

## PROJECT 15

### The Challenge of the Twenty-first Century

Read the speech delivered at the Bob Dole Institute by President Bill Clinton (appendix, pages 111–15) and the excerpt from the CIA 2020 Project (appendix, page 128), then answer the following questions in sentences, in your own words, using supporting quotes from the text.

1. To what event does Clinton refer when he says the minds of many initial critics of “the first” United Nations (by which he means the League of Nations) were changed?
2. What does Clinton mean by the phrase “all this new diversity”?
3. What are the terms Clinton and the 2020 Project prefer to “globalization” and why?

*(continued)*



## 11. BILL CLINTON ON GLOBALIZATION

Edited by Elizabeth Carter, Robert J. Dole Institute of Politics. By permission, "Liz," Bill Clinton Institute, New York, NY, September 2004.

*This text is a selection from a speech presented by Bill Clinton to his friend and colleague Senator Bob Dole. Clinton's statement provides a president's perspective on globalization and the global problems facing the world and the United States.*

DATE: May 21, 2004  
EVENT: First Annual Dole Lecture  
FEATURED SPEAKER: President Bill Clinton  
LOCATION: Allen Field House, University of Kansas

[Following an introduction by Bob Dole and statements by Bill Clinton] . . .

Now, I say that to try to drive this point home. You may agree or disagree with our policy in Iraq. You may think, for example, we should have put more emphasis in Afghanistan, where the Al Qaida are, because they're the ones that caused 9/11. But—[Applause] Wait, wait, wait. This is thinking time, not cheering time. You can cheer later if you like it. But think. The point I wish to make is this. You should have disagreements with your leaders and your colleagues, but if it becomes immediately a question of questioning people's motives, and if immediately you decide that somebody who sees a whole new situation differently than you must be a bad person and somehow twisted inside, we are not going to get very far in forming a more perfect union. Now, why does it happen? Here's why. Because at the end of the Cold War, the paradigm, the way we looked at the world evaporated and we had to create a new one. It was my great good fortune, but also challenge, to become the first president to serve my entire term in the post-Cold War era, to be the first president of the 21st century, as well as the last president of the 20th century. America is in one of those periods where we are trying to come to grips with fundamental questions. How are we going to relate to globalization, how are we going to relate to the global threat on terror? What is the role of government in our lives now? What are we to make of all this new diversity? Is it going to—the religious and racial and ethnic diversity—is it going to make us more fractured or will it make us more interesting and more unified? These are big, big questions.

When the Cold War was over and the industrial age began to be replaced by an information age, ever more globalized, we changed the way we work, the way we live, the way we relate to each other and certainly the way we relate to the rest of the world in ways that are marvelous and ways that are frightening. I believe we live in an age normally referred to as globalization, sometimes referred to as the global information society. I prefer the term "interdependence." Because it goes far beyond economics. There's good and bad in it. I have a cousin that lives in the hills of Northwest Arkansas that plays chess over the Internet with a guy in Australia twice a week. They take turns figuring out who's got to stay up late. On the other hand, 9/11 was a testimony to the power of interdependence. Don't you agree? The Al Qaida, what did they do? They used open borders, easy travel, easy access to information and technology to turn an airplane into a weapon of mass destruction, to murder 3,100 people nearly, in Wash-

ington, Pennsylvania, and New York from 70 countries. It's a story of global interdependence. The dark side of global interdependence. When I was president, 30% of the economic growth that we had came from trade.

When I was president, Senator Dole was always pushing me until we got it right—to end the ethnic slaughter in Bosnia. A hundred years ago, we wouldn't have known how to find Bosnia on a map. But it offended us because we had to watch those people being killed just because they were Muslims being slaughtered, and because we wanted Europe to be united and peaceful and democratic for the first time in history, to make the Cold War all worthwhile. So then we would be united, we'd be working together, we'd be fighting the problems of the rest of the world together. That, too, is interdependence. So if it can be positive or negative, it's obvious what we ought to be doing. If you agree with me. We need a strategy that builds up the positive and beats down the negative. We need to recognize that interdependence is inherently an unstable condition. And we need to move the world toward a more integrated, global community defined by three things, shared benefits, shared responsibilities, and shared values. That's what I believe.

Now—[Applause] Here's the point I want to make. This may seem simple to you, but if everybody thought that way, then in every area, there would be a slightly liberal or a slightly conservative way to do that, and then we would have all these debates, and in all probability, as free discussion usually does, it would lead to the best possible outcome. I'll just give you an example. In my view, there are five big issues here, for whatever it's worth. Number one, we have to have a strategy to fight the new security threats of terror and weapons of mass destruction that is both offensive and defensive. What's the best way to have homeland defense? If you have limited amount of money, if you think about it like this, then you can say, well, I think what we should do is triple or quadruple the number of containers we're checking at the ports and airports for biological or chemical weapons or somebody else can say, no, I think we should be reinforcing the bridges or putting guards outside the electrical plants that have nuclear power or whatever you think. But the point is, if you're focused on it that way, you can focus on homeland defense. What's the best way to pursue an offensive strategy? Is it to go to Iraq and establish a beach head of freedom in the Middle East or is it to stay in Afghanistan and root out the Al Qaida, and then turn your attention to the rest of the world? But once you're focused on it, you can have a civilized debate, and if you both agree on the issue, then just because somebody has got a different idea than you do about how to handle it, you don't think there's something wrong with them.

So that's the first thing. Second thing we have to do is to have a strategy to make a world with more partners and fewer terrorists. Now, why do I say that? Besides the fact that I'm a Democrat. Why would I say that? Why should every American think that? Even people that don't believe in social programs? Because if you believe the world is interdependent and you cannot kill, occupy, or imprison all your actual or potential adversaries, sooner or later you have to make a deal. That's what politics is. If there's a factual matter, that's what I talked until I was blue in the face in the Middle East about they walked away from that peace deal in 2000. It was the dumbest thing I've ever seen in my life. All we've got now is the Middle East is not a bit less interdependent today than it was when we made seven years of progress toward peace. We got 3,000 dead Palestinians, about 9,200 dead—I mean 920 dead Israelis. They're no less interdepend-

ent. Nothing has changed except more people are dead and now more people are mad and there's less trust and it's harder to deal with it, but they are not a bit less interdependent. So you remember that. If you're in any environment in life that you don't have total control over, you have to make a deal. That's what politics is. And that's why compromise is honorable, not dishonorable.

[Applause]

So, anyway, so how would you go about making a world with more friends than fewer enemies? Well, first of all, you gotta realize that half the people that live on earth aren't part of this globalized economy that works. On earth, half the people live on less than \$2 a day, of the 6 billion people on earth, 1 billion live on less than \$1 a day, a billion and a half people never get a clean glass of water, a billion people go to bed hungry every night, 10 million kids die of preventable childhood diseases, and one in four deaths every year on earth now come from AIDS, TB, malaria, and infections related to diarrhea. Most of them are little children who never got a single clean glass of water in their lives. So for a tiny fraction of what we spend on defense and homeland defense, and I do mean tiny, we could double what we spend to help put all the children in the world who aren't in school in school, to pay our fair share of the fight against the world's diseases—[Applause]—and to do these other things. And to give you an example, after 9/11, I think we increased—believe this is right. I think we increased defense and homeland defense 60 something billion dollars in one year. We could double our assistance programs in these other areas, double them, for about 10 or 12. In a budget that must now be nearly \$2 trillion, I don't know what it is. I haven't looked at it. I don't have to look at it anymore, so I don't, but I think that's about what it is. So you got to have a strategy for terror, a strategy for more friends.

The third thing I think is to find more ways to cooperate institutionally. This is a big challenge for America because we're going through a period in history when we have unrivaled military, economic, and political power. So every time we make a deal with anybody to do anything, we're giving up some of our freedom of action. Maybe a good deal for them, not a good deal for us because most of the time we can do whatever we please. The problem is, we will not be the only military, economic, and political superpower forever. If present growth rates continue, China, India, and the European Union will equal or surpass the United States sometime in the 21st century, just because of their size. They may not ever have to reach the per capita income we do to have greater output. So I think we should do that, but if you believe that, then it puts a whole different cast on the debates you hear today over putting up missile defense, getting rid of the anti-ballistic missile treaty, should we be part of the comprehensive treaty, should we be part of the criminal court, should we be part of the Kyoto Climate Change Accord, and I say that, I didn't join—there's one I didn't join. I didn't join the land mine treaty because they wrote it in a way that was absolutely hostile to the United States, and we have the finest record of any country in the world in promoting demining in the last 15 years, and it had enormous bipartisan support. Bob supported it. And so I'm not saying we can join every treaty, but I'm saying we should have a preference for being part of every conceivable network that will bring people together, because I can tell you something. It's just like any club you belong to, any organization you belong to, it builds the habit of working with other people. And the more you're in the habit of believing that if you stay on the team, good things

will happen, as compared to if you get off the team, the more likely we are to find peace and resolution to the problems of the 21st century.

So I think that's very, very important and now I want to make just two more points. So terror, more friends, more cooperation. Fourth thing is, we have to keep making America better. A lot of our influence in the world comes not from the size of our military or our arsenal of weapons, but from the power of our example. One of the schools that was destroyed in New York City on September 11th, 2001, the children had to leave and go meet in a temporary facility. So Hillary and I went to this school to see these kids, elementary school kids. Six hundred kids from over 80 different national, racial, and ethnic groups. One school. If we can prove that freedom brings mutual respect and that people can be proud of their heritage and proud of their religion, and proud of everything that's special and still bound together in a more perfect union, that will do as much to undermine the long-term appeal of terror as anything else we can do. Just continuing to prove America works.

[Applause]

. . . But anyway, none of this will happen until we move the American people's way of thinking about other people forward. And let me explain what I mean by that. You guys love your basketball team. I like the Arkansas Razorbacks. We're all pulling for different people in the NBA playoffs. We have wars you know who you're for—you got over 600 people from Kansas in Iraq today putting their lives on the line. We think in categories that are oppositional. And we have to organize ourselves in little boxes. I see a man, I see a woman, I see somebody that's white, I see somebody that's black, I see somebody that's brown, all right. I see a Baptist, a Catholic, a Jew, a Muslim, a Buddhist, a Sikh. I mean, if we couldn't put ourselves in boxes, nobody could function. You think about how many University courses are designed to giving people more boxes to think with. . . . But at some point it has to become irrelevant. The whole story of humanity is a story of forming a more perfect union. Ever since our forebearers stood up on the African savanna, something over 100,000 years ago, they learned to relate to other people, first they were in clans. Then larger tribes, then villages, and they would come into contact with wider and wider circles of people that had different views and felt threatened, and there would be fighting and killing, but sooner or later, before they destroyed the human race, they'd find a way to get along. In the twentieth century, our weapons were so powerful, we nearly got it wrong. But we escaped. We gave in to neither the tyranny of Hitler or the tyranny of communism or the power of our weapons to destroy. We threaded a big needle there. And everybody that made a contribution deserves our gratitude. But the point I want to make is that if you believe to go back to the founders that our job is to form a more perfect union and nobody has got the whole truth, then everybody's got a contribution to make. And I think America, if we're ever going to truly defeat terror without changing the character of our own country compromising the future of our children, has got to not only say, "Okay, I want to shoulder my responsibilities, I want to create my share of opportunities" but we have to find a way to define the future in terms of a humanity that goes beyond our country, that goes beyond any particular race, that goes beyond any particular religion. We should continue to judge people based on what they do. And if they persist in terror, we should punish them. We should go to war, we should use military power, we should do whatever we have to do. I'm not suggesting we act like it doesn't matter what you

do. It matters a great deal what you do. But we have to be able to say to the world, we want a home for every peaceable person. We like our faith, we like our ethnic group, we like our crowd, we like our basketball team, we like the way it is. But there's a place for you here, too.

The world has never before, never in all of human history, had to do this. It's a big psychological jump. It's easy for somebody like me, who has been to 100 and something countries to stand up and give a speech like this. It's quite a different thing for a country to live this way. It was not until 1945, after World War II, that we even had a United Nations. The Americans thought it was weird. The Senate defeated it after World War I. "Who wants to be in a United Nations with all those guys? You gotta be kidding." So then we nearly blow ourselves up and we have a U.N., right? And a universal declaration of human rights. It was a fraud until the end of the Cold War. Not a fraud, we just couldn't make it available to everybody. We have had 15 short years since 1989 to build a global community in which everybody thinks, like Dole does, that people in Kosovo and people in Kansas are more alike than they are different.

Now, I will leave you with one last statistic to put in your little box. My last year in the White House, Hillary sponsored a lot of these what we call "Millennium Evenings." We'd bring in people to talk about big questions. One night, Vinton Cerf, who sent the first e-mail to his profoundly deaf wife, now 22 years ago, and Eric Ladner, a biologist and genome expert from Harvard, came to talk about how the digital chip made possible the sequencing of the human genome. Forget about that. You know the most interesting thing that he said? Genetically, all human beings are more than 99.9% identical, and the genetic differences among individuals within a given racial group are larger than the genetic differences of one group as compared to another. Now, next time you start to feel like you really need to demonize somebody, think about that. Biggest laugh I ever got at the State of the Union Address was telling the Republicans and the Democrats whether they liked it or not, they were 99.9% the same.\* There had been a lot of blood spread over that one-tenth of one percent, and all you really have to do is figure out how to free yourself to live by the other 99.9%. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

---

\*Researchers now set this number slightly lower, to closer to 99.0%.





The wars of no century can match the sheer volume of death and destruction of the wars of the twentieth century. The slaughter of troops was unprecedented in both world wars, but the Second World War brought also massive killing of civilian populations. In contrast to Old Regime kingdoms where people were subjects, modern democracies identify people as citizens. Unlike subjects, citizens participate in the decisions of the nation-state and are commonly thought to be accountable for the behavior of their leaders. A historical example of this is the contrast between 1815 and 1918. At the conclusion of the Napoleonic wars in 1815, leaders of the victorious monarchies of Europe exacted punishment on France by convicting and punishing Napoleon personally. He was the emperor, after all, and was held responsible for the decisions of his state. But in 1918, Allied victors meeting at Versailles held the German people responsible for the human and material cost of the First World War. Germany was found **collectively responsible** for the actions of the state. And in the Allied press, treaties, and popular imagination the concept of “German” defined the enemy. This was also true after the Second World War. This collective, national, ethnic guilt was an invention of the age of nation-states.

The First World War was a disaster for participants, families, and heads of state; nations lost millions of young lives, and governments fell. Four empires collapsed as the former subject people of the Russian, Ottoman, German, and Austro-Hungarian empires revolted and emperors fell from power, were murdered, or fled. In place of those multinational empires, national states were established; Hungary, Yugoslavia, Austria, Czechoslovakia, the Ukraine, Romania, Bulgaria, Poland, and many more nation-states formed to represent ethnic populations. “Successor” states emerged from colonial empires as well. After the unforgivable losses suffered on the battlefields of Europe, citizens of colonial powers refused to support adventurism. Great Britain and France lost colonies around the world, and the United States attempted to retreat into diplomatic isolation.

Despite efforts to isolate, however, advances in communication and transportation spurred globalization. In response to the “world” nature of the war, diplomacy also globalized. After 1918, older states worked with new states to create a balanced, inclusive diplomatic system that recognized smaller as well as larger nations. There emerged a movement to institutionalize a forum for global diplomacy that might prevent another world war. Led by Woodrow Wilson of the United States, the victorious powers assembled a **League of Nations** to ensure that member states,

In order to promote international co-operation and to achieve international peace and security by the acceptance of obligations not to resort to war,

by the prescription of open, just and honourable relations between nations,  
by the firm establishment of the understandings of international law as the actual rule of conduct among Governments, and by the maintenance of justice and a scrupulous respect for all treaty obligations in the dealings of organised peoples with one another,  
Agree to this Covenant of the League of Nations.<sup>6</sup>

Founders intended that the League of Nations would prevent war, protect human rights, and promote the right to national self-determination. The success of such goals depended on broad membership, one of the elements the league never achieved. While a majority of European states joined before 1920, Germany did not join until 1926, then quit seven years later; the Soviet Union only entered the league for six years after 1934; Italy and Japan abandoned the league in the 1930s; and the United States never joined, through no fault of the U.S. president, one of the league's most avid supporters. But the League of Nations left a legacy of cooperation, research, human rights, and a diplomatic forum for a globalizing world.

Nation-states established after the First World War followed the previous model: a centralizing majority defined a "national" concept, usually associated with a language or perception of a culture. But it was not always clear which people might be included as citizens of a new state. There were (and still are) groups in every "national" configuration that did not fit national or ethnic images of the countries in which they lived. There were gypsies in Romania, Jews in Austria, Poles and Bavarians in Germany, Alsations in France, Macedonians in Yugoslavia, Basques in Spain, and the list could continue into the hundreds of "ethnic" people who did not necessarily identify with the national majority, or who were not welcome in the new national communities. As in the nineteenth century, national groups strove to assimilate or expel those people (the Other) who did not willingly adhere to the majority national identities. Sometimes assimilation was dealt with peacefully, sometimes violently.

In the 1930s, Chancellor of Germany Adolf Hitler, in an effort to homogenize multinational Germany, formed state policies on the basis of racial stereotypes. Laws defining citizenship, property rights, and legal protections were outlined differently for one ethnic group than for another. While precedent for ethnically based state programs had occurred in other countries as part of the nationalizing processes, the Nazis of Germany merged nationalism and racism with industrialism and modern bureaucracy to "resolve" some of the German minority issues. The German media created propaganda that constructed people of one group or another as "uncivilized," "subhuman," or

---

6. *The Preamble of the Charter of the League of Nations*, <http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/leagcov.htm> (1 February 2006).

traitors to the nation. These categories were used as excuses to scapegoat, persecute, and eliminate whole populations. Similar state-sponsored behaviors were repeated in many forums—fascist and other—around the world throughout the twentieth century.

The two greatest wars of the twentieth century have been named world wars because, in the industrial and national age, war can rapidly spread to the entire world. The Second World War was fought with Italy, Japan, and an enlarged fascist Germany on one side, and the democracies of the United States, Great Britain, and allies fighting alongside the communist (Stalinist) Soviet Union on the other. The industrialized Second World War attained levels of destruction never before seen. Massive “carpet bomb” and firebomb attacks from the sky, rocket attacks, atomic weapons, blitzkrieg tactics, and concentration camps where many died made killing large numbers of people easier in the Second than in the First World War. And the principle of “nationality” led military and political leaders on all sides to believe that, as citizens of warring states, civilians were responsible for the actions of their countries and were therefore legitimate targets. Hundreds of thousands of women, children, and other civilians of London, Rotterdam, Stalingrad, Hamburg, Dresden, and Hiroshima died for the actions of their countries in ways that in the pre-national age would have seemed irrational. Whereas in the First World War militaries suffered huge losses but civilian populations did not, in the Second World War civilian losses far exceeded military losses. This was due in large part to the changed perceptions of “nations” and citizens.

While countries entered the war on one side or the other as national states, many people fighting in the Second World War thought more of international than national causes and effects. Leaders, troops, and civilians claimed international justifications, and not only the protection of their own countries as just causes for war. Participants claimed human rights and democracy as justifications to go to war against dictators, racism, and oppression. Many who sacrificed in the wars of the twentieth century fought increasingly with a mentality that the world shares a common humanity and a common fate. The latter was frighteningly affirmed in 1945 when the United States detonated atomic bombs over two Japanese cities. It was clear from that day forward that the militaries of the world could destroy everyone on earth. **Friend shared fate with foe, civilian with military.**

After the conclusion of the Second World War, the League of Nations revived under the new name the **United Nations**. Note how closely the Preamble to the United Nations resembles the stated aims of the League of Nations.

We the peoples of the United Nations determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has

brought untold sorrow to mankind, and to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small, and to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained, and to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom, and for these ends to practice tolerance and live together in peace.<sup>7</sup>

The United Nations has survived for a half century, during which time the institution has averted countless disasters and alleviated suffering in many more. The international institution has provided enormous quantities of food, medicine, clothing, and shelter to the needy people around the world in times of disaster, natural and man-made. The United Nations was also a critical forum for public, international dialogue between Soviet, U.S., and Allied interests during the Cold War. The United Nations has developed wider goals, however, while it has also grown more controversial. As the most prominent international organization, it has almost naturally fallen into a position of arbiter of globalization even when war and peace were not immediately at stake.

With every passing year, we see the world shrink not only in time and space but also in economic, environmental, and technological terms. Global influences extend into the political sphere such that people living and working in one part of the world suffer consequences or reap benefits from political decisions made in other, distant regions. Purchases of consumer goods in the United States impact the lives of families in India or small businesses in South Africa or large corporations in Korea. The Internet is creating a single worldwide marketplace. Greenhouse gases emitted from industrial sites in China contribute to the warming of the oceans that moderate the climate in London. In short, the world's economy, environment, warfare, and political spheres have never been as singular as they are today. And tomorrow we will be more global still.

A Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) report of 2005 (see page 128) on globalization, named the 2020 Project, opened its executive summary with, "The very magnitude and speed of change resulting from a globalizing world—apart from its precise character—will be a defining feature out to 2020." The CIA project identifies various reasons why globalization will not reverse despite its detractors. It reports that, while the United States will continue to play an important role, the geographic center of globalization is already shifting and by 2020 will reside in Asia.<sup>8</sup>

---

7. *The United Nations Charter*, <http://www.un.org/aboutun/charter> (1 February 2006).

8. *Report of the National Intelligence Council's 2020 Project*, [http://www.cia.gov/nic/NIC\\_globaltrend2020\\_cs.html](http://www.cia.gov/nic/NIC_globaltrend2020_cs.html) (9 March 2006).

In 1889, visitors to the Paris Exposition who climbed the Eiffel Tower witnessed something they had never seen before: the world from the sky. The view from nine hundred feet above the ground was shocking, writes Robert Hughes. People looked the same from the top of the tower, kings and princes blended in with peasants and workers, Parisians were indistinguishable from Englishmen. Society, like the earth, appeared flatter. In the century of modernization, the construction of the Eiffel Tower marks a shift in our perspective; the experience represents what Hughes calls “a pivot in human consciousness.”

The conditions of seeing were also starting to change . . . not so much the view of the tower from the ground, it was seeing the ground from the tower. Nobody except a few men in balloons had ever seen this before. . . . It was the Eiffel Tower that gave a mass audience a chance to see what you and I take for granted every time we fly: the earth on which we live seen flat as patterns from above.<sup>9</sup>

A century after the Paris Exposition, the world received photographs of Earth viewed from space, one solitary blue orb in the empty expanse of the universe. What was in 1889 a rare perspective has today become commonplace.

In 2004 Bill Clinton, speaking at the inauguration of the Bob Dole Institute in Kansas, made the case that if we are careful, globalization can proceed constructively, positively, and peacefully. If we do not take care to proceed with respect, globalization might be our demise. Globalization, after all, seems to be advancing without a pause, pushed on by global corporations, trade, and communications. But Clinton stressed that more powerful societies share the planet with the less powerful, and both carry responsibility to pursue peaceful and generous resolutions to the world’s problems. As Pico wrote, we “have the power to degenerate into the lower forms . . . or to be reborn into the higher forms.” The truth of the twenty-first century is the world will elevate or degenerate together.

---

9. Robert Hughes, “The Mechanical Paradise,” in *The Shock of the New* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1991), 16.

