20, no. 114 (2006): 111, http://www.jstor.org/stable/20645999.
[17] Rebekah Lynam, Maureen Taylor, and Peter Gade, "Newspaper Frames of Hizbullah: Uni Dimensional Framing of a Multi-Dimensional Organization," *International Security & Counter Terrorism Reference Center,* EBSCO*host*. Journal of Middle East Media 12 (2016): 75.
[18] Anthony H Cordesman, "Lebanese Security and the Hezbollah," *Center for Strategic and International Studies* (2006), http://file.setav.org/Files/Pdf/lebanese-security-and-the-hezbollah---anthony-cordesman---csis-report-2006.pdf
[19] Steven Metz, "Rethinking insurgency / Steven Metz," Carlisle, PA: *Strategic Studies Institute*, US Army War College, Government Printing Office Catalog, EBSCO*host*, (2007): 6.
[20] Rebekah Lynam, Maureen Taylor, and Peter Gade, "Newspaper Frames of Hizbullah: Uni Dimensional Framing of a Multi-Dimensional Organization," *International Security & Counter Terrorism Reference Center,* EBSCO*host*. Journal of Middle East Media 12 (2016): 68.
[21] Ídem. Pg. 75.
[22] S/RES/425, S/RES/426
[23] "Israel-Lebanon" (S/RES/425), United Nations, Approved March 19, 1978. Accessed December 12, 2017. http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/425(1978)
[24] "Israel-Lebanon" (S/RES/426), United Nations, Approved March 19, 1978. Accessed December 12, 2017. http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/425(1978)
[25] Greg Breining, "The Thin Blue Line," In Wild Shore: Exploring Lake Superior by Kayak, *University of Minnesota Press,* (2000): 2, http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5749/j.ctttv2b0.4.
[26] "Approved resources for peacekeeping operations for the period from 1 July 2016 to 30 June 2017" (A/C.5/70/24), United Nations General Assembly. Approved June 22, 2016. Accessed December 10, 2017. http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/C.5/70/24

Blue Line peacekeepers still strive to protect the local population, to ensure the security and mobility of humanitarian workers and the UN, and to assist LAF in its objective to effectively control the territory and keep the area free of irregular armed elements.[27] Problems arise with the explosive situation formed by the direct presence of Hezbollah and the indirect war in Syria, whose volatile influence aggravates the sectarian tensions in Lebanon and worsens the complexity of the historically fragile Middle East. It is in the eastern zone of the Blue Line where day-to-day operations of the blue insignia become increasingly more dangerous. The Shebaa farms, for example, are disputed lands where the conflicting borders of Israel, Syria, and Lebanon intersect, and the importance of this contested border must be understood in relation to the uncertainties generated by the incomplete territory over which Lebanon has full sovereignty. Lebanon's borders must therefore be restored and respected, especially because the Shebaa farms continue to be the argument raised by Hezbollah in order to justify its resistance within Lebanon, and refuse disarmament against the Israeli occupation.

## UN RESPONSE TO LEBANON

A proper analysis of the Blue Line in 2006 must also focus on prior UN actions regarding this issue, in the form of SC resolutions. The UNSC insisted on said actions in the preamble to Resolution 1701 (2006), invoking Resolutions 425 (1978), 426 (1978), and 520 (1982), which supported UN intervention in Lebanon. [28,29,30,31] The preamble focused on the causes of the conflict's resumption in 2006, framing them in terms of repeated non-compliance to the previous resolutions. Resolution 1701 was adopted almost a month after the beginning of the armed confrontation to urge parties to stop hostilities and protect the area between the Blue Line and the Litani River. Resolution 1701 was also the result of complicated negotiations that led to its unanimous approval within the UNSC[32] and reflects the intensity of the discussions. UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan underlined that Lebanon's conflict requires the UN, "to do a lot of work and, unfortunately, much of that work will not be new."[33] In fact, some of the demands expressed before the start of the confrontation are not reflected in it, but it has the acceptance of Lebanon and Israel, which opens a door to the hope that hostilities will not be resumed.[34]

As for the use of force, the mandate of the new UNIFIL II continues to be adopted under Chapter VI (and not VII as Israel requested), which concerns the peaceful measures that must be taken to resolve a conflict. However, in paragraph 12 of resolution 1701, UNIFIL II is authorized to "take all necessary measures," not only those aimed strictly at self-defense but also those necessary to ensure compliance of the mission and, under certain conditions, to ensure the protection of civilians

[27] "United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) Mandate," United Nations. Approved in 2006. Accessed December 10, 2017. https://unifil.unmissions.org/unifil-mandate

[28] "Israel-Lebanon" (S/RES/425), United Nations, Approved March 19, 1978. Accessed December 12, 2017. http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/425(1978)

[29] "Middle East" (S/RES/1701), United Nations. Approved August 11, 2006. Accessed December 7, 2017. http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/1701(2006)

[30] "Israel-Lebanon" (S/RES/426), United Nations, Approved March 19, 1978. Accessed December 12, 2017. http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/425(1978)

[31] "Israel-Lebanon" (S/RES/520), United Nations, Approved September 17, 1982. Accessed December 12, 2017. http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/520(1982)

[32] "Letter dated 21 August 2006 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council concerning the reinforcement of UNIFIL" (S/2006/675), United Nations. Approved August 2006. Accessed December 7, 2017. http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/2006/675

[33] "Middle East" (S/2006/733), United Nations. Approved September 13, 2006. Accessed December 10, 2017. http://repository.un.org/bitstream/handle/11176/19298/S_2006_733-EN.pdf?sequence=3&isAllowed=y

[34] Ídem, S/2006/733.

who are subject to an imminent threat of violence.[35] The Rules of Engagement (ROE) are more robust than in the old UNIFIL and provides the PKO armed forces with military equipment from the European states. Under the new ROE, Blue Helmets can resort to force to: defend UN personnel from attempted kidnappings or hostile actions, prevent attempts to kidnap or injure members of the Lebanese government and humanitarian workers, and protect civilians of direct physical threats.[36] Soldiers may also use force if an armed individual refuses to lay down their weapons, but not to defend buildings, facilities or equipment. The new UNIFIL enjoys heavy armament and better ROE, which shows the intention of the operation to be a deterrent force.[37]

Indeed, the UNSC authorized in Resolution 1701 an increase of up to a maximum of 15,000 soldiers, with a marked improvement in their capabilities.[38] The UNFIL force has more than 12,000 troops, 300 international civilians, 600 local civilians, with the majority of contributions of personnel and equipment coming from European Union states.[39,40] The increased involvement of European personnel is the differentiating element that provides the basis for affirming that Resolution 1701 has changed the very nature of UNIFIL's mandate, transforming it from a first-generation of PKO into a second generation type.[41] Troops have the mandate to control the smuggling of arms from Syria to Hezbollah, yet, they do not have the mandate to control the Syrian-Lebanese border, since this must result from an internal arrangement of the Lebanese government.[42] A meritorious achievement of UNSC 1701 is the establishment of a tripartite military committee composed of Israel, Lebanon, and, UNIFIL to monitor the border and generate preventative responses to potentially destabilizing situations.[43]

## ANALYSIS OF UNIFIL II, TOWARDS UNIFIL III?

Within Lebanon, violence is dialed up by the state's weakening control, raising the question of whether Lebanon is a "failed state." This argument is grounded on the fact that although the government actually exists, it is not in a position to exercise control over its whole territory. Moreover, it cannot guarantee public order and the security of its civilians, which is the cornerstone of any rule of law. Due to these factors, Lebanon is subject to the intervention of political interests by foreign powers. In this regard, the most important achievements of UNIFIL II have been the pacification of the Blue Line, a clear success compared to the previous situation of instability, and the deployment of LAF in the south of the country after decades of absence. The general situation has remained stable, despite the fragility of the cessation of hostilities and the occasional tensions between internal factions in May 2008.[44] The presence of LAF and the UNIFIL II forces have ensured respect for Resolution

---

[35] "Middle East" (S/RES/1701), United Nations. Approved August 11, 2006. Accessed December 7, 2017.
http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/1701(2006)
[36] Ídem, S/RES/1701.
[37] Nicholas Blandorf, "UN shifts toward aid projects in Lebanon," *The Christian Science Monitor*. Boston: The First Church of Christ Scientist, Published February 8, 2007, http://www.csmonitor.com/2007/0208/p07s02-wome.html
[38] "Middle East" (S/RES/1701), United Nations. Approved August 11, 2006. Accessed December 7, 2017.
http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/1701(2006)
[39] "Troop and police contributors archive (1990 - 2016)," United Nations. Last modified 2006. Accessed December 9, 2017.
http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/resources/statistics/contributors_archive.shtml
[40] Ídem.
[41] Félix Vacas Fernández, "Las Operaciones de Mantenimiento de la Paz de Naciones Unidas y el Principio de no Intervención," *Tirant lo blanch* (2003): 176.
[42] Gema Martín Muñoz, "El Conflicto De Oriente Próximo: La Cosecha De Un Año." Política Exterior 20, no. 114 (2006): 112, http://www.jstor.org/stable/20645999.
[43] Alexander Mattelaer, "Europe rediscovers peacekeeping? Political and military logics in the 2006 UNIFIL enhancement," *Archive of European Integration*, EBSCO*host*. Egmont Paper No. 34 (2009): 21.
[44] Waleed Hazbun, "The Politics of Insecurity in the Arab World: A View from Beirut," *PS: Political Science & Politics* 50, no. 3 (2017): 656-659.

1701 and the achievement of a peaceful situation on the southern border of the country. UNIFIL II has also carried out humanitarian activities, particularly in connection with the provision of medical and educational services, including lectures on the dangers posed by cluster bombs.[45] This is important from a practical point of view, but it also has symbolic value since reconstruction of welfare systems in southern Lebanon used to be handled by Hezbollah, who had *de facto* replaced the government and gained popular support. Finally, the political and diplomatic achievement of monthly tripartite meetings has enabled dialogue on security and confidence-building issues between the parties involved (IDF and LAF).[46] This is the only forum of debate between Israel and Lebanon, as these two countries do not maintain diplomatic relations.

Despite positive achievements, in May 2008, international concerns were raised about the effectiveness of UNIFIL II, when intense clashes broke out between Christian and Shiite factions. The situation further deteriorated during the Gaza crisis (December 2008 to January 2009), which included sporadic rocket launches from Lebanese territory and the Israeli response with artillery fire. At present, there is still a risk of additional rocket and artillery fire exchanges, not to mention the perennial threat posed by the arsenals of weapons that continue to exist in the area.[47] This is the part of the mandate in which the Lebanese Government and UNIFIL II have not yet achieved satisfactory results. The border with Syria is still used to deliver weapons and related material to Hezbollah, which contributes to a potential long-term instability, giving Israel a motive and an excuse for not cooperating. Israeli authorities have publicly denounced the arms trade, as did the Israeli ambassador to the UN, who blamed UNIFIL II for Hezbollah's capacity to circumvent authorities and keep rearming. Moreover, UNIFIL II has failed to prevent the IDF from flying over Lebanese airspace, and it has also been unable to prevent Israel from occupying Lebanon, thereby contravening resolution 1701 (2006).[48] Neither has Israel succeeded in cooperating by providing information on the exact number and location of cluster munitions used during the war. From July 2006 to March 2009, 27 civilians were killed and 238 injured as a result of cluster munitions, a figure that must be added to the 14 deaths and 43 wounded resulting from demining activities.[49] Furthermore, neither Resolution 1701 nor the mandate of the UN Forces envisage the possibility that UNIFIL II may act on its own initiative in complying with the proposed embargo measures. This embargo requires demand from the Lebanese authorities, and its approval conceals the reformulation of the operation's mandate. Therefore, the key issues to be addressed for the assurance of peace are: the exchange of Lebanese and Israeli prisoners, the continuing Israeli violations of Lebanese airspace, and respect for the arms embargo.

## HOW SUCCESSES AND FAILURES PREDICT THE FUTURE OF LEBANON

Lebanon's future is based on the results and shortcomings of UNIFIL II mission in particular and the inherent unfulfilled promises of PKOs in general. Resolution 2373 on August 30, 2017, has

---

[45] Nicholas Blandorf, "UN shifts toward aid projects in Lebanon," *The Christian Science Monitor*. Boston: The First Church of Christ Scientist, Published February 8, 2007, http://www.csmonitor.com/2007/0208/p07s02-wome.html

[46] Ídem.

[47] "Middle East" (S/RES/1884), United Nations. Approved August 29, 2009. Accessed December 10, 2017. http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/1884(2009)

[48] Anthony H Cordesman, "Lebanese Security and the Hezbollah," *Center for Strategic and International Studies* (2006): 20, http://file.setav.org/Files/Pdf/lebanese-security-and-the-hezbollah---anthony-cordesman---csis-report-2006.pdf

[49] "Middle East" (S/RES/1884), United Nations. Approved August 29, 2009. Accessed December 10, 2017. http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/1884(2009)

unanimously adopted the renewal of UNIFIL II's mandate until August 2018.[50] The UNSC's 15-member body has supported the hybrid peace governance between the Lebanese state and foreign countries. This geostrategic region will continue to anticipate the national interests of UNSC members towards the conflict, using the region as a proxy to fight Lebanon's neighbors. The continuation of UNIFIL II as a relationship of external powers will lead Lebanon to depend on international foreign aid. The military presence of UNIFIL has gradually been strengthened since 2000, rising from 2,000 troops to 15,000 troops in 2017, and the continuation of the PKOs maritime task force.[51] Resolution 2373 tackles Lebanese local authorities as an important ingredient to be considered in the coming projection of power.[52] Proportionality between the involvement of local actors and the inclusion of foreign powers is imperative if there is ever to be a durable ceasefire and a long-term solution in Lebanon through a PKO.

However, Lebanon's protection under the auspices of the UN also recalls the myriad ways in which the local population deals, subverts, and adapts to the process of hybrid peace governance in post-conflict environments. The existing gap between the intra-Lebanon conditions and its regional and international challenge regarding peace and security, will not be solved until Hezbollah is adroitly countered.[53] Foreign countries' tendency to label Hezbollah as a terrorist group contradicts the perspective of Lebanon's local population towards Hezbollah as "a group that garnered 88 percent of the Shiite vote and, in conjunction with its allies, 54 percent of the popular vote in the 2009 election."[54] Hezbollah's presence was further reinforced when President Michel Suleiman ended his term on May 2014 and a new crisis ensued over the presidential succession.[55] After two years of a political vacuum, the firm ally of Hezbollah, Michel Aoun, assumed the presidency of Lebanon in October 2016.[56] The advent of the election was primarily the persistence of the powerful Shiite groups, but also to the gradual weaknesses of political adversaries, led by the Sunni leader Saad Hariri. The next round of elections has been called for May 2018, allowing citizens to vote for the first time since 2009. The results will surely have a direct impact on the way UNIFIL II will continue to operate. The election of a leader supported by Hezbollah will ultimately bolster Iran's pursuit of hegemony in a region that maintains close ties with Saudi Arabia.

**CONCLUSION**

UN political ideals of freedom, equality, and the defense of human rights for all members of society and all societies have not been attained in Lebanon's geographical and social conflicts. Lebanon's case ultimately inhibits critical thinking about the political reality and fundamentals of PKOs. The enhanced mission in Lebanon is a traditional heritage operation with some particularities: more robust ROEs and the complexity of being a European-led operation in the Middle East. The constellation of Lebanon's dilemma needs to be linked to the scope of globalization and the premises of foreign-directed state-building within this scope, which favors the deployment of UNIFIL II as a

---

[50] "Middle East" (S/RES/2373), United Nations. Approved August 30, 2017. Accessed December 10, 2017. http://www.securitycouncilreport.org/atf/cf/%7B65BFCF9B-6D27-4E9C-8CD3-CF6E4FF96FF9%7D/s_res_2373.pdf
[51] "Approved resources for peacekeeping operations for the period from 1 July 2016 to 30 June 2017" (A/C.5/70/24), United Nations General Assembly. Approved June 22, 2016. Accessed December 10, 2017. http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/C.5/70/24
[52] "Middle East" (S/RES/2373), United Nations. Approved August 30, 2017. Accessed December 10, 2017. http://www.securitycouncilreport.org/atf/cf/%7B65BFCF9B-6D27-4E9C-8CD3-CF6E4FF96FF9%7D/s_res_2373.pdf
[53] Marie-Joëlle1 Zahar, "Norm Transmission in Peace- and Statebuilding: Lessons from Democracy Promotion in Sudan and Lebanon," *Legal Source*, EBSCO*host*. Global Governance 18, no. 1 (2012): 73.
[54] Ídem, Pg 80.
[55] Waleed Hazbun, "The Politics of Insecurity in the Arab World: A View from Beirut," *PS: Political Science & Politics* 50, no. 3 (2017): 656-659.
[56] Ídem.

vivid accommodation of outside powers. Within this scenario, the UN's approach to Lebanon through the conveyance of democratic norms has failed to establish political autonomy and self-government. Therefore, the promotion of democracy within PKOs does not necessarily guarantee success in the development of stable norms and predictable relationships within the country of intervention. Indeed, post-conflict environments are limited to the deployment of interventions, usually after the signing of a formal peace agreement. The establishment of the Blue Line took place after the UNIFIL Resolutions 425 and 426 in 1978 and the Taif Agreement in 1989. [57,58,59] Yet, a stable future was not guaranteed through regional agreements; this was seen in 2006 with the resumption of armed confrontations between Hezbollah and Israel, and in and 2008, when local violence in Lebanon could have potentially precipitated a civil war.

Future research should consider the alternatives of scaling down foreign involvement in Lebanon and the social conundrum of promoting local ownership. That is to say, research should focus on the commitments of the UN to defend and promote human rights within Lebanon, deescalating Lebanon's "bad neighboring effect," and tightly embracing the doctrine of Responsibility to Protect (R2P). Research should also explore the role of French and British colonial regimes in Lebanon, Syria, and Palestine. On the 11th anniversary of the formation of UNIFIL II, it is worth considering the need to withdraw from homogenizing universalist concepts, and to commit to the welfare of diverse cultures and dynamics of local communities in Lebanon.

---

[57] "Israel-Lebanon" (S/RES/425), United Nations, Approved March 19, 1978. Accessed December 12, 2017. http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/425(1978)
[58] "Israel-Lebanon" (S/RES/426), United Nations, Approved March 19, 1978. Accessed December 12, 2017. http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/425(1978)
[59] "The Taif Agreement," United Nations, Approved November 4, 1989. Accessed December 12, 2017. https://www.un.int/lebanon/sites/www.un.int/files/Lebanon/the_taif_agreement_english_version_.pdf

# The Times of European Identity

*Allie Vlachakis*

## THE INVENTION OF TIME

Europe: in the past decade, terrorism, economic recession, "exits" and unprecedented migration flows have stripped the word of any confident meaning. A whole generation used to the perks of porous borders and safety in peacetime, is now confronted with a sudden reality check that puts into question the perceived communal identity of Europeans. The nation-state, the cornerstone of the European status quo for more than a century, is placed under scrutiny.

The attempt to understand "what is happening" in Europe, to explain the changes that are now taking place, implies that we examine an *actuality* or a *situation*. Realizing that going into the details of these terms is ambitious, a basic understanding of what they signify in the context of international affairs is nevertheless necessary for this paper as it deals with issues of time and collective identity. How these notions are perceived in the context of globalization is a central theme of the commentary in this paper.

The recent attention to "fake news" and "the post-fact world" show that the self-evidence of facts has become less self-evident; the succession of the same term highlighting the mythical nature of the fact. Using Barthe's definition of myth,[1] it can be argued that a fact is first a symbol – the signifier – and it contains the signified – something that happened. The linguistic-mythological dimension of "fact" is not easy to discern as the etymology of the word itself deals with reality; it refers to the reality of the event that has *happened*. It is nevertheless possible that a fact bears no trace of absolute truth. For example, what may seem a belief to an outsider, may still be a fact for the believer.

What this discussion on facts merely underlines, is that contemporary societies are built upon a *rational* consensus, based on a general agreement. Thus, the notions of transparency and objectivity that are meant to define journalism as well as history are inherently political since they too are negotiated by way of a simultaneous, general agreement. Untangling rational nationalistic discourse from state sovereignty is crucial to addressing the logic behind exclusionary policies and in imagining state power as more socially-oriented.

In *Imagined Communities,* Benedict Anderson links simultaneity with press-capitalism and the creation of global time that permitted regulation of international trade. Anderson's explanation focuses specifically on nationalist narratives. Western imagination, he says, has been fashioned by "the cosmic clock that has made intelligible our synchronic transoceanic pairings;"[2] but despite this general agreement, different groups of nations have different genealogical readings of nationalism that engage "historical traditions of serial continuity."[3] Thus, according to Anderson, nations employed common characteristics that implied continuity*,* especially language, to legitimize their destiny: in Europe, this took the form of privileging a common tongue over regional dynamics, whereas in America, it was the linguistic attachment to the metropolis that permitted colonial nations to appropriate their territory by labeling it "new;" thus erasing indigenous history. In both cases, "forgetting" is central to the process of constructing the nation and forging its myth. These processes are central to Anderson's

---

[1] Barthes, *Mythologies* (New York: Farrar, Strauss &Giroux, 1991), 113.
[2] Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities* (New York: Verso 2006), 194.
[3] Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 195.

thesis that historical time is imagined.

However, for Anderson, "the possibility of imagining the nation arose historically,"[4] meaning that in the genealogy of the nation, historical continuity is based on the rupture, independent of narrative, with a set of historical events. For example, settler colonialism might have imagined its legitimacy against that of the indigenous peoples, but a material rift in continuity took place as well – especially in terms land appropriation. In the genealogical method, developed by Nietzsche and later Foucault, continuity as a barrier of absolute truth is disrupted, in order to debunk essentialist identities.[5] Despite its tendency to counter historical essentialism, genealogy remains a historicized concept.

## ENDS OF HISTORY

The disruption of imperial centers of power in the 19th century, gave birth to a Europe of nations that has continued to evolve ever since. Hegel believed that the historical justification of the nation-state came to being through a replacement of the religious community with an anonymous one, held together by calendric time invented by print capitalism. In the final chapter of his *Phenomenology of the Spirit,* Hegel defines the concept of absolute truth as the full historical consciousness of the subject, acquired through remembrance[6].

Hegel's universalism is primarily *idealist* and mostly focuses on the forging of national freedom; the historical subject is most of all a dialectical subject and does not subscribe to an anthropological or moral discourse. The "end of history," a diachronically debated idea that humanity will attain a point of original expression in the context of a sustainable global utopia, has a limited application in Hegel's thought. For Hegel, such an end is embodied by the state, both as a compound of the nation-state and as a motor of identity. In retrospect, Hegel's insistence on the state over the nation can be viewed as a counter to totalitarian notions of ethnically homogenous nations. Although a Europe of nations was still in the making in Hegel's time, he, as well as Metternich, hinted at a belief in internationalism or federalism as models of peace. Later writing in the *Philosophy of the Right,* Hegel actually saw the future of his ideas as lying in the US, representing the triumph of federalism.

A second interpretation of the "end of history" is that of Alexander Kojeve, whose theories were mostly developed in the interwar years. The lectures he gave on Hegel in Paris, were attended by French intellectuals like Jacques Lacan and Maurice Merleau-Ponty and directly influenced others, like Sartre. His considerable influence on this generation of intellectuals led to a consolidation of his views, but what is more significant is the effect this consolidation had on yet another generation of French thinkers, namely, the post-structuralists.

Kojeve interpreted Hegel anthropologically. Whereas in the work of Hegel the historical subject is an *idea* that refers to human consciousness, Kojeve placed the historical subject in the human *being*, thus presenting Hegel's dialectics as a history of man himself. Consequently, the "end of history" in Kojeve's thought, is a much more obscurantist and utopian notion that presents itself as the synthesis that emerged out of political conflict in first-half of 20th century Europe.

Kojeve, who gave up his position as an academic to work for the French state and later helped

[4] Anderson, *Imagined Communities,* 36.
[5] Foucault discusses Nietzsche and explains how the genealogical method tackles the "origin" to offer alternative narratives in his lecture *Nietzsche, la généalogie, l'histoire.*
[6] Hegel, G. W. F*., Phénoménologie De L'Esprit* (Paris: Flammarion, 2012), 680-690.

to build the European Economic Community, actively contributed to the functionalist European project that emerged in postwar Europe, establishing a form of *doux commerce* through free-trade zones and embedded liberalism. Besides his career as a statesman in Europe, Kojeve's political interests also extended abroad: Kojeve had showed his trust in the Soviets - allegedly having worked as a spy for the USSR - and he had also expressed his admiration for post-Fordist United States[7].

Even if his political career seems antithetical to his idea of history ending, Kojeve never altered his thinking. What he saw as an end, was the conviction that "no new political order can emerge that is both fundamentally different and rational;" yet the possibility for fundamental contingencies remains for Kojeve, who further saw his own "practical activity as administration of the details of the end of history."[8]

The remarkable thirty years of prosperity that followed the defeat of the Nazi regime was an era of peace and economic growth for the liberal European community. But with the advent of de-colonization and the economic crises of the '70s, the disillusioned next generation of Europeans had little respect for capitalist values. Similarly, post-structuralist thought that emerged in the context of civil rights movements in Europe and America, had little respect for Kojeve's generation. Interestingly, the fundamental break that occurred in continental philosophy with the rise of post-structuralist theorists, did not take the form of hatred for Kojeve or his contemporaries, but instead for Hegel; as in Kojeve's *reading* of Hegel's history as a history of man.

Deconstruction, the era's philosophical credo, developed mainly by Derrida, Deleuze and Foucault, attacked the notion of a historical subject, questioning not only the idea of history but also the wholeness of the human subject itself. For post-structuralists, the idea that human consciousness, in the state of absolute truth, is able to identify itself in the "other" was preposterous. They believed instead in a radical "other" that was by no means fully comprehensible. Except for Foucault, who mainly drew his influence from Nietzsche, French intellectuals of the time "were seduced by an altogether darker strain in German thought."[9] Heidegger and Schmitt became the new main influences of French theorists. This new philosophical alignment was inherently problematic. Schmitt and Heidegger were relevant to post-structuralist thought because of their critique of progress and their notion of a "temporal being," but it was these same philosophers that had inspired and collaborated with the Nazi regime. Nevertheless, these associations were silenced in an urgent need for an anti-capitalist philosophical support.

This silencing led to another effect. Post-structuralist libertarian values were successfully institutionalized in Great Britain and the US. Parallel to the rise of neo-liberalism in the Anglo-Saxon world was the emergence of a theoretical capital that justified the emerging self-realizing individual. Following the silencing of the affiliations of the specific branch of German philosophy that influenced post-structuralism, came a mutation of Marxist critique, that was conveniently "relieved of its embarrassingly atavistic attachment to economic categories and political institutions."[10] As Tony Judt shows in the second part of *Postwar* where he examines the discontents of postwar prosperity, by 1970 the Left was starting to emulate the radical Right that had been discredited in 1945 and a "180-year cycle of ideological politics in Europe was drawing to a close."[11]

---

[7]James H. Nichols, *Alexandre Kojeve: Wisdom at the End of History (Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 2007)*, 135.
[8] *Ibid,* 136-137
[9] Tony Judt, *Postwar* (London: Penguin, 2006)*, 480.
[10] *Ibid,* 479 - 483
[11] *Ibid,* 449

Practical Marxism faded completely with the denouement of revisionism in Eastern Europe. In terms of time, the end of the Communist "interlude" in Europe, brought with it new needs for re-examining Europe's historicity. Once again, the term "end of history" re-emerged with American political scientist Fukuyama[12], who used the concept more-or-less in the same manner as Kojeve. Reaffirming Kojeve's end of history, Fukuyama saw the globalized world after the fall of communism as an expected outcome of the unchangeable, rational political order; this time, liberal democracy was emerging from this order as the ultimate form of human government.

## CONTINUITY VERSUS REALITY

Postwar Western Europe collective identity was achieved through the forgetting of recent history and opting for 19th century humanist liberalism. Cold-War 'Europe', writes Judt, signified "domestic political stability, increased economic productivity and a steady expansion in foreign trade."[13] The two-generation *stasis* in Europe gave the "impression that peace was the natural order of things."[14] This was true for liberal Europe and for the Communist East that "too, had lived through an age of unusual, albeit involuntary, calm."[15] Until the fall of the Wall, "inter-state war disappeared from the continent of Europe" while "war (and ideological confrontation), was outsourced to the so-called Third World."[16] Detached from its "self-evident relationship" to America, liberal democratic Europe eventually reached, however reluctantly, its Eastern counterparts. But the ways in which integration of the East would proceed were already set.[17]

In *Dark Continent,* Mark Mazower chooses to interpret the modern European society as the product of liberal democracy's confrontation to Nazi totalitarianism, a thesis that is especially pertinent for studying European postwar identity. Blueprinting postwar Europe gave birth to the welfare state, a compromise of "*étatisme* at home and liberalization of trade."[18] The European project's functionalist thinkers, including Kojeve, created a system of state bureaucracy that despite subscribing to a Hegelian conception of a strong state containing the nation, reflected a continuity with that part of Nazi ideology, that understood the *synthesis* of the history of the human in an anthropological sense; the post-war peacekeeping community managed to "conquer Germany, but not their ideas." [19]

Culturally, this continuity was consolidated by a "myth of resistance" that tacitly marginalized anti-nationalist culture and appointed Nazi collaborators in the offices of the new bureaucracy. Institutionally, the military state was replaced by a police state,[20] that mainly exercised its power by violently containing colonized subjects in the "Third World." A product of globalization and colonization, the modern *refugee,* was also the product of the Jewish genocide that in Mazower's reading equals imperialism "turning on its head"[21] within the European borders. The history of the refugee, including the Jews in Nazi Germany, religious and gender minorities, Eastern Europeans, capitalism's guest-workers from the South and now the refugees fleeing war in Syria, can be read as the history of the European Other, which might as well be identified as the stateless non-national that the privileging of negative integration in European development never cared to account for. This deliberately

---

[12] Fukuyama, Francis. 2002. *The end of history and the last man*. New York: Perennial.
[13] Judt*, Postwar,* 750-751.
[14] *Ibid.*
[15] *Ibid.*
[16] *Ibid.*
[17] *Ibid.*
[18] Mark Mazower, *Dark Continent* (Vintage, 2000)*,* 206.
[19] Mark Mazower, *No Enchanted Palace* (Princeton University Press, 2008), 63.
[20] *See* James Sheehan, *Where Have All The Soldiers Gone?* (Mariner Books, 2009), 3-69.
[21] Mazower, *Dark Continent.,* xiii.

"forgotten" history, not only corresponds to Europe's criminal record of colonialism and treatment of refugees, but also serves as dormant fuel for authoritarian nationalism that, as it did the inter-war years, has the power to jeopardize the nation-state model and the union between them.

The geographical continuity of the European Union, proclaimed with the Schengen Agreement of 1985, gave birth to "Fortress Europe", an inherently xenophobic concept. "The greatest trans-national achievement" of Europe, the Schengen Agreement was a "provincial" measure, reinforcing "external borders separating [Europe] from outsiders."[22] The postwar negotiation of civil rights, a trademark of European integration, clearly defined the East as "undesired" and "lesser", settling for national definitions and guarantees that precluded the West from any obligation to the East. Positive institutions in the form of liberal intergovernmentalism and negative integration to establish solidarity between members of the Union was a means for European integration that evolved in the 20th century. During deindustrialization, taxation policies shifted to allow for transnational capital and market criteria took over political and legal institutions.

Neo-liberal rationality imposed a supranational economy and governance and an international management of rights and laws, vested in the International Monetary Fund, the World Trade Organization, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and the United Nations. Ironically, efforts to "transcend the shortcomings of national political calculation"[23] led to the decline of the nation-state through discrediting national sovereignty. Liberal European democracies did not really mark a radical break with totalitarianism, but instead put in place a loose union of nation-states that is responsible for today's nationalistic nostalgia and new authoritarianism.[24]

Boswell identifies welfare-based nationalism,[25] together with explicitly racist nationalism, as the two justifications of refugee policy in Europe and as the main outlook of new authoritarianism in Western Europe. The cultural impact of negative economic integration is starting to show: In Germany's social market economy, discrepancies caused by a decline in industry jobs have fueled xenophobic sentiment vested in extreme right populist parties like the AfD and the NPD. France's welfare nationalism is expressed differently by the right-wing FN and the center-left, with the latter actually recently modifying labor laws, following Germany's example, a measure that could lead to a fall in unemployment, an increase of income discrepancies and a shrinking of the welfare state.

Framed by the economic crisis of 2008 and the European migration panic starting in 2015, European geography has somehow been *remembered*. In an Eastern European state like Hungary, a complete absence of government representation positioned on the libertarian[26] side of the ideological spectrum accounts for a compressed policy space that also proves eastern EU Member states' lack of obligation to the liberal universalist project as well as a strong attachment to material values in ex-communist Europe. Institutionalized ethnocentric nationalism in Hungary, in comparison to mainly welfare-based nationalistic arguments in the West, highlights the importance of welfare for European identity.

The comparison between East and West, shows that a strong welfare state has become a mark

[22] Judt, *op. cit.,* 534.
[23] *Ibid*, 534.
[24]Wendy Brown, Walled *States, Waning Sovereignty* (Zone Books, 2010) – Brown shows how neoliberal rational ideology dislodges nation-state sovereignty, by assigning governance to globalized institutions.
[25] Christina Boswell, "European Values and the Asylum Crisis," International *Affairs*, Vol. 76, No. 3 (July 2000): 537-557.
[26] See, The Dimensionality of Party Politics in Europe: http://www.jhubc.it/ecpr-porto/virtualpaperroom/104.pdf and The Chapel Hill expert survey trend file: http://chesdata.eu/Papers/PP_2015.pdf

of prosperity. France's example shows that welfare can be sacrificed by EU-friendly governments in order to satisfy welfare-based secularist arguments at any time. Eurosceptic, right-wing populist parties on the other hand, reject libertarian European values and push for an exit. Libertarian values have been absorbed into neo-liberal rationalism in a political alignment that has emerged as an asymmetrical dynamic between a European Commission that is more liberal than the average member-state.

Geo-political discontinuity is also exemplified by countries of *entry,* in their relationship to the EU. Greece, which has always been imagined as the frontier of free Europe, currently has a left-wing populist government that aligns itself both with traditional left redistribution and mildly progressive libertarian values. The Greek government's failure to stick to the outcome of the 2015 referendum, testifies to the clientelism that defines its relationship to the EU. The election of a left government was nevertheless a turning point for European policies on refugees; it followed the "hands-off" attitude of the Greek government which created a humanitarian-industrial complex to deal with refugee influx on Greek soil by contracting NGO's with European money. EU policy has repeatedly undermined national sovereignty in Greece, blaming the Greek government for failing to impose adequate asylum policies. This has led to a rise in support for the Euro-skeptic and xenophobic Golden Dawn party.[27]

If a European identity is to emerge from this crisis, measurements of integration or globalization cannot go on ignoring the cultural and social integration of non-nationals as a parameter. But for the time being, asylum applications are piling up because of geographical discontinuity (the Macedonian border), treatment of refugees as human capital (the rhetoric that refugees can be a solution to demographic decline in developed European countries) and a lack of obligation to solidarity (ethno-centric nationalism). Moreover, employing the European databases of population flows, the humanitarian-industrial complex is exploiting the crisis to extract knowledge from border controls and enhance the police state and the war against terrorism.

**WELFARE IDENTITY**

This paper has tried to show that the idea of Europe is most of all a matter of geography. The regressiveness of this idea is undoubtedly the product of ethnic-cleansing and border control, that have not only replaced polyethnicity with a pluralism producing surplus human "stock" but have also undermined European-scale integration by promoting a reductive form of internationalism based on the privilege of citizenship and race. The creation of racially pure states might not be an exclusively European occurrence, but a union that is both made of and encourages the formation of the nation-state as a unit, is. Diversity in Europe is a matter of dependency; to the nation-state order on the one hand, to the nation framing the state on the other.

Both obscurantist, reactionary notions of European identity like *Mitteleuropa*[28] and rationalistic associations of Cold War Europe with the "West"[29] are outcomes of "forgetting," that invent European identity negatively, namely against its Eastern Other. The imperialist nature of the nation-state lies in its need to pass through the stage of an ethnic empire.[30] If the current identity crisis of Europe is an "end" of some idea, it is the end of the nation-state. For since its creation, the nation-

---

[27] For more on how sovereignty, or the lack thereof, has affected the rise of right-wing extremism, see Genealogy of a Crisis: Europe, Greece, and the Management of the Refugee Population, by Helen Makkas: http://www.inquiriesjournal.com/articles/1430/genealogy-of-a-crisis-europe-greece-and-the-management-of-the-refugee-population.

[28] Gerard Delanty, *Inventing Europe* (London: Palgrave MacMillan, 1995), 105.

[29] Delanty, *Inventing Europe,* 115.

[30] *Ibid,* 104.

state, as a strong state containing the nation, was part of an idea of Europe that was an alternative to nationalism. European modernity, as Gerard Delanty presents it in *Inventing Europe,* is "self-negating" and "representing the past" of–in the words of Baudrillard– "a nineteenth-century bourgeois dream."[31] European identity is "a secularizing anti-obscurantist normative idea [that] became an aesthetic impulse."[32]

In conclusion, European modernity is a euphemistic invention that merely disguises the continent's fascist past. Pressed by embarrassment and obsessed with peacekeeping in a postwar context, bourgeois aesthetics accidentally produced institutions that despite being backed by eugenic, hygienist and imperialist narratives, contained European cosmopolitan identity at its best; the welfare state was the only sign of a politics of "care" as opposed to genocidal pride that ended cosmopolitanism in the Holocaust. In a disrupted political landscape, the welfare state serves as a cultural reference that is one of the few identity contexts invented by Europe that allow for anti-nationalist culture.

If re-inventing itself is the genealogy of European identity, then the possibility for a collective identity that does not adapt to "the times," a vision, or a destiny, but to the reality of ethnic diversity and perhaps immoral cosmopolitanism, is still open.

---

[31] *Ibid,* 81-82.
[32] *Ibid.*

# The Rising China

## A Real Challenger to the US Hegemony?

*Kaibo Wang*

**INTRODUCTION**

Is China a real challenger or a potential partner for the US? This is a question which has been asked more frequently in the last ten years. After the Cold War, historian Francis Fukuyama argued that the world was at "the end of history." However, people immediately found out that history did not end at all. Although the Soviet Union disappeared, China became a new threat for America. In May 2007, the cover of *The Economist* featured a terrifying image for Americans in which a panda climbed atop the Empire State Building.

Various schools of thought in international relations offer different answers to this question. Realists assert that China is a real competitor because they are "faithful to Hobbes for whom the three causes of quarrels were competition, difference (i.e., distrust), and glory." [1] Specifically, realists view international politics as a zero-sum game, in which China's gain will be come at cost of a loss to the US globally. Furthermore, even though communist ideas have lost popularity there, China is still an outlier and a threat to the US because of its authoritarian political system, lack of freedom, and rule *by* law (rather than rule *of* law). Moreover, the fast growth rate of China will make America lose it dominance over the world economy.

In contrast, liberals consider China a potential partner. In the era of globalization, China and the US share enormous common economic interest, which means they have already become economic partners. "Economic interdependence would discourage states from using force against each other because warfare would threaten each side's prosperity." [2] What's more, liberals are strongly confident with international institutions. Consequently, they point out that China and the US could solve disputes and cooperate for better global governance in international organizations.

Unfortunately, not every school can comprehensively explain the complex relations between the two countries. When you apply liberal thought to understand the Sino-US relations, you could easily find that mutual economic interdependence doesn't bring the honeymoon between the two countries described in the theory of commercial pacifism. For realists, it is sometimes hard to explain the cooperation between the two nations ranging from economic issues to regional conflict. It is necessary for us to tackle this question by examining history with theories of international relations.

This topic is significant because no theory can fully answer the question related to world peace and prosperity. The Sino-US relationship is not merely about the two nations, as it has influence all over the world. When we define China as a challenger or a partner, China's attitude toward the American world order could be seen as the benchmark. After careful analysis, my conclusion is that China is only a rising power in the international order, it has not behaved like the USSR, which sought to develop a new world order. Thus, China is not a real challenger for the US, which means the US still could consider China as a potential partner for global prosperity and governance.

---

[1] Waltz, "Realist Thought and Neorealist Theory," 35.
[2] Walt, "International Relations: One World, Many Theories," 29.

The essay will be divided into five sections. In the first section, I will offer the definition of a challenger to American hegemony by examining the history of the USSR, a real challenger to the American world order. Models of economic development, security alliance systems, and global strategies will be considered as three key elements to define a challenger. In the second section, I will analyze why China does not fit the definition above. My response to opposing arguments will be presented in the third section, where Mearsheimer's viewpoints on China will be discussed. The fourth section will be the analysis of the strategy for the US to transform China into a partner. Finally, a conclusion will be drawn based on the discussion.

## WHAT IS THE DEFINITION OF A CHALLENGER TO THE US HEGEMONY?

When people search for the definition of a challenger to the hegemony of the US, the history of the Cold War provides them a good start. The existing world order was consolidated after the Second World War by the US. With the norms of democracy, open economy, and freedom, the US designed the American model of development and consolidated its blueprint of world order based on its model. People believed that their world could be modernized in the American way because they thought that the "American example could help people to liberate productivity and innovation from 'ancient' cultures and ideologies."[3] With the American model of development, America formed a liberal world, which was also called the international order designed by the US. However, the American world order was soon under the threat of a rising power—the Soviet Union.

According to the theory of communist internationalism, the USSR needed to support the "gigantic pace of world revolution and prevented revolution from being defeated by alliance of capitalist under the League of Nations."[4] It was seen as the way to create a new world order which was different from the American one. "Soviet Communism became a deadly rival of Americanism because it could be seen as an alternative modernity."[5] This new world order was founded on centralized politics, state-led economy, and world revolution, which became a threat to the capitalist world order. Consequently, the USSR became a challenger to the hegemony of the US. In order to protect the American model of economic development, the Marshall Plan was conducted to rebuild the economy of Europe, a continent which was a frontier that had to be defended against the invasion of the communism model. Containment was the main American foreign policy because the US needed to prevent the domino effect under the menace of the Eastern Bloc. The Bretton Woods system was developed as a global strategy to protect the American world order for the reason that the US needed to "make American capital available as cheap public loans to those governments that chose an open economy and the development of capitalist markets." [6]

From the competition between the two superpowers in the Cold War, we can determine the definition of a challenger to the US hegemony. It is the country that tries to develop a new world order which includes three key elements. A challenger should initially have and promote an alternative model of economic development to build the economic foundation for the new world order. The USSR applied and promoted the communist economic model, which "was based on a system of state ownership of the means of production, collective farming, industrial manufacturing, and centralized

[3] Westad, *The Global Cold War: Third World Interventions and the Making of Our Times*, 11.
[4] Mazower, *Governing the World, The History of an Idea, 1815 to the present*, 176.
[5] Westad, *The Global Cold War: Third World Interventions and the Making of Our Times*, 17.
[6] Odd Westad, *The Global Cold War: Third World Interventions and the Making of Our Times*, 153.

administrative planning."[7] It is a different model of economic development compared with the Western economic development model which valued private business, free trade and market. If the communist model spread broadly, it would reduce the influence of the American global economic influence. Second, a challenger should have security alliance to support its world order. The competition between the two superpowers was also the contest between the Eastern Bloc and the Western Bloc. The Soviet security alliance provided the global collective defense and sphere of influence for its alternative world order. Third, a challenger should have a global strategy to challenge the existing international system and promote its new world order. Although the USSR did not ruin the world order built up by America, its global strategy of world revolution and the spread of communism indeed placed the American international system in a swamp.

These three factors are generalized from the history of the Soviet Union, the only real challenger to the American world order. It is reasonable to argue that the definition drawn from the USSR is partial because "Wilhelmine Germany (1890–1918), Imperial Japan (1937–45), Nazi Germany (1933–45), and the Soviet Union (1945–90) all tried to match what the US had achieved in the Western Hemisphere."[8] However, the first three competitors were only the challengers to the interest or power of the US. They were not challengers to the US hegemony because the American world order was not built up at that time. The definition of a challenger in this essay obviously does not cover all perspectives of a challenger, but it indeed points out the major characters of a challenger by examining the economic foundation, security concern, and global strategy.

## IS CHINA A CHALLENGER TO THE US HEGEMONY?

From the perspective of international relations, hegemony usually means dominant power or significant influence in the world. Therefore, to some extent, the US hegemony equals with the American world order, a global order consolidated and controlled by the US after World War II. After clearly defining the words "challenger" and "hegemony," it is time to examine China from the perspective of model of economic development, security alliance system, and global strategy.

Although China still has its own characteristics in economic development, it also applied the American model of economic development after the Chinese economic reform. Instead of behaving like the USSR, which developed its economy by the communist model and stayed outside of the American system with the ambition to counteract the American economic system, China has changed from the communist economic model to the American model of economic development. After the opening-up policy, China began to follow the Western model by advocating for the market economy, free trade, and private business. To some extent, it not only did not threaten the American international economy system, it also became a beneficiary or even an active promoter of the American model. "The rapid growth of China's economy and US-China economic relations have largely conformed with and been driven by force of international economic globalization."[9] This globalization is exactly the most significant element of American world economic order, which facilitates free trade, capital movement, and interdependent economies. To be more specific, China will not become a revisionist in the American economic world order if it can continue to enjoy enormous economic benefits by applying the American model and staying within the American economic world system. For instance, after joining the WTO in 2001, one of the cornerstone institutions of the American-led economic

---

[7] Philip Hanson, *The Rise and Fall of the Soviet Economy: An Economic History of the USSR from 1945*, 6.
[8] Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, 367.
[9] Sutter, *US-Chinese Relations Perilous Past, Pragmatic* Present, 192.

order, Chinese "exports and imports in 2004 were both more than twice as large as those just three years earlier, in 2001."[10]

Without any doubt, the Chinese economy still has its own communist features, such as strong state-owned enterprises (SOEs) and a planned economy. It does sometimes violate the rule of the American economic world order when it manipulates currency, intellectual property rights, and trade subsidies. Take China's manipulation on currency as an example, "from July 2005 through June 2013, the RMB appreciated by 34% on a nominal basis against the dollar and by 42% on a real (inflation-adjusted) basis."[11] With the undervalued currency, China could promote its exports with attractive lower prices. Another example is related to SOEs. SOEs generate roughly 40 percent of China's GDP and have trouble adapting to new market conditions due to their monopolies and oligopolies.[12] If China is willing to continue to develop its economy, it has to get rid of these Communist-style drawbacks on its economy. As long as China keeps its economic policy, it will always welcome foreign investment and advocate trade and globalization, which makes China a strong supporter of the US economic world order.

With a high growth rate under the American economic system, China has no intention to challenge the American model of economic development. Even certain realists, who perceive this as a zero-sum game, acknowledge China's gain in the American world order by saying that "rarely in history has a rising power made such prominent gains in the international system largely as a consequence of the actions and inattentiveness of the dominant power."[13]

Secondly, China's double-digit increase on military spending has made the world worried about China's military ambition. However, its ambition has not created a global security alliance system. Thus, it is hard to consider China as a challenger to the American global security system. First, no one could deny that Chinese military growth is an undeniable phenomenon. "Since 1990 China's official defense budget has increased in nominal terms by double digits every year except 2010. Its projected official defense budget in 2014 was 808 billion renminbi (approximately $132 billion), a 12.2 percent increase over 2013."[14] In addition to the increase in number, Chinese military power spread geographically. Take the Bay of Bengal as an instance, "China is building up its military existence in the region in the Gwadar port under the name of China-Pakistan Economic Corridor."[15] What's more, Chinese submarine activities at the Hambantota port and the development of the Colombo port have made India suspicious.[16]

However, the increase in military spending and several global military actions cannot directly lead to the conclusion that China is a challenger to the US hegemony. The most convincing reason is that China does not have a security alliance system to counter the power of the American ally system. North Korea is the only official ally for China, but China considers it a trouble-maker instead of a useful ally. Beijing admires Pakistan as the only "all-weather strategic partner" though they have not built a formal alliance relationship. Except for these two countries, China has no more allies all over the world. On the other side, "the US alliance system comprises some sixty allies, which, if one

---

[10] Lampton, *The Three Faces of Chinese Power: Might, Money, and Minds*, 88.
[11] Morrison and Labonte, *China's Currency Policy: An Analysis of the Economic* Issues, 2.
[12] Denoon, "Where Did China's Economy Go Wrong."
[13] Christensen, *The China Challenge: Shaping the Choices of a Rising Power*, 90.
[14] Liff and Ikenberry, "Racing toward Tragedy? China's Rise, Military Competition in the Asia Pacific, and the Security Dilemma," 66.
[15] Suryanarayana, *India Ocean and the Bay of Bengal: A Strategic Factor in China-South Asia Relations*, 12.
[16] Suryanarayana, *India Ocean and the Bay of Bengal: A Strategic Factor in China-South Asia Relations*, 10.

includes the US itself, constitutes some 80 percent of global military spending."[17] The American world order is strongly protected by its global alliance system, which is impossible for China to challenge at all.

Moreover, China also has no possibility to form its alliance system in the future due to the US alliance system in Asia. Mearsheimer argues that "the paramount goal a great power can attain is regional hegemony, which means dominating one's surrounding neighborhood."[18] The regional hegemony is "one of the main reasons the US is able to station military forces all around the globe and intrude in the politics of virtually every region is that it faces no serious threats in the Western Hemisphere."[19] That means if a country is eager to construct a global military network or security alliance, it needs to make sure the military domination in its own region. China obviously does not have this military influence in Asia. For one, the US keeps a strong presence in Asia Pacific. "Six of 11 aircraft carrier battle groups and 60 percent of the US Navy's ships are scheduled to be home-ported in the Pacific Ocean by 2020."[20] In addition, it seems that no big powers in the region have intention to form a strong military relationship with China. In fact, China's growing military power makes the countries in the region more anxious toward it. Australia's enhancement of its military ties with the US and Japan "appears to be a direct reaction to China's increasing military capabilities, as well as doubts about Beijing's intentions."[21] Moreover, China's aggressive action in the South China Sea made Southeast Asian countries more anxious.

"China must recognize that its rise is not occurring in a strategic vacuum," [22] consequently, China would face extreme difficulty if it was determined to give up the non-alignment policy and began to form its own security network. For example, Cambodia supported China twice on the dispute of the South China Sea which prevented China from being humiliated on the meeting of ASEAN. However, China does not have dominant power even in Asia compared with the US. It has more competitors than friends in Asia-Pacific region. After the US presidential election of 2016, President Trump added many uncertainties about American diplomacy which include its Asian alliance system but, obviously, his argument has not all become his policy. Overall, President Trump keeps the US alliance system in Asia and maintains the existence in this region and therefore China is not living in a strategic vacuum.

Third, China could not become a challenger to the US hegemony without owning a global strategy to keep its sphere of influence. According to Lenin, "unevenness of economic and political development is the inflexible law of capitalism. It flows from this that the victory of Socialism may come originally in a few capitalist countries or even in a single capitalist country. The victorious proletariat of that country would rise against the remaining capitalist world, drawing to itself in the process of oppressed classes of other countries."[23] Although the USSR slowed down the speed of world revolution, its general global strategy was never changed. This strategy of the USSR led to its competition with the US for the influence in the Third World. This global strategy directly imperiled the American world order because it was designed to expand the sphere of influence of communism.

[17] Christensen, *The China Challenge: Shaping the Choices of a Rising Power*, 89.
[18] Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, 365.
[19] Mearsheimer, *The tragedy of Great Power politics*, 365.
[20] Liff and Ikenberry, "Racing toward Tragedy? China's Rise, Military Competition in the Asia Pacific, and the Security Dilemma," 83.
[21] Liff and Ikenberry, "Racing toward Tragedy? China's Rise, Military Competition in the Asia Pacific, and the Security Dilemma," 71.
[22] Liff and Ikenberry, "Racing toward Tragedy? China's Rise, Military Competition in the Asia Pacific, and the Security Dilemma," 89.
[23] X, "The Sources of Soviet Conduct," 567.

However, China does not own a global strategy to compete with the world order of the US. With China's economic miracle, the China threat theory emerged. In 2011, famous Chinese scholar Jisi Wang published an article to reply to the China threat theory and pointed out that China did not form a grand strategy because Chinese "foreign and defense policies have been remarkably consistent and reasonably well coordinated with the country's domestic priorities and China did not disclose any documents about its grand strategy."[24] Thus, we could find that instead of forming a global strategy to threaten the existing world order, China's action at that time merely was to figure out its global position and the way to suit Chinese domestic interests. The domestic interests included the quality of life for Chinese citizens, increased economic development, and an international reputation. All of these domestic interests actually demonstrate the Chinese ambition to get rid of the 100 years of humiliation and to achieve status as a developed nation. Thus, these domestic concerns have no connection to Chinese hegemony because they mainly concentrate inward instead of outward.

After President Xi came into power, the topic of Chinese global strategy became popular again. With the One Belt One Road (OBOR) and Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB), China is once again seen as the possible challenger. However, none of this can create a potential to challenge the American global system. First, it is impossible to consider the AIIB as a global strategy for China. Although the AIIB has successfully drawn people's attention, it is still only a financial institution within the American system. The creation of the AIIB will be likely fill some gaps of the existing system with more focus on infrastructure. The AIIB not only applies methods similar to the Asian Development Bank or the World Bank to invest in various projects, it also cooperates with the existing institutions. "The AIIB and the World Bank have co-financed five projects, supporting power generation in Pakistan; a natural gas pipeline in Azerbaijan; and slum upgrading, dam safety, and regional infrastructure development in Indonesia."[25]

Compared with the AIIB, the OBOR seems more like a global strategy. China may have ambition to develop the OBOR as one of the cornerstone for its global ambition. According to the report of PwC, the OBOR will mobilize up to "1 trillion US dollars of outbound state financing from the Chinese government in the next 10 years, which is considered to be a way to reform the structure of its own economy."[26] But the reality is that after it was created in 2013, China has not formed a global network in the last four years. Many countries are interested in the project but no one clearly understands where the project will lead. As a result, several bilateral cooperation treaties have been signed although the OBOR was planned to be a global and multilateral initiative at the beginning. Even though we assume the world will welcome the OBOR projects one day, China still needs a long time to form its global influence through this ambitious, but unclear, initiative.

All-in-all, after careful examination, we see that China cannot be considered as a real challenger to the US hegemony because it is only a rising power under the world order of the US. First of all, China enjoys the status quo in the existing global economic system, and, consequently, China lacks the capability and the incentive to create an alternative model of economic development. Second, China has no security alliance system to provide enough military power to become a challenger to the US hegemony. Third, without a global strategy, China does not own a potential international initiative

---

[24] Wang, "China's Search for a Grand Strategy: A Rising Great Power Finds Its Way," 68.

[25] World Bank and AIIB Sign Cooperation Framework, World Bank, Last modified April 28, 2017, http://www.worldbank.org/en/news/press-release/2017/04/23/world-bank-and-aiib-sign-cooperation-framework.

[26] PwC's Growth Markets Centre, *China's new silk route: the long and winding road,* 4.

to construct its own global order. Therefore, it is hard to believe China has been, or will be, a real challenger to the US hegemony as long as the American world order exists.

## RESPONSE TO THE OPPOSITE OPINION: THE MEARSHEIMER'S VIEWPOINT ON CHINA

Although I argue that China is not a challenger to the American world order, I have noticed that there are many different and opposite opinions. Mearsheimer, as one of the leading realists, asserts that China is a significant threat for the US. He argues that "if China continues its striking economic growth over the next few decades, it is likely to act in accordance with the logic of offensive realism, which is to say it will attempt to imitate the [US]. Specifically, it will try to dominate Asia the way the [US] dominates the Western Hemisphere. It will do so primarily because such domination offers the best way to survive under international anarchy."[27] Mearsheimer agrees with my argument that China has not been a real challenger yet because of the large economic and military gap between the two countries. However, I disagree with Mearsheimer on the dynamics between China and America in the future. According to Mearsheimer, when China has roughly the same size of economy and military power as the US, it will become a challenger to the American world order because it will follow the same road as the US to construct its hegemony.

My first response is that China will not follow the American way to dominate Asia. As I mentioned before, there is almost no strategic vacuum in Asia because of the growing US military presence and the Western alliance system. If China follows the same way to push the US out of Asia, it will only worsen the security dilemma in the region or even raise military conflict with the US. The security dilemma would destabilize Asia, damaging the Chinese economy. Economic development has always been a major concern for China. A potential conflict between the superpowers would likely be unaffordable for China. It is not wise for China to take the risk to lose what it has already achieved only to pursue an impossible regional hegemony.

My second response is that people should take the American world order into account rather than consider the US as only a regional hegemon. Mearsheimer argues that the US is only a regional hegemon because it is hard to "conquer and subdue distant great powers."[28] Therefore, China will be a significant threat for the US if it can become an Asian hegemon. By this logic, the competition between the US and China will be the struggle between two nominally equal regional hegemons. I argue that this is not the case, with Mearsheimer overestimating China's threat by undervaluing American power. The US is a global hegemon which keeps control of the world order. If it were only a regional power, no one could explain the existence of the domination of the American economy model (market economy and free trade), the US worldwide alliance system, and its global strategy to maintain the liberal world order. It is even confusing to understand the reasons for America to get involved in the issue of the South China Sea if the US is only a regional power which merely worries about its survival in an anarchy state. When we predict whether China will become a challenger to American world order or not, we need to consider American global power seriously. After we understand the global dominance of the Unites States, China seems to have no possibility or intention

---

[27] Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, 368.
[28] Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, 364.

to challenge this powerful hegemon. China's action will be seen as irrational and destructive if it recklessly challenges the American world order supported by US alliance system in the future.

## STRATEGY FOR THE US TO TRANSFORM CHINA INTO A PARTNER

If China is not a challenger to the US hegemony, then how should America deal with this rising power in its international system? From my point of view, China could act as a partner in the American world order—but only if the partnership is not taken for granted. The US should transform China into a partner just like it brought China into the liberal economic order before.

One the one hand, the US still needs to lead the liberal world. By keeping its global influence, America could continue to provide public good and prevent a strategic vacuum that could induce China to challenge the status quo. In other words, the Unites States needs to keep the world order "hard to overturn and easy to join."[29] America should make China realize that it "faces a Western-centered system that is open, integrated, and rule-based, with wide and deep political foundations."[30] Then China will feel assured because it still could benefit from the global system led by America. It is better for China to cooperate with the US in the existing system rather than challenge the American world order to form an alternative one.

America should also transform China into a partner in the American world order. It is unreasonable to stop Chinese economic growth in the American-led system because it is not the behavior of a responsible global leader. If countries only have the right to survive without the right to thrive in the American international system, it is hard to believe the system will be popular and stable. However, this does not mean the US should let China do whatever it wants. Christensen develops a good strategy for this transformation, which is "a very strong US military presence in East Asia with a consistent diplomatic posture that invites China to participate in regional and global governance."[31] This mixed strategy first ensures that there is no strategic vacuum to allow China to bully the small powers in Asia and try to build up its own regional hegemony. Second, it also recognizes and welcomes the growing influence of China in the American world system, which will transform China into an American partner in various areas, such as counterterrorism and climate change.

In general, as long as the US keeps its global world order, China has no chance to challenge the existing international system. Moreover, if the existing world order continually allows China to develop, China also has no incentive to construct an alternative world order. With the strong military power and friendly diplomatic posture, America could transform China into a partner.

## CONCLUSION

China is not a challenger to the US hegemony for several reasons. When people examine Chinese behaviors with the definition of a challenger, China does not have the three key elements of a challenger. The success of China's economy has been achieved because China follows the Western model of economic development. With the great interest China is earning in the American world economic system, China has no incentive to overthrow the existing world economic system. If people focus on security, it is easy to find out that China is not an American challenger because China lacks an alliance system. If China had ambition to challenge the American hegemony, it would soon find

---

[29] Ikenberry, "The Rise of China and the Future of the West: Can the Liberal System Survive?", 24.
[30] Ikenberry, "The Rise of China and the Future of the West: Can the Liberal System Survive?", 24.
[31] Christensen, *The China Challenge: Shaping the Choices of a Rising Power*, 289.

out that China has no one to cooperate with against a global dominant military power. Finally, we could hardly foresee a successful global strategy of China. Although China's economy has grown, it still needs more time and power to figure out a proper and feasible global strategy. The AIIB and the OBOR are not enough to make China a real challenger to the American hegemony.

Mearsheimer shows a good analysis and prediction on China, but he undervalues American global power. When we take the global influence of America into consideration, we find that China has no capability to build a regional hegemony by following the American way in the Western Hemisphere. Moreover, China also has insufficient power and incentive to overthrow the American international system.

Finally, I argue that while the US behaves as a world leader, China has no chance to be a real challenger. The success of China shows the advantage of the American world system. Thus, America should continue to consolidate its global influence and defend the values it holds. With strong global domination, America has the capability to transform China into a partner through economic benefit and military deterrence. No one can deny that China is rising in the American world system; however, I posit that instead of depicting China as the frightening panda which climbs up to the top of the Empire State Building, Americans should view China as a potential partner with whom to work on emerging global challenges.

# The Puzzle of Ethnopolitical Fragmentation and Party Systems in Africa

*Alina Zheng*

## INTRODUCTION

Africa has long been recognized as one of the most ethnically diverse continents in the world. Scholars have found that Sub-Saharan Africa has the largest number of ethnic groups, and level of ethnic fractionalization in any region by a significant margin.[1] Africa's ethnopolitical groups also have the highest levels of geographic concentration in the world.[2] Yet there still remains much debate as to how this ethnic diversity affects the political composition of African countries.

In previous research, many have shown that both district magnitude and ethnic fragmentation increase party system size.[3] In countering this, Mozaffar et al. recently published research claiming the exact opposite, concluding that "high ethnopolitical fragmentation is likely to reduce the number of parties."[4] Researchers found that both district magnitude and ethnopolitical group concentration negatively correlate with the number of political parties in Africa. In this paper, party fragmentation is defined as how many parties are in a system and their relative size. Thus, "a party system is fragmented if it contains more than two parties, none of which comes close to obtaining an absolute majority in the representative assembly."[5] MSG (Mozaffar et al.) theorize that high levels of fragmentation stimulate the growth of intergroup coalitions that in turn reduce the number of parties in the system. MSG propose that when ethnopolitical fragmentation is high enough—as is the case in Africa—a large number of small parties exist that are unable to win enough votes individually, thus pushing them to form coalitions and reach a multiethnic base. They argue for a joint explanation where both electoral institutions and ethnopolitical cleavages (divisions/splits) contribute to the explanation of party concentration and fragmentation. It is important to note that MSG's theory has one caveat: the geographic concentration of Africa's ethnopolitical groups. They state that geographic concentration has the opposite effect but that "geographic concentration by itself, however, is unlikely to overcome the reductive effect of high fragmentation due to the presence of large numbers of small ethnopolitical groups."[6]

Notably, Mozaffar and Scarritt published another paper two years later with an additional reinforcement of low fragmentation in African party systems, but in the context of high volatility.[7] According to Mozaffar and Scarritt "the Mozaffar et al. (2003) explanation relies on cross-sectional data on 62 elections only in Africa's emerging democracies and does not take into account how strategic choice and institutional legacies affect party formation in the first place."[8] The transition from a different, or more autocratic regime into a democratic one can impact the formation of political

---

[1] James D. Fearon "Ethnic and cultural diversity by country." *Journal of Economic Growth* 8, no. 2 (2003): 195.

[2] Robert Gurr *Minorities at risk*. US Institute of Peace Press, 1993.

[3] See Neto, Octavio Amorim, and Gary W. Cox. "Electoral institutions, cleavage structures, and the number of parties." *American Journal of Political Science* (1997): 149-174; Riker, William H. "The two-party system and Duverger's law: an essay on the history of political science." *American Political Science Review* 76, no. 04 (1982): 753-766; Powell, G. Bingham. Contemporary democracies. *Harvard University Press*, 1982.

[4] Mozaffar, Shaheen, James R. Scarritt, and Glen Galaich. "Electoral institutions, ethnopolitical cleavages, and party systems in Africa's emerging democracies." *American political science review* 97, no. 03 (2003): 379-390.

[5] Lauri Karvone "Party System Fragmentation." SAGE Reference. 2011. Accessed December 21, 2016. http://sk.sagepub.com/reference/intlpoliticalscience/n419.xml.

[6] Ibid, 381.

[7] Mozaffar, Shaheen, and James R. Scarritt. "The puzzle of African party systems." Party Politics 11, no. 4 (2005): 399-421.

[8] Ibid, 407.

parties, based on the institutions that were in place before. Only using those elections is likely to produce biased results. Thus, they use expanded data including elections from Africa's well-established democracies. Once again, Mozaffar and Scarritt emphasize the "distinctive" formation of African ethnopolitical groups that result in complicated and unique cleavages in two dimensions, which they define as fragmentation and concentration.[9] Mozaffar and Scarritt show that the result is the dominance of a small number of large parties accompanied by some smaller parties, most of which are able to attain only little to no representation. Once again, no single ethnopolitical group is large enough to form a political party – thus, multi-ethnic coalitions tend to form. In addition, Mozaffar and Scarritt find that high electoral volatility results "can be viewed as a system-clearing device that eliminates inefficient parties" leaving behind the system they described.[10] Overall, Mozaffar and Scarritt detail that for Africa's emerging democracies, the remnants of authoritarian regimes are still represented in the electoral rules for legislative elections while ethnic coalitions provide an alternative source of information for voters. The result is the puzzling combination of low frag- mentation and high volatility that they present.

However, the claims from these two papers have met with significant rebuttals due to errors in their methods of data analysis. Most notably, Golder et al. claim that MSG use interaction models in which they do not include all constitutive terms, interpret constitutive terms as unconditional marginal effects, and fail to calculate marginal effects and standard errors over a sufficiently large range of modifying variables.[11] They argue that although MSG made an attempt to include interaction terms, they did so without accounting for all of the base variables, which would render their models inaccurate. Thus, GBC (Golder et al.) replicate MSG's 2003 study interpreting the effects of fragmentation and district magnitude on the number of parties with the previously omitted interaction terms *of (Fragmentation x log(Magnitude))* and *(Concentration x log(Magnitude))*, among others. They point out that by omitting these variables, MSG made a key assumption without justification. A further problem is that even with the revised model on hand, MSG did not provide any analysis on the marginal effect of ethnic fragmentation, and there is no way of determining whether its marginal effect is statistically significant since they did not provide any standard errors. BCG find that using the revised model, "ethnic fragmentation does reduce the number of parties when concentration is zero."[12] However, of the observations for which group concentration was zero, almost all of them had only a single ethnopolitical group where ethnic fragmentation could not have been the cause. Thus, the authors reject MSG's claim about the effect of ethnic fragmentation.

Finally, another notable complaint is aimed at Mozaffar and Scarritt's 2005 paper instead. Bogaards complains that the puzzle of low fragmentation and high volatility may be jumping to conclusions since Mozaffar and Scarrit did not control for regime type as other existing literature has in similar studies.[13] Bogaards points out that in investigating the party systems of Africa, Mozaffar and Scarritt use indicators based on data from the entire continent instead of controlling for varying factors of each country, as Africa's political climate varies greatly from country to country. Bogaards emphasizes that Mozaffar and Scarritt use the average effective number of legislative parties across all elections to measure the presence of dominant parties in the system, but don't go into further dimensions that may also vary, such as a measure of dominance or time. Thus, Bogaards performs an

[9] Ibid, 400.
[10] Ibid, 417.
[11] Brambor, Thomas, William Roberts Clark, and Matt Golder. "Are African party systems different?" *Electoral Studies* 26, no. 2 (2007): 315-323.
[12] Ibid, 6.
[13] Matthijs Bogaards "Dominant Party Systems and Electoral Volatility in Africa A Comment on Mozaffar and Scarritt." *Party Politics* 14, no. 1 (2008): 113-130.

alternative analysis where two methods for counting parties are taken into account. These include the effective number of parliamentary parties to determine each party's share of the vote; as well as the number of relevant actors in party competition.

Significantly, Bogaards' alternative analysis controls for regime type grouped into four different classifications. Bogaards finds that with these changes, the calculated electoral volatility across Africa is much lower than reported by MSG. Thus, Bogaards nullifies the discussion of the puzzle of high electoral volatility and low fragmentation by finding relatively normal levels of electoral volatility in Africa's party system. Further, in determining if there is a correlation between party system type and volatility, Bogaards finds that "dominant parties in Africa experience less electoral volatility than non-dominant pulverized party systems."[14] Finally, Bogaards tests for a correlation between the number of political parties and level of volatility to determine if the contradiction truly exists in Africa, and finds that the relationship is actually positive and statistically significant instead of the negative relationship that we would expect. However, Bogaards does not negate Mozaffar and Scarritt's claim of low fragmentation existing in Africa's party system nor their theory about the effect of ethnopolitical fragmentation.

For the purposes of this paper, I seek to clarify the puzzling debate on the effect of ethnic fragmentation on Africa's electoral system and party composition. Specifically, I will be analyzing new data on Africa's strictly democratic elections using both MSG and GBC's methods of analysis.

## DATA, METHODS, AND MODELS

### The Variables

*Party Systems*: To evaluate the structure of the party system, I use the *Effective Number of Electoral Parties* and the *Effective Number of Legislative Parties* in the system, employing the indices widely used and developed by Laasko and Taagepera to operationalize these two measures.[15] These are the indicators that MSG use in their paper as well.

*Electoral Institutions*: Scholars widely recognize district magnitude as the major institutional construct that affects and determines the structure of party systems. Countries with proportional representation electoral systems end up with many districts with varying size.[16] Consequently, I follow Lijphart and MSG in using the logarithm of average district magnitude to measure the effects of district magnitude, and control for the possibility of a curvilinear relationship.[17]

*Proximity of Presidential and Legislative Elections*: This variable is another independent variable affecting the structure of party systems, calculated by Cox's formula.[18] This is the length of time passed between presidential and legislative elections. Following Cox's theory, I expect that an increase in proximity between presidential and legislative elections should result in a decrease in the number of electoral and legislative parties, depending on the degree of fractionalization of presidential elections. Thus, following MSG's analysis, I will include the interaction variable of *Proximity X Effective Number of Presidential Candidates*.

---

[14] Ibid, 123.

[15] Laasko, Markku, and Rein Taagepera. "The" Effective" Number of Parties:" A Measure with Application to West Europe"." *Comparative political studies* 12, no. 1 (1979): 3.

[16] Kenneth Benoit "District magnitude, electoral formula, and the number of parties." *European Journal of Political Research* 39, no. 2 (2001): 203-224.

[17] Arend Lijphart Electoral Systems and Party Systems. Oxford University Press, USA, 1995.

[18] Gary W. Cox Making votes count: Strategic coordination in the world's electoral systems. Vol. 7. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

**Ethnopolitical Cleavages**

*Ethnopolitical Group Fragmentation* is a variable based on the "share of the politicized population that belongs to each ethnopolitical group or subgroup."[19] MSG use their own indice for ethnopolitical fragmentation that factors in ethnopolitical concentration. This is problematic because ethnopolitical concentration is considered a separate variable in their model, and in their theory. To boot, they do not provide a formula for this indice so I instead use Alesina's newer measure of ethnopolitical fragmentation. It covers more countries allowing me to analyze a larger share of the data and isolates the effects of geographic concentration.

*Ethnopolitical Group Concentration*: I base this variable on the Minorities at Risk dataset that indicates the ethnic group spatial distribution for each country on a scale from 0 to 3 where 0 = widely dispersed, 1= primarily urban or minority in one region, 2 = majority in one region, dispersed in others, and 3 = concentrated in one region.[20] Notably, I shall be incorporating a more updated version of the Minorities at Risk data released in 2009 now providing statistics for 2004-2006, in addition to the Phase III dataset used by MSG. The Concentration index is calculated by multiplying the concentration code by the group's share of the ethnopolitically relevant population. The sum of these numbers is the concentration score for each country. I will also include an interaction term of *Ethnopolitical Group Fragmentation X Ethnopolitical Group Concentration* to test whether fragmentation and concentration have a joint effect on the number of parties.

**Other Measures of Ethnopolitical Cleavages**

In MSG's paper, they claim that their proposed measure of ethnopolitical cleavages is better than the traditionally used Ethnolinguistic Fractionalization (ELF) Index and the politically relevant ethnic groups (PREG) index developed by Posner (2000). It is important to acknowledge that there are certain challenges in measuring ethnic diversity in the first place. As Fearon has pointed out, a key problem with the Herfindahl formula used to calculate these indexes is that it cannot account for specific variation in the ethnic makeups of the countries that we are studying.[21] For instance, if we had a country with two groups of equal size and another country with three groups encompassing two-thirds, one-sixth, and one-sixth of the population respectively, their indices by the Herfindahl formula would both be 0.5. Although we solve the problem of variation dependent on the geographic concentration of ethnic groups across countries, there remains the issue of the inability to measure the depth of the separations between ethnic groups. This is a relevant problem because one of the unique aspects of ethnic cleavages in studying coalition and party structure is the depth of separation between these groups within a country, and the resistant nature of their reconciliations.[22] Another obstacle to measuring ethnic diversity is that it can be calculated based on many different kinds of separation—linguistic, religious, caste, etc.

One of the most widely used measures is the ELF (Ethnolinguistic Fractionalization Index). One problem with the ELF is that it is mostly calculated from data in the Atlas Narodov Mira[23] which would make its measurements more than fifty years out of date. In addition, as Posner points out, the ethnic categorizations presented by the Atlas are such that ethnic groups are mostly listed individually with their corresponding population counts, but in some cases, are grouped into larger families as a

[19] Mozaffar, Scarritt, and Galaich, *Electoral Institutions*, 384.
[20] Asal, Victor, Amy Pate and Jonathan Wilkenfeld, *Minorities at Risk Organizational Behavior Data*, September 2008, http://www.mar.umd.edu/data.asp.
[21] Fearon, *Ethnic and cultural diversity*, 207.
[22] Rabushka, Alvin, and Kenneth A. Shepsle. Politics in plural societies. *Stanford University Press*, 1972.
[23] Mira, Atlas Narodov. "Atlas of the Peoples of the World." Moscow: *Glavnoe Upravlenie Geodezii i Kartografii*, 1964.

single population count.[24] This leads to lumping together some groups that are definitely distinct in other political and ethnographic studies, which would give the measure a bias indicating less ethnopolitical fragmentation than existing in reality.

The second measure that MSG investigate is the Politically Relevant Ethnic Groups index (PREG). In response to the problems with ELF[i], Posner developed this measure using the Atlas data as a base population count of the groups, then incorporated secondary sources to weed out groups unimportant in policymaking and separate the groups that ELF previously grouped together.[25] MSG rely on the PREG as they claim that it includes more ethnopolitical groups and "hence. . . [they expect] it to be more closely related to the number of electoral and legislative parties."[26]

Finally, in this paper I utilize a third alternative to both the ELF and the PREG. Although less widely used, Alesina et al.'s measure of ethnic fractionalization is especially useful for the sake of including more complete indicators for the data I will be using.[27] Alesina et al. developed this new measure of ethnic fragmentation "based on a broader classification of groups, taking into account not only language but also other cleavages such as racial characteristics."[28] By offering a new measure of ethnicity that involves a combination of both racial and linguistic characteristics, Alesina et al.'s measurement offers a more comprehensive view of the ethnopolitical cleavages present in Africa. Alesina et al. compiles and cross-references several different sources to procure this data including the Encyclopedia Britannica (2001), CIA (2000), Levinson (1998), and Minority Rights Group International (1997), allowing them to cover a much wider range of countries than either the ELF or PREG. Overall, Alesina et al. incorporate more aspects of ethnopolitical fragmentation rather than just population, which will also allow a more diverse calculation of my indicator.

## DATA AND CASE SELECTION

The data I will be using is a more updated version than used by either MSG or GBC. I will be using Golder's Democratic Electoral Systems (DES) dataset, spanning 1946-2011.[29] Using only the data on Africa, this includes 54 different democratic lower house legislative elections in the national legislatures of 23 different African countries. Firstly, this will be useful for testing whether both MSG and BGS's claims hold true when studying only democratic regimes instead of countries in transition to democracy as studied before. Each regime meets Golder's four criteria: (1) the chief executive is elected, (2) the legislature is elected, (3) there is more than one party competing in elections, and (4) a change in leadership under identical electoral rules has taken place. Furthermore, Golder's new data is an update from the previous two articles with elections spanning till 2011. Now that the third wave of democracy is settling in Africa, I will strive to observe which side of the debate's view stands more strongly for Africa's democratic elections.

### Model Specification

I first use OLS regression to test eight variables, four each of *Effective Number of Electoral Parties* and *Effective Number of Legislative Parties*, following MSG's paper. Model 1 focuses strictly on the

---

[24] Daniel N. Posner "Measuring ethnic fractionalization in Africa." *American journal of political science* 48, no. 4 (2004): 849-863.

[25] Ibid.

[26] Mozaffar, Scarritt, and Galaich, *Electoral Institutions*, 284.

[27] Alesina, Alberto, Arnaud Devleeschauwer, William Easterly, Sergio Kurlat, and Romain Wacziarg. "Fractionalization." *Journal of Economic growth* 8, no. 2 (2003): 155-194.

[28] Ibid, 157.

[29] Bormann, Nils-Christian, and Matt Golder. "Democratic electoral systems around the world, 1946âĂŞ 2011." *Electoral Studies* 32, no. 2 (2013): 360-369.

institutional factors impacting the effective number of parties by including the measurement to test the impact of legislative electoral institutions (*log(District Magnitude)*) and two facets of the presidential elections—*Proximity of Presidential and Legislative Elections* and the interaction term of *Proximity* and the *Effective Number of Presidential Candidates*. Model 2 focuses strictly on the effects of ethnopolitical cleavages by incorporating the two specifications of *Ethnopolitical Group Fragmentation* and *Ethnopolitical Group Concentration*, in addition to their interactive effects given by *Ethnopolitical Group Fragmentation X Ethnopolitical Group Concentration*. Model 3 is an additive socio-institutional model in which I incorporate all six of the variables and interaction terms just specified. Model 4 is an interactive socio-institutional model which MSG refer to as "fully specified" as cognizant of all the possible factors and interactions that we are studying.[30] However, as mentioned above, GBC take issue with this notion. Model 4 has five of the six variables included in Model 3 but instead of using the interaction term between *Ethnopolitical Group Fragmentation* and *Ethnopolitical Group Concentration*, it uses an interaction term representing a combination of both the institutional and sociological factors by taking the product of *log(District Magnitude)*, *Ethnopolitical Group Fragmentation*, and *Ethnopolitical Group Concentration*.

## RESULTS

My results with the newer data are detailed in Tables 1 and 2, where Table 1 shows the results for determinants of the effective number of electoral parties using our four models, whereas Table 2 shows the results for those models with respect to the effective number of legislative parties. The strictly institutional model (Model 1) accounts for 34% of the variation in our Electoral Parties variable and 42% of the variation in the number of legislative parties. The strictly sociological model (Model 2) accounts for 27% of the variance in the number of electoral parties (a decrease of 7% from the institutional model), and 17% of the variation in the number of legislative parties (a decrease of 25% from the institutional model). The additive effects of electoral institutions and ethnopolitical cleavages in Model 3 account for 46% of the variation in number of electoral parties and 52% of the variation in number of legislative parties. This is an increase compared to the institutional model of 12% in the electoral party system and 10% in the legislative system. Finally, the interactive socio-institutional model (Model 4) has the most explanatory power out of all the models and accounts for 65% of the variation in the number of electoral parties and 65% in the number of legislative parties.

My results are consistent with MSG's in proving the significant effect of the *Proximity of Presidential and Legislative Elections* on the number of parties. For both electoral and legislative parties, my results are significantly negative across all four models. This verifies that when the presidential and legislative elections are maximally proximate (concurrent), this significantly reduces the number of parties in the system as preferences are aggregated similarly when both branches are voted in at the same time.

However, these results contain some key differences from MSG's results with respect to the ethnopolitical cleavages. Firstly, while the additive and interactive models are more explanatory of both party systems like MSG's results, contrary to their results in this case the sociological model (Model 2) had much less explanatory power than the strictly institutional model (Model 1). Moreover, in both tables, the *Ethnopolitical Fragmentation* variable is not a significant indicator in contrast to MSG's results. Unlike the ELF, PREG, and Alesina et al. measurement, MSG's calculations include ethnopolitical concentration as part of the formula for their fragmentation variable, while Alesina's methods focus solely on social cleavages such as language and religion. However, as MSG point out,

---

[30] Mozaffar, Scarritt, and Galaich, *Electoral Institutions*, 385.

not every one of these types of social cleavages are politically relevant. This explains the lack of significance in my coefficients, and the lesser explanatory power of Model 2 in comparison to Model 1.[31] I would argue that this is a more accurate representation of the correlation between ethnopolitical fragmentation and the number of parties separated from the effects of geographic concentration. Since the geographical concentration of ethnic groups often have impact on the way political parties are formed, it is necessary to separate these effects from those of ethnopolitical fragmentation alone. Still, ethnopolitical concentration of the different ethnic groups is an important aspect of the unique ethnopolitical cleavages that exist within Africa. These results confirm the significant impact of such cleavages on the strategies and party structure of not just Africa's emerging democracies, but also its democratic elections in general.

For both legislative and electoral parties in MSG's paper, *Ethnopolitical Group Concentration* has a positive but insignificant coefficient. In my results, *Ethnopolitical Group Concentration* is positive and significant in both cases for Model 2, likely because it bears more weight in representing the ethnopolitical cleavages compared to MSG's measure. Notice that in both Model 2 and Model 3, the effect of *Ethnopolitical Group Concentration* and the interactive term *Fragmentation X Concentration* is much less significant for legislative parties than for electoral parties. This implies that perhaps ethnopolitical cleavages have different effects on the party systems for legislative elections as opposed to presidential elections—a factor not yet being fully researched. From these results, it would seem that I achieved the opposite results from MSG's conclusions. In both legislative and electoral parties, I found that both *Ethnopolitical Fragmentation* and the interaction term *Ethnopolitical Fragmentation X Concentration* were positive. However, when the sociological factors are interacted with my institutional factor of district magnitude, I do get positive and statistically significant results. Again, this is a conflicting result from what I would expect based on the previous two models.

---

[31] Ibid, 382.

**Table 1:** *Determinants of Effective Number of Electoral Parties*

|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| log(District Magnitude) | -0.351 |  | -0.0970 | -5.908*** |
|  | (-0.96) |  | (-0.25) | (-5.34) |
| Proximity of Presidential and Legislative Elections | -5.174*** |  | -4.448** | -2.413* |
|  | (-4.02) |  | (-3.29) | (-2.15) |
| Proximity X Effective Number of Presidential Candidates | 1.928*** |  | 1.589*** | 1.130** |
|  | (5.07) |  | (3.77) | (3.45) |
| Ethnopolitical Fragmentation |  | 5.649 | 0.240 | -8.570*** |
|  |  | (1.63) | (0.07) | (-4.94) |
| Ethnopolitical Group Concentration |  | 5.858*** | 3.200* | -1.746** |
|  |  | (4.00) | (2.03) | (-2.89) |
| Ethnopolitical Fragmentation X Concentration |  | -7.376** | -3.381 |  |
|  |  | (-3.38) | (-1.45) |  |
| District Magnitude × Fragmentation × Concentration |  |  |  | .490*** |
|  |  |  |  | (5.26) |
| Constant | 3.662*** | -0.793 | 2.311 | 13.66*** |
|  | (6.45) | (-0.42) | (1.06) | (7.17) |
| Observations | 53 | 53 | 53 | 53 |
| $R^2$ | 0.34 | 0.27 | 0.46 | 0.65 |
| F | 8.598 | 6.177 | 6.488 | 14.01 |

*t* statistics in parentheses

\* $p < 0.05$, \*\* $p < 0.01$, \*\*\* $p < 0.001$

This three-way interaction term would seem to prove MSG's theory right that district magnitude is only significant when in interaction with fragmentation and concentration. As in MSG, for my purely institutional model and additive model, *District Magnitude* did not significantly correlate, but with the "fully specified" Model 4, when both institutional and sociological interactions are taken into account, *District Magnitude* and *District Magnitude X Fragmentation X Concentration* have a significant coefficient. According to MSG, "large district magnitudes tend to reduce the number of parties if ethnopolitical fragmentation is high and ethnopolitical concentration is low, but they tend to increase the number of parties if both fragmentation and concentration are high."[32] This theory seems to hold with these results since for Model 4 in both branches, the coefficient of *District Magnitude* alone is negative, while the coefficient for the interactive term is positive. Moreover, similar to MSG's results, my variable for *log(District Magnitude)* is insignificant until I use the interactive model, verifying that without also including the factor of ethnopolitical cleavages, the effect of *log(District Magnitude)* is not foreseeable.

---

[32] Ibid, 387.

**Table 2:** Determinants of Effective Number of Legislative Parties

|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| log(District Magnitude) | -0.126 |  | 0.0198 | -2.672*** |
|  | (-0.61) |  | (0.09) | (-4.05) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Proximity of Presidential | -3.366*** |  | -3.647*** | -2.059** |
| and Legislative Elections | (-4.63) |  | (-4.74) | (-3.07) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Proximity | 1.283*** |  | 1.261*** | 0.822*** |
| X Effective Number of Presidential Candidates | (5.97) |  | (5.26) | (4.22) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Ethnopolitical Fragmentation |  | 3.402 | -0.677 | -1.917 |
|  |  | (1.53) | (-0.33) | (-1.85) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Ethnopolitical Group Concentration |  | 2.096* | 0.0771 | -0.823* |
|  |  | (2.23) | (0.09) | (-2.28) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Ethnopolitical Fragmentation |  | -2.410 | 0.656 |  |
| X Concentration |  | (-1.72) | (0.49) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| District Magnitude X Fragmentation |  |  |  | 1.701*** |
| X Concentration |  |  |  | (4.30) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Constant | 2.773*** | 0.103 | 2.387 | 6.103*** |
|  | (8.65) | (0.09) | (1.92) | (5.37) |
| Observations | 53 | 53 | 53 | 53 |
| $R^2$ | 0.43 | 0.18 | 0.52 | 0.65 |
| F | 12.11 | 3.623 | 8.251 | 14.53 |

*t* statistics in parentheses

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

While MSG do add some value with their analysis of the effect of ethnic cleavages, there are some significant flaws in their models that limit the usefulness of their results. Mainly, in Models 3 and 4 where MSG include interactive terms, they fail to include all of the terms denoting all possible relationships between the independent variables. According to MSG, the fully-specified model is as follows:

$$\text{Parties} = \delta_0 + \delta_1 \text{Fragmentation}$$

$$+\delta_2 \text{Concentration}$$

$$+\delta_3 \log(\text{magnitude})$$

$$+\delta_4 \text{Fragmentation} \times \text{Concentration} \times \log(\text{Magnitude})$$

$$+\delta_8 \text{Proximity} \times \text{PresidentialCandidates} + \varepsilon$$

But, as GBC point out, the actual accurate fully specified model should be the following:

$$\text{Parties} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Fragmentation}$$

$$+\beta_2 \text{Concentration}$$

$$+\beta_3 \log(\text{Magnitude})$$

$$+\beta_4 \text{Fragmentation} \times \text{Concentration}$$

$$+\beta_5 * \text{Fragmentation} \times \log(\text{Magnitude})$$

$$+\beta_6 * \text{Concentration} \times \log(\text{Magnitude})$$

$$+\beta_7 \text{Fragmentation} \times \text{Concentration} \times \log(\text{Magnitude})$$

$$+\beta_8 \text{Proximity}$$

$$+\beta_9 \text{PresidentialCandidates}$$

$$+\beta_{10} \text{Proximity} \times \text{PresidentialCandidates} + \varepsilon$$

In MSG's model they omit *Fragmentation X log(Magnitude)*, *Fragmentation X Concentration*, *Concentration X log(Magnitude)*, and *Presidential Candidates*. This is a key error in that when using interactive models, it is essential to include every possible constitutive term.[33] By omitting those four terms, MSG are assuming that those coefficients are approximately zero but there is not any substantial evidence that that is true. Furthermore, in the instance that any of those coefficients are not truly zero, that would cause all of the estimators to be biased and force the inaccurate model to pass through the origin regardless of the data's true tendencies. Thus, in Table 3 below, I present the results side by side of each model (institutional, sociological, additive, and interactive) using MSG's original model on the left, and Golder's corrected models on the right. Note that a corrected version of the purely sociological model is not included because Golder simply corrected some inconsistencies in MSG's

---

[33] Brambor, Clark, and Golder, *African party systems*, 2006.

data, which don't occur here. Firstly, we can see that before MSG omitted the *Effective Number of Presidential Candidates* variable, and in the corrected fully-specified models I consistently find that *Effective Number of Presidential Candidates* is positive and significantly correlated with *Effective Number of Legislative Parties*. This does make sense since generally more candidates indicates a likelihood of more parties in democratic elections.[34]

A key difference in Table 3 that negates one of the conclusions drawn by MSG is that while indeed in MSG's "fully-specified" interactive socio-institutional model, *District Magnitude* has a significant negative effect on the number of legislative parties, when I add in the missing constitutive terms detailed above, *District Magnitude* no longer has a significant effect. To investigate the reasons behind this change, I also take into account that the *Fragmentation X District Magnitude* interaction variable that was not included in MSG's analysis is essential. Using my new fully-specified Model 4, the coefficient is negative and statistically significant. However, neither the *Ethnopolitical Fragmentation* variable nor *log(District Magnitude)* are significant by themselves in the fully-specified interactive model. This implies that *District Magnitude* does not significantly affect the number of political parties when there is no ethnopolitical fragmentation at all because presumably in that case, the preferences of the population would be relatively uniform throughout. The coefficient of *Ethnopolitical Fragmentation* alone here is irrelevant because it represents the effect of ethnopolitical fragmentation when the district magnitude is nonexistent. Finally, the significant negative coefficient of the interaction term shows that higher levels of ethnopolitical fragmentation will either increase the number of parties in the system, but by a lesser margin when district magnitude is high or will limit the number of political parties in the legislative system, conditional on a large district magnitude. As GBC point out, "district magnitude matters in this causal story because it is the decisive factor determining electoral system permissiveness."[35]According to MSG, ethnopolitical fragmentation tends to reduce the number of parties overall, however ethnopolitical concentration should counteract this reductive effect. Assuming these two things are true, that would imply that the coefficient on *Fragmentation* would be negative and the coefficient on *Fragmentation X Concentration* be positive. However, I do not find evidence that ethnopolitical fragmentation alone would significantly reduce the number of parties in the system in any of the models, nor that the interaction term would be positive.

---

[34] Kenneth Benoit "District magnitude, electoral formula, and the number of parties." 203-224.
[35] Ibid, 5.

**Table 3:** *Corrected Models vs. Mozaffar's Models*

| | (1a) | (1b) | (3a) | (3b) | (4a) | (4b) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| District Magnitude (logged) | -0.126 | -0.0170 | 0.0198 | 0.0432 | -2.672*** | 3.340 |
| | (-0.61) | (-0.09) | (0.09) | (0.22) | (-4.05) | (1.68) |
| Proximity | -3.366*** | -2.578*** | -3.647*** | -3.062*** | -2.059** | -2.107*** |
| | (-4.63) | (-3.94) | (-4.74) | (-4.48) | (-3.07) | (-3.75) |
| Proximity X Effective Number of Presidential Candidates | 1.283*** | 0.579* | 1.261*** | 0.682** | 0.822*** | 0.522* |
| | (5.97) | (2.33) | (5.26) | (2.69) | (4.22) | (2.64) |
| Effective Number of Presidential Candidates | | 0.609*** | | 0.576*** | | 0.314* |
| | | (4.23) | | (4.01) | | (2.58) |
| Ethnopolitical Fragmentation | | | -0.677 | -1.163 | -1.917 | 5.823 |
| | | | (-0.33) | (-0.65) | (-1.85) | (1.53) |
| Ethnopolitical Group Concentration | | | 0.0771 | -0.615 | -0.823* | 1.599 |
| | | | (0.09) | (-0.77) | (-2.28) | (0.96) |
| Ethnopolitical Fragmentation X Concentration | | | 0.656 | 1.406 | | -2.980 |
| | | | (0.49) | (1.20) | | (-1.41) |
| District Magnitude X Fragmentation X Concentration | | | | | 1.701*** | 4.665** |
| | | | | | (4.30) | (3.39) |
| Fragmentation X District Magnitude | | | | | | -8.701** |
| | | | | | | (-3.45) |
| Concentration X District Magnitude | | | | | | -1.976 |
| | | | | | | (-1.87) |
| Constant | 2.773*** | 2.038*** | 2.387 | 2.253* | 6.103*** | -0.377 |
| | (8.65) | (6.24) | (1.92) | (2.09) | (5.37) | (-0.13) |
| Observations | 53 | 53 | 53 | 53 | 53 | 53 |
| $R^2$ | 0.43 | 0.58 | 0.52 | 0.64 | 0.65 | 0.82 |
| F | 12.11 | 16.67 | 8.251 | 11.68 | 14.53 | 18.99 |

*t* statistics in parentheses

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

The most significant finding from this actual fully-specified model is the fact that neither ethnopolitical fragmentation nor district magnitude have a significant effect on their own. Instead, they only have a significant effect in their interaction. This indicates that ethnopolitical fragmentation and district magnitude have a cross-over interaction. Thus, there is no overall effect of either ethnopolitical fragmentation or district magnitude, but instead the effect of ethnopolitical fragmentation on the number of parties is dependent on the district magnitude and vice versa. Specifically, that ethnopolitical fragmentation has a reductive effect as MSG theorized only when district magnitude is sufficiently large.

**CONCLUSION**

Overall, the findings of this paper provide some insight to this question that scholars have been debating. The major insight here is that it is likely not appropriate to make sweeping claims about the effect of ethnopolitical fragmentation in all African countries, but we should instead recognize that the effects are contingent on other aspects of each electoral system. While MSG did scratch the surface on these joint effects, they failed to make accurate statements due to some flaws in their model. With the helpful corrections in the model from GBC and the newer data narrowed down to strictly democratic elections in Africa, we can start to extrapolate these findings to the idea of stability for democracies in Africa. What are the implications?

First, I can consider the reasons behind why we might have found these numbers. In light of these findings, there actually does seem to be some logic in MSG's original theory, recalling that when levels of ethnic fragmentation are high enough, it is in the parties' best interests to cooperate in order to reach a multiethnic base. However, since Africa's ethnic groups tend to be highly fragmented *and* highly geographically concentrated, when the district magnitude is small it is possible that each district will be comprised of a small number of ethnic groups. This allows for the formation of intragroup cleavages to take over, and results in a high number of political parties. On the other hand, when district magnitude is large, there will likely be such a multitude of ethnic groups in a given district that MSG's theory would be plausible and multiethnic coalitions would be a more beneficial strategy for the parties involved.

Second, the idea that ethnopolitical fragmentation can correlate with less political parties under certain conditions, does imply that the stability of African democracies is possible. Finally, this research raises yet more questions to be studied in the future to clarify this relationship as studies have yet to control for other important variables, such as the type of electoral system in these countries that would have a significant effect on these relationships. For instance, in the case of small district magnitude and high fragmentation and concentration mentioned above, in a proportional representation system it would be much more likely to observe the results that I speculated. Whereas in a majoritarian system, it would be more likely to observe one or two parties capitalize on that small number of ethnic groups within a district to maximize votes. The interaction that I found gives way to crucial, but incomplete insights for the possible link between Africa's emerging democracies and its unique ethnic composition.