

The Washington Quarterly >
Volume 32, 2009 - Issue 2

Free access

2,874 8 Views | 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

We Care About Your Privacy

We and our 855 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

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, which re-emphasized the role of the G20 in shaping the global economic order. The paralysis of the G20 is among the decisive factors in the current crisis.



U.S. policy after the Second World War was to redraw

✕

☰ Article contents

☰ Related research

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 upward buffers to byprodu are due prices.

The que endu economi emerge, equilibri and priv costs of repeated

to aid in
upward
buffers to
byprodu
are due
prices.

The que
endu
economy
emerge,
equilibri
and priv
costs of
repeated

the long-term
the liquidity
is en as
the surpluses
commodity

permanent,
until some
w to
ady
s of public
stle the
rywhere will
state in



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 discontent over the central Chinese investment program and its impact among oligarchs, work so appears oil in the 7-8% for threshold of growth GDP uprising



Volatili

S.

As the c no that free

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, particularly in the energy sector, has been a spectacular one. It has led to a sharp decline in investment in fossil fuels and a relative increase in investment in renewable energy. This could lead to a significant shift in the global energy landscape.

A recent report from the International Energy Agency (IEA) indicates that the world's energy demand will continue to grow, but that the growth will be driven by a shift towards renewable energy. This is a positive sign, as it suggests that the world is moving towards a more sustainable energy future. However, the report also notes that the transition to renewable energy will not be a smooth one, and that there will be significant challenges along the way. These include the need for significant investment in infrastructure, the need for a stable regulatory environment, and the need for a global energy market that is open and competitive. The report also notes that the transition to renewable energy will be a long-term process, and that it will take several decades to complete. This is a challenge, as the world's energy demand is expected to continue to grow over this period. The report also notes that the transition to renewable energy will be a global effort, and that it will require the cooperation of all countries. This is a challenge, as the world is currently divided into several major powers, each with its own interests and priorities. The report also notes that the transition to renewable energy will be a complex one, and that it will require a significant amount of research and development. This is a challenge, as the world is currently spending a significant amount of money on research and development in other areas, such as artificial intelligence and space exploration. The report also notes that the transition to renewable energy will be a difficult one, and that it will require a significant amount of political will. This is a challenge, as the world is currently facing a number of other challenges, such as the COVID-19 pandemic and the war in Ukraine. The report also notes that the transition to renewable energy will be a long-term process, and that it will require the cooperation of all countries. This is a challenge, as the world is currently divided into several major powers, each with its own interests and priorities. The report also notes that the transition to renewable energy will be a complex one, and that it will require a significant amount of research and development. This is a challenge, as the world is currently spending a significant amount of money on research and development in other areas, such as artificial intelligence and space exploration. The report also notes that the transition to renewable energy will be a difficult one, and that it will require a significant amount of political will. This is a challenge, as the world is currently facing a number of other challenges, such as the COVID-19 pandemic and the war in Ukraine.



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 repositioning strategy, which was based upon the early entry into the global market, entered a new phase in the early 1990s, when the United States entered a recession. The United States' strategy was to its advantage, as it allowed the United States' economy to emerge from the recession in a better position than its competitors. The United States' position appears to be stronger than ever through the global financial crisis. At the same time, the United States' position in the Middle East is not as strong as it once was. Hostility

antipathy not forgotten, the commonly described “unhappy marriage” between China and the United States could metastasize into a mistrusting union between Beijing and Washington, spilling over into widespread distrust of the United States among swaths of emerging and mature economies. Global financial protectionism, while not a big feature in the report, represents a new danger. Its forms, such as numerical leverage ceilings and outright bans on entire markets, may be greater and more systemic than traditional trade and investment protectionism. Should imminent domestic regulatory battles aggregate into destructive and futile “what touches here, clears here”-style regulation, credit markets would be left balkanized even as regulatory blind spots would grow.

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

The dollar's recent strengthening suggests that the NIC was perhaps unwarranted in flagging concerns over the dollar's ability to maintain its role as the world's leading global reserve currency. Comforting as it would be to believe in such an eternal flight to quality, the dollar's rebound may have more to do with the unwinding of dollar-

denomin
stimulus
exorbita
decision
privilege
ambitiou
t fiscal
ving on an
mic
s atop these
hieving
ose aims.

The renc
own
choice
widening
actors th
agreeab
d States'
y U.S. policy
gests that
te market
es, however
investors.



The report's 30,000 ft. lesson that historic changes in the global economic and financial landscape require corresponding shifts in foreign policy thinking, is, if anything, even more apt. Artificial divisions between “economic” and “foreign” policy present a false dichotomy. To whom one extends swap lines and how the IMF is recapitalized are as much foreign policy as economic decisions. Several states openly hinge support for NATO and U.S. coalition efforts upon domestic economic conditions which in turn, they insist, is contingent on U.S. monetary and fiscal aid. Others blend the two with even greater calculation: China using its SWF to compel Costa Rica to disavow Taiwan, Russia resorting to military tactics to scare would be investors away from competing pipeline projects.

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

Economics as High Politics

As markets prove truly global in reach and risk, as margins progressively thin, and states assume ever-more market presence, the fictional barriers between “economic” and “foreign” policy are eroding. Finance and markets are becoming more integrated and more powerful. Washington and the IMF are being challenged by a new set of actors, including Brazil, China, India, and Russia. India levied a new duty to import tariffs. In an effort to curb the progress of the world's most powerful nations, the price of oil has risen, and some suggest that the responsibility for this increase lies with the G-20 or the IMF. The IMF's efforts, however, have been largely ineffective.



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 inherit procedures for collecting intelligence, particularly in the absence of a downturn in the global economy.

The most pressing nuclear issue in the region is the acquisition of nuclear weapons by Iran. In addition, it is not clear that the powers for the region are clear. Episodes of conflict could lead to a breakdown in the umbrella of security between



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 al
changing
states in

What I

Perhar
world
several
greater
is likely
instituti
state ac
either st



manage
d between
anges in the
ast in
oward
of decades
worsening
th of non-
ene could
-World War

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 frag

× result.

An ongo
the direc
risk of co
and Chin
did i
widespre
they der

en further in
heightened
ssia, India,
ny and Japan
ge if their
benefits



Addit

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 Foroohar, "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 offer similar views.
3. Global Trends 2025: A Transformed World (Washington, D.C.: World Economic Forum, 2008), <http://siteweb.weforum.org/assets/pdf/GT2025.pdf>.

Download



Related

Information for


- Authors
- R&D professionals
- Editors
- Librarians
- Societies

Opportunities

- Reprints and e-prints
- Advertising solutions
- Accelerated publication
- Corporate access solutions

Keep up to date

Register to receive personalised research and resources by email

 Sign me up



Copyright © 2024 John Wiley & Sons, Inc. All rights reserved. Wiley and the Wiley logo are trademarks of John Wiley & Sons, Inc. or John Wiley & Sons Group, Inc. or one of its affiliates. Wiley Online Business is a service mark of John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Accessibility

Registered
5 Howick Place

Open access

- Overview
- Open journals
- Open Select
- Dove Medical Press
- F1000Research

Help and information

- Help and contact
- Newsroom
- All journals
- Books

