Affective Bonds and Moral Norms: A Communitarian Approach to the Emerging Global Society

AMITAI ETZIONI

Most communitarian writings have focused either on general philosophical positions (e.g., the relationship of the good to the right)[1] or on intra-societal issues, such as the relationship between democracy and community,[2] women's status,[3] and abortion or pornography.[4] In recent years numerous developments have occurred on the international level (for example, the thickening of the European Union and the rise of transnational norms) that suggest the time is ripe to apply communitarian thinking more extensively to international relations. This article seeks to point to several key areas in which communitarian analysis might be productively applied (including the rise of the global civil society, the development of transnational moral dialogues, the evolution of some sets of shared norms and even values, and efforts to fashion supranational levels of community), and the reasons why such application might be beneficial.

Attempts to proceed in this direction face the difficulty that there is no one agreed-upon communitarian position. East Asian communitarians,[5] who might be called authoritarian communitarians, differ greatly from the works of scholars associated with communitarian thinking in political science, especially Charles Taylor, Michael Sandel, and Michael Walzer. And these in turn differ from the works of sociologists such as Ferdinand

1. See, for instance, chapter one in Yong Huang, *Religious Goodness & Political Rightness: Beyond the Liberal-Communitarian Debate* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2001).
2. See Charles Taylor, »No Community, No Democracy, Part I« *Responsive Community,* 13, no. 4 (Fall 2003): 17–27; and Charles Taylor, »No Community, No Democracy, Part II« *Responsive Community,* 14, no. 1 (Winter 2003/04): 15–25.
3. Elizabeth Frazer and Nicola Lacey, *The Politics of Community: A Feminist Critique of the Liberal-Communitarian Debate* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993).
4. See, for example, Michael Sandel, *Democracy's Discontent: America in Search of a Public Philosophy* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 1996).
5. For more on the subject, see Daniel A. Bell, *East Meets West: Human Rights and Democracy in East Asia* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000).

Tönnies, Emile Durkheim, Robert N. Bellah and his associates, and a group referred to as responsive or political communitarians, which includes Philip Selznick, William A. Galston, and Amitai Etzioni.[6] This article draws on a diversity of communitarian writings other than the East Asian ones; it draws especially on sociological writings.

Many of the issues raised in this article require empirical exploration. Such evidence is not provided here either because it has not been collected yet or because surveying existing studies would have turned this preliminary exploration into a book.

The Rise of a Global Civil Society

In the past, communitarian analysis has focused on concepts that apply to communities, and by some stretches to societies, which may have some community-like features, for instance, shared conceptions of the good, a shared identity, and a sense of belonging. (Societies and nations are sometimes referred to as imagined communities.[7]) In contrast, the study of international relations has historically focused on relations among nation-states, whether they are engaged in diplomatic give and take, war, or trade. None of these relationships have communal features. Even when nation-states are members of international organizations, these organizations are not considered to have communal attributes but rather structures in which various nation-states collaborate in line with their respective national interests, which are controlled by national representatives. Hence, in these intergovernmental organizations, the member states' concern for a common good – to the extent that it serves no one member state in particular or requires sacrifices for the longer-run well being of all member states – is typically low. Therefore, references to an »international community« are considered bits of rhetorical excess.

A key communitarian question, however, is whether new »supranational« bodies, of which the European Union is considered the most advanced, are developing some communal features and governing agencies. And whether other similar regional groupings of nation-states might develop in similar fashion – for instance, in central America or Southeast

6. See chapter four in Frazer and Lacey, *The Politics of Community.*
7. Benedict R. O. G. Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1983).

Asia. Finally, what are the implications of such regional groupings for the world order?

Before I can suggest that there are now some indications that a measure of one or more transnational communities are developing, I must define communities. This is important given that major scholars have argued that the concept of community is so vague that it can hardly be used responsibly.[8] However, one can translate the meaning of the term community in common parlance into a reasonably precise sociological term. Namely, communities have two attributes. One is commonly recognized: Members of a community are involved in a web of criss-crossing, affective bonds (as distinct from one-on-one bonds that characterize friendships). And one is less often mentioned: Communities share a moral culture, a set of values and norms. In the following paragraphs I examine whether the first attribute can now be found on the transnational level and then I ask the same question about the second attribute.

Several recent studies have pointed to the rise of transnational, interpersonal bonds, sometimes referred to as transnational citizenship.[9] People who hold citizenship in more than one country have interpersonal ties and a sense of loyalty to two or more nations, which in turn may dampen their commitment to any one nation and thus foster some transnational bonding. True, in some cases, multi-citizenship may merely exist to facilitate travel for business people or other strictly utilitarian and pragmatic considerations, say tax advantages, avoidance of military service, or an escape rout in case of a totalitarian take over. However, in many instances, holding multiple citizenship does seem to reflect a lack of willingness to be fully involved in the community of one nation or another. This may be a reason why some Mexicans in the United States do not seek to become American citizens; the reason why Turks who live in Germany send their children to be educated in Turkey during their teen years; and so on.

8. Robert Booth Fowler, *The Dance With Community: The Contemporary Debate in American Political Thought* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 1991).

9. See, among others, William Alonso, »Citizenship, Nationality, and Other Identities,« *Journal of International Affairs* 48 (1995): 585–599; Rainer Baubock, *Transnational Citizenship: Membership and Rights in International Migration* (Brookfield, VT: Edward Elgar, 1995); Richard Munch, *Nation and Citizenship in the Global Age: From National to Transnational Ties and Identities* (New York, NY: Palgrave, 2001); Daniel M. Weinstock, »Prospects for Transnational Citizenship and Democracy,« *Ethics & International Affairs* 15, no. 2 (2001): 53–66. See also the website of the World Service Authority, which issues passports and other documents for »world citizens«: http://www.worldgovernment.org.

Another indicator of the scope of transnational bonds is the high level of transnational remittances. In 2003 alone, Mexican workers in the United States sent $13.3 billion back to Mexico, which surpassed Mexican levels of foreign direct investment.[10] The British Department for International Development estimates that such remittances constitute »more than half of Bangladesh's development budget, 40 percent of India's trade deficit and most of Pakistan's foreign exchange sources.«[11] These can be seen as an indicator of the rise of transnational communities based on, as Roberto Suro of the Pew Hispanic Center puts it, a »bond of interdependence that jumps across borders.«[12]

The growth and prevalence of the Internet and frequent transnational travel are also contributing to the formation of transnational bonds among people who share some sociological attributes. Thus, although it may well be a rhetorical exaggeration to speak of a worldwide Jewish community, a transnational community of Roma (gypsies), and transnational affinities between gay and lesbian people, informal observations indicate that transnational bonds among various people who view themselves similarly exist and seem to be rising.

Transnational Associations

Since 1990 there has been increasing evidence that an inchoate global society is evolving (the term inchoate is predicative of the extent to which a global society might evolve as well as to the direction it might take).[13] Scores of studies have shown an explosive growth in transnational voluntary associations.[14] They now number in many thousands and they include organizations as different as Amnesty International, the International Red Cross, Doctors without Borders, and Transparency International. In these associations citizens from many nations work together in

10. John Authers, »Mexican Migrants Send Home Dollars 13 bn,« *Financial Times*, January 31, 2004, 2.
11. Cited in Alastair Lawson-Tancred, »Expatriate Remittances to Asia Exceed Western Aid,« *Financial Times*, June 24, 2003, 6.
12. Roberto Suro, »Money Sent Home Binds Families,« *Baltimore Sun*, December 4, 3003, 21A.
13. Marlies Glasius, Mary Kaldour, and Helmut Anheier, eds., *Global Civil Society 2001* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2001).
14. Commission on Global Governance, *Our Global Neighborhood* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1995), 32.

ways that are similar to how they work within their own national societies and local communities. Aside from carrying out some social business, beyond what is carried out by intergovernmental agencies (such as WHO), these voluntary associations generate a modicum of social fabric as members learn to know each other personally during transnational meetings, as they work together across borders, and as they campaign for various issues and candidates for office within these associations.[15]

The rise of transnational citizenship, remittances, affective communications, voluntary associations, and social movements has several communitarian implications. They suggest that some social or communal bonds, a sense of identity and loyalty, are beginning to be formed across national borders.

These organizations, international nongovernmental organizations (INGOs), also play a political role on the international level, similar to the political role of NGOs. INGOs lobby various intergovernmental bodies, such as the United Nations, the World Bank, and the IMF, to change their policies and even structures in ways these voluntary associations favor. INGOs have been criticized for being undemocratic as they are not accountable to anyone.[16] However, it should be noted that the same criticism has been applied to domestic voluntary associations.[17] Finally, there are also transnational social movements, such as those concerned about the environment, women's rights, and anti-globalization.[18]

The rise of transnational citizenship, remittances, affective communications, voluntary associations, and social movements has several com-

15. Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye, »Transgovernmental Relations and International Organizations,« *World Politics* 27, no. 1 (1974): 39–62; and Diane Stone, »The ›Policy Research‹ Knowledge Elite and Global Policy Processes,« *Non-state Actors in World Politics*, eds. William Wallace and Daphne Josselin (New York: Palgrave, 2002), 113–132.
16. For a discussion, see the collection of essays in the *Chicago Journal of International Law* 3, no. 1 (2002): 155–206.
17. See for instance, Jesse Macy, *Political Parties in the United States* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1900).
18. The classic text on transnational social movements in general is Margaret Keck and Kathryn Sikkink, *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Relations* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1998).

munitarian implications. They suggest that some social or communal bonds, a sense of identity and loyalty, are beginning to be formed across national borders. Also, they show that a »third sector,« one based on voluntary relationships (not based on command and control nor on exchanges), is now developing on the transnational level. Finally, people are acting to some small extent as transnational citizens, as they lobby international organizations to change the ways they conduct themselves. In short, transnational relations meets one of the criteria of the definition of community: There are webs of affective bonds that cross borders.

A methodological point is called for here. If one views communities as a dichotomous variable, they either exist or they do not, few of the transnational bonds and associations may suffice to qualify as a »community.« However, if one views communities as a continuous variable, then – as the previous discussion suggests – there can be little doubt that a measure of community exits on the transnational level and that these crisscrossing, affective bonds and associations are increasing in their affect and effect.

Transnational, Shared Understandings of the Good

The second attribute of communities that I described above is a shared moral culture. This attribute concerns a major fault line between liberals and communitarians. Communitarians argue that there ought to be shared understandings of the good while liberals hold that the right should trump the good, that each person should choose his or her own moral ends.[19]

Some scholars have suggested that every state in effect favors some conception of the good and that a state cannot be completely neutral in these matters,[20] but liberal scholars hold that such conceptions ought to be as thin as possible. The question of what is the appropriate scope of shared conception of the good, is usually debated as a matter of principle rather than in the context of an analysis of any particular kind of society, nation, or global community. However, Charles Taylor pointed out that the more diverse a society, the less acceptable it would be to impose

19. See Yong Huang, *Religious Goodness & Political Rightness: Beyond the Liberal-Communitarian Debate*.

20. William Galston, *Liberal Purposes: Goods, Virtues, and Diversity in the Liberal State* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

shared understandings of the good.[21] Because the global society, whatever its scope, is clearly highly diverse, Taylor's observation would necessitate a thin conception of the common good. At the same a sociologist may point out that without some such conception, without some shared values, a society cannot be formed nor sustained once formed.

Sociologists tend to approach the question of what is the proper scope of the shared common good as an empirical rather than a normative question. They tend to think in terms of what scope of such conception a society – whether domestic or transnational – requires in order to be formed and sustained rather than asking whether such conceptions should be viewed as liberal or anti-liberal.

Before the sociological approach and its implications can be spelled out, it is best to present a key difference among sociologists on the issue at hand because it has direct implications for international analysis. Some sociologists view society mainly as an arena in which one class dominates the others or in which classes (or some other social group, especially racial and ethnic ones) clash.[22] Power and economic interests dominate; and normative claims are considered ideologies that various groups form in line with their interests or use to mislead other groups. This position in international relations is that of realpolitik.[23] Recent discussions of and references to a global empire as opposed to a global society also fall into this category.[24]

In contrast, other sociologists, drawing on the work of Emile Durkheim and others, view society as having a normative »shell«, formed by a consensus of basic values,[25] which in the political arena help to prevent differences among the members from resulting in civil war; encourage the acceptance of procedures, such as the winner of a democratic election taking office despite differences of opinions and interests; and which

21. See Charles Taylor, *Multiculturalism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994).
22. See Lewis A. Coser, *Functions of Social Conflict* (New York: The Free Press, 1964).
23. For example, see John J. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics* (New York: Norton, 2001).
24. For two far left examples, see Noam Chomsky, *Hegemony or Survival: America's Quest for Full Spectrum Dominance* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2003); and Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *Empire* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000).
25. Talcott Parsons, *Toward a General Theory of Action* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1951).

lead to people viewing themselves as part of a community, society, or nation. This normative shell in turn encourages the members of a community to make sacrifices for the common good of their community, society, or nation, sacrifices that they are unwilling to make for others. Thus, West Germans have been shelling out hundreds of billions of dollars for the reconstruction of East Germany – because East Germans are members of the German community. West Germans have not shown that they are willing to make anything remotely approaching the level of contributions to East Germany to members of other nations-states. Similarly, the American tax system collects much less in taxes from some states but grants them a disproportionately larger share of federal expenditures in some areas. While some grumbling may be heard on occasion, Americans in general support the system. But one assumes they would not support a tax system that would disproportionately send more money to other nations, even nearby Mexico, than to American states.

The question here is whether shared norms and values can and do develop on a transnational level and whether they may promote a willingness to resolve differences in a peaceful manner and foster decisions that make substantial sacrifices for people of other nations – that is, acquire some measure of the second defining attribute of a community. Progress on this front is being made among the nation-states that are part of the European Union, which is somewhat of a transnational community. EU-member nation-states have committed not to war against one another and they have been willing to make sizeable monetary contributions to member states that they are unwilling to make for nonmember states.

Some shared norms are also developing on a global level. Before I list some shared norms it should be noted that reference is only to the attentive public.[26] Hundreds of millions of people who are preoccupied with the elementary demands of making a living, who do not recognize a political realm at all, or who recognize only the village level, are not part of the attentive publics. However, the same difference between the attentive and inattentive publics is found also in domestic societies, but this does not prevent them from functioning as integrated societies. Moreover, on

26. As defined by Gabriel Almond, the attentive public is comprised of people who are informed and interested in policy issues, and those who make up the audience for policy »discussions among the elites.« (Though Almond focuses on foreign policy, attentive publics also exist in the domestic realm.) Gabriel A. Almond, *The American People and Foreign Policy* (New York, NY: Frederick A. Praeger, 1960, 1950]), 138.

both the domestic and transnational levels, opinion-makers often affect norms, even for those people who are not directly attentive to political communications. Paul F. Lazarsfeld noted that communications do not flow directly from the media to the masses, but typically they flow from the media to what he calls opinion leaders and from them to the people, in a two-step communication process.[27] Finally, the fact that some people only pay lip service to the evolving norms on the transnational level is not necessary debilitating for the formation of some measure of transnational community as the same phenomenon is observed on the domestic level. Moreover, paying lip service shows that the people involved pay some homage to the evolving norms, rather than rejecting their validity altogether.

Probably the best example of a set of norms (which, when taken together reflect the sharing of a basic value) is the respect for human rights in general and the UN Declaration of Human Rights in particular. True, there are great differences in the scope of rights to which homage is paid (e.g., are socio-economic rights included?) and in the interpretation of specific rights within nation-states; however, very few leaders and opinion makers, as well as groups within the attentive public, outright deny the validity of human rights. In fact, many consider these rights semi-scared[28] or natural.[29] Even totalitarian leaders tend to explain why they do not heed these rights yet or why they do not heed them more fully (e.g., that economic development must take precedence is a common argument), but these leaders do not deny their validity.[30]

Other specific norms that appear to be gaining in worldwide respect are women's rights (see, for instance, Afghanistan's new constitution) and the environment. Mentioning the Kyoto Protocol is enough to bring to mind how widespread the normative commitment to the environment

27. Paul Lazarsfeld, Bernard Berelson, and Hazel Gaudet, *The People's Choice: How the Voter Makes Up His Mind in a Presidential Campaign*, 3rd ed. (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1968), 151.
28. Elie Wiesel in »Human Rights at Fifty: Program 9849.« Narr. Mary Gray Davidson. Prod. Stanley Foundation. Common Ground Radio. KWPC, Muscatine, Iowa. December 8, 1998. Transcript available at: http://www.commongroundradio.org/shows/98/9849.html. Accessed 1/27/03.
29. For a discussion, see John Finnis, *Natural Law and Natural Rights* (Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 1988).
30. Daniel A. Bell, *East Meets West: Human Rights and Democracy in East Asia*.

has become in recent years, albeit these commitments are not necessarily that deep. There are also much narrower norms that seem to have gained a transnational following, including limiting the hunting of whales, bans on the ivory trade, and opposition to land mines, among others. Similarly, there has been an almost worldwide rejection of the Bush Doctrine of unilateral and preemptive interventions. Although there are great variations in the strength of the transnational commitments to these norms, they are not vacuous because they have some behavioral consequences.[31]

Moral dialogues are often messy; they meander and have no clean beginnings or endings. They are passionate and often contentious. Nevertheless, over time they often lead to new shared understandings.

Here is just one case in point to stay with the last example. In preparing for the 2003 war against Iraq, the Bush Administration initially planned to confront on its own what the U.S. president called the »axis of evil«. When the proposed unilateral action against these three sovereign states encountered worldwide criticism, including among close U.S. allies, and raised doubts within the United States (and even within the administration), Secretary of State Colin Powell succeeded in persuading the administration to seek the approval of the United Nations for its plans to use military force against Iraq. The result is well documented: The United States faced strong objections from three of the five permanent members of the UN Security Council, i.e., France, Russia, and China. The invasion of Iraq was also fiercely opposed by numerous American allies and scores of other nations, and it generated unprecedented and coordinated worldwide demonstrations and collective outrage, which fed and

31. For some preliminary evidence, the Australian government, based on the obligations that it had undertaken as a signatory of the Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women, instituted laws to prevent sexual harassment in the workplace. See Leila Rassekh Milani, ed., *Human Rights for All* (Washington, DC: Working Group on Ratification of the U.N. Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, 2001), 25. In accordance with the standards set forth in the Convention on the Rights of the Child and other UN documents, Ghana and Mauritania, among others, reformed their penal codes to separately address child criminals.

were fed by rising anti-Americanism and a growing opposition at home.[32] Global opposition to U.S. policy had some very real consequences. Anger with U.S. plans to go to war with Iraq led to the reelection of Chancellor Schroeder in Germany in 2002, as well as Roh Moo Hyun, a previously unknown politician in South Korea, both of whom rushed to oppose U.S. policies; the first with regard to Iraq and the second with regard to North Korea. Public opposition to the war also prevented the United States from opening a second front through Turkey and Saudi Arabia did not permit the United States to launch attacks against Iraq from its air bases.

Transnational norms continue to be developed via transnational moral dialogues. Moral dialogues occur when a group of people engage in a process of sorting out the values that should guide their lives. The values involved are not necessarily such personal values as veracity, modesty, and honesty, but they are values that affect what public policies people favor, either in their own country or in other countries. These transnational moral dialogues address matters including affirmative action, the treatment of asylum seekers, the recognition of gay marriages, the imposition of the death penalty, and much more.

Moral dialogues are often messy; they meander and have no clean beginnings or endings. They are passionate and often contentious. Nevertheless, over time they often lead to new shared understandings, which in turn deeply affect not merely what people believe but also their actions, not only what people consider virtuous but also the habits of their hearts. Among the most telling examples are the development of a moral commitment to the environment following the moral dialogue initiated by the publication of Rachel Carson's book Silent Spring; the change in the ways people viewed relations between men and women following the moral dialogue initiated by the publication of Betty Friedan's The Femi-

32. A poll conducted in March 2003 found that 69 percent of Germans opposed an Iraq war; in France, 75 percent of the public did not support the war; and in Russia, 87 percent. Similar views were also expressed in Belgium and Greece, where 95 percent of the public opposed the war. The United States lost favor in the eyes of many. For instance, in Indonesia, where 60 percent of its citizens held a favorable opinion of the United States in 2002, a mere 15 percent felt this way in May 2003. Similarly, in Turkey, 30 percent had a favorable view of the United States in 2002, but that number fell to 15 percent in May 2003. In Britain, a prewar poll found that only 39 percent of the people supported their country's decision to join in military action against Iraq and 51 percent opposed it. In Spain, 81 percent of Spaniards opposed military action in Iraq.

nist Mystique; the changes in race relations that followed the moral dialogue initiated by the civil rights movement in the 1960s; and the nearly self-enforcing ban on smoking in public in the United States after the prolonged moral dialogue about the ill effects of smoking on nonsmokers.

Transnational moral dialogues occur on three levels: Should the people of one culture »judge« those of others? If yes, which values should guide such judgments? And, what means should be employed, beyond speech and symbolic gestures, to undergird these values?

It is easy to demonstrate that such dialogues take place constantly – and often productively – in well-formed national societies, which most democracies are, and that frequently they result (albeit sometimes only after prolonged dialogues) in a new normative direction for these societies. But can such moral dialogues take place transnationally, and if so, to what effect? Granted, transnational moral dialogues are much more limited than their intranational counterparts in scope, intensity, conclusion, and result. Nevertheless, they are beginning to provide a wider shared moral understanding, political culture, and legitimacy for transnational institutions than existed until recently. For example, transnational moral dialogues appear to be taking place on issues such as opposition to the death penalty, debt relief, and free or low cost sharing of select medications.

True, such dialogues are affected by numerous nonnormative considerations, often dressed up as normative claims. Nevertheless, these dialogues do affect what people of different nationalities consider to be morally appropriate. Thus, one reason most countries try to avoid being perceived as environmentally irresponsible is that they do not wish to be seen as acting illegitimately in the eyes of other nations.[33] Moreover, transnational moral dialogues occur on three levels: Should the people of one culture »judge« those of others? If yes, which values should guide such judgments? And, what means should be employed, beyond speech and

33. Gareth Porter and Janet Welsh Brown, *Global Environmental Politics* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1996), 69–105; Beth Simmons, »International Law and State Behavior: Commitment and Compliance in International Monetary Affairs,« *American Political Science Review* 94, no. 4 (2000): 819–835.

symbolic gestures, to undergird these values? For instance, there is much stronger agreement that terrorism should be curbed than there is about which means are best used to do so.

In short, not only is the second defining attribute of community (i.e., a shared moral culture, a set of values and norms) met in the transnational realm, albeit on a low level, but that level seems to be rising.

Society without a State?

An important difference between domestic societies and the inchoate global society is rarely discussed. Domestic voluntary associations not only protect individuals from the state, but also they greatly benefit from its existence. Hence, as there obviously is no global state, its absence greatly curbs the scope of the social missions that transnational associations can carry out. Domestic associations benefit from the fact that contributions made to them are deductible from domestic taxes. Next to no such incentive is available on the transnational level. Domestic associations often are

> The global society, however inchoate and limited in its scope, is more advanced than the global polity; it is like a young turtle that is growing faster than its shell. Hence one can predict that either future growth of the global society will be held back by the lack of a political »shell« (a global state) – or that some elements of such a polity will develop.

in part financed by national governments. For instance, Catholic Charities' USA receives about 66 percent of their funding from U.S. government grants and contracts;[34] and the National Urban League receives about 40 percent of its total revenue from the government.[35] Very little of such financing is available on the transnational level. Above all, domestic associations have much of their effect by lobbying the nation-state to enact various policies, to expand its missions, or to change the ways that

34. Catholic Charities, Frequently Asked Questions: General. Available at: http://www.catholiccharitiesinfo.org/faqs/general.htm. Accessed 5/6/03.

35. Joseph R. Hagal, »Faith-Based Community Development: Past, Present, Future,« *America*, April 23, 2001, 15. The National Urban League, *Annual Report 2001–2002*. Available at http://www.nul.org/pdf/NUL_reportFinal.pdf. Accessed 2/3/04.

policies are carried out. There is, of course, no such state to redirect on the global level. True, various transnational associations do lobby intergovernmental bodies such as the United Nations – however, their budget, scope of mission, and authority are highly limited. For instance, the total United Nations' budget is $2.5 billion. Moreover, intergovernmental organizations – including not only the United Nations but also the IMF and World Bank – are themselves dependant on national governments for their budgets.

The global society, however inchoate and limited in its scope, is more advanced than the global polity; it is like a young turtle that is growing faster than its shell. Hence one can predict that either future growth of the global society will be held back by the lack of a political »shell« (a global state) – or that some elements of such a polity will develop. The issue can be readily discerned by examining the most advanced transnational community: The European Union.[36] There is an evident struggle between the forces that seek to strengthen the authority and scope of mission of the European Union's government-like institutions and those that seek to keep a fuller measure of national sovereignty.

Facilitating Factors

The development of any new form of global governance, or a significant expansion of the existing one, so taxes the imagination that many wonder if it is at all conceivable. It should be noted that over the last decades several developments have made such a progression somewhat less far fetched. As these progressions have often been depicted, I merely list them here for the completeness of the record and for balance. They include the development of English as a de facto lingua franca (approximately 1.6 billion people, almost one-third of the world's population, use English in some form);[37] the rise of worldwide communication systems; great increases in international trade and travel; the development of worldwide news (e.g., CNN and BBC); and the development of transnational civil and legal institutions and norms, which are already part of the evolving global normative synthesis. All of these factors make the devel-

36. See Amitai Etzioni, *Political Unification Revisited: On Building Supranational Communities* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2001).

37. Joshua A. Fishman, »The New Linguistic Order,« *Foreign Policy* 113 (Winter 1998–1999): 26.

opment of some form of a new or stronger global authority somewhat less implausible.

A State without a Community?

Nations are regularly defined as communities invested in a state.[38] The addition of communal elements greatly enhances the commitments of the citizenry to the state. Hence the question arises, if there are going to be some elements of global governance, however limited in scope and authority, could it also be backed up by some notions of a global community? People often associate community with local residential social entities in which members know one another personally. It is further assumed that for informal social controls to work, which is important in establishing social order, people must both bond with one another and have a shared moral culture. But what about a worldwide »we«? Are not communities typically defined in separation from some other people? Can there be a »we« without a »they«?

My response is that the new »they« are weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and pandemics; they fully qualify as enemies of humanity. After all, we have long seen people uniting to fight runaway fires or flooding rivers, not just to fight other people. Tragically, it is worth reiterating that the world has become accustomed to WMD, as they have been rarely employed and because the United States and the USSR were able to work out rules and strategies that reduced the danger of a nuclear tragedy.[39] Now pollyannas believe that other countries, with much less stable governments, might be able to do the same. For instance, it has been suggested that one could allow North Korea to maintain and develop its nuclear arsenal because American, Chinese, and Russian nuclear weapons (and sooner or later those acquired by still other nations, Japan included) would countervail them.

This is a dangerous way of thinking, reminiscent of military strategist Herman Kahn – of making a world with nuclear powers thinkable rather than impossible. Suffice it to note that even the relatively stable United

38. Benedict R. O. G. Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*.
39. Richard N. Haass, *The Reluctant Sheriff: The United States After the Cold War* (New York, NY: Council on Foreign Relations Press, 1997).

States and USSR came close to nuclear Armageddon on several occasions. Newly released documents reveal that Khrushchev's threats to invade West Berlin prompted the Kennedy administration to seriously consider a first-strike nuclear attack against the USSR.[40] A government-sponsored study from 1967 shows that the United States was attempting to create a nuclear bomb designed to dig its way beneath the earth's surface before exploding.[41] The United States on other occasions moved toward the use of these weapons against still other countries, such as Vietnam and Laos.[42] Fearing that Israel was about to be overrun after it lost the first rounds in the October War of 1973, Israeli Defense Minister Moshe Dayan ordered Israeli missiles to be armed with nuclear warheads.[43]

Even more dangerous is that the governments that now labor to develop or who already command WMD are much less reliable world citizens than even the United States and the USSR. The ruler of North Korea, Kim Jong Il, is widely held to march to a different drummer, to put it kindly. And there is always the danger that one of these countries will sell WMD to a billionaire like Bin Laden or to other terrorists. In short, WMD have in the past and still do constitute a clear and present danger.

Sadly it may take a war in which WMD are again used, for instance a confrontation between India and Pakistan, which would result in millions of casualties and turn most of Kashmir and adjacent regions into a radioactive desert, to mobilize the people of the world to support the needed actions.[44] Once such a horror occurs – one must of course work and pray, long before, in anticipation – many governments and world public opinion will strongly favor total worldwide nuclear disarmament, imposed and verified by a Global Authority. However, most people and governments will soon realize that the superpowers will continue to be unwilling to lay down their nuclear weapons, and that there is no realistic way to make them. Noting that these powers are committed to greatly curtailing their WMD – most national governments and the public are

40. Fred Kaplan, »JFK's First Strike Plan,« *Atlantic Monthly*, October, 2001, 81.
41. Walter Pincus, »'67 Study Discouraged Use of Nuclear Weapons in Vietnam War,« *Washington Post*, March 9, 2003, A26.
42. James A. Nathan, »The Heyday of the New Strategy,« *The Cuban Missile Crisis Revisited*, ed. idem (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992), 9; and Pincus, »67 Study,« A26.
43. Benny Morris, *Righteous Victims* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1999), 404.
44. For an informed look at the India-Pakistan conflict, see K. Shankar Bajpai, »Untangling India and Pakistan,« *Foreign Affairs* 82, no. 3 (2003): 112–126.

likely to support a less just and less democratic but relatively effective treatment of the immediate issue at hand: They would support (the way cities awash with crime support strong-armed police) the demand that all smaller nuclear powers give up their nuclear arms and submit to inspections. In return, their borders will be guaranteed by international forces. Without such guarantees nations who have small conventional forces are likely to resist giving up their WMD even after a major catastrophe.

In addition to WMD, the world is facing yet another common enemy. The outbreak of SARS in 2003 showed that the phrase, »we all are living in one global village« is much more than a cliché. All one has to add to the picture is a new, much more fatal illness that could spread even more easily than SARS did and be much more fatal. Dr. Anthony S. Fauci, the director of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases of the National Institutes of Health, pointed out that a drug resistant bug, even a flu, could generate such a pandemic quite readily. Aside from a naturally caused pandemic, there are those that a terrorist could unleash. Dr. Fauci specifically listed anthrax and botulinum toxin as two for which we are very unprepared and which could cause the kind of global disasters that the flu did in 1918 when between 20 and 100 million people died worldwide. HIV surely also qualifies and could readily become even more devastating if it produced a stronger mutant strain to which the key nations of the West would be defenseless.

All this does not show that even a measure of a global community will evolve, but it does suggest, however, that some of the factors sociologists consider facilitated such developments, even on a very large scale, are in place and are becoming more prominent.