*The*EUROPEAN JOURNAL *of*MANAGEMENT *and*PUBLIC POLICY

ECPD

CONTENTS

Editorial Policy

The *European Journal of Management and Public Policy* publishes original scholarly papers across the whole spectrum of disciplines encompassing Management and/or Public Policy (widely defined). The areas of interest include Accounting, Finance, Human Resource Management, Organisational Behaviour, Industrial Organisation, Marketing, Public Administration, Public Policy, Transformation and Transition Studies, etc. but this list is by no means exhaustive. The Journal aims to be eclectic and pluralistic and, consequently, multidisciplinary work and work endorsing different (even conflicting) schools of thought is welcome. The Journal desires to be an influential policy forum and therefore the submissions must be primarily policy oriented and capable of influencing the policy processes at both the micro and macro levels. However, good quality theoretical papers, which may also be considered for publication, should clearly demonstrate the potential for replication and further extension by the professionals and policy-oriented scholars. Each paper submitted for publication will be judged, based on its own merit and international standards of excellence. The editors and referees will pay particular attention to the originality of the topic, the quality of the methodological approach, the paper's relevance for future developments of and within the discipline and the overall quality of exposition. Although the Journal promotes high quality, original empirical and theoretical work, high quality review articles are also welcome, especially if they demonstrate excellence to the extent that they may influence the directions of further research on the particular topic or in the focus area. All published papers must be accessible to both academics and practitioners, who should be able to understand papers published without being experts on the particular topic or area of research. All papers submitted will be judged in the first place by the Editor. If the paper is initially judged to be suitable for publication in the Journal, the Editor will send the paper to *at least* two anonymous referees. The referees can recommend a paper for publication without revision, publication with minor revisions, publications with major revisions and to reject publication of a submitted paper. In all cases where they recommend some changes to be made, the referees must provide a detailed report listing all the changes that are recommended. Based on the referee reports, the Editor will decide on the status of the submitted paper. The decision of the Editor is final and cannot be disputed.

The Journal aims to publish contributions of the highest quality possible that can be of interest to the wider international professional public. However, the research topics should preferably reflect research interests and traditions of Europe, notwithstanding the comparison of different approaches existing in other parts of the world.

The prospective authors may contact the Editor and respective Regional Associate Editor (if appointed) with questions regarding the suitability of the paper for publication in the Journal. However, the final decision can only be made on the submitted full paper. The editors can assess submissions that are incomplete, using their discretion, but their comments are not binding regarding any decision on a later submitted full paper. The editors will not provide detailed comments on papers prior to formal submission to the Journal. The Editor reserves the right to return manuscripts to the authors without the full refereeing process if, in his professional and academic judgement, the paper is not of a quality acceptable to the Journal, or for any other reason. However, the Editor or his nominee will provide a prospective author with reasons for such a decision, especially if the paper falls outside the editorial policy or the authors seriously disregarded the Notes to the Contributors, published on the back cover of the Journal.

The Journal is committed to best publishing practices and emphasises that the full referee procedure will be completed within 16 weeks from the date of submission to the Journal. The Editor will personally confirm receipt of the submission in writing and keep authors informed on the progress of their submission. Every effort will be made by the Editorial Board to inform the author of the decision within the committed 16 weeks from the date of submission. No submission fee is currently being charged.

Editorial Board

Foreword

I would like to extend the most sincere appreciation to the European Center for Peace and Development (ECPD) of the United Nations University for Peace for launching a special issue devoted to the Republic of Belarus. The issue essentially presents how Belarus' Foreign Policy officials view some key issues on global policy agenda.

Specifically, the ECPD's issue contains five articles by some top Belarusian diplomats. The articles overwhelmingly relate to multilateral diplomacy and to a significant degree cover some major foreign policy initiatives of Belarus or its stances on some major international issues. While working on all of them the Ministry of Foreign Affairs' officials did their best to focus on international relations and foreign policy matters in such a way as to make their pieces both interesting and understandable not only to experts, but to average readers in these areas. Thus, the articles sought to provide more input related to global rather than national perspectives.

The Minister of Foreign Affairs is the author of the first three articles. The first of them entitled *"The Emerging Global System: Embracing Diversity-Politik and Partnerships"* argues that in the current world of multiple global "players" and ever-rising threats the world needs a set of principally new concepts and policies that substantially differ from those that were consistently pursued by world's countries in the past. The author tries to substantiate his case by tapping to certain extent into the ongoing theoretical debate on international relations.

In his second article titled "*Human Rights: What and Who Made Them Divide the World?*" the author makes an attempt to demonstrate that different and opposing attitudes that countries currently take on human rights stem from their specific historic experiences of development, which in some cases served to forge a centralized and collective nature of societies, whereas in others these experiences were conducive to entrenching decentralization and individualism. Appreciating those specific historical experiences of each other, in author's view, should help find ways to treat the issue of human rights in a non-confrontational manner.

The Minister's third piece titled *"Human Trafficking in the Post-Cold War Period: Towards a Comprehensive Approach"* extensively traces how the international community, by trial and error, progressed over the past decades in

fighting the crime of human trafficking. This "journey" culminated in the adoption of the UN Global Plan of Action to Combat Trafficking in Persons by the UN General Assembly in July 2010.

The fourth article entitled *"The Evolution of the Non-Aligned Movement and Belarus' Interests"* was written by Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs Mr. Valentin Rybakov. The author attempts to demonstrate how the Non-Aligned Movement evolved through its various figurative phases over the last five decades. Mr. Rybakov further describes the context that circumstanced Belarus' entry into this international gathering and dwells particularly on the significance of NAM's high-level events held over the past two years.

Finally, in an article titled *"Building Stability in a Post-Crisis Context: Five Lessons to Address"* Mr. Yury Ambrazevich and Mr. Vadim Pisarevich, both Ministry's senior officials dealing with multilateral diplomacy, argue that effectively tackling the global economic crisis requires far more than just doing what makes ostensible economic sense like bail-out measures and stimulus packages. Hence, they suggest a five-layer framework that, in their opinion, is worth implementing in the post-crisis international environment.

When the Ministry of Foreign Affairs agreed with the ECPD on the issue in principle, what we, the Belarusian diplomats, had in mind was the need to trigger by our articles a lively discussion on such important issues like, among others, global governance, human rights, economic and financial crisis, transnational threats and challenges. I genuinely hope that this special issue will help us succeed in this goal.

Minister of Foreign Affairs
of the Republic of Belarus

VLADIMIR MAKEI*

Human Trafficking in the Post-Cold War Period
Towards a Comprehensive Approach

Abstract

Trafficking in persons represents a serious crime, although one that is not yet fully explored. Notwithstanding, what is known about it makes one wonder how this modern-day slavery could acquire such immense proportions. The international community has progressed a long way over the past two decades in understanding and tackling the crime of human trafficking. Throughout the 1990s, it was primarily viewed as, and often confused with, illegal migration. The UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crime with its Protocols adopted in 2000 successfully addressed this distinction and inaugurated a specific approach to fighting trafficking in persons. Yet, as the levels of trafficking continued to rise, that paradigm developed in the 2000 convention and protocols was increasingly questioned. The 2008 Vienna Forum to Fight Human Trafficking developed momentum for a comprehensive approach against the crime. This effort led to the adoption – by the UN General Assembly – of the Global Plan of Action to Combat Trafficking in Persons in 2010.

Key words: Trafficking in persons, illegal migration, Human Trafficking Protocol, Vienna Forum, comprehensive approach, Global Plan of Action.

Contemporary Human Trafficking:
Extent of the Challenge

A bit more than two centuries after Parliament of the United Kingdom prohibited slave trade in 1807 – which essentially marked the onset of global efforts at eliminating that scourge – the world is still confronting its offshoot in the form of human trafficking. One cannot but agree that it is "the crime that shames us all today", as Antonio Maria Costa – former Executive Director of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) – put it in a foreword to UNODC's two reports on human trafficking, released in 2006 and 2009, respectively.

Human trafficking has an elaborate internationally agreed definition that is contained in the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children – also known as the Human Trafficking Protocol – that supplements the 2000 United Nations Convention

---

* Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Belarus since August 2012.

against Transnational Organized Crime.[1] The very complexity of the definition would indicate that the international community knows much about human trafficking. This, however, is not the case. This section will explore what we really know about the issue.

Human trafficking is believed to affect all countries in the world, though in different ways. Countries are generally divided into three categories: origin, transit, and destination. Affluent countries generally stand as the destination for the trafficking of individuals that originated in poorer countries. However, both poor and affluent countries may serve as transit states. At the same time, trafficking in persons is also known to take place in within the borders of a country.

Various studies by international organizations and individual states furnish statistics on numbers of trafficking victims that significantly differ from each other. For example, the 2012 Global Estimate of Forced Labour by the International Labour Organization (ILO) put the total number victims at 20.9 million.[2] The U.S. Department of State's 2012 Trafficking in Persons Report cites 27 million victims.[3] Human trafficking is regarded as a problem that overwhelmingly targets women and girls, which together account for more than 80 percent of all victims. As far as children victims of trafficking are concerned, the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) estimates that figure to be around 1.2 million children annually.[4]

Breaking down human trafficking by purpose reveals that public's primary concern has traditionally been with the trafficking for sexual exploitation. This form was estimated to account for the lion's share of total trafficking figures – up to 80 percent or more.[5] However, recent years have seen increasing

---

[1] According to article 3 (a) of the Human Trafficking Protocol "Trafficking in persons" shall mean the recruitment, transportation, transfer, harboring or receipt of persons, by means of the threat or use of force or other forms of coercion, of abduction, of fraud, of deception, of the abuse of power or of a position of vulnerability or of the giving or receiving of payments or benefits to achieve the consent of a person having control over another person, for the purpose of exploitation. Exploitation shall include, at a minimum, the exploitation of the prostitution of others or other forms of sexual exploitation, forced labor or services, slavery or practices similar to slavery, servitude or the removal of organs".

[2] According to the ILO, "Human trafficking can also be regarded as forced labor," implying human trafficking for the purposes of labor and sexual exploitation; ILO Special Action Programme to combat Forced Labour ,"The ILO 2012 Global Estimate of Forced Labour, Executive Summary,"(Report, International Labour Organization, Geneva: 2012), 1; Ibid., 1.

[3] Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, "Trafficking in Persons Report 2012, " (Report, U.S. Department of State, Washington D.C.: 2012), 9.

[4] House of Representatives Committee on International Relations, *Hearings on Enhancing the Global Fight to End Human Trafficking*, 109th Cong., 2nd sess., 26 September 2006, 13.

[5] OSCE Report "From Policy to Practice: Combating Trafficking in Human Beings in the OSCE Region, September 2006, p.7. Also, UNODC's Global Report on Trafficking in Persons, 2009, p.6.

realization that the trafficking for the purposes of labor exploitation might be far higher in magnitude than previously thought.[6]

In particular, the ILO makes this point clear in its own studies. Hence, in its 2012 Global Estimate of Forced Labour, the ILO estimates that of the total figure of 20.9 million victims, 14.2 million are victims of forced labor exploitation – 68 percent – whereas 4.5 million – 22 per cent – are victims of sexual exploitation. The remaining 2.2 million – 10 percent – are victims of other forms of trafficking-related exploitation.[7] Since labor exploitation is higher than sexual exploitation, the ILO gives the figures in terms of gender breakdown that challenge the previous perceptions of human trafficking targeting women almost exclusively. According to the ILO, women constitute 55 percent of all forced labor victims.[8]

In geographical context, the 2006 UNODC report identified the following global patterns; Western Europe and North America were the main destinations for trafficked persons, with Asia also featuring to some extent as a destination. The regions of Eastern Europe, Latin America, Africa, and Asia, were the countries of origin for victims. With that, Asia is estimated to generally account for more than half of all human trafficking cases – origin and destination.[9]

When it comes to profits, trafficking in persons is widely viewed as the world's third largest illegal activity after the illegal trafficking of arms and of drugs. Incomes from human trafficking, by some estimates, vary from $7 billion to $32 billion a year.[10]

Human trafficking is underpinned by economic and social causes. In economic terms, it is a by-product of globalization that is driven by its own supply and demand logic. The later involves the demand for sexual and labor services, which is the largest in affluent countries. The supply, in turn, stems from poor countries, where some people are keen to attain better life in more prosperous states. Yet, setting out in search of happiness abroad, future victims of trafficking do not foresee that they may fall victim to exploitation in order to satisfy the above demand.

As for the social causes, human trafficking, on the one hand, is certainly made possible by gender biases, still prevalent in many supply-related countries. These serve to force women and girls to look for income abroad,

---

[6] David A.Feingold, "Human Trafficking", Foreign Policy, September 2005. The article argues that trafficking for sexual exploitation accounts only for around 10 per cent of all trafficking.

[7] "The ILO 2012 Global Estimate of Forced Labour, Executive Summary", p.2.

[8] Ibid.

[9] Ibid. Also, Vidyamali Samarasinghe, "Confronting Globalization in Anti-Trafficking Strategies in Asia", Brown Journal of World Affairs, volume X, issue I, summer/fall 2003.

[10] Hearing in the US House of Representatives 26 September 2006 on the topic "Enhancing the Global Fight to End Human Trafficking", serial No.109-232, p.11.

thereby making them easy prey to criminals. On the other hand, trafficking in persons would not be possible in the demand countries, if their societies did have a degree of tolerance to human exploitation.

Nonetheless, for all that we know by now about human trafficking, it seems that we do not know enough. In fact, the UNODC 2009 Global Report on Trafficking in Persons admits as much.

The lack of credible and sufficient data on human trafficking can be attributed to several factors. First and foremost, we should realize that it is a very clandestine activity, and the traffickers go to great lengths to keep it that way. Thus, it is hardly surprising that we do not know everything about this crime. Moreover, not all countries have enacted appropriate human trafficking legislation that allows for effective action and proper reporting. Indicative of this is UNODC's finding that two out of five countries surveyed in its 2009 report – 155 countries were surveyed – failed to report at least a single conviction related to human trafficking.[11]

What is most worrisome is that levels of human trafficking appear to be persistently rising. Judging by the ILO's recent study, the number of victims of forced labor has increased from 12.3 million in 2005 to 20.9 million in 2012.[12]

The First Post Cold-War Decade: Problem's Recognition

During the Cold War, human trafficking was not as prominent an issue. With the borders between the two ideological camps tightly closed, there were hardly any significant flows of people between them. For that reason, trafficking in persons was not a matter of great concern to either of the superpowers or their respective allies. Moreover, during the period in question there was not much interest in transnational challenges in general, because the world's major players were primarily preoccupied with traditional security issues. It is plausible and probable that trafficking occurred elsewhere throughout the world, but it did not solicit attention or focus. What is interesting is that the issue of human trafficking received more global attention in the first half of the 20th century than in the second. Apparently, such was the case, because the former period was characterized by a more open international environment than the latter.

Indeed, a number of international instruments adopted over the first three decades of the 20th century attest to the world's attention to preventing illicit human trafficking: the 1904 International Agreement for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, the 1910 International Convention for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, the 1921 International Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic of Women and Children, and the 1933

---

[11] UNODC's Global Report on Trafficking in Persons, 2009, p.6.
[12] "The ILO 2012 Global Estimate of Forced Labour, Executive Summary", p.2.

International Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women of Full Age.[13] Interestingly, they all focused on fighting white prostitution, and thus – in my opinion – failed to acknowledge and confront a wider scope of the challenge.

While the Cold War period did not give substantial attention to the topic of trafficking, there were several gender-related events that raised awareness about trafficking in general. The proclamation of the Decade for Women in 1975 was as a catalyst of such efforts.[14] In 1979, the United Nations adopted the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women. As a result, the 1980s saw the advent of a multitude of international non-governmental organizations engaged in activities against gender violence and discrimination.

The end of bipolar rivalry triggered the opening of borders. Consequently, the international community came to realize the importance of addressing transnational threats. While the opening of the borders was one factor that enabled transnational threats, another was associated with advances in information and communication technologies, above all the Internet and mobile phones, which made the work for traffickers, drug dealers, and terrorists much easier than used to be in the past. For example, the Internet considerably helps facilitate recruitment for some activities related to migration, like work in model agencies, which on surface look nothing but legal. Yet candidates who respond to such advertisements may in fact be deceived to the true purpose of their prospective enterprise and instead end up abroad as forced laborers.

Human trafficking in the initial post-Cold War period was mainly viewed in the context of illegal migration, which falls within the broader category of transnational organized crime. Indeed, trafficking in persons and illegal migration seem to have many similarities. What appears to unite them above all is that most future victims of trafficking start as illegal migrants, hoping for a better life abroad. But, at some point their migration goes awry, and instead of getting better off, they end up being exploited. So, human trafficking may be regarded as a prevented form of migration.

However, despite an ostensibly similar nature of human trafficking and illegal migration, they represent two different challenges. Such an understanding

---

[13] United Nations, "International Agreement for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic" (Agreement, United Nations, Lake Success, NY: 1904); United Nations, "International Convention for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic" (Convention, Paris: 1910); United Nations, "International Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children" (Convention, United Nation, Geneva: 1921); United Nations, "International Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women of Full Age" (Convention, Geneva: 1933)

[14] The United Nations General Assembly declared 1975 to be the International Woman's Year and held the first World Conference on Woman. At the recommendation of the conference the years 1976 to 1985 were declared to be the United Nations Decade for Woman.

would come by the decade's end and result in a number of relevant international legal instruments.

Meanwhile, the realization of the need to cope with rising transnational organized crime led to the establishment of a specialized UN agency. Thus, in 1992 the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice was established with the view to implementing the United Nations Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Programme that was designed a year earlier. Further institutional arrangements led to the establishment in 1997 of the United Nations Office for Drug Control and Crime Prevention by combining the United Nations Drug Control Programme and the Centre for International Crime Prevention. In 2002, that entity was to be renamed into the UNODC.

The issue of human trafficking also received certain degree of attention at some major international events held in the 1990s: the 1993 Vienna International Conference on Human Rights, and the 1995 Beijing International Conference on Women. They contributed to a better understanding of the issue of human trafficking.

Overall, the 1990s can be regarded as a period when the international community began feeling the impact of trafficking in persons that was flourishing as result of the relatively open post-Cold War globalization and the global environment. Nonetheless, there was no clear understanding of the challenge at the time. Its complex nature that closely linked it with other problems – like illegal migration, contemporary slavery, and violence against women – that made it difficult to grasp relevant the nuances. Consequently, trafficking in persons was not treated as a distinct form of crime. As a result, throughout the 1990s there was neither any specific legislation against trafficking in persons in most countries, nor tangible international cooperation or coordination among their law enforcement and other relevant agencies.

THE 2000 HUMAN TRAFFICKING PROTOCOL: STAKING ON A SECURITY PARADIGM

As the challenge of transnational organized crime was becoming more persistent at the end of the 1990s, the international community began treating it more comprehensively. As a result, there emerged an understanding that illegal migration and human trafficking were not the same, but rather stood as two separate crimes, each requiring separate analysis and appropriate action.

Indeed, despite apparent similarities, there are significant differences between the two. First, illegal migration is a clear crime against the state, the borders of which a migrant illegally crosses. Whereas trafficking in humans is a crime against an individual, who becomes the object of exploitation. Second, illegal migration is about a voluntary act by an individual to cross the border of another state. Trafficking in persons may look like a voluntary act at some

stages.[15] Yet it is not, because it involves violence or deception against an individual, which results in their exploitation.

Such an understanding was reflected in two separate Protocols – covering trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants – adopted by the United Nations General Assembly as part of the 2000 United Nations Convention on Transnational Organized Crime – also known as the Palermo Convention and Protocols.

With the benefit of hindsight, it could be reasonably argued that the Human Trafficking Protocol contained both positive and flawed elements. On a positive side, the Protocol generally inaugurated a three-pronged approach against the crime anchored around the three Ps – prevention, prosecution, and protection.

As well as providing guidelines for reducing human trafficking, the Protocol furnished the international community with a clear-cut definition of the crime of trafficking in persons. It also established specific obligations for signatories to criminalize human trafficking, and implement a number of other measures – such as tightening border controls, and enhancing cooperation between law enforcement agencies.

Despite the successes of the Protocol, it can also reasonably be held that it failed to cover all possible angles of the crime. On the surface, the Protocol may seem to be concerned with all the three Ps, in reality it favors one prosecution more than prevention and protection. The Protocol's drafters appear to have ushered an approach that could be described as a law and order paradigm. They created a strong law enforcement tool with comparatively weaker language on preventive and protective measures. Indeed, the prosecution provisions in the Human Trafficking Protocol contain mandatory language, such as "states parties shall," while the protections and assistance provisions soften the language to terms such as "in appropriate cases" and "to the extent possible."[16]

As the protocol on the smuggling of migrants – officially the Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air – was based on the same understanding, what it meant in practice was that the signatories began harmonizing their legislation in line with the Protocols, and the nexus of human trafficking and illegal migration was increasingly addressed as a security concern rather than as an issue that spans the realms of security, development,

---

[15] A trafficking act may look like a "voluntary act", when a particular case begins as one of legal or illegal migration. For instance, a person may be willing to cross other state's borders in search of employment opportunities, for instance to work in the services sector, knowing that he/she is doing it illegally (thus the act is so far voluntary), but as a result of coercion or violence against him/her at a destination point that person may end up entrapped by traffickers for the purposes of sexual or labor exploitation.

[16] Jo Goodey, "Human Trafficking: Sketchy Data and Policy Responses", Criminology and Criminal Justice, 2008 (4), p.423.

and human rights. This primarily served to bring about the adoption of restrictive immigration laws and policies.

Another concern with the protocols – on trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants – relates to the problem of victim identification. Since neither protocol provides guidance with regards to identifying smuggled versus trafficked persons, their identification became the prerogative of individual countries. This created ambiguity, because it is often quite hard to clearly identify whether an individual is the victim of trafficking or of illegal migration. What matters is that the outcomes from the identification are different. If the case falls within human trafficking, the victim is entitled to protection. If, however, the case is identified as illegal migration, states are expected to facilitate the return of victims to the countries of their permanent residence.[17]

Two main factors seem to explain why the international community opted for a law and order paradigm against trafficking in persons. First, the Palermo Convention and Protocols were drafted by criminal justice experts, whose primary experience involved prosecution of crimes.[18] That is why, in this author's view, the drafters advanced such measures that in terms of their competence mattered more than anything else – like tightening border controls and arresting criminals, thereby perhaps inadvertently, imparting their specialized-based preference into the international legal instruments. Second, at the turn of the millennium, countries came to view transnational threats primarily through the lens of security, disregarding their no less important links to development and human rights. The 11 September terrorist attacks on the United States served only to justify such an approach.

The crucial question then becomes whether the security-based paradigm to address human trafficking would yield positive results.

The 2008 Vienna Forum: Search for New Momentum

The Palermo Convention with its Protocols came into effect in 2003.[19] Three years later, the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime produced a landmark international report on trafficking in persons. The UNODC built on data collected between 1996 and 2003 in an attempt to assess the occurrence of trafficking in regional and national contexts. Yet, this data did not allow

---

[17] According to Article 18 titled "Return of Smuggled Migrants" of the 2000 Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air, Supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime

[18] Melissa Ditmore and Marjan Wijers, "The Negotiations on the UN Protocol on Trafficking in Persons", available at http://www.bayswan.org/traffick/NEMESIS_Ditmore.PDF, p.85

[19] United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, *Signatories to the United Nations Convention Against Transnational Crime and its Protocols*, United Nations, 2013, https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/treaties/CTOC/signatures.html

for an assessment of the impact of the Protocol in the fight against human trafficking. Nor did the report provide actual numbers of trafficked victims – the report only provides numbers of identified victims, an issue if there is underreporting or misidentification of victims. Notwithstanding, the report revealed the crime's immense geographical reach.

Naturally, the report's findings provided a boost to further research on, and action against, trafficking in persons. Many countries in the UN started asking what was to be done to speed up the implementation of the Protocol, which as of 2006 was very far from being a universally ratified tool.[20] Further consideration is needed for what other additional measures on human trafficking were worth adopting.

The international community was thus poised to explore ideas for enhanced international coordination on human trafficking. On 20 October 2006, the UN General Assembly adopted a Belarus-sponsored resolution titled "Improving the coordination of efforts against trafficking in persons". The resolution's key value was to empower the Inter-Agency Coordination Group against Trafficking in Persons (ICAT), consisting of 17 international agencies, that was established only a month earlier at a meeting in Tokyo. This move enabled the UN agencies involved in the fight against trafficking in persons to organize regular exchanges of information and effective coordination of their activities.

Likewise, the context prompted a greater scrutiny of the Protocol itself, in particular, whether the document sufficiently dealt with the causes of trafficking. As a result, there gradually began to emerge a growing understanding that the Protocol, with its law and order thrust, concerned itself more with the consequences of human trafficking than with its causes.

Indeed, tightened border controls certainly made it more difficult for those willing to illegally cross borders in search of a better life abroad to get to a destination point. But these measures fail to address the reasons that force people to migrate illegally. Moreover, the law and order approach, perhaps inadvertently, might have enhanced the role of traffickers and smugglers. Indeed, faced with the restricted legal migration opportunities, such determined "fortune seekers" had no option but to ask the assistance of criminal groups.[21]

This understanding – with regard to the Protocol – might have stood behind some regional anti-trafficking initiatives, which attempted to cover the Protocol's purported deficiencies. In particular, the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) adopted the 2003 Action Plan to Combat

---

[20] As of February 2013, 154 States were Parties to the Protocol, detailed information is available at http://treaties.un.org/Pages/ViewDetails.aspx?src=TREATY&mtdsg_no=XVIII-12-a&chapter=18&lang=en

[21] Melissa Ditmore and Marjan Wijers, "The Negotiations on the UN Protocol on Trafficking in Persons", available at http://www.bayswan.org/traffick/NEMESIS_Ditmore.PDF p.87.

Trafficking in Human Beings that ostensibly treated equally all aspects of the Protocol: prevention, prosecution, and protection.[22] Furthermore, in 2005, the Council of Europe adopted the Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings, which, by contrast, provided a pronounced focus on the third P, which is protection of victims.

Regional initiatives, however, were not enough to turn the rising tide of human trafficking. With this in mind, since 2007 Belarus began developing the idea of devising a universal comprehensive document on human trafficking. Interestingly, this coincided with another important initiative on human trafficking, the United Nations Global Initiative to Fight Trafficking in Persons, launched in March 2007 by the UNODC's Executive Director, Antonio Maria Costa. The initiative became known as the UN.GIFT and its central element was the Vienna Forum that took place in February 2008.

The Forum brought together around 1600 participants representing governments, international organizations, civil society, and the private sector.[23] It was undoubtedly the largest ever-held gathering on the issue of human trafficking. Its greatest value lay in the fact that it was able to awaken the world to the very bitter reality that slavery is still with us in our contemporary life, and it is thriving. The event compelled the international community to challenge its knowledge, perceptions, and attitudes with regard to many things, related, among others, to the causes and consequences of trafficking, in order to gain a better understanding of how human trafficking occurred and why it was on the rise.

The Vienna Forum did not aim to produce an outcome document. Perhaps it was not possible among so many different participants. Its purpose rather was to begin shaping a global partnership against trafficking in persons, which was to include in its ranks all the aforementioned players. Interestingly, Belarus came up with idea of a Global Partnership against Slavery and Trafficking in Human Beings before this by proclaiming it from the UN rostrum in 2005.[24]

In retrospect, the Vienna Forum could be fairly viewed as the beginning of the international community's move towards a genuinely comprehensive anti-trafficking approach in terms of stakeholders and coverage.

The 2010 Global Plan: Embracing a Comprehensive Approach

The Vienna Forum ended with the closing remarks by UNODC Executive Director Costa, in which the latter urged the UN.GIFT team to "help the General Assembly prepare its own comprehensive strategy for the following

---

[22] http://www.osce.org/pc/42708

[23] See UN GIFT Intiative at http://www.ungift.org/ungift/en/vf/index.html

[24] Sergei Martynov, Statement to the General Debate of the 60th Session of the United Nations General Assembly. https://www.un.org/webcast/ga/60/statements/bel050921eng.pdf

year."[25] Some other speakers at the Forum, including Sergei Martynov – then Belarus' Minister of Foreign Affairs – have also spoken in favor of a comprehensive document on trafficking in persons.

The rationale for such a tool was thoroughly articulated in a few post-forum publications by some top Belarus' diplomats.[26] Basically, the reasoning was related to certain structural, normative and organizational arguments. Structurally, in addition to the Human Trafficking Protocol, at the time there were in place a number of other international and regional tools on the issue that had previously been elaborated within ILO, the International Organization for Migration, OSCE, the Economic Community of West African States, and other institutions. Each, however, was mainly covering some specific aspect of human trafficking, or a specific region, rather than the issue as a whole. In other words, the global anti-trafficking structure could be characterized as being dispersed. Thus, it seemed only logical in that context to impart to it a higher degree of coherence and uniformity.

Normatively, a comprehensive document on human trafficking would be one that put an equal emphasis on each of the three Ps. There was reason to believe that an international anti-trafficking tool elaborated under the auspices of a specialized agency was imbued with a preference for advancing a specific aspect that fell under the mandate of such an agency. Thus, all the above tools essentially became "specialized". Therefore, it seemed prudent to draft a new comprehensive document at the UN General Assembly, lest biases prevail again.

Organizationally, it was about how the international community organized its anti-human trafficking work in terms of actors. Indeed, there appeared multiple players in the area of human trafficking that had not been visible on the global scene even a decade ago: states, international organizations, civil society, private sector, even celebrities. Yet, the existing international tools on trafficking in persons did not prescribe precise roles for the increasing number of non-state actors, because the former primarily aimed at harmonizing relevant national legislation. That is why there was the need for a global framework that would ensure effective cooperation, coordination, and pursuit of concerted policies among various stakeholders and multiple anti-human trafficking initiatives. Thus, the traditional three P approach to human trafficking would acquire an additional P – partnership.

---

[25] Closing Remarks by Antonio Maria Costa, Executive Director of the UNODC, accessible at http://www.ungift.org/ungift/en/vf/speeches/costa2.html

[26] See two articles: 1) Sergei Martynov, "Human Trafficking: Beyond the Protocol", Forced Migration Review, No.31, October 2008, p.68, accessible at http://www.fmreview.org/sites/fmr/files/FMRdownloads/en/FMRpdfs/FMR31/FMR31.pdf, 2) Alexander Sychov, "Human Trafficking: A Call for Global Action", Globality Studies Journal, No.14, October 2009, accessible at http://globality.cc.stonybrook.edu/wp-content/uploads/2011/03/no14.pdf

Several important events that took place in the post-forum environment served to boost momentum towards a new comprehensive anti-trafficking tool. First, it was the UNODC's Global Report on Trafficking in Persons, released in February 2009. In contrast to its 2006 Report, this time the UNODC operated with a far more extensive dataset and managed to survey 155 countries. The report amply focused on trafficking trends in various contexts, as well as on national anti-trafficking legislations. Its message was unambiguous – trafficking in persons is a serious rising threat that needed to be urgently confronted by the world.

Another vital boost to a comprehensive approach was provided by the UN General Assembly's interactive dialogue on the theme Taking Collective Action to End Human Trafficking that was held on 13 May 2009. The debate clearly demonstrated the determination of a large number of countries to begin work on a Global Plan of Action to Combat Trafficking in Persons.

Finally, in February 2010, the United Nations Security Council held its first ever meeting devoted to the challenge of transnational organized crime, owing to increasing perception around the world of the dangers posed by growing global criminal networks. That elevated the issue to a new level of consideration, because it was no longer framed just as a global issue, but as a threat to international peace, security, and development. As a result, policymakers and experts began making parallels with how other similar threats, for instance, terrorism were treated. As far as the latter was concerned, since 2006 there had already been in place a global UN counterterrorism strategy that provided an overarching framework to more than a dozen relevant treaties and conventions. That fact, too, bolstered the argument in favor a having a similar comprehensive framework on the issue of human trafficking.

So, the overall context became so compelling as to make the President of the UN General Assembly's sixty-third session appoint two co-facilitators on a Global Plan of Action in the end of 2009. Soon after that, there occurred another important development that was essential to bringing the work on the Global Plan to fruition. Namely, in March 2010 – at the initiative of Belarus – there emerged in New York the Group of Friends United against Trafficking in Persons that comprised twenty UN Member States.[27]

The UN Global Plan of Action to Combat Trafficking in Persons was adopted by the General Assembly in July 2010. While equally treating the crime's key aspects, the Plan, however, puts a high premium on a human-rights and victim-centered approach. For example, by launching the Voluntary Trust Fund for Victims of Human Trafficking, the Global Plan raised in importance the

---

[27] The Group of Friends United against Trafficking in Persons initially included Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia, Ecuador, Egypt, India, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Libya, Nicaragua, Nigeria, the Philippines, Qatar, the Russian Federation, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan, and Venezuela. Later, Singapore and Laos joined the Group.

issue of protection, which was believed to have been disregarded somewhat in the past. In organizational terms, the Plan prescribes specific measures for all the relevant stakeholders. The document also encourages a greater degree of cooperation and coordination among all of them.

The Global Plan's importance seems to be twofold. First, it is significant in that it provides all-encompassing measures against human trafficking. Second, as such it is also bound to contribute to the implementation of other numerous specialized international instruments on human trafficking. Importantly, in addition to the New York-based Group of Friends, branches began operating in other hubs of multilateral diplomacy, in Vienna and Geneva, with the view to contributing to Global Plan's effective implementation.

So, how effective is the new global anti-trafficking regime? It is rather hard to answer that with certainty at the time of writing this article. To some extent this question will be answered by the UNODC's next global report on trafficking in persons. Even so, finding the answer to the above question will be the primary task of a High-Level Meeting of the UN General Assembly, scheduled for 13 May 2013. Hopefully, they all will demonstrate that the twenty-year-long effort to arrive at a comprehensive approach against trafficking in persons has met with success.

Yury Ambrazevich*, Vadim Pisarevich**

Building Stability in a Post-Crisis Context: Five Lessons to Address

Abstract

The global crisis that erupted in 2008 may somewhat be generally abating but it is hardly the cause for complacency because its ramifications appear to be far larger than perceived. Therefore, projecting post-crisis stability on the globe requires not only dealing with financial issues, like bank bail-outs, stimulus packages, and sovereign debts, as it is indeed what most governments have been doing, but addressing its underlying causes, which go beyond the realm of finances. In this regard, the article draws five major lessons from the crisis, focusing on which should help strengthen global stability. Internalizing these lessons requires to: 1) move away from extremes; 2) embrace multilateralism and partnerships; 3) shape global policies around a new "engine" of economic development; 4) consider options for better international financial arrangements; and 5) factor in the multidimensional nature of the recent crisis. Due to increasing global interdependence the suggested course becomes the matter of necessity rather than choice.

Key words: Stability, crisis, extremes, partnerships, engine of economic development, financial arrangements, multidimensional implications

The global economic and financial crisis that unfolded in September 2008 has urged many analysts, primarily in the field of economics, to dwell upon its most visible immediate causes, as well as its current repercussions. Yet, this effort does not seem to lead to many studies about what lessons we should learn from the event with the view to projecting global stability rather than just hedging against possible future financial meltdowns. Hence, this essay is an attempt to rectify the perceived academic shortcoming and propose, from the author's humble point of view, five lessons from the crisis by looking deeper into its long-term underlying causes. The authors do not pretend either to provide an exhaustive list of lessons or to know any ultimate truth. As Austrian and British philosopher Karl Popper eloquently put it: "Truth is never definitive and error is always probable"[1]. With this in mind, it is merely an attempt to broaden discussion on the interrelated topics of crisis and stability, and try to induce policymakers to make effective use of what we know by now.

---

* Mr. Yury Ambrazevich, Director for Multilateral Diplomacy, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Belarus,

** Mr. Vadim Pisarevich, Deputy Head of the Department for Global Policies and Humanitarian Co-operation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Belarus.

1 Santiago Montenegro, "Innovation and Philosophy", published on 28 August 2009 by Project Syndicate, accessible at http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/montenegro1/English

Therefore, the essay tackles the issue of international stability only to the extent to which it is affected by certain concerns stemming from the 2008 global crisis.

Lesson One: Move away from Extremes

Eric Hobsbawm, perhaps, Britain's most renowned historian of all time, who died in early October 2012, characterized the history of the XX century as an age of extreme in his book under the same title (1994). The past century truly deserves such an unsavoury "honor" since it has indeed overwhelmingly been a century of ideological warriors who had been reluctant to recognize limits in pursuit of their extreme objectives. For Eric Hobsbawm, the age of extreme came to a close with the end of the Cold War. However, with the benefit of hindsight it is clear to many today that the age of extreme, in fact, continued its steady march even after 1991 and was brought to a halt only by the 2008 crisis.

What the crisis has obviously put an end to was a global economic extreme, one that traces its origin back to the early 1970s, when the US government decided to abandon the international fixed exchange rate mechanism. That mechanism was established at the Breton Woods Conference in 1944 and was basically about pegging the participating countries' currencies to the US dollar, which, in turn, was fixed to gold. The USA thus opted in the early 1970s for a system with a floating exchange rate. That move has arguably unleashed an era of global economic deregulation, which through its own evolution resulted in 2008 in the global economic and financial downturn. The set of deregulation policies became known to the wider public as the "Washington Consensus", although the term came into mode only in the 1990s.

The rationale behind the above US decision seems to have been two-fold. First, as Western Europe and Japan started accumulating vast amounts of gold reserves throughout the 1950s and 60s, US exports were becoming less competitive. Moreover, its currency fixed to gold was increasingly flowing out of the United States[2].

Second, that period had seen growing private capital flows around the world, which were barely in existence when the Bretton Woods system was erected in the mid-1940s[3]. Those private flows were overwhelmingly of the US provenance. The American private capital was seeking greater latitude and greater profits that were to a certain degree constrained by the global fixed exchange rate system. So, there was a strong domestic constituency behind President Nixon's decision to part ways with the Bretton Woods system.

---

[2] P.Davidson, "Reforming the World's International Money", a paper for the conference "Financial Crisis, the US Economy, and International Security in the New Administration", November 2008, pp.12-13, accessible at http://econ.bus.utk.edu/november%20newsschool.pdf

[3] Harold James, "The Making of a Mess: Who Broke Global Finance and Who Should Pay for It?", published by Foreign Affairs, January/February 2009, in the section "a New Bretton Woods".

In the post WWII US-based Western hegemonic system other Western countries had no choice but to follow in the US footsteps in adjusting to the floating exchange rate system. Thus, the business in the capitalist core[4] has dismantled the "shackles" on its freedom of action. Moreover, with full state support it set to the task of opening up markets in the so-called global periphery. These policies were underway for almost four decades.

The record with implementing the "Washington Consensus" has admittedly been rather mixed. While some countries that have opened up may have indeed benefited from it, many others undoubtedly suffered. Michael Spence, an American Noble-prize winning economist, in his "The Next Convergence" (2011) argues that the Washington Consensus' ten principals on surface seem sensible, but were not so in practice. The key, according to him, is whether the principles have been adequately adjusted to local conditions, because otherwise they would bring disastrous results like those Asia in 1997-1998 and Argentina in 2002[5].

But deregulation has been only one of the contemporary economic extremes. Another, closely associated with it, is what is called trade imbalances. An imbalance is the situation, in which some countries run surplus from foreign trade, which they often turn into domestic savings, while their trading counterparts experience current account deficits.

Trade imbalances is a common and natural feature of the world, but what made it an extreme in the latest decade is that it was based on a pattern which appears to any logic a contradiction in terms. The world's superpower was living beyond its means at the time when economic and political power was shifting away from it.

Indeed, domestic consumption in the United States was invariably growing over the past decade. Yet, it was based not on solid domestic economic performance, but on foreign borrowing, primarily from Asian countries. Some may argue that a similar pattern was at work before. Indeed, Germany tried to "ride" on US consumption in the 1960s, and Japan – in the 1970s, but both proved mainly unsuccessful[6]. The Argentine financial meltdown of 2002 may serve as an extreme example of what consequences domestic consumption based on debt-financing could bring about[7].

---

[4] The terms of "core" and "periphery" in the world are used as they were defined by Immanuel Wallerstein in his "The Modern World-System: Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the XVI Century". An abstract from the book with definitions accessible at http://media.pfeiffer.edu/lridener/courses/WORLDSYS.HTML

[5] Michael Spence, "The Next Convergence", Published by Farras, Straus and Giroux, 2011, p.92.

[6] Mathew J.Burrows and Jennifer Harris, "Revisiting the future: Geopolitical Effects of the Financial Crisis", the Washington Quarterly, April 2009, p.29.

[7] Jeffrey A.Frieden, "Global Imbalances, National Rebalancing, and the Political Economy of Recovery", working paper, published by Council on Foreign Relations, October 2009, accessible at http://www.cfr.org/publication/20464/global_imbalances_national_rebalancing_and_the_political_economy_of_recovery.pdf

However, what distinguishes the current pattern of imbalances from previous ones is its immense scale, as it proved a huge success for some of current "riders" and an enormous setback for the worlds' largest economy. Trade imbalances alone might not have sufficed to produce a crisis situation, but in combination with deregulation they did. It was precisely the entrenched culture of deregulation in the USA, especially in the wake of the repeal in 1999 of the Depression-era Glass–Steagall Act (a measure served to lift constraints on financial operations and to make it possible for non-bank agencies to get involved in bank activities), which channeled the cheaply borrowed foreign loans into speculation, thereby turning the imbalances into a crisis[8].

The irony with the current economic extremes lies in the fact that they were allowed by their proponents to go as far as to let economic deregulation and trade imbalances spiral out of control in the capitalist core itself. In fact, in the end the economic deregulation seems to have hit its major protagonists from the core much harder than its opponents from the periphery. Moreover, the bail-outs and stimulus packages have made a contribution of their own to the advent of sovereign debt crises around 2010 that still severely afflict a number of European countries.

So, when it comes to economic extremes in general, what is needed is that all countries fully address the problems of deregulation and imbalances rather than confine themselves to short-term measures like bail-outs and stimulus packages.

Thus, the first lesson to draw from the recent economic crisis is that there is the need for the world to move away from any form of extreme, be it in political, ideological, or economic realms. People learned how to avoid extremes in private life, which invariably produce trouble. Extremes in international life work in a similar fashion, as they inevitably generate crises, conflicts, and instability.

In this regard, it seems that the way to avoid them is to adhere to the "middle of the road", to the kind of political conservatism based on the virtues of tradition, continuity, and evolution that was advocated by Edmond Burke, an XVIII century British politician and philosopher. The Briton splendidly did it in an intellectual exchange of views with his opponent Thomas Paine over the French Revolution, which the former condemned as an extreme, whereas the latter saw it as progressive development[9].

Therefore, for the sake of global stability it makes sense to pursue on a global scale the policies of moderation and centrism rather than any messianic and

---

[8] Robert Wade, "Financial Regime Change?" the New Left Review, no.53, September/October 2008, pp.12-13.

[9] Edmund Burke produced his "The Reflections on the French Revolution" in 1790. Thomas Paine's work "Rights of Man" came as a response (1791) to the former's critical view on the events in France.

extreme ideas. Such an approach naturally rejects any truth of last resort as well as the imposition on others of values, policies and forms of governance by "self-righteous" owners of such kind of truth.

Burke once said: "Those who do not know history are destined to repeat it"[10]. If history any guide, it is indeed time to learn to avoid policies predicated on extremes, if we are to have stability in the world.

Lesson Two: Embrace Multilateralism and Partnerships

The economic extreme associated with deregulation was possible because the capitalist core was hegemonic in the Gramscian sense[11] at the time this specific policy began to be implemented. In other words, it was dominated by a single state powerful enough to impose its preferences on other member-states in the group with their more or less explicit or implicit consent. That is what distinguishes hegemony from imperialism, where the will of the mighty is imposed without consent.

With the end of the Cold War the hegemon from the winning side, that is from the capitalist core, by default became a hegemon for the whole world. As a result, the policies of economic deregulation began to be applied globally.

Thus, it was the hegemonic nature of, initially, the sub-system, and then, of the entire international system that in the long run brought about the recent crisis. And again there is another irony – the policies of economic deregulation pursued by the hegemon for the reason of conceiving them to be beneficial for its own strategic and business interests, along with the subsequent domestic consumption spree that created huge global imbalances, ended up with weakening rather than strengthening the hegemon, both politically and economically.

The recent crisis has admittedly brought the "Unipolar Moment", as the US political analyst Charles Krauthammer has characterized the condition of the world right after the Cold War, to an end[12]. In fact, the world has hardly been totally unipolar at all in the past two decades as pointed out by another US analyst Joseph Nye through his three-dimensional "chess board" analysis[13].

According to Nye, on the top "board", the world is indeed unipolar in terms of military power with US military preponderance unequaled by any other country or even a combination of states. On the middle "board", economic

---

[10] Edmund Burke: "Those who do not know history are destined to repeat it". See the citation at http://wiki.answers.com/Q/Who_said_those_who_ignore_history_are_bound_to_repeat_it

[11] Robert W.Cox, "Gramsci, Hegemony and International Relations: an Essay in Method", Millennium: Journal of International Studies, 1983, vol.12, no.2.

[12] Charles Krauthammer, "The Unipolar Moment", Foreign Affairs, no.70, vol.1, 1990/1991.

[13] Joseph S.Nye, "Recovering American Leadership", Survival, vol.50, no.1, February-March 2008, pp58-59.

power among world's states is already multipolar, with the USA, Europe, Japan and China representing a majority of world economic output. The bottom "chess-board" is the realm of transnational relations that involve actors crossing borders outside of state control. On this bottom "board", power is widely dispersed.

The global crisis along with globalization and growing interdependence makes the Nye's global "board" even more complicated. These developments recast our traditional perceptions about international relations. There is increasing understanding that these relations are no longer based on the top-down hierarchy as used to be the case for the past centuries, but stem from horizontal networks, which can be called partnerships.

A partnership can be identified as a new form of global co-operation in terms of both its purpose and its membership. It is a particular form best suited for managing the "diffused" multipolar world.

The concept should not be confused with traditional alliances. The latter's purposes have always been to organize joint action against other states, be it the XIX century Holy Alliance or current NATO. Although alliances have been organized around some shared ideas or interests, the impact they used to produce and create now invariably includes an element of negativity because it affects those members of the system against whom an alliance is overtly or covertly directed.

The purpose of partnerships, by contrast, is to produce action against specific global threats, the result of which is elimination or mitigation of a threat that will have only a beneficial impact on all positive actors of the world.

Partnerships are especially essential for dealing with transnational threats, which, as former UN Secretary General Kofi Annan pointedly remarked, do not recognize borders. Growing interdependence has not only altered inter-state relationships, it also transformed international crime, as it created an environment in which it is easier to carry out criminal activities.

As former EU Commissioner Chris Patten indicated in his recent book "What Next?" (2008), we are facing today the post-modern networked criminal world, whose life, like ours, is just another wired-up, market-driven phenomenon, whose reach is truly global, with cyber space and cutting edge technologies at its disposal. Postmodern criminal "entrepreneurs" meet every market demand from the disposal of hazardous waste to the sale of narcotics to the trafficking of children[14].

Successfully fighting postmodern transnational crime requires a new form of global co-operation, one, which includes all positive stakeholders of today's world – states, international organizations, civil society, and private sector.

---

[14] Chris Patten, "What Next?", Penguin Books, 2009, pp.256-267.

Thus, in terms of membership alliances as we conceive of them do not seem to constitute a proper form to confront transboundary challenges. They are mostly products of the past eras, the ages in which it was only states, primarily great powers that mattered. In today's world this form leaves out the majority of world's countries, as well as non-state actors that exercise an increasing amount of influence on global affairs.

How partnerships are to be established and function in specific practical terms? It would make sense to contemplate the process as evolutionary. Partnerships are likely to be forged initially in areas or on issues that prove easiest and least confrontational. Establishing a partnership should not be a goal in itself. Instead, it must be regarded as a means to institutionalize a certain level of cooperation.

A good example of how a particular partnership could be set up and function is the area of human trafficking. In 2005, from the rostrum of the United Nations General Assembly, Belarus proposed to establish a Global partnership against slavery and human trafficking. That partnership has been gradually evolving and was partially shaped by the Vienna Forum on human trafficking, held in February 2008 that brought together for the first time ever on such a huge scale governments, international organizations, civil society, global business, and celebrities.

The Partnership is believed to have further received a kind of an "institutional garb" with the adoption of the Global Plan of Action to Combat Trafficking in Persons that was adopted by the UN General Assembly in July 2010. This document prescribes specific roles to different stakeholders in the fight against the modern-day slavery. It is a very important development in that it recognized that success in fighting the specific threat of human trafficking lies in getting on board all positive actors of the world. It is no longer just a matter for states as used to be the case in the past.

So, today, the Partnership is operating like an informal and flexible structure. The 2013 appraisal of the Global Plan by the United Nations is expected to demonstrate the extent to which the tool of partnership proved more useful than the heretofore state-driven paradigm in fighting human trafficking.

Partnerships may be the key to successfully addressing all current global problems. As the UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon stated at the opening of the 63rd session of the United Nations General Assembly on September 23rd 2008: "Nations can no longer protect their interests, or advance the well-being of their people, without the partnership of the rest"[15].

In light of the above, Belarus is actively advocating global partnerships in various fields with the view to strengthening international co-operation against transnational threats. We believe that it is indeed time to address through

---

[15] The UN Secretary General's Address to the UN General Assembly, New York, September 23, 2008.

partnerships such acute global issues like energy, narcotic drugs, food security, and many others.

So, the second lesson to draw from the crisis is that unrestrained power and unilateralism are not conducive to global stability. The global crisis has clearly undermined the proponents of the so-called Hegemonic Stability Theory, who claim that stability in the world is most likely to take hold under a single dominant state[16].

As the world grow increasingly multipolar and diverse it seems that the best way to manage it is through partnerships that built around all states and multiple positive non-state actors.

Lesson Three: Shape Global Policies around a New "Engine" of Economic Development

Crises usually create an environment that is propitious for retrospection and analysis as to what went wrong in the past. So, it would apparently be useful to take a terse look at world's historic experience in economic development with the view to finding out parallels, patterns, etc, that may help identify appropriate solutions for now as well as for the future.

In this regard, it would be useful to make another reference to Eric Hobsbawm, namely, to his four volumes on the world history since 1789, in which he masterfully traced major trends and developments in world politics, economics, sociology, science and arts[17].

The take-off of the Industrial revolution, according to the British historian, occurred in the United Kingdom around 1780. Ever since, the revolutionary pace of change in economic development first in his native country, then in the continental Europe, and later in other parts of the world became a norm[18].

The process of permanent and rapid innovation and change in economics is what the renowned Austrian economist and sociologist Joseph Schumpeter more than half a century ago characterized as "creative destruction"[19]. Indeed, people permanently create new means of economic development, which in the process replace outdated tools of production. In other words,

---

[16] Michael C.Webb and Stephen D.Krasner, "Hegemonic Stability Theory: An Empirical Assessment", Review of International Studies, vol.15, no.2, 1989.

[17] The four books by Eric Hobsbawm are: 1) "The Age of Revolution: 1789-1848", 2) "The Age of Capital: 1848-1875", 3) "The Age of Empire: 1875-1914", 4) "The Age of Extreme: 1914-1991".

[18] Eric Hobsbawm, "The Age of Capital: 1848-1875", published by Abacus in 2008, pp.42-49.

[19] Schumpeter articulated his theory in "Business Cycles: A Theoretical, Historical and Statistical Analysis of the Capitalist Process" (1939). For more on Schumpeter and his "creative destruction" see "Adjusting to Global Economic Change: The Dangerous Road Ahead", an occasional paper of RAND Corporation, accessible at http://www.rand.org/pubs/occasional_papers/2009/RAND_OP243.pdf

each and every stage of global economic development is driven by a specific "engine" for as long until there appears another one, better and more efficient "vehicle".

The very first engine at the beginning of the Industrial Revolution was cotton. At the turning of the XIX century, Britain as the world's industrial leader placed high premium on developing domestic cotton production. But it was not enough for capturing the world cotton market. This endeavor, in turn, required something else – the means of transportation. As a result, there emerged the need for railroads and steamships, which enhanced the role of other new economic "engines" – coal and steel. Therefore, it was hardly surprising that most economic production at that time was located in and around the areas rich in coal, in North-East England and German Ruhr.

The global economy right after WWII became dependent for its uninterrupted development on yet another "motor", namely, oil. This trend has enormously enhanced the role of the oil-rich Middle East. The great extent to which oil was playing the role of a global economic "driver" was, for instance, amply demonstrated by the oil embargo imposed by Arab states in 1973 against Western countries that supported Israel in the war against its Arab neighbors. The four-fold increase in oil price resulted for the Israeli sympathizers (and actually for many others, including developing countries) in general price spikes and economic recession.

The 1990s saw the world embrace information and communication technologies as just another new "engine". American columnist Thomas Friedman in his "The Lexus and the Olive Tree" (2000), as well as in "The World is Flat" (2004) focused on technological determinism which should bring about a global democratic capitalist revolution[20]. However, technologies admittedly seized to exercise its dominant role at the very beginning of the new century with the so-called "dot-com" bust.

Finally, the tool of finances may be characterized as the "vehicle" of the past decade. Cheap and easy credit in the capitalist core enabled primarily by Asia's profuse lending set in train what the former Chairman of the US Federal Reserve Alan Greenspan called "irrational exuberance" of financial markets[21], which in the end, in a traditional cycle applicable for any type of exuberance, led to boom, speculation, and bust.

The scale of the bust is quite telling: the worldwide losses on US-backed securities and other forms of risky debt are estimated by the International Monetary Fund to be around 2.2 trillion US dollars[22]. How could it have been otherwise,

---

[20] Ken Jowitt, "Setting History's Course", Policy Review, October-November 2009, p.2, accessible at http://www.hoover.org/publications/policyreview/60829297.html

[21] Allan Greenspan, "The Age of Turbulence", published by Penguin Books, 2008, p.164.

[22] Niall Ferguson, "The Ascent of Money: A Financial History of the World", published by, Penguin Books, 2009. p.356.

if by 2006 eight dollars out of every ten that were lent were provided by unregulated operators[23].This makes meaningful the point expressed by financier and philanthropist George Soros that financial markets are self-destabilizing and occasionally they tend towards disequilibrium rather than equilibrium[24].

Against this backdrop many would agree that the recent economic and financial crisis put an end to the financial tool as the "engine" of at least current, but also perhaps, of future economic development. With no chance of yet another "irrational exuberance" and awaiting instead enhanced oversight and regulation at all levels – global, regional, and domestic, finances, like all other previous "engines" before it, are set to descend from the scene in the never-ending process of "creative destruction".

But what is to replace it?

Logic would prompt one to assume that a new "engine" should emerge as a response to a most pressing current global challenge. There is growing perception across the globe that climate change may rightly claim to fall into such a category. As the former Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev eloquently said: "The climate crisis is the new Wall that divides us from our future," when in 2009 he tried to draw parallels with the fall of the Berlin Wall that came down 20 years ago[25]. Indeed, the biggest challenge for the world results from the way in which people have been living over the past two a half centuries in terms of environmental sustainability.

Since the climate problem is being caused by the excessive use of fossil fuels harmful for the atmosphere, the way to mitigate the problem in the short run and to solve it in the long one seems to require all states to move away from the entrenched energy-intensive pattern. Instead, countries of the world must increasingly place economic development on harmless renewable sources of energy, in other words, on a sustainable basis.

So, renewable sources of energy or as they are often dubbed "green" technologies" seem to be the next appropriate option needed to drive global economic development, which should be sustainable therewith. Besides, renewable sources of energy are surely the key to the future, because we all know that fossil fuels are finite and sooner or later they will run out. The Rome Club turned out to be wrong with its famous 1972 forecast in "The Limits to Growth" that the world would run out of oil in the early 1990s. But it failed only in terms of timing, because its basic message about the inevitability of resource exhaustion was certainly correct.

---

[23] Chris Patten, "What Next?", published by, Penguin Books, 2009, p.78.

[24] an interview with George Soros, "Crisis is Endemic to the Financial System", New Perspective Quarterly, vol.26, winter 2009, accessible at http://www.digitalnpq.org/archive/2009_winter/02_soros.html

[25] Mikhail Gorbachev, "More Walls to Fall", published by Project-Syndicate at http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/gorbachev5/English

The biggest challenge with regard to "green technologies' is how to ensure that all countries make effective use of them. Indeed, it would be meaningless to implement the technologies in the Western core alone only to have increased levels of carbon dioxide emissions in other parts of the world. Besides, as David J. Rothkopf pointed out in his article "Is a Green World a Safer World?" the "greening" may also be fraught with resource conflict over water, lithium and other appropriate resources unless states find ways to manage them collectively[26]. Otherwise, the world may see another wave of protectionism, this time the "green" one. Therefore, there seems to be no meaningful option other than to ensure that the process is all-inclusive.

In this respect, some may find of interest the initiative of Belarus that was promulgated at the United Nations General Assembly in 2007 and called upon UN Member States to establish within the United Nations a global mechanism, which would ensure that each and every country around the world enjoys equal access to technologies for alternative and renewable sources of energy. These technologies, in Belarus' opinion, should become a source of mankind's common property rather than being owned by a small group of states or private companies.

The idea was much discussed ever since, for instance, at the UN General Assembly's thematic debate on energy in June 2009, staged at the initiative of Belarus[27]. But, a genuine momentum to the initiative came only recently as a result of the International conference on sustainable development "Rio+20" that was held in Brazil in June 2012. Urged by the Conference's Outcome Document "The Future We Want", the UN Secretary General in his appropriate report to the 67th session of the UN General Assembly (September 2012) laid out some options for a facilitation mechanism that promotes the development, transfer and dissemination of clean and environmentally sound technologies[28]. This essentially marks the beginning of an intergovernmental process to design a global mechanism for transfer of "green technologies".

Likewise, the transfer of "green" technologies to developing countries and emerging markets is likely to be a vital element of the post-Kyoto global framework for climate change that operates under the United Nations Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).

Yet, not all is bright here. "Green" technologies as the next economic engine are likely to face initial difficulties, especially in terms of politics as some

---

[26] David J.Rothkopf, "Is a Green World a Safer World?", Foreign Policy, September-October 2009, accessible at http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2009/08/17/is_a_green_world_a_safer_world_not_necessarily?page=0,0

[27] See document "Interactive Thematic Dialogue of the United Nations General Assembly on Energy Efficiency, Energy Conservation and New and Renewable Sources of Energy, 18 June 2009".

[28] Report of the UN Secretary General A/67/348 dated 4 September 2012 "Options for a Facilitation Mechanism that Promotes the Development, Transfer and Dissemination of Clean and Environmentally Sound Technologies".

states will surely continue to think about the problem of climate change as a "zero-sum" game. They may be unwilling to adopt changes that may cause relative gain for others or discontent among domestic constituencies. This point was vividly demonstrated by flawed negotiations at the UNFCCC conferences over the past few years. But in the long run, there seems to be no alternative to embracing "green" technologies, if the planet is to survive. The sooner this realization comes to everyone, the better.

Therefore, the third lesson to learn from the crisis is that finances stopped be the main "drive" of economic development and should give way to "green" technologies, which will help ensure that future economic development is both stable and environmentally sustainable.

Lesson Four: Consider Options for Better International Financial Arrangements

Although finances have seemingly lost their role as the main engine of global economic development, they are certain to stay with us for the simple reason that the global financial system remains one of the most integrated parts of the world. Indicative of this is the fact that daily volumes of global financial transactions exceed US$ 3 trillion[29]. Therefore, exchange rates and money transfers may hurt much harder in today's world than conflicts or natural disasters. That is why finances should be turned into an effective and useful tool for the whole of the world. They must not any longer serve the speculative interests of the few.

Money has always played a vital role in economic development of each and every country. As was demonstrated by British economic historian Niall Fergusson, the XVII century saw the advent of a financial revolution, which, in fact, preceded and made possible the Industrial revolution[30]. The former revolution took place first in the United Provinces of Holland, and then in the United Kingdom. These two countries grasped that money was about credit, which, in turn, enabled economic expansion.

Both established central banks, the tools of stocks and bonds, tax-collecting machinery, the institution of debt, and parliamentary control over state spending. The reforms enabled Holland and Britain to defeat in wars their traditional opponents, France and Spain. The latter two, though better endowed in terms of population, natural resources, standing armies, and centralized governments, failed to understand what role money and credit should have played.

---

[29] Chris Patten, "What Next?", published by Penguin Books, p.276.

[30] Money is the topic of two Nial Ferguson's books: "The Cash Nexus: Money and Power in the Modern World, 1700-2000" (2001) and "The Ascent of Money: A Financial History of the World" (2008).

Success in embracing financial and industrial revolutions is what made Britain a hegemon in the second half of the XIX century. In terms of finances, since the mid-1850s Britain started actively promoting the gold standard, which fixed currencies to gold. That measure served to make commodity prices and trade stable and diminished possibilities for reducing debt through currency depreciation.

The gold standard, however, was abandoned soon after the beginning of WWI, because the major antagonists were more interested in financial latitude associated with the unfetted printing of money than in financial stability. But, it came to life again after the war only to be ditched once more in the 1930s in the wake of the Great Depression.

After WWII the United States emerged as an undisputed leader of the West's core or as it has otherwise started to be called the First World. As a matter of fact, the US might have claimed that leadership even earlier – after the end of WWI, but had not done so at the time owing to powerful domestic political constraints on country's global engagements. This was amply demonstrated by the US Congress' refusal to ratify in 1919 the League of Nations Covenant, the idea of which was vigorously advanced by then US President Woodraw Wilson.

However, with a different mood prevailing in Washington in the 1940s on the US role in the post-war world, the United States reversed its previous stance and instead set about to actively shape an emerging international political and economic architecture.

The result in terms of finances was the establishment of the Bretton Woods system, whose function, among some others, was to supervise the global currency mechanism, initially within the First World, with its countries' currencies pegged to the dollar, whose price, in turn, was fixed to gold.

After the United States abandoned the fixed exchange rate mechanism in the early 1970s, for the reasons indicated in the first section of the essay, countries began to put an increasing emphasis on accumulating currency of the leading economy in the world. Thus, since the 1970s the US dollar became an undisputed global reserve currency.

The United States, on its part, since the early 1980s has started taking advantage of its position as the primary issue of global reserve currency to finance its growing current account deficit. This situation, as was shown earlier in the text, has served to produce dangerous imbalances.

The recent crisis has inevitably raised doubts about the expediency of excessively relying on the dollar as the world's reserve currency and set in motion ideas on the need to move away from the pattern. The dollar does not seem any longer to enjoy the trust and confidence that it once did. The logic points to the need to place financial relationships on the currencies of several countries rather than one. Yet, it is not enough to have logic and desire at one's

side. A reserve currency is determined, to a large extent, by markets. Today, however, no other currency of any other country or of a group of countries (meaning the euro) seems ready to take its place.

China proposed the creation of a "super-sovereign reserve currency" patterned after the IMF's Special Drawing Rights (SDRs) as a way to diversify away from the dollar31. The proposal to reform the reserve currency was received positively by BRIC (Brazil, Russia, India, China) and some other countries, as well as by the United Nations, and even by some in the International Monetary Fund. Senior U.S. officials, on their part, including President Obama, Treasury Secretary Geithner, and Federal Reserve Chairman Benjamin Bernanke, categorically rejected calls to replace the dollar as the world's reserve currency32.

So, is there a chance for change here?

First of all, in spite of opposing views among the leading powers on the issue of a reserve currency, there were some positive developments in this regard. Above all, the G20, an entity empowered by the crisis, decided at their Summit in London in April 2009 to allocate $250 billion of additional SDRs33.

Countries should not shy away from wider use of IMF Special Drawing Rights, because these are denominated in several national currencies, with no single currency enjoying an unfair advantage. But at the same time it would make sense to widen the range of currencies included in the SDRs to better reflect global economic realities that tend to enhance the power of emerging markets.

Another option for a viable reserve currency may be associated with the so-called SDR Substitution Account. The basic idea behind it is that countries running currency reserves above the level necessary to maintain their domestic economic and financial stability would allow to convert parts of those excessive reserves into Special Drawing Rights. As a result, a vast amount of reserves may be accumulated, thereby making many countries feel more secure financially.

This kind of arrangement may be arrived at through an inter-governmental agreement. If a second Bretton Woods conference were indeed to take place, the calls to which were heard from everywhere in the wake of the crisis34, the issue of a reserve currency in general and of the SDR Substitution Account, in particular, should stand in the forefront.

---

[31] Daniel W.Drezner, "Bad Debts: Assessing China's Financial influence in Great Power Politics", International Security, vol.34, no.2, Fall 2009, p.33, accessible at http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/pdfplus/10.1162/isec.2009.34.2.7

[32] Ibid, pp.39-40.

[33] The Final Communiqué of the G20 London Summit, April 2009, "The Global Plan for Recovery and Reform", p.5, accessible at http://www.londonsummit.gov.uk/resources/en/PDF/final-communique

[34] Sebastian Mallaby, "Bretton Woods, the Sequel?", the Washington Post, 20 October 2008.

Thus, the fourth lesson to draw from the crisis is that a global financial arrangement (whether the gold standard or a single currency) stands inevitably as a reflection of interests of the dominant economic power in the world. As the crisis undermined that power, it seems reasonable to consider other options for global financial arrangements that should be stable, predictable, effective, and better reflect the distribution of economic power in the world.

Lesson Five: Factor in the Multidimensional Nature of the Crisis

It would be rather incorrect to call the recent crisis economic and financial, because it was not about economics and finances only. Indeed, the crisis started as a financial problem for just one country. Then, it spilt over to some other states that were more than others linked to the first. The crisis further expanded its scope and started hitting sectors of national economies other than finances until it virtually engulfed the economies of all countries, albeit to a different extent.

Its next ramification was social. Weaker or negative economic growth triggered by the crisis inevitably created masses of unemployed and slashed social expenditures. According to the International Labor Organization, 50 million jobs have been lost in 2009[35] as a result of the crisis.

Social problems, in turn, set in motion political developments associated with upheavals and unrests in many parts of the world against constitutional authorities. These only serve to undermine domestic peace and stability with destabilizing external consequences.

Therefore, the process that began in the summer of 2007 as a seemingly functional problem for just one state has apparently grown into a strategic challenge for global peace, security, and stability. Thus, there is actually no decoupling for anyone from the recent crisis.

It is the essence of global interdependence of the early XXI century – the haves are not able to enjoy the fruits of their wealth and ordinary people are not able to live in peace, security and stability, until there is a growing mass of have-nots and until there are people intent on realizing their objectives by the means of extremism and fundamentalism in whatever forms and manifestations.

Given the extent of interdependence in today's world, the global crisis appears to be much more multidimensional, and therefore, much more dangerous than, for example, the economic and financial crisis, which started with the crash of the Wall Street in 1929.

---

[35] Cited from the testimony for the US House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Terrorism, Non-proliferation and Trade by Nancy Birdsal on "Foreign Implications of US Efforts to Address the International Financial Crisis: TARP, TALF, and the G20 Plan", p.3. Accessible at http://foreignaffairs.house.gov/111/bir061009.pdf

There are, indeed, significant parallels between the Great Depression and the current crisis. Both were caused by the "financial exuberance". The Great Depression hit the countries in the West's core hard and forced them to turn economically inward. As a result, the world trade shrank by two thirds[36]. But autarky and protectionism only exacerbated the crisis and ultimately led to international conflicts and the world war.

What will the current crisis generate?

Another lost decade for development, like was admittedly the case with the 1990s? It is most likely. The impact on the poor will be severe, reversing gains in poverty alleviation and development made over the past few years. In this context it is reasonable to doubt that the Millennium Development Goals adopted at the UN Summit in 2000 will be met by 2015. What is more, the problems stemming from the crisis are not likely to be confined to developing countries alone, but will claim as victims many other states.

At the same time, there are also some marked differences between the two crisis periods. Unlike the Great Depression, which was worsened by the US Federal Reserve's decision to tighten the credit[37], now countries decisively embarked on opposite measures that seek to make credit more available, bailout financial institutions in distress and expand economic stimulus packages.

As a result, so far protectionism is mostly confined to some individual acts and not mass scale tariff hikes like those during the Great Depression. Yet, as was indicated earlier, the above measures are primarily of short run, needed to assuage the immediate effects of the financial meltdown. They are not a guarantee against a repetition of similar developments unless the underlying causes are addressed.

Therefore, what is needed to be done in the long run in order to strengthen global stability is to address the five lessons associated with the global governance structure (lesson one), the form of global co-operation (lesson two), the primary engine of global economic development (lesson three), the global financial arrangements (lesson four), and the increasingly multifaceted nature of contemporary global crises (lesson five). These measures might, in effect, constitute a kind of a global New Deal like its famous predecessor that was launched by US President F.D.Roosevelt in the 1930s, and ultimately helped overcome the crisis domestically and, to a certain extent, internationally.

Thus, addressing the lessons outlined above is a matter of necessity rather than choice, if the world is keen to avoid instability and conflicts that invariably come in the wake of global crises.

---

[36] Niall Ferguson, "The Ascent of Money: A Financial History of the World" published by, Penguin Books, 2009, p.159.

[37] Lawrence M.Stratton and Paul Craig Roberts, "The Fed's "Depression" and the Birth of the New Deal", published by Policy Review, August–September 2001, accessible at http://www.hoover.org/publications/policyreview/3476271.html

VLADIMIR MAKEI*

HUMAN RIGHTS: WHAT AND WHO MADE THEM DIVIDE THE WORLD?

ABSTRACT

The issue of human rights began to loom large on the global policy agenda over the past two decades. Furthermore, this issue, more than any other, served to sharpen differences among countries across the world and thus, divide them. Basically, the division relates to the primacy, which different states and groups of states attach either to individual or collective human rights. In this regard, the author attempts to demonstrate that different and opposing attitudes that countries take on human rights stem from their specific historic experiences of development, which in some cases served to forge a centralized and collective nature of societies, whereas in others these experiences were conducive to entrenching decentralization and individualism. Appreciating specific historical experiences of each other that shaped individual countries' and societies' stances on human rights should in general help them all find ways to treat the issue of human rights in a non-confrontational manner.

Key words: Human rights, historical experience, societies, centralization, decentralization, collectivism, individualism.

INTRODUCTION

Since the end of the Cold War the issue of human rights has unquestionably come into increased global prominence. Specifically, less than a decade ago human rights had been elevated by the international community to the level of importance in the United Nations that heretofore only the issues of peace/security and development enjoyed. This shift in global attitudes has been duly reflected in the Outcome document of the UN Summit in 2005, which purportedly equalized in significance all the three domains: peace/security, development and human rights.

Nevertheless, no other issue on the international agenda appears currently to be as much divisive and politicized as human rights. Indeed, international relations have been increasingly viewed and conducted through the prism of human rights. Some countries, more than others, have come to assume the mantle of human rights "defenders", and make political and economic relationships with other states contingent on the latter's observance of those human rights "standards", in which the former group allegedly excels. The opponents often respond with appropriate accusations and policies of their own.

---

* Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Belarus since August 2012.

Thus, international relations are being increasingly conducted not on the basis of pragmatism, as used to be the case throughout much of history, but on the premise of ideology that was characteristic for much of the XX century. As the great American historian Arthur M.Schlesinger Jr. said: "Ideology is counterhistorical. It lives by models and substitutes models for reality".[1] Building on that logic, it can reasonably be argued that by engaging in fruitless and endless debates about human rights, we all are departing from our own reality. Essentially, we are setting aside such vital tasks as effectively governing the globe and addressing ever-rising transnational challenges, for instance, the problem of climate change, because we have all been captured by the dangerous logic of ideology, which forces some countries to prove that they are better and more worthy in something than others.

Simply put, the human rights debate is mainly about the primacy of specific categories of human rights. While in rhetoric all countries support the equality of all human rights categories, the practice, however, is different, as the industrially advanced countries traditionally put a very high premium on individual civil and political rights, whereas developing states advocate the supreme nature of collective economic, social and cultural rights.

The author is convinced that the above division traces its origin far back to specific historical development of particular societies, which, in turn, came to shape their contemporary attitudes on human rights. Therefore, if we can better appreciate each other's historical circumstances of development, we will certainly be able to better understand each other's current approaches to human rights, and, hopefully, find ways to bridge the differences stemming from the human rights discourse that at present seem irreconcilable.

This essay is an attempt to contribute to the task set above. It is not and certainly cannot be a thoroughgoing study of civilizations and societies. Nor is it a research devoted exclusively to the issue of human rights. The author merely confines himself to realizing the task by tapping primarily into the following major works: Francis Fukuyama's "The Origins of Political Order" (2011), Niall Ferguson's "Civilization: The West and the Rest" (2011), Samuel P. Huntington's "The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order" (1996), Arthur M. Schlesinger's "The Cycles of American History" (1985). They all provide useful general insights into how Eurasian, American and other societies came to embrace either collectivist or individualist societal attitudes, and thus, help grasp their particular attitudes to human rights.

However, before proceeding with that inquiry, the author deems it necessary to provide a rather concise overview of how the issue of human rights progressed throughout history.

---

[1] Arthur M.Schlesinger, "The Cycles of American History", published by Mariner Books, 1999, p.56.

Human Rights History: a Concise Overview

Human rights ostensibly trace their origin to numerous world religions, which taught individuals to respect other individuals and treat them in a humane way. Nonetheless, as Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr. argues: "Since religion [Christianity] had traditionally ordained hierarchy and inequality, and since it had traditionally disdained earthly happiness, early human rights formulations, as with Voltaire and later in the French Revolution, had a markedly anti-religious cast".[2]

An important antecedent of human rights was the idea of natural rights – that people should enjoy some rights that come to them *naturally* – which goes as far back as the Classic Greek or Roman worlds. But, the notion that natural rights have immediate, specific and universal application came into being only a few centuries ago. In particular, the 1776 US Declaration of Independence and its subsequent Constitution were premised on the idea of natural rights.

The British anti-slavery campaign of the late XVIII-early XIX centuries was both another vital contributor to spreading the idea of natural rights, and the forerunner of West's human rights activism in the XX century.

Another milestone in the human rights history can be associated with the US Civil War that ended slavery in that country, although racial discrimination there persisted for another century. Even though the US was built upon the idea of natural rights, these rights were accorded only to the white population, since the black population was regarded as "property rights", a category that was at that time as sacrosanct to the white settlers as the notion of natural rights itself, in fact, it was an inalienable part of the latter. Niall Ferguson claims that the lot of slaves was better at that time in Latin America than in North America, because in the former the "property rights" were not as sacred as in the North.[3]

The next critical juncture in the history of human rights was the United Nations Charter adopted in 1945, and more specifically, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights endorsed by the United Nations General Assembly in December 1948. The latter document was spurred by the tragic memory of immense human losses suffered during WWII. Interestingly, the Universal Declaration covered both civil and political rights, as well as economic, social and cultural ones, although the constituency for the second set of rights was not as strong in 1948 as it would emerge later, in the 1960s, when a wave of decolonization swept the world.

The UN Declaration was followed by a series of subsidiary United Nations conventions, including the two Covenants on Civil and Political Rights and

---

[2] Ibid, p.89.

[3] Niall Ferguson, "Civilization: The West and the Rest", published by the Penguin Press, New York, p.131.

on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights adopted in 1966 and entering into force for the signatory states in 1976.

During the Cold War the issue of human rights largely remained in the background of great power politics. Throughout much of that period, the major antagonists, despite their opposing ideologies, placed their mutual relations on the logic of pragmatism and *Realpolitik* rather than on ideological underpinnings and human rights. Such an approach best found its expression in the policies of *détente*.

Nevertheless, like with everything else, the idea of human rights was also caught up in the Cold War, with Western states traditionally assailing the communist world for its abuse of civil and political rights; the communist countries responded by attacking its opponents for the latter's neglect of social and economic rights. A marked departure from the *Realpolitik* pattern occurred under President Carter, who significantly elevated the issue of human rights in US foreign policy, and especially under Reagan, who unequivocally favored ideology over pragmatism.

According to Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr., it was Reagan, whose administration more than any other US administration, applied double standards on human rights, justifying that it was applying them against totalitarian regimes like the USSR, but their violation might be condoned with regard to authoritarian regimes that had happened to be US allies.[4]

With the end of the Cold War human rights had acquired new importance. A major hallmark of that period was the 1993 World conference on human rights held in Vienna – the largest ever gathering on human rights. The Conference concluded with the Vienna Declaration that reconfirmed the equal status of both individual political and civil rights, and collective economic, social and cultural rights.

Notwithstanding, one fault line at the conference was clearly drawn between the Western nations that proclaimed a universal meaning to human rights versus developing nations, which on their part argued that human rights needed to be interpreted differently in non-Western cultures and that attempts to impose a universal definition amounted to interference in their internal affairs.[5]

In the wake of the Conference a new UN office was established – the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights. Finally, in 2006 the UN Human Rights Council was established to replace the UN Commission on Human Rights that had functioned since 1946. The latter move was aimed at ending politicization in the Commission, yet it failed to turn things around, as the issue of human rights continues to increasingly divide countries of the world.

---

[4] Arthur M.Schlesinger, "The Cycles of American History", published by Mariner Books, 1999, p.104.

[5] See "World Conference on Human Rights, available at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/World_Conference_on_Human_Rights

Eurasian Societies: Centralization and a Sense of Community Prevail

First, a short note on definitions. Although the notion of "Eurasia" is generally taken to cover the whole of Europe and Asia, in the current article for the sake of proving his argument the author implies by this term Asia in its entirety and only those part of Europe, which include the Western part of the Commonwealth of Independent States, as well as Turkey. The reason is that a separate section following this one will be devoted to Europe.

Francis Fukuyama in his "The Origins of Political Order" advances the point that biological similarity of humans explains why separate societies came to similar political orders in a distant past. Specifically, all earlier sedentary societies that came to rely on agriculture were tribal societies in a sense that political and economic hierarchies were overwhelmingly structured in them along the lines of kinship and tribal ties. Fukuyama defines this phenomenon as "tribalism" or "paternalism".

However, leaders in those societies at some point came to grasp that "tribalism" and "paternalism" stood in the way of effective functioning of such societies since it served to appropriate resources for a few that might otherwise have been employed for the benefit of entire societies, most crucially in terms of economic development and military power. Essentially, "tribalism" and "paternalism" represented an earlier form of government's corruption.

Hence, early societies' leaders embraced the need to fight "tribalism". The way to do that was basically about replacing kinship and tribal ties in governance with meritocracy. In other words, the key to societal successful development, as this compelling logic went, should not have been associated with such factors as birth or inherited wealth, but rather with individual's personal characteristics, like intelligence, knowledge, integrity, commitment, etc. The extent to which separate societies eventually succeeded in that task determined their internal structure (centralized or decentralized), their internal nature (collectivist or individualist), and, later, their attitudes to human rights.

According to Fukuyama, China was the first society that realized the task with success. In III B.C. it was able by action from the top to establish a strong centralized state based on meritocracy.[6] Europe, by contrast, would be able to repeat a similar path only a millennium later.

Fukuyama further argues that China's development was ever since shaped by the two concepts or doctrines. First, it was what he called "Legalism", which sought to strengthen the state and tie individuals to it.[7] "Legalism's" success was possible by the meritocratic nature of China's system of governance. Second,

---

[6] Francis Fukuyama, "The Origins of Political Order", published by Profile Books, 2011, p.21.

[7] Ibid, p.116.

"Legalism" went hand in glove with a philosophical concept of Confucianism that emphasized such virtues as morality, family, tradition, community.

Although at certain periods one doctrine dominated the other, they were not in conflict, but rather supplemented each other. As Henry Kissinger claims in his "On China" (2011), the Confucian philosophy was about redemption of the state through virtuous individual behavior.[8] Thus, "Legalism" and Confucianism both served to shape China as a centralized society with a strong sense of community. Basically, these two concepts are in work today and embody China's current "Harmonious Society".

Individualism has never developed in that society. Instead, as Samuel P. Huntington notes: "For East Asians, East Asian [economic] success is particularly the result of the East Asian cultural stress on the collectivity rather than the individual".[9] He further argues that "the Confucian ethos pervading many Asian societies stressed the values of authority, hierarchy, the subordination of individual rights and interests, the importance of consensus, the avoidance of confrontation, "saving face", and, in general, the supremacy of the state over society and of society over the individual".[10]

A very peculiar way to fight "paternalism" was developed in the Ottoman Empire. Fukuyama notes that in their military campaigns the Ottomans enslaved Christian boys, whom they educated for future service in political and military administrations.[11] The Mamluks, which were a ruling caste in Egypt in the centuries past, adhered to the same practice. This pattern worked with success to a certain point as the Ottoman Empire was able to effectively utilize that human reserve with the view to centralizing and increasing its power.

However, as the Ottomans began to run up against increasingly assertive European countries and Persia in the XVII century, their scope for territorial aggrandizement and boys' enslavement significantly diminished. As a result, according to Fukuyama, without the foreign cadre for future administrators and soldiers, the Ottomans soon succumbed to internal paternalism, which, among other factors, ultimately served to bring about the disintegration of their Empire. Thus, societies in the Asia Minor and the Middle East acquired a mixed record of state centralization/decentralization, but managed to retain to a substantial degree the paternal nature of their societies. Consequently, individualism could not gain there much traction.

When it comes to Eurasian societies, it is also worth to dwell on the experience of Russia and Eastern Slavs. The development of that society up to the XIII century was in many respects similar to that of other European

---

[8] Henry Kissinger, "On China", published by Penguin Books, 2011, p.15.

[9] Samuel Huntington, "The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order", published by Simon and Schuster, 2002, p.108.

[10] Ibid, p.225.

[11] Francis Fukuyama, "The Origins of Political Order", published by Profile Books, 2011, p.191.

countries. It was mainly associated in both Eastern and Western Europe with the establishment of numerous more or less decentralized political principalities. But, the Mongol invasion that came to Eastern Europe and lasted for a century and a half was that critical juncture that shaped future development of Eastern Slavs in a way different from its Western neighbors.

The Mongol conquest significantly retarded Russia's development, as it curtailed its ties to both Byzantium and Western Europe. As a result, as Fukuyama posits, both Renaissance and Reformation passed Russia by.[12] Another critical juncture for Russia was the period that came to be known in history as the Troubled Times, which occurred in the early XVII century, owing to problems with royal succession. The Troubled Times brought about a virtual disintegration and subjugation of the Russian state by foreigners.

These two critical junctures served to imbue the Russian society with the kind of its own doctrine of "Legalism", that is, the need to centralize the state, lest it again fell prey to external forces. This, in turn, shaped a particular form of Russia's governance. According to Fukuyama, Russian aristocrats, bearing in mind the Mongols and the Troubled Times, feared a weak state, thus they let the monarchy solidify its hold on power. More than that, this sense of insecurity was conducive to the situation, in which Russia's lower gentry came to be subordinated directly to the monarchy rather than to top aristocracy, as was the case at that time in Western Europe.[13]

So, viewed in political terms, specific historical circumstances laid the foundation for the establishment by Russians of a highly centralized state, which was also replicated in some territories that came under Russia's control or influence later. Yet, it was not all, because the same historical circumstances served to produce an effect in social terms as well. Namely, they imbued the Russians with a very strong feeling of "commonality", a conviction that only by standing together could people both overcome difficulties and make progress. It was, in a sense, Russia's way of achieving redemption of the state through virtuous behavior of its people.

In this author's view, the nature of Russia's spiritual and collective development was excellently characterized by Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr. in his reference to Alexander Solzhenitsyn made in "The Cycles of American History". In particular, Schlesinger said that "for Solzhenitsyn, with his organic view of society, the nation even more than the individual is the crucial moral unit, the nation must concentrate on inner tasks: on healing its soul, educating its children, putting its own house in order".[14]

---

[12] Ibid, p.388.

[13] Ibid, pp 391-392.

[14] Arthur M.Schlesinger, "The Cycles of American History", published by Mariner Books, 1999, p.115.

Even though the Russian and Eastern Slav societies, starting with Peter the Great in the XVIII century, came to be divided by the two competing visions of their future associated respectively with *Westernizers* and *Slavophiles*, the specific historical circumstances of the earlier centuries seem to have clearly and irrevocably shaped their centralized and collectivist nature.

With regard to Russia's developmental experience, Samuel P. Huntington seems to have summed it up right: "Russian civilization was a product of its indigenous roots in Kievan Rus and Moscovy, substantial Byzantine impact, and prolonged Mongol rule. These influences shaped a society and a culture which had little resemblance to those developed in Western Europe under the influence of very different forces".[15]

EUROPEAN EXPERIENCE: ARRIVING AT DECENTRALIZATION AND INDIVIDUALISM

At the time when China managed to establish a strong centralized state, Europe was dominated by the Roman Empire. But, unlike China, Rome's governance structure was not based on meritocracy, but rather on patron-client relationships. As a result, the state was never sufficiently centralized. Furthermore, as British historian Chris Wickham argues in his "The Inheritance of Rome: A History of Europe from 400 to 1000" (2010), the erosion of that type of relationship by V A.D. was one of the main causes behind Empire's collapse.[16]

In the aftermath of Roman Empire's disintegration European development proceeded at a somewhat different pattern than other societies in Eurasia opted for. Above all, Europe's specific path was circumstanced by its geography. According to the American evolutionary biologist Jared Diamond (Guns, Germs and Steel: The Fate of Human Societies, 1997), the European terrain with its numerous rivers, mountains and forests was conducive to the establishment of multiple decentralized political units, in contrast to Eurasia, whose more or less flat terrain was instrumental to setting there large centralized entities.[17]

Next, Europe's own peculiar path of development was influenced by the rise and consolidation of Catholic Church. First, as Fukuyama posits, the Catholic Church was in a position to consolidate itself, because, as shown above, Europe's geography made its political map fragmented, and hence, there was

---

[15] Samuel Huntington, "The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order", published by Simon and Schuster, 2002, p.140.

[16] Chris Wickham, "The Inheritance of Rome: A History of Europe from 400 to 1000", published by Penguin Books, 2010. p.43.

[17] Cited from Niall Ferguson, "Civilization: The West and the Rest", published by the Penguin Press, New York, pp.11-12.

no truly centralized force to effectively stand in Church's way.[18] Second, the Church succeeded, because, as Fukuyama suggests, it was able to overcome "paternalism" within itself through the reforms of Pope Gregory VII (reigned in 1073-1085), which were mainly associated with priest celibacy.[19] What the measure essentially meant was that childless priests became disinterested in personal matters, and began instead channeling all their energy to the advantage of the Church.

The eminent British religious historian Diarmaid MacCalloch in his flagship "A History of Christianity" (2009) claims that Gregory VII realized a vision of a universal church, which clashed with German emperors' vision of a universal Empire. As a result, Europe got a fragmented map of countries and authorities.[20] This development effectively signified that European political and religious authorities had to coexist and share power. They got accustomed to live in a decentralized environment, where they had to take into consideration others' views. Thus, since the Middle Ages a decentralized Europe did not develop that sense of community that was characteristic to the more centralized Eurasian societies.

Another development that served to entrench that trend was the Black Death that struck Western Europe in the mid-XIV century. According to Fukuyama, the Black Death significantly reduced Europe's population, which, in turn, forced the authorities to make concessions in the interest of a scarce labor force. This effectively entailed the abolition of serfdom in Western Europe and increased individual freedom, whereas serfdom in Eastern Europe went on for another several centuries.[21]

Yet, decentralization produced an advantage of its own. Indeed, the geographical, political and religious conditions that made Europe decentralized also served to propel its development at a pace far exceeding that of other societies. Fukuyama argues that a decentralized Europe faced intense internal competition that drove its accelerated development, while centralized consolidated Eurasian Empires did not face such a competitive environment, hence they had no incentive for perfection.[22] That, in Niall Ferguson's view, explains, for instance, the fact that China virtually abandoned its seafaring activities by the end of the XV century, while at the same time European powers driven by competition, above all Spain and Portugal, embarked on global sea voyages.[23]

---

[18] Francis Fukuyama, "The Origins of Political Order", published by Profile Books, 2011, p.266.

[19] Ibid, p.264.

[20] Diarmaid MacCalloch, "A History of Christianity", published by Penguin Books, 2009, p.376.

[21] Fukuyama, "The Origins of Political Order", published by Profile Books, 2011, p.376.

[22] Ibid, p.126.

[23] Niall Ferguson, "Civilization: The West and the Rest", published by the Penguin Press, New York, pp.32-33.

Ferguson's central point in his "Civilization: The West and the Rest" (2011) is that while until 1500 Europe and some Eurasian societies developed more or less at an equal pace, European creative competition spurred by the continent's decentralized nature, allowed Europe to make a quantum leap forward in its development. Ferguson claims that competition bolstered another five factors, which, all taken together, he calls the "six killer applications" – competition, science, property rights, medicine, the consumer society, the work ethic – which allowed the West (Europe and European descendants in North America and Austrasia) to significantly outpace the rest of the world in development.[24] This all led to the Industrial Revolution in Europe by the early XIX century, which empowered it to dominate and impose its values on the rest.

Moreover, Europe's competitive environment was also conducive to social developments associated in a succeeding order, with Renaissance, Reformation, Enlightenment and French Revolution, which all served to increase and entrench the individual character of European societies. It seems that of particular significance in this regard was Reformation. American political scientist Walter Russell Mead in his "God and Gold: Britain, America and the Making of the Modern World" (2007) advances the point that Reformation's slogan "Scripture alone" led to different interpretations of Bible, to the diversity of religious opinions, which served to emphasize the primacy of particular (individual) over general (common).[25]

Furthermore, since its very beginning the Reformation turned out be a belligerent religion. As Water Russell Mead reminds us, it was a staunch Protestant British ruler Oliver Cromwell, who first used the phrase "the Axis of Evil"[26], that later was borrowed and much utilized by another ideology-driven world leader not so many years ago.

Finally, it seems that the Cultural revolution in Western Europe in the 1960s, as the eminent British historian Eric Hobsbawm argues in his "The Age of Extreme: 1914–1991" (1994), was just another in the string of trends, developments and events that bolstered individualism and individual freedom at the expense of societal cohesion.[27]

North America: Following in Europe's Footsteps, but by its Own Way

Like in Europe, it was geography above all that served as a key factor in shaping a specific pattern of North America's development. Daron Acemoglu and James A. Robinson in their "Why Nations Fail" (2012) vividly depicted

---

[24] Ibid, pp.12-13.

[25] Walter Russell Mead, "God and Gold: Britain, America and the Making of the Modern World", published by Atlantic Books, London, 2007, p.210.

[26] Ibid, p.21

[27] Eric Hobsbawm, "The Age of Extreme: 1914–1991", published by Abacus, 2009, pp.334-335.

how different developmental patterns were established for South and North Americas.

Indeed, starting in the early XVI century the Spanish and Portuguese were able to impose extractive forms of governance on locals in Southern and Central America. Crucially, these areas were very rich in resources, which the European colonizers were keen to extract for their own monarchies. They succeeded in this goal, because these areas were also densely populated with indigenous people. Thus, the colonizers subjugated the locals for the purpose of resource extraction.[28]

However, as Acemoglu and Robinson note, a similar pattern could not be replicated in North America. The English colonizers very quickly realized that situation, because North America lacked both precious metals and dense local populations. Hence, as the locals could not be forced to work for the European settlers, the latter had to work themselves for their own sustenance.[29] The English Virginia Company that was then in charge of North American colonization had, therefore, to provide incentives in order to attract new settlers to North America.[30]

As a result, according to Acemoglu and Robinson, strong hierarchy and centralization failed to take root there.[31] These developments have instead produced, since the early days, an egalitarian society based on settler agricultural middle class. As the economist William Easterly argues, because the basic food item produced by the majority of US population (i.e. farmers) was wheat, such a situation contributed to establishing a middle-class society. In contrast, where the basic item was a rare commodity or product that were unavailable to all, and the profits were reaped by a small minority rather than by the majority, like was the case with sugar plantations in the Caribbean, such places, unlike the USA, saw the entrenchment of inequality and oppressive forms of governance.[32]

Given the prevailing logic of US farmers to engage in constant frontier expansion with the view to ratcheting up their primarily wheat-based agricultural production, this dominant class developed a strong sense of individualism, distrust of government, and stood for the removal of any kinds of constraints.

Alexis de Tocqueville, a famous French connoisseur of an early America, in his "Democracy in America", written in the 1830s, stressed the importance of individualism in the United States. He saw American individualism as self-withdrawal – the tendency of each member of the community to "draw apart

[28] Daron Acemoglu, James A.Robinson, "Why Nations Fail", published by Crown Business, 2012, p.18.

[29] Ibid, p.23.

[30] Ibid, p.26

[31] Ibid, p.2

[32] William Easterly, "The White Man's Burden", published by Oxford University Press, p.2007, p.110.

with his family and friends so that after he has thus formed a little circle of his own, he willingly leaves society largely to itself".[33]

Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr. provides additional useful insight into a further development of a North American, specifically, a US society, especially in terms of its foreign policy impact. According to him, United States' politics was molded by the two traditions, namely, by the fusion of classic indoctrination with Calvinist judgment.[34] With regard to the first tradition, being well read in classic history, the US Founders had forebodings about America's prospects, because of previous negative experience with republican forms of government, but believed that their own experiment would escape the past pattern of classic republics' doom.[35]

The second tradition, in turn, was rooted in Calvinist branch of Protestantism given that the first settlers were overwhelmingly religious Calvinist Puritans fleeing Europe. According to that tradition, as Schlesinger notes, America was a redemptive history, a prophecy fulfilled, a new Israel.[36]

So, while the first tradition was secular, which contemplated the United States as an experiment and was about realism, the second tradition was mystical, which took the US as a destiny, and was about idealism.[37] Therefore, as Schlesinger argues: "The theory of America is [about] the divergence between the pragmatic conception of America as a nation, one among many, engaged in a risky experiment, and the mystical vision of America as destiny appointed by the Almighty to save unregenerate humanity".[38]

The author claims that, owing to the second tradition, "Americans acquired the image of the saviors of the world"[39], while "the theory of the elect nation, the redeemer nation, almost became the official creed".[40] He went on to say further that "the United States was founded on the proclamation of "unalienable rights", and human rights have had ever since a peculiar resonance in the minds of Americans. Americans have agreed since 1776 that the US must be the beacon of human rights to an unregenerate world. The question has always been how America is to execute this mission. The early view was that America would redeem the world not by intervention but by example".[41]

---

[33] Alexis de Tocqueville, "Democracy in America", published by Bantam Classic, 2004, p.618.

[34] Arthur M.Schlesinger, "The Cycles of American History", published by Mariner Books, 1999, p.6.

[35] Ibid, p.10.

[36] Ibid, p.12.

[37] Ibid, p.14.

[38] Ibid, p.26.

[39] Ibid, p.15.

[40] Ibid, p.17.

[41] Ibid, p.89.

Therefore, its early foreign policy was guided more by pragmatism than by idealism. This attitude was best reflected in the famous speech by President John Quincy Adams (1821), in which he warned that "she [America] goes not abroad, in search of monsters to destroy".[42]

But the growth of American power, as Schlesinger posits, also confirmed the messianism of those who believed in America's divine anointment, that is, "that there was a couple of real monsters roaming the world encouraged a fearful tendency to look everywhere for new monsters to destroy".[43] This trend has been steadily on the rise ever since President Woodrow Wilson brought the US into WWI under the slogan to "make the world safe for democracy".[44]

Schlesinger himself, writing his "Cycles of American History" in the mid-1980s, was highly critical of the US' mystical tradition. In particular, he said that "Americans would do well to sober up from the ideological binge and return to the cold, grey realism of the Founding Fathers, men who lucidly understood the role of interest and force in a dangerous world and thought that saving America was enough without trying to save all humanity as well".[45]

Schlesinger proceeded from the assumption that the morality of states was inherently different from the morality of individuals, and the individual's duty of self-sacrifice and the state's duty of self-preservation were in conflict.[46] Indeed, one cannot help but agree with this historian's dictum that "saints can be pure, but states must be responsible".[47]

A similar position was shared by another distinguished American – philosopher Reinhold Niebuhr, who argued in his "The Moral Man and Immoral Society" (1932) that "a sharp distinction must be drawn between the moral and social behavior of individuals and of social groups, national, racial, and economic, and that this distinction justifies and necessitates policies which a purely individualistic ethic must always find embarrassing".[48]

To sum up, a strong sense of individualism developed out of North American first settlers' material experience, along with a strong strand of messianism spurred, in turn, by their religious experience served to shape United States' proclivity to embrace a pro-active stance on human rights, especially on those aspects that relate to individual rights. The force of that stance, however, has never been constant, but was rather circumstanced by the size of US

---

[42] The statement is available at https://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/jqadams.htm

[43] Arthur M.Schlesinger, "The Cycles of American History", published by Mariner Books, 1999, p.53.

[44] Strobe Talbott, "The Great Experiment", published by Simon and Schuster, 2008, p.146.

[45] Arthur M.Schlesinger, "The Cycles of American History", published by Mariner Books, p.68.

[46] Ibid, pp.71-72.

[47] Ibid, p.72.

[48] Cited from Arthur M.Schlesinger, "The Cycles of American History", published by Mariner Books, 1999, p.97.

power relative to other powers in the world. Not surprisingly, in the Unipolar Moment's environment characterized by unrivalled American power, this country's drive to advance individual political and civil rights has become as strong as ever.

A Way to End Division

Thus, the positions that world's countries take on the issue of human rights have been shaped by their specific historic experiences of development. If countries' attitudes have indeed been historically constructed, they certainly cannot be easily changed. The practice with human rights debate over the past two decades proves that an exercise of that kind was absolutely futile, because it is impossible to change what has acquired over centuries strong indigenous cultural, religious, and other underpinnings. Therefore, what makes most sense in such a context is to discontinue with meaningless mutual accusations with regard to human rights, and seek instead to gain better understanding of how each and every country or society arrived at a particular stance on this issue.

This author tried to show how different societies through their specific patterns of development came to favor either collective or individual rights. Although the author did not cover all global societies, for instance, those of Latin America and Africa, but confined his task only to some Eurasian and North American societies, it appears that overwhelmingly, with some exceptions, they adopted centralized governance structures and embraced collective economic and social rights. At the same time, the author demonstrated how Europeans and North Americans, owing to their geography and subsequent social, political and economic developments came to a different societal outcome, and began giving preference to decentralized forms of governance and individualism, in addition to embarking on active proselytizing their values and views due to the historical legacy of belligerent Protestantism in the West.

Indeed, the prominent American political commentator Fareed Zakaria posits in his "The Post-American World and the Rise of the Rest" (2008) that the reason for the West and the United States in particular to pursue policies that seek to transpose Western values on other societies, that is, democracy promotion and human rights, go back to the past tradition of active Protestant proselytizing elsewhere.

If it comes to that, Buddhism and Confucianism, among others, did not advocate a similar effort in the past, and, thus, do not claim universal application today.[49] Similarly, the Russian Orthodox church for most of the time

---

[49] Fareed Zakaria, "The Post-American World and the Rise of the Rest", published by Penguin Books, 2009, p.84.

worked in tandem with the state rather than against it as was often the case with other Christian denominations in Europe.

In practice, this attitude first involved active Western efforts at religious conversion in other parts of the world over the past few centuries. However, as Schlesinger argues: "Ironically, it was the [Western] missionaries who, in order to prove the natives' spiritual equality, were most prepared to destroy his cultural identity".[50]

The policies of active proselytizing gained renewed momentum in the post-Cold War context, when Fukuyama's "The End of History" thesis associated with liberal democracy's victory over other forms of governance enjoyed a near-unanimous acceptance.[51] As a result, Western states had become more imposing and less tolerant to others in the context of human rights in the United Nations, as well as in other international organizations.

This attitude was duly reflected in the activities of the UN Human Rights Commission throughout the 1990s and the new century's first few years. Western countries' efforts to "flog" a number of non-Western countries by means of country-specific resolutions on the situation of human rights in the latter group that, in fact, had more to do with political rather than humanitarian considerations, created such an atmosphere that inhibited cooperation among UN Member States on many important transnational issues.

On the eve of the UN 2005 Summit, however, the vast majority of states had grasped that a state of affairs like that, when the issue of human rights essentially determined the levels of cooperation in other areas, could be quite counterproductive. As a sign of promising change, they all agreed to replace the UN Human Rights Commission with a UN Human Rights Council (HRC).

They also decided to abandon the practice of country-specific human rights resolutions, and, instead, place the consideration of this issue on an ostensibly neutral tool associated with the universal periodic review (UPR). In other words, each and every state must undergo UPR and all should cooperate on countries' human rights shortcomings revealed by UPRs rather than continue to engage in confrontational stances. Regrettably, this supposedly cooperative pattern has failed so far to take hold, as political and perhaps some other considerations pushed Western countries to revert in the HRC to the previous practices, inherent to the UN Human Rights Commission. As a result, country-specific resolutions on human rights have been brought into usage again, whereas UPRs permeated with "traditional" individual vs. collective rights divisions, slowly but surely started to lose their attractiveness.

---

[50] Arthur M.Schlesinger, "The Cycles of American History", published by Mariner Books, p.156.

[51] The thesis stems from Francis Fukuyama's book "The End oh History and the Last Man" (1989).

Worryingly, since West's opponents, due to their own historically constructed societal mindsets, involved themselves more in building domestic peace and harmony than in proselytizing their values, it may appear to an ordinary observer that they have been on the defensive and, hence, that collective rights have been somehow lower in importance than individual rights. Yet, this is a dangerous and flawed perception, which, regrettably, has captured to a large extent the human rights discourse over the past few decades.

What one side has been vigorously advancing as purportedly being universal in nature, has in fact, been nothing more than a mere reflection of its own historically constructed values and preferences. As Samuel P. Huntington said: "The West won the world not by the superiority of its ideas or values or religion but rather by its superiority in applying organized violence. Westerners often forget this fact, non-Westerners never do".[52]

Therefore, there could hardly be tangible progress on human rights in such inflamed an environment, because the other side regards the former's action as an attempt at cultural imperialism, which, according to Schlesinger, maintains that one set of values is better than another.[53] Progress instead can emerge only if this issue is treated in a truly comprehensive and unbiased manner based on the appreciation of how specific societies came to embrace particular types of human rights.

A way to end that division can be found, among other sources, amidst certain advices expressed over time by a number of outstanding American experts of society. To begin with, the philosopher Reinhold Niebuhr, writing in the mid-XX century, in his "The Irony of American History" (1952) admonished his own country as follows: "Today the success of America requires a generous appreciation of the valid elements in the practices and institutions of other nations though they deviate from our own".[54]

Furthermore, in the same book, Niebuhr gives us another valuable piece of advice: "General community is established only when the knowledge that we need one another is supplemented by the recognition that the other, that other form of life, or that other unique community is the limit beyond which our ambitions must not run and the boundary beyond which our life must not expand".[55]

Likewise, Joseph Stiglitz, one of America's most eminent contemporary economists and a Nobel Prize laureate in economics, argues in his most recent "The Price of Inequality" (2012) along the same lines: "We [Americans]

---

[52] Samuel Huntington, "The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order", published by Simon and Schuster, 2002, p.51.

[53] Arthur M.Schlesinger, "The Cycles of American History", published by Mariner Books, p.156.

[54] Reinhold Niebuhr, "The Irony of American History" (1952), published by the University of Chicago Press, 2008, p.79.

[55] Ibid, p.139.

should take seriously the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which emphasizes the importance of not just civil rights, but of economic rights, and not just the rights of property, but the economic rights of ordinary citizens".[56]

Thus, the issue of human rights must not be as divisive as it is, if only we begin to genuinely appreciate each other's specific historical courses and treat each other accordingly. This is especially true now, as globalization empowers identity politics, and relationship with the other, according to the French political scientist Dominique Moïsi, has become more fundamental than ever.[57]

---

[56] Joseph Stiglitz, "The Price of Inequality", published by W.W.Norton&Company, 2012, p.289.

[57] Dominique Moïsi, "The Geopolitics of Emotions", published by Anchor Books, p.20.

VLADIMIR MAKEI*

The Emerging Global System: Embracing Diversity-Politik and Partnerships

Abstract

Theories of international relations are essential to explaining developments in this domain. In particular, realism with its *Realpolitik* best accounts for what had taken place in the international system since the formation of the modern state system in the mid-XVII century throughout the end of the Cold War. Likewise, the period known as the Unipolar Moment is best explained by liberalism and, specifically, by its key component of Democratic Peace. However, these two dominant theories served well for dealing with events occurring in "concentrated" systems in terms of both international "players" and threats that existed in the past. The current emerging system, in contrast, has become a "diffused" one characterized by multiple stakeholders and ever-rising challenges. This system cannot be effectively administered through the tools advocated either by realism or liberalism. Instead, policymakers would do well to apply to it the logic of *Diversity-Politik* with the tool of all-inclusive partnerships.

Key words: Realism, liberalism, concentrated system, diffused system, diversity, partnerships.

I. Introduction

Theories and concepts have always served as a useful guide to international politics. Specifically, the theories of realism and liberalism appear to have been the most prominent contributors in this respect, being, in author's view, more successful than others in accounting for much of what has happened in global politics over a few past centuries.

Political scientists associated with the school of realism argue that the outcomes of international relations invariably stem from the nature of a particular system. For centuries, anarchy has been the underlying principle, and the nature, of the modern global system. What is meant by anarchy in the international system is not a condition of total chaos, but the lack of a global overarching authority capable of ensuring compliance on the part of all of its units, such as states. It was the American international relations theorist Kenneth Waltz who elaborated this thesis in his flagship publication "Theories of International Relations" (1979).

---

* Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Belarus since August 2012.

According to realists, the anarchy creates a realm of self-help, in which each and every state is concerned only with its own survival, security and its maximization. It is a domain of fierce competition among states that often results in confrontation. What matters in such a system is its units' (that is, states') capabilities rather than intentions. That is why the nature of countries' domestic structure (order) is irrelevant for realists. They believe that the constraints of anarchy that inhibit productive international co-operation among states cannot be overcome, but only mitigated by power accumulation and balances of power.

The opponents of this paradigm from the liberal school tend to counter those premises on the ground that domestic structures of countries, in fact, matter. In contrast to realists, they believe that some specific domestic structures may overcome the adverse effects that anarchy produces on states' behavior and interaction. In the liberal view, the field of international relations is not only about capabilities, but is very much about intentions. This belief gave rise to the theory of "Democratic Peace" – a view that democracies do not wage war against each other, because democratic governments are accountable to their populations and, hence, cannot harbor hostile intentions against fellow democracies.

This concept, in turn, traces its origin from the idea of XVIII century' German philosopher Immanuel Kant, who argued in his work "Perpetual Peace" (1797) that states with a republican form of government were more conducive to peace with each other than with other countries. Therefore, the recipe for overcoming the constraints of anarchy, in the liberals' view, is to make all units in the system similar in the nature of their domestic structure, that is, to make them all democracies. This, in turn, would make the accumulation of power and balancing irrelevant and unnecessary in a world inhabited by like-minded countries.

The dispute between these two major views is still under way, with the liberals seemingly gaining the upper hand in the post-Cold War period. Yet, what the proponents of both schools have overlooked is that around the turn of the millennium a new paradigm shift in the international system began to take shape. Although changes linked to that paradigm shift have not eliminated the condition of anarchy, they are set to produce systemic outcomes and behavior different from the patterns anticipated from the units either by the realists or their liberal opponents. Therefore, different approaches to international relations may now be needed.

The purpose of this article is to elaborate on these "profound changes" and demonstrate in what way they produce an impact on the field of international relations (chapter IV). The analysis, in turn, leads to the identification of foreign policy "solutions" that may be deemed appropriate in today's emerging global context (chapters V and VI). However, in order to arrive at both the analysis and the "solutions" it would seem worthy to start by providing

summary characteristics of certain historical epochs in the context of specific theories of international relations, and demonstrate what major foreign policy tools (or "solutions") were dominant in each of them (chapters II and III). This effort, in turn, helps one understand why some dominant foreign policy instruments of the past and of the very recent past mostly prove counterproductive today.

This exercise does not attempt to provide a thorough analysis of either specific historical periods or particular theories of international relations. Nor does it seek to distinguish between and dwell upon different branches of realism, like neo-realism, offensive realism or defensive realism, and liberalism and its offshoots, like institutional liberalism or interdependence theory. Although the latter two are important components of the liberal theory, liberalism, is nevertheless predominantly associated in the minds of general international affairs readers with the idea of Democratic Peace, because it was the latter that posed a most serious challenge to realism. In fact, John Mearsheimer, one of the leading contemporary realist theorists in his "The Tragedy of Great Power Politics" (2001) admits as much.[1]

Furthermore, by avoiding reference to other theories of international relations, the article does not purport to diminish their valuable contribution to the study of world politics, like, for instance, that of critical theories. Rather, what it is trying to accomplish is to identify certain general points of contiguity between history and theory whereby it would be able to outline a new pattern of historical-theoretical/conceptual interface that may be relevant for the world of today.

II. The Westphalian System: Realpolitik Reigns Supreme

The modern system of international relations is usually associated with the Treaties of Westphalia that ended the Thirty Years War of 1618-1648. That is why it came to be called the Westphalian system. Those events, however, did not really create a completely new system, but rather consolidated the one that had for centuries been taking shape against the backdrop of divided political legacy left by the Roman Empire and the Roman Catholic Church that was growing in influence in Western and Central Europe.

With the Westphalia came the rules of sovereignty, as we know them today, which governed international politics for better or for worse for the last few centuries – territorial integrity, supreme rule within a given territory, overriding importance of national interests, a need for international alliances and balancing. Moreover, that system inaugurated secular regimes in western and

---

[1] John Mearsheimer, "The Tragedy of Great Power Politics", published by Norton Series, 2001, p.367.

central parts of Europe as the religious chaos triggered by the XVI century Protestant Reformation soon gave way to a secular political order.

This form of political organization first functioned only in Europe. British political scientist Paul Kennedy in his book "The Rise and Fall of Great Powers" (1987) amply explained why it was Europe, which gave birth to the modern state system. He argued that as a result of its post-Roman fragmentation Europe became the place where several major territorially adjacent states started competing with each other in a self-help realm of regional anarchy. It was precisely that kind of fierce competition that drove the development and modernization of European countries. In contrast, the non-European systems were not fragmented, but imperially-consolidated and isolated from each other. Not faced with a Europe-style security environment, they felt neither external pressure nor a compelling reason to keep a similar pace with Europe's development and modernization.

The Westphalian system created an environment which left the European states to fend for themselves. They began operating through the balance of power by establishing coalitions among weaker members in order to keep in check the ambitions of more powerful. Since the very beginning, the considerations of internal domestic structures in the system were not as important as the considerations of national interests, the fact that confirms the realists' emphasis on capabilities over intentions. For example, during the Thirty Years War a Catholic France opted for allying with a Protestant Sweden against a Catholic Habsburg Empire, because France viewed the latter as its most intractable adversary, despite the fact that both countries overwhelmingly professed the same religious denomination.

Over time, as the Industrial Revolution, progress and modernization came to gradually embrace other continents, the pattern of European self-help security environment began to be increasingly replicated in other parts of the world before acquiring truly global dimensions in the XIX-XX centuries. The Cold War stands as the apogee of this pattern.

So, what was the Westphalian system about? In general, it was a system overwhelmingly skewed towards confrontation. The units in that system functioned precisely in the manner envisaged by realists in the context of anarchy. All states, despite different internal structures, invariably produced the same pattern of external behavior – accumulation of power, distrust of neighbors, and balancing against strongest in the system.

What motivated them was politics that is geopolitical considerations stemming from the anarchical structure of international relations rather than anything else. The eminent American historian Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr. writing in the midst of the Cold War said that "Raisons d'état, not the dynamics of capitalism, created the American thrust for world influence. A Soviet America would have behaved the same way, no doubt with greater ruthlessness. Political and strategic motives, national power and national security have a life

and force of their own, independent of the systems of ideology and owner-ship" (The Cycles of American History, 1986).[2]

As a matter of fact, at certain periods the balancing provided a certain type of stability in the system as was the case during the Cold War. However, this specific pattern of "nuclear stability", predicated on the knowledge of Mutu-ally Assured Destruction (MAD), was hardly reassuring to the antagonists.[3] The basic instrument of states' foreign policy conduct throughout the West-phalian period was *Realpolitik*. Although this word came into public usage only in the XIX century's second half to describe the ruthless nature of for-eign policy pursued by the German chancellor Otto von Bismarck, it ade-quately captures the similar pattern of foreign policy behavior that actually all states exercised for centuries.

Relentless pursuit of national interests at the expense of other countries through military and economic means, diplomacy and balancing allianc-es have always stood at the core of *Realpolitik*. National interests, howev-er, meant different things at different times. For instance, the national inter-ests pursued by leading European countries within the Concert of Europe in the XIX century's first half could be fairly identified as elite interests dove-tailed to the preservation and perpetuation of European monarchies. As far as the Cold War antagonists' are concerned, they contemplated their national interests as the advancement of their respective competing ideologies. Not-withstanding, what all kinds of national interests throughout the whole of the Westphalian period seem to have had in common was the states' con-cern with territory and what that territory may add to all of them in mate-rial terms.

What has also been intrinsic to the Westphalian system is that it has always been a system for, and of, a few big states. It has invariably been the destiny of the most powerful few to set international agendas and implement them, be it the Concert of Europe in the decades following the Napoleonic Wars, the *Entente Cordiale* and Central Powers around the First World War, or the USA and the USSR during the period of bipolar rivalry after WW II.

In other words, the Westphalian system has always been a concentrated sys-tem. The role of small states in it has been extremely marginal. They almost always had to align with great powers in order to survive. The significance of non-state actors was even less salient, though there were some exceptions, like the British East India Company, which for many decades up to 1870 had virtually ruled India.

---

[2] Arthur M.Schlesinger Jr., "The Cycles of American History", published by Mariner Books, 1999, p.149.

[3] The concept of "MAD" was coined by US Defense Secretary McNamara in the 1960s, see Strobe Talbott, "The Great Experiment", published by Simon and Schuster, 2008, p.218.

Therefore, states in a concentrated system faced only concentrated threats. Those threats, first and foremost, were directed against someone's territory and sphere of influence rather than domestic structures. What was happening inside a state in terms of its internal social and cultural life was almost irrelevant for other countries for as long as those developments did not produce an extremely contagious spillover effect like, for example, the one set in motion by the French revolution at the XVIII century's end.

However, there has been one noticeable exception within the Westphalian system that ostensibly seems to be able to refute the general characteristics inherent to it. That exception is associated with European integration that started in earnest in the 1950s. Indeed, the creation of the European Coal and Steel Community, and its subsequent evolution, first, into the European Economic Community and, then, into the European Union was not based on the philosophy of "zero-sum" game, dominant during the Cold War, but on its antipode – that of "win-win". The conventional wisdom holds that the development became possible because the main engines behind the initiative - France and Germany, which for centuries bled each other, came to realize the need to engage each other in co-operation to the maximal extent possible if they were not to experience once again destruction on a scale even greater than that of WWII.

But, let us consider the following question: what made it possible for this "paradise" to take root within the "jungles" in the wake of WWII and not earlier? Although it may appear to some as an oversimplification of EU history and of an intricate rationale behind its foundation, it seems that this development did not take place on its own, but rather it was very much encouraged to take place, because it was of great strategic importance to one of the two "mightiest" in the bipolar "jungle".

Indeed, the United States was prepared to go to great lengths in order to make Western Europe its reliable partner and an ally in confrontation with the Soviet Union. First of all, for all intents and purposes it "bailed out" Western Europe's war-torn economies through the Marshall Plan. Moreover, the United States ardently supported the European integration politically believing that a united and prosperous Europe was the best bulwark against possible Soviet expansionism westwards. What is even more crucial, though, was that the USA extended its military, above all nuclear, umbrella to Western Europe that enabled the latter to focus less on security and more on economy.

Although history does not recognize "if", one cannot help imagining how the victorious Britain and France might have treated the defeated Germany if the mighty United States had not stood behind the former. Would the history of Europe have been that of yet another misery rather than of successful integration? Interestingly, similar integration developments might have happened after WWI, but they did not.

Some scholars argue that world peace after the war would have been secured had the USA and the United Kingdom backed up France to engage with Germany.[4] Instead, during the Paris peace conference the UK thought in "balance-of-power" terms, seeing France as the next contender for European mastery, whereas the US President Woodrow Wilson was overwhelmingly concerned with gaining support for his idea of a League of Nations rather than with anything else, which ultimately proved a toothless tool for collective security. The great British economist John Maynard Keynes, who took part in the conference, argued that the others clearly saw Wilson's "incompetent egotism" and used it to their advantage.[5] As a result, that situation left France with a few options but to be harsh on Germany, which, in turn, strengthened the hardliners in the latter and sowed the seeds for a conflict in the future.

Thus, seen in this light, the integration of Western Europe during the Cold War was not really an exception from the Westphalian system. Rather, it was a deliberate tool with which the United States wanted to deter its bipolar archenemy. As a result of it, the condition of anarchy had virtually "ceased" to exist for Western Europe as the United States "replaced" it by itself. That is why Western Europeans could have the luxury to think among themselves in terms of "win-win" rather than "zero-sum" at that time.

Robert O.Keohane, one of the most prominent thinkers of the liberal theory school, in his "After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy" (1984) recognized that US hegemony within the Western block was essential for building Western institutions and regimes, which, in his view, had acquired such a strong momentum as to able to operate even without a hegemon.[6]

The above logic suggests that a similar "paradise" might have been possible in Eastern Europe. Yet, it did not materialize, because the other "mightiest" of the world – the Soviet Union – was the weaker of the two and not in a position to extend to Eastern Europe the same amount of economic assistance that would have knit the countries of the bloc closer together. Instead, the Soviet Union tried to ensure "unity" by imposing on its satellites a political straightjacket, alien to them in terms of their previous political, economic and social history. This served to give rise and perpetuate permanent discontent between Eastern Europeans and the Soviets. In other words, the USSR failed to exercise the same kind hegemony for Eastern Europe that the USA succeeded in extending to Western Europe.

---

[4] Anthony Best, Jussi M.Hanhimaki, Joseph A.Maiolo, Kirsten E.Schulze, "International History of the XX Century", published by Routledge, 2004, part "The Paris Peace Settlement", p.39-44.

[5] John Maynard Keynes, author of part "The Conference" in "Issues in American Foreign Policy", vol.2, published by Collier-Macmillan Limited, 1969, p.217-228.

[6] Robert O.Keohane, "After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy", published by Princeton University Press, 2005, p.31.

III. The Unipolar Moment: Democratic Peace in Ascendance

Although the Westphalian system proved its efficacy throughout centuries, the end of the Cold War served to undermine it. With the erosion and the subsequent disintegration of Soviet camp in the late 1980s and early 1990s, the realist tools clearly became less appropriate. Indeed, overt balancing on the global scale disappeared, great powers began to think less in terms of power politics and prospects for international co-operation seemed to be brighter than ever. These developments have apparently prodded the 41st US President George H.W. Bush to proclaim in 1991 the advent of "a new world order".[7]

This epochal transition, however, has not eliminated anarchy as the underlying principle of international politics. But, as it usually occurs, great changes trigger new grand ideas. It was also the case at the end of the Cold War. Indeed, that time there sprung novel ideas suggesting ways to transcend the constraints on global co-operation imposed by anarchy. The end of bipolar confrontation gave rise to the schools of political thought that emphasized the importance of domestic structures in shaping the patterns of states' international behavior. The key intellectual influence in this regard was Francis Fukuyama with his work "The End of History and the Last Man" (1989), in which he articulated how a Kantian vision of a future democratic world would be realized.

Fukuyama's basic point was that human development was always driven by human quest for personal recognition. According to him, only liberal democracy was able to satisfy this quest in a domestic context, because it allowed to channel this process into peaceful avenues, like sport and culture, etc. In contrast, Fukuyama argued, other forms of governance dealt with recognition in the realm of politics and in such a way as to recognize some humans as superior to others, which led to conflict.

Thus, according to his vision, the impending end of the XX century was witnessing not only the end of the Cold War and the elapse of a specific period, but also the end of history and the evolution of human ideologies altogether. Furthermore, it was not the end of a single ideological and strategic conflict, but the end of all ideological and strategic conflicts. The trend was supposed to bring the popularization of Western freedom and democracy as the last form of governance for mankind. Such an outcome was anticipated on the assumption that liberal democracy, which won the Cold War confrontation, should be viewed as the only proven legitimate and universal form of government in the world, because it, unlike other governance models, satisfied the ever-lasting human quest for recognition. The theorist thus went on

---

[7] The idea of "A New World Order" was articulated in some statements by President G.H.W.Bush, for instance, that of 1 March 1991, available at http://www.al-bab.com/arab/docs/pal/pal10.htm, and that of 11 September 1991, available at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=byxeOG_pZ1o

to posit that as much as democracy solved the issue of recognition domestically, so will the Democratic peace be able to do internationally.[8]

The sole superpower that emerged victorious from the bi-polar contest has naturally assumed the lead in this endeavor. In reality, however, the USA has for very long held a profound faith in Democratic Peace. Ever since the US founding as an independent nation the Americans have genuinely believed that a replication of their republican form of government by other, primarily hostile European monarchical states, would make the USA more secure.

As the political analyst Walter Russell Mead put it: "This project – to protect our own [American] domestic security while building a peaceful world order of democratic states linked by common values and sharing a common prosperity – has deep roots in the American past".[9] Another prominent political thinker Fareed Zakaria argues in his "The Post-American World and the Rise of the Rest" (2008) that the reason for the West and the United States in particular to pursue policies that seek to transpose Western values on other societies (democracy promotion and human rights) goes back to the past tradition of active Protestant proselytizing elsewhere.[10] If it comes to that, Buddhism and Confucianism, among others, did not advocate a similar effort in the past, and, thus, do not claim universal application today.

However, historic circumstances did not allow any Western country in the past to have adequate economic and military capacities or political will to bring about a grand vision of making the world "democratic". "To make the world safe for democracy" was a slogan, which US President Woodrow Wilson brought to bear to make the case for US entry in the First World War. Though not the first among American leaders to speak about democracy promotion abroad, and albeit his vision of "democracy" applied primarily to the defeated nations rather than to all countries, it was Wilson rather than any other American leader, who came to impart in US foreign policy a distinct idealistic streak, which for the sake of convenience may be dubbed *Moral-Politik*.

Once the United States emerged as the world's sole superpower in the early 1990s, it thus had the basis from which sprung a renewed strong interest in Wilsonianism and Democratic Peace promotion. Besides, this time, unlike in the post WWI context, the US ostensibly had both the necessary capacities and political will to bring its vision into effect. This realization was evolving for a decade and came to be particularly sharpened by the 9/11 terrorist attacks. That momentous event helped the previous Republican administration

---

[8] Francis Fukuyama, "The End of History and the Last Man", published by Free Press, 2006, p.260.

[9] Walter Russell Mead, "Power, Terror, Peace, and War", published by Alfred A.Knopf, New York, 2004, p.7.

[10] Fareed Zakaria, "The Post-American World and the Rise of the Rest", published by Penguin Books, 2009, p.84.

mobilize American public opinion around both an aggressive expansionist foreign policy and the "war on terror" that was unleashed in the attacks' immediate wake. The United States at first identified prevention as a main instrument in fighting the war.

However, the failure to find weapons of mass destruction in Iraq and inability to pacify the country compelled the US administration to shift the focus and introduce at a later stage an element of "democracy" promotion as the means of waging the war against terror and as the end in itself. The vagueness surrounding the term "war on terror" allowed for such a strategic sleight of hand. This evolution of thought was duly reflected in the US National Security Strategies of 2002 and 2006, with the former giving priority to prevention, whereas the latter put a high premium on "democracy" promotion.

In contrast to its previous efforts at "democracy" promotion, this time, in the period of unipolar supremacy, the G.W. Bush Administration adopted a very aggressive posture and couched its policies in the rhetoric of good and evil. While in the past the evil has assumed a variety of faces, the USA started to associate it with "autocratic" tyranny and terrorism. According to this logic, with evil compromise was impossible and retreat was unacceptable.

As we know today, the superpower failed in its grand design to bring about Democratic Peace, and failed to establish new rules of the game for the international life. Afghanistan and Iraq vividly revealed the limits to US strategic global leverage. American belief in its unrivaled power capable of "replacing" the anarchic structure with its own will (a "democratic" form of government) on other units proved miscalculated. Preponderance is not omnipotence.

Thus, the End of History did not come to an end. Interestingly, an answer to the Fukuyama's thesis was in fact provided more than half a century ago by the great American philosopher Reinhold Niebuhr, who said that "the course of history cannot be coerced from a particular point and in accordance with a particular conception of its end" (The Irony of American History, 1952).[11]

One may wonder in this context about the transition to democracy that many countries around the world made over the past two decades and that occurred without coercive imposition of Democratic Peace. Indeed, in places like Central and Eastern Europe and Latin America this trend was predominantly shaped by internal evolutionary developments as countries in the above regions, unshackled from the rigid constraints of the Cold War, proved able to shake off the forms of governance that were to a great extent foisted on them by the respective bipolar rivals in the first place. External influence was minimal there.

But this self-evolving "democratic" background, in turn, played a role of its own. It surely made the United States perceive that its hegemonic position

---

[11] Reinhold Niebuhr, "The Irony of American History", published by the University of Chicago Press, 2008, p.79.

presented a strategic opportunity to expedite and make the process of democratic transition complete world-wide once and for all. The calculation proved wrong, as not every nation was prepared or willing to embrace external recipes for their own development.

Certainly many would share in this context the point expressed by the former EU Commissioner Chris Patten that in democracy promotion the USA tended to be more moralistic than moral (What Next, 2009).[12] Strobe Talbott, prominent American diplomat in the Clinton Administration, certainly was also right opining in reference to the US foreign policy during the Unipolar moment's period that "we were neglecting a lesson of history: nations build themselves, and democracy emerges slowly and iteratively, outsiders can only encourage the process" (The Great Experiment, 2008).[13]

The Obama Administration seems to have recognized to a large extent the futility of the above approach and so far has not been interested in pursuing an aggressive and unilateral foreign policy agenda. But, perhaps, simply it was not in a position to do so, as, by the time Barack Obama came to office, the US global power, according to political scientist Fareed Zakaria (2012), had already peaked, namely, on the eve of the 2003 Iraq war.[14] Prominent American economist and a Nobel Prize winner in economics Joseph Stiglitz (2009) thinks along the same lines saying that the era of US triumphalism was between the fall of the Berlin Wall and the fall of Lehman Brothers in 2008.[15]

The mission to remake the world in its own image was undertaken by a very peculiar superpower – the one that had on its hands four types of deficit - the federal budget deficit, the savings deficit, the balance of payments deficit, and the leadership deficit.[16] Taken together, and in conjunction with international overextension, these all set in motion a vigorous debate about US decline, which, as American political analyst Robert Kagan put it: "has taken on an element of conventional wisdom".[17]

Indeed, many international relations theorists and practitioners began speaking about US decline. Some, as Joseph Nye[18], Robert Kagan, and Robert Keohane say that the declinist discourse is cyclical, with each wave triggered by other countries' achievements, this time – the fifth in the last six decades – caused by the juxtaposition of China's rising power and America's economic,

---

[12] Chris Patten, "What Next?", published by Penguin Books, 2009 p.59.

[13] Strobe Talbott, "The Great Experiment", published by Simon and Schuster, 2008, p.302.

[14] Fareed Zakaria, "The Post-American World: Release 2.0", published by W.W.Norton, 2012, p.52.

[15] Joseph Stiglitz, "Freefall: Free Markets and the Sinking of the Global Economy", published by Allen Lane, 2009, p.236.

[16] David Walker, "Four Deficits", Brown Journal of International Affairs, spring-summer 2008.

[17] Robert Kagan, "Can America Outwit Decline", speaks at the Legatum Institute, the video available at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nAoUJh5tqdA

[18] Joseph Nye, "Is America in Decline", speaks at the Chatham House, the video available at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wl1nJ8oR-9w

political and military malaise.[19] Each time, however, according to them, the US had proven both its resilience and pessimists to be wrong.

At the same time others, like, for instance, Joseph Stiglitz (The Price of Inequality, 2012) and another American Noble Prize laureate in economics Paul Krugman (The Conscience of a Liberal, 2009) see the decline associated not so much with external factors, as with American internal structural economic and political deficiencies resulting, respectively, in growing domestic inequality and political polarization.

Whether decline is cyclical or not this time around only the future will tell, but the current predicament of the USA appears to be a certain thing. A recent article in Political Science Review argues that with the Republicans in control of the House of the Representatives since the 2010 midterm elections, Obama faces "the fiercest political opposition and the most daunting constraints of the modern era".[20] Parag Khana, a prominent Indian American international relations expert points that while the US' defining trait has been self-renewal, now America has lost momentum (The Second World, 2008).[21] So, the former US National Security adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski might have been right after all when he argued in his "The Grand Chessboard" (1997) that "America is not only the first, as well as the only, truly global superpower, but it is also likely to be the very last".[22]

To sum up, as the realists' tools of power accumulation and balancing became largely inappropriate in anticipating foreign policy outcomes after the Cold War, so does the incremental winding down of *Pax Americana* deprive the liberals' major instrument of Democratic Peace much of its substance.

IV. The Emerging System: Structural, Social and Functional Diffusion

So, bearing in mind all the above, the question is what instruments are appropriate for the emerging world. But, first, we need to identify what kind of a world it is. Fareed Zakaria in his 2012 "The Post-American World. Release 2.0" argues that "while unipolarity continues to be a defining reality of the international system for now, every year it becomes weaker and other nations and actors grow in strength".[23]

This development, however, changes nothing at the systemic level, as the world retains its anarchic structure. Indeed, neither an overarching supranational

---

[19] Robert Keohane, "Hegemony and After", review essay, Foreign Affairs, volume 91, No.4, 2012, pp.1-5.

[20] Theda Skocpol, Lawrence R.Jacobs, "Accomplished and Embattled, Understanding Obama's Presidency", Political Science Quarterly, vol.127, number 1, 2012, p.22.

[21] Parag Khana, "The Second World", published by Random House, 2009, p.333.

[22] Zbigniew Brzezinski, "The Grand Chessboard", available at http://www.takeoverworld.info/Grand_Chessboard.pdf, p.217

[23] Fareed Zakaria, "The Post-American World. Release 2.0", published by W.W.Norton, 2012, p.242.

authority nor a world government that can command obedience of all countries in the system is in the offing. The United States has by and large ceased to "substitute" anarchy by itself to Europe. On the other hand, international organizations should not be confused with such a global overarching authority, because they are a mere reflection of states' interaction, and can produce action only if there is agreement among their members. The history of the United Nations Security Council fully attests to this point.

With anarchy intact, there is, nevertheless, a paradigm shift within the system that requires from the units the types of foreign policy behavior different from those advocated either by realists or their liberal opponents. This paradigm shift's characteristics can be identified as taking place at the following three levels – structural, social, and functional. In this context it is worth to borrow again from Fareed Zakaria, who succinctly put it in his two books on the post-American world and in a relevant Foreign Affairs article that there were three tectonic power shifts over the last 500 years: the rise of the West in the XV-XVIII centuries, the rise of the USA in the XX century, and the current rise of the rest of the world.[24]

The most crucial implication of the latter trend is that the domain of international relations ceased to be a game played by a few great powers, and instead is progressively becoming one, in which global policies are determined by multiple players and are directed from multiple places. Indeed, the ineluctable ascendance of Asian giants and other assertive countries, the increasing significance of regional blocks, the growing prominence of international institutions, as well as the meteoric growth and influence of global civil society and business in world politics all serve to create multiple power centers with their diverse agendas and interests.

In other words, in structural terms, it is the first time in our politically conscious human history that the world is steadily moving away from a "concentrated" system towards a "diffused" system. This emerging format should not be confused with the classical XIX century-style multipolar system, dominated by several great states through balancing. It is precisely the "diffused" world because traditional concentration of power does not exist any longer, as power is being increasingly assumed by multiple state and non-state actors.

This is the reason that we do not see any longer balancing on the global scale. There is, of course, still accumulation of power by world's countries, but it is no longer only a quest to acquire traditional "hard" power based on military and economic might as understood by the realist school and exercised in the past. Today, states are no less interested in acquiring the so-called "soft" power – a concept elaborated by the American political scientist Joseph Nye in the 1990s – that has its roots in social life and culture.

---

[24] Fareed Zakaria, "The Future of American Power", Foreign Affairs, May-June 2008.

In social terms, the world's population is experiencing what the former US National Security adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski called a great Awakening (Strategic Vision, 2012). It is somewhat reminiscent of the trend that was salient in the late XIX century's Europe. Then, the intensification of industrial capitalism mobilized large numbers of people for politics by disrupting their traditional ways of life, drawing them into cities, subjecting to new insecurities of capitalism, and exposing to regular intense political communication. That trend ultimately resulted in the emergence of the two ideologically driven states that were intent on aggressively advancing their respective competing ideologies.

Globalization is now producing similar effects on many heretofore unperturbed parts of the world. It is unleashing forces unprecedented in scope and intensity that furnish the politics of populism and transform the configurations of power. Globalization is socially massive. It arouses social and political consciousness to the same extent to which the French revolution caused Europe to brew for a quarter century, or WWII boosted unraveling of the global colonial system.

Modern means of communication produced by globalization make population in developing countries increasingly conscious of social injustice throughout the world. After all, the modern world failed to put developing countries on a stable path of development. Various studies point out to the growing external and internal inequality around the world with no breakthroughs to turn the tide. The great British historian Eric Hobsbawm seems to have captured it right saying (On History, 1998) that inequality around the world is growing, but the West does not seem to care since it is set to settle for an "acceptable level" of violence.[25]

The awakened mankind dislikes the status-quo and demands political dignity, self-determination, fair rules in economics, respect for religions, and human rights. In the age of awakening the issues of status and honor become as significant as economic wealth and military power. That trend, as Brzezinski says, is very much about the developing world's search for its own national, ethnic and religious identity.[26]

The restive population is molding its identity in defiance of Western values, which it associates with the countries that not so long ago were their colonial masters. The rise of identity politics, especially of religion, is also a response to the crisis of modernity, which, for all intents and purposes, codified each and every aspect of daily life by reducing the world to what can be controlled by reason, science, technology, bureaucratic rationality, and leaves out the considerations of what relates to religious and spiritual affairs.

---

[25] Eric Hobsbawm, "On History", published by Abacus in 2008, p.45.

[26] Zbigniew Brzezinski, "Strategic Vision", published by Basic Books, 2012, p.32.

People in the West often fail to grasp the importance of religion for non-Westerners, because the former view the issue through the prism of their own past experience. Indeed, Western nations had undergone the privatization of religion as a result of the Thirty Years War, which clearly separated the state from religion. Ever since, religion for Europeans became, for the main, a purely private matter. In contrast, the rest of the world did not have a similar experience.

That is why religion remains an extremely powerful component of its collective conscience. Moreover, that is the reason that we may witness today how elites in many developing countries try to outbid each other in enhancing their religious credentials, and how any insensitivity to religion on the part of the West may result in a serious backlash. Thus, in social terms the world is also becoming "diffused" as ascendancy of Western values seen as such at the end of the Cold War fails to take root in the rest of the world. The current world is, therefore, one of multiple competing values.

Finally, in functional terms – in the area of global threats and challenges, we observe that the same tendency is taking hold as in the structural and social domains. Namely, there has already been for some time a steady drift away from the world of concentrated threats, which implied threats to states' territorial integrity, to one burdened by the increasing number of threats and challenges of universal nature, which can be identified as the "diffused" threats.

Indeed, the world does not seem much concerned about traditional threats to states that in the past were usually posed by the strongest with the purpose of carving up parts of landmass and population of the weakest. The phasing out of that type of threat is the consequence of how states redefined their national interests in an era of globalization. They do not any longer associate their interests with the acquisition of raw material power at the expense of others, but instead gear them towards improving the "hard" capacities that states already possess within their own boundaries and acquiring "soft" capacities, with which to wield influence in the global awakened environment.

The new threats and challenges to a very great extent relate to the rise in the global awakening and restlessness. Global inequality aligned with religious, ethnic, cultural, and racial divides serve to increase global tensions everywhere and produce new threats. In the "diffused" system the space for aggressive non-state actors to advance their particularistic strategic aims is growing as information revolution has been putting critical technologies within reach of both states and non-state actors. Today, we have come to witness the privatization of war on the global scale like the XVII century Europe saw the privatization of religion. As a result, terrorists can wield such power of destruction that has until recently been available only to great powers.

Likewise, nowadays we can see how the heretofore separately viewed problems of energy, food security, and the environment have come to the point of convergence thereby posing an existential threat to the planet. Other global

challenges like poverty, HIV/AIDS, malaria, narcotics, human trafficking, transnational crime have also all been on the rise and challenge humanity in a way that could not have been imagined just a few decades ago.

The "diffused" threats clearly indicate one thing. If states continue with their traditional foreign policy tools like balancing, wars, sanctions, regime change, "democracy" promotion and the like, mankind is likely to be ultimately overrun by multiple threats and modern "barbarians" in a way similar to that whereby the Roman Empire had succumbed to the barbarians of its own time, as Joseph Nye pointedly invoked in this historical analogy.[27]

v. New Framework and Tools: Diversity-Politik and Partnerships

The world that is structurally, socially, and functionally "diffused" has become interconnected to the degree never experienced before. In this system what happens anywhere can have a huge effect on the rest of the world. Moreover, the system is not static. Changes are constantly underway, and the pace of change is faster than at any other point in human history, thereby constantly increasing the interconnectedness between different domains and aspects of the global system.

What tools are needed to manage the "diffused" system, the one that is growing evermore diverse? The traditional policies advocated by either realists or liberals worked in the concentrated system. But they seem redundant in the age of multiple actors, competing values, and growing threats. Indeed, can accumulation of power or balancing produce a solution to the challenge of global warming? Or, can imposition of a "democratic" regime in a particular country or countries be successful in addressing the problem of HIV/AIDS?

The system of diverse actors, values, and threats demands policies that recognize and respond to its increasingly diverse nature. It would make sense to coin that set of policies as *Diversity-Politik*. In contrast to *Realpolitik* that sought to pursue national interests at the expense of others in a zero-sum game, *Diversity-Politik* is geared towards pursuit of such interests in a win-win manner.

The latter concept requires that states redefine their perception of national interests and the way they pursue them. First, they must clearly understand that in a system of "diffused" actors it is meaningless to pursue national interests in a realist fashion, that is, at the material expense of other states. Second, in an age of "diffused" social attitudes and values national interests should not be championed in a "liberal" mode either, namely, with the purpose to impose a particular value on others. Third, in a world of "diffused"

---

[27] Joseph S. Nye Jr., "The Future of Power", published by Public Affairs, 2011, p.xii (preface).

threats it is in the national interests of states as well as in the interests of numerous positive non-state actors to join in a collective international effort against global threats and challenges.

This concept can be realized through the instrument of global partnerships. A partnership is a new form of co-operation in terms of both its purpose and its membership. It is a particular form best suited for managing the "diffused" world. The concept should not be confused with traditional alliances. The latter's purposes have always been to organize joint action against someone or something, be it the XIX century Holy Alliance within the Concert of Europe, or current alliances. Although alliances have been organized around some shared ideas or interests, the impact they used to produce and create now invariably includes an element of negativity because it affects those members of the system against whom an alliance is directed. The purpose of partnerships, in contrast, is to produce action against specific threats, the result of which – elimination or mitigation of a threat - will have only a positive impact on all actors.

Likewise, in terms of membership, alliances are mostly products of the bygone era, the ages in which it was only states, primarily great powers that mattered. In today's world this form leaves out in the cold many of the middle and small states, as well as non-state actors that exercise an increasing amount of influence on global affairs. Thus, partnerships are structures that, in most cases, should include all positive stakeholders of today's world - states, international organizations, civil society, and private sector. The ordering principle of partnerships goes beyond shared ideas and interests to embrace also the recognition of growing diversity of the world.

The question that surely will arise at this point among readers is how partnerships are to be established and function in specific practical terms. It would make much sense to contemplate the process as evolutionary. Establishing a partnership should not be a goal in itself. Instead, it must be regarded as a means to achieve specific objectives. One historical analogy might be of benefit here.

Diplomats working at the League of Nations were obsessed with disarmament believing that reduction of weapons alone, irrespective of other approaches would eliminate wars. They failed to grasp and implement either of the only two real options to prevent war. First, to engage in co-operation, i.e. to build trust and confidence among former adversaries that could later lead to voluntary disarmament on their part. Of course, in the incensed environment produced by the WWI settlement this option was hardly feasible. Or, the second option – to confront revisionist states with military deterrence and alliances thereby making unacceptable the cost for potential troublemakers.

Since we are not living in the post WWI-type incensed environment, partnerships will come into being as a result of co-operation, not the other way around. Establishment of partnerships will be a long process. They will

initially be forged in those areas, which already have considerable amount of co-operation among global positive actors. Uniting those stakeholders in a partnership would essentially institutionalize their existing co-operative arrangements.

A good example of how a particular partnership could be set up and function is the area of human trafficking. In 2005, from the rostrum of the United Nations General Assembly, Belarus proposed to establish a Global partnership against slavery and human trafficking.[28] That partnership was gradually evolving and came to be partially shaped by the Vienna Forum on human trafficking, held in February 2008 that brought together for the first time ever on such a huge scale governments, international organizations, civil society, global business, and celebrities. The partnership was further institutionalized with the adoption in July 2010 of the UN Global Plan of Action to Combat Trafficking in Persons, which spelled out specific roles for interested international stakeholders.

For now, it is mostly an informal and flexible structure that has been taking its first tentative steps in addressing the challenge. Nevertheless, it is a very important development in that it recognized that success in fighting the particular threat of human trafficking lies in getting on board all positive actors of the "diffused" system. Why not give a chance to this initiative if, after all, the previous state-oriented agenda in that area failed to bear fruit? Time will tell whether it was worth it.

Partnerships may acquire different forms. For instance, diplomats at the United Nations often speak about the Global Partnership for Development, which essentially embraces all comprehensive policies tailored to the achievement of the UN development agenda built around the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). This particular partnership is very informal and mainly symbolic.

In contrast, the Fourth High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness, held in Busan (The Republic of Korea) in November 2011, launched the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation, which appears to be a formal and duly institutionalized structure. Indeed, it has its own governing structure, plans and methods of work, as well as its budget.[29] This partnership will work to realize the targets agreed upon at the Forum.

Next in the pipeline of formal or informal partnerships may be one on the intertwined issues of energy, climate change and food security. There is general

---

[28] For more on Belarus' efforts at promoting international cooperation against trafficking in persons see Vladimir Makei, "Human Trafficking in the Post-Cold War Period: Towards a Comprehensive Approach", the Journal of International Affairs, January 2013, available at http://jia.sipa.columbia.edu/human-trafficking-post-cold-war, and Alyaksandr Sychov, "Human Trafficking: A Call for Global Action", Globality Studies Journal, October 2009, available at http://globality.cc.stonybrook.edu/wp-content/uploads/2011/03/no14.pdf

[29] For detailed information see the web page of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation: http://www.aideffectiveness.org/busanhlf4/about/global-partnership.html

acknowledgement of the above nexus as well as of the need to take action against these challenges before it becomes too late. Likewise, it is not only states that tackle the above problems, but numerous non-state actors, whose contribution has been on the rise for some time.

It seems that a partnership in this area can be built around a number of important components, like the International Conference on Sustainable Development Rio+20 (June 2012, Brazil), a post-Kyoto Protocol agreement on climate change, a strategy on global food security and a global comprehensive energy agenda. To succeed, this kind of partnership will naturally require bringing on board all relevant international stakeholders. It may turn out to be an uphill battle, yet it is important to move ahead on these tasks. At some point of progress, the time will be ripe to institutionalize the effort into a partnership.

It would be most difficult to set up partnerships on security issues, as states far too often continue to think in terms of parochial national interests and would hardly contemplate sharing their authority with non-state actors. There is no easy recipe on how to make headway on such kind of partnerships. Perhaps, as partnerships are established in non-security areas, the increasing logic of co-operation, interdependence, trust, and mutual confidence will make possible partnerships on global security issues as well.

There is currently underway in the United Nations an effort to design a post-2015 UN Development Agenda, as the MDGs process will come to an end in 2015. In this context the UN System-Wide Task Force on the post – 2015 UN Development Agenda came up in June 2012 with a report "Realizing the Future We Want for All". The report proposes to build the post – 2015 Development Agenda on specific comprehensive partnerships against concrete thematic threats and challenges.[30] If the process indeed embraces such an approach, there can be much hope that a global partnership will increasingly become an indispensible instrument in our emerging world.

Partnerships may be a key to successfully addressing all current global problems. As UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon stated at the opening of a United Nations General Assembly's session a few years ago: "Nations can no longer protect their interests, or advance the well-being of their people, without the partnership of the rest"[31].

It makes sense in this context to cite Parag Khana's point that there cannot be "grand bargains" and ultimate solutions to multiple contemporary challenges (How to Run the World, 2011). The way to address them all is through

---

[30] "Realizing the Future We Want for All", the report of the UN Secretary General prepared by the UN System-Wide Task Force on the post-2015 UN Development Agenda, June 2010, available at http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/pdf/Post_2015_UNTTreport.pdf, p.42.

[31] The UN Secretary General's Address to the UN General Assembly, New York, September 23, 2008.

constant diplomatic attention.[32] All-inclusive partnerships seem to be the best way to safeguard such a focus. Therefore, if we want our world to continue on its path towards progress, in the years ahead we will have to articulate and set about realizing specific forms of partnerships against specific threats and challenges.

VI. Diversity: a Source of Conflict or Co-operation?

Perceptions of the world that was growing more diverse and of its implications for international politics began to take shape almost two decades ago. The 1994 report of the Commission on Global Governance titled "Our Global Neighborhood" was a very conspicuous effort is this regard.[33] The Commission was composed of a number of eminent persons, whose task was to work out a set of recommendations for a post Cold-War world. The Commission recognized the emerging trend of growing diversity and called for "a new kind of dialogue among civilizations".

In 1997, at the Eighth Islamic Summit in Tehran, Iran's then President Mohammad Khatami stepped forward with the idea of "Dialogue of Civilizations".[34] The initiative emphasized the imperative of positive interaction, dialogue and understanding among cultures and religions. Building on the initiative, the United Nations designated the year of 2001 as the Year of Dialogue among Civilizations. In its wake, Spain and Turkey launched at the United Nations a dialogue within the frame of their own initiative called "Alliance of Civilizations".[35]

The flurry of activity to raise the importance of diversity in the post-Cold war world came primarily as a response to the political analyst Samuel Huntington's idea of "clash of civilizations", which he first spelled out in a Foreign Affairs article in 1993.[36] He anticipated the continuation of conflicts in the future, but surmised that in the post-Cold War period they would be spurred by different forces.

He argued that world politics would be dominated by conflicts among cultures, rather than among rival ideologies. Huntington thought that the power of culture trumped other forces of globalization, and people's loyalties were

---

[32] Parag Khana, "How to Run the World", published by Random House, 2011, p.7.

[33] The Commission was established in April 1992 with 28 renowned public persons as its members. The Commission functioned in 1992-1994 with the approval of then UN Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali. For more information see http://www.sovereignty.net/p/gov/gga-nalysis.htm

[34] See President Khatami's speech at the Islamic Summit in Tehran, December 1997, at http://www.radioislam.org/islam/english/islamwo/khatami.htm

[35] See more for activities of the "Alliance for Civilizations" at http://www.unaoc.org/

[36] Samuel Huntington, "The Clash of Civilizations?", Foreign Affairs, summer 1993, available at http://www.polsci.wvu.edu/faculty/hauser/ps103/readings/huntingtonclashofcivilizationsforaff-summer93.pdf

growing increasingly local, based on ties of shared history, culture, traditions, religion, and ethnicity. Therefore, the non-Western world, in his opinion, would try to set up and advocate its own values and institutions as opposed to values like democracy and individual rights, which, according to the West, have universal bearing.

It seems that Samuel Huntington was only half right, because he correctly captured the nature of systemic changes driven by globalization – the growing political, social, and cultural diversity, but anticipated a negative outcome from that development. Yet, the outcome of these changes should not necessarily be negative. Diversity in itself is not a cause for conflict, but may result in one under certain circumstances. The real culprit in that case would be those who ignore the diversity and its importance, and continue to believe that only they possess the truth of governance and try to foist it on others.

Former US Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice stated in her article in Foreign Affairs of a few years ago: "For the United States, promoting democratic development must remain a top priority… The real question is not whether to pursue this course but how".[37] Nowadays, especially at the time of the aftermath of the global economic and financial crisis, the United States may believe that it cannot do it alone due to the recognition of limits of its power, but still can achieve the goal by bringing on the board of "democratic" crusade like minded "democratic" states.

In the waning days of the G.W. Bush administration the political discourse in the USA prominently featured the idea of establishing a League of Democracies. It was apparently viewed by many as a new source of international legitimacy for realizing the Democratic Peace agenda. The 2008 Republican Presidential candidate John McCain has taken up the idea and made a League of Democracies a linchpin of his proposed foreign policy.

The argument was also echoed by the academia as, for example, political analyst and former President Clinton Administration's official Philip Bobbitt said in his book "Terror and Consent" (2008) that "Nation states are in principal equal sovereigns whereas what our current environment demands is the legitimation of the authority of democratic, human rights-respecting states"[38]. Any approach to realizing the idea of Democratic Peace is bound to repeat the fate of its predecessors, because it remains anchored in the logic of a concentrated system and ignores the nature of profound changes that have been occurring at the structural, social, and functional levels that made the system "diffused".

The "diffused" system is impervious to such instruments, because it increasingly views any policies of assimilation and exclusion as illegitimate, both

---

[37] Condoleezza Rice, "Rethinking the National Interest", Foreign Affairs, July-August 2008.

[38] Philip Bobbitt, "Terror and Consent: The Wars for the Twenty-First Century", published by Allen Lane, 2008, p.481.

at domestic and international levels. Positive outcomes in that system may come about only if the world begins to apply the logic of *Diversity-Politik* through the tools of partnerships. It is in this way that the international community would be able to build a true *Pax Universalis* with shared aspirations, responsibilities and action.

The idea of partnerships essentially somewhat builds on the ideas of Dialogue of Civilizations and Alliance of Civilizations and may be considered as a comprehensive program of action embracing, inter alia, the latter two concepts. Indeed, in a "diffused" system, dialogue is an important ingredient, but not in itself sufficient to produce a positive systemic outcome. What is needed is an action that can be organized through partnerships. In conceptual terms, action, which is about politics, and dialogue, which is about culture, work at different levels, with the former governing activities, the latter mentality, the former dealing with specific situations, the latter requiring generations to produce any result.

Implementing the ideas of *Diversity-Politik* and partnerships certainly requires a revolution in the minds of today's politicians. Some may say that what is suggested is utopia and idealism, because the proposed approach ignores the importance of power politics that proved its relevance over the course of centuries. Let us bear in mind what the great British playwright George Bernard Shaw said in this regard: "Those who cannot change their minds cannot change anything."[39]

Furthermore, let us ask ourselves. Do the ideas of *Diversity-Politik* and partnerships really stand as a form of idealism? Not at all, because it is not that we wish the world to be "diffused" and diverse. It has already become such. Therefore, it is those should be called idealists who remain negligent of the new developments that transform the globe, and persistently stick to the belief that the outmoded tools of *Realpolitik* and *Moral-Politik* can yield a desired outcome in the fundamentally different global environment. With this in mind, the author would like to conclude with the words of US President John F. Kennedy, who, paraphrasing the famous dictum of President Woodrow Wilson, mentioned earlier in the article,: said: "If we cannot now end our differences, at least we can help make the world safe for diversity".[40]

Acknowledgement

---

[39] Michael Spence, "The Next Convergence", published by Farras, Straus and Giroux, 2011, cited from a cover page.

[40] Arthur M. Schlesinger, "The Cycles of American History", published by Mariner Books, 1999, the citation to be found on p.415.

Valentin B. Rybakov*

The Evolution of the Non-Aligned Movement and Belarus' Interests

Abstract

The Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) arguably traces its history from the 1955 Bandung conference, though its first Summit took place in 1961 in Belgrade. Ever since the Movement has gone through several figurative phases. During its "political" phase the NAM focused on its internal consolidation. At the following "economic" phase the Non-Aligned countries tried to advance the New International Economic Order, which basically anticipated a new type of international relations in the world. The end of the Cold War, however, questioned the very meaning of the notion of "non-alignment". Notwithstanding, some geopolitical events of the early XXI century allowed the Movement to reclaim its role and place in world affairs. Belarus sought membership in the Non-Aligned Movement on the ground of its political and economic interests. But, since becoming member of the NAM in 1998 Belarus has been consistently trying to do its part to make the Movement stronger and more effective.

Key words: The Non-Aligned Movement, "political" phase, "economic" phase, "crisis of identity" phase, Movement's "Renaissance", NAM high-level events in 2011–2012.

I. Introduction

The Non-Aligned Movement has held a number of important events over 2011-2012 that have captured widespread global attention. In May 2011, Bali (Indonesia) hosted the XVI Ministerial Conference, which ended with the adoption of a strategic document titled "The NAM Shared Vision for the Next 50 Years". In September 2011, Belgrade (Serbia) was the place where the Movement convened a Ministerial Meeting in commemoration of its half-centenary anniversary. In May 2012, the NAM Coordination Bureau staged its Ministerial Meeting in Sharm-El-Sheikh (Egypt). Finally, in August 2012, Teheran played host to the NAM's XVI Summit, which marked the onset of Iran's three-year Presidency in the Movement.

The foregoing events can apparently be set apart from the Movement's previous traditional meetings and conferences, because of their significance. First, the Bali and Belgrade meetings coincided with the Movement's 50-year anniversary, which allowed its participants to take stock of the Movement's activities over the past half a century. Second, more crucially, the issue of NAM's

---

* Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Belarus since January 2013.

future role for the next three years that would lead to a Summit in 2015, as well as for a more distant time perspective underlay all the events throughout 2011 and 2012. Indeed, the resulting outcome documents focus on NAM' future activities more than on anything else.

Since joining the Non-Aligned Movement in 1998, the Republic of Belarus has consistently prioritized its involvement with this forum. With this in mind, Belarus approached in full earnest the NAM's 2011-2012 high-level events. In particular, it strove for bringing home to Non-Aligned countries its own vision for the Movement's long-term future and worked to duly reflect it in NAM's strategic documents.

So, how does Belarus see the prospects for the Non-Aligned Movement in the years and decades to come? Answering the question in a meaningful way requires, first, tracing the evolution of the Movement; second, assessing Belarus' NAM-related activities, and finally, identifying NAM's prospective role and place in the world. The latter objective, however, necessitates an attempt at charting current and future trends in international relations.

I. Non-Aligned Movement's Major Phases

Conceivably, it makes sense to divide the history of the Non-Aligned Movement into the four figurative phases:

1) The "Political" phase (1961-1973) that involved Movement's activities overwhelmingly tailored to the political formation of new post-colonial states;

2) The "Economic" phase (1973-1991) that prominently featured NAM's efforts at advancing the so-called "New International Economic Order" (NIEO);

3) The "Crisis of Identity" phase (1991-2003) that was triggered by the collapse of the bipolar world system, whereby it essentially questioned the very meaning of the "non-alignment" concept;

4) The "Renaissance" phase (since 2003) that saw rekindled activism by the Movement and the rise of its role and place in global affairs.

1) The "Political" Phase

Interestingly, there is no consensus on when and where the Movement was conceived. In India, Jawaharlal Nehru, its first Prime Minister, had been regarded as the "architect" of Non-Alignment. The Indians date the history of the Movement back to 1946-1947, when India in its struggle for independence and self-determination opted for "transferring" the spirit of its non-violent approach into international politics. When it came to foreign policy, it was tantamount to abstaining from either of the two ideologically-driven blocs established after World War II under the aegis of the USSR and the USA, respectively.

Nevertheless, most countries took the Bandung Conference (Indonesia, 1955), which was attended by the delegations from 29 Asian and African nations, as the event from which the Non-Aligned Movement really traced its inception. To the extent that Vietnam's anti-colonial struggle against France provided a momentum to the Bandung, the 1955 Conference was overwhelmingly viewed as a forum of Asian solidarity with Vietnam.[1]

However, soon after the Bandung conference there began coming to the fore the ideas of expanding Asian political solidarity to other regions of the world and shaping the Non-Aligned Movement as a new international entity. Certain international trends were conducive to that, too. First, the number of post-colonial independent states (mostly in Africa), which needed a forum for expressing and advancing their common interests, was steadily on the rise. Second, there was a growing confrontation between the superpower blocks, including their struggle for influence in the Third World, which provided an incentive for the new post-colonial countries to band together. Third, the rise of nationalism in the Arab world and neutral Yugoslavia's active stand on the international arena, which ardently promoted the idea of a Non-Aligned Movement, imbued developing countries with hopes for setting up an efficient international forum of their own.

Thus, the first two trends were crucial for determining the Movement's "defensive" principles, that is, non-interference in the affairs of other countries, respect for states' sovereignty and territorial integrity, peaceful settlement of disputes, and abstention from the two military blocs. The third trend, in turn, gave rise to the NAM's so-called "forward-looking" principles, that is, promoting peace and security through pro-active mediation between the rival blocs, as well as by fighting colonialism, apartheid and racism.

The first conference of the Non-Aligned Movement attended by 25 countries was held in Belgrade (Yugoslavia) in 1961. The conference adopted certain NAM's key organizational documents and principles that largely acquired a "loose" character. These institutional foundations began to center around summit conferences, usually held once every three years, ministerial meetings and the principle of consensus (which meant at that time unanimity) in decision-making.

Member states' reluctance to set the institutional arrangements typical for virtually all other international organizations and institutions (such as a permanent secretariat and a regular budget), occurred apparently because the NAM "Founding Fathers" had no common ideological platform with regard to what they understood by Non-Alignment. India's leader Jawaharlal Nehru, perhaps more than other "Non-Aligned" leader, viewed it as a philosophical concept. Most African leaders treated it as a political course for survival

---

[1] Antony Best, "International History of the Twentieth Century", section "Neutralism, Development and the Rise of the Third World", published by Routledge, 2004, p.312.

and consolidation of their new post-colonial countries. Yugoslavia and Egypt rather contemplated it as a diplomatic mechanism for achieving certain foreign policy goals, like enhancing their own image and political clout among great powers.

Until 1973, that is, prior to the NAM's 4th Summit in Algiers, its activities were mainly driven by a political factor harnessed to the need to strengthen political independence of the newly established developing countries. It is striking in this respect that the Belgrade Summit's declaration contained as much as 24 political provisions and as little as three economic ones. Likewise, the other pre-1973 summits focused, first and foremost, on the international political agenda.

Little wonder, then, that the debates during Movement's meetings over that period mainly involved discussions on international political issues, like decolonization, situation in the Middle East and South-East Asia, as well as superpower confrontation.

What was the extent of Non-Aligned Movement's impact on the balance of power in the world during its first decade?

Even though the Soviet Union and the United States had to cater to the so-called "third force", and seek developing countries' backing, the impact of NAM was generally insignificant then. Indeed, the Movement had little effect on major international issues throughout the 1960s, like the Cuban missile crisis, the Vietnam War, "Brezhnev doctrine's" implementation in Czechoslovakia, United Nations debates, and others. The NAM's "political" phase was primarily about self-preoccupation, which allowed the Movement to grow and assert itself.

Indeed, the number of NAN Member States was steadily increasing with every Summit. For instance, by the Summit in Algiers in 1973, 75 countries became members of the Movement.

2) The "Economic" Phase

In the early 1970s, the Non-Aligned Movement entered into its "economic" phase, whose key objective was to attain genuine economic independence for its Member States.

The fact of an ever-widening gap in living standards between the West and the East on the one hand, and the South on the other, prodded intellectuals and experts in NAM countries to think that their economic difficulties had been wrought by some structural problems. In other words, such difficulties resulted from the existing international order, rules, institutions, which served to entrench developing countries' economic dependency, rather than from their own action. Therefore, in their view, turning the situation around required structural change on the global scale by establishing a "New

International Economic Order." An economic program under the same title was formulated at the NAM's 4th Summit.

The decision of Non-Aligned countries to go confidently ahead with the New International Economic Order, it appears, was bolstered by the following international factors and trends.

First, the early 1970s were characterized as a relatively benign international context for advancing major initiatives, owing in large measure to the onset of détente between the two blocks. Although with the benefit of hindsight the process might fairly be viewed as having been less about a real détente and more about political maneuvering, both the USSR and the USA, against the background of their global "peace" rhetoric, had been more than ever before inclined to curry favor with developing countries.

Second, the first development decade, that is the 1960s, turned out to be a failure in economic and social terms. The economic situation worsened virtually across the entire Third World, whereas its population was rapidly rising. The average economic growth in almost all developing countries was either minimal or negative. Their share in world trade dropped to 18% in 1972 from 31% in 1950.[2] As for their total debt, that figure had soared from US\$ 8 billion in 1955 to US\$ 114 billion in 1972, which far exceeded developing countries' total export revenues at the time.[3] Investments that were expected to flow into Third World's economies never materialized. Nor did the efforts on the part of the UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) and the UN Development Programme (UNDP) established in the 1960s have any tangible results for developing countries in terms of international trade or technical assistance.

The NIEO program formulated in Algiers was adopted by consensus at the 6th Special Session of the UN General Assembly in May 1974 through the Declaration on the Establishment of the New International Economic Order and the Plan of Action.

The Programme included the recommendations that sought to create favorable conditions for developing countries with regard to trade, development assistance, technology transfer, investment flows. Likewise, those recommendations urged, among other measures, a transformation of international financial institutions in the interests of Third World countries, as well as enabling the latter to exercise tighter control over multinational corporations that operated on their territories.

Overall, the NIEO was predicated on a pattern of close cooperation and coordination among Western, Eastern and Southern countries that might have characterized it as a form of "economic" détente. United Nations' endorsement

---

[2] K.Sauvant, "Changing Priorities on the International Agenda: The New International Economic Order", published by Pergamon Press, 1981, p.81.

[3] Ibid, p.104.

of the Programme was a major victory for the Non-Aligned countries, which were able to demonstrate in those years genuine unity and solidarity in pushing forward their common interests.

There, however, arises a question: how was the Movement able to succeed in the United Nations with an economic program that would strike anyone today as being rather radical? That outcome was circumstanced and made possible by international politics that prevailed at the time in question.

In October 1973 (that is, when the NIEO Programme had already been given the "go-ahead" by the Algeria Summit), OPEC countries imposed embargo on oil exports against some Western states that had backed Israel in a war against its Arab neighbors. That measure led to the 4-fold increase of oil prices on the world market. Although developing countries had taken a serious hit from the OPEC action, they all sided with that Organization, whereby they demonstrated real political unity and solidarity of all Third World countries. OPEC›s success inspired the Movement to push ahead with its own economic program. An important factor in binding the NAM's Programme with the OPEC move was the role played by Algeria, which, as the NAM's Chair worked to advance the Programme, whereas as a key OPEC player, it did its best to unite the Movement around OPEC. With the East and West being at that time in détente, and the latter affected into the bargain by the 1973 oil crisis, the developed countries had no better option but to yield to pressure by accepting the NIEO Programme at the UN General Assembly's 6th Special Session.

Thus, the 1973-1975 saw the peak of unity and solidarity within the Non-Aligned Movement and of its influence on international affairs. The NAM began to consolidate itself institutionally, mainly by setting up numerous working groups and actively coordinating its activities in New York with the view to implementing the NIEO Programme.

Nevertheless, that victory proved to be short-lived. As subsequent events clearly showed, succeeding in acquiring actual economic independence turned out to be more difficult than getting political independence. Indeed, the East and West, it seems, agreed to the "New International Economic Order" only in words, but did next to nothing to realize the initiative in deeds, making excuses about the voluntary nature of UN General Assembly's recommendations.

No doubt, the advanced countries saw the NAM initiative as a threat to their own political influence and economic prosperity, insofar as its implementation would have surely entailed a redistribution of global wealth towards the South. Moreover, the NIEO Programme ran counter to the international economic policies, which later would come to be dubbed as the "Washington Consensus". Those policies were ushered in by the United States in 1971 by President Richard Nixon's decision to untie the US dollar's peg to gold. The measure essentially marked the beginning of economic deregulation that

involved a reduced role for the state, and aggressive promotion of the principles of "free" trade and "open" market economy by the United States around the world.

In other words, what the US and other Western countries did ever since by sticking to the above economic policies was to perpetuate further the structural deficiencies against which the NIEO Programme was hammered out in the first place. As a result, almost all of the provisions of the "New International Economic Order" remained unrealized.

In summing up the NAM's "economic" phase, it makes sense to argue that NAM's failure in implementing the NIEO Programme had undercut the Movement psychologically. Indeed, while maintaining rhetoric about unity and solidarity, the NAM countries ceased to follow this principle in practice. Furthermore, throughout the 1980s, they increasingly began resorting to individual deals with developed countries to advance their own interests, which often took the toll on NAM's common interests.

3) The "Crisis of Identity" Phase

Thus, the Non-Aligned Movement had already been stricken by crisis, when the "Cold" war came to an end. With the collapse of the bipolar system the Movement entered a period that could have been called a "crisis of identity", because the very idea that underlay its founding, that is, abstention from aligning with either of the opposing military blocs, had allegedly lost much of its appeal.

Indeed, throughout the 1990s, when unipolarity indeed loomed large, the Movement patently demonstrated its weakness by failing to arrive at a common position with regard to some unilateral policies pursued by the United States of America and its allies. In particular, the US-led NATO military campaigns against the Bosnian Serbs in 1995 and against Yugoslavia in 1999, which were launched without UN Security Council's authorization, were not enough to convince NAM Member States to forge a united stand. The Movement's strong Muslim contingent sided with their religious brethren, the Bosnian Muslims and Kosovo Albanians, whom the USA and NATO purportedly defended against their adversaries. At the same time, other NAM countries denounced the use of force as violation of the United Nations Charter.

Therefore, the political fragmentation and serious disagreements among its Member States naturally begged a question about Movement's role in the world, and about the need for it to stick further with its long-standing governing structures.

In the mid 1990s, Colombia in its capacity as NAM's Chair took the lead in an effort to solidify the Movement by revising its institutional framework, in particular, the principle of consensus. The ensuing lengthy negotiation process made NAM countries realize that consensus in NAM's activities was not supposed to imply unanimity as had consistently been the case before, but

rather meant a very substantial majority. Such an approach was reflected in the "Cartagena Methodology" adopted at the NAM Ministerial Conference in 1996, held in Colombia. Since then, the Member States found it somewhat easier to finalize outcome documents for ministerial meetings and summits. Most crucially, however, that move proved to be instrumental in checking a destructive momentum that for some time was gaining force within the Non-Aligned Movement.

4) The "Renaissance" Phase

Generally, the pessimistic scenarios regarding Movement's future did not come true. Some geopolitical events in the early XXI century enabled the Movement to embark on a kind of "Renaissance". Indeed, the Non-Aligned countries were able to consolidate themselves both economically and politically.

In economic terms, they were quite successful in advancing at the 2000 United nations Millennium Summit the Programme associated with the "Millennium Development Goals". Although the latter was hardly as ambitious as the NIEO Programme, it still prioritized action to address a number of specific acute challenges facing developing countries.

As for the political context, the US war against Iraq, a member state of the Non-Aligned Movement, unleashed without UN Security Council's mandate in march 2003, served to reunite and consolidate the Movement once again. This time it occurred around their opposition to a unipolar world and unilateral policies. The fact that the consolidation did take place was in a large measure due to Malaysia's chairmanship in the Movement from 2003 to 2006. That country embraced an uncompromising stance against any attempt by the superpower at establishing or imposing its global hegemony on others.

The subsequent chairs – Cuba (2006-2009) and Egypt (2009-2012) – did their best to build on the momentum generated in the first decade of the XXI century to strengthen the Non-Aligned Movement.

II. Belarus' Involvement in the Non-Aligned Movement

Belarus' place in the Movement and the scope for it to advance its interests there were similar in some respects to the situation that Yugoslavia (SFRY) experienced in 1948-1961 *vis-a-vis* NAM countries.

Indeed, expelled by Stalin from the socialist camp for pursuing independent foreign policy, Yugoslavia found itself in 1948 in serious international isolation, because ideologically it was neither willing, nor seeking closer co-operation with the Soviet opponent, that is, the West. Yugoslavia's strategic response to its isolation began to emerge around the mid-1950s. It was based on the idea to promote the interests of the newly founded post-colonial

states. Such a stance made the country one of the NAM leaders in its early years.[4] What is more, it served to enhance its image around the world. This happened because Yugoslavia was able both to instill into the Movement a "forward-looking" spirit associated with a pro-active advance of NAM Member States' interests, and to urge them to mediate between the two superpower blocks.[5]

Belarus, too, had to take into consideration the factor of its large neighbors while designing and implementing its independent foreign policy. Moreover, like Yugoslavia in the 1950s, Belarus was not seeking membership in European structures for ideological reasons, because the Europeans were pressuring the country and, by the way, continue to do so now. With this in mind, by the late 1990s Belarus began to show interest in "entering" into other parts of the world. That move was expected to enable the country to offset to some extent the weight of European pressure, and improve its international political and economic standing via increased contacts with developing countries.

Since it joined the Movement and up to the XVI Ministerial Conference (May 2011, Indonesia), Belarus, like Yugoslavia five decades ago, was the Movement's sole European Member State (Azerbaijan joined the Non-Aligned Movement at the above conference).

What benefits has Belarus reaped from being in the Non-Aligned Movement?

From today›s perspective, it is clear that the country succeeded at large in addressing a number of political and economic objectives that it had set for itself yet in 1998, and which in 2004 were revised within an effort to draft Belarus' NAM Strategy document.

Politically, Belarus pinned its NAM-related hopes on gaining political support from developing countries, especially at the United Nations. Its expectations have been mostly fulfilled. For example, Belarus effectively employed the Movement's potential at the UN General Assembly in 2004 in its effort to rally opposition to a draft resolution on the situation with human rights in Belarus sponsored by Western countries. As for the most recent years, the Non-Aligned countries have become Belarus' most reliable partners in the advance of its major foreign policy initiatives, like combating trafficking in persons, recognizing the diversity of ways towards progressive development, establishing global partnerships, enhancing international co-operation on energy issues, supporting talented youth.

What is also crucial is that throughout its NAM membership period, which coincided with the pursuit of unilateral foreign policies by the United States, Belarus vigorously stood in the Movement for the primacy of international

---

[4] A.Rubenstein, "Yugoslavia and the Non-Aligned World", published by Princeton University Press, 1980, pp.15-31.

[5] Ibid, pp.55-61.

law and NAM's interests. This position, undoubtedly, served to bolster Belarus' image among the Non-Aligned states.

As for economic benefits that Belarus gained from its NAM membership, they have been evident as well. Indeed, since 1998, Belarus began assertively accessing the markets of its Non-Aligned partners in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Trade and economic relations with NAM countries have been consistently on the rise. Moreover, co-operation with Non-Aligned countries has turned out to be conducive to addressing such a crucial policy issue as safeguarding the country's energy security by diversifying energy imports. Furthermore, Belarus' footprint in NAM countries' markets helped it enjoy easier access to the markets of other, primarily neighboring and adjacent states.

This situation would hardly be feasible without Belarus enjoying a fully-fledged membership in the Movement, which, in turn, afforded the country to have fruitful co-operation with Non-Aligned countries through regular high-level meetings, exchanges at the level of diplomatic missions, and the common work at the NAM coordination entities based in New York, Vienna and Geneva.

If Belarus's entrance in the Non-Aligned Movement in 1998 was mostly seen as a defensive move, its today's stance can be rather regarded as being forward-looking. Indeed, what Belarus is anxious to do at the NAM now is not just to push with its own national interests, but also to contribute in a vigorous manner to the strengthening of the Movement and its role in the current geopolitical context. It seems appropriate in this context to draw another parallel with Yugoslavia, which had initially joined the Movement for defensive reasons, but had turned into a key NAM player over time.

III. Belarus and NAM: Together in the "Renaissance" Phase

The future of NAM will largely depend on whether its Member Sates will be able to effectively bring to bear the "Renaissance" moment and build upon it the Movement's potential.

Certainly, there are fears that NAM countries may let the Movement's "Renaissance" slip by. This anxiety is particularly acute today given the unfolding geopolitical events in the Middle East. Indeed, we come to witness how Western countries once again over the past two decades assign themselves the right to decide upon the fate of other countries and nations by disregarding international law and the United Nations Charter. Dressing their actions in lofty slogans about "protecting civilians", the Western states, in essence, seek to overthrow legitimate governments in the Middle East and install palatable regimes that are willing to heed West's political and economic concerns. In other words, what we have been observing there is nothing else than West's attempts to reimpose neocolonialism on developing countries.

It seems that both the Movement itself and its individual members should not contemplate ambiguity in their collective position if it were to be gauged in terms of the NAM's principles. This position must unequivocally condemn all acts of interference in internal affairs of the Non-Aligned states. Regrettably, the Movement has failed to forge a common stance on the events unfolding across the Middle East. Moreover, a number of Non-Aligned countries opted for supporting, and what is even worse, for siding with the West's neocolonialist policies in the region. What stands behind this situation is, perhaps, some developing countries' interest in undermining their regional economic rivals, which also happen to be Non-Aligned states, by the hands of the West.

A new impetus to the Movement was given by the admission of Azerbaijan in its ranks in 2011. This country began to show a particular interest in reflecting the topic of Nagorno-Karabakh conflict in NAM's strategic documents. However, the other party concerned, Armenia, is only an observer in NAM, and hence it cannot take part in the negotiations on Movement's documents. Both parties vigorously work to rally support behind their opposing positions. The Republic of Belarus stays uninvolved in the discussion, because it enjoys friendly relations with each of the above countries.

It is quite clear that if the considerations of personal and parochial gains on the part of some NAM countries prevail over the NAM's sacred principles and its traditional solidarity and unity, the Movement will not be able to transform itself into an independent and significant center of world power. Given the ongoing global trends, such an evolution of NAM should now be craved by its Members more than ever before.

Indeed, the trends point to the world increasingly getting interdependent and multipolar. The recent global financial and economic crisis demonstrated the degree of interdependence perhaps more than any other event. The mortgage crisis in the U.S. that broke out in the fall of 2007 gradually mutated into a financial and economic crisis that ultimately engulfed almost all countries in the world with a serious fallout for domestic stability in many of them. In a nutshell, a functional problem inherent to an individual country has grown into a threat to peace and stability for the whole planet.

There should be no doubt that the unipolar world has been giving way to a genuinely global multipolar order. Indeed, the failure of both the US foreign policy to establish global dominance and of the American "free-economics" to spread itself worldwide is a testimonial to that. On the other hand, a multipolar order is being made possible by the steady growth and rising influence in recent years of other major countries, like, among others, China, India, Russia, and Brazil.

The key question in the context of an emerging multipolar world is how to manage a new order. The typical examples for that date back to the XIX century. In its first half, the world's governance had been spearheaded by the

"Concert of Europe" through regular informal congresses, at which then five leading states, Austria, Great Britain, France, Prussia, and Russia handled international matters. That was a consultative model.

In the century's second half, however, that model was replaced by a confrontational one predicated on the balance of power, which entailed military alliances and blocs to balance each other. Stability within a confrontation model could not be everlasting, as indeed was the case in August 1914.

So, what models can be anticipated for the future?

The current model of global governance *de jure* rests with the UN Security Council, which, according to the United Nations Charter can make mandatory decisions on all issues of international concern. This model is much reminiscent of the "Concert of Europe", but there is one key difference in that the latter was an informal association, whereas the former is a formal mechanism. For this reason, most countries question its legitimacy, because the organ's permanent members composition does not reflect the realities of the XXI century's second decade.

Unwilling to share power in an official way, Security Council's permanent members contemplate new informal mechanisms that would govern the world, such as once the "Concert of Europe" did. Crucially, other large "players", including those that lost power in 1945 (Germany, Japan, Italy), and those that emerged on the international arena relatively recently (India, Brazil, Argentina, Mexico, Indonesia, South Africa), seem to have grasped the futility of enhancing their status through official venues (for instance, through an expansion of Council's permanent membership). Thus, they joined the permanent members in an effort to forge new global and regional informal mechanisms with all of them inside.

Therefore, it seems reasonable to assume that global governance will be realized in the future via different formal and informal groups of states that of late came to be fashionably called "centers of power", like, for instance, the Group of Twenty, the Group of Eight, the "BRICS" (including Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa), the European Union, the Major Economies Forum on Energy and Climate, and some others.

It is extremely important for the Non-Aligned Movement not to find itself shunted aside from these developments. In other words, the Movement should become itself an independent power center, insofar as it is the best way to safeguard its Members' interests in the unfolding global context. This, in turn, would require, first, consolidating and unifying NAM countries, because as a divided body the Movement would not be able to turn itself into a potent power center, with which other global stakeholders would reckon. Second, it would do well for the Movement to adopt a more active stance on nurturing co-operation with other current and emerging centers of power. A key role in this effort should belong to the Movement's Chair and its "Troika" mechanism, which includes the current, previous, and next chairs.

The Movement's future will also be contingent upon whether it will be able to make a contribution of its own in addressing the so-called "functional" problems, which essentially mean transnational challenges and threats. Their rise is a key feature of the current world, although this situation has not resulted from the transition from one kind of a world order to another, but rather stems from globalization that has been producing its own upsides and downsides.

Indeed, by removing or surmounting various barriers and borders, globalization expands the scope for economic development and cooperation among states. Likewise, it is creating a "fertile" ground for negative non-state actors, like terrorists, drug-dealers, weapon and human traffickers, and is exacerbating the situation with climate change and in other areas. Successfully coming to grips with a whole host of transnational challenges in the context of emerging multipolarity, that is, when the number of global "players" is constantly rising, is an uphill struggle.

What is the way to proceed with it? Most appropriate in this regard may be a tool of "global partnerships", the idea of which belongs to Belarus, and which the latter consistently voiced already for some time at the United Nations and other fora. Belarus believes that global partnerships can constitute a form of co-operation that would enable the international community to focus on specific "functional" global problems. In terms of participants, global partnerships provide for the involvement of not just states, but also of other positive international "players", like power centers, international organizations, civil society, various networks, and private sector.

Human trafficking can provide a good example of how a global partnership can be established. In 2005, Belarus came up with the idea to forge a "Global Partnership against Slavery and Human Trafficking for the XXI century". The initiative was institutionalized by the UN Global Plan of Action to Combat Trafficking in Persons that Belarus proposed and the UN General Assembly adopted in July 2010. The Non-Aligned Movement made a significant contribution in the design and implementation of the Global Partnership against Human Trafficking both by reflecting this issue in its strategic documents and through a common effort of its Member States in drafting the Global Plan in the United Nations.

It is crucial both for the Movement to throw its weight behind similar global partnerships, and for Member States to take the lead in promoting specific partnerships the way Belarus has been doing on human trafficking. This approach, undoubtedly, will help tackle transnational threats and challenges. Moreover, it will be instrumental in enhancing NAM's image and turning the Movement into an effective global power center.

Belarus' position with regard to the major NAM events over 2011–2012 was shaped by a number of considerations. In particular, Belarus came to realize the need, first, for Movement's internal consolidation against the background

of developments unraveling in the Middle East; second, for mounting efforts with the view to transforming the Movement into a viable power center; third, for actively engaging the Non-Aligned countries in efforts to forge global partnerships against transnational challenges; and, finally, for focusing their attention on co-operation on economic and social issues that would help somewhat smooth political differences among them.

The preparatory work to the NAM high-level events was carried out within the NAM coordination mechanism in New York. This body dealt with drafting and finalizing relevant outcome documents. Such documents traditionally cover all major aspects on the international agenda. The Belarusian delegation's task was to reflect in the outcome documents both country's specific interests, and its vision regarding the future role that the Non-Aligned Movement should play.

Finalizing outcome documents is a complicated challenge, as that entails the need for adequate reflection of all NAM countries' interests, as well as for certain trade offs among them. On the whole, the delegation of Belarus was successful in making its major foreign policy initiatives and interests present in all outcome documents adopted at the NAM high-level events in the past two years.

First, the delegation did its best to include them such provisions that stressed the necessity for Non-Aligned countries to unequivocally uphold the Movement's sacred purposes and principals. This measure, in turn, ought to help reinforce unity and solidarity among Non-Aligned countries and bolster the Movement in its aspiration to evolve into a significant power center. Those provisions were indeed included. So, what remains to be done is to bring them to fruition.

Second, the Belarusian delegation strongly advocated the ideas for enhanced co-operation between the Non-Aligned Movement and the existing centers of power. Belarus went in this regard to great lengths to accentuate the need for a more vigorous role and a greater involvement in this effort on the part of NAM's Chair and "Troika". Our proposals, including a call for developing Movement's declarations on acute contemporary issues, received the majority's backing and found their way into the outcome document of the NAM's XVI Summit.

Third, Belarus spared no effort to steer the Movement onto the path to embracing the idea of global partnerships against transnational challenges and threats. As a result, the outcome documents did both identify specific transnational problems and spell out measures to address them by means of co-operation based on partnerships among states, international intergovernmental organizations, civil society and private sector.

Finally, Belarus was particularly interested in seeing its major foreign policy initiatives and interests, like recognizing the diversity of ways towards progress, fighting human trafficking, creating a global mechanism for the

transfer of energy technologies, shaping a comprehensive UN energy agenda, promoting youth matters, preventing unilateral sanctions and biased human rights approaches reflected in the outcome documents. This happened to be the case, as they all became part and parcel of the outcome documents endorsed at the Movement's high-level meetings in 2011-2012.

In particular, the Outcome document of the Movement's XVI Summit contains the following provisions related to the initiatives and interests of Belarus:

- paragraph 32 takes note of the recognition of every state's right to independently determine its way of progressive development and emphasizes that the recognition of diverse ways of development is a value that should underlie peaceful and prosperous life on the planet, thereby fully capturing the gist of the Belarus' initiative;

- paragraph 558 draws attention to the initiative on shaping a comprehensive UN energy agenda and contains a specific call for its implementation in the United Nations;

- a number of provisions in paragraphs 574-577, sponsored by Belarus, focus on the need for a non-politicized approach in the consideration of human rights;

- the Belarus' initiative related to human trafficking has been fully reflected in a relevant section (paragraphs 680-691), including in provisions on the UN Global Plan of Action to Combat Trafficking in Persons and the Voluntary Trust Fund for Victims of Human Trafficking (paragraphs 686-688);

- some elements of the Belarusian youth-related initiative have been captured in paragraph 403 of the Outcome document;

- with regard to the initiative on global partnerships, it found its adequate reflection in paragraphs 65, 69, 73, 79.4 of the document;

- the idea of strengthening NAM's co-operation with global power centers has been fully captured in the section on "Dialog and Co-operation between the North and the South" (paragraphs 235.1-235.6). Moreover, paragraph 235.5 includes the proposal of Belarus to draw up NAM's declarations on acute contemporary issues;

- the topic of unilateral sanctions and actions that affect sovereign countries has been duly reflected in paragraphs 14, 22.1, 22.14, 23.2, 23.4, 23.4, 24.4, 24.5, 24.7, 27.8. They all emphasize the futility of unilateral sanctions and call on NAM Member States to oppose them.

Movement's various working groups that operate at the United Nations headquarter and its offices in Vienna and Geneva began to deal with the implementation of NAM's strategic documents. It is highly gratifying that the Summit's Outcome document clearly embraced a "forward-looking" approach for the Movement's future activities, which Belarus did its best to bring about.

Far from overstating the role of a European Belarus in the Non-Aligned Movement, which essentially stands as a political core of developing countries, it is worth remarking that Belarus was able to bring a lot of "fresh wind" into the Movement in the past two years. Perhaps, Belarus can now be counted among those countries that set the rhythm at many of NAM's negotiations, summits and events.

Belarus' deep involvement in preparations for the NAM's XVI Summit fully attest to that. The preparatory work began in the summer of 2012 in New York at the Movement's Coordinating Bureau. The delegation of Belarus came up with a proposal to develop a draft declaration on shaping a comprehensive UN energy agenda that would later be endorsed at the Summit. This has triggered the first-ever broad discussion on energy issues in the NAM. The debate appears to have furnished a proper basis for the Movement to focus further on the matter, spearheaded by Belarus.

Besides, even though Belarus in the end decided to abandon the idea of the declaration, because support to it fell short of being total, its pro-active stance in advancing it allowed the country to accentuate once again its paramount interest in energy and make others perceive Belarus as a leader in promoting comprehensive approaches to the interrelated issues of economic growth, energy, climate change, and food security.

As for the Tehran Summit proper, it was attended by a national delegation led by Minister of Foreign Affairs Mr. Vladimir Makei. The head of the delegation made welcoming remarks on behalf of the Movement's European Group, and delivered a national statement, in which he voiced Belarus' approaches with regard to the role and place of the Non-Aligned Movement for a long-term perspective.

Specifically, Mr. Makei strongly argued for Movement's greater involvement in addressing current economic distempers. In dwelling on the issue of "green economy" that underlay the international conference on sustainable development "Rio+20" held in June 2012, the Minister spoke in favor of establishing a Global fund on "green technologies". He further emphasized the importance for the Movement to forge a single voice that should be clearly heard by such leading global clubs as the Group of Eight and the Group of Twenty. Other delegations made positive comments on Mr.Makei's statement.

In general, the Movement's high-level events held over the last two years generated a feeling that Member States retained a keen interest in making the NAM stronger so that the gathering of Non-Aligned countries would be able to continue to stand vehemently by its Members.

Belarus, in turn, will do its best to remain deeply involved with the Non-Aligned countries within various frameworks at the United Nations and the Non-Aligned Movement with the view to implementing our common long-term vision, especially in those areas, in which Belarus exhibited so much interest during the NAM's recent high-level events.

About the Authors

Vladimir Makei is Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Belarus since August 2012. Prior to his current position, Mr.Makei had served for 4 years as Head of the Presidential Administration of the Republic of Belarus. From 2000 to 2008, Mr.Makei had worked as assistant to the President of Belarus. Mr.Makei's articles on some issues related to international relations and foreign policy have been published in recent years by Journal of International Affairs and Russia in Global Affairs. Minister's article on trafficking in human organs is scheduled to appear in UK-based Forced Migration Review in May 2015.

Valentin Rybakov is Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Belarus since January 2013. Mr.Rybakov has served as assistant to the President of Belarus from 2006 to 2013. Before that, Mr.Rybakov has worked in Belarus' diplomatic missions in Washington and New York. Mr.Rybakov takes a particular interest in the Non-Aligned Movement and has been regularly taking part in NAM's high-level events.

Yury Ambrazevich is Director General for Multilateral Diplomacy in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Belarus. Mr. Ambrazevich has twice worked in the Embassy of Belarus to Belgium. He is Chairman of the 55th session of the United Nations Committee on Programme and Coordination (June 2015, New York). His areas of particular interest include human rights, global economics, and international financial organizations.

Vadim Pisarevich is Head of the Department for Global Policies and Humanitarian Cooperation. Mr. Pisarevich has worked in Belarus' Mission to the UN in Vienna as well as in the OSCE Missions in Kosovo and Croatia. He has been involved in Vienna in efforts to advance Belarus-sponsored resolutions on human trafficking and trafficking in human organs.

Detailed instruction for authors

The Journal solicits papers which are 8,000 to 10,000 words in length. Shorter papers between 5,000 and 8,000 words will also be considered for publication, especially if they are review articles or if they put forward new, insufficiently explored ideas and approaches (often deemed to be premature by other journals). Book reviews should exceed 2,000 words and reviewers are required to submit a copy of the book reviewed if they initiate a review of the publication.

All submissions must be in English. However, as this journal belongs to the UN family, it encourages the translation of works originally written in other languages into English. Nevertheless, submission to the journal implicates that the paper has not been published elsewhere (regardless of the language of publication) and that it is not submitted for publication in any other medium.

All papers submitted for publication should be sent electronically to the Editor at the following address: zeljko.sevic@gcal.ac.uk or ecpd@eunet.yu.

Submission of a paper will be held to imply that it contains original unpublished work. The Editor does not accept responsibility for damage or loss of papers submitted. Upon acceptance of an article, author(s) will be asked to transfer copyright of the article to the publisher – the European Center for Peace and Development at the University for Peace established by the United Nations (ECPD). This transfer will ensure the widest possible dissemination of information.

Manuscripts should be double-spaced with wide margins. All pages should be numbered consecutively. Titles and subtitles should be kept as short as possible. References, tables and legends for figures should be inserted into the main text and also submitted as separate files with the final version of the paper. This final version should be sent in hard copy form and on a 3.5" diskette or a CR-Rom to the editor at the following address: Zeljko Sevic, Caledonian Business School, Glasgow Caledonian University, Cowcaddens Road, Glasgow, G4 0BA, Scotland, UK, UK or ECPD, Terazije 41, 11000 Belgrade.

The first page of the manuscript should contain the following information: the title; the name(s) and institutional affiliation(s) of the author(s) and an abstract of not more than 200 words. At the bottom of the cover page, please provide the full postal address, telephone number, fax number, and E-mail address of the corresponding author. Please also supply up to five key words with up to three Journal of Economic Literature codes.

In principle, any acknowledgements, and information on grants received should be given in a first footnote, which should not be included in the consecutive numbering of footnotes, and marked with a asterisk (*).

Footnotes should generally be avoided. The Journal's view is that if the material is worth including in the paper, it should be incorporated into the text. However, footnotes can be used for very long lists of references that would otherwise break up the text, or for material that is substantive but takes the reader too far afield to be easily integrated into the

text. Acknowledgments also belong in the footnotes (e.g., "We thank John Long for suggesting this new approach/test/interpretation.") A general guideline is no more than one footnote to every 4-5 pages of text, not including acknowledgments and long lists of references. Footnotes are numbered consecutively in Arabic superscripts. Footnotes must not, under any circumstances, include displayed formulae or tables.

Displayed formulae should be numbered consecutively throughout the manuscript as (1), (2), etc. against the right-hand margin of the page. Section headers are left-justified with Arabic numerals. Only the first word is capitalized. Headers are in boldface type, and subheads are in italics. A period follows the last numeral. As headers and subheads introduce text, it is preferable that they not be immediately followed by additional subheads. References in the text to other sections of the paper are capitalized (e.g., "as noted in Section 2.2").

The first line of each paragraph is indented. The use of the active voice greatly improves the readability of a paper (e.g., "the tests show" or "we show," not "it is shown"), but authors should avoid the use of 'I', since good academic writing should be depersonalised. Italics, quotation marks, and capital letters are considered to be distracting and should be kept to a minimum (although the words a priori, etc., i.e., e.g., et al., ex ante, and ex post are italicised). Special terms can be italicised but only at the first occurrence, and all foreign (non-English) words should be italicised. Abbreviations should be kept to a minimum, and the full text with an abbreviation in brackets should be given when the term is used for the fist time. Do not assume that all readers are familiar with the abbreviations/acronyms that are used in your paper. The use of appendices is discouraged but if they are used, please refer to them as Appendix A, Appendix B, etc.

The Journal endorses full Harvard referencing style. Potential authors are strongly encouraged to consider the latest edition of the Chicago Manual of Style, before submitting their paper. The list of references should appear at the end of the main text (after any appendices, but before tables and legends for figures). It should be double-spaced and listed in alphabetical order by author's name. Everything in the list of references should be cited in the text, with no discrepancies in the spelling of the authors' names or in the date of publication. In the reference list, there are no quotation marks, no underlines, and no italics. The authors' last names and first initials are used. Only the first word of an article title is capitalised. Book and journal titles take normal initial capitals. References should appear as follows:

For Monographs/Books:

Hunt, B. and D. Targett (1995), *The Japanese Advantage? The IT Battleground in Europe, Oxford*: Butterworth Heinemann in association with "Management Today".

For Contributions to Collective Works (book chapters – edited volumes/conference proceedings):

Barsoux, J.-L. and P. Lawrence (1991), Countries, Cultures and Constraints in R. Calori and P. Lawrence, eds. *The Business of Europe: Managing Change*, London: SAGE Publications, 198-217.

For Journals:

Kornai, J. (1993), The Evolution of Financial Discipline under the Post-Socialist System, *Kyklos*, 46(3), 315-336.

For Unpublished material:

Bonin, J. P. and M. E. Schaffer (1995), *Banks, Firms, Bad Debts, and Bankruptcy in Hungary 1991-94*, CEP Discussion Paper No. 234, London: Centre for Economic Performance at LSE

For WWW material:

CATO Institute (1998), *Rita Gluzman, Petitioner v. United States of America, Respondent, Brief of Amicus Curiae the Cato Institute in Support of the Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit*, http://www.cato.org/pubs/legalbriefs/gluzman.pdf [*accessed* 15th March 2001]

Journal titles *should not* be abbreviated. Also, the location of the university or publisher must only be a city. Do not provide information on a county, state or a country.

Citations in the text and footnotes should include the surname of the author(s) followed by the year of publication in brackets, such as (Merton, 1986). If the author refers to a direct quotation, this should be given under quotation marks and page number should be provided, such as (Merton, 1986: 3). If there are more than three authors credited to a single publication, the reference is referred to as the first author's surname, followed by et al. typed in italic, whilst all the authors will be listed at the end of the paper in the list of references. For instance, (Merton, *et al.*, 1986). Note that where there are more than two authors, their names should be separated by commas and multiple parenthetical citations should be separated by semicolons.

Use commas in numbers with more than three digits (e.g., 1,234 vs. 1234). Per cents appear as 12.34 per cent (not 12.34%). In principle, avoid the use of symbols in the main text. Decimals are preceded by a zero, as in 0.1234 (not .1234). A number or percent at the beginning of a sentence is spelled out (e.g., "Forty-two of these firms are in the full sample…") but it is preferable to use a different construction (e.g., "The full sample includes 42 of these firms…"). Months and years are written without commas or apostrophes (e.g., 1980s, January 1990).

Any illustrations will be reproduced photographically from originals supplied by the author; the publisher will not redraw them. Please provide all illustrations in duplicate (two high-contrast copies). Care should be taken that lettering and symbols are of a comparable size. The illustrations should not be inserted in the text, and should be marked on the back with figure number, title of paper, and author's name.

Tables should be numbered consecutively in the text in Arabic numerals and inserted into the main text. However, they must also be printed on separate sheets and saved into separate files labelled appropriately in an understandable manner (table 1, table 2, etc.) when the final version of the accepted paper is submitted in electronic and hard copy to the Editor. The legends, axis labels, column and row labels and footnotes for all figures and tables should be clear enough so they are self-contained; that is, the content of the table or the figure must be understandable without reading the text of the article and authors should avoid describing the same material presented in the tables in the main text. Each table must have a title (at the top) followed by a descriptive legend. The source(s) of the table must be given below the table, following the word 'Source:' written in italic script (For example: '*Source*: John, 1992, p. 23'). Authors must check tables to be sure that the title, column headings, captions, etc. are clear and to the point. All graphs and diagrams should be referred to as figures (e.g., Fig. 1), and should be numbered consecutively in the text in Arabic numerals. Illustrations for papers submitted as electronic manuscripts should be in traditional form.

The legends and captions for tables or figures should be complete enough that the table or figure can stand on its own. Large tables and graphs must be presented in landscape format, and tables should be typed in 9 pt script, while the main text is typed in 12 pt script. In particular, the TITLE AND LEGEND of the table or figure must describe the content of the numbers or symbols in the body of the table or the content of the figure. For example, a table legend that says "Descriptive Statistics" is unsatisfactory.

Equations in the text are indented on a separate line with the number of the equation right-justified. All equations are numbered, even if they are never referred to in the text. In general, equations are punctuated as normal parts of a sentence if the sentence continues after the equation, as follows:

Revenue, R is calculated as

$$R = P*V \tag{1}$$

where

– P is the selling price, and
– V is the volume of sales in units.

Ensure that the letter "I" and digit "1", and also the letter "O" and digit "0" are used properly, and format your article (tabs, indents, etc.) consistently. Characters not available on your word processor (Greek letters, mathematical symbols, etc.) should not be left open but indicated by a unique code (e.g., alpha, @, etc., for the Greek letter "alpha"). Such codes should be used consistently throughout the entire text and a list of codes should accompany the electronic manuscript. Do not allow your word processor to introduce word breaks and do not use a justified layout. Please adhere strictly to the general instructions below on style, arrangement, and, in particular, the reference style of the Journal.

Any manuscript that does not conform to the set instructions will be returned to the author(s) for necessary amendments before being sent to the referees.

Once the accepted paper is ready for going to print, the page proofs will be sent to the corresponding author. Proofs should be corrected carefully; the responsibility for detecting errors lies with the author. Corrections should be restricted to instances in which the proof is at variance with the manuscript. Each author will receive 5 reprints of his/her paper and a copy of the journal issue in which the paper has appeared. All the reprints will be sent to the corresponding author and he/she will be responsible for distributing reprints and copies of the journal to other co-authors.

Potential authors are strongly encouraged to consider the Journal of Financial Economics' style guide as this promotes good academic writing. However, if there is an inconsistency between the above instructions and the JFE style-sheet, the authors should adhere to the above stipulated guidelines. JFE style-guide can be accessed via WWW at http://jfe.rochester.edu.