

US: A quasi state of war?; South China Sea; integrating immigrants into Europe

July 18, 2016



"USS Ronald Reagan Transits the South China Sea"
Copyright: [Official U.S. Navy Page](#), [Flickr Creative Commons](#)

Short Piece

[A semi-permanent quasi state of war?](#)

Many Americans, and surely many people around the world, will be shocked to learn about the kinds of foreign policy “architecture” the President plans to leave for his successor. The main elements of this architecture, which the president outlined for [The Washington Post](#), are the following: (a) The US will be in a quasi-state of war “for years to come”. (b) The quasi war will be carried out in scores of countries. The President did not identify them, but these involve the growing number of nations in which ISIS, its affiliates or similar groups, are rising. (c) The main tools of this continued warfare will include a mixture of drones, Special Forces, and CIA operations—and building up of local forces (“capacity building” in the Pentagon’s lingo). (d) The goal of these operations is mitigating

“low grade” threats by terror groups and “repairing fractured societies in Syria, Iraq and Afghanistan.”

Longer Pieces

[Apple: Good Business, Poor Citizen](#)

Journal of Business Ethics

The recent case between Apple and the FBI, in which Apple refused to comply with a court order to aid the FBI in overriding the security features of an iPhone used by one of the San Bernardino terrorists, brought the tension between national security and individual rights to the forefront. This article looks at the case and these two core values from a liberal communitarian ethics perspective, and provides an analysis of how these values are reflected in U.S. law. It concludes with an ethical discussion relevant to the resolution of differences between high-tech corporations and the government.

[Freedom of Navigation Assertions: The United States as the World's Policeman](#)

Armed Forces & Society Vol. 42 No. 3 July 2016

In line with its “Freedom of Navigation” program, the United States conducts “operational assertions” by sending naval vessels to violate what it considers to be the excessive maritime claims of other states. Efforts have been made to legitimate this program to the public and elected officials on both liberal and realist grounds: Freedom of navigation is an important component of the liberal international order while also central to the exercise of U.S. naval power. However, it does not follow that military assertions, which create a security risk and are inconsistent with liberal principles, should take precedence over diplomatic and multilateral steps. Rather, the program has faced little scrutiny to date due to its relative obscurity

[From Partnership to Community](#)

President Reuven Rivlin is calling for a dialogue among four “tribes” to develop a framework for a societywide partnership in Israel. (These are also referred to as population segments, which include secular Jews, Haredim, National religious groups, and Israeli Arabs.) The President outlined four “pillars” on which such a partnership may rest. These include a sense of security, shared responsibility, equity and equality, and a shared Israeli character.

President Rivlin's referenced speech is available [here](#).

For our response in English, click [here](#).

Feedback: Immigration to Europe

Last month we asked the following question:

Ten years from now, do you expect that the majority of the people who recently

immigrated to Europe will be well integrated, a source of some conflict, or follow some other course? And what should European societies do to help the transformation? What do you think about the notion that the legal and ethical right to asylum means that the person has to be provided a safe haven, but not necessarily in your country?

Below are some responses:

Joseph Margulies, Professor of Law and Government, Cornell University

Can't it be both? Certainly a majority of any group can be "well integrated," even as their presence--indeed, their very existence--remains "a source of some conflict." That, in fact, is a pretty good summary of the history of immigration in the United States and certainly describes the status of the Muslim community today. Looking beyond asylum seekers, consider the mixed fate of gay rights in the United States. On the one hand, acceptance of same sex marriage in particular and homosexuality in general is at record highs throughout the population. On the other hand, look what happened in Orlando....

So in answer to your question, I would say, yes, the majority of asylum seekers in Europe will be well integrated, and their presence will continue to be a source of some conflict.

I gather what you really want to know is how (or whether) Europe can maximize integration while minimizing conflict. To put it somewhat differently, can we get past the seductive appeal of demonization based on immutable characteristics like race, religion, ethnicity, or country of origin (or sexual preference, etc)? As you know, the lesson of history is not kind to the premise, and nothing in recent events in either Europe or the United States should give us reason to be particularly sanguine. Yet, for reasons I do not completely understand, I am hopeful, or at least, cautiously optimistic. Perhaps it is simply a character flaw, but I think we are seeing signs that irreversible demographic trends will change things, at least in the United States. [I have adapted what follows from something I wrote elsewhere]

The most important of these trends is also the most obvious: the country is becoming less white. According to the Census Bureau, the millennial generation, which is the largest in history and makes up more than a quarter of the country's population, is more diverse than any prior generation. More than 44 percent of the Millennials are part of a minority ethnic or racial group. Yet the generation after Millennials is even more diverse, with more than 50 percent non-white. Projections indicate the United States will be a majority minority country in about 30 years, and majority minority among children under the age of 18 by 2020.

At the same time, the country is growing increasingly secular, with a record number of people reporting no religious affiliation. There are now more people who claim membership in no religious group than there are Mainline Protestants and nearly as many who describe themselves as Evangelical Protestants.

It is also becoming more urban. Major metropolitan centers in the United States are growing substantially faster than rural areas, and cities today are not only the economic

engine of American life, generating 90 percent of our GDP and 86 percent of our jobs, they are also home to the cultural, racial, and ethnic diversity that increasingly represents the American experience. Young people today are far more likely to start their professional lives in a major city than they were in the second half of the 20th century.

Finally, and not coincidentally, the United States **as a whole** is becoming more tolerant, with a widening embrace of diversity in all its manifestations, as demonstrated by, among other things, the growing acceptance of homosexuality, same-sex marriage, premarital sex, cohabitation, and interracial marriage. And once again, the young lead the charge; Millennials are not simply tolerant of difference, they embrace it enthusiastically.

And that explains a great deal, for it is precisely its decline that accounts for the virulence of the demonization so much in evidence today. As Clifford Geertz described over half a century ago, when “the established images of political order fade into irrelevance or are driven into disrepute,” those who depend on them to organize their lives cling to them most fanatically. Paradoxically, it is precisely when cultural symbols are least stable that the attachment to them is most intense.

This is precisely what produces the insensate rage so much in evidence. In the zero-sum world of the right, tolerance is appeasement, acceptance surrender, and equality defeat. It puts Muslims and asylum seekers in the cross hairs, sometimes literally. They are the immediate manifestation of a declining world view, the front line in a state of symbolic siege. One day the siege will end, the intransigent core of the right will fade away, and the resistance to irreversible demographic trends will stop. Until that day, we must understand the rage against today's asylum seekers for what it is: the death rattle of a declining demographic.

William Outhwaite, Emeritus Professor of Sociology, Newcastle University

I certainly hope that they will be well integrated, and that Europe will eventually come understand itself as a region of substantial immigration, not quite like your hemisphere but closer to it than at present. This will involve the relativisation of identities in the way familiar in North America, where defining yourself as a Polish or Iranian American can mean a whole range of stronger or weaker identifications with the country or region of origin (or that of your parents or grandparents).

All this presupposes that Europe will take the necessary steps to prevent the sort of disgraceful hostility to immigration. even within Europe itself, which animated the recent referendum campaign in the UK or, in the US, Trump's current imbecilities. This means in particular the maintenance of adequate social welfare policies to reduce the danger of anti-immigration agitation.

By Europe I mean the Europe of the Schengen Area: the members of the European Union and associated states (currently Norway and Switzerland). Assuming that the freedom of movement provided in the European Union treaties is maintained, this will mean that most of Europe will become a single space of potential immigration, which will need to be

regulated (more competently and hopefully more humanely than at present) at its external borders.

The UK has opted out of these common policies, to a degree which remains to be fixed. The important point is that it will now no longer be sharing in the formulation of common EU policies, in this and other areas, though it will of course continue to be affected by them.

Feedback: the concept of "diversity within unity"

Prof. Dr. Dres. h.c. Wolfgang Streeck (emer.), Max Planck Institute for the Study of Societies

This draws attention to the issue of who is admitted and how many over what period of time – which is a core issue in Europe today, and one that cannot in my view be circumvented. The implications are enormous. For example, low selectivity at entrance may mean that one has to accept a relatively high degree of social segmentation, with ethnic or cultural enclaves that require internal as distinguished from external border management. Such enclaves already exist in several German cities, and while they may be inevitable, they require “native” citizens to adjust, often by avoiding certain localities, just as governments, in particular the police force, will have to learn to leave the maintenance of order in such places partly to community leaders, limiting themselves to negotiating with them. In several places exactly this is happening – although it is officially denied – with “extended families” from the Lebanon or Palestine (indirect rule, delegated state functions etc.). The formation of enclaves, I believe, must be tolerated within limits, but the problem should be clearly spelled out. Whether or not girls have to take swimming lessons with boys, and in what swimsuit, is peanuts compared to this.

The normative question of selectivity at entry is further exacerbated by recognition that different immigrant communities are different with respect to their willingness to live under and respect an overarching common culture. The Habermasians believe this to be irrelevant, but communitarians know better. Muslims from Afghanistan, apparently, differ in this respect from Muslims from, say, Turkey. (There is also generational change: second-generation immigrants may be more “fundamentalist”, or separatist, than their parents.) In any case, the local population will have to be told that they must live with (much) lower expectations of behavioral familiarity, and this may be a painful lesson to learn. It should not be papered over. (Again on enclaves: it seems that today, with TV dishes, the internet and cheap air travel, the readiness to accept local normative and behavioral protocols should be rather weaker than in the past.)

You rightly note that it is far from easy for local populations exactly to determine what the core local norms are. What makes the matter even more tricky is that such norms are themselves rapidly changing, sometimes driven by moral entrepreneurs who like to use the very opportunity of immigration for an “in your face” reeducation strategy in relation to their countrymen and –women. That homosexual men kissing in public is something that

is generally approved in European societies is claimed by the “progressives” but is far from a fact. Immigrant Muslims are told it is, but the real addressees are the locals. The same holds for the smartphone apps with instructions for good oral sex: quite a few natives find them in bad taste and wonder why they are being used to teach immigrants the “core values” of the community they are joining.

Which gets me to your premise that European societies have “shared values” and a shared “identity”. This is to be seen with more than a grain of salt. On a growing range of issues, the best that can be hoped for is resigned acceptance of practices and behaviors, from gay marriage to halal or kosher slaughtering of animals, that people find “strange”. Studied indifference is what needs to spread in a heterogeneous society, less sensitivity to moral issues, since a higher morality of “tolerance” is and remains rare. The catalogue of norms valid for all is and must be shrinking, and apart from “Thou shalt not kill”, including physical violence as a means of settling disputes, nobody is willing to offer a substantive list, also for fear of being accused of ethnocentrism or xenophobia.

For information on diversity within unity, see our platform [here](#) and the paper [In Defense of Diversity within Unity](#).

Feedback: Human Nature

Uriel Abulof, senior lecturer at Tel Aviv University, research associate at Princeton University

We all know: Humans are complex beings, driven by multiple motivations. Yet to simplify matters, we often reduce human motivations to their single, arguably most important, core: *homo economicus*, driven by material cost-benefit calculation; *homo sociologicus*, driven by social identities and norms; *homo psychologicus*, propelled by feelings; *homo biologicus*, driven by evolutionary imperatives; and *homo civicus*, seeking the common good. There is a missing piece: *homo conscientious*, individually driven by a moral compass, constructing and construing values and virtues that may defy conventions. The *homo conscientious* is distinctively human. We share material calculations, biological imperatives, feelings, even norms, with fellow animals, but only we seek moral meaning. Following our intellectual ancestors, Weber and Durkheim, the social sciences ought to study the role of morality in our socio-political universe, and revisit Maslow in realizing the complexity of human motivations. Etzioni’s concept of the *moral wrestler* is a good example of initiating such a synthesis, effectively juxtaposing the *homo psychologicus*’s drive to individual happiness with the *homo civicus*’s commitment to the common good.

Your Responses Are Requested

Are nations becoming ungovernable? If so, what should be done?
Comments may be published in an upcoming issue of the Communitarian Observer—please send them to icps@gwu.edu.

I Read

Edward Fischer's book *The Good Life: Aspiration, Dignity, and the Anthropology of Wellbeing* is an excellent source of insight on how people attain fulfillment and the role values play in economic decisions.

"Scrambled regs," an article in *The Economist* from April 16, 2016 discusses the dilemma of end-to-end encryption in the privacy versus security debate and the practical implications of the draft bill sponsored by Senators Feinstein and Burr requiring tech companies to have the ability to decrypt messages sent electronically. The article asserts "there is no way to weaken [cryptography] so that only the authorities would benefit." I provide a liberal communitarian perspective on this issue in [Apple: Good Business, Poor Citizen?](#)

For the Record

On European Integration

1965: "It seems to us that unification cannot be stabilized on any and all levels of integration; it either has to continue to grow or it will regress."

2004: "The basic reason halfway, mainly economic, integration is not sustainable is that the libertarian model is erroneous. Society is not composed of individuals seeking to maximize their pleasure or profit, not are markets self-controlling...when economic integration that benefits their pocketbook threatens their national identity, people will tend to balk."

2005: "The EU is trying to integrate the economies (and regulatory regimes) of its member states, but allowing them to maintain their essential political independence. The EU is seeking to stand between two steps on the ladder of integration: above the level of limited integration of a few economic sectors and below the level of a full union that would include political institutions sufficient to create a United States of Europe."

2007: "The European Union is suffering not just from a democratic deficit, but a community deficit. The level and scope of its integration activities far exceed the degree of community that it sustains."

2011: "[I]f the EU is unable to engage in much stronger community-building—if there is no significant transfer of commitment and loyalty from the citizens of the member nations to the evolving supranational community—the EU will be unable to sustain the kind of encompassing state-like shared governance endeavor it attempts to advance."

On China's activities in the South China Sea

In light of the Hague tribunal's July 12, 2016 on the South China Sea, here is a brief excerpt of our platform of Mutually Assured Restraint, introduced in January 2014:

"To reduce this mistrust and tension, to move toward resolving outstanding differences, and to promote world order and peace, we suggest that consideration should be given to a foreign policy based on mutual respect, according to which each side would limit its projection of power—especially in the Western Pacific—so long as the other side does the same, with the important qualification that these measures of self-restraint must be verifiable."

To read the entire position paper, click [here](#). To see a list of its endorsers, click [here](#).

***Foreign Policy: Thinking Outside the Box* was just released!**

INSIGHTS: A Chatham House Series
on Critical Issues in International Affairs

FOREIGN POLICY: THINKING OUTSIDE THE BOX

AMITAI ETZIONI



**CHATHAM
HOUSE**
The Royal Institute of
International Affairs



Recent Tweets

1.3M smart thermostats sold in 2015. This is an example of an ethics bot. <http://ow.ly/xJlg30242Se>

First fatal crash of a driverless car in the US: <http://ow.ly/Fh1z301QmI3>

Methinks it worthwhile to give China all the disputed islands and then some in exchange for restraining North Korea <http://ow.ly/RHMc3018tYX>

Our Most Popular Video [You Don't Need to Buy This](#)



Conference

This may be of interest to you:

[Sustainable Wisdom: Integrating Indigenous Knowhow for Global Flourishing](#)
September 11-15, 2016

Follow the Institute for Communitarian Policy Studies on [Twitter](#), [Facebook](#), or [YouTube](#).
To subscribe to our other updates, send an email to icps@gwu.edu listing your fields of interest.

The Institute for Communitarian Policy Studies
Executive Associate in University Professors Department
1922 F Street NW, Room 413
Washington, DC 20052

(202) 994-8190

If you do not wish to receive any more of our newsletters, please [Opt Out](#).