

NEW WARS , OLD THINKING

Tom Arendshorst

Professional Club

4-13-07

Who here has seen the movie *Blood Diamond*? Or *Hotel Rwanda*? *Lord of War*?

Imagine, if you will, that you are a villager in the eastern hinterlands of Sierra Leone, in 1998. You have a small farm holding, a wife, and three children, and live in a thatched home. Suddenly, this afternoon, your village is overwhelmed by a large troop of wildly excited men wielding machine guns and panga knives. You shout for your wife, son, daughter, and baby girl to flee with you to the forest, but before your wife and baby are out the door two youths corner them in the house. You and your daughter stop, wanting to help them, but two other young men grab your daughter from behind. A third points his Uzi at you. The soldiers, if that's what they are, wear no uniforms, but all have a red sash or bandanna hanging from their belts. Two have baseball caps on their heads; two others wear stocking caps. Four of the five wear sunglasses.

The boy aiming at you swings his rifle and clouts you in the head with the gun butt. The other pins your daughter to the ground, and rips her dress open. Lying on the leaf-littered ground, you hear your wife scream. You try to get to the young man who is raping your daughter, but his partner smashes his gun butt into your throat, and fires into your leg. You struggle to stand again, and look to your hut, where you see one youth with his pants down, raping your infant child. Your wife is on the ground, bleeding from gaping neck and abdominal wounds.

The attackers laugh and shout as they work. You scream at them to stop. They drag you and your daughter to a tree. Two of them pin your daughter and stretch her right hand across a log. You see a boy wearing a beret swing an axe, amputating your daughter's hand and wrist. You try to scream, but another attacker forces your mouth open and cuts out your tongue with his knife.

War has changed since Napoleonic times. We read of genocidal massacres in Sudan, ethnic apartheid in Palestine, and religious carnage in Iraq. We

remember ethnic holocausts in Bosnia, the slaughter of Tutsis in Rwanda, unending drug wars and rebellions in Colombia and Peru, armies of conscripted child soldiers in Sri Lanka and Uganda, and flares of seemingly lunatic violence all over the world. Our own nation has dedicated itself and its children's futures to a computerized, high-tech invasion that, despite overwhelming weaponry and technology, is utterly unable to quell Iraqi violent resistance.

Less than twenty years ago the Cold War ended. We, the United States, stood alone as the greatest economic and military power in the history of the world. Hope ran high for a new era of peace, stability, and prosperity that would set its sights on giving the world a future of decreasing poverty, rising health, environmental healing, and growing peace.

Since that fleeting moment of optimism, however, the world has entered new darkness. Long-running wars have gained gory new energy. New and strangely terrible violence has erupted with increasingly horrible results. Anarchic terrorists have continued to wreak sporadic havoc. The United States has embarked on a campaign of unopposable militarism. And the world has been spurred anew to arm itself for future wars.

What has gone wrong? Have important decision makers fouled up? Is the world fracturing along economic or cultural fault-lines? Or is the world's new violence an inevitable result of chaotic forces and inevitable conflicts? It seems that long-established wisdom and lessons from history are somehow no longer working. What has changed?

I'm going to talk tonight about evolving concepts that are widely recognized among conflict and peace scholars and practitioners, concepts that fit current realities and offer compelling insights, but that have not been grasped by pivotal actors who wield global power. These concepts describe the rapidly evolving characteristics of what Mary Kaldor calls the "New Wars," question and examine the nature and underlying causes of change in the New Wars, and present powerful insights that can guide more cogent and useful responses.

The grisly war in Sierra Leone shared signal characteristics with the conflicts that have ravaged Bosnia-Herzegovina, Northern Ireland, Cyprus, Somalia, Sudan, Uganda, Rwanda, Burundi, Liberia, Democratic Republic of Congo, Algeria, Israel-Palestine, Afghanistan, Iraq, Azerbaijan and

Armenia, Chechnya, Tajikistan, Sri Lanka, Peru, Mexico, Guatemala, other countries, and the urban slums of American and European cities. In contrast to the great wars of the first half of the twentieth century, the new wars are generally internal or civil wars. They typically involve relatively few soldiers, and primarily victimize civilians rather than an enemy army. The new wars occur in areas where government is failing to provide needed services and has lost its monopoly over legitimate violence. These conflicts are deeply related to processes of globalization, and rely on high-tech communications and external sources of money and weaponry. Crucially, they are powered by politics of discrimination, exclusion.

The Nature and Rationale of “Old” War

In order to understand how war has changed, I want to first look at what war has been until the recent past, the patterns and traditional wisdoms of our “old wars.” Our culture’s understanding of war has evolved along with the evolution of the modern European –American system of sovereign states, and is deeply rooted in our concept of sovereign states. Our traditional assumptions are that war is a legitimate state enterprise, that war employs state militaries to fight battles to gain or defend territorial claims (or, in the case of the Cold War, ideological claims), and that war serves legitimate state interests. *This cultural notion of war continues to dominate the way policy-makers conceive of security, even though the realities of war and security have shifted markedly.*

As early European monarchs consolidated territorial boundaries, they centralized political power through their growing economic control over customs duties, taxes and borrowing from wealthy merchants. They developed standing armies, which were independent of other nobles and much more efficient than raising and disbanding forces. These professional armies gave states control over armed force. From this history has come *our concept of the state as the only legitimate user of violence.* The state monopoly of violence also served to integrate law-enforcement and internal economies.

Clausewitz defined war as “an act of violence intended to compel our opponent to fulfill our will;” “‘We’ and ‘our opponent’ were states, and the ‘will of each state could be clearly defined.”¹ War was engaged by states in the pursuit of “state interest.” *State interest became the legitimate justification for war,* replacing religious-based justifications of defensive

war. Clausewitz described war as “the continuation of politics by other means.” Once state interest had become the basis for legitimate violence, only states --- no group or individual --- could claim the right to pursue justice by violent means.

Clausewitz was the first to stress the importance of overwhelming force and the readiness to use force; these dynamic fundamentals focused war on decisive battles. Napoleon pioneered “total war,” in which all of a state’s resources were mobilized toward victory in war; World Wars I and II were also total wars. Over time, states developed rules together governing legitimate warfare: these laws eventually culminated in the Geneva Conventions, the Hague Conferences, the United Nations Charter, the Nuremberg trials, and the International Criminal Court (which the United States has refused to ratify).

The Collapsing Legitimacy of Warfare

Wars between democratic states have become rare, as citizens have gradually grown more and more fearful of war’s destructive power and skeptical about the legitimacy of warfare. First, the industrial revolution, opposing networks of state alliances, the developing integration of the military-industrial complex, and complex technology have all moved warfare into its present capacities for mass destruction, and have eroded the distinctions between combatant and civilian.

Second, as the World Wars and the Cold War gradually have erased the distinction between public and private, combatant and civilian, the justification of war in terms of state interest has grown increasingly hollow. Soldiers have come increasingly to question the legitimacy of the wars they are asked to die in (Viet Nam, Iraq, etc), as their duties have come more and more to include counterinsurgency tactics against civilians and civilian’s environments. Research reveals that soldiers need to feel like heroes in order to make war, and post-World War interventions have given soldiers the feeling that they are pawns, or even murderers. As a consequence, the United States has devised strategies, based on air power and high-tech rocketry, to minimize American casualties; regrettably, these strategies has greatly increased the damage done to non-American civilians. Edward Luttwak has termed this “Post-Heroic Warfare.”² War is now more and more disconnected from the society and lives of First-World people whose

government uses war. For many, war has taken on a sterile, “virtual reality” character, far different from the “total war” experiences of the World Wars.

Third, the technical capacities of modern war have developed to a point of sharply decreasing usefulness. Weapons systems and their logistics have become extremely complex and expensive, decreasing their social utility. The costs of war have precluded major operations unless against a clearly inferior enemy. At the same time, we, and others, now have fantastic over-capacity to annihilate our enemies and ourselves. Our capacities for mass destruction argue compellingly that post-modern war has grown past its supposed premise for legitimacy, state interest.

Fourth and finally, the legitimacy of war as a state enterprise has been undermined by the institutionalized networks of supra-national alliances. States have long since recognized, in this way, that security needs have outgrown the capacities of state sovereignty. The accelerating advance of globalization processes has eroded and even dissolved the boundaries between public and private, state and non-state, soldier and civilian, and legitimate and criminal.

The Goals and Opportunity Contexts of the New Wars

The New Wars differ from traditional wars in their *goals, methods, and economics*. The goals of the new wars are no longer the control of territory, but the control of people via identity politics. Identity politics, or “particularism,” is the claim to power based on a particular identity (nation, clan, religion, history, language, economic identity, etc). Identity politics therefore, are based on *labels*, and are inherently *exclusive*. They relate to nostalgic, idealized representations of the past, and are re-invented in contrast to the corrosion of other sources of political legitimacy, such as socialism or attachment to former colonial masters. Identity politics arise in contrast to the corrosion of other political legitimacy, or in the vacuum created by the absence of forward-looking projects. These are situations of the “failing” or “failed” states we hear about.

Label-based exclusivism produces social and political fragmentation. Conflicts that are often reported to us as being “religious” or “tribal” or “racial” are virtually always identity-politics conflicts instigated by power-lords for economic or political gain, in which the power figures have *recruited* religious, tribal, or racial allegiances as tools of control.

Particularist, identity politicians (Hitler, Milosevic, and countless others) have shown that appealing to the victim mentality, even of a privileged majority, is an extremely powerful tool to gain control over a population in order to terrorize and drive out of exterminate a minority. I have heard whites in the American South talk of the unfair advantages held over them by African- Americans.

The identity politics that drive the new wars are related to globalization processes. Diaspora communities in wealthy first-world countries exert greatly enhanced influence, imposing their own frustrations and fantasies on local situation. American communities are huge sources of support for Northern Ireland, Israel, and Cuba. Global technology lends tremendous power to political mobilization, through television, radio, & videos.

The administration of economic globalization, by the U.S.-led International Monetary Fund and World Trade Commission, has intensified competition for decreasing resources at the level of states, and has fueled growing criminalization of economies. The IMF's routine structural adjustment demands for liberalization, deregulation, and privatization have all shrunken tax bases and resources for governance, while empowering transnational crime and all levels of corruption. The ease with which economically-troubled populations can be manipulated by label-oriented politics has fueled the new identity wars.

The new wars are predatory in nature, instigated and manipulated by political warlords for economic and political plunder and power. The new wars are most likely to present in "failing" or "failed" states. When a state lacks the resources to maintain its legitimate monopoly over violence, violent power struggles enter the vacuum. If a state lacks the economic resources --- trade and customs duties, collected taxes, state-owned enterprises --- to maintain services and infrastructure for its people, the likelihood of conflict surges.

The New Wars' Strategies, Tactics and Methods

The new wars exhibit a radically changed mode of warfare. They draw on historical experiences of both guerrilla warfare and counterinsurgency. In conventional war, the goal is the capture of territory via military battles. Guerrilla warfare, in contrast, aims to control territory through shared political vision, by winning the hearts and minds of the people and

circumventing concentrated military might. Mao wrote of the guerrilla thus being able to operate “like a fish in the sea.” Counterinsurgency, which has a record of almost universal failure, has aimed to counter guerrilla methods by destroying the environment where the guerrilla operates, “poisoning the sea.” Defoliation and forced population “resettlement” are typical tactics of counterinsurgency.

The new wars aim to avoid battle and to control territory through political control over a population; they accomplish this political control by getting rid of everyone having a different identity or even a different opinion. Rather than loyalty to a state or an idea, the loyalty is to a *label*. *These wars aim to create an unfriendly or dangerous environment for everyone who cannot be controlled by the chosen identity label.* The new wars use mass killings, forcible displacement, environmental damage (landmines, shells and rockets against civilians, etc) and a wide range of political, economic, and psychological intimidation to achieve population expulsion. This is why these new wars produce such terrible numbers of refugees and displaced persons, and why civilian casualties are so extremely high. At the turn of the last century, the ratio of military to civilian casualties was 8:1; in the wars of the 1990s, this ratio was completely reversed, to approximately 1:8. War behaviors that were outlawed in classical warfare are essential, dominant features of the new wars: rape, torture, and murder of non-combatants; and destruction of historic monuments.

Instead of vertically organized military units, the new wars are being fought by highly decentralized, privatized groups: paramilitaries, local warlords, foreign mercenaries, criminal gangs, police forces, special military forces, and sometimes internationalized foreign troop peacekeeping or peacemaking forces. Warring parties utilize cell phones and the internet to coordinate trade in contraband and weapons, for operational logistics, and to evade the law. In contrast to traditional wars, the new wars use small numbers of soldiers in combat, & unemployment is high. The new wars commonly use children as soldiers, after kidnapping the children from their homes or schools.

The New Globalized War Economy

The new globalized war economy is essentially an extreme version of globalization, the virtual opposite of the war economies of the two world wars. Old war economies were centralized, totally mobilized toward the war

effort, and government- controlled. In contrast, the new globalized war economies are informalized, developing in the absence of viable state governance, where downward-spiraling state revenues lead to growing civil and military disorder. Salient features of the new wars are privatization of security forces and the military, escalating crime and corruption, and marked dependence on external resources. Instead of heightened domestic production, the new wars damage and paralyze industry and trade.

Fighting units finance themselves through plunder, black market, and outside assistance (diaspora funding; the "taxation" of humanitarian aid; or illegal trade in drugs, guns, and lootable commodities such as diamonds or oil). Hence, the new war economies *depend on* and *are sustained by* continuing violence! The new wars feed themselves on war, and need war to survive.

The new wars spill over borders, and the destabilizing effects of refugees, crime, illegal trade, and famine stimulate conflict in neighboring states. Clusters of war economies develop around these processes and the raging small arms trade. The processes of identity politics tend to spread across borders, too.

In the new wars, warring parties share the aim of spreading fear and hatred and a climate of insecurity and suspicion -- and are therefore often mutually-supporting and mutually reinforcing. Warring factions do, in fact, sometimes cooperate for economic or military gain. They are not trying to win traditional battles, but control people through predatory social relationships.

A word here about the participation of our own United States in the new war economies. I am troubled by realities that point to American policies that work to stimulate and/or profit from new war dynamics in faraway places among faraway peoples.

Our militaristic answer to terrorist crime has been, from its outset, wildly misguided. It has increased not only terrorist risks, but has made American militarism the world's greatest fear. Why would we pursue such a benighted policy? Could there be a connection to the gigantic American weapons industry, one of the world's two leading exporters of the small arms that feed new war violence? Could there be a link between our own warmaking and the privatization of our own military that pours tax revenues into the

pockets of Blackwater and other mercenary contractors? Could our warmaking be connected to the subsequent need for massive reconstructive projects, the projects that are the business of Bechtel, Halliburton and others? Might the individual fortunes of oil concessions be a windfall of war in Iraq? How much influence over the decisions of a mighty nation-state can extremely powerful individuals have? You can, I'm sure, add more troubling questions of your own.

These policies and decisions do not benefit the American people, or even the overall American economy, but provide massive profits to a very few. The costs in suffering are unimaginable.

Examples of New Wars

Some of these new wars are very familiar to us; many others have largely escaped American public notice. In the "ethnic cleansing" war in Bosnia-Herzegovina, power lords recruited old suspicions, injuries, and prides to divide previously integrated groups of Orthodox Serbs, Muslim Bosnians, and Catholic Croats so they could each rule over a homogeneous population. In order to homogenize their particular regions, the Christian Serbs and Croats ostracized, drove out, or killed those they decreed no longer belonged. The First World states assumed the ethnic cleansing leaders represented legitimate new states, and unwittingly served the ethnic cleansing interests of Milosevic and the other warlords by negotiating to award each a territory.

In Rwanda, the Hutus and Tutsis are not racially, religiously, linguistically, or geographically different from each other. But the Colonizing British created a class of more-educated, more politically powerful indigenous Rwandans, and they became known as Tutsis. In the run-up to the 1994 genocide, the Hutu-run government radio spewed vicious threats against the Tutsi "snakes" and "cockroaches," exhorting Hutus to kill them all. No outsiders backed Hutus who opposed this identity campaign, and 800,000 people died.

The Sierra Leonean "civil" war exposed economic features of the new wars. Sierra Leone has diamond mines, and the notorious Liberian war-profiteer Charles Taylor organized the Sierra Leone war as a way to gain control of and loot the diamond mines. The rebel forces that terrorized the country weren't interested in changing the government, but took advantage of the

state's fragility and incapacity, disrupting Sierra Leone's population and government forces through unimaginable violence. The longer they could keep Sierra Leone in a state of violence and panic, the more they could profit from the diamonds.

Uganda is yet another new war example. Joseph Kony's Lord's Resistance Army is a paramilitary force that has terrorized the northern Ugandan Acholi people since 1987. The aims of the LRA are obscure; Kony claims to be fighting for a government based on the ten commandments, but the LRA activities have focused on self-sustaining predation. Ugandan President Yoweri Museveni has long-standing hostility toward the Acholi, and has allowed the LRA to continue operating. The LRA is perhaps the world's most severe example of child soldier abuses: they abduct children from homes and schools, force new recruits to ritually kill weaker children, and make sex slaves of girls. In northern Uganda today, many children hike miles every night to sleep in village centers for protection. The anti-Acholi war goes on.

First World Responses to the New Wars

The First-World powers have related and responded to the new wars in a variety of ways:

- 1) Patronage and instigation (Iraq-Iran, Afghanistan, Algeria, Nicaragua, Mozambique, Israel-Palestine, DRC, etc);
- 2) Neglect (Sudan, Rwanda, Burundi, Democratic Republic of the Congo, etc) – when precious and readily-available resources are not present for the taking;
- 3) The humanitarian and peacebuilding efforts of non-governmental organizations;
- 4) Regional peacekeeping and mediation efforts, including the delivery of humanitarian aid, protection of people in safe havens, disarmament and demobilization of armed forces, monitoring of elections, reporting human rights violations and monitoring ceasefires;
- 5) International diplomatic negotiations from above, which tend to empower illegitimate warlords by granting them legitimacy. The error is in assuming that they are legitimate representatives of constituencies, rather than being predators.
- 6) U.N. peacekeeping and peacemaking missions, organized by the U.N. Security Council, and composed of individual states' military forces. These missions have suffered from the misconceptions that the

warring parties a) are coherent armies b) representing legitimate state-like bodies who c) want to gain control of territory d) by fighting battles.

- 7) And economic, weapons, and targeted individual sanctions, which are evolving but have caused horrendous harm to vulnerable populations --- which their rulers weren't interested in protecting anyway.

Responses to the new wars have been virtually unanimous failures: *Why?* The short-range focus of politicians, media excitability and lack of conscience, lack of international coordination, and lack of resources have all contributed to these failures. "But the most important explanation is misperception, the persistence of inherited thinking about organized violence, the inability to understand the character and logic of the new warfare."³ As long as intervening powers treat warring parties as if they have legitimate claims to statehood, these interventions may actually cause more damage than good.

Alternative Responses to the New Wars

Several prominent theories have surfaced to conceptualize and explain this changing scene of global violence. A great deal of attention has been given to Huntington's argument in his *Clash of Civilizations*, that the world is dividing along fault lines of history, essentially pitting the Christian West against the Muslim East. However, Huntington's analysis fails to pay much attention to globalizing processes, the non-Muslim global East and South (including China and India), or the profusion of major violent conflicts that don't fit his Christian-Muslim Armageddon scenario. His view offers little beyond fuel for continuation of American imperial motives.

A second, more deeply troubling analysis acknowledges that the world has moved beyond traditional state-based norms, but sees these changes as a reversion to primitive chaos. This fatalistic analysis treats the new wars as tribal or ethnic expressions of Hobbesian human baseness. In this view, the best we can do is apply Dutch-boy fingers to the wounds as they appear.

But international political science experts Mary Kaldor,⁴ Richard Falk,⁵ Robert Johannsen,⁶ Chalmers Johnson⁷ and others contend that the world does, in fact, have a genuine alternative, and it is this alternative that is the subject of the rest of my talk.

The Cosmopolitan Approach

In order to distinguish this forward-looking alternative from past concepts of internationalism and globalization, this approach has been termed

“cosmopolitanism,” drawn from Immanuel Kant’s writings.

“Cosmopolitanism refers to a positive political vision that embraces tolerance, multiculturalism, civility, democracy, and legal respect for . . . overriding universal principles” including human rights and humanitarian law.⁸ I don’t think the term is catchy enough, and it suffers from connecting images to 1950s cocktails and Hope fraternity pranks, but we’ll work with it.

To our present point in history, the world’s military and economic powers have not grasped the rational disconnection between the reality of globalizing finance, trade, information, and culture they’ve promoted, on one hand, and the unreality of state-based politics on the other. State borders have become porous to all forms of movement, and economies are webbed together so that national economies struggle for identity, but the world’s military powers cling to non-globalized, state-based political governance. Interestingly, for most of the world’s peoples the national state is *not* the real frame of legitimacy; most people relate to more local identities. Even religious identities are particularized; Islam is fractured into angry subgroups, and I cannot fathom the Christianity many of my supposed religious brethren claim.

We are, indeed, at an historic, historical crossroads. The legitimacy of the European-American concept of the nation-state, evolved over the past half-millennium or more, appears to be running on fumes. Globalization, which has been evolving for thousands of years, has sprinted past the utility of the state-based system, and reality demands that humanity respond with governance that can responsibly embrace globalizing human activity.

Specifically, the world needs responses to the new wars that swing from “hate and fear” to “hearts and minds.” We must replace the prevailing identity politics of exclusion with politics of inclusion. We need to replace the past’s focus on state security with dedication to human security. Primitive Hobbesian urges for power, control, and profit must be at least balanced by invested priorities of respect for all others, inclusive community, and a sustainable future.

How Can the Apparent Idealism of the Cosmopolitan Approach Be Made Realistic?

The keystone of a cosmopolitan approach to the new wars is the reconstruction of *legitimacy*.⁹ Power always depends on the perception of legitimacy, not violence. Violence has never, in all of history, been sufficient by itself to sustain political power. The new wars are precipitates of the breakdown of legitimacy. Given a vacuum of legitimate governance, label-based warlords can readily recruit chosen traumas and religious or ethnic suspicions in order to particularize, polarize, exclude, and mobilize political power.

Top-down diplomacy must be replaced with effective conflict transformation and peacebuilding. Top-level diplomacy suffers from several critical weaknesses. First, public, official talks with warlords confer a sort of public legitimacy on illegitimate, indeed criminal, leadership. Second, top-down diplomatic solutions almost inevitably empower the identity-based horrors they are trying to end. Territorial partition is what the ethnic cleansers are after, and power-sharing agreements have proved impossible fancies. Third, top-down diplomacy tends to exaggerate the power of the warring parties to implement agreements. Indeed, this is a crucial fault of top-level peace negotiations in general; they are mere paper agreements between men in suits who make promises they have no way to keep. Unless popular support is engaged, and unless root causes of conflict are genuinely addressed, diplomatic treaties are doomed to fail.

The cosmopolitan approach of conflict transformation and peacebuilding is a complex, long-term process, requiring major investments of expertise, committed political support, and material resources. The engagement of hearts and minds can only be sustained by real change that moves toward inclusive, non-discriminatory relationships; processes of decision-making that are open, fair, and transparent; and resulting political and economic systems that are just and accountable. The scope of conflict transformation and peacebuilding are beyond the limits of time we have, but important elements are:

- 1) In the presence of active violence, warring parties *can* and *must* be engaged in talks, *but in a context there other political constituencies are included as equally legitimate parties*. In every new war environment there are significant groups of dissenting civil society who argue against exclusivism and for peace. Negotiations should

aim to legitimize these islands of civility, and marginalize those who profit from warfare. Over time, this is the process that is bringing stable peace to Northern Ireland, for example. In West Africa, Central America, Eastern Europe, and Philippines, nonviolent resisters have reigned in and overthrown violent oppressors.

- 2) Conflict transformation and peacebuilding are relationship-building processes, based on inclusiveness, tolerance, and respect for all people.
- 3) Peacebuilding is focused on just processes, rather than results and objectives. Hoped-for ends do not, after all, justify corrupt or unjust means. This is not just Jesus and Gandhi talking, it is also reality; actions generate unexpected results different from what was "foreseen." Open, accountable actions based on integrity tend to yield positive outcomes.
- 4) Peacebuilding is nonviolent. It refuses to legitimize violence.
- 5) Peacebuilding is long-term work. It is not crisis-driven, but is crisis-responsive. Peacebuilding seeks genuine redress of root structural causes of conflict.
- 6) Peacebuilding empowers people to be the agents of their own changes.
- 7) Peacebuilding accents analysis and the wisdom of discourse over action --- ask all the questions first, so you don't do the dumb thing and shoot. Embrace the full complexity of problems, rejecting the weakness of simplistic thinking.

In the context of the new wars, conflict transformation and peacebuilding can be advanced in a number of realistic ways. First, civil society --- the network of non-governmental organizations, grass-roots initiatives, and international agencies --- are active all over the globe, and are pushing toward cooperative ventures together. Civil society actors are agents for legitimate governance where new wars rage. Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch have brought the new war horrors to the world's attention; without them, we would never have heard of the Darfur genocide, for instance. Advocates like Jody Williams, who won the Nobel Peace Prize for her work to outlaw landmines, are working the world over to change global society. Local and transnational humanitarian and conflict-resolution groups are at work. These actors have stepped into the void of global government leadership in recent years, and have grown to be a real strength, but are vulnerable in war situations and need committed support. We need to replace the yes-men political scientists who now advise our leaders'

decisions with legitimate experts who are aware of new realities, and who question continually failing policies based on political “realism.”

Second, cosmopolitan law enforcement can, and must, replace military peacekeeping, military peace-enforcement, and military approaches to humanitarian aid. Traditional assumptions about the dynamics of war and peace have collapsed in a succession of failures related to globalizing processes, including the global flood of weapons and underlying conditions of injustices and unmet human needs. In Iraq, we are witnessing the gross inability of military forces to do police work. The military mission is, at its core, inconsistent with the priorities of humanitarian police work; the military mission is to overwhelm with force, and is deeply hard-wired toward extreme responses. Experts around the world know that the arrival of military and guns immediately heightens the risk of violence in The mission of police work is radically different from the military paradigm. Police work is protective, rather than combative; police work is integrative, not meant to pursue conflict. Police work enforces law with minimum force, and aims to empower people toward lawful, mutually compatible behavior. Robert Johannsen has proposed that the United Nations commission a standing, permanent, non-national, humanitarian police-trained force that would be ready to respond immediately to situations of humanitarian emergency.¹⁰ Such a force of perhaps 10,000 expert agents would be able to bring expertise and potential legitimate order into situations where military-based responses now occur only after many months or not at all. A strict code of fair, humanitarian behavior would be necessary for a cosmopolitan police force. We’ve become all too familiar with the abuses and crimes of our military forces; much greater competence and integrity are essential. This would be a radical improvement in our world’s capacity to provide cosmopolitan law-enforcement, bridging the chasm between soldiering and policing – separating belligerents, maintaining ceasefires, protecting safety zones and relief corridors, ensuring freedom of movement, securing community safety, and returning displaced persons and refugees.¹¹

The reconstruction of legitimate political authority and institutions must begin coincident with --- not following --- the cessation of violence.

Reconstruction includes:

- basic assurances of safe water, power, transportation, and telecommunications;
- an independent, transparent judiciary;
- an accountable, benevolent police and zones of civil law and order;

- the resumption of domestic, grass-roots economic processes;
- the disarmament and demobilization of various military forces;
- employment and education programs;
- and an independent, free media to stop the relentless propaganda.

All of these reconstructive efforts are parts of the process of conflict transformation, the movement toward a safe, just society.

Peacebuilding is the viable alternative to the new wars of identity and profit. What has been lacking has not been the alternative, but the political choice, and the political will to back it up with commitment and resources.

Over the past hundred and fifty years, civilization has already moved assertively toward this cosmopolitan approach. The international community has agreed on laws governing abuses of legitimate power in war and in controlling a state's own citizens: these include the Geneva Conventions, the Hague Conferences, the United Nations Charter, and the International Criminal Court. Though they have been manipulated for the advantage of a powerful few, the United Nations possesses agencies for potential cosmopolitan economic governance, in the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and the World Trade Commission.

Idealism, or the Necessary Option?

Warfare has changed remarkably from the traditional concept we have known, because the aims and strategies of war-makers has shifted with globalizing tides. Our 350-year-old state-centered model of governance is losing legitimacy as well to globalizing realities. How will the world respond? How *can* the leaders and people of the world respond, in order to regain human security and sustainable peace?

The alternative cosmopolitan approach to the challenges of the new wars begins with the recognition that no solution can work if it is founded traditional concepts that legitimize the political goals of the identity-based warring parties. Any rational solution must begin with principles of alternative politics that prioritize inclusiveness, tolerance, and mutual respect.¹² Is this impossibly idealistic? Mary Kaldor writes, in defense of these proposals, "I am not an optimist, yet my practical suggestions may seem utopian. I offer them in hope, not in confidence, as the only alternative to a grim future."¹³

¹ Mary Kaldor, *New and Old Wars: Organized Violence in a Global Era*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA, 1999, 2001).

² Edward N. Luttwak, "Towards post-heroic warfare," *Foreign affairs*, 74, 3 (May/June 1995).

³

⁴ Kaldor, .

⁵ Richard Falk, .

⁶ Robert Johanssen, .

⁷ Chalmers Johnson, .

⁸ Kaldor, .

⁹ Kaldor, .

¹⁰ Johanssen, .

¹¹ Kaldor, .

¹² Kaldor, .

¹³ Kaldor, .