



The Washington Quarterly >
Volume 32, 2009 - [Issue 2](#)



Free access

3,035

Views

8

CrossRef citations to date

6

Altmetric

Listen

Provocations

Revisiting the Future: Geopolitical Effects of the Financial Crisis

Mathew J. Burrows & Jennifer Harris

Pages 27-38 | Published online: 12 Mar 2009

Cite this article <https://doi.org/10.1080/01636600902772604>

Full Article

Figures & data

Citations

Metrics

Reprints & Permissions

View PDF

Share

We Care About Your Privacy

We and our 911 partners store and access personal data, like browsing data or unique identifiers, on your device. Selecting "I Accept" enables tracking technologies to support the purposes shown under "we and our partners process data to provide," whereas selecting "Reject All" or withdrawing your consent will disable them. If trackers are disabled, some content and ads you see may not be as relevant to you. You can resurface this menu to change your choices or withdraw consent at any time by clicking the ["privacy preferences"] link on the bottom of the webpage [or the floating icon on the bottom-left of the webpage, if applicable]. Your choices will have effect within our Website. For more details, refer to our Privacy Policy. [Here](#)

We and our partners process data to provide:

...

I Accept

Reject All

Show Purpose



Theories about emerging markets decoupling from the U.S. economy have been dispelled.



How Much of a Geopolitical “Game Changer” is the Financial Crisis?

Mapping the NIC's predictions against early facts, one of the most interesting observations is less about any particular shock generated by the financial crisis and more about its global reach. If anything, the crisis has underscored the importance of globalization as the overriding force or “mega-driver” as it was characterized in both the NIC's 2020 and 2025 Global Trends works. Developing countries have been hurt as decoupling theories, assertions that the emerging markets have appreciably weaned themselves from the U.S. economy, have been dispelled. This second epicenter of the crisis in emerging markets could also continue to exacerbate and prolong the crisis. Alongside foreseeable exposures, such as Pakistan with its large current account deficit, are less predictable panics like Dubai, whose debt was financed on suddenly expensive dollars. Even those with cash reserves, such as Russia and South Korea, have been severely buffeted.



It is not possible to change the

high and its authorities appeared to be trying to lower the value of the RMB against the dollar, in effect trying to restore the status quo ante. Export-led growth models, however, have been unsustainable and prone to volatile unwinding. German attempts to forge export-led growth atop U.S. consumption proved unsuccessful in the 1960s. Japan tried and failed in the same manner in the 1970s, and similar attempts by the East Asian tigers met the same fate in the 1990s.

Such lessons also apply to any U.S. attempts to reinstitute past patterns of mutual dependence. After noting the familiar definition of insanity, repeating the same action and expecting a different result, a Wall Street leader recently summarized the future of U.S.-China relations, stating that the incoming U.S. leaders must ask themselves if they are willing to double down again on the country's national debt to facilitate the economic rise of those insistent upon an export-led growth model.

Inauspicious as traditional prospects surrounding the U.S. financing of export-led growth might be, the crisis suggests this may now be an even riskier bet than in previous eras. In 1971, then-Treasury Secretary John Connally simply pulled the plug on Japanese undervaluation by refusing to exchange dollars for gold. Likewise, former president Ronald Reagan issued credible threats that forced cooperation from Germany and Japan in the Plaza and Louvre Accords in 1985. The United States enjoys no such unilateral options today, as the current crisis involves more actors and few willing allies in adjustment. The crisis is more so than either Bretton Woods or the Plaza Accords.

How Much?

However, the crisis appears to have accelerated the shift into the Group of 20 (G20) on a permanent basis. The G20, a billion of which represent 85% of the world's population, is a further step in the process of globalizing the world's economic system. The G20's further globalization is among the most significant developments in the world's economic system.

U.S. policy after the Second World War was to redraw the map of the world's economic system.



perhaps too quickly in Beijing's view, China's decisionmaking remains almost exclusively domestic. This is consistent with the report's view of China as a status quo power which has benefited from the current geopolitical arrangement and now sees itself in a waiting game. Beijing is loathe to play its hand too early for fear of taking on too much risk or disrupting prospects for its continued rise. Hence China's reluctance to use its reserves to come to the rescue of other countries in need, or subsequently to have far more say in how the new economic order is constructed.

An Enlarging State Role ...

The 2025 report pointed to the resurgence of the state in economic affairs, particularly for the rising powers. As with previous countries whose economies had taken off, such as South Korea and Taiwan in the 1960s and 1970s, the state is playing an important economic role not just in authoritarian states like China, but arguably even in rising democracies like Brazil and India. The financial crisis would seem to have further heightened the role of the state, potentially even more so where governments in the West are funding bailouts and coordinating stimulus packages.

Perhaps the best known, but hardly the only, mark of these collapsing firewalls between state and markets is the upsurge in sovereign wealth funds in recent years. It is worth recalling that sovereign wealth funds came into fashion roughly fifty years ago, initially to aid in the development of oil-rich states. They were seen as a way to build up long-term reserves to aid in the development of oil-rich states. They were seen as a way to build up long-term reserves to aid in the development of oil-rich states. They were seen as a way to build up long-term reserves to aid in the development of oil-rich states.

The question of how to manage the transition from a state-led economy to a market-led one is a permanent one. It is a question that has been asked in many different forms, but the answer is always the same: it is a question of how to manage the transition from a state-led economy to a market-led one. It is a question that has been asked in many different forms, but the answer is always the same: it is a question of how to manage the transition from a state-led economy to a market-led one.



Ultimately, we anticipate that the shift toward a greater state role in the economy may be more permanent than not. State-owned enterprises (SOEs), long seen by the report and others as a more insidious threat, may gain greater market prominence and heightened political stakes amid increased state presence in markets and revamped industrial policies. The report recounts how SOEs, once mere exercises in job creation, are not only resurfacing, but are newly aggressive, and in many cases (e.g. Gazprom, Lenovo) are expanding beyond national borders to become global household names. Even before the crisis, state wealth was increasingly deployed to subsidize non-tariff barriers that lend SOEs advantages over private firms. This competitive advantage is particularly concerning as SOEs increasingly operate across national lines. Now, as the state finds itself managing more industries, as job creation again becomes a core concern, and as neo-mercantilism looms ever larger, SOEs may become a dangerous source of attraction.

... But Authoritarianism May Face A More Uncertain Future

The report predicts that even for successful state capitalists, authoritarian regimes would face a day of reckoning when, at some point, they would have to loosen the political reins and open up, partly in order to encourage continued investment and greater scientific and technological innovation. Turbulent experiences, such as the growing labor unrest in China, have begun to erode authoritarianism among oligarchs and elites. The report also notes that the Chinese government's work so far has been "incomplete" and that the state's economic policy appears to be "incomplete". The report also notes that the state's oil in the market is "incomplete" and that the state's benchmark oil in the market is "incomplete". The report also notes that the state's 7-8% for the state's oil in the market is "incomplete" and that the state's threshold for the state's oil in the market is "incomplete". The report also notes that the state's of growth for the state's oil in the market is "incomplete" and that the state's GDP for the state's oil in the market is "incomplete". The report also notes that the state's uprising for the state's oil in the market is "incomplete" and that the state's

Volatility in the market is "incomplete".

As the country's economy grows, the state's role in the market is "incomplete".

public hostility during times of economic strain. The admirable growth performances of many non-democratic emerging states moved several economists and commentators to publicly question whether democratic developers, such as India, bear a “democracy tax,” and whether China and other strong state developers, enjoying greater concentration and reach of decisionmaking power, might perhaps offer a more efficient growth alternative.² But as these “state capitalist” countries fall under severe strain, their leaders are finding that with centralized responsibility comes a conspicuous target for accountability. Without any open election to vent popular frustration, the likelihood of increased domestic turmoil and conflict may be even greater than originally forecasted.

The report hypothesizes that a reversion to more political liberalism in Russia would only happen in event of a prolonged economic downturn. The same may be true for China. While economic growth appears to be falling, the Chinese Communist Party, whose legitimacy has rested on continued growth, may have to reinvent itself and that might include greater accountability.

A More Distant Post-Carbon World

The report highlighted the emergence of a new global agenda centered around climate change and an energy transition out of fossils fuels. The volatility that the world has experienced in the last few years, with a sharp drop in oil prices and a corresponding increase in stock prices, has already begun to reshape the global agenda. The volatility that the world has experienced in the last few years, with a sharp drop in oil prices and a corresponding increase in stock prices, has already begun to reshape the global agenda.

A recent report from the International Energy Agency (IEA) suggests that the world may need not only to phase out fossil fuels but also to invest in renewable energy. The report suggests that the world may need to invest in renewable energy to meet the growing demand for energy. The report suggests that the world may need to invest in renewable energy to meet the growing demand for energy. The report suggests that the world may need to invest in renewable energy to meet the growing demand for energy.



The Future of the United States

The report projects that the United States will remain the preeminent single power by 2025, but the gap between it and others will narrow. This is the result of several factors, not just due to the increasing economic powers of rising states like China and India. Power itself has for some time been diffused with non-state actors rising in importance. As seen most recently in Iraq, military power, on which the United States will remain technologically superior, can be blunted with the use of asymmetrical strategies and others, like China, are expected to narrow the high-end technological edge with the United States. Cyber and space are two areas where the United States currently has a near monopoly, but by 2025 it will disappear. The financial crisis raises the question whether the United States' relative decline, particularly in the economic realm, will arrive sooner than anticipated in the report or whether the crisis will be an opportunity for the United States to emerge stronger in coming years, helping to maintain a bigger edge for a longer time into the future.

Recessions are a relative game, and historically, the United States has proven more adroit at responding to them than most. The United States emerged from oil shocks of the 1970s far faster than more heavily oil-dependent counterparts like Europe and Japan. Its global reach, which has been a key to its success, has not been diminished by the global recession. Europe is in a recession of its own, and the early 1990s recession was its last. The United States entered the 21st century with a new strategy, and it is to its credit that it has emerged from the recession of the early 2000s in a better position than most. The country appears to have emerged from the recession through a combination of factors. At the same time, not all of the country's strengths are being tested or not, and this is a test of its resilience in the Middle East. Hostility



The United States has historically proven more adroit at responding to recessions than most.



Hostility toward the U.S. as the source of the crisis may have received too little credence.



Of course, the report encompasses more than economics and indeed believes the future is likely to be the result of a number of intersecting and interlocking forces. With so many possible permutations of outcomes, each with ample opportunity for unintended consequences, there is a growing sense of insecurity. Even so, history may be more instructive than ever. While we continue to believe that the Great Depression is not likely to be repeated, the lessons to be drawn from that period include the harmful effects on fledgling democracies and multiethnic societies (think Central Europe in 1920s and 1930s) and on the sustainability of multilateral institutions (think League of Nations in the same period). There is no reason to think that this would not be true in the twenty-first as much as in the twentieth century. For that reason, the ways in which the potential for greater conflict could grow would seem to be even more apt in a constantly volatile economic environment as they would be if change would be steadier.

In surveying those risks, the report stressed the likelihood that terrorism and nonproliferation will remain priorities even as resource issues move up on the international agenda. Terrorism's appeal will decline if economic growth continues in the Middle East and youth unemployment is reduced. For those terrorist groups that remain active in 2025, however, the diffusion of technologies and scientific knowledge will place some of the world's most dangerous capabilities within their reach. Terrorist

groups in the Middle East are inheriting a legacy of training procedures and collection of intelligence that the absence of a downturn in the region's economic

The most pressing nuclear threat in the region is the addition of nuclear weapons to the arsenal of the most of the region's Episodes of conflict could be



rivals combined with underdeveloped surveillance capabilities and mobile dual-capable Iranian missile systems also will produce inherent difficulties in achieving reliable indications and warning of an impending nuclear attack. The lack of strategic depth in neighboring states like Israel, short warning and missile flight times, and uncertainty of Iranian intentions may place more focus on preemption rather than defense, potentially leading to escalating crises.

Types of conflict that the world continues to experience, such as over resources, could reemerge, particularly if protectionism grows and there is a resort to neo-mercantilist practices. Perceptions of renewed energy scarcity will drive countries to take actions to assure their future access to energy supplies. In the worst case, this could result in interstate conflicts if government leaders deem assured access to energy resources, for example, to be essential for maintaining domestic stability and the survival of their regime. Even actions short of war, however, will have important geopolitical implications. Maritime security concerns are providing a rationale for naval buildups and modernization efforts, such as China's and India's development of blue water naval capabilities. If the fiscal stimulus focus for these countries indeed turns inward, one of the most obvious funding targets may be military. Buildup of regional naval capabilities could lead to increased tensions, rivalries, and counterbalancing moves, but it also will create opportunities for multinational cooperation in protecting critical sea lanes. With water already a scarce resource, competition for water will become a major management challenge in the future. The changing nature of power and the increasing competition between states in the Asia-Pacific region will also have significant implications for the global security environment.

What Is to Come

Perhaps the most significant changes in the world's security environment in the past several decades have been the move toward a more multipolar world. The end of the Cold War and the collapse of the Soviet Union have led to a more fragmented world. The rise of China and India, along with the resurgence of the United States, has created a new balance of power. The world is likely to see a continuation of these trends, with the emergence of new great powers and the decline of others. The global security environment is likely to become more complex and volatile, with a greater risk of conflict. The world is likely to see a continuation of these trends, with the emergence of new great powers and the decline of others. The global security environment is likely to become more complex and volatile, with a greater risk of conflict.



The diversity in both type and kind of actor raises the likelihood of fragmentation occurring over the next two decades, particularly given the wide array of transnational challenges facing the international community.

Because of their growing geopolitical and economic clout, the rising powers will enjoy a high degree of freedom to customize their political and economic policies rather than fully adopting Western norms. They are also likely to cherish their policy freedom to maneuver, allowing others to carry the primary burden for dealing with terrorism, climate change, proliferation, energy security, and other system maintenance issues. Existing multilateral institutions, designed for a different geopolitical order, appear too rigid and cumbersome to undertake new missions, accommodate changing memberships, and augment their resources. Nongovernmental organizations and philanthropic foundations, concentrating on specific issues, increasingly will populate the landscape but are unlikely to affect change in the absence of concerted efforts by multilateral institutions or governments. Efforts at greater inclusiveness, to reflect the emergence of the newer powers, may make it harder for international organizations to tackle transnational challenges. Respect for the dissenting views of member nations will continue to shape the agenda of organizations and limit the kinds of solutions that can be attempted.

A fragment of the world's population is projected to live in a state of... result.

An ongoing trend toward... further in... heightened... ssia, India, ... ny and Japan... ge if their... benefits

Article contents

Related research

Mathew J. Burrows

Mathew J. Burrows is a counselor in the National Intelligence Council (NIC), the principal drafter of Global Trends 2025: A Transformed World

Jennifer Harris

Jennifer Harris is a member of the NIC's Long Range Analysis Unit who worked closely on the report

Notes

1. National Intelligence Council, Global Trends 2025: A Transformed World, November 2008, http://www.dni.gov/nic/PDF_2025/2025_Global_Trends_Final_Report.pdf.
2. Morgan Stanley Asia chief Stephen Roach articulates this growing view: “What we're seeing is that the Chinese command-and-control system can actually work more effectively than other market-based systems in times of economic stress.” Quoted in Rana Foorohor, “Why China Works,” Newsweek, January 19, 2009. While offering no normative endorsements, Robert Kagan of The Washington Post and Gideon Rachman of the Financial Times also make this point. See Kagan, “The Case for China,” and Rachman, “The Rise of China,” both in The Washington Post, January 19, 2009.
3. Global Trends 2025: A Transformed World, National Intelligence Council, Washington D.C.: World Affairs, 2008, http://www.dni.gov/nic/PDF_2025/2025_Global_Trends_Final_Report.pdf.



Related

Information for

Authors

R&D professionals

Editors

Librarians

Societies

Opportunities

Reprints and e-prints

Advertising solutions

Accelerated publication

Corporate access solutions

Open access

Overview

Open journals

Open Select

Dove Medical Press

F1000Research

Help and information

Help and contact

Newsroom

All journals

Books

Keep up to date

Register to receive personalised research and resources by email



Sign me up



Copyright © 2019 John Wiley & Sons, Inc. All rights reserved. Wiley, Wiley Online Library, and Wiley InterScience are trademarks of John Wiley & Sons, Inc. or John Wiley & Sons Group, Inc. or one of its subsidiaries. All other trademarks are the property of their respective owners. Wiley is an Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action employer. Minorities and women are encouraged to apply.

Accessibility

Registered
5 Howick Place

