

Curtis Li

tl;dr: Globalization hasn't necessarily made us less secure or more powerful

In his new book, *The Global Village Myth*(2015), Patrick Porter tackles the modern era of American interventionism as being the result of a faulty belief in the risks and abilities presented by globalization.

To make his case, Porter considers various instances of armed conflict in which a globalist view of the world led to costly strategic blunders and the importance of strategic space. According to Porter, the globalist view began on December 7, 1941 with Pearl Harbor, when Americans realized that they could not depend on the vast oceans which surround them to keep them safe. This feeling of insecurity has persisted throughout the Cold War and informs policy decision to the present day. As a result of this insecurity, the United States has attempted to install democracies, which is somewhat of a contradiction in itself. He notes that international terrorist groups such as al-Qaeda, while aided by fast air travel and modern communications, also face significant challenges. As a decentralized organization operating across multiple countries it has a great deal of flexibility, but this flexibility often comes at the cost of coordination. Their brutal and indiscriminate attacks following the overthrow of Saddam Hussein undermined their appeal with many Muslims. Another counterexample that Porter provides is the case of cyberwarfare. Certainly cyberattacks can seem to be very powerful weapons that can instantly cripple vulnerable infrastructure from afar, but Porter reminds us that these weapons require a large degree of expertise and skill to use successfully. In his book he looks at the use of Stuxnet. Stuxnet, while successful was also a very complex piece of software that required physical access to Iranian nuclear facilities(Stuxnet was delivered on a flashdrive). Also, while Stuxnet was successful in hindering the Iranian nuclear weapons program, it did not necessarily stop it. Essentially, while technologies, geography and social organization seem to favor offensive actors, Porter suggests they are merely mediums which can advance defensive capabilities as well.

Instead of imposing liberal democracies in order to safeguard ourselves, Porter posits that we should take more of a realist approach when it comes to matters of national security. His suggestion a refreshing alternative to the otherwise alarmist rhetoric that so often pervades national security discussions. Rather than seeking to entirely eliminate threats perhaps we should take a more sober view and consider that it's not such a small world after all.