It is my great pleasure to introduce the first issue of *Intersections*, an annual publication of the Center for International Education (CIE), devoted to highlighting the work of UWM’s Global Studies Research Fellows. The Global Studies Fellows Program was officially launched in 2010 in an effort to bring together scholars from across disciplines, colleges, and schools to discuss multiple dimensions of globalization. This scholarly work advances the study of global and international issues, and also supports the curriculum of the Global Studies undergraduate degree program, which is one of the fastest growing majors on campus and unique in the country for its interdisciplinary approach to the study of the political, economic, artistic, and social processes and practices of our time. This inaugural edition of *Intersections* underlines CIE’s commitment to fostering and supporting interdisciplinary scholarship and to disseminating the world-class research of UWM faculty.

*Patrice Petro - Vice Provost for International Education*
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Information Policy and Sustainable Peace

by Sandra Braman

Uses of digital information technologies have affected our ability to achieve a sustainable peace in at least three ways. They can increase the likelihood of war when states act in response to new types of vulnerabilities introduced by digital technologies (Braman, “Vulnerabilities of the state”). They are used in war as weapons, whether against the material or human targets of traditional warfare via intelligent weapons, or against the networked computing systems of cyberwarfare via intelligent agents and malware. And they can be used in peace-making and peace-keeping via the mandated information collection and distribution of what became known as confidence- and security-building measures (CSBMs) when they began to be included in arms control treaties in the 1980s.

The informational nature of CSBMs means that they also populate a distinct information policy domain, information policy and sustainable peace (Braman, “Impact of confidence-building measures”). Information flows have always been central to the theory and practice of war, but it is only since the close of World War II that they have been suggested as a means of keeping peace. By the mid-1980s, though, up to 85% of arms control treaty language (Earle) and two of the three types of CSBMs dealt with information, not weapons (Efinger) – a vivid demonstration of the extent to which information policy tools have come to be the tools of choice for the informational state (Braman, “Change of state”). By the close of the 1980s, defense issues had infiltrated seemingly every element of domestic information policy as well (Relyea). Political scientists consider arms control a model of international regime formation (Stein); uses of information policy tools for peace-making and –keeping have been important contributors to the development of the global information policy regime (Braman, “Emergent global information policy regime”).

Perhaps because information warfare is sexier than peace-keeping, or perhaps because arms control is simply “boring” as a topic (Benedict), the impact of digital technologies on war has received a great deal more scholarly and public attention than has the use and potential of digital technologies on sustainable peace. This research turns attention to where “the light don’t shine,” on efforts to use information policy tools to make and keep – to sustain – peace.

A study of the development of the use of informational provisions in defense-related treaties, beginning with the Geneva Protocol in 1928 and concluding with the Conventional Armed Forces in Europe Treaty (CFE) in 1989 – just before the former Soviet Union dissolved – found 25 different types of informational provisions, with a clear growth in the range of types of provisions, the number of such provisions in any given agreement, and the amount of operationalization detail formalized within
agreements going up over time (Braman, “The CSCE and information policy”). Many of these policy tools are familiar from the world of “intelligence,” a term that refers to the same types of information gathering activities that are called “verification” when they occur in the treaty compliance context. These include regular flows of information such as details about military forces; ground, aerial, or satellite observation of a range of types of weapons production, testing, and use activities; and the exchange of telemetry (computerized data flows about each of these activities). Strikingly, however, many of these also map very closely onto information policy provisions in other types of international agreements; mandated flows of trade about domestic commerce, for example, were attempted within trade agreements (Braman, “Trade and information policy”) but not achieved until they showed up in the arms control context (Braman, “Contradictions in brilliant eyes”).

Since that 1990 study, things have changed. A number of new treaties have been put in place. By now we have years of experience with verification programs. It has become clear that the effects of verification are felt beyond the defense arena (Herman), but many believe that CSBMs have not been effective in achieving their stated goals (Johnson). The arms control literature is littered with examples of significant differences of interpretation of verification data (e.g., Der Derian), demonstrating the enduring reality that no amount of information will outweigh a lack of political will. Some of the types of information collection that were extraordinary in the 1980s have become normalized within the architecture of the network environment and within military concepts of operation (Rosen). This may be one reason why the use of verification has spread from arms control to many other issue areas (Hettling).

For defense purposes, verification has moved into new environments as exotic as space (Takaya-Umehara) and as mundane as shipping containers (Gaukler, et al.). The development of an industry in the technologies involved facilitated international collaborations in their use, exacerbating a trend fueled by the history of tensions between large blocs of countries and by the dissociation of the polity, the loci of geopolitical decision-making, and the actual nature of the public sphere wrought by globalization (Braman, “Interpenetrated globalization”). Technological innovation within that industry continues apace (e.g., Romano, et al.).

Importantly, the blurring of boundaries between the military and civilian sectors, and between war and peace – exacerbated by the globalization of anti-terrorism laws (Braman, “Anti-terrorism laws”) – has also brought about a convergence between arms control regimes, international humanitarian law (Thakur and Maley), and civil liberties. Meanwhile, theories of nonlinear causality (chaos theory) have sensitized strategists to the potentially significant amount of power that can be unleashed through seemingly small amounts of information or what may appear to be ineffective or irrelevant information flows (Lawson).
The most fundamental change in the use of information policy tools for sustainable peace since 1990 has been doctrinal. It is not only that the nature of the enemy has had to be redefined since the purported close of the Cold War, and that the nature of warfare has had to be reconceptualized for today’s communicative, social, and technological conditions. From an information policy perspective, it may be that the most profound doctrinal change has been away from deterrence and towards preemption. As Brian Massumi argues, the preemption policy put in place by Bush – which drives global anti-terrorism efforts – differs from the deterrence policy that governed throughout the Cold War ontologically and epistemologically. Deterrence, like prevention, begins by assuming it is possible to know what the threat is, to measure it, and to organize around it. Preemption begins by assuming there is uncertainty about what the threat may be, and that uncertainty is ontological because the threat itself has not yet formed. All that one can organize around, then, is an always-indeterminate potential of a threat that is unknowable.

The New START treaty of 2011 illustrates some of these trends. Of the 12 areas in which action is required by a state once it is signatory to the treaty, 10 are informational in nature and only two involve weapons. Under pressure from the US Congress, the treaty includes requirements for a number of reports and certifications from the US president – including assurance that the Russians themselves are in compliance – before the treaty could go into force (Crook). Concern about the high cost and difficulty of sustaining verification programs influenced the shape of the treaty (Blank). Although this treaty was Obama’s biggest success in arms control to date, the president has not achieved all of the goals he announced in this area at the launch of his presidency (Müller), and it is not clear that progress will continue (Benedict). From cables released by WikiLeaks, we did learn that Obama engaged in what some view as a troubling information exchange of his own – giving secrets about Britain’s armed forces to Russia in exchange for its agreement to the treaty (Moore, et al.).

By 2012, the nature and effectiveness of the use of information policy provisions for the purposes of sustainable peace has come to the fore as a pressing issue as concern about nuclear and other weapons is again intensifying (Miller). My research project this year as a Global Studies Research Fellow analyzed the evolution of information policy provisions in treaties designed to control arms and otherwise contribute to sustainable peace.

Works Cited


Germany’s invasion of Poland in 1939 initiated a series of conflicts that came to be known as the Second World War. Today, German-Polish partnership has become a symbol for peace in Europe. Indeed, the success of European integration after 1989 is judged in part by just how remote the possibility of war between these two countries seems. Both nations, it appears, have successfully mastered their complex past, and the 2012 award of the Nobel Peace Prize to the European Union was very much a recognition of the reconciliation process between Germany and its neighbors. Yet underlying the often gushing pronouncements of friendship – what Klaus Bachmann has called “reconciliation kitsch” – are unresolved tensions that date back to the world war and the division of Europe during the Cold War.1 These differences are among the greatest problems that Europeans face today and hinder international efforts to resolve issues such as the ongoing debt crisis in the European Union. Far from uniting people, what it means to be and act as a European remains highly contested and divisive. Local, national, and international understandings of Europeanness thus shape and constrain attempts at peace-building between Germans, Poles, and others.

The history of ethnic politics in the Polish city of Łódź reveals these possibilities and limits of German-Polish-Jewish interaction in the twentieth century. As Poland’s second largest city in the twentieth century, Łódź has served as a screen for utopian and dystopian visions of multiethnicity. Located in the Polish partition of the Russian Empire before the First World War, Łódź grew dramatically in the nineteenth century as a center of textile production, which earned it the sobriquet of the “Polish Manchester.” The city attracted immigrant entrepreneurs and workers from the German and Polish lands as well as elsewhere in the Russian Empire, prompting various observers to see the rise of the “lodzermensch,” or “person of Łódź.”2 This simultaneously local and transnational stereotype blended the putative characteristics of the city’s Poles, Jews, and Germans. It especially embodied nationalist anxieties regarding polyethnic cohabitation, including the dangers of cultural contamination and the need for a stricter separation of nationalities. This early, negative “lodzermensch” appeared most strikingly in the newspaper serial Ziemia Obiecana (The Promised Land, published as a novel in 1899) by

---


Władysław Reymont, who later won the Nobel Prize in literature. In the story, three factory owners – a Jew, German, and a Pole – appear as typical “lodzermenschen” who prized wealth over their nationality and who in the end succumbed, financially and morally, to their greed.  

After the First World War, Poland gained its independence, but it was short-lived after the invasion by Germany and the Soviet Union in September 1939. The world war, which included the Holocaust and ethnic cleansing, largely destroyed the Jewish and German-speaking populations in Łódź. The following communist period was one that did not look back fondly upon the multiethnic past of the city; the Jews and Germans were associated with capitalist factory owners who had oppressed the Polish proletariat. After the end of the Cold War, Łódź suffered as the textile industry continued to decline. Moreover, the city was largely ignored by tourism operators despite being a major city. Polish guide books also gave the city relatively little attention compared to Warsaw, Cracow, or even much smaller Poznań. The city also gained a sordid reputation for its post-industrial decline and anti-Semitic graffiti. Municipal officials have thus tried to rebrand Łódź by emphasizing its history of ethnic pluralism. This marketable multiculturalism, in turn, has led to a certain romanticization of the city’s past. It is not surprising then that the “lodzermensch” is no longer associated with a dangerous hybridity but instead has become a transnational icon of international reconciliation and an emblem marking Łódź as a prototypical European city.

This construction of a non-threatening polyethnic history could be seen in the memorials that appeared in the early 2000s in Łódź. One of these is the Monument to Three Industrialists, located on the main thoroughfare of Łódź, Piotrkowska Street. The monument depicts three figures, marked as “Henryk Grohman (1862–1939),” “Izrael Kalmanowicz Poznański (1833–1900),” and “Karol Scheibler (1820–1881).” The three figures are standing and sitting on chairs around a table and appear to be planning the city’s future. In the middle of the table is an engraved image of a textile mill with the caption “Bawełniana Potęga” (Cotton Power). The monument is not based on any historical event – the biographical timelines would suggest that a very young Grohman had met with the elderly Poznański. Yet the memorial stretches across time in another sense by reminding the city’s inhabitants of Łódź’s illustrious past and by inspiring them to become “lodzermenschen” once again. The three empty seats around the table invite pedestrians to sit down and to engage these role models. The monument’s location on a busy shopping corner, surrounded by an American fast food chain restaurant and a
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3 Andrzej Wajda also directed a film adaptation in 1977.
supermarket, suggests the advent of the capitalist future. Yet also serving as a backdrop
to the monument is a drab building that houses a discount clothing store with signs
proclaiming a “Chinese textile market.” This “foreign” competition today clearly stands
in contradistinction to the city’s past as a “cotton power,” thus symbolizing Poland’s
current challenge in finding its place in the global economy. Will today’s
“lodzermenschen” be able to compete in the new world? Indeed, who will usurp the
mantle of becoming the next “lodzermenschen”?

In German media, the strange career of the “lodzermensch” reflects the reevaluation of
German history in the wake of ongoing discussions about the expulsions of Germans
from Eastern Europe after the Second World War. In this context, German writers have
presented the “lodzermensch” as the model of a non-nationalistic “Good German” in
Central Europe – an antagonist of those nationalist Germans who had destroyed this
purportedly multicultural world though war and genocide. This development can be
seen in the Polish and German reception of Karl Dedecius, the prolific Polish-German
translator and the 1990 recipient of the Peace Prize of the German Book Trade –
Germany’s equivalent of the Nobel Prize for Literature. Born in Łódź in 1921 to a
German-speaking family, Dedecius was a Polish citizen and attended Polish schools in
his youth. He had just turned 18 when Nazi Germany conquered Poland. He was
drafted in the German army and was captured during the Battle of Stalingrad in early
1943. After several years in Soviet captivity during the war, he was released and
ultimately settled in West Germany. He worked in an insurance company but also
translated modern Polish poetry into German. He later founded an institute promoting
Polish culture in Germany and has become the epitome of the now positively
reinterpreted “lodzermensch.”

Dedecius himself has emphasized the importance of his environment in his 2006
memoir, *Ein Europäer aus Lodz (A European from Łódź).* As the title of his
autobiography suggests, Łódź was a breeding ground for Europeanness and hence can
serve as an example for Germany and Poland to become post-national members of the
European Union. Dedecius paints a picture of interethnic peace among this Central
European city’s inhabitants. He acknowledges the existence of anti-Semitism in Poland,
but for him it remained a local and “ambivalent” phenomenon: a “religious and social
irritation” that was different from the systemic and “fanatic Weltanschauung” in
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7 Heinrich Olschowsky, “‘Er bringt das eine zum Anderen’: Laudatio zur Verleihung des Friedenspreises
der Deutschen Buchhandels (1990),” in *Karl Dedecius und das Deutsche Polen-Institut. Laudationes, Berichte,
Interviews, Gedichte. Für Karl Dedecius zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. Manfred Mack (Darmstadt: Justus von Liebig,
1991), 43-54, here 44-45. Similarly, Karl Schlögel has called Dedecius the “lodzermensch par excellence.” Karl
Schlögel, “Łódz – Das polnische Manchester,” opening lecture at *Weiße Nächte an der Oder – Łódź*, Europa-

translation appeared two years later: *Europejczyk z Łodzi. Wspomnienia*, Trans. Sława Lisiecka (Cracow:
Wydawnictwo Literackie, 2008).
Likewise, Dedecius suggests that the Germans of Łódź, who grew up in a “volksdeutsch” (ethnic German) environment, were mainly concerned with their private lives and possessed a live and let live attitude, which made them somewhat less jingoistic than their “nationaldeutsch” counterparts in Germany. Only the external events of war and occupation destroyed this coexistence.

Not surprisingly, many Germans and Poles have attributed considerable political significance to Dedecius’ literary-cultural achievements and consider him to have been an important figure in German-Polish rapprochement. His studies of the German-Polish cultural relationship in Botschaft der Bücher coincided with Germany’s changing eastern policy, or Ostpolitik, in the early 1970s. In the eyes of his admirers, he had helped change the image of the Pole in Germany and the German in Poland, making possible the positive German-Polish relations that existed for much of the 1990s. Dedecius has hence been praised as a “living bridge” that enabled Poland to return to the European family, both culturally and politically.

Such narratives of peaceful cosmopolitan coexistence stress how the “Promised Land” of Łódź can return to its European roots and thus compete in a globalized future. The multicultural trope of the “lodzermensch” now stands for German-Polish reconciliation within the EU as well for a usable past in both countries that are struggling with postcommunist transitions and with the integration of immigrant communities. Yet this process of Europeanization raises several questions: Do multicultural narratives relegate...
Jews to the past? Jews today, after all, do not have a state in the EU and are a small minority in Germany and Poland, yet the remembrance of the Holocaust remains a touchstone of European identity. Here, the concept of “selective cosmopolitanism,” which Ruth Mandel has coined in her discussion of the marginalization of people with Turkish background in Germany, can reveal much about the politics of exclusion within an EU framework. Yet there are also shifting agendas and countervailing trends, especially in a Europe that is trying to reconcile the traumas of its western and eastern halves. Does the EU-centric German-Polish reconciliation process, even more than German reunification itself, decenter the triadic postwar relationship between Americans, Jews, and Germans?

An examination of memory politics in Łódź can thus help to reveal wider developments in Polish and German memory politics after 1989. Although it has become common to see the “lodzermensch” as a tragic figure from a lost world, it is more helpful to understand how local ideas of multiethnicity that were initially used to separate nations could become instrumentalized in European reconciliation and international peace-building efforts.
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Precarity Performed
or foot-notes for a four-step pedologue

by Sarah Davies Cordova

Following pathways on the ground, across borders is a tenuous journey. Following the traces of performance is fraught with the clichés of movement’s evanescence and untranslatability. Following leads in archives, in memories, in the logs of arms deals, of raw materials, of imports and exports, of human chattel, of refugees is often risky and/or unreliable work. Tracks are tricky registers of human moves, of bodies’ plots, be they (final) witting or unwitting resting places, performances or (un)mapped trajectories, or intrigues whether conspiratorial, tactical or peaceful.¹

Foot-Notes:
And moving for peace is about steps – metaphorical ones yes, but also bodily steps. They take on the shapes and patterns of foot notes, of foot messages culturally coded and referenced².

Feet shuffle and tap to the beat of time passing and passed, waiting in lines, on resolutions, for necessary papers, with vital notations in the margins, at the foot of the page.

Feet step in time and out of time in marches, in military practice, to strike, toy-toying, in flight and in chains, as activist, militia, worker, prisoner, slave, maroon, or refugee.

Feet register the long stretches of legal and political processes in the anti-rooms of World organisations’ meeting places, in the salle des pas perdus of courtrooms, in camps

“We used to pretend the body was uninvolved, that it remained mute and still while the mind thought. We even imagined that thought, once conceived, transferred itself effortlessly onto the page via a body whose natural role as instrument facilitated the pen [. . . .] Now we know that the body cannot be taken for granted, [. . .], cannot be taken. A body, whether sitting writing or standing thinking or walking talking or running screaming, is a bodily writing.”

(Choreographing History, 3).

¹ Of paper’s notes at the foot of the page, or when pages are personified: footnotes then credit others, explain or add examples and illustrations. Here a credit: Hayden White looks at these various senses of “plot” in his “Bodies and Their Plots”, (29) as he re-examines Freud’s notion of “drives” and their display of modes of emplotment.

² An illustrative footnote: To wit, the plot of the 2011 award-winning Israeli film Footnote in which a father-son’s relationship is destabilized by a literal misnomer or malapropism of their shared family name in asserting the winner of a distinguished prize. The footnote clues the father in to realise the error.
along national borderlines or on the edges of disaster areas. These back and forth pedalogues or foot conversations record the corporeal engagement of socio-historical determinations and perform the paced negotiations of resolutions.

Feet leave footprints: imperceptible toes, barely visible arches and traces of flat feet, fatigued, still energised, wounded; and shod imprints of boots and shoes, fitted or ill-sized, with new or worn-out soles or heavy indentations of heels. The prints pattern the contours and features of body weight and velocity in space and time with the specificity of chorographies. As maps, they trace in trajectories of precarious performances in movement as choreography, as bodily writing.

Feet signify as Louis XIV the dancing king par excellence knew. His own steps in high heeled shoes made of carefully crafted soft leather showed off his slender ankles with multiple beats in precisely patterned grounded and airborne steps that embodied the acquisition of political capital with their explicit allegory of the body politic. Indeed the Bourbon kings sent explorers on proprietary colonising missions with the belief in the universality of the language of danced steps as their form of diplomatic representation.

Feet point variously to status, rank, training, and legal in/human denomination. Foot-binding like pointe shoes conceal and re-present the foot. Highlighting the veneer of accouterment and disguising the performance’s simulacra, the (de)formed foot as instrumentation of beauty in silken sheaths obtains gendered and contained strides and movement styles. Statutes and fashion’s imperialism stipulate(d) appropriate shoe styles and the wearing or not thereof according to culture, activity, social position and the politics of identity, and they regulate their design and the market’s accessibility according to the economics of supply and demand that in turn determine the location of footwear’s production along the routes of global commerce.

************

In pedologue: four socio-historical bodies’ abbreviated plots
Plots align the steps of embodied stories that tell of enslavement and freedom, of passages and trading, of violence and escape, of acceptance and rejection, resistance and submission, hospitality and proprietary domination, of pathways to reconciliation and recognition of one another’s humanity.

3 A definitional and citational footnote: In Nobiltà di Dama (1600), the choreographer and dance theoretician Fabritio Caroso describes persons’ fashioning of selves in danced civil intercourses which looked to bearing and comportment as “pedalogues” (see Choreographing Empathy, esp. 29).
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– Such foot-talk bears witness in Butare, Rwanda, as part of the outreach of the university’s Center for the Arts’ drama and dance program. Women survivors of the 1994 genocide stand and hold and beat the drums, the sacred possessions of their society’s men. Precariously empowered these women stomp and beat out rhythms of Rwandese, Burkinabe and Senegalese origins and dance out their silenced traumas before their communities, breaking with their socialised/gendered sex and breaching the taboos associated with making manifest their raped status.

Other bodies’ plots include those referenced – once or twice-removed – and “dramaturgised” in written or enacted performances such as the Magnet Theatre’s works in South Africa⁴ that challenge the convenience of rendering invisible historical and contemporary marginalisations and displaced persons. Footsteps whether of bare feet or of shoes appear as a recurring motif in their productions. As traces, they are already at stake in Rain in a Dead Man’s Footprints. As means of conveyance they figure in Every Year, Every Day, I Am Walking; and as symbols of freedom their absence signify the bondage that metaphorise humans into chattel whether in trading of slaves or of mass production sites in Cargo.

– In Every Year, Every Day, I Am Walking, the performers’ figured patterns dance the very mut(e)ability of their journey into exile, geographical, political and embodied. They signal at once permanence and impermanence, traceability and erasure, existence and resilience. Shuffling and shifting weight in place and in trajectories that circle and criss-cross the stage. Their movement-bound bodies articulate the poignant plight of immigrants and displaced bodies in steps that struggle to advance with hands inserted into shoes walking up imaginary steep pathways and hitting up against material or intangible obstacles. Their shoes, whether worn on their feet or handheld to embody the journey convey the passage of time, the frailty of safety on their long walk away from home.

Once upon a time not so long ago, shoes signified freedom.

– The intrigue of Charles Baudelaire’s prose poem « La Belle Dorothée, » in its allusion to the socio-legal status that shoes conferred upon a person, illustrates the extent to which royal edicts and commercial statutes served as legal instruments to determine all aspects of slavery and the status of « nègres et personnes de couleur » in colonial domains across the world: « Car Dorothée est si prodigieusement coquette, que le plaisir d’être admirée l’emporte chez elle

⁴ The material of footnotes: The Magnet Theatre is a physical theatre company that was started during South Africa’s state sanctioned apartheid regime, and that has operated in and out of South Africa for the past twenty years. The company’s productions foreground the language of the body to engage with the historical processes at work in society and with the political conditions at stake during critical junctures of the nation’s sociological transformation.
sur l’orgueil de l’affranchie, et, bien qu’elle soit libre, elle marche sans souliers. Likewise at the Cape (of Good Hope), slaves were forbidden to wear shoes and stockings even though they were often employed in the production of shoes.

Whereas in Every Year, Every Day, I am Walking, shoes stand in as metaphors for refugees’ bodies and their escape journey’s untranslatability, in Cargo, they connote the steps of activists against human indenture.

– Another type of walk – a present day, care-free, bare-footed walk – along the beach at Mouille Point in Cape Town kicks up a piece of blue and white (Dutch) china, a heritage so intimately tied to slavery and trade, to disenfranchisement and free passage. Such happenstance drive dramaturges to leads in archives, in ships’ logs, in the colonial records of slave auctions, to when the human cargo from a slave ship is sold, shoes are taken off and added to the container’s catalogue of items thus abiding by the dehumanising gesture in currency to hinder a slave’s escape and aid in recognising one. In pairs and threesomes, the individuals take off their shoes as they give their name and indicate where they are from: “Rachel van de Caap, from Bengal. Duamas from Madagascar. Mubarak from Bougie”, and then merge as items into non-identity, as one among many sold as slaves. As the performance closes, the dancers recuperate their shoes and assert their off-stage identity: “Luvuyo, from Langa. Owen, from Alex’. Koliswa, from Khayelitsha. Adam, from Mitchells Plain. Ilza, from Namaqualand”. Falling in and out of character, they muse about the new cargo arriving at the Cape: drugs, women, shoes. Sneakers – Converse not made in the US but in China – they add as they pose ready to march, ready to go on strike.

The time may not be, after all, that of ‘once upon a time’ for the bondage of globalisation still traffics in soles, or is it souls? Cheap imports are ruining the chances for South Africans to work in shoe and textile factories that, in post apartheid South Africa, are closing their doors, becoming not so unwitting resting places in that they deny the local population opportunities for a living wage now that embargos against South Africa have been lifted. As Cargo indicates, the Chinese clothing manufacture implantation in South Africa (and other nation-states of the African continent such as Lesotho), the production of and dependence on imported shoes – the new cargo – create a different imprint on the mind, a different slavery to fashion one highlighted in June 2012

5 An explanatory footnote: “For Dorothée is so very coquettish, that the pleasure of being admired overrides the pride of the emancipated, and so even though she is free, she walks without any shoes” (my translation). A French Royal Ordinance dated 18th March 1819, forbade blacks from wearing shoes (cited in «http://www.ordesiles.com/L_esclavagisme/index2.php?champ=Guadeloupe» on the page entitled: ‘l’esclavage à la Guadeloupe’).

6 Shoes in footnotes: In Brett Bayley’s and Third World Bunfight’s Orfeus, another production playing in the same festivals as Every Year, Every Day I am Walking and Cargo, the participatory audience is taken to Hades and witnesses among other horrendous scenes, a group of chained children in a barbed-wire cage busily sewing sneakers as they are subjected to an outpouring of German sounding garbled orders coming from a loud-speaker.
by the fiasco that Adidas’ Jeremy Scott created with his designer sneakers with chains and cuffs that resemble slaves’ chains. Although the message was intended to relate them to fashion’s hold on society’s patterns and modes of dressing, such design matters sink deep into collective memories of unshod slave labour. Such polemical scandalous faux pas trip up global marketeers and sink the ship before it reaches its port of sales.

********************

Post-it foot-notes

“Scandal is everything that prevents us from dancing” writes René Girard (316) for, like stumbling blocs, scandalous plots tangle human desires in unyielding muscular knots. As with Mallarmé’s swan who seeks to break free of the ice, stepping out is a precarious performance. As praxis, foot movement imprints sinew-ous grooves like characters that are always there being washed over, eroded, erased, countered.

To posit asymmetry (of power) is to refer to unequal distributions (of forces) between opposing sides which are marked by (de)militarization and/or commercialization (of warfare). Such disequilibrium can be seen in genocide (as in Rwanda), in such on-going guerilla/mercenary warfare as in the Congo (RDC), in the miners’ strikes in post-apartheid South Africa, or in the aftermaths of dictatorships and occupations as in Haiti, indeed in all such places where civilians are most often invisibly, and in silence, the recipients of perpetuated violence, hiding their dis-placement: they are out of joint, out of step.

As embodied form and social medium, the works of dance and physical theatre that I examine contribute to and affect the confrontational and peace-making processes of civilians. Their choreographic practice and improvisational steps shift the weight (of war’s effects) to plot corporeal agency on all sides. Their metaphorical and embodied movements on the one hand serve as places of witness, of trauma treatment and catharsis, and activating memory. On the other, such displayed steps play to contingent audiences: to those who pass by; who contribute to humanitarian pleas and causes; and who might walk out in support of those who must walk every day, every year in the shadows, as displaced or disenfranchised person, refugee, migrant, immigrant in the performance of precarity.

7 More shoes in footnotes: Planned for an August release, the German brand, Adidas, pulled the Originals Roundhouse 2012 Autumn/Winter line after initiating a barrage of indignation at what was seen to be a racist design on its Facebook page and in other social media circles (Gazane, and photo of shoe, Le Figaro).

8 A credit footnote: This is Susan Foster’s neologism in Dances that Describe Themselves: The Improvised Choreography of Richard Bull (217-18).
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In late 2003, several hundred activists from Phiri, a poor section of the Soweto township of Johannesburg, in South Africa, took to the streets to protest the forced installation of prepaid water meters in their neighborhood. These devices, according to Johannesburg Water, the city’s publicly-owned but privately-run water utility, were to monitor and help control the population’s consumption of the resource. Yet the people of Phiri saw them as a discriminatory measure that would effectively cut off the access to water of those unable to pay, an outcome that contradicted the right to water enshrined in the country’s Constitution. Despite being shaped by very particular South African dynamics, the events of Phiri exemplify similar processes that took place in different parts of the world in the 1990s and 2000s. The common denominator in all these events was the radical transformation of access to water, which in a few years went from being considered a citizenship right that was mostly provided by the state to an economic good in whose provision the private sector, the profit motive, and markets were to play a central role. How did this shift take place, and what does it tell us about the broader dynamics of the global governance of the water sector?

The topic of global governance has received much scholarly attention in the last two decades. The concept of governance differs from government in the assumption that authority is disaggregated: a number of actors of different types, which relate to each other in non-hierarchical ways, are involved in the tasks of governing (Rosenau; Rosenau & Czempiel). Governance is key to addressing global concerns, given the lack of a centralized world government with the power to impose and enforce policies. Despite the increasing importance of business and non-governmental actors (such as non-governmental organizations or NGOs) in global governance processes, national states have remained at the very core of these initiatives, particularly when they refer to social sectors that directly affect the lives of their citizens. They do so by being either the main actors in governance regimes, the founders of the organizations at the center of governance systems, or at the very least the gatekeepers of the processes and regulations adopted. Yet despite the sensitivity of access to water, I argue that the global management of this resource presents a new type of governance in which the state is not a central actor.

The provision of water for human consumption has several characteristics that determine the types of regimes that can govern it, as well as their reach. One the most important of these features is the fact that water is mostly delivered at the quasi-local level. There is a growing market for bottled water that has a global reach, but it represents a very small percentage of global water consumption. Most of the water used in the world is captured, channeled, treated and delivered in the proximity of where it is to be consumed. This means that, although we think of water access as a global problem,
the decisions to deliver it remain within the purview of national and local authorities. What is the point of talking about the global governance of water, then? Water is a basic element for human life, and since the 1970s the international community has included improved access to water in its efforts to promote development in poor nations (Streeten). It was in the late 1970s that the World Bank and other aid agencies started promoting projects about water, and the recognition of the severe weaknesses of water provision around the world triggered a search for approaches and policies that could make a dent on the problem. Global water governance, then, does not entail the direct implementation of policies by global institutions. It attempts, instead, to generate and promote the best possible practices so that national and local governments will improve their provision of water and their populations, particularly their most vulnerable segments, will gain adequate access to the resource. The global governance of water, therefore, is about knowledge – the approaches and policies which will be used by national actors.

The early initiatives in the global governance of water, although with the peripheral participation of a number of actors, were clearly initiated by states or their derived institutions. In 1977, the United Nations organized a Water Conference in Argentina, and it was also the United Nations which labeled the 1980s as the International Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation Decade in order to promote action in the water sector. The search for new approaches to water provision during that decade was, as in retrospect seems inevitable, deeply affected by the widespread turn to market-based solutions and to a focus on private actors instead of on public ones. The World Bank and other institutions played a key role in promoting these ideas, which quickly gained prominence in the field. However, the international governance initiatives that had taken place, led by states and their organizations, in the 1970s, dried up in the 1980s. As Goldman argues, transnational policy networks took the lead in promoting policies for water provision, yet there was no set system of global governance for the water sector. This lack of institutional articulation was perceived by many of the participants in the water domain as a weakness (see, for instance, Grover and Biswas). Several voices throughout the 1970s and 1980s called for the development of a global system of governance for water by either strengthening existing United Nations organizations or by creating new ones (Grover and Howarth). None of these attempts was successful or effective enough, and the 1990s started with a renewed recognition of the importance of water issues (alongside general environmental concerns) and a lack of international mechanisms to address them.

Unexpectedly, the next step in the development of a global form of governance for the water sector was not spearheaded by states or the international system. It was actually the International Water Resources Association (IWRA), the largest professional association of water experts in the world, which in its 1994 congress launched an initiative to create an international organization that would deal with water issues. This
organization, called the World Water Council (WWC), was conceived as a private institution that would have as members water-related organizations of all types. Thus the Council would include government agencies, but also corporations, research centers, and NGOs. All of these actors would have equal standing and say in determining the actions and direction of the WWC, and thus states would not be able to control it in the way they usually would with traditional governance mechanisms.

However, the plan of the IWRA did not pan out as expected. The nature of the WWC as a private institution not backed up by states did not allow the organization to be perceived as ‘the’ world water organization. Because of some disagreements between founding members, a second, similar organization, the Global Water Partnership, was created that same year (1996), and soon a number of other organizations, some of them focused on specific water issues – such as the World Commission on Dams – emerged. The result was a system that, as water experts often argue, was seen as a chaos or a cacophony of voices, with none of the characteristics that would normally be expected from a system of global governance. Yet I argue that it represents, in fact, a new form of global governance, and that it is precisely its novelty which prevents us from perceiving it as such. This is indeed a case in which we cannot see the forest for the trees.

The World Water Council, the Global Water Partnership, and similar global water organizations are institutions with relatively small budgets which are unable to undertake much research or to implement policies themselves. They are, however, in charge of the crucial task of convening what, in a slightly different sense, Robert Varady and his colleagues have referred to as ‘global water initiatives’ (Varady, Meehan, and McGovern). These include global conferences such as the World Water Forums, which take place every three years, or expert reports on water issues such as that of the Camdessus Commission on how to finance the needs of the water sector in the 21st century. These ‘initiatives’ are always presented as open and participatory, and actors of all types are invited to take part in them. They are important because they are where knowledge about water management is generated and diffused and, even more importantly, legitimized as the outcome of the global water sector. If we analyze the products of these initiatives collectively, we realize that they promote a very consistent message in support of seeing water as an economic good, charging the full-cost of provision to water users, and having the private sector play a central role in the water domain. These views have become hegemonic and underpin water delivery in most of the world.

The events that took place during the 1990s and 2000s in the water sector hold very significant lessons for the study of global governance. Although many actors in the sector do not recognize the existence of a system of global governance for water, I argue that we are in the presence of such a system, only one that looks very different from what the term usually brings to mind. What I call the ‘global water regime’ is not
formalized or explicitly agreed, but it has a distinct mode of operation, it obtains results that are highly consistent, and it is successful in promoting policy convergence. The most prominent characteristic of the global water regime, however, is that national states do not play a prominent role in it, which opens the door for other actors to occupy central positions. Power in the regime is given by the capacity that some agents have to exercise a disproportionate influence in the global water initiatives that are at its core. This gives particular clout to the for-profit private sector and to actors that support its role in water provision, which have managed to make a remarkable imprint in several global water initiatives. The view that the private sector is necessary to deal with contemporary water problems has become mainstream, a fact that represents a big departure from the traditional view of water provision as a public service through most of the 20th century. Moreover, this idea has remained in place even as the first wave of private sector involvement in the 1990s, which took the form of full privatization of water provision, was unsuccessful, as we are now seeing the emergence of alternative, less intrusive forms of private participation such as short-term management contracts (Still, Gertzen, & Ricketson).

What is the future of the water sector and of its system of global governance? Is the influence of the private sector bound to continue? The open and participatory nature of the global water regime has been seized by actors such as the activists from Phiri mentioned at the beginning of this article, who alongside others from different parts of the world have created a global social movement that radically opposes the ideas at the core of the regime and promotes the view that access to water should be a human right. These activists have attempted to participate in and influence the global water initiatives, at the same time that they vociferously point out the illegitimacy of what they consider a corporate-driven system. It remains to be seen the extent to which the regime's informal structure and form of operation will prove adaptable and resilient, but this promises to be a crucial development to monitor as water issues become increasingly prominent and pressing in the future.
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Austerity Confronts Peace: Unraveling Social Europe

by Jeffrey Sommers

Context

Contra current pronouncements by the 2012 Nobel Peace Prize committee suggesting the European Union continues apace on its path toward peace, Europe is in trouble; and as the saying goes, when it “sneezes, the world catches a cold.” The past half century witnessed an uncharacteristically calm period of peace in Europe (Balkans aside) in what otherwise has been a history marred by near perpetual war from the end of the Roman Empire to the conclusion of World War II. This calm, however, risks merely being an interregnum, with the potential for a return to storm conditions presented by the current economic crisis. Indeed austerity, the “tool” applied to “repair” much of the European Union’s economic crisis, is undermining the Jacques Delors’ “Social Europe” project and instead realizing the ultimate victory of Margaret Thatcher’s policies writ large across much of Europe. Given Europe’s storied millennium of frequent war preceding Bretton Woods and European social democracy, the stakes are high, to say the least, for whether European nations continue their march toward austerity and movement away from the peace generating Social Europe model.

History is replete with examples of how economic crises can breach the citadel of the material world and enter the wider social sphere of conflict. The signs of contagion are already manifest, with signals on the horizon already visible. In the Baltics, tensions between ethnic Balts and ethnic Russians simmer. In Hungary, the far-right Jobbik is now the country’s third largest party and Jews are being openly intimidated. Meanwhile, fascism surges forward with Greece’s Golden Dawn party. Throughout much the rest of Europe, foreigners, especially Muslims, are the targets of ethno-religious bigotry. Yet, economic crisis persists and policymakers continue their rush toward austerity under these conditions of social tumult.

What is to be done? From the person on the street, to policy experts, and politicians alike, people are desperate to find answers to what appears to be an intractable economic crisis. Out of this confusion an increasing chorus of support has emerged singing the praises of the Baltic model of austerity and internal devaluation of currencies to pull the EU out of the current Chinese finger trap it has inserted its digits into. From former Soviet Union (FSU) shock treatment policy expert Anders Aslund, to Robert Samuelson in The Washington Post, to Chrystia Freeland in The Economist and others in the financial press, analysts with thin knowledge of the Baltics at best have praised them as plucky states that through discipline and foresight have clawed their way back toward prosperity. More a Protestant morality tale than serious economic and social analysis, the Balts are presented as having displayed the maturity necessary to achieve economic success through a short period of pain leading to much gain. The reality, however, is that
the Baltic model has neither been the success its boosters promote, nor have their publics democratically endorsed the policies imposed. In fact, for the Baltics, austerity is merely a continuation of two decades of neoliberal policy whose dire social consequences are undermining social stability.

My research under the aegis of the University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee’s Global Studies Research Fellowship investigates what lies behind the hagiographic accounts of the Baltic model presented in the financial press and by European policymakers. In particular, we will examine the social consequences and impact on labor of the Baltic model in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. Serious analysis from experts long in the region can pull back the veil to see what “really existing austerity” policies look like on the ground under the Baltic model. In much of Europe and the world, the condition of labor is perilous and growing less secure by the day. Nowhere are these trends more evinced than on Europe’s periphery in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. It is in the small Baltic states that neoliberal policies have been both most vigorously embraced (and imposed), and consequently where we can earliest see the results of austerity and its impact on social peace.

The Baltics are situated directly to the east of the world’s most advanced social democracies in Scandinavia, thus providing the best point to juxtapose and compare the Social Europe model with its Baltic austerity counterpart. The Baltics have been a zone for experimentation with reforms for both the EU and FSU alike. Historically, they have also frequently found themselves in the crosshairs of war between their neighbors to the East and West. The past twenty years have seen them on the vanguard of neoliberal policies proposed for the EU, while in the twenty years prior to that, they were centers for reform in the FSU. Their small size, FSU experience, and European history make them the ideal place to introduce policy experiments in the European Union.

The effects to date of these austerity and internal devaluation experiments in the Baltics suggest a collapse (implosion) of orderly labor markets (and of prospects for balanced social and economic development). The consequent responses to failure of genuine voice (using Albert O. Hirschman’s concept of “voice, exit, and loyalty”) are now being observed in the Baltics and spreading across Europe. Increasingly, loyalty to democracy and government fades and the exit option is chosen; thus also creating tensions with receiving countries taking migrant labor.

In this context, the hard fought post-war stability of Bretton Woods Europe is under threat, as is the stability that (regardless of its many other faults) the Soviet system provided to labor in the Baltics. In its place is a system being introduced to the EU increasingly shorn of national autonomy both in economic and social spheres. National regulatory frameworks for protecting labor are eroding under supranational legal frameworks of the EU. With this, ethnic tension and inter-European conflicts are emerging to fill the void vacated by the dissolving Social Europe model.
In short, this project investigates the extent to which the Baltic model of austerity is generating disruptions threatening the peace created previously by the Social Europe model. In so doing, this research can present cautionary instruction to European and global leaders embracing the Baltic model as a cure for their economic challenges. This is vital for maintaining peace both within states and among them.

**Research Questions**

- To what extent is the Baltic model of austerity poised to replace the Social Europe model for the European Union?

- Has austerity contributed to social peace or instability in the Baltics?

- Has Baltic emigration been driven primarily by the introduction of austerity policies?

- Has austerity been a driver of inter-ethnic conflict between ethnic Balts and their ethnic Russian populations (along with Roma and Jews) within the Baltic states themselves?

- Has austerity induced emigration from the Baltics contributed to ethnic tensions between themselves and local labor encountered in the migration destination countries of Ireland, Sweden, Finland, and the United Kingdom?

- Have austerity policies in the Baltics eroded faith in democracy and promoted extremism and ethnic conflict?

**Design**

This research is analytical and qualitative, making use of extant data sets (e.g., Eurostat, etc.) and creating new ones. It researches both established patterns and emergent trends, using a multi-axial approach inspecting both economic and social spheres. Interviews with key stakeholders guided preliminary research in the Fall of 2012. Our research group is in contact with key figures in the region from former Prime Ministers to heads of Ministries, to directors of NGOs, to key academics and journalists. This research also expands to interviews and surveys with labor migrants. Quantitative metrics will be developed at later stages of research. Research designs and survey methods have already been developed on past Fulbright research in the Baltics, with partners, such as Charles Woolfson, having collected data extensively while serving as the European Commission Marie Curie Chair to the region.
Theoretical frameworks of this project are multi-disciplinary, emerging out of geography with David Harvey’s concept of spatial fixes to overcome crises of capital accumulation, for which we see as a driver of both labor migration and European integration from past EU expansion. Other disciplinary frameworks employed are a modified form of world-system theory. Past global analyses on hegemonic change are anchored in historical sociology, with figures such as the late Giovanni Arrighi. Meanwhile, the project is also guided by Dorothy Bohle’s work on political economy in East Europe.

**Partners**

- **Charles Woolfson**, recent European Commission Marie Curie Chair to Baltics, Professor of Labour Studies, REMESO, Institute for Research on Migration, Ethnicity and Society, Linköping University, Sweden

- **Michael Hudson**, Distinguished Research Professor of Economics, University of Missouri-Kansas City, frequent economics contributor to the *Financial Times*

- **Erik Reinert**, Professor of Technology Governance and Development Strategies at Tallinn University of Technology and president of The Other Canon foundation in Norway

- **Rainer Kattel**, Professor and Directory of Technology and Governance and Chair of Public Administration at Tallinn Technical University

- **Jolanta Aiduakite**, Associate Professor Lithuanian Social Research Centre

- **Markku Sippola**, postdoctoral researcher in Labor Studies at the Karelian Institute, University of Eastern Finland

- **Arunas Juska**, Associate Professor of Labor Sociology at East Carolina University

**Results**

The above enumerated research partners have a contract with Routledge to publish a book, *The Contradictions of Austerity*, on the above research impacting the conditions for promoting peace in the EU and beyond.
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The Center for International Education at the University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee selected five Global Studies Fellows for the 2012/13 academic year. The Global Studies Fellows program, established in 2010, aids faculty in advancing their research on interdisciplinary topics relating to globalization, its cultural, political, social, economic, and environmental dimensions. Global Studies Fellows meet monthly to share their progress and devise research strategies. They also share their work at a series of colloquia, and participate in CIE’s annual conference.

Sandra Braman

Sandra Braman is Professor of Global Studies and Communication at the University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee. Her research on the macro-level effects of technological innovation and their policy consequences has been supported by the Ford, Rockefeller and Open Society foundations as well as the US National Science foundation. Chair of the Law Section of the International Association of Media and Communication Research, Braman was formerly Chair of the Communication Law and Policy Division of the International Communication Association. Her books include Change of State: Information, Policy, and Power (MIT Press, 2007/2009) and the edited collections Biotechnology and Communication: The Meta-Technologies of Information (Lawrence Erlbaum, 2004), The Emerging Global Information Policy Regime (Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), and Communication Researchers and Policy-Making (MIT Press, 2003). Braman has served the Freedom of Expression Professor at the University of Bergen, and as a Fulbright scholar or visiting professor at universities in South Africa, Sweden, and Brazil.
Winson Chu

Winson Chu is Assistant Professor of Modern Central European History at the University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee. His doctoral dissertation won the UC Berkeley History Department’s James H. Kettner Graduate Prize as well as the Fritz Stern Dissertation Prize, which the Friends of the German Historical Institute (Washington, DC) awards to the best North American dissertations in German history. He has received fellowships from the German Academic Exchange Service, the United States Department of Education, the German Historical Institute in Warsaw, the American Council on Germany, and the American Council of Learned Societies. Chu was also a recent fellow at the Center for Advanced Holocaust Studies at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. His book, *The German Minority in Interwar Poland*, was published by Cambridge University Press in 2012.

Sarah Davies Cordova

Sarah Davies Cordova is Associate Professor of French at the University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee. Her interdisciplinary research in dance, writing the body, and French and Francophone literatures moves across the Atlantic to and from Haiti and the Antilles, Africa and France and includes her monograph *Paris Dances: Textual Choreographies in the Nineteenth-century French Novel*, and contributions to *The Cambridge Companion to Ballet and New writings about dance and culture: dancing bodies, living histories*. She led the Marquette University South Africa Service Learning Program in Cape Town, South Africa (2005-2008) which was housed at the Desmond Tutu Peace Centre and the University of the Western Cape. She has focused on representations of issues surrounding reconciliation and re-membering in post-apartheid, post-genocide, and post-dictatorship societies of South Africa, Rwanda and Haiti as an extension of her work in (post) colonial societies of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.
Oriol Mirosa

Oriol Mirosa is Assistant Professor of Sociology and Global Studies at the University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee. He holds an MPhil in Development Studies from the University of Sussex (UK) and a PhD in Sociology from the University of Wisconsin–Madison. His research interests include globalization, governance, social movements, development, and the environment. Mirosa’s recent work has focused on the global governance of water, with specific attention to the effects of the commodification of water provision on how vulnerable populations access the resource in Bolivia and South Africa. He recently published an article (co-authored with Leila M. Harris) titled “Human Right to Water: Contemporary Challenges and Contours of a Global Debate” in the journal Antipode.
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