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Introduction
On April 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 2013, \textit{The New York Times} reported that President Obama announced an ambitious, new research initiative, “to invent and refine new technologies to understand the human brain…”\footnote{Markoff, John. “Obama to Unveil Initiative to Map the Human Brain.” New York Times, sec. Science, April 02, 2013.} According to the article’s author, John Markoff, the project has been compared to the Human Genome Project because of its aim to map and record brain circuits; nevertheless, there is one large difference: Neither President Obama, nor any of his administration have officially declared an endpoint or goal for the brain-mapping initiative.\footnote{Ibid} The President \textit{did} announce that his budget for 2014 would include $100 million for the project, which is being called \textit{BRAIN: Brain Research through Advancing Innovative Neurotechnologies.}\footnote{Pathe, Simone. “Obama Hopes Mapping Project Reveals Brain’s Mysteries.” PBS NewsHour Extra, April 08, 2013.} Regarding the Initiative, the President said
funding would give “scientists the tools they need to get a dynamic picture of the brain in action and better understand how we think and how we learn and how we remember.”

One of the three government agencies slated to receive funds from the BRAIN Initiative is the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA), which will receive $50 million.

This isn’t the first time in recent history that DARPA has received a large sum of money to finance neuroscience research. In 2011, DARPA received approximately $240 million to fund its brain research, much of which has dual-use purposes that benefit American civilians as well as military forces. Furthermore, the BRAIN Initiative seems to fall in line with the projects President Obama brought up in his State of the Union address in January. Mark Memmott of NPR offers some insight into the importance of this Initiative in the eyes of the Obama administration. According to Memmott, during his White House announcement about the BRAIN Initiative, President Obama said successful government research has “changed our lives in ways we could never imagine,” specifically mentioning the development of computer chips, GPS, the Internet, and “other technologies.” Furthermore, the U.S. Department of Health & Human Services claims that “by accelerating the development and application of innovative technologies, researchers will be able to produce a revolutionary new dynamic picture of the brain that, for the first time, shows how individual cells and complex neural circuits interact in both time and space.” Additionally, they hope the research this Initiative produces will “fill major gaps in our current knowledge and provide unprecedented opportunities for exploring exactly how the brain enables the human body to record, process, utilize, store, and retrieve vast quantities of information, all at the speed of thought.”

4 Ibid  
7 Memmott, Mark. “Obama Says $100 Million Will Be Invested In Brain-Mapping Initiative.” NPR, April 02, 2013.  
8 Memmott, “Obama Says $100 Million Will Be Invested In Brain-Mapping Initiative.”  
10 Ibid
how the brain works could be the key to creating new, innovative technologies that benefit public and private sectors.

Yet, with a bit of reading between the lines, the potential application of these research findings doesn’t seem to be purely medical or scientific. A closer look at the allocation of BRAIN Initiative funds hints at perhaps an ulterior, or at least additional, motive for the Obama administration. As Patrick Lin of *The Atlantic* notes: “…defense-related applications are a major driver of science and technology research.”

With DARPA receiving nearly half of the U.S. government’s funding from the BRAIN Initiative, the dual-use intent becomes clearer. A quick glance at the White House webpage for the Initiative outlines DARPA’s role: “$50 million for understanding the dynamic functions of the brain and demonstrating breakthrough applications based on these insights.”

DARPA is an agency of the United States Department of Defense whose primary task is developing new technologies for use by the military. Thus, it can be concluded that the BRAIN Initiative serves at least some military purpose. Moreover, fifty million dollars is half of the federal funding for this Initiative, meaning that DARPA is receiving the most federal funding out of the three agencies slated to receive funds. If we imagine that allocation of funds is representative of the relative importance of each agency, then it becomes obvious that defense is the U.S. government’s primary goal. A better understanding of the brain and a more comprehensive map, two of the Initiative’s goals, will bolster DARPA’s research capabilities in neuroscience and accelerate its ability to use these advances for enhancing humans in combat. While much of the research outcomes that are highlighted by the U.S. government relate to curing diseases, an inescapable question arises as to what this kind of research means for the future of warfare. If the United States begins to build an army of super humans, what will be the implications for world politics? As we have seen with the recent history of nuclear weapons, development of new military technologies can lead to security dilemmas, arms races, and a slew of reactionary plays from states that fear for the future of their international power and security. Cognitive/neural enhancement of human beings is just one area of research that DARPA is already pursuing.

---


in the area of human enhancement technology (HET), along with biological enhancement and enhanced materials. Thus, the proposed BRAIN Initiative and its military implications lead us to the following question: How will human enhancement technologies (HET) alter warfare in the 21st century?

Conventional Wisdom

Typically, Americans seem to be enthusiastic about human enhancement research because of its medical and therapeutic applications. According to the Pew Research Center, non-partisan polling data suggests that most people are optimistic about the medical advances that will likely result from human enhancement research. The National Science Foundation reported similar results in their polling data. For instance, according to a 2002 Life Sciences Survey, 86% of American respondents agreed that “developments in science have helped make society better,” and 90% agreed “scientific research is essential for improving the quality of human lives.” Furthermore, the NSF data found that 72% of Americans believed “the benefits of scientific research outweigh any harmful results.”

Americans are technological optimists, especially in regard to science and medicine. They believe that technology has consistently improved their lives for the better and that it will continue to do so in the future. Americans seem to have faith in the ability of science to overcome many of the problems plaguing the world, such as disease and illness. However, according to Pew, Americans seem to be aware of the implications of enhancement technologies. Another non-partisan poll found that many people correctly believe there are some serious risks for society involved with pursuing human enhancement research. Nevertheless, Americans’ technological optimism prevails in the polling data, highlighting their belief that the benefits of biotechnology outweigh those risks.

---
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This paper argues this conventional wisdom is incomplete. While it is true that HET may break through some medical barriers and lead to cures for serious ailments, it is also true that these medical advances have an increasingly complex relationship with military technology. Many historical medical advances that have benefited civilians have been born of a need to aid soldiers in or after combat.\(^\text{18}\) It is unrealistic for Americans to believe that HET can or will only mean advances for therapeutic and/or civilian medical purposes in the future. Technology doesn’t dictate how it’s used. According to experts,\(^\text{19}\) the future of biotechnology seems to be aimed at using biology to “enhance our capabilities to conduct military operations: not by degrading our adversaries, but by improving the material of war, enhancing the performance of warriors, and using biological processes to improve systems design and performance.”\(^\text{20}\) This is a new kind of biotechnology. While in the past the term biotechnology conjured up images of offensive germ attacks, in the future the term could be used to describe biologically enhanced soldiers. Americans are right to believe that there are serious risks involved in pursuing HET. However, in this instance, America’s technological optimism is leading it to have more faith than perhaps it should. Americans do not seem to fully understand just how entangled medicine and defense research really are or how much more complicated that entanglement is likely to get in the future. Certainly, as we can already see, human enhancement technology likely means human enhancement in both medical and military settings.

**Qualitative Methodology**

This paper uses qualitative methodology to first examine the theoretical paradigm, realism, and second, to examine three case studies that help reveal the role human enhancement technology will play in 21\(^\text{st}\) century warfare. As case studies, this paper examines three categories of human enhancement technology with potential military applications: human biological enhancement, human cognitive/neural enhancement, and enhanced materials.

\(^{18}\) See: smallpox vaccine, yellow fever, antityphoid vaccine, syphilis blood test, rabies vaccine, etc.

\(^{19}\) Robert E. Armstrong is a senior research fellow in the Center for Technology and National Security Policy at the National Defense University. Jerry B. Warner is president of Defense Life Sciences.

For these three case studies, this paper will use a combination of both primary and secondary sources as evidence to determine how human enhancement technology will alter warfare in the 21st century. The primary evidence draws from U.S. government advisory reports, such as those from JASON, non-partisan statistical data, DARPA reports, and archival evidence. JASON and DARPA reports give insight into the kind of research that is already being conducted and its potential military applications. This paper will also use evidence provided by secondary sources such as the New York Times, The Atlantic, and the Washington Post, as well as scholarly journals. Robert Armstrong and Jerry Warner’s article, “Biology and the Battlefield”, published in the March 2003 edition of Defense Horizons provides expert insight into the history and future of biological research for military purposes. Furthermore, Fred Ikle’s book, Annihilation from Within: Ultimate Threat to Nations, is an important resource that provides a detailed examination of how HET will affect the future of political order. Empirical evidence from sources such as these provides a better platform for understanding the effect human enhancement technology will have on warfare and the further effects it will have on the international balance of power.

**Theoretical Paradigm**
The answer to this research question is best framed using the realist theory of international relations. Realism is made up of several basic assumptions. One assumption is that the international system is anarchic. Realists would argue: “There is no essential harmony of interests between states, but rather a web of conflicting national objectives in an anarchical world.”\(^1\) The second assumption posits that states are the highest centralized authority, making them the most important actors on the international stage. The third assumption is that states’ decision-making is rational and therefore based on their own best interests instead of in the interest of international cooperation. In short, this assumption of the realist theory can be summed up as “might is right.”\(^2\) If a state is rational and acting in its own best interest, then realism assumes that survival is a state’s primary concern. Essentially, “power or state capabilities,

\(^{1}\) Sean Murphy, Principles of International Law, (St. Paul: West, 2006): 18.

rather than common interests, shape relations among nations…”

For realists, cooperation only exists if interests coincide, but certainly isn’t born of shared moral or ethical principles. However, it is important to note that this isn’t the radical or extreme realism expressed by the Machiavellian doctrine “that anything is justified by reason of state.” The line should be drawn between such extreme realism and the assumptions of classical realism described above when framing this research question. While classical realism emphasizes that a state will act in its own best interest, it does not involve the “glorification of war or conflict.”

In examining the impact that human enhancement technology will have on military operations, it is clear that the realist theory can be applied. The realist emphasis on competition, states’ concern for their own security and interests, and struggle for power are represented in the U.S. government’s investment in human enhancement technology. Realists consider anarchy to be what determines the outcomes in international politics. The international stage is literally a self-help system because it lacks a common governing authority. Under the realist theory, the United States is responsible for its own survival and is “free to define its own interests and to pursue power.” In this case, the United States is pursuing power in the form of human enhancement technology because it believes HET will maximize its power and will give it a leg up on military power relative to other states. The U.S. seeks to remain hegemonic and the best way to do that is to ensure that it always has an advantage by being at the forefront of new technology.

The U.S.’s development of human enhancement technologies can be directly explained by the realist notion of relative power. The first states to harness these new technologies will have an advantage and a new way in which to secure power relative to other states. The ability to engineer better soldiers will improve the efficiency of any military that can afford to harness the technology. According

---
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to the realist system, once they do that, they will become stronger international forces and secure their place on the international stage. Thus, actors such as the U.S. have an incentive to develop these technologies first to ensure their continued placement at the top.

The conventional wisdom cannot be framed or explained by the realist theory. The conventional wisdom is best framed using the constructivist theoretical paradigm of international relations. The key principle of constructivism is that international relations are shaped by constructed ideas such as “ideas, beliefs, norms/values, religion, culture, and/or nationalism.” Thus, perceptions hold just as much if not more weight in international politics than the facts do. If we view the conventional wisdom through the constructivist lens, we can see that the layman applies this theory to the issue of human enhancement technology. Essentially, Americans believe that the future of human enhancement is socially constructed and not an inevitable reality.

**Case Study: Biological/Physical Enhancement**

Human enhancement can be described as: a “medical or biological intervention introduced into the body designed to ‘improve performance, appearance, or capability besides what is necessary to achieve, sustain or restore health’.”

The military use of human enhancement technologies isn’t a new idea. Under some definitions of human enhancement, vaccines count as a type of enhancement of the immune system. This would place the first military use of human enhancement technologies during the American Revolutionary War from 1775-1783 when George Washington had the Continental Army vaccinated against smallpox.

The current focus of the U.S. military on human enhancement aligns with its logical objective to maximize the performance of its troops. According to an Army training manual:

> “War places a great premium upon the strength, stamina, agility, and coordination of the soldier because victory and his life are so often dependent upon them. To march long distances with full

---
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pack, weapons, and ammunition through rugged country and to fight effectively upon arriving at the area of combat; to drive fast-moving tanks and motor vehicles over rough terrain; to make assaults and to run and crawl for long distances; to jump into and out of foxholes, craters, and trenches, and over obstacles; to lift and carry heavy objects; to keep going for many hours without sleep or rest—all these activities of warfare and many others require superbly conditioned troops.”

DARPA already has several programs in place that are aimed at enhancing the U.S. military using biological means. DARPA calls these types of programs “Maintaining Human Combat Performance” programs. Each individual program has unique goals but they are all related because they are aimed at enhancing soldiers through biology. Enhancing the human immune system has been a longtime goal of scientists and the military alike. According to Mark Wheelis, “tools are rapidly becoming available that will produce improved vaccines (more efficient, longer lasting, and safe), produce new antibiotics and antivirals, enhance defenses against diseases, and protect against damage from overreaction of defensive systems.”

One such program is DARPA’s 7-Day Biodefense program. The goal of the program is to “develop innovative approaches to counter pathogens without regard to their exact nature.” Similarly, DARPA’s Prophecy program “seeks to transform the vaccine and drug development enterprise from observational and reactive to predictive and preemptive by spurring development of a multidisciplinary approach to predicting viral evolution.” If a military can harness the human immune system, they will be considerably less vulnerable to biological warfare. This could tip the balance of power away from states intending to implement biological weapons and toward states that have militaries able to withstand these attacks. Furthermore, the U.S. military might be more likely to use biological weapons if they know there won’t be any collateral damage to their own soldiers.

---

A more extreme form of biological human enhancement is human-machine interface. According to JASON, non-invasive “brain control” is unrealistic.\(^{35}\) This only means that JASON doesn’t foresee a way of using this technology without a permanent medical procedure. However, successful implementations of invasive interfaces have occurred in “medical applications in which nerve signals are used as the mechanism for information transfer.”\(^{36}\) This might mean that the more extreme example of potential remote guidance of a human being could be successful in the future, should the U.S. or another state decide to implement it. A more realistic possibility is the use of medical devices created to fix impairment in completely healthy soldiers.

What if the military began to give cochlear implants to its healthy soldiers in order to make their normal hearing extraordinary? Or if the military could alter human genes to make soldiers run faster and carry heavier loads? We now know enough about biology and engineering to make these enhancements a reality. According to a 2010 JASON advisory report: “both offensive and defensive military operation may be impacted by the appliance of personal genomics technologies through enhancement of the health, readiness, and performance of military personnel.”\(^{37}\) In this 2010 report, JASON—the U.S. government’s most esteemed group of scientists—advised the United States that they would benefit significantly if they employed genomics technologies when assessing the health and performance capabilities of the military.\(^{38}\) Later in the same report, JASON advises the Department of Defense to “determine which phenotypes that might reasonably be expected to have a genetic component [with] special relevance to military performance…”\(^{39}\) Although it is unlikely that the U.S. will implement as invasive a procedure as genetic modification anytime in the near future, it is a scientific possibility that may be imposed upon U.S. soldiers at some point or be utilized by states without moral opposition to it. Moreno has pointed out: “According to the Uniform Code of Military Justice, soldiers are required to accept medical interventions that make them fit for duty. Experimental treatments are a harder case, but the US government has

\(^{36}\) Ibid
\(^{38}\) JASON. 2010. The $100 Genome: Implications for the DoD, pp. 4.
\(^{39}\) JASON. 2010. The $100 Genome: Implications for the DoD, pp. 43.
shown a tendency to defer to commanders in a combat situation if they think some treatment is likely to do more harm than good, even if unproven.”

According to Patrick Lin, Maxwell Mehlman, and Keith Abney, “in changing human biology with enhancements, we also may be changing the assumptions behind existing laws of war and even human ethics.” If genetically modified soldiers become a thing of reality, the international consequences would be severe. This type of “mutant warfare” would cause uproar in the international arena for multiple reasons. First, opposing states are likely to feel that their security is threatened by such an obvious military advantage. Second, it is likely that many states would ethically oppose such an act against nature. The ramifications of this kind of international bad blood would be tragic.

Case Study: Cognitive/Neural Enhancement
The definition of human enhancement includes permanent and non-permanent forms of medical intervention (e.g., implants vs. supplements). A recent example of cognitive enhancement in the military is the use of amphetamines by different militaries worldwide. It is well known that the United States, Germany, England, and others used amphetamines widely during World War II, and that they were used again by the United States in Korea. According to reports, the United States continued to use amphetamines, or “speed”, during such events as Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm. A study done by Caldwell, Caldwell, Smythe, and Hall found that amphetamines are shown to improve performance of helicopter pilots in flight simulators. The use of such performance-enhancing substances by the U.S. military proves that they are willing to take, what some would consider, extreme moves in order to improve their military.

These days, the goal seems to be to go beyond “preparation for the demands of military service and instead enable ‘functioning at a new optimal level to face new missions or challenges’.” According to a 2008 JASON advisory report, “the technical developments in neuropharmacology will continue to push the

limits of what may be achievable.” The realist theory would maintain that having a military means being in the business of protecting oneself and one’s interests. If the U.S. government can get its hands on new, innovative technologies that would push the limits of what is humanly possible even further, there is no reason to believe they wouldn’t ravenously pursue it, especially if it means having a military advantage of its opponents.

In fact, according to the same JASON advisory report for the U.S. government, there is a lot of excitement surrounding the possible applications of cognitive enhancement. At present, the most pressing factor of human cognitive performance that affects military effectiveness is “degradation of performance under stressful conditions, particularly sleep deprivation.” This sentiment is echoed by DARPA, which states one of their program objectives to be: “… developing technologies to allow our highly skilled and impeccably trained warfighters to maintain their peak physical and cognitive performance despite harsh conditions of combat.” To contend with performance degradation, DARPA is currently working on a program called Enabling Stress Resistance. This program strives “to develop and implement cognitive, behavioral, and pharmacological interventions that will prevent the deleterious effects of stress on warfighters.” What this one statement can ascertain is that DARPA, and by extension the U.S. military, is researching ways to make soldiers more resilient against stress—including the use of performance-enhancing pharmaceuticals.

Sleep deprivation is a serious problem for soldiers. It is known to have a “significantly harmful impact on physical performance, alertness, and the ability to perform complex cognitive tasks.” DARPA is working to find a fix. The intent to establish technologies that will require warriors to spend less time sleeping without hampering their effectiveness can be seen if we examine DARPA’s 2013 budget. In 2013 DARPA plans to spend twelve million dollars on “Bio Interfaces” programs, which includes “improving our understanding of sleep-wake cycles.” The significance of sleep-related improvements is clear: “If
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an opposing force had a significant sleep advantage, this would pose a serious threat.\footnote{JASON. 2008. Human Performance, pp. 1.} The United States believes that it needs to be the first to implement sleep deprivation therapies \textit{and} they need to do it best.

Cognitive research is currently underway aimed at enhancing many other aspects of the mind as well. DARPA’s Human Assisted Neural Devices program is aimed at strengthening and restoring memories.\footnote{DARPA, “Department of Defense Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 President’s Budget Submissions.” pp. 50.} Furthermore, DARPA is working on an artificial intelligence project called Deep Green. The purpose of the project is to enhance decision-making and planning.\footnote{DARPA, “Department of Defense Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 President’s Budget Submissions.” pp. 246.} Additionally, several research programs at DARPA are utilizing the advances in neuroscience and cognitive psychology to enhance learning abilities.\footnote{DARPA, “Department of Defense Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 President’s Budget Submissions.” pp. 163.} Some of those programs are: Neurotechnology for Intelligence Analysts, Accelerated Learning, Education Dominance, Augmented Cognition, and Training Superiority Programs.\footnote{Ibid} These different cognitive enhancement programs are just the tip of the iceberg. There are hundreds of other government-funded research programs looking into cognitive and neural enhancement technologies.

Two of the realist assumptions apply to this case. The first assumption that applies is that states are rational actors and therefore act in their own best interest. The second assumption that applies is that states’ primary concern is survival. “Might is right” certainly seems to be the U.S. government’s belief when it comes to cognitive and neural enhancement. Although cognitive and neural enhancement might not be considered strength in the conventional sense, it certainly is an offensive and defensive military advantage. America wants to equip its soldiers with the best equipment, including cognitive functioning. If soldiers can sleep less, remember more, learn faster, and become less mentally and physically impacted by stress, they can do considerably more damage. From a military standpoint, the goal is to make organic, living beings perform like machines. As Lieutenant General E.R. Bedard states: “It is about transforming our forces to meet the new reality and retaining our dominance as the
finest military force in the world.”58 The impact this type of military advantage will have on the international balance of power is considerable. According to defense expert Fred Ikle, “a competitive race with China to build the first super-intelligent system might start sooner than most think tanks and government forecasters expect”59 and “we cannot assume America would prevail.”60

Case Study: Enhanced Materials
For the purposes of this research, we include enhanced materials/tools in the definition of human enhancement. Enhanced materials are materials designed to aid in the achievement of the above medical or biological improvements. New materials are the foundation upon which every device or system that transforms the military is built.61 The United States currently has several ongoing programs that aim at creating enhanced materials that can be used by soldiers in combat. These materials enhance the performance and endurance of soldiers in order to gain and sustain military advantage.

Continuing advances in lightweight body armor that can be worn by soldiers in combat could incorporate health monitoring and cooling.62 Furthermore, the United States Army has visions of a powered exoskeleton that would enable soldiers to interact with “robotics, software systems, and hardware platforms via an array of ‘third generation’ interfaces that will rely on natural language commands, gestures, and virtual display/control systems.”63 These armor improvements could prolong the stamina of the warrior wearing it. As discussed above, enhanced stamina is a key goal of the United States military at this point. Furthermore, the melding of biology and materials could transform current systems or even provide new, unique capabilities. These materials intended for external use are called “bioinspired materials.”64

60 Ikle, Annihilation from Within: Ultimate Threat to Nations, pp. 33.
The United Kingdom is working on enhanced materials with military applications as well. The BAE System’s Q-Sight is a flight helmet that “enhances situational awareness as well as control of the aircraft, including targeting through eye movements.”55 Along the same lines, the U.S. Army Research Office, in collaboration with the University of California, Irvine, Carnegie Mellon University, and University of Maryland are working on “synthetic telepathy,” which would enable communication through thought alone.66 According to JASON, a recent DARPA proposal for an advanced imaging system includes a requirement for a brain interface capable of responding to subconscious recognition of an enemy.67

Alternatively, there are materials intended for incorporation into a living organism. These are called “biomaterials.”68 Examples of biomaterials are those that would be used for wound healing. Wound healing is a large area of interest for the military. Take, for instance, DARPA’s material program called Fracture Putty. Through this program, DARPA hopes to create an innovative “putty-like material that, when packed in and around a compound bone fracture, provides full loadbearing capabilities within days.”69 This would restore a soldier to fighting function with dramatically reduced rehabilitation time and elimination of infection and secondary fractures all while normal healing is going on internally. Reduced down time means soldiers are back fighting sooner. More manpower means more military strength and less potential for vulnerability. Furthermore, there are biomaterials that can be used to control excessive bleeding, which accounts for 55 percent of combat deaths.70 According to Robert Armstrong and Jerry Warner, experts in military technology, combining Fibrin, the protein found in blood, and adhesive proteins found in barnacles could create “biosealants” that would slow or stop bleeding.71

When bioinspired materials and biomaterials are crossed, you have hybrid materials. These are engineered materials, but with at least on biological
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molecule. For instance, a bacterium called bacteriorhodopsin absorbs microwave radiation at higher frequencies, plant proteins could be the basis for infrared signature reduction in paints, and certain biological systems can give us the blueprint for new structural patterns that diffract light. All of these enhanced materials can yield advanced camouflage and stealth characteristics, that when coupled with armor, enhance a soldier’s capabilities.

United States General George Casey stated: “The goal of our Army is to continue the transformation process of building a campaign quality expeditionary Army that can support our combatant commanders in challenges of the 21st century across the full spectrum of conflict.” The implementation of enhanced materials is the exact kind of transformation in military affairs that will aid commanders in 21st century conflict. The ability of soldiers to recover from injury more quickly, perform missions without being seen, and control military devices by thought is a step toward the creation of an entirely new kind of soldier. But once again, these advances in material technology come at a large international cost. The United States is focused on maintaining its place as the best military in the world and its use of enhanced materials will certainly further this goal. However, as with the U.K., other countries are racing to create these materials as well, leaving the international balance of power hanging in the crossfire.

Implications
Since World War II, technology superiority has been a major landmark of the U.S. military. As I have shown, human enhancement is one of the most rapidly growing areas of technology with military significance. Successful implementation of human enhancement technologies will give the United States, or any country that successfully harnesses them, an undeniable advantage over their opponents in warfare. They have the potential to make it easier and safer for soldiers to perform in combat but they also have the potential to disrupt the international balance of power. In the future, the strength and power of a military won’t be judged purely by its size or skill, but also on the quality of
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its enhanced soldiers. According to experts, “a weapon system can no longer be evaluated or enhanced in isolation from its human operator.” Soldiers are becoming a part of the weapon. In short, “the complexity of combat has increased, and with it the tempo of operations.”

The international implications are likely to be two-fold. On the one hand, countries that can afford to develop these technologies will all be racing against each other to develop human enhancement technologies the fastest and most efficient ways possibly. The likely result is an HET arms race between the wealthiest countries in the world. In the past, arms races have had favorable results for advancing military technologies. However, hasty implementation before a technology has been adequately tested or refined can have deadly consequences. This is especially true when human beings are an integral part of the technology.

The United States isn’t the only country pursuing human enhancement technology. China and Russia are likely to move much more quickly on this technology than most other countries, but it is unlikely that other international actors will be as open as the U.S. about what they are doing. The advantage this technology provides will not likely go unnoticed. There is a potential threat “for adversaries to exploit advances in Human Performance Modification, and thus create a threat to national security.” In creating new technologies that benefit a state, you’re opening up that technology for potential proliferation. Once it has been created, unless there is a standing governing body to police it, there is no way of controlling who will get their hands on it. According to David Axe, “it’s equally hard to tell to which terrorists, militants and criminal groups these countries might have ties—and whether new biological weaponry might proliferate these channels.” With a lack of transparency, international mistrust is likely to stew.

---
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The second potential implication deals with the relationship between the haves and the have-nots. Countries that aren’t one of the first several to implement human enhancement technologies in the military are likely to feel threatened by the increasing gap between their military power and the military power of countries with HET. The increase in power may seem like a provocation. Thus, in the 21st century the development of human enhancement technology may also trigger a security dilemma between less technologically developed countries and superpowers like the U.S.


Bedard, E.R. “Nonlethal Capabilities: Realizing the Opportunities.” Defense Horizons. no. 9 (2002)


—”Department of Defense Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 President’s Budget Submissions. Justification Book Vol. 1.”


Memmott, Mark. “Obama Says $100 Million Will Be Invested In Brain-Mapping Initiative.” NPR, April 02, 2013.


—“As you may know, scientists have recently discovered how to map the human genetic code. In your opinion, will this mostly be a good thing for our society, or are there some serious risks involved?.” Last modified July 2000. Accessed May 19, 2013. http://webapps.ropercenter.uconn.edu/psearch/question_view.cfm?qid=426539&pid=50&ccid=50.


LISA HAINES is Vice President of Public Affairs for Disneyland Resort and graduated with a degree in Political Science in 1989 from Cal Poly.
ALUMNI SPOTLIGHT

Lisa Haines Heppelmann

“Do the best job possible and you will be recognized,” was the advice Lisa Haines Heppelmann offered to students and graduates alike. This mantra rings true when looking at Lisa’s career path.

While attending Cal Poly she interned for her local congressperson, once in his district, and then again in Washington D.C. Looking back she noted that it was her summer internships that gave her a pathway to a career after graduation.

After she graduated, Lisa started her first job; she worked on her Congressman’s re-election campaign. She did anything and everything, from making copies to meeting with the political consulting/public relations firm helping with the campaign. One meeting in particular stood out to Lisa; she was waiting inside to meet the representative from the firm, and it was raining heavily outside. Lisa saw the representative get out of his car and fidget around for an umbrella. He did not have one, but Lisa did. She ran outside to meet him and walked him into the building under her umbrella. After six months of active campaigning, the Congressman left the race because of personal matters. Lisa, who was fresh out of college working her first job, and was now left unemployed, received a phone call from the political consultant she had met
with on that rainy day. He offered her a temporary job working through the campaign season, and that temporary job turned into a six-year stint working in PR and political consulting.

After many campaign cycles, Lisa was ready for something new. She wanted to venture into the public relations field a bit more. A few months of searching for a job led her to a healthcare company where she started as Manager of Public Relations. Lisa worked for this company for the next eight years in several different capacities, coming to fruition when she did all of the merger communications when another healthcare company was acquiring her company. Her work got the attention of the acquiring company, and they kept her on in a director role. She spent the next five years doing corporate communication and thoroughly enjoyed her position, colleagues, and the company. Amusingly enough, at this point her in life, she was not looking for a change in her career path, but it happened anyway.

Lisa met a woman at a barbeque who was forming a public affairs team at the corporate level for Walt Disney Parks and Resorts, one of the four main segments of The Walt Disney Company. They talked throughout the barbeque, and she asked Lisa if she was interested in a possible position. Originally, Lisa said no. She was very happy with her current job. On her drive home from the barbeque, she realized that this had the potential to be a great opportunity. Lisa interviewed for the position, and a few months later began working for Disney. She started as Vice President of External Communications, which allowed her the opportunity to work on the opening of the Disney park in Hong Kong. After nearly five years in that role, Lisa moved to the Disneyland Resort to serve as Vice President of Communications, where she was responsible for all internal and external communications. This led to the position Lisa now holds as Vice President of Public Affairs for the Disneyland Resort. In this role, Lisa oversees a team of 60 Cast Members whose responsibilities include internal and external communications, government and community relations, and executive engagement. Wearing many different hats, Lisa thrives on the fact that day-to-day occurrences are never the same. Her adaptability and ability to be flexible are constantly being tested. While she explained that the unpredictability could be difficult, she loves working for a large well-known brand. Whenever she has a tough day, Lisa will walk through the Disneyland park and be reminded that what she does as a part of Disney brings happiness to so many.
As a professional with many years in the workforce, Lisa offers some helpful advice to students and young professionals: “Make your time mean something.” Lisa was adamant about making the most of summer breaks and the importance of gaining experience through work or internships. Without her summer internships, Lisa said she would not know where she would be today. As someone who reviews a lot of resumes in her current role, she firmly believes this hands-on experience really sets applicants apart in the job market. In addition, Lisa reminded students not to underestimate the importance of informational interviews. Even if there is no spot available at that time, an employer will remember the impression you made on them when you sat face to face. Lisa “blindly found” her path, but that would not have happened without the effort and time she put into her internships and the jobs that followed. She encourages students to focus on having a strong work ethic and doing great work, and their talents will be noticed.
ANDREW SMITH, 21, political science student. Right now I’m busy with my senior project, a paper on naturalism in legal philosophy. I enjoy words, music, and not eating meat (vegetarian since fifth grade). Who knows what the future holds. With any luck it will involve at least two of these things and unfold here in SLO County, which, no matter where I go, will always be my home.
In some ways it makes little sense to compare Cardinal Richelieu’s *Political Testament* and the National Intelligence Council’s *Global Trends 2030: Alternative Worlds*. The former is a theologically-inspired political manifesto in the form of a handbook (written for King Louis XIII of France); the latter is a report, an analysis of contemporary politics and economics and a forecast for these over the next two decades. Further complicating matters is that centuries have passed since Richelieu wrote *Political Testament*: our international world is very different from the European theater he knew. What could such a work have to tell us about modern politics? If one reads Richelieu literally, importing his seventeenth-century beliefs into the twenty-first century, I think the answer is “very little.” So I propose a compromise. I believe that if by comparing these works one hopes to learn something relevant about governance or political theory, comparing them position-by-position is misguided: *Global Trends*’ dispassion does not lend itself to this approach, and Richelieu’s thought is too dated for serious consideration. Even so, I believe that the authors of *Global Trends* are not without goals or values, though generally these must be inferred, and I believe that Richelieu is far from being so dogmatic that a modern reader can’t extract the essence of his thought and imagine—were he here to
pass judgment—what a modern Richelieu would think of our world. (Note that from now on I will use “GT” in place of “the authors of Global Trends.”)

For Richelieu, the ideal society is a society governed in accordance with God’s will. It is therefore static: a society governed in accordance with God’s will could change only for the worse. This alone puts him at odds with GT, for whom change is not just acceptable but inevitable. Consider these illustrative differences: Richelieu believes that most people should be kept illiterate; GT predict the rise of an educated middle class and take for granted the ubiquity of advanced information technology. Richelieu favors absolute monarchy; GT predict a nonstate world (one of several possibilities) in which networks of private interests predominate and nation-states that succeed are those that cooperate with emerging nonstate coalitions. Some preliminary points: First, this proves beyond all doubt that Richelieu’s historical views are incompatible with the modern world (consider that I need Internet access to do this assignment), which is why I believe that comparing them with the futures sketched in Global Trends is a waste of time: we learn nothing because Richelieu cannot help seeming an archaic mumpsimus. Second, if GT has any overarching value or goal, it is human health and well-being. And here, I think, lies the chief difference between these works’ visions for governance and for humanity. GT see human well-being as interchangeable with the empirical reality of widespread human health and happiness—that is, the subjective experience of leading a life relatively free of fear and danger, having time and opportunities to pursue one’s interests, and generally enjoying substantial autonomy in a free society.

For Richelieu, though it might be going too far to say that all such concerns are trivial, well-being is more collective and abstract. Under a literal reading of Political Testament, well-being is social and political conformity with God’s plan for mankind. And even under a reading of the work’s bare principles, well-being similarly refers to the status of state and society. The assumption seems to be that this leads to “enough” empirical well-being, which in turn leads to broad social stability. Order, stability, and the integrity of the state are what matter to Richelieu, which is why he not only tolerates but accepts as a matter of course social and political inequality that today many would find repellent at best. Most of his recommendations exacerbate and enshrine inequality in ways that GT disapprove, whose work propounds very different ideas about the role of government, the nature of the state, and therefore about how the state should pursue its national interest.
To understand Richelieu’s thought one must appreciate that he is fundamentally a hierarchical thinker. At the top of the great chain of being (a Christian cosmological hierarchy widely accepted during Richelieu’s time) is God, “the first essential.” Beneath God are his angels, and beneath angels are Earth’s highest political authorities: kings. Here is where Richelieu drastically departs from GT and from modern thought generally. That there should be a king is for Richelieu self-evident. The king’s role is to preserve this hierarchy, understood to constitute part of God’s divine plan. Just as man is ordained to reign over the beetle, so is the king ordained to reign over all other men. (Below the king there is some fuzziness. It is clear that Richelieu believes further distinctions of rank are part of the great chain of being and that they must be acknowledged, but it isn’t clear whether he believes that each rank present under the France of Louis XIII was necessary as such or whether these were merely the ranks that naturally arose under reasonably competent leadership.) Richelieu sees kings as stewards of God’s earthly kingdom, which, to be kept pristine, needs rule by an authority who commands total obedience. But Richelieu’s thinking is as practical as it is theological. In his view, such an arrangement leads to a stable society, and in some sense he is undoubtedly correct. During times of peace and under competent, compassionate rule, it would have been true that most people’s basic needs were met. In a minimal sense, then, even by modern standards, empirical well-being would have been achieved.

Another important feature of Richelieu’s thought is that he understands society to comprise three spheres: the clergy, the nobility, and the common people. I prefer spheres to classes because the former more deeply appreciates Richelieu’s system, which is not merely vertical but pyramidal. Although the relationship between individual members of each sphere is vertical (the nobleman invariably outranks the commoner), the spheres themselves are equal as institutions, for each is necessary in a healthy society: The clergy are society’s librarians, its guardians of forbidden knowledge (which for Richelieu is most knowledge); the church organizes and unifies society, prescribing the daily ritual on which general order depends. The nobles keep the common people in line and raise armies in times of war, serving as the king’s local administrators. And the common people are the backbone of society, its laborers and producers. The need to regulate these spheres is why society needs a king, a rational overseer who ensures that each sphere fulfills its role and that no sphere dominates or dilutes the others. What one finds in reading Richelieu is that this striving for
balance is consistently what motivates his thinking and what all his advice has in common, from how the king comports himself at dinner to how he manages the realm: nobles should be given latitude to pursue their ambitions, but they must not be allowed to terrorize the peasantry. The common people should be educated, but only to the level that their jobs require; too much education would make them unruly and unproductive. This harmony of the spheres is what Richelieu means by “public good,” which he cites as the king’s highest priority. Hence, maintaining order and stability is the national interest. And for the king to promote the public good effectively, he needs absolute authority, which explains Richelieu’s other theme: quashing challenges to the same. Artists who injure the king’s reputation should be censored. Nobles who defy him should be stripped of their titles. Dueling should be outlawed because it preempts the king’s justice. Even Political Testament’s seemingly apolitical sections exemplify this theme—its chapters on how the king should conduct himself, what to look for in advisors and so on. Because the king’s authority depends on his being perceived as strong, competent, and masterful, nothing can be allowed to challenge these perceptions. It all fits: the sober and rational king commands trust and respect, both of which ensure compliance; the king’s advisors should never publicly question his judgment, which, after all, would tarnish his image as a leader.

Generally, then, Richelieu places little emphasis on the individual and great emphasis on the collective—on institutional balance and integrity. For Richelieu the public good is paramount: no other principle is sacred. Yet so eager is he to subordinate legalism, procedure, and private interests that his work often invites contradictions, the first being religion’s limited practical role in his system. To be sure, invoking religion is a brilliant way to justify his unobvious claim that society needs an absolute king; but this is by no means necessary—an interpretation borne out by Richelieu’s policies as France’s Chief Minister. Far from being a precisian of orthodoxy and scripture, Richelieu was an uncompromising pragmatist and Machiavellian statesman. Suspected criminals were punished promptly and terribly if accused of subversion or espionage—due process was a luxury on Richelieu’s watch. And pragmatism explains his grudging tolerance of French Protestants, his wariness of a church monopoly on education, and his stormy relationship with Rome. After Richelieu’s death Pope Urban VIII is reputed to have said, “If there is a God, the cardinal will
have much to answer for; if there is not, then he was a great man.” Nor did Richelieu practice servile deference to the crown. *Political Testament* reveals him to be staunchly—even condescendingly—technocratic. Despite the king’s unsurpassed rank, in practice Richelieu sees the king’s role as purely executive, the responsibilities of policymaking and statecraft falling to expert advisors. This is no contradiction for Richelieu, whose priority is the good of the realm. Religion and king are but parts—albeit essential ones—of the means to that end.

Today most reject Richelieu’s theological premise, as do GT, to whom his hierarchical assumptions would seem laughably impertinent. Nor then can GT accept his stability-as-the-state’s-raison d’état approach, which makes sense as he pursued it only given these assumptions and given a greatly simplified arena of world politics. We live in a world incalculably more complex than the world Richelieu knew; GT’s goal is responding to the challenges posed by this complexity in a way that encourages human thriving. Whereas Richelieu sought to use the power of the state to contain and manage society, GT have no choice but to accept forces beyond the state’s control. GT and Richelieu have different ideas about the role of the state because they have different ideas about what the state is. For Richelieu, the state is the alpha and omega; for GT, it is merely another player in a grand political and economic arena. Probably because of the modern world’s overwhelming complexity, GT do not single out a particular kind of state or society as ideal, though they prefer the democratic to the authoritarian: democratic societies have better records of empirical well-being.

GT identify four megatrends that they believe will profoundly shape the next two decades. These are individual empowerment: better education and healthcare, widely available new technology, and growth of the middle class; demographic change: an aging population, population growth, and urbanization; diffusion of power; and greater diminishing natural resources: “demand for food, water, and energy will grow by 35, 40, and 50 percent respectively.”


Other than positing the significance of these trends, GT make few unqualified claims. Those they do submit are bold and portentous. They predict that by 2030 no country will reign supreme. Asia’s economy—particularly China’s—will grow as America’s share of the world economy declines, and countries in Africa and other underdeveloped regions will begin to catch up with the developed world. In short, Global Trends predicts economic equilibrium. Though some countries will still be appreciably wealthier than others, the gap will no longer be politically relevant as it is today. And perhaps even more controversially, they predict that private interests will rise and the nation-state will fall, though by no means to the point of insignificance. Countries that don’t adapt to this reality will lag economically.

GT also identify several “game-changers,” possible events or developments that will shape the course of history should they occur. Some of these include democratization in China, global economic crisis following collapse of the Eurozone, and American isolationism. Submitting these is GT’s way of admitting that they can’t predict with much specificity what will happen in each region of the globe, what role any given country will play, or how whatever happens will affect world politics. Instead they allow for possibilities, offering four possible futures. One, “fusion,” involves collaboration between China and the United States, which will be the dominant powers, and whose cooperation GT believe would be “the most plausible ‘best case’”.83 Others range from American and European isolationism to the previously mentioned nonstate world. In all possible futures, what GT emphasize is that individual empowerment—though it will bring challenges ranging from new forms of terrorism to greater strain on already limited resources—and global cooperation are desirable and inevitable: “Technological innovation—rooted in expanded exchanges and joint international efforts—is critical to the world staying ahead of the rising financial and resource constraints that would accompany a rabid boost in prosperity”.84

In short, Global Trends expects an international world even more complex than the world of 2013, itself immeasurably more complex than seventeenth-century France. Nowhere in Richelieu’s work is there a discussion of resources and energy; scarcity wasn’t a problem then. And as with empirical well-being generally, he was probably safe to assume that under competent rule they

83 Ibid., xiii.
84 Ibid., xiii.
never would be. But even hypothetical scarcity in Richelieu’s time is different from the scarcity contemplated in *Global Trends*. For the first time in human history, scarcity will mean not just immediate unavailability but absolute unavailability—e.g.: Earth’s oil reserves will eventually be depleted, whatever our various political and economic arrangements. So we are left with two questions: (1) How would Richelieu respond to problems such as a crisis of scarcity? and (2) How would Richelieu govern if he were politically active today? The second is the easier. Richelieu easily slips into the role of modern conservative, the inveterate realist and champion of so-called national interest. Given the primacy of the state in his system, doubtless he would emphasize national defense. But generally he is far more concerned about threats within the state than without. He would restrict speech, especially speech critical of the government or potentially damaging to national security. He would be deeply wary of corporations and other powerful private interests, seeing them as competitors of the state, which alone is qualified to make policy. But in most areas Richelieu would be unacceptably concessive in the eyes of his historical self. Democracy would have to be tolerated, as would corporations and publicly available Internet, both of which would have been unthinkable in Richelieu’s France even if theoretically they could have existed. Modern Richelieu would have to settle for superior intelligence-gathering, which of course would come at the expense of individual privacy. And here again, we are back to Richelieu’s collective notion of well-being. Richelieu would see thorough surveillance as necessary for the public good, as a way to prevent subversion and social upheaval. GT and I see this thinking as narrow-minded. Policies that so elevate the importance of the state as an abstraction ignore urgent problems that no lone state can hope to solve. Survival in the twenty-first century will require pooled expertise from a vast array of fields and disciplines; only our collective acumen can save us from ourselves. This means that people need to be free and educated, and it means GT are right to see individual empowerment as the national interest. No king, counsel, cabinet or president, however informed, can solve the challenges before us.

Not appreciating this is Richelieu’s great failure. Even his updated counterpart succumbs to nation-state myopia. Simply put, he offers no solutions because he is wedded to ideology rather than outcome, to the intangible (or, less charitably, incoherent) “national interest” of scholars and intriguers rather than the actual welfare of human beings. Nation-state fetishism leaves little
place for considered government responses to transnational corporations or desertification or climate change, all of which exist on a global scale and all of which will require international efforts of unprecedented scope and nuance to solve their accompanying problems. In view of this, GT’s definition of national interest is vastly superior. Global problems require cooperative global solutions, and for GT the goal of every nation should be working toward these solutions. Everyone with a car contributes to the problem of climate change. If Washington decides to build a nuclear power plant near the Canadian border, not only Americans will be affected. I think one of the great failures and tragedies of human history is our species’ fixation on local identity, whether family, clan, race, club, or nation. In the end we are all human beings, or even more generally living creatures. Like GT, I am a firm believer in the paramountcy of empirical well-being. We each get one life on one shared world. I think we should try to make the best of them.


MELISSA PRATT PEDROZA is the Deputy District Attorney for San Bernardino County and graduated with a degree in Political Science in 2002 from Cal Poly.
Melissa was a driven and ambitious undergraduate student, a “Type-A” personality, as she would refer to herself. When she graduated from Cal Poly, Melissa commissioned from the ROTC program into the U.S. Army. After about four years of active duty service, including two tours in Iraq, Melissa attended law school and then promptly began working for the District Attorney’s office in San Bernardino.

While at Cal Poly, Melissa became involved in Model United Nations and the ROTC program. The combination of Model UN and ROTC gave her valuable skills. Model UN helped her hone her public speaking and writing skills and the military encouraged her self-discipline, time management, and gave her a path after graduation. Melissa signed a contract with the Army after her first year at Cal Poly; the Army would pay for the rest of her education and she would owe time after school.

After graduating, she was active duty in the Army for four years. Following training in Virginia, Melissa was stationed in Fort Drum as the Platoon Leader of a Supply Platoon. Within two months of being at Fort Drum, her platoon was deployed to Tikrit, Iraq where she spent her time doing convoys and humanitarian missions. Melissa was back in the states for six months after her
first tour, and then her unit was sent back to Iraq again for another year. She was promoted to Captain and pulled up to battalion staff, which changed her responsibilities. They were stationed outside of Abu Ghraib so they took mortar fire often. Things calmed down when they moved camps halfway through the second tour.

It was at this point in time that Melissa began applying for law school; she took the LSAT her junior/senior year at Cal Poly and her scores were about to expire. To decide which law schools to apply to, she looked at the areas she wanted to live in, cost of living, housing, tuition, scholarship availability, and if the school had the areas she wanted to study. Based upon all of these factors, Melissa chose the University of La Verne. There were approximately thirty people in her classes, so there was a lot of individual attention, which she said kept her on track. The national law school rankings were something Melissa did not take into account. She said, “Unless you are going to work for a big name law firm, it doesn’t matter where you get your degree.”

She enjoyed law school more than her undergraduate career; she liked all of her classes, thrived in the smaller environment, and became very involved thanks to the guidance of some of her professors. Melissa was involved in Moot Court, which is similar to mock trial; she would present case law to argue her point in front of judges as if it was an appellate court. Melissa felt as though she finally had found what she was meant to do, and was offered the job she wanted upon graduation from law school. During law school, Melissa had done an externship with the U.S. Attorney’s office and the District Attorney’s office. The DA’s office was faster paced, so she set her sights on working there after graduation.

Melissa’s hard work paid off and she began work at the San Bernardino DA’s office after graduating from law school. When she started at the DA’s office, she handled misdemeanor cases for a few years, such as DUIs, child abuse, domestic violence, and petty thefts, for which she appeared at pre-trials, and handled the cases that went to trial. During her first two years, Melissa did twenty misdemeanor trials.

Now, Melissa is handling felony cases. A typical weekday for Melissa involves responding to motions, appearing in court to argue a motion, taking part in preliminary hearings, or preparing for cases to go to trial. For Melissa, trials are the most difficult and the most enjoyable. Her least favorite aspect of her job is jury selection, because she is required to ask twelve strangers personal questions
and delve into their issues. Questioning witnesses and cross-examination is Melissa’s favorite part of her job; she says it is a game of trying to get all of the evidence out while making out the defendant to be untrustworthy.

Melissa encourages seniors and recent graduates to take a year off, travel, intern, and figure out what you want to do. She stated that it helps to have life experience after college before committing to do postgraduate work, whatever it may be. Gaining experience puts many things into perspective. Once you start your career, you will not have the time to have these experiences again. Melissa would not have changed her path at all. The horror stories that students and young professionals hear about lawyers who are miserable and unhappy are not all true. Melissa is in the business of seeking justice, and loves it.
KATIE HOSELTON is a 4th year Political Science major with a concentration in Global Politics. After graduation in June, Katie plans to travel and work abroad, before applying for graduate school. She is passionate about international law and human rights, and is currently working to make Cal Poly a conflict mineral-free campus, in an effort to divest from companies that support the conflict in the Democratic Republic of Congo. She loves big dogs and strong margaritas, and dreams of the day when Hilary is president and when the IMF actually gives more than it takes. She hopes to work for an international institution and change the current system of foreign aid, all while having a large family of adopted children and dogs.
THE TRAGEDY OF TEXTILES: EXPLORING THE ACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE EXPLOITATION OF WORKERS IN THE GLOBAL GARMENT INDUSTRY

Katie Hoselton

Introduction

On April 24, 2013 the world witnessed the worst accident in the history of the garment industry, when an eight-story factory collapsed in Bangladesh. Over the course of the following two weeks, the death toll rose to over 1,100 people, as more bodies were found in the rubble. The New York Times reported that the building previously had been deemed unsafe for occupation due to multiple cracks in its infrastructure, however the building owner, Sohel Rana, ignored these warnings and continued operation without making any amends.85 The Washington Post reported that the building was constructed on swamp land, making the area unstable for tall structures.86 The original building plan had been approved to be five-stories; however, reports say that the owner illegally

added on three stories so that he could rent the space out to more companies. The heavy weight of the machinery required for garment production, combined with the additional stories and the unstable foundation of the building are all factors that contributed to the collapse. 87 It was noted that cracks in the structure’s walls caused authorities to deem the building unsafe for inhabiting the day before the collapse, however the owner required all workers to report to work the next day, not wanting to lose any time that could be spent manufacturing. Five different companies, including Tommy Hilfiger and Calvin Klein, operated in this eight-story factory, causing extreme overcrowding and pushing the weight of the building far past its capacity. 88 Workers in the former Rana Plaza factory in Bangladesh work for $38 a month, which is purportedly a standard, but nearly unlivable, wage for workers in the region.89

Sadly, the exploitation of workers in the garment industry is nothing new to the international arena. The early 1990’s brought the notion of sweatshops to the public eye, through multiple media exposés of large Western corporations.90 In 1995, Nike admitted to “serious breaches” of its labor standards, as the media exposed its rampant use of child labor and overcrowded, underpaid sweatshops.91 Nike founder and CEO Phillip Knight confessed in 1998 that, Nike products have “become synonymous with slave wages, forced overtime, and arbitrary abuse,” which is the first step to solving the problem.92 Since this exposure, Nike has made adjustments in their labor practices such as revamping their code of conduct and reimbursing workers; however, many groups are skeptical that their policy changes have actually improved conditions for workers.93 Oxfam and The Clean Clothes Campaign, an organization dedicated to improving the working conditions of garment workers, were “not convinced”94 by a sustainability report published by Nike in 2001, noting that Nike’s efforts “haven’t
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ended abuses across the hundreds of factories that produce its goods.”95 Let it be noted however, that Nike is by no means the only culprit of garment worker exploitation; NGOs have confirmed that Walmart also has a “long history of high-profile labor rights violations,” and while it has instituted reforms over the years, the International Labor Rights Forum has noted that their inspections “are still overwhelmingly pre-announced and, partially as a result, ineffective”.96

Exploitation of workers in the garment industry is also not limited to individuals in developing countries. In 1996, President Clinton gave a speech in which he acknowledged that over seventy workers in a factory in El Monte, California had been working “in virtual slavery behind barbed wire in a garment factory.”97 In response to this, the California Senate passed one of the most comprehensive anti-sweatshop laws in history, Assembly Bill 633. Known as the “sweatshop reform bill”, the legislation provides California garment workers with minimum wage standards and protection under the law.98 However, the same protections cannot be said for workers in other nations. It is clear that the recent collapse in Bangladesh is not unprecedented but is rather another incident in a long pattern of tragedies in the garment industry. While history shows that corporations have made efforts to improve their standards, it appears as though the changes made have lacked teeth, as this vulnerable population of garment workers continues to be exploited. As the companies involved in the Bangladesh crisis scramble to clear their image by proposing international agreements and writing checks to support safety programs, it will become clear in the weeks and months to come whether these efforts will institute any tangible reforms, or whether they will simply be like the rest of the labor laws in the garment industry: toothless and ineffective.

The recent incidents in the garment industry, namely in Bangladesh and Cambodia, combined with the grim history of labor law enforcement, implies that the state of the garment industry is neither improving, nor remaining stagnant; conditions for workers are actually deteriorating. This presents a rather
troubling scenario: how is it that globalization has improved so many aspects of people's lives, from medicines to technological inventions, yet the lives of those producing the goods are getting so much worse? Clearly something is missing in the efforts that have been made to uphold human rights in this industry. The question is, where are these shortcomings occurring? The non-profit investigative group, CorpWatch, attributes the widespread exploitation of garment industry workers to intense global capitalist system, which forces companies to market goods for the lowest price possible.\(^9^9\) This quest for the lowest sticker price can be traced back to the place where the goods are made; it is the factory workers that bear the largest burden of this system, as their wages are slashed to absolute minimums. CorpWatch notes that this slashing of prices is fed by “brutal competition from the mass-merchandise discounters,” trapping retailers in a “Darwinian battle for survival.”\(^1^0^0\) This race to the bottom will not cease unless a drastic change is made at one of three levels: international organizations, Western corporations, or consumers. CorpWatch claims that the conditions of garment workers will not change “as long as global commodity chains continue to [...] satisfy the needs of powerful transnational corporations.”\(^1^0^1\) We, as consumers, have built a system of trade that is based on a foundation of exploitation, which leads us, as members of the international community, to ask the question: Why does the garment industry exist without minimal labor protections, leaving workers extremely vulnerable to exploitation?

**Conventional Wisdom**

One might think that the United States, as a prominent upholder of human rights, would oppose trade agreements that condone sweatshop labor; however, partisan polling data suggests otherwise. Americans generally favor all policies that promote international trade, throwing caution to the wind when it comes to labor standards. A Gallup poll from February 2013 found that fifty-seven percent of Americans view foreign trade as an opportunity for economic growth, rather than a financial threat.\(^1^0^2\) A poll conducted by the Pew Research Center
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in 2009 found that the percent of Americans who feel that international trade is good increased twelve percentage points from 2008.\textsuperscript{103} Despite the massive global economic recession of 2008, the poll shows that Americans feel that engaging in trade of all forms is beneficial to the U.S. economy. The Pew Research Global Attitudes Project also found in a recent poll that Americans feel that international trade not only benefits the U.S., but also boosts foreign economies. The poll published on May 23, 2013 cited this American belief that developing countries involved in the manufacturing side of goods production also benefit from trade agreements. Pew found that fifty-four percent of Americans think that trade is beneficial for citizens of developing countries, compared to only nine percent which disagree.\textsuperscript{104} Pew holds that in general, “the U.S. business community has supported trade agreements.”\textsuperscript{105}

Interestingly, the same Pew poll found that Americans are concerned about the threat of inflation: fifty-one percent felt that “rising prices are a very big problem.”\textsuperscript{106} This concern about rising prices helps to explain the exploitative actions of companies who seek to compete in the global capitalist market. Despite this concern, the majority of the countries surveyed in the Pew 2009 poll believe that “the free market approach to economics is good for society, even if it produces income inequalities.”\textsuperscript{107} From this belief it can be inferred that most Americans feel that globalization and international trade agreements are ultimately beneficial to all parties involved. This perception is wrong because recent events have shown that all parties involved in trade do not benefit equally. In contrast, workers on the manufacturing end of commodity production benefit substantially less than those on the corporate side, and in fact are exploited to the extent that their basic human rights are violated. The conventional wisdom

is also incorrect because it assumes that Americans are generally unaware of the horrific working conditions that many laborers in the manufacturing industry are subjected to, which explains why Americans believe that trade is mutually beneficial. In reality, many Americans are aware of the degree and extent of exploitation that occurs in developing countries and still think that trade should be pursued and prices should be driven lower. Americans generally feel that even though sweatshops often commit rampant human rights violations, cheap labor is essential to keep prices low, and is thus the best of a series of bad options. Pew polling data shows that Americans favor free trade and globalization and sadly, the basic rights of workers in developing nations is simply not an issue of primary concern to them.

**Methodology and Primary Evidence**

In order to understand how a crisis as deadly as the recent Bangladesh collapse can occur in this day and age, this paper will use quantitative methodology to investigate which actor has the most influence on the garment industry. This paper will draw data from primary sources, including but not limited to CRS Reports, ILO reports, Presidential speeches, and non partisan polling data. This research will be supplemented by data from secondary sources, employing scholarly journals, such as JSTOR, as well as articles from university publications, and noteworthy newspapers like The New York Times and The Washington Post. This paper will employ three different case studies, as well as the theoretical paradigm of Marxism, to examine the issue from variant perspectives. It will examine international institutions, multinational corporations, and consumers, to see the role that each plays in the garment industry.

**Theoretical Paradigm**

My research suggests that the best paradigm to frame and explain my findings is the structural framework of Marxism as it pertains to international relations. Based off of the teachings of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, Marxism looks to class-rankings, social systems, and the international division of labor to explain state behavior.\(^{108}\) It takes a material approach to historical development, to show how trade, economics, and capitalism have framed the current

international system. While Marxism is a structural as opposed to an ideological theory, it can provide insight on many of the historical behaviors of states in international relations. Its key implication is that material forces drive the behavior of actors in the international arena, as opposed to abstract factors like power, sovereignty, and norms. Gareth Dale, a senior professor at Brunel University, holds that a society’s “mode of production” is the “key to understanding its systems of power and belief.” Marxism views state behavior from a context of capital, production, trade, and industry, which provides an insightful framework to view the issue at hand.

While Marxism works well to explain my second case study of multinational corporations, it does not shed much light on the first case study of international institutions. Marxism barely even recognizes the existence of non-state actors, and makes almost no reference to international law; B.S. Chimni of the Center for Studies in Diplomacy in New Delhi notes that the founders of Marxism “never directly address the subject.” As a result, scholars are left to apply the tenets of Marxist methodology to international institutions and not-state actors, in hopes of viewing the rest of the behaviors of international actors through Marxist eyes. In doing so, scholars postulate that within the Marxist framework, international institutions are actors with limited power, but influence none the less. Because they serve the interests of groups, as opposed to the national interests of states (a concept which Marxism discredits), we can infer that Marxism gives international institutions some viable credit as an actor. However, since they are driven by interests rather than capital or production, they are not the most influential or dominating actor. Chimni posits from the

---

109 David McLellan and Sidney Hook, “Marx: The First Hundred Years; Marxism and Beyond,” Foreign Affairs, 1983.
111 Ibid
115 Ibid
works of Marxism that international institutions are viewed “as a device which
serves sectional global interests,” but not any other actor in particular.\textsuperscript{116}

In contrast, Marxism frames my second and third case studies, of multina
tional corporations and consumers very well. Marxism supports the idea that
workers are being exploited because of the race to the bottom mentality felt
by multinational corporations in the aggressive capitalist market.\textsuperscript{117} A Marxist
would see the rampant exploitation of garment workers as a consequence of
corporate greed, driven by the high demand of consumers. This fierce com­
petition drives corporations to seek the lowest wage possible, causing many to
ignore the flimsy standards put in place in hopes of gaining an edge on the
prices of their competitors.\textsuperscript{118}

\textbf{Research Findings}

\textbf{Case Study: International Institutions}

The most obvious culprit and often the first to be blamed for crises like the recent
collapse in Bangladesh are international institutions such as the International
Labor Organization (ILO) and the United Nations (UN). For the purposes
of this paper, I will examine only the ILO as a representative of international
institutions, since it is designed primarily to tackle the topic of interest. The
ILO can set forth labor standards in the form of either conventions or recom­
mandations.\textsuperscript{119} Conventions are legally binding contracts to all states that
are members of the ILO and choose to ratify it.\textsuperscript{120} Recommendations are
non-binding and merely set forth suggestions often regarding how to imple­
ment certain aspects of a convention.\textsuperscript{121} The ILO meets once a year to draft
and update conventions and ratifications, and if asked by a member state for
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technical assistance during the year, the ILO will gladly abide.\textsuperscript{122} The labor standards set forth by the ILO are backed by supervisory system, which conducts periodic inspections to ensure that states are adequately abiding by the conventions they ratify. If it is found that the standards are being breached, the ILO can make further recommendations, or “assist countries through social dialogue and technical assistance.”\textsuperscript{123} It also allows any worker or employer organization to file a complaint if they believe that an aspect of a convention is being violated.\textsuperscript{124}

But this, many argue, is where the authority of the ILO ends. Like the UN, and other international institutions, the ILO has only as much power as its members allow it to have, which is usually not very much. The ILO has set forth eight fundamental conventions, covering all aspects of labor from minimum age to forced labor, and hoped to receive universal ratification on these eight crucial documents, but today still only 83% of the total possible states have signed on.\textsuperscript{125} While this may seem like a high percentage, the implication of this is that there are roughly thirty nations that have not agreed to international labor standards and therefore legally do not need to comply. The ILO is fully aware of the rampant violations of labor laws in countries around the world, as seen in their emphasis in problematic regions discussed later in this paper; many argue that they lack the authority to do anything about it. Nazia Habib-Mintz of the Journal of International Business and Economy frees the World Trade Organization (WTO) of any blame by noting that the task of developing and promoting labor standards was delegated to the ILO in 1996.\textsuperscript{126} She notes the “toothless” aspect of the organization’s enforcement power, when saying that the ILO merely “urges nations to honor their obligation,” to meet the


standards that they agreed to in a convention.\textsuperscript{127} She implies that this honors system approach to enforcing labor standards does not provide enough of an incentive for countries to abide by when big businesses with copious capital to invest are mixed into the equation.

In contrast, Kimberly Ann Elliot from the Institute for International Economics makes the case that the ILO does indeed have teeth, arguing that it “is the competent body to set and enforce labor standards in general and should be given the support necessary to do the job.”\textsuperscript{128} She holds that the ILO has three tools available to it for the purpose of law and norm enforcement: regular reporting and review processes, the ability to provide technical assistance, and avenues to raise issues of noncompliance; she refers to these tools colloquially as sunshine, carrots, and sticks.\textsuperscript{129} Another scholar from the International Institute for Economics agrees with this argument, noting that “the ILO has extensive mechanisms for supervising the application of its labor conventions.”\textsuperscript{130} This scholar points to numerous examples of the tangible and significant reforms the ILO was able to make when provided with sufficient funding.\textsuperscript{131} Elliot cites the example of Burma in 1996, when delegates filed a complaint that Burmese factories were tolerating forced labor, employing the “sticks” tool of the ILO.\textsuperscript{132} The report was processed and the ILO was eventually able to cut off technical assistance to the region, ban Burma from its meetings, and call upon member states to impose sanctions on the country.\textsuperscript{133} These actions were enough to get Burma to cooperate to some degree, marking a huge success for the ILO and for diplomacy in general.\textsuperscript{134} In this case, the mere threat of sanctions was enough to convince Burma to change its ways, but whether the sunshine and carrots approach is enough to convince other nations to move, is the question
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we are left with. Elliot says that “the real test of ILO credibility, however, will come over time as we see whether Burma is a precedent or an aberration.”

Other successes of the ILO have been documented and debated by scholars. A project instigated by the ILO in 2001 called Better Factories Cambodia supposedly made so much progress in improving working conditions in the region, that it served as the model for the creation of the ILO’s Better Work Program. This program, created in 2012 is supported by the International Finance Corporation and seeks to promote the implementation of safe labor practices in seven developing countries.

After hearing both sides of the debate over the effectiveness of the ILO, we are left to conclude on its ability and responsibility as an international actor to regulate and enforce labor standards in the garment industry. There is indisputable evidence that the ILO does indeed have enforcement powers, and it has been cited that the combination of its carrots, sticks, and sunshine have produced desirable results. However the question of whether the “sticks” of the ILO are truly strong enough to enforce the range and realm of its conventions, still looms. It is important to keep in mind that the ILO is not an international police but rather an institution comprised of willing members; it is this distinction that is both the greatest attribute and detriment to an organization of this kind. The ILO serves the important function of creating and maintaining global norms, that for the most part, reflect the ideas of the international community. International institutions have predominately defined our concepts of right and wrong regarding international markets, and determined what is acceptable completely unacceptable in today’s world, most of which transcend all cultural and geographic boundaries. And, while it has been proven that the ILO does have influence over the labor conditions of workers in the garment industry, in a world driven by capitalism and material gains, international institutions are not the actors with the most influence on the enforcement of labor standards.

Case Study: Multinational Corporations

Another group of actors that have undeniable influence in the garment industry are multinational corporations (MNCs), to which some scholars claim, “are a
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powerful economic force.” Adhering perfectly to Marxist theory, G. Gereffi of the Journal of International Economics argues that MNCs are the driving force in “the whole supply chain,” and use their penetrative force to “ensure productivity, efficiency, and reliability of performance.” This posits that MNCs, as the possessors of capital and global resources, are one of the most dominating actors in the international arena. However, ethical concerns that arose when corporations began moving overseas for cheap labor have caused some scholars to believe that apparel manufacturers are currently “in a squeeze,” or struggling financially. MNCs have huge incentives to violate labor standards, and are able to do so as a result of a lack of law enforcement which is in turn “due to institutional and infrastructural limitations.” Dexter Roberts, a Businessweek reporter, notes that it is fairly easy to violate labor laws and get away with it; a Businessweek investigation found that “numerous Chinese factories keep double sets of books to fool auditors and distribute scripts for employees to recite if they are questioned.” Gereffi says that because foreign manufacturers can produce goods that are similar in quality but much cheaper in cost, the question for most MNCs today “is no longer whether to engage in foreign production, but how to organize and manage it,” implying that the use of foreign labor by MNCs is inevitable.

The effects of the extremely competitive capitalist market have triggered what scholars are calling a “race to the bottom,” which is an aggressive quest to produce goods at the lowest cost possible. Evidently, this starts with the production of the raw materials which occurs in the textile and apparel sectors of the garment industry, and directly affects the wages of the manufacturers
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in these regions. The NGO CorpWatch identifies one cause of this race to the bottom as wage deflation.\textsuperscript{145} Hector Figueroa, a journalist for the North American Congress of Latin America, reported that the prices of retail clothes in the U.S. are not increasing quickly enough to keep up with inflation, and as a result, “average profit margins for apparel manufacturers are around 2 percent below manufacturing as a whole.”\textsuperscript{146} Further exacerbating this effect are “declining average wages” in U.S. household incomes, “increasing income inequality,” and “brutal competition from the mass-merchandise discounters.”\textsuperscript{147} The consequence is that MNCs today are “caught in a Darwinian battle for survival,” and when push comes to shove, it is the vulnerable workers who will feel the burn of these effects.

These findings present the question: do MNCs have the power to improve the working conditions of laborers in the garment industry? Nazia Habib-Mintz of the Journal of International Business and Economy holds that the motivations of MNCs “are complexly tied with labour standards and its practice,” implying that MNCs do have a significant hold on the industry.\textsuperscript{148} She also notes that the labor supply in developing countries is “inelastic,” or fixed, causing wages to decline over time, and giving MNCs “more bargaining power over wages and choices.”\textsuperscript{149} Scholars from the University of Colorado, Boulder argue that MNCs are left to compete “on the basis of one of the few factors of production they control: the cost of labor.”\textsuperscript{150}

All of these factors show that MNCs have a direct influence on the wages and working conditions of laborers in developing countries. The fact that MNCs can choose to “turn a blind eye to labor standards irregularities,” “ignore set minimum wages,” and “coerce labor to work over 100 hours per week in
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unhealthy environments,” shows that they also have the power to revoke these practices and implement humane ones.\footnote{Q. Tahmina, “Labour-Bangladesh: Garment Exports Thrive on Dirt,” Inter Press Service News Agency. April, 2007, (Accessed June 6, 2013).}

However, because of the capital-driven market system, MNC’s decision of whether or not to uphold human rights hinges on consumer demand. If Marxism is the lens through which this issue is best viewed, the dominating actors are “big business[es],” which will respond to one thing only: capital. The instant consumers begin to demand products that have been manufactured ethically and responsibly, MNCs will respond. This was seen with Nike in the 1990s, after multiple media outlets exposed the company’s use of child labor and domestic servitude in its Asian factories.\footnote{“Sweatshops,” International Labor Rights Forum. 2012. (Accessed May 28, 2013).} In response to the national outcry and opposition of consumers, Nike admitted to its mistakes, and supposedly reimbursed its workers and tightened its regulations and inspection techniques.\footnote{Janelle McCalla, “Global Reputation,”https://sites.google.com/a/email.vccs.edu/bus100jmc­calla/home/global-reputation-2 (Accessed May 28, 2013).} While it’s unclear whether Nike’s reforms have actually improved the conditions of their workers, this example gives support to the idea that MNCs will respond to consumer demand, and that they do have a strong influence over worker conditions. CorpWatch sums up the state of the industry fairly well: “As long as global commodity chains continue to discipline and direct the region’s economies to satisfy the needs of powerful transnational corporations, the working conditions of people throughout the hemisphere are not likely to improve.”\footnote{Hector Figueroa, “In the Name of Fashion: Exploitation in the Garment Industry,” CorpWatch, January 1, 1996. http://www.corpwatch.org/article.php?id=3034 (Accessed May 26, 2013).}

**Case Study: Consumers**

Consumers are one of the most overlooked but important actors that have a huge influence over the entire global supply chain. Scholars from the University of Boulder, Colorado argue that the role that consumers play in the global market is often disregarded, holding that any attempt to improve sweatshop conditions for workers “must recognize that the dynamics of the buyer-driven apparel chain result in systematic cost pressures on suppliers that are conducive
to violations of workers’ rights.” The effect that consumers have is undeniably significant, but indirect; consumers do not have access to the factories themselves, but their actions directly affect those who do. Many scholars argue that this increase in political activism by consumers and human rights groups “has focused greater scrutiny on the behavior of exporting firms and large multinationals.” Steven Greenhouse of The New York Times reported that after the collapse in Bangladesh, companies rushed to clear their names of all connections to the crisis: “The apparel brands and retailers face a greater level of reputation risk of being associated with abusive and dangerous conditions in Bangladesh than ever before.” These findings show that MNCs are greatly affected by the attitudes and opinions of their consumers.

Perhaps the most prominent example of consumer impact on the garment industry is the Nike scandal of the 1990s, discussed briefly in the previous case study. Scholars from University of California, Berkeley found that “international concern over globalization and labor standards increased dramatically” during this time. Activism took the forms of newspaper campaigns, media exposés, grassroot organizations, and pressure applied on the governments of developing countries. One strategy that was particularly effective and continues to be completely consumer-driven, is the massive increase in the number of articles published on the topic of labor standards and the condition of workers in the garment industry. Ann Harrison, a professor of economics at UC Berkeley, cites that the number of major newspaper articles that were published “more than tripled” between 1990 and 1996, peaking at over 1,500 articles.
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effects of this period of intense consumer activism produced concrete results at the national and international levels: threats from the United States to increase tariff barriers in Indonesia resulted in “a twenty-five percent increase in real wages for unskilled workers,” within this six year period.\textsuperscript{161}

It is important to keep in mind that this change instigated by consumers is different from the effects that other actors such as international institutions and MNCs have on the industry. While MNCs can directly determine wages, and international institutions such as the ILO can directly implement conventions and recommendations, consumers can only affect the industry indirectly by using their voice, either through purchasing power or grassroot organization. Harrison reported that consumers in the 1990s used their voices to pressure the U.S. government, which in turn applied pressure on the Indonesian government, “which led to changes in the minimum wage.”\textsuperscript{162} This should by no means diminish the effects of consumer-driven change, but rather show that this approach tackles the system in a slightly different manner. And, while the “reforms” instigated by Nike in the 1990s have not significantly altered the lives of workers, the uproar that average citizens were able to cause demonstrates the effect that consumers are able to make on the industry.\textsuperscript{163}

Another very prominent way that consumers can affect the garment industry is through their purchasing power, or ability to chose what type of products to buy. A TIME Magazine reporter, Brian Walsh, believes that consumers can play a considerable role by carefully choosing which brands to buy, but that it is unlikely that they will be willing to pay more for items produced ethically: “Customers can do their part by putting a little pressure on their favorite brands, though that would require placing as much value on the cost of a life as you might on the cost of a T-shirt.”\textsuperscript{164} Bryan Walsh interviewed a 21-year old college student about her willingness to stop buying cheap clothes that have been produced by sweatshop labor. She responded, “it bothers me, but [...] I can’t see how I can change anything,” continuing that corporations “definitely

\textsuperscript{161} Ibid
\textsuperscript{162} Ibid
need to improve, but I’ll still shop here. It’s so cheap.”

Walsh fears that her response is representative of a large portion of apparel consumers, and will reflect a growing generation of apathetic shoppers.

Scholars from Harvard University make the case that consumers actually are interested in buying goods that were produced humanely, and would be willing to pay a higher price for “socially labeled” items. A different reporter from *TIME Magazine* supports this theory, saying that there is “evidence that consumers are willing to pay at least a small premium for assurance that their clothing is produced in fair and safe working conditions.” The Harvard scholars believe that if companies improved the working conditions of their employees in developing nations, and advertised it on the product’s labels so that consumers were aware, “many consumers would be willing to pay higher prices for such items.” They continue, that if the additional profit earned from the increased price of the product went to cover the “costs associated with raising labor standards,” then “everyone would win.” These scholars believe that this model has the potential to “improve working conditions without adversely affecting investment and growth in developing countries.” This is a powerful assertion, and one that could have a huge impact on the global commodity chain, if proven effective and implemented. To conclude, the effect that consumers have on the conditions of workers in the garment industry is disputed. Evidence suggests that consumers can make a difference, but only when a large group of people act cohesively. Thus, while consumer-driven change can be tangible, consumers are not the actor with the most influence over the garment industry, and are not the primary culprits for the recent tragedy in Bangladesh.

**Implications**

In answer to my research question, workers in the international garment industry have been left extremely vulnerable to exploitation which is a result of
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multiple actors falling short of their duties. This paper explored the roles that three different actors play in the lives of garment workers, and reveals that each has the capability to affect labor conditions in its own unique way. However, my research findings suggest that multinational corporations are able to exert more influence over wages, enforcement, and working conditions, than the other levels of the global supply chain. The key to improving conditions for workers in this industry, is understanding how each of these actors act and interact, and knowing the weight that each can pull in the international arena. The solution to the problem of worker exploitation will involve all three actors to some degree, as well as some other actors that were not discussed, such as NGOs and local and national governments. But, the largest takeaway from this paper is that while consumers are decidedly not using their purchasing power enough to effectively choose which companies to support, and while the ILO may not be aggressive enough on the enforcement of its conventions abroad, it is the multinational corporations who are markedly inhibiting the conditions of workers from improving by intentionally keeping wages and prices irreconcilably low. Thus, it is imperative for all actors to come together to tackle the issue of basic human rights, as each is an integral piece to this complex puzzle; however, it is the multinational corporations that must make the most significant changes in their practices and policies in order for palpable and lasting improvements to be made in the lives of garment workers worldwide.
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Though she had known where she was going after graduation, Kelli still took the necessary steps during college to rule out some future options. After a short internship at a law firm in SLO, she decided going to law school was not in her future. She recalls that while she may have had the skills necessary to excel at being a lawyer, it was not her passion. For her, passion is what dictates happiness. Her advice for graduating students who are figuring out their next
steps is as follows: if you are passionate about what you do, you will be more successful and much happier. Your job will feed your spirit and you will love those 40-60 hour workweeks. That is the kind of career you want to pursue. Just because you’re good at it, does not mean it is for you.

Kelli’s own passion is clearly displayed through her monumental accomplishments thus far in the world of international affairs. She began her career as a Presidential Management Intern in Washington D.C. for the U.S. Department of State where she worked on policy issues relating to diplomatic posts overseas. Since then, Kelli has worked at the Pentagon for the United States Air Force as the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Space Plans and Policy, as the Branch Chief of International Space Cooperation, then the Division Chief for Space and Cyberspace Cooperation, and then the Director of Strategy, Operations and Resources. She was promoted to the Senior Executive Service of the Air Force in 2010, which is the civilian equivalent of a military general.

Kelli’s tasks in those jobs were primarily to provide expertise in the fields of political and military issues, global engagement strategies, cyberspace capabilities and the assessment of Air Force partnership strategy. She also provided oversight for the execution of operations and maintenance, research and development and foreign military sales budgets to support the security cooperation community and U.S. national security purposes.

One of the highlights of Kelli’s career was during her time as the Branch Chief of International Space Cooperation when she was the lead negotiator on a $6 billion Memorandum of Understanding with Australia’s Defense Department for the Wideband Global Satellite communications system. The system provides bandwidth for communication purposes regarding tactical command and control, intelligence and surveillance. For her, the chance she had to be able to have a great concept for collaboration with a partner, be able to pull together a team of all the right players, convince them that particular next steps are the correct ones, move forward and then make something happen- that is what she considers the greatest reward in her career.

After 18 years of doing space-cooperation work with NATO allies, Kelli’s next achievement came in the form of a new position as the Director of International Affairs and Foreign Policy Advisor for the United States Coast Guard. At the Coast Guard, the primary focus is the western hemisphere, which is a part of the world that she is less familiar with, making her thrilled to have a new mission and new cultures to work with. Although she has only
been in this new position since December of 2013, Kelli loves the fine line the U.S. Coast Guard plays between military and civilian work. As part of the Department of Homeland Security, the Coast Guard plays an essential role in the world through the development of international agreements and other countries’ coast guards.

Kelli has faced her share of challenges during her time in public service. Being a mom of two and balancing her family with her career has been stretching for her, particularly when she works approximately 55-60 hours a week. Her secret? Staying fit and healthy and having a supportive partner. She posits that you cannot do much without those three things.

Kelli Seybolt’s accomplishments in public service to the United States are noteworthy. Her story is one of someone so driven and so prepared to make a difference in the world, that it may seem impossible to reach that level of potential when approaching graduation at the age of 20 as I am. However, her advice is this: go for what you’re passionate about, (chances are, you already know what that is) stay fit and healthy, choose a supportive partner, be a team player and you’ll love every second of whatever you do. As Confucius said, when you love your job, “you’ll never work a day in your life.”
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AN ASSESSMENT OF ISRAEL’S MILITARY CAPABILITY

Joi Sullivan

Oil and Islam. When juxtaposed, these words scream the Middle East, more than any other region in the world. Because these aspects of Middle Eastern culture and politics are entrenched into modern day life and are consistently interacting, they continuously and relatively overtly play a part in the stability of the region. In the northwest side of the region that makes up the Middle East, one can find the crux of religious clashes. Amidst the primarily Islamic countries in that area, lies one outlier, Israel. The country of Israel, with its Jewish heritage and narrow landscape, wedged between Lebanon, Syria, Jordan, Egypt and the Mediterranean Sea, seems to be a David in the midst of a collective Goliath. During decades of violence with nearby countries, the small country of Israel has proven to be capable militarily to not only force ceasefires, but also dominate in terms of military prowess in a region marked by economic prosperity allowed by oil monopolies in Islamic countries. Events such as the War of 1948 and the Six Day War in 1967 have shown Israel, when completely outnumbered and seemingly headed into total decimation, managing to not only scrape by, but thrive and succeed in their military engagements.

In a time where military technology is developing at supersonic rate and the Middle East is ravaged by conflict, Israel continues to display superior
military aptitude. This coupled with continuous technological developments demands a further assessment of Israel’s military capability as it relates to the region around them. The remaining discussion will posit that while using comprehensive definitions of power, due to technological developments, manpower, economic strength and external support, Israel’s current military capability is exceptional and has a consequential impact on the world at large.

**Military Capability**

The conceptualization of military capability is extensive at the least. It mandates a thorough definition of power and an analysis of relative power in order to be an all encompassing concept. The theoretical paradigm of realism defines states’ main interests as power, and further divides power into two categories: hard power and soft power. Hard power is that which is tangible, primarily military artillery and number of soldiers. Conversely, soft power is epitomized in monetary value and influence in various realms. One invaluable resource concerning indicators of power is the Correlates of War project (COW) which was created in 1963, to provide an “accumulation of scientific knowledge” concerning war through the conceptualization of a “state” and a “war.”

Power is often defined as “control over resources, control over actors, and control over events and outcomes.” In this project specifically, indicators of military power primarily included factors such as “material resources and industrial capacity” but wrongfully excluded things such as potential to mobilize people and “geo-strategic bargaining leverage”. While COW includes some factors that are non-conventional, military power as defined solely by resource numbers and capacity is misleading. It fails to address key aspects of military prowess. A country can have millions of soldiers but have less advanced technology, thereby putting them at a lower ranking in terms of world military power. One of the fundamental indicators of military capability is latent power, the ability to turn assets of the population into military power particularly
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because military power is impossible to possess without wealth. Also, the percent of GDP per capita spent on the military is indicative of how high of a priority military development is. It is rather logical and clear that those with military development as a high priority generally have the most military power. Additionally, while COW chooses to ignore military power in terms of ability to mobilize, with Israel in particular, it is necessary to address the complexity of its compulsory draft and how the ability to mobilize thousands of people affects their capability to succeed in military engagements.

Measuring military power must be executed through a means of comparison. The relative gains of one country compared to another country can reveal a great deal about the increase, decrease or stagnation of any one country’s military capability. Also, the ability for a state to carry out its military intentions even with resistance contributes to the total military capability of a country. These factors, though seemingly unconventional and rather abstract, do play a rather large role in not only the level of military capability a state has, but also the way in which the world perceives the threat of a specific state. The assessment of the military capability of a state as compared to its historical capabilities and other states indicates reasoning behind its interactions and justifications for action in the international realm. With these acknowledgements about the complexity of military power, this paper will assess the military capability of Israel and determine its level of competitiveness and strength as compared to the past and the present.

**Manpower**

When Israel declared its independence in 1948, it enacted compulsory military service for all men and women that reach the age of eighteen. Voluntary service is allowed at the age of seventeen. This encompasses all children of Israelis including those who were born in Israel and left the country when they were
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young. Currently, because of this compulsory draft, 3.8 million Israeli men and women are available for military service, although only about 2.9 million men and women are actually fit for service.\(^\text{10}\) There used to be major exceptions to the compulsory draft law, one which related to a particular religious group within Israel. The Haredim, or the ultra-Orthodox Jews of Israel, were provided an exception to the rule if they were studying in seminary full time. However, in March of 2014, the Israeli government removed that exception and mandated the draft of a certain quota of this group of people, only allowing 1800 of the group to escape the draft. The Haredim make up 10% of Israel’s 7.8 million people, making them 780,000 strong.\(^\text{11}\) If 1800 are given exceptions to this new draft law that leaves 778,200 to be available for mobilization. While that number is rather small in comparison to the 3.8 million available for military service, it still contributes a large degree to the number of people who are able to be mobilized with one political act.

Israel’s manpower may be one of the most underestimated factors of its military power. The ability to mobilize 2.9 million people, roughly 40% of Israel’s population, who are actually fit for service, is comparable to the largest country in the world. China has 45.6% of its population, which is roughly 1 billion people, ready and fit for service. The United States has 37.6% of its over 300 million people fit for service.\(^\text{12}\) The largest country in the world and arguably the strongest military power in the world have relatively equal sizes in ‘reserves’ in terms of population percentages with the 99th largest country in the world.\(^\text{13}\) While when facing other states in battle, percentage of population ready for service bears little weight in the outcome—because smaller populations will still produce smaller cohorts of soldiers— the comparable percentages paint a picture of Israel’s priorities and their development of society’s preparedness for military engagement. To have 40% of an entire state’s populace ready to mobilize indicates a society where preparation for military engagements is a way of life and not unusual to the common people. It is this kind of society that is ready for battle before it arrives at their doorstep.


\(^{12}\) “CIA - The World Factbook.”

\(^{13}\) Ibid.
Technological Developments
In a world where technology has become its own language, states with the greatest technological advances tend to be perceived as those with the greatest power. In fact, technology has become one conceptual definition of power in its comprehensive self. The development of cutting edge technology, particularly as it relates to military capabilities, gives any state an advantage when faced with a less developed state. In Israel’s case, they have increasingly become a military-industrial state, where the state’s marketplace is largely characterized by companies who primarily focus on the arena of military related technological advancement.

In 2000, Israel presented its first anti-missile machinery, an interceptor and destroyer known as the Arrow System. Created through a partnership between Boeing and Israel Aerospace Industries, the system and its newer versions, is designed to destroy incoming exo-atmospheric kill vehicles. It has fire-control radar, a launch control system and a battle management center. Following the production of the Arrow System, the state owned company Rafael Advanced Defense systems designed the Iron Dome, which became operational in 2011. This new anti-missile defense system was built to destroy short-range rockets and artillery shells from four to seventy kilometers away. The system also was recognized as an effective measure against aircraft at certain altitudes. Lastly, the development of the David’s Sling Weapons system in 2010, a system which is “designed as an additional layer of defense against ballistic missiles, to add interception opportunities to the joint U.S.-Israel Arrow Weapon System and to improve Israel’s defense capabilities against missile threats” gives Israel its third anti-missile system in fourteen years. All three systems are effective at intercepting and destroying their intended targets.

However, military technology is not solely limited to anti-missile systems. Because of the innovation and new direction of military attacks in the 21st century, states have begun to find it necessary to prioritize technology pertaining to cyber-security. Israel has within the Israeli Defense Forces (IDF) its own

Economic Strength
In addition to technological development, a state’s economic development will always play a significant role in its military power. Wealth and power are undoubtedly linked through a number of ways. Not only does the research and development of military artillery and technology as well as the sustainment of forces rely on funding, but the overall health of the state’s economy gives way to what aspect of government will take top priority. Israel has the twenty-seventh largest GDP per capita in the world. Israel ranks fourth in the world for highest percentage of GDP spent on military expenditures, falling behind South Sudan, Oman and Saudi Arabia. Israel’s current economic strength can be attributed in part to its industry of military technology that generally sells a great deal of products. The country’s annual export sales for the past eight years of unmanned aerial systems (UAS) have been roughly $578 million in U.S. dollars. It is expected to “increase by ten percent yearly” through the year 2020. It is primarily the percentage of GDP spent on military expenditures
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that makes clear that the Israeli government’s top priority is the strength of its military and its overall power. As discussed earlier, the concern for power and military capability may be in part due to its geography in relation to many Arab Islamic states.

**External Support**
Between oil politics and religious underpinnings, the region is inflated with external party interests, economic opportunities and spiritual clashes, all of which, through traces of history, have been the basis of the world’s characterization of the region. These factors in the Middle East have been the cause for centuries of violence and militarization of the region due to power incentives that external actors and involved states possess. As outside states find the potential for increased power or economic monopolies in another region, it is argued by realists in particular, that they will find any excuse to become involved in the area to take advantage of those opportunities.

For whatever reason they wish to be involved, a number of outside states, particularly the United States, have instilled in their budgets and in their speeches resounding support for the country of Israel. Since 1985, the United States has provided Israel with almost $3 billion in grants annually, most of which goes towards the Israeli military. Because of the United States role as a hegemon in international politics, this bears significant weight on the military power of Israel. At this point in history, the 99th largest country in the world has the military powerhouse backing it in almost every situation. Depending on how one perceives it, this could be a positive or negative thing for the state of Israel. In terms of its military power, Israel has been able to increase its capabilities through the funding of the United States. It also can proceed into military engagements with some faith in America’s support.

Additionally, there is a large deterrent factor in the sense that other states are less likely to engage militarily with Israel due to its hegemon supporter. From a skeptical standpoint, the support of the United States is conducive to complications and tangled alliances that may be tricky as time goes on. History has already shown that alliances with the United States may not always be beneficial due to the tendency for the U.S.’s extreme involvement in that state’s
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affairs. Either way, with the support of the United States, both financially and in its rhetoric, Israel has enough leverage in world politics to be one of the most influential states with the most potential to gain more power and capabilities.

**Implications**
Through even a rather brief analysis of Israel’s military status, it is evident that one of the top priorities of this specific state is its military capability. In contrasting numbers and percentages with other powerhouse states, it is understood that Israel continues to be consistently progressing in the world of military strength. It has not slowed its military growth nor has it become stagnant in any way.

To fully assess Israel’s military capability, an extensive statistical analysis would need to be performed. However, for the purposes of this analysis, I posit that the assessment performed was adequate for the purposes of this discussion. Between its ability to mobilize huge amounts of manpower, technological developments through contracts with companies like Raytheon, economic strength due to industry surrounding military technology and external support through the hefty sums given by the United States, Israel has made its mark on the world as a country with military as a high priority with few to no intentions of negating that priority through any means.

Because of this high and increasing military capability, Israel will continue to maintain its status as a major and definitive player in Middle Eastern politics. As referenced earlier, the militarization of a state, for whatever stated cause, tends to evoke similar actions in surrounding states and invested states. As Israel continues this path of military progression, the rest of the region will respond in kind. Although Israel can and does cite its fear of being wiped off the face of the earth, a fear evoked by a quote from Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad in 2005 and claims regarding increased military action from other states, it can also be inferred that its increased militarization are inciting realistic responses from Arab states.\(^{23}\) Israel must understand that even if their intentions behind increased and continuous military progression are defense related, the perceptions increased militarization create could give way to that Cold War like state down that road, where security in the region heightens to an unprecedented level.

Additionally, in the case of the Middle East, it is only natural that states within the region respond accordingly to the possibility of external actors becoming involved in the area. Specifically regarding special interest politics, the country with the largest oil reserves in the world, Saudi Arabia, also has the seventh largest defense budget in the world and is expected to grow by 7.92% annually, possibly revealing a correlation between military strength and a high priority of resource protection.\(^\text{24}\) In response to increased militarization of one state, surrounding states undergo threat perception analysis to devise their own strategy of how to enhance military capability and preparedness as a precaution to possible danger. As militarization continues, the region increasingly moves closer to reaching a Cold War like status, leaving states in a Prisoner’s Dilemma concerning how to respond to possible threats without entering into a period of unprecedented heightened security.

Israel’s military capability is superior to that of other states. What it chooses to do with that increased military power will define oil politics and religious interactions in the Middle East for the next decade. Those decisions will also have an effect on how the country is perceived by external states, as well as its sources and levels of funding for militaristic endeavors. Military capability, though difficult to measure through quantitative analysis, plays a large role in world politics. In the Middle East, a region so defined by special interest politics and religious underpinnings, military capability continues to be the impetus by which Israel will thrive in the next decade.
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POLICY IMPLICATIONS OF THE AUTHORIZATION FOR THE USE OF MILITARY FORCE: UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES?

Katie Magnus

The Authorization for the Use of Military Force (AUMF) is a piece of legislation that was enacted shortly after the attacks on September 11, 2001. It states,

That the President is authorized to use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations, or persons he determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, or harbored such organizations or persons, in order to prevent any future acts of international terrorism against the United States by such nations, organizations or persons.25

This almost sixty word sentiment laid the ambiguous foundation for the United States military policy in the post 9/11 era. Following the AUMF was the war in Afghanistan, the war in Iraq, as well as Special Forces operating in nations where the U.S. was not directly at war. More recently, during the end of the

Bush Administration and continuing throughout the Obama Administration, the U.S. utilized Unmanned Aerial Vehicles or drones to combat terrorists and/or terrorist organizations within nations where the U.S. is not at war. Many of these policies have created new questions involving legality and the protection of an individual’s rights. A main implication of the AUMF has been the increased use of UAVs or drones as a counterterrorism tool. The paper will explore this implication, the elevation of drone usage, and the repercussions it has for the United States and the international community as a whole.

**Literature Review**

Much of the academic literature on this topic can be organized into several different camps, a few of which this literature review will feature. The schools of thought can be divided into about three groups; one group of scholars highlight the necessity of drones as a tool for the U.S., but also focus on the fact that the program needs to improve in the future. Another band of academics look at some of the legal aspects of UAVs, primarily arguing that the legal foundation utilized by the Bush and Obama Administrations for drone strikes is flawed. The last school of thought that will be discussed is the grouping of articles that claim that UAVs are not useful at all, advocating against their usage. The United States’ drone program is controversial, so there are many topics covered throughout academia. The pieces reviewed for this paper comprise the most general classifications.

There are some scholars who showcase concern over the future of the drone campaign instead of focusing on past missteps of the campaign. A *Foreign Affairs* article by Kreps and Zenko recommends specific changes to the current administration’s policy, beginning with a reminder that the United States, as a world power, needs to lead by example. There will come a time when the global development of UAV technology will rival the technology of the United States. Nations looking to utilize drones for one reason or another will follow the precedents set by the U.S. Zenko and Kreps state, “Spurred by the United States’ example, other countries are likely to threaten or conduct drone strikes in ways that are harmful to U.S. interests, whether by provoking regional adversaries or targeting domestic enemies.”

that the United States needs to restrain from drone proliferation, create an independent review panel to increase transparency, and that Congress needs to hold hearings to discuss the use of drones and the legal framework that allows it.\textsuperscript{27}

Other scholars who seriously critique the UAV program as a whole contrast the above point of view. Instead of offering changes for the future of U.S. drone policy, they focus on the seriousness of the flaws of the program. Michael Boyle, writing for \textit{International Affairs}, explains the theory of blowback; Boyle is arguing that the positive outcomes of the drone program—killing terrorists—have not been accurately weighed against the negative outcomes.\textsuperscript{28} To explain further, Boyle only looks at the CIA-run drone campaigns outside theatres of war, and contends that the drone campaigns in Yemen, Somalia, and Pakistan undermine the efficacy of local governments and open the door for extremist Islamic groups to gain recruits.\textsuperscript{29} He comes to the conclusion that the picture of the effectiveness of drones is not entirely what it may seem and follows up that notion with his possible solution; limiting drone strikes to high value targets (HVTs) only.\textsuperscript{30}

Agreeing with Boyle's ideological stance on drones, Cronin authored a piece entitled "Why Drone's Fail," and argues against the effectiveness of the drone campaign as a whole. She begins with the idea that al Qaeda bears little to no resemblance to the other terrorist groups that have been successfully "destroyed through decapitation," or by the targeted killings of drone strikes.\textsuperscript{31} The disparity lies in the fact that the successfully destroyed groups were characterized by a cult of personality, hierarchical structure, and were no more than ten years old. Al Qaeda is a group that is about twenty-five years old and has a vast interconnected group of militants at its disposal. Cronin is disputing the efficacy of using drones as a counterterrorism tool to combat Al Qaeda. However, she does not dispute the high levels of destruction that have afflicted al Qaeda. She states that even while the group may be more concerned with staying alive versus planning attacks on the homeland, al Qaeda still has the
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ability to “perpetuate its message.”\textsuperscript{32} Even if the militaristic wings of al Qaeda are unfocused and unsuccessful, the public relations campaign the organization is waging is keeping them afloat, hindering the United States’ long-term goal of demobilizing the group. While Cronin does not doubt the full efficacy of the U.S. drone program like Boyle does, she argues that the destruction of Al Qaeda will not come solely from UAVs.

On the contrary, Byman in his piece “Why Drones Work,” focuses on the necessity of drones as a tool in the United States’ counterterrorism toolbox, contrasting Cronin’s piece. He argues for targeting higher value terrorists along with the foot soldiers.\textsuperscript{33} “It has become more politically palatable for the United States to kill rather than detain suspected terrorists,” Byman suggests. He counters the arguments most commonly given by the critics of drones; the alternatives to drones (i.e. raids) are unreasonable, how difficult it is to counter terrorism with political or financial means (i.e. bringing nations out of poverty), and that nonproliferation is essentially futile.\textsuperscript{34} Byman does address the fact that drone strikes may be unpopular according to a poll taken in Pakistan in 2012, but again highlights the lack of better alternatives; “74 percent of Pakistanis viewed the United States as their enemy, likely in part because of the ongoing drone campaign…. It is hard to imagine that alternatives to drone strikes, such as SEAL team raids or cruise missile strikes, would make the United States more popular.”

Cronin and Byman make convincing arguments in their respective pieces, and they both touch upon an important piece to the puzzle when it comes to drone policies, the legal basis for UAV strikes. Much of the legal framework for counterterrorism measures taken since 2001 comes from the Authorization for the Use of Military Force (AUMF). Cronin does concede that the authorization from Congress was most likely a necessity during that time, but she disagrees with what the authorization has morphed into. The ambiguous phrasing of the legislation may have been originally intentional, but currently, “In this endless contest, the United States risks multiplying its enemies and heightening their incentives to attack the country.”\textsuperscript{35} Byman does not completely agree with that

\textsuperscript{32} Ibid
\textsuperscript{34} Ibid
\textsuperscript{35} Op. cit. fn. 7
conclusion, but he does address the fact that the AUMF is twelve-plus years old, and it may not sufficiently cover the UAV program in its entirety.

**Research Findings**

Because much of the United States UAV program is shrouded in secrecy for national security reasons, it is difficult to decipher what are the concrete policies of the U.S. President Barack Obama, State Department Legal Advisor Harold Koh, and Central Intelligence Agency Director John Brennan have all given speeches on the topic, which are continually referenced by government officials when drone policy questions are asked. Each set of remarks, President Obama’s, Koh’s, and Brennan’s, try to showcase the reasoning behind U.S. targeted killings by the way of drones. The AUMF was cited as being the legal basis for the actions taken. Other measures such as the increased transparency, though seemingly hollow, were outlined as well. In President Obama’s speech at National Defense University, he references written counterterrorism policy standards entitled, “Presidential Policy Guidance,” which outline the exact standards for the use of lethal force. Essentially, the policy standards reiterate what the White House and government agencies have been explaining to the American people. Lethal force is not an alternative for prosecution; it ideally is used only when there is a “continuing imminent threat to U.S. persons.”

The appropriate members of Congress have continuously been informed, the Department of Justice has been consulted to run legal analysis, but yet the President still maintains his authority to take action as he sees fit in a lawful manner, a reminder of the powerful legal authority the executive branch holds.

Harold Koh, the State Department Legal Advisor, took a different approach in his speech at the American Society of International Law. Koh outlined what was dubbed an “Emerging ‘Obama-Clinton Doctrine’,” which is comprised of four different areas to which the U.S. is committed. The four areas correspond to the ideas that have been consistently iterated by the Obama administration, “…challenges of the twenty-first century can’t be met by any one leader or any
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one nation,” simply saying that the international community needs to become more interdependent.\footnote{Ibid} These elements frame the United States as the multilateral actor that former Secretary of State Clinton and President Obama may want the nation to be. Koh states, “U.S. targeting practices, including lethal operations conducted with the use of unmanned aerial vehicles, comply with all applicable law, including the laws of war.” It is the AUMF that authorizes the U.S. to use force from a domestic standpoint. There are different international laws in place regarding the usage of force or more specifically targeted killings, however they disagree with the U.S.’s position and actions, so the federal government defers to domestic law. Koh’s remarks seemed to be aimed towards satisfying the public and possibly other U.S. representative’s calls for justification of the executive branch’s actions. The phrasing “comply with all applicable law” aims to increase the legitimacy of Koh’s claims and attempts to decrease the legitimacy of the criticisms of the drone program. Further, it sets the precedent that the only legal framework that matters is the U.S.’s, not international law.

At Harvard Law, John Brennan takes a more hawkish position stating, “… As President Obama has stated on numerous occasions, we reserve the right to take unilateral action if or when other governments are unwilling or unable to take the necessary actions themselves.” Continuing, Brennan almost walks back that previous statement by pointing out that the U.S. cannot just use military force whenever it pleases, because the U.S. respects international law and state sovereignty.\footnote{Wittes, Benjamin. “John Brennan’s Remarks at HLS-Brookings Conference,” Lawfare: Hard National Security Choices, September 16, 2011.} Brennan tries to shed light on the perspectives of intelligence agencies and the military by explaining that the face of warfare is changing, underscoring the necessity of drones. The U.S. military does not face the same type of combatant as they once did; al Qaeda wears no uniform and does not carry weapons openly. Brennan takes a similar path as Koh by offering what seem to be justifications for U.S. missteps; he argues that President Obama has actually increased transparency by allowing the release of budgetary information, reconstituting the Intelligence Oversight Board, and declassifying legal memos.\footnote{Ibid}
These remarks made by high-level officials are more or less the public version of the United States current UAV policy. Critics and skeptics are in no way satisfied with these claims and arguments because many of what are arguably the biggest questions surrounding the policies are unanswered. This has led to an outpouring of critiques regarding the current status of the program, how the U.S. should handle the program in the future, and assessments regarding the morality of the program as a whole.

Essentially, there are groups within the U.S. and throughout the international community that would like to see some hard data, some specifics, on the United States UAV program. There have been conflicting reports throughout news outlets on numbers of civilian causalities and the locations of U.S. drone strikes. Some specifics can be found; since 2008, the U.S. has administered 1,000 plus drone strikes in Afghanistan. As of July 2013, the British had conducted 299 drone strikes in Afghanistan comparatively. From 2008 onward, the U.S. has launched 48 drone strikes in Iraq, approximately 145 in Libya, 400 in Pakistan, 100 plus in Yemen, under 20 in Somalia, and possibly one in the Philippines.42

Conclusions can be drawn when hard data is analyzed. While Cronin argues against the use of drones, she does cede the point that, “Political scientists Patrick Johnston and Anoop Sarbahi recently found that drone strikes in northwestern Pakistan from 2007 to 2011 resulted in a decrease in the number and lethality of militant attacks in the tribal areas where they were conducted.”43 There is definitely effectiveness to the weaponry; otherwise it would not be used on such a widespread scale. The effectiveness is only questioned insofar as the actual toll of civilian loss of life, and whether or not that leads to negative long-term effects, i.e. blowback. Cronin and Boyle, for example, both argue that the lasting impact drones have are adverse to the goals the administration is trying to achieve. The drones-first counterterrorism policy can be used as a recruiting tool for extremist organizations, undermine the stability and confidence of local governments, and increase anti-American sentiment. All of these implications have a high probability of being accurate. The “Times Square bomber” explained that his motives were directly related to drone strikes. More recently, the relationship between the United States and Pakistan has
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been strained because the Pakistani government is facing hostile opposition to U.S. drone strikes. While the Pakistani government has often condemned the strikes in public, it is now widely known that they give the U.S. permission in private. In November 2013 there were protests in Peshawar, activists claim that the U.S. is hindering Pakistan’s peace process with the Pakistani Taliban, as they were just about to begin negotiations when a drone strike killed a top Taliban leader.44

Drone strikes conducted on the Pakistani Taliban seem a long way from the policies described in the Authorization for the Use of Military Force. While the ambiguousness of the authorization is partly necessary to avoid obstacles regarding terrorist organizations changing their names to avoid sanctions, Cronin explains, “Washington now finds itself in a permanent battle with an amorphous and geographically dispersed foe, one with an increasingly marginal connection to the original 9/11 plotters. In this endless contest, the United States risks multiplying its enemies and heightening their incentives to attack the country.” Daniel Byman in his article contradicting Cronin’s piece does agree that Washington needs to improve drone policy to an extent. Speaking in regards to the targeting of Anwar Awlaki, the U.S. citizen that was targeted in Yemen, Byman states, “Yet with the war on terrorism almost 12 years old and bin Laden dead, critics, such as the Georgetown University law professor Rosa Brooks, have begun questioning whether the AUMF still justifies drone strikes today. As Brooks has argued, ‘Many of the groups now being identified as threats don’t fall clearly under the AUMF’S umbrella -- and many don’t pose a significant danger to the United States.’”

The decision-making when it comes to deciding on drone strikes has been compared to a hostage situation, where police are not barred by the law from killing a hostage taker if they have a clear shot. Obviously there are some major differences between the urgency of a hostage situation at home and terrorists plotting miles away, but Mr. Leiter, former head of the National Counterterrorism Center, vocalizes that “[the president’s reliance on strikes] is far from a lurid fascination with covert action and special forces. It’s much

more practical. He’s the president. He faces a post-Abdulmutallab situation, where he’s being told people might attack the United States tomorrow.\(^45\)

On top of the immediate policy implications are concerns of a drones arms race. The number of states with any type of drones has almost doubled since 2004, according to the U.S. Government Accountability Office. It is predicted that the civilian and military drone market will reach $8.4 billion by 2018, which will actually only be a portion of global defense spending which is supposed to hit $1.9 trillion by the end of 2017.\(^46\) While the conjecture of a drone arms race may be farfetched, the advancements made in drone technology will make it easier to enter far away conflicts. Previously, when heads of state contemplated military action, they had to consider boots on the ground and the impact that would have. Now and in the future they will have the option to send an UAV to complete the obligations troops normally fulfill.

**Conclusion**

The Authorization for the Use of Military Force is a decade-plus old piece of legislation that had dictated the legal framework for the United States’ counterterrorism policy following September 11, 2001. Developing throughout the Bush Administration and continuing in the Obama Administration, the use of UAVs as the main tool for countering terrorists abroad has been a direct implication of the AUMF. The ambiguous wording of the document has allowed President Obama to essentially create his own criteria for enacting these strikes, concentrating power within the Executive Branch. The costs and benefits of drone strikes are more easily understood than the legal framework that justifies them. The use of UAVs has had obvious positive outcomes when imminent threats are neutralized without having to place troops directly in harm’s way. Because the program is relatively new, the long-term implications are difficult to decipher. As mentioned previously, there have been theories regarding possible blowback, with drone strikes negatively affecting the U.S.’s goals. Also, the proliferation of drone technology has yet to be seen on a grand scale, such as an arms race; however, it is a possibility that the technology could
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disseminate quickly, leaving questions about international policy regarding the use of drones.

Foundationally, there is little concrete information on the exact formula used by President Obama and his advisors when deciding on targets and when and where to strike. Further, the lack of foresight on the issue creates a vacuum and feeds speculation on future occurrences. Clearly there are national security concerns at stake, so full transparency is not an option. However, the United States needs to begin setting international precedent with the point in mind that other nations will garner this technology eventually. Essentially, the Obama administration needs to begin to look at the future of the UAV program instead of as a short-term solution to the problem of terrorism.
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BOURNE’S MESSAGE REVEALED
USING CHARLES TILLY’S *WAR MAKING AND STATE MAKING AS ORGANIZED CRIME TO UNDERSTAND RANDOLPH BOURNE’S UNFINISHED FRAGMENT ON THE STATE*
Zachary Antoyan

“War…war never changes.”
Voice of Ron Perlman, *Fallout 3*

**Introduction:**
Perhaps I’ve been spending too much time studying political theory, because my understanding of how states are formed has, to some extent, been skewed for a while. It would seem that as people leave the state of nature, the mutual benefits of creating a society are not explicitly laid out. There is no instantaneous transition from the state of nature to a social contract, and to think so would be folly. Rousseau may have had the idea right, but his time-frame was a bit off, as it appears to me that this transition is still taking place.

Within the state, the accomplishment of a social contract between the members of society is a major step forward in avoiding violence and protecting rights. However, between states, no such doctrine exists, and all states act
accordingly by being at each others’ throats a majority of the time. History is littered with wars and conflicts that have shaped the world as we know it. And as it turns out, there is a plethora of theoretical and empirical work being done to examine this aspect of international relations. The primal instincts that drive action in the state of nature for individuals are the same forces that incite power struggles at the state level, and one political theorist attempts to explain how this state of nature for states is where they are truly in their prime. “For war is essentially the health of the state,”\(^47\) explains Randolph Bourne in his unfinished essay entitled \textit{The State}. But what is most perplexing about Bourne’s piece is that he holds this notion while being a pacifist, which forces the reader to consider two perspectives on the article: either Bourne is writing satire, or he is a liar.\(^48\)

Assuming that Bourne is not a liar, the statement above must be further clarified, such that we define what the health of the state really is. In order to see the true meaning of Bourne’s message, we must consider that the health of the state is a bad thing. Perhaps after we understand this, the lens we look through to view Bourne’s article better links his argument to his anti-war sentiment. To do this, Charles Tilly’s “War Making and State Making as Organized Crime” will suffice.

What Tilly aims to do in his paper is argue that war and state making are forms of legitimized crime, where the state attempts to extract power, resources, and wealth from as many entities as possible. The state in this sense is not to be confused with the populace that lives within the state, and he spends a portion of the paper explaining the role that capitalism and capitalists play in using the legitimacy of government to exploit that very populace. For Tilly, war plays a very large role in this exploitation, and the connection between organized crime, the state, and war manifests itself in the protection racketeering that exists in the relationship between state and people.

So, for the purposes of this essay, the thesis that comes out of the examination of these two pieces of political theory is thus: Charles Tilly’s article complements Randolph Bourne’s argument by revealing the true nature of health of the state, by shedding light on the fact that the health of the state is in no way

---


equivalent to the health of the people within the state. Instead, the health of the state represents the health of legitimized violence, corruption, and in a more extreme form, crimes against humanity. In order to better understand this, I will examine relevant information from both articles, then revisit Bourne's argument from the perspective of Tilly's lens, and finally cover the implications of the thesis as a whole.

**Health of the State:**

It is almost humorous what Bourne begins his article with: “Government is synonymous with neither State nor Nation … Government is the only form in which we can envisage the State, but it is by no means identical with it.”

The distinction that Bourne gives so blatantly at the beginning of his article between the government, state, and nation serves to show how aware he is of the consequences of a state fully realized.

What he does in this opener is distinguish between the state and government by claiming that “Government is the idea of the State put into practical operation in the hands of definite, concrete, fallible men.” Essentially, the government is the vessel through which the values of the state can be achieved, but it falters when certain conditions are not met. These qualifications are necessary to the state being enabled to act according to its own agenda. In order to reach the full potential of the State, where the herd works at peak efficiency, the state of war must become a reality. However, Bourne carefully withholds who really is at the helm of this vessel of government, and what it truly means for a government to reach this peak, as the state.

Bourne continues that “War-time brings the ideal of the State out into very clear relief ... For war is essentially the health of the State.” The nation necessarily unifies, seeking to act offensively or defensively against another state. The reasons behind a conflict are of no concern to the people, as their purpose is now to ensure the survival of the state by assisting the war effort. The “central purpose” of war that Bourne claims to exist as a result of conflict
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49 Bourne, 140.
50 Ibid, 140.
51 Ibid, 141.
52 This is a point that Tilly will provide a counter-argument to, claiming that “popular resistance to war making and state making made a difference. When ordinary people resisted vigorously, authorities made concessions: guarantees of rights, representative institutions, courts of appeals. Those concessions, in their turn, constrained the later paths of war making and state making” (Tilly 1985)
allows the state come forward to take control of “men’s businesses and attitudes and opinions.” 53 This is one of the ideals of the state, wherefore “within its territory its power and influence should be universal.” 54

One major effect that this shift in power has is the integration of the individual into the function of the State; almost instantaneously, the rights and protections of the individual and of the minorities are eliminated. Opinions critical of the state are met with harsh legal punishment; all the while, actions taken by people and their motivations for doing so, exist solely to serve the purpose of the state. As loyalty to the state becomes the paramount value, the individual is forced to fade into the ether. This control that the state now exerts over the individuality of its citizens should be a clear indication of the disparity between the health of the state and the health of the people. Uniformity becomes a major aspect in the health of the state, and this is further supported by Bourne’s claim that:

[War] automatically sets in motion those irresistible forces for uniformity, for passionate cooperation with the Government in coercing into obedience the minority groups and individuals which lack the larger herd sense...the nation in war-time attains a uniformity of feeling, a hierarchy of values culminating at the undisputed apex of the State ideal. 55

Take note of the mention of coercion, as this will become central to the link to Tilly’s argument in the future.

What ultimately results from war is the unification of the individual with his state and society, and thusly: “In a nation at war, every citizen identifies himself with the whole, and feels immensely strengthened in that identification.” 56 Now that the individual has a defined purpose contributing to the success of the state, they can feel at ease in their place in society. Finally, Bourne believes that “The individual as social being in war seems to have achieved almost his apotheosis.” 57 This is the perfectly realized elimination of the individual, where

53 Bourne, 142.
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57 Ibid, 147.
the problems of society can be done away with, if only the very things that make us different are controlled and suppressed. What is meant by the individual as a social being is the elimination of the individual. But what results is greater peace within the society, and the thriving of the state. This forces the reader to believe that in order for the state to work at its best possible level and for the citizen to find their perfect place in society, war is a necessity. But as the state works at its peak level, we must ask the question, who is the health of the state really good for?

Organized Crime:
Tilly’s argument is simple, and is the first sentence of his article. If the protection rackets of the mob are the most efficient form of organized crime, then war making and state making, which Tilly likens to protection rackets themselves, represent the most legitimate form of organized crime. His definition of the state allows him to see “war makers and state makers as coercive and self-seeking entrepreneurs.” This is significant in that rather than the state being the upholder of rights and freedoms for individuals and society or the regulator of an economy, the state exists purely as a function of a small minority in power to acquire more wealth and maintain that very power. Already, we see the word “coercion” come into play again, and it bears heavy weight upon the idea that the government controls the means to legitimately coerce its citizens to do whatever it wants. The specific conceptualization of this type government is a “relatively centralized, differentiated organizations the officials of which more or less successfully claim control over the chief concentrated means of violence within a population inhabiting a large, contiguous territory.” What he fails to include in this concept in the modern day is the influence of interest groups representing big businesses and industries, but this will come later as well.

Tilly then moves on to describe the idea of protection itself, where in one sense, it is the defense of a one entity from another aggressor entity. This, he states, is a legitimate function of government, yet one that can be easily exploited to appear more like a protection racket: “Someone who produces

59 Tilly, 170.
both the danger and, at a price, the shield against it is a racketeer.”

The ways that governments can fall under this classification are usually cases in which the threats that the government offers protection from are imaginary, or are caused by the actions of the government. The War on Terror comes to mind, as does the Cold War, and perhaps even the War on My Taste-Buds from the ever present threat of my aunt’s cooking during Thanksgiving, only remedied by my mother’s pie.

Tilly further asserts that governments have a tendency to amass and control the main methods of violence. Creating a standing army, it would seem, is not just a function of government, and Tilly points to the fact that just because we give the government the legitimacy to create this army does not mean that this is where that power should reside. In fact, this is where the transition from the state of nature into a society comes into play. Utilizing European history as his example, Tilly argues that governments and monarchies were nothing more than loosely affiliated groups of powerful people controlling the masses through this power. His argument is best summed up here: “Power holders’ pursuit of war involved them willy-nilly in the extraction of resources for war making from the populations over which they had control and in the promotion of capital accumulation by those who could help them borrow and buy. War making, extraction, and capital accumulation interacted to shape European state making.”

Even though governments technically existed, they only existed because the powerful person at the top could afford to be there, and exploited everyone under them to stay there. It was only until more recently in the history of governance that masses of people did begin to demand rights, liberties, and protections lest they revolt and start making some rich peoples’ heads roll.

Legitimacy, then, was not something that a group of people simply distributed, and in many cases, it was just claimed as being of divine right, or in the case of King Arthur a product of “strange women lying in ponds, distributing swords…[and] farcical aquatic ceremonies.” In large part, it is because these
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entities controlled the means of violence that they were able to influence so much, and it was only until masses of people fought back that legitimacy and the social contract become something of a reality. However, since these entities had no initial interest in controlling or creating nation-states, they sought only to acquire more wealth and power, and offering the protection of their power was one way to do this. As these large entities became states however, these practices of racketeering did not wear off. In order to more effectively control and extract from the regions in which they lorded, governments needed to eliminate the power struggle within their borders, which Tilly claims “all came down to massive pacification and monopolization of the means of coercion.”

By creating police forces that answered to the government, eliminating lords with control over militias, and by slowly building up their own standing armies, governments were able to expand their scope of extraction.

The next stage in history that is relevant to this topic is how capitalism played into the amassing of the means of violence. Tilly argues through another author, Frederic Lane, that there are four main managers of the government: the citizens themselves, a single self-interested monarch, the managers themselves, and one that Tilly adds, a dominant class. All of these players would interact and control the government in a different way, but as it turns out, the dominant class won out, simply because it was able to manipulate the flow of money to provide for the functions of government, chiefly the function of violence.

According to Tilly, the driving force behind the connection between capitalism and governments was the increase in military size, where “Both the trade and the capital served the purposes of ambitious rulers.” He furthers this point by maintaining through yet another thinker Jan de Vries, that “One cannot help but be struck by the seemingly symbiotic relationship existing between the state, military power, and the private economy’s efficiency in the age of absolutism. Behind every successful dynasty stood an array of opulent banking families. Access to such bourgeois resources proved crucial to the princes’ state-building and centralizing policies.” The role that capitalists played increasingly became a staple of preforming government, and if the current debt of the United States is any indication of where this relationship has gone, then we know that borrowing and paying interest is still a viable option for many governments.
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Consequently, governments and rulers needed excuses to increase taxes to pay off the debt. War making became that excuse, such that in order for a government to wage war that it claimed was for a justified cause, it needed to raise taxes. This was an extremely lucrative move, and even as the war ended, governments did not lower the taxes back down to pre-war rates. Tilly acutely describes what happened: “When public revenues and expenditures rose abruptly during war, they set a new, higher floor beneath which peacetime revenues and expenditures did not sink.”

For Tilly, the states carried out four main activities to increase their own power:

1. War making: Eliminating or neutralizing their own rivals outside the territories in which they have dear and continuous priority as wielders of force.
2. State Making: Eliminating or neutralizing their rivals inside their territories
3. Protection: Eliminating or neutralizing the enemies of their clients
4. Extraction: Acquiring the means of carrying out the first three activities: war making, state making and protection.

While with these four there is some overlap and some independency, they all rely on the monopoly of violence to achieve their goals. Additionally, effective combination of the four yields better results than if one is taken by itself. For instance, if a country is able to effectively justify a war that protects its interests and all the while increasing taxes and creating a more connected and productive populace, then it will be more well off than if it just raised taxes.

Additionally, if a state wanted to increase its frequency in one aspect of these actions, the result would be a lasting bureaucratic effect on the state and on the people. Wars beget armies, state making creates greater control over rights and liberties, protection results in the protected asking for what is owed them, and extraction yields a larger taxation and accounting entity. The bigger the project, the larger the government needed to be to deal with the project, and the floor was raised ever higher.
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Tilly goes on to explain how the gradual creation of these bureaucracies is what helped first-world nations today become the powers they are, and that the second and third world states that now try to skip steps in this process, routinely falter in the endeavor of nation-state building. Their use of coercion in many cases is much worse, and subject to greater levels of illegitimacy, behind the veil of “democracy.” Next we will examine how government still attempts to exploit the population it controls by using these four actions.

**Bourne Revisited:**

Now, with our understanding of how governments use war making, state making, and protection to exploit the people, we can look at Bourne’s interpretation of war as it relates to the state. Bourne openly speaks of the coercion that governments use to bring minorities in line during a time of war. But what is the act of bringing in all members of society into one mindset of war if not coercion? Consider the following statement: “A state that successfully eradicates its internal rivals strengthens its ability to extract resources, to wage war, and to protect its chief supporters.”\(^67\) When a government is able to act in whatever way it wishes without opposition and with the necessary funds to carry out any task, hasn’t it taken control of the populace? Through this, we can see the positive yield a state may garner from having a homogenous populace with little opposition and a large subject for extraction. Here, we can also see that the health of the state, in truth, means the health of those who control the state or those who control it through a proxy. It is in this sense that the health of the state means the subjugation of the people, and the stifling of individual rights and liberties. If a country can justify a war, then it can justify the increased control of its citizens and the increase in extraction.

What the government provides is the means to an end for the dominant class to exploit all those under them, and do so “legitimately.” The creation of government was never intended to be for the protection of people and not to ensure positive rights when leaving the state of nature. Instead, it was a workaround for the dominant class to legitimize exploitation. Government, in this case, provides the one thing that capitalists cannot have: legitimacy. They cannot, for fear of retaliation, blatantly exploit the common man, but through the veil of government legitimacy, anything is possible.

---
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It is easy to construe Bourne’s obsession with uniformity as the motivation for war. I thought that Bourne believed in order to achieve a more collective community, the differences of cultural values had to be done away with. However, this notion that Bourne’s justification for war was the resulting social good, is utterly wrong. It is at this point that his argument is so brimming with satire, that I could easily imagine Stephen Colbert reciting it in a sarcastic tone; “Other values such as artistic creation, knowledge, reason, beauty, the enhancement of life, are instantly and almost unanimously sacrificed.”68 This is Bourne’s warning, that what we achieve in social cohesiveness and connection to the state through war, we lose in sacrificing other core values. Uniformity creates the structures necessary for the legitimate exercise of power over the individual, shunning liberties and violating rights. The rest of the quote further contributes to the idea of an upper class at the helm of the vessel of government “…and the significant classes who have constituted themselves the amateur agents of the State, are engaged not only in sacrificing these values for themselves but in coercing all other persons into sacrificing them.”69

Bourne’s article is at first glance something that doesn’t quite add up, where we are faced with a conclusion that is a far stretch from the mentality of the author. But after we are able to see state making and the health of the state in a negative light, it easier to understand Bourne’s article as a warning, as compared to a suggestion. Tilly’s argument fits perfectly with Bourne’s, as the health of the state is war, and in a war environment the government and those controlling it get exactly what they want. War is essentially the most effective tool for a government or those behind it to marginalize class to exploit each itself. Screw you capitalism: you create war for profit at all costs.

**Legitimacy and Corruption:**

Now it would be easy to claim that a state such as this, that uses a racketeering method to extract more from its populace and other states, is harder to find in the modern-day government, since representation and the relevant documents protecting rights are there to ensure equality and fairness. Alas, there is difficulty in finding an example of this government, and in fact, there is much evidence to the contrary. Ask the question, what if those in power aren’t the
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ones who are interested in this organized crime, but are influenced and even controlled by those who wish to profit from the legitimate exercise of power?

Assume for the sake of argument that inside of some great representative government, there exists a representative with a connection to a major oil company. This oil company wants to expand its scope of business, so it taps its representative friend on the shoulder and asks if he can help them out. The representative then, in kind, vehemently suggests to the administration that the country should go to war with another country over oil deposits. Now, it would never pass in this day and age to just go and take something from some other country. Instead, this country wants to appear righteous. So it collects its propaganda machine, and fashions a War on Terror that it can use to justify involvement overseas. It might even blow up a couple of its own buildings and kill a few thousand of its own people to sell the threat. Now it has a case, and next thing you know, it’s twelve years later and the occupation is finally winding down, all the while Haliburton has all the contracts for oil extraction in the Middle East. Conspiracy theories like these are always an interesting thing to read, but represent a possible truth about the actions of government, and perfectly highlight the racketeering relationship that governments have. This shows people outside of power influencing ‘legitimate’ power as a means of getting what they want through violence and fear mongering. A more concrete example would be the Patriot Act, which allows the government to tap phone calls and view emails, among other things. Originally this notion would have been ludicrous. With the justification of national security, anyone could be tuning into my conversations. There are plenty of buzz words that can be used to create the imaginary threat that the government has to protect its citizens from, but whether it be the War on Terror or the Cold War, it always circles back to state making, war making, or protection. This is the sort of relationship that President Eisenhower warned us about with regards to the military-industrial complex, where the government creates the war that is supplied by weapons and munitions manufacturers and fought by average men and women in the armed services. The worst possible scenario includes top military brass, legislators, and the heads of these companies working with each other to perpetuate conflict in the name of profit, paid for by the United States government. So as it turns out, when Edwin Starr asks the question “War, huh, yeah, what is it good for?” in his song War, and answer with: “Absolutely nothing,” what he neglected was that war is actually pretty profitable for a select group of people.
Tilly’s argument assumes that those with power, influence, and money wish to keep it, and also want to expand it. This is a very dark perspective, one where it assumes much about the head of the government, and who is in power. At what level of government is this all decided? What level of influence is condemnable; wanting to simply increase the budget for your department/project? The social contract is an extremely important doctrine, and with it comes the legitimacy to use violence in ways that government deems necessary. This would lead me to believe that any exercise of power that would otherwise be illegitimate, could in part be considered corruption. While I can understand that this notion is idealistic and that this flaw in the system is inherent, I cannot shake the fact that this is an issue that isn’t immediately evident to many people. Apparently I’m not alone in this thought, as there are some who wish to deem corruption as a crime against humanity. If we are at all concerned with the efficient and ethical exercise of power through government, we should hold the ability to control the peoples collective will in the highest regard. Any infringement upon that exercise of power would be akin to the most severe abuse of that collective will and our rights.

Additionally, the health of the state comes at the expense of the health of other states, and the livelihoods of those outside of the state. Considering that war is a selfish tool used by the few to exploit the many, we cannot justify using violence to “protect our interests.” Under these circumstances, no war to “maintain the interests of the state” can be legitimate, because it is killing and stealing in the name of profit, and all those who support this are complicit in crimes against humanity. These, of course, are the theoretical ethical implications, but they begin to manifest after we truly consider the nature of Bourne’s paper and his anti-war sentiment.

**Conclusion:**
For me, the state had always been the people. It had always been the conglomeration of the group. The health of the state through war was ethically acceptable because it positively affected the people, which made Bourne’s paper confusing, because he was a pacifist. But through the lens of Tilly’s argument, the true nature of Bourne’s article reveals the sinister motivation behind war. The health

---

of the state has nothing, in this case, to do with the people, and everything to do with the very select few beneficiaries of war. Freedom, eliminating terror or communism, are all proxies to hide the truth, the mad grab for more profit. This method of profiting from war is the worst form of corruption in government; utilizing legitimacy to take what you want. That may be what politics is, but it is not what government should be allowed to be. Society should hold it to a higher standard than that.

Contemporary thought that focuses on reducing the role of government, like that of the libertarian, correctly disassociates government from business practices. It does this in the interest of allowing individuals to carry out their lives as they wish without government interference, driven by fear of this very corruption. But it is limited in its scope because it assumes that the core of the problem lies in government, when I am inclined to say that while government is the vessel, those at the helm who use that power to exploit others, are truly to blame. The key to a successful government, the key to a state that is made for the people, is severing the connection between capitalistic intentions and government action.\textsuperscript{71} This also means eliminating the avenues of corruption in political positions (talk about idealistic). The health of the state is the exploitation of the masses, and society should therefore, be wary of the actions a government takes that it claims are in its interest.

\textsuperscript{71} Perhaps a more feasible form of direct democracy? Maybe even a system that allows people to choose the projects that government takes on. Perhaps there is a way for people to use money to be politically active, without just contributing to campaigns.
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