



"From Challenges to Opportunities to Solutions"

Exploring the Practice of Global Partnership: Anarchy is What People Make of It

By Walter L. Christman (November 16, 2012)

Abstract: The concept of 'partnership' has seen increased salience amongst policymakers and scholars, yet its use is often unfocused and unaccompanied by any recognizable pattern of action. This paper offers a definition of global partnership as a doctrinal orientation for global public policy, one that encourages a strategy of foresight and innovation. Accounting both for the fracturing of authority in a multi-polar international system and the increased influence of non-state actors, partnership as an orienting principle promotes poly-hierarchical and emancipatory responses to problems of the shared global commons and the recurring problem of international anarchy. The paper reaches toward new responses to the condition of anarchy for a new and better way of being--based on the power to choose--and offers 'partnership' in doctrinal terms as *'a multi-level response to shared global risks leading to new institutional approaches carried out through networked forms of governance.'* Properly implemented it can foster resilience and adaptiveness to the interconnected problems of globalization. A series of design principles are offered that would help implementation of a global resilience approach based around partnership.

Many thoughtful observers have identified 'anarchy' as the central problem of international relations (Bull, 1977; Mearsheimer, 2001; Wendt, 1992). Throughout history, the primary task of those engaged in the protection of a tribe or nation's external security from potential adversaries has been to structure relationships in such a way as to mitigate the tendency toward chaos and violence. The tools at their disposal have varied through the ages, but since ancient times have always seemed to include some combination of an appeal to shared norms and interests, coupled when necessary with the implicit threat of force (Thucydides, trans. 1959). Anarchy has been thought to be the state of nature in international relations because there is no central authority to govern world affairs. With the proliferation of powerful non-state actors, the anarchical situation in which nation-states find themselves is growing even more volatile. The contemporary threat of anarchy therefore may require responses that may be more complex than the modern nation-state can be expected to address. Indeed, emerging forms of anarchy and any presumptive antidotes to them more and more appear to elude the nation-state, an increasingly porous entity with opaque boundaries.

*Global Challenges Forum Foundation
Rue du Cendrier 15, Case Postale 1106
1201 Geneva, Switzerland*

For those devoted to the task of promoting global security in world politics, this situation offers unprecedented opportunities and brings new and daunting obligations. Rapidly accelerating changes in the global system appear to be leaving the Realist's notion of a balance of power and the Idealist's vision of a world community trailing behind the emerging requirements of global security in a postmodern age of fractured authority. As systems fracture, how should policymakers organize to be part of the solution, and not part of the problem? What are possible indicators of success? Indeed, how might one even think about the problem of multi-level cooperation to address shared global threats? If one begins with a threat-based assessment, it seems clear that globalization's increasing tendency to undermine the sovereignty of nation-states results in the unhappy condition that governments in general, and militaries in particular, face an increasingly broad gamut of challenges to established governance and security. Whether addressing complex challenges in response to transitional conflict between nations, or coordinating comprehensive responses to humanitarian disasters, coping with emerging complex threats posed by terrorism and international crime, engaging networked populations empowered through social media, or contending with increased tensions due to changing climatic, environmental and resource issues, foreign policy and national security sector organizations must increasingly manage a process for interplay among varied actors beyond anyone's direct control. As former US Defense Secretary Robert Gates (2009) has said, 'In recent years, the lines separating war, peace, diplomacy, and development have become more blurred and no longer fit the neat organizational charts of the twentieth century.' This 'blurred' condition is the result of a power shift and the relative weakening of states, as well as the emergence and increasing influence of non-state actors, such as international organizations, non-governmental organizations, multinational corporations, and others (including, of course, illicit actors such as criminal networks and transnational terrorist networks).

Successful policies in the pursuit of future international security in an era of globalization are more likely to include partnership-based approaches that transcend traditional nation-state conceptions of interest, power, and authority, pushing for solutions that lay both above and below level of nation-state engagement. As Mary Kaldor (2007) suggests, civil society is increasingly the medium through which public consent is generated and today, and in light of the profound transformations posed by globalization, 'a social contract is being negotiated at several different overlapping layers – national, local and global' in which the

preeminent *social choice* for protection is increasingly focused on the defence of individuals rather than states. Contrary to Alexander Wendt's (1992) famous constructivist dictum, 'anarchy is what states make of it,' this paper will enlarge the argument to advocate instead that in a world where national security threats have been overtaken by global security risks, 'anarchy is what people make of it.'

Optimistic writers, such as Anne-Marie Slaughter (2004), point to the possibilities of 'a new world order.' Slaughter has identified many examples where state action has been strengthened and reinforced in various domains of governance. Through person-to-person, point-to-point, joint collaboration, foreign counterparts in various national ministries in different countries have devised creative, sectoral responses through 'trans-governmental networks.' However, these government practitioners have yet to cultivate cross-domain perspectives, even within compartmentalized departments within a single state bureaucracy despite the use of similar language. For example, *computer virus* attacks with the potential to cause billions of dollars in financial losses or cripple government networks are a fundamental concern of cyber-security experts. Medical and public health officials increasingly must cope with *viral pandemics* and the rapid global transfer of dangerously mutating diseases. State security officials throughout the world observe the propensity for terrorist networks to be *viral and self-spawning* as they search for effective counter-responses. National and global financial regulators seek to thwart systemic economic collapse posed by instances of panic and *contagion*, as fear and lack of trust permeate open capital markets. In each case, the linguistic root metaphor of a *virus* at work clearly suggests a wide-spread subliminal understanding that human life on planet Earth is a system of systems, analogous to the human body's many systems. Each of these viral threats carries the danger of spill over effects undermining the health and indeed survivability of the global system. Indeed, one is prompted to ask: Should globalization itself be regarded as an overwhelming viral threat -- a super auto-immune disease afflicting the global commons, both contagious and self-replicating? Count the author of this paper among the pessimists that Anne-Marie Slaughter's prescription of more effective and robust trans-governmental communications between the silos of nation-state bureaucrats will cure the patient. Capacity building to address global risks requires a new understanding of public-private relations that transcends national borders and governmental organizations, inviting cooperation and innovation across varied domains with an eye toward more building a more effective collective, global systemic response.

Today, a self-reinforcing fixation upon statist doctrines of security, based on the robustness of theory and policy that have developed around concepts such as deterrence and pre-emption, has impeded understanding and hindered new doctrines from emerging that could adequately address the problems of globalization. Doctrines, once theorized, gradually become better defined; they are expanded, scrutinized, practically modelled, framed within different issue areas, and become embedded within institutional structures. Doctrines are self-reinforcing, as they condition the thought processes that practitioners use when considering how to approach certain types of problems. When underlying conditions change, doctrinal assumptions can be limiting for policymaking bodies, creating institutional blinders that stifle any innovative thinking. In sum, the global community would benefit from a robust, consistent, methodological and practical understanding of how a new doctrine based on *partnership* might operate.

If we may employ Benhabib's terminology about cosmopolitanism, we need to explicate a partnership doctrine in a way that could 'mediate moral universalism with ethical particularism,' mindful in each case that the cosmopolitan task is 'a philosophical project of mediations and not reductions or totalizations' (Benhabib, 2006). This approach can address open-ended ambiguity is that academic and policy communities both in the United States and throughout the world are burdened with multiple notions of 'partnership' that are ill formed and malnourished. Partnership is today a catch phrase, a jumble of reactive, good-will homilies in praise of limited collaboration. Echoing US Supreme Court Justice Potter Stewart's famous quip on obscenity, policymakers can avoid the details of partnership and simply assume that they will recognize it when they see it.

Toward a doctrine of Partnership

This paper explores the practical elements of a possible doctrinal approach to partnership through the elaboration of design principles. A rising tide of interrelated global security risks necessitates a robust doctrine of partnership as a logical and comprehensive alternative for a global community facing problems of ever-increasing complexity. The paper reaches toward new responses to the condition of anarchy for a new and better way of being--based on the power to choose--and offers 'partnership' in doctrinal terms as '*a multi-level response to shared global risks leading to new institutional approaches carried out through networked forms of governance.*'

In developing the argument for the Partnership approach, it is not necessary to depict it as a radical departure from all that came before. Charles Tilly's *Coercion, Capital, and European States, AD 990-1900*, provides a basis for critical understanding. He asks: 'What accounts for the great variation over time and space in the kinds of states that have prevailed in Europe since AD 990, and why did European states eventually converge on different variants of the nation-state?' (Tilly, 1990). Tilly's well demonstrated answer is the nation-state eventually came to be the dominant organizational apparatus for the social collective because of its role in fighting wars. The rise in the scale of war with the advance of technology combined with the ability to provide for greater aggregation of resources and authority is what helped form the modern nation-state.

Thus, if *war* is what explains the convergence of a modern conception of the state within roughly the last three hundred years, then the transformation of war today is equally certain to affect the relative role of the nation-state, as it must respond to emerging threats to societal welfare in the future. The organization for war is after all a knowledge-based enterprise built around the mobilization of productive resources to contend with external threats to the public good, in whatever form those threats may come. Taking this further, Philip Bobbitt (2002) suggests that the combination of strategy, technology and law, which converge during the conduct of war, determine the nature of states. However, ultimately it is the ability of states to resolve their major crises that determines whether or not the system they use retains legitimacy. The current system will lose legitimacy if it continues to fail to resolve emerging shared global threats and risks. Bobbitt traces the historic move in the past from the 'state-nation' to the 'nation-state' and suggests the emergence of the 'market-state' as the next leading paradigm of governance. Similarly, this paper will suggest that more open source approaches to social production may be necessary part of sustaining governing legitimacy at all levels of society in the future.

In support of these notions, the practice of partnership as described herein looks toward an international and global system more characterized by community than by anarchy. Partnership embraces what Kwame Anthony Appiah (2006) calls 'universality plus differences.' It advances under the banner of *cosmopolitanism*, a more relevant and realizable response to global risks and threats than offered by the more dominant alternative perspectives:

either state-centric realism or multi-lateral liberalism. Partnership doctrine as applied global public policy practice supplants power politics with the mobilization of even greater and more diverse forms of power. The meta-governance (governance of governance) task is to grasp more fully the interrelationships among a full range of causal factors, and respond with more collaborative and innovative approaches. International relations theorist Robert Keohane provided a broad contextual understanding in a blog posting on institutional innovation, where he said:

If I had to choose a purely conceptual and theoretical topic, however, I would agree with my close friend and collaborator Joe Nye and focus on how information affects power. My perspective on this issue stems from Hannah Arendt's definition of power as 'the ability to act in common.' Historically, such communication has been very difficult except through formal organizations, including the state, and all but impossible across state boundaries except with the aid of states. This formerly constant reality has been changing with incredible speed during the last two decades, but we have hardly begun to understand the implications of this momentous fact. *One implication may be that collective action on a global scale, for good or ill, is easier than it has ever been before. In this sense, there is more power in the system than in the past* [emphasis added]. (Keohane, 2011).

This points toward a participatory global public policy with the aim of enhancing security as Ken Booth suggests through *emancipatory politics and networks of community* at all levels, and the transformation of the state as an actor relationship to 'the potential community of communities—common humanity' (Booth, 2005). Partnership as a policy 'doctrine' greatly depends on the timely presence and general willingness of would-be partners. Unlike multilateralism's elaboration of authority based upon state-to-state agreements, partnership as a policy doctrine needs to foster multi-layer, multinational, transnational and global discourse in support of a global public policy response to globalization's new security risks. It is a convergence of bottom-up and top-down approaches; a catalyst rather than a universal panacea. It requires a polycentric approach to complement nation-state authority in a hetero-polar world and is not an attack on conventional governance. Through *self-differentiation*, individuals, organizations, and cosmopolitan-oriented states increasingly have the ability to choose to collaborate on terms that reflect each's own interests and identity, providing for coordinated action by a host of actors in the spirit of *new institutionalism*. The primary sources of innovation are the formal legal rules and informal social norms that govern individual behaviour and structure social interaction in a hetero-polar world through

polycentric, social choice policies. As its primary point of orientation, a partnership approach that is focused on global security risks must place the pursuit of global justice ahead of national sovereignty.

Support for this transnational and multi-disciplinary approach to collaboration necessarily involves a pluralist model of social learning. It will have to balance the participatory culture of a widely distributed public with the elite technocracy of bureaucracy. Developing new networks of collaboration where none previously existed will likely involve prototyping and much trial and error. It could entail networks between government bureaucracies, networks between state and society within borders and across borders, or entirely non-governmental cooperation between entities with no formal authority.

Drawing ideas from the epistemology of New Institutionalism

In turning to analyze the epistemology of partnership, it is not necessary to subject general laws of application to increasingly robust empirical generalizations. Rather, I seek mechanism-based explanations to identify salient constitutive characteristics based on partial causal analogies (Goodin & Tilly, 2006). The aim of the exercise is to demonstrate how the theoretical claims of a partnership doctrine can be rationally justified in light of observable objects and forces. This approach is justified by the fact that academic literature identifies a growing gap between contemporary international relations theory and the emerging global realities evolving from the dynamics of globalization (Slaughter, 2004; Kaldor, 2007; Held & McGrew 2007).

The epistemological issues that emerge in this context concern the relationship between knowledge, control and power, as well as the managed diffusion of power. Globalization has caused many organizations to witness their diminished ability to manage and control processes historically within their unitary purview, in part because the distribution of information and knowledge is being continuously reconstituted across the global information commons. This has led to a crisis of context that, at its core, is defined by tensions between identities (individual participation), enterprises (bounded formal organizations), communities (organic organizations), and open systems (public sphere) (White, 2008). However, global perceptions of risk have also widened the space in which transnational responses can be explored, breaking through 'national orthodoxy' and facilitating a cosmopolitan perspective (Beck, 2005).

Furthermore, this more diffuse spectrum of threats and risks has no ideological centre. An enemy with no fixed address also tends to elude theory.

Elinor Ostrom, the 2009 Nobel Laureates in Economics points toward socially situated knowledge that may underpin a new institutionalist global policy. Ostrom's study of collaborative approaches to governance for the commons can help foster new forms of collaboration through partnership. Ostrom is fundamentally concerned with identifying the core elements of a 'new institutionalism,' which for the purposes of this paper is defined to mean the formal legal rules and informal social norms that govern individual behaviour and structure social interactions. Elinor Ostrom's analysis examines empowerment through 'generativity,' experienced in terms of local citizen participation in the governance of the local commons -- with global commons implications. She defines 'new institutionalism' to mean understanding 'how a group of principals who are in an interdependent situation can organize and govern themselves to obtain continuing joint benefits when all face temptations to free-ride, shirk, or otherwise act opportunistically' (Ostrom, 1990, p.29). Ostrom suggests in her conclusion to *Understanding Institutional Diversity* that:

...self-organizing arrangements enable people to learn more about one another's needs and the ecology around them. Learning problem solving skills in a local context generates citizens with more general problem solving skills that enables them to reach out and more effectively examine far-reaching problems that affect all peoples living on this earth. (Ostrom, 2005, p.228)

Bridging traditional splits between policy and theory, economics and political science, and micro- versus macro-levels of analysis, a discourse around 'new institutionalism' is occurring amongst some of the world's most well-recognized thinkers. They share a preference for an inter-subjective understanding, which when applied to new institutional approaches to global policy would favour comparative 'social choice' approaches over 'rational choice' assertions of unilateral national interest or binding 'social contract' norms sought through multilateral regimes.

Partnership as praxis: Governance networks supported by emancipatory political action

'Partnership' is best conceptualized as an *emancipation process* as seen through the prism of Critical Theory. A key element is that 'communicative actions' are seen to be the

basis of a just society because legitimacy and shared interests are made possible by negotiating common definitions of circumstances and situations in which competing interests are at stake. Emancipation brings together a concept of the totality of society. It encompasses the micro-level where a variety of actors enter the public arena, as well from the macro perspective as a study of the relationships between major structural components of society. Jürgen Habermas emphasizes political participation as the core of a democratic society and as an essential element in individual self-development. In *Moral Consciousness and Communicative Action* Habermas explains the concept:

‘Communicative action can be understood as a circular process in which the actor is two things in one: an initiator, who masters situations through actions for which he is accountable, and a product of the transitions surrounding him, of groups whose cohesion is based on solidarity to which he belongs, and of processes of socialization in which he is reared.’ (Habermas, 1996, p.135)

Further elaborating on this process, Thomas Risse concludes that ‘When actors engage in a truth-seeking discourse, they must be prepared to change their own views of the world, their interests, and sometimes, even their identities’ (Risse, 2000, p.2). Accordingly, the Partnership doctrine approach that this paper advances is grounded in the philosophical stance of the Frankfurt School of Critical Theory and emancipatory theory of security cooperation offered by Ken Booth, who argues: ‘*Critical security theory is both a theoretical commitment and a political orientation. As a theoretical commitment it embraces a set of ideas engaging in a critical and permanent exploration of the ontology, epistemology, and praxis of security, community, and emancipation in world politics. As a political orientation it is informed by the aim of enhancing security through emancipatory politics and networks of community at all levels, including the potential community of communities—common humanity.*’ (Booth, 2005, p.268).

Networked forms of governance raise dialogue as the primary form of *transaction* in the social sphere and stand in contrast to the command hierarchy of the state and the price exchange determination of the market (i.e., the leviathan and the invisible hand). Bob Jessop (2002, p.1) defines this particular approach to governance as: ‘*the reflexive self-organization of independent actors involved in complex relations of reciprocal interdependence, with such self-organization being based on continuing dialogue and resource-sharing to develop mutually beneficial joint projects and to manage the contradictions and dilemmas inevitably involved in such situations.*’ New tools of effective global emancipation in the form of social

media empower citizens and create new patterns of engagement, offering both credible influence and intellectual capital, which can be channelled through new educational approaches and brought to bear on shared problems. What must change -- and what sits at the heart of any global partnership -- are the solutions and opportunities for research and educational collaboration that political, economic, and social challenges present. Those at the local level will inevitably contribute to and draw upon resources from a global level and its information sphere. If the risks to an interconnected world are to be addressed, everyone must feel welcome to participate in sharing ideas and contributing to the universal pool of knowledge.

A significant challenge will be for the stewards of the current order to emphasize the commonalities that emerging voices have with the traditional Western liberal democracies and leverage their differences to promote new modes of thinking. To paraphrase Robert Merry (2011), the Western world will need to ‘recognize the exceptionalism of its values without insisting on their universality.’ For example, Chinese scholar Qin Yaqing (2010) suggests that Chinese participation in a reformed international society will require more of a process-oriented approach that emphasizes the ‘relationality’ between different actors more than their interactions as discrete entities. The peaceful rise of China, with its unique political and economic system, is symbolic of the changes occurring to the prevailing global order. China has charted a unique path. While it has its flaws, over the past two decades, Chinese development has lifted hundreds of millions of individuals out of poverty and set in motion emancipation from the previous limitations posed by totalitarianism. One question that remains open is whether and how China might fit into the existing liberal order. Not only due to its sheer size, but its status as a developing nation and as a regional power in Asia, Chinese participation will be vital in addressing any shared global problems. The Chinese must be given strong incentives to join as creative stakeholders in developing the practice of partnership. This can best be done by acknowledging the greater diversity that the emerging order will embrace. Chinese thinking in terms of ‘relationality’ is highly compatible with the practice of partnership.

Initiating a call to global partnership at the November 2010 launch of the Global Challenges Forum in Geneva, Switzerland, Chinese Ambassador HE Yafei (2010) foresaw these kinds of challenges when he declared, ‘*We need a new global partnership that is more equal, that is more balanced, that has mutual and shared benefits. We survive or we sink together. So this new global partnership is extremely important...We are interdependent for*

the security of others. So we need new thinking: new concepts, new mechanisms, and new means to achieve this concept.'

In the effort to devise new thinking, concepts, mechanisms and means to achieve global partnership, it will be necessary to inspire partnerships that combine educational and civil society networks that transcend local, regional, global, public, private sectors and foster research and policy support to support informal networked governance on a global scale. As Yochai Benkler suggests, a decrease in the authority, reach, and legitimacy of states to tackle the most serious security challenges highlights the need for 'a practical diagnosis of opportunities, barriers, and strategies for achieving improvements in human freedom and development given the actual conditions of technology, economy, and politics' (Benkler, 2006, pp.21). As international relations and public policy scholars consider the implications of increasingly open models of diplomacy, it may be worthwhile to consider Benkler's observations concerning the social production process:

The actual practice of freedom we see emerging from the networked environment allows people to reach across boundaries, across space and political division. It allows people to solve problems together in new associations that are outside the boundaries of formal, legal-political association. In this fluid social economic environment, the individual's claims provide a moral anchor for considering the structures of power and opportunity, of freedom and well-being. (Benkler, 2006, p.19)

While unexplored in foreign policy, in other domains open partnership models are hardly unique. 'Open source' social production processes, mechanisms, and principles – which operate to facilitate collaboration among decentralized and autonomous actors pursuing distinct logics of motivation – have expanded beyond their initial uses in software development to now having an established presence within diverse practices, including agriculture, bio-medicine, media, academia, and even various aspects of domestic government. In framing the explanation for this interpretation of a global partnership doctrine, one is tempted to propose that it be thought of as 'Linux-inspired foreign policy code writing,' because it situates foreign policy as a social artifact in the context of an open standards model, in which almost anyone is invited to help develop operating instructions and content.

This analogy also permits an interesting question in terms of constitutive theorizing: what might exactly constitute this new institutional 'code' within a new diplomacy based on

partnership, and how is influence brokered? Could it be negotiating bilateral and multilateral treaties that include reference to cooperation with non-governmental partners in addressing shared global challenges? Or, could it be more open-ended, like crafting a new Strategic Concept of NATO to include a comprehensive approach explicitly incorporating collaboration with humanitarian organizations in zones of conflict? Alternately, is it discrete and specific, such as a particular collaboration project in which the US State Department or the Foreign Ministry of any country facilitates the leadership role of a faith-based based group, or a non-governmental organization, or a multinational corporation, or all three, to address a specific humanitarian challenge in a specific country? Further, what might be the institutional ecology of foreign policy in an open world model? Would it contradict or include the use of elite semi-independent advisors whose recommendations are conjured outside the bureaucracy and announced by press release? Would it open the door to reciprocal and interactive responses with non-traditional partners to ongoing events and thereby strengthen global capacity for collective action? Alternately, would it result in diluting the authority of foreign policy, relegating it to an interpretative role in a global information sphere that has already been ceded to other more powerful players?

By whatever approach is taken to construct it and measure it, in answering the question ‘how?’ the constitutive theorizing of partnership implies a strong element of recognition by others. In short, if a partnership approach is being implemented, how would you even know it? Constitutive approaches involve recognition, and not declaration. While a cosmopolitan foreign policy could accommodate a diverse set of organizational typologies, this paper posits that ‘new institutionalism’ in foreign policy implies a process bias toward networked governance with emphasis on change mechanisms of three specific types: 1) decentralized and poly-hierarchical *coordination*; 2) non-proprietary and process-oriented *collaboration*; and 3) *cooperation* among a diverse set of actors in a meritocratic framework.

Overcoming what Ulrich Beck (2009) has described as ‘methodological nationalism’ would likely require introduction of coordination processes that are *decentralized and poly-hierarchical*. Rather than each participant having a discrete task in the policy making process, with a clear chain of command to follow, authority and competency would be more broadly distributed among the participating individuals and groups, among and between different countries, both within governments and outside. A guiding principle for collaboration through partnership could be to explore the specific organizational options that *reduce transaction*

costs, while preserving the most public benefit. Cooperation with results means resource allocation; for nation-states, this involves considerations similar to that of the firm, namely 'make or buy.' When out-sourcing to non-governmental actors the roles of governance, there is also more scrutiny of the individual contributions. In traditional foreign policy, the authority structure is hierarchical and policy generally takes a top-down approach and the scrutiny by outside actors is exogenous, whereas in 'new institutional' approaches it is likely to be more participatory and endogenous. This implies a significant enlargement of the number of players in the coordination process and the need for non-hegemonic discourse centred on governance with respect to the commons -- whether local, regional, or global. With wider discourse and more actors making a conscious decision to act this way, partnership frameworks move beyond being ad hoc or accidental, proceeding purposefully.

Thus, the alternative 'methodological cosmopolitanism' of partnership can also be induced in socially produced collaboration processes that are *non-proprietary and process-oriented*. Global policy initiatives are inherently non-proprietary if there is no special branding as part of a national agenda, risk is diffused and credit claiming may be shared, and shared knowledge results in community products understood to be global public goods -- even if produced in a local context. Process-oriented in this way, partnership would give *material* properties to *social* capital, which would create further incentives for collaboration. For example, non-governmental networks that promote stability reduce the need for military expenditure to protect the populace. In each instance, the transaction must be the basic unit of analysis. Mutual gains are realized when opportunities to reduce conflict are achieved through more open and transparent outcomes.

Cooperation among a diverse set of actors *in a meritocratic framework* is another potential characteristic element in a methodological cosmopolitan approach to partnership. In the foreign policy realm, cosmopolitanism would likely favour partnerships with actors who are able to bring diversity and niche expertise. This widens the community of experts able to contribute. For example, academia, faith-based groups, humanitarian and other civil society groups, as well as multinational corporations, could provide diverse and complementary institutional capabilities. If capacity building for development is multi-dimensional, a partnership approach can combine performance-based objectives with elements of peer-to-peer accountability.

For practical reasons, implementing a partnership doctrine would almost certainly need to build primarily upon existing resources and work to promote synergies among and between ongoing cooperative programs. This would involve multinational strategies that draw upon resources and commitment from levels above and below the nation-state, as well as strengthening transnational partnerships between governmental, non-governmental and private organizations. It could also involve facilitating partnerships through mentoring relationships with compatible counterparts and working with regional multilateral organizations to facilitate a networked approach. Implicit is the notion that widely distributed participants can work together, choosing among feasible alternatives to make comparative improvements in response to specific challenges.

As stated at the outset, partnership doctrine as applied practice will likely be understood with certainty only on a case-by-case basis, likely involving prototyping and much trial and error. Constitutive theorizing of a social object implies that it must be recognized by others. Support for this transnational and multi-disciplinary dialogue approach will necessarily involve a pluralist model of social learning, strengthening the partnership between civil society and governance hierarchy in addressing global risks.

Seven design rules for implementing the Partnership approach

The overarching emancipatory design rule of the partnership doctrine is that any such new approach to engagement must be formulated as an empowerment paradigm, wherein partners are encouraged to contribute solutions to shared problems on their own terms. Unifying the theory and practice of partnership along the lines of new institutional models of networked governance requires empowering and engaging with diverse actors in innovative forums and addressing how to manage the diffusion of power (Sorensen & Torfing 2008). New actors involved in the foreign policy making process potentially bring new ideas, new synergies, and new types of collaboration to the tasks at hand, akin to Eric von Hippel's (2005) concept of 'user-driven innovation' through feedback in social networks. To support this process, seven design rules apply.

1. *Use existing resources more effectively by promoting synergies among and between cooperative programs.* Throughout the world there are many established governmental and non-governmental programs in which a cooperative relationship may be established

based upon the realization that political stability, military security, and economic growth are all inter-related. Realizing this opportunity requires a coherent, concerted, comprehensive approach based upon a global vision with specific goals. A partnership model focused on results, requires a bottom-up approach to surface tacit knowledge and integrative mechanisms to foster the cross levelling of knowledge. It requires opening up established bureaucratic hierarchies, especially to foster new possibilities for public-private partnership, most especially for collaborations focused on the transition to democracy, free market economy, and cooperative security relations.

2. *Employ multinational strategies that draw upon resources and commitment from levels above and below the nation-state.* Central to the success of the Partnership concept in practice would be a multinational and multi-level character. Multinational participation is not easy to achieve and is very often best accomplished as a result of multiple bilateral ties being draw together in reinforcing ways to permit niche competencies and distinctive contributions. The organizational imperative of ‘thinking global, acting local’ leaves adequate room for the hierarchical structures of the nation-state to shape events without getting in the way. The development of a web of informal consultancies helps to realign the knowledge-power nexus in ways decidedly more useful and effective than traditional bureaucratic structures are willing to permit. Furthermore, as new security challenges overlap with issues of broader public interest, this means that trans-governmental networks, including between militaries, have to maintain public legitimacy in the expenditure of scarce resources.
3. *Strengthen partnerships with non-governmental, private organizations, and international foundations.* Non-governmental organizations are an essential element in the development of the civil society component of a security community. For example, as the civil sector is strengthened in its competency to evaluate military affairs, the capacity for effective defence reform and transformation is strengthened. Information sharing efforts employing information technology carried out in tandem with non-governmental organizations can provide a more neutral forum for the development and dissemination of information, particularly if it involves the sharing of ‘best practices.’ In the area of democratic control of armed forces, an innovative approach is to join a multinational group of stakeholders to an organization devoted to strengthening the civil society of foreign nations through the

enhancement of capacities for effective civil-military dialogue, including mentoring advice and technical assistance.

4. *Facilitate partnership through mentoring relationships with compatible counterparts.* Establishing linkages (through diverse forums allowing one-to-one, one-to-many, and many-to-many lines of communication) can only be accomplished through the pairing of entities in which a sense of natural reciprocity is possible. Comparable size institutions find it easier to facilitate the cross levelling of knowledge. In any case, the presumptive mentor is likely to benefit as much as the understudy because the dialogue and exchange between them would force a critical examination of concepts for their validity. The process of attempting to cross-level knowledge across different cultural and organizational boundaries inevitably implies an adaptation process. This boundary line is one ripe for experimentation and the re-evaluation of assumptions and untested presumptions.
5. *Work with regional multilateral organizations to facilitate a networked approach.* While bottom-up initiatives may find a protective environment within which to flourish, gaining support from a multilateral organization may help yield a multinational commitment to leverage shared resources to best effect. Support for a global security agenda will require a networked approach extending across the spectrum of political, military, economic and informational issues. The greatest benefits can be achieved only if there is a shared commitment to joint action, without regard to organizational affiliations. Regional participants need to define common problems and work in tandem with regional partners to define common solutions, and regional multilateral organizations (e.g., EU, NATO, ASEAN, African Union) are well positioned to assist.
6. *Foster bilateral communities of practice among and between foreign countries through information technology.* Building mechanisms that foster cooperation between the ‘new actors’ in international affairs is a far-reaching conceptual departure from business-as-usual. The concepts of self-help and mutual obligation need to be the primary basis for weaving together a network of activities to attract and retain the necessary financial support there needs to be a sub-structure of consensus based upon ‘performance legitimacy.’ Performance legitimacy can also be strengthened through the incorporation of information technologies which promote a networked integration through a horizontally connected ‘virtual agency’ approach, in which donor organizations can directly participate in the life

of the community of practice and actively subsidize events and projects which appear to yield the greatest return on investment. Virtual communities of interest should be forged among and between countries, in terms that still respect national sovereignty.

7. *Establish performance objectives in support of communities of interest based upon a broad definition of security.* Confronting emerging security threats posed by globalization is almost by definition a movement into uncharted territory. The linkages between defence reform, democratic civil-military relations, and performance legitimacy have to be invented ‘on-the-fly’ with no certain end state in mind except that emerging leaders and change agents find new possibilities to co-develop a model of innovation in the quest for new knowledge. In forging a Partnership approach, special attention must be paid to the knowledge-power nexus in which change agents work to confront emerging security threats by developing new mechanisms for networked governance structures that are more comprehensive and effective than previous conceptions of ‘trans-governmental networks’.

The partnership model in support of this approach may be characterized in four ways:

- ***Partnership as a Pivot Point for Transformation.***
- ***Partnership as a Focal Point for Problem Solving.***
- ***Partnership as Information Market Place.***
- ***Partnership as a Facilitator of Endowments.***

As a ***Pivot Point for Transformation***, the partnership concept could facilitate transformation and defence reform directed toward the emerging security challenges of the twenty-first century. In cooperation with existing programs, new models of innovation developed at the local level can help to forge strategic partnerships among governmental and non-governmental entities, international and private financial organizations, and private industry, principally the modern global corporations. Together, they could develop personnel networks and partnerships between those in the security sector and those engaged in economic development, facilitating a sharing of best practices among advisors and consultants who can best contribute to the change process.

As a ***Focal Point for Problem Solving***, the partnership concept can help to identify and develop future problem solvers. Through various programs of cooperation that are enriched

and sustained through online collaboration, the primary focus must remain on ‘expertise identification’ and assembling the individuals needed for joint problem solving. This would entail bringing together diverse numbers of individuals whose tacit knowledge is joined to that of others in formulating new methods of adaptation based upon best practices.

As an ***Information Market Place***, the partnership concept is focused on helping to establish continuous, online, experiential learning. In cooperation with leading academic institutions, think-tanks, and practitioner organizations, the Partnership approach is concerned with building a ‘network of dreams’ connecting minds before connecting modems. The open architecture of a shared learning environment helps to facilitate worldwide participative problem solving, focused especially on ‘benchmarking’ or learning from the world’s best, working to adapt their successful processes to local conditions.

As a ***Facilitator of Endowments***, the partnership concept could expand the boundaries of mutual obligation far beyond the tradition sphere of security cooperation and defence affairs to address broader issues of human security. With primary attention to future leader development, cooperation with private philanthropy, global corporations, and private universities can broaden the realm of the possible. Of key concern is the perpetual replenishment of competent civilian participation in the democratic control of armed forces, because ‘War is too important an activity to be left to the generals.’ So too is building the peace of the future. That is a challenge for all people.

Conclusion

A global resilience network for the twenty-first century based upon the practice of partnership is needed to create new mechanisms of convergence to foster greater capacities for innovation and resilience in response to emerging global threats and risks. Implicit in the partnership approach is a de-emphasis of both traditional security ideals: the unitary nation-state and the international community of states. *Partnership would move beyond an international system characterized by anarchy, toward a cosmopolitan concept of community to be developed through global partnerships.* It could be achieved by developing widening and overlapping circles of local individual and institutional responsibility. Transaction costs need to be closely monitored when opting to co-develop a new cooperative program within the context of a broader regional and international community. Individuals at all levels of

hierarchy within government and elsewhere can socially construct the world through actions at the local level that stem more from ideals and values born from a sense of mutual obligation to one's fellow man, than from any conception of pursuing national interests.

The argument that has been made here is that a partnership doctrine as applied practice will likely be understood with certainty only on a case-by-case basis, likely involving prototyping and much trial and error. It would involve multinational strategies that draw upon resources and commitment from levels above and below the nation-state, as well as strengthening transnational partnerships with non-governmental and private organizations. It could also involve facilitating partnerships through mentoring relationships with compatible counterparts and working with regional multilateral organizations to facilitate a networked approach. Implicit is the notion that widely distributed participants can work together, choosing among feasible alternatives to make comparative improvements in response to specific challenges.

The partnership doctrinal approach in this paper has been cast in the emancipatory terms of 'relational realism,' defined by Tilly & Goodin to be: 'the doctrine that transactions, interactions, social ties, and conversations constitute the central stuff of social life... [and] concentrates on connections that concatenate, aggregate, and disaggregate readily, forming organizational structures at the same time as they shape individual behavior' (Goodin & Tilly, 2006, p.10) Partnership transcends other notions of IR doctrine, holding no region of the earth as 'foreign' to any other. It advances under the banner of *global cosmopolitanism*, a more relevant and realizable response to global risks than offered by the more dominant alternative perspectives: either state-centric realism or liberal institutionalism. Partnership doctrine as applied global public policy practice supplants power politics with the mobilization of even greater and more diverse forms of power. Through *self-differentiation*, individuals, organizations, and cosmopolitan-oriented states choose to collaborate on terms that reflect each's own interests and identity, providing for coordinated action by a host of actors in the spirit of *new institutionalism* that differentiates liberal institutionalism from global cosmopolitanism. The primary sources of innovation are the formal legal rules and informal social norms that govern individual behavior and structure social interaction in a hetero-polar world through polycentric, social choice policies. This points toward a participatory global public policy with the aim of enhancing security through *emancipatory politics and networks*

of community at all levels, and the transformation of the state as an actor relationship in relationship to all of humanity.

Further, the argument made herein is to suggest that the development of new identities or sustainable communities is not an autonomous act. Rather, it is to suggest that change in the *materialist* structure of world politics wrought by the advent of the same information technologies that also fuel larger dynamics of globalization need to be leveraged and co-opted. Put simply, *globalization is a material part of the post-modern anarchical structure of world politics and not a social construct*. Regardless of how various attempts are made to reshape interests and identities within various ‘practices’, these alone do not provide the prima facie proof of a cosmopolitan vision. In the framework of partnership, identities and interests are contingent and can change. Partnership explicitly concerns itself with strategic culture and adaptive governmental institutions, understanding that identity formation is a consensual and self-participatory process. No one forms someone else’s identity without their participation, and there are limits to cooperation. The Partnership response is borne as much of materialist factors stemming from the injection of new information technology, as it is from any normative response. Partnership doctrine, grounded in new institutionalist thinking and guided by the principal of ‘self-differentiation,’ can be an integrating and empowering response to the post-modern fractal sense of self, whether at the individual, organizational, or nation-state level. Thus, contrary to the argument of Alexander Wendt (1992), who is perhaps the most recognizable scholar of the Constructivist persuasion, anarchy is not just what states make of it. *Anarchy is what people make of it!*

References

- Appiah, K. Anthony, 2006. *Cosmopolitan Ethics in a World of Strangers*. New York: Norton,
- Beck, Ulrich, 2005. *Power in the Global Age*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Beck, U., 2009. Rights: Beyond Methodological Nationalism Interview [online]. Available from: <http://www.re-public.gr/en/?p=157> [Accessed 4 November 2009].
- Benkler, Y., 2006. *The Wealth of Networks: How Social Production Transforms Markets and Freedom*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Benhabib, S., 2006. 'The Philosophical Foundations of Cosmopolitan Norms', in R. Post (ed.) *Another Cosmopolitanism*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 13-45.
- Bobbitt, Philip, 2002. *Shield of Achilles*. New York: Alfred Knopf
- Booth, K., 2005. 'Beyond Critical Security Studies' in *Critical Security Studies and World Politics* edited by Ken Booth. Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Reinner Publishing
- Bull, Hedley, 1977. *The Anarchical Society*. London: Macmillan
- Clinton, H., 2009a. Opening Remarks before the House Foreign Affairs Committee [Online]. Available from: <http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2009a/04/122048.htm>US house [Accessed 24 November 2009].
- Clinton, H., 2009b. Foreign Policy Address at the Council on Foreign Relations [Online]. Available from: <http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2009a/july/126071.htm> [Accessed 4 November 2009].
- Etzioni, Amitai, 2011. "Tunisia: The First Arab Islamocracy," *The National Interest*, October 26, 2011. Available from <http://nationalinterest.org/commentary/tunisia-the-first-arab-islamocracy-6084> [Accessed 12 December 2011]
- Gates, Robert, 2009. 'A Balanced Strategy: Reprogramming the Pentagon for a New Age,' *Foreign Affairs*, Jan/Feb
- Goodin, Robert E and Tilly, Charles, 2006. *The Oxford Handbook of Contextual Political Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D. and Perraton, J, 1999. *Global Transformations: Politics, Economics and Culture*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Held, D., McGrew, A. (eds), 2007. *Global Transformations Reader* (2nd ed). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Jessop, B., 2002. 'Governance and Meta-governance: On Reflexivity, Requisite Variety, and Requisite Irony,' *Department of Sociology, Lancaster University* [online]. Available from: <http://www.lancs.ac.uk/fass/sociology/papers/jessop-governance-and-meta-governance.pdf> [Accessed 27 December 2009].

- Kaldor, M., 2007. *Human Security – Reflections on Globalization and Intervention*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Keohane, Robert, 2008. Institutions and the Need for Innovation in the Field, *Theory Talks* [online]. Available from: <http://www.theory-talks.org/2008/05/theory-talk-9.html> [Accessed 4 November 2009].
- Mearsheimer, John, 2001. *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company
- Merry, Robert, 2011. “American Exceptionalism and the Universality Fallacy,” *The National Interest*, 30 September 2011. Available from: <http://nationalinterest.org/commentary/american-exceptionalism-the-universality-fallacy-5956> [Accessed 12 December 2011].
- Norwegian Nobel Committee, 2009. The Nobel Peace Prize for 2009 [online]. Available from: http://nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/peace/laureates/2009/press.html [Accessed 4 November 2009]
- Obama, Barack, 2008. 'Obama's Speech in Berlin,' *New York Times*, 24 July [online]. Available from: <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/07/24/us/politics/24text-obama.html> [Accessed 15 January 2009].
- Obama, Barack, 2009a. Remarks by the President at the Acceptance of the Nobel Peace Prize [online]. Available from: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-acceptance-nobel-peace-prize> [Accessed 20 December 2009].
- Obama, Barack, 2009b. Remarks by the President on a New Beginning [online]. Available from: http://www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/Remarks-by-the-President-at-Cairo-University-6-04-09 [Accessed 24 November 2009].
- Obama, Barack, 2009c. Remarks by the President at the Clinton Global Initiative [online]. Available from: http://www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/Remarks-by-the-President-at-the-Clinton-global-initiative [Accessed 24 November 2009].
- Ostrom, Elinor, 1990. *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ostrom, Elinor, 2005. *Understanding Institutional Diversity*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Risse, Thomas, 2000. ‘Let’s Argue!: Communicative Action in World Politics,’ *International Organization*, Vol 54, No. 1 (Winter): 2.
- Sanger, David, 2009. 'Obama Outlines a Vision of Might and Right', *The New York Times*, 11 December [online]. Available from: <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/12/12/world/12sanger.html> [Accessed 20 December 2009].
- Slaughter, A.M., 2004. *A New World Order*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

- Sorensen, E and J. Torfing (eds), 2008. *Theories of Democratic Network Governance*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillian.
- Thucydides , *The Peloponnesian War*, translated by Crawley, ed. Sir Richard Livingstone, 1960. New York: Oxford University Press, New York.
- Thucydides , *The Peloponnesian War*, translated by Thomas Hobbes, ed. David Green, 1959. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Tilly, Charles, 1990. *Coercion, Capital, and European States, AD 990-1990*. (Oxford: Blackwell, 1990). p. 5.
- US Department of State, 2011. 'Guide to Partnering' [online]. Available from: <http://www.state.gov/s/partnerships/guide/index.htm> [Accessed 15 January 2011].
- Von Hippel, E., 2005. *Democratizing Innovation*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Wendt, Alexander, 1992. 'Anarchy is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics,' *International Organization*, 46, pp: 335-370.
- White, H., 2008. *Identity and Control: How Social Formation Emerge* (2nd Ed). Princeton; Princeton University Press.
- Yafei, He., 2010. "Keynote Address – Launch of the Global Challenges Forum" given and Remarks Château de Coppet, Geneva, Switzerland, 16 November 2010. Accessible from <http://globalchallengesforum.org/> [Accessed 12 December 2011]
- Yaqing, Qin, 2010. "International Society as a Process: Institutions, Identities, and China's Peaceful Rise," *The Chinese Journal of International Politics*, Vol. 3, 2010: 129-153.