



WHY GOVERN? THE STRATEGIC, FUNCTIONAL, AND NORMATIVE LOGICS OF GLOBAL GOVERNANCE

a Conference Report by One Earth Future and
the UNESCO Chair in Transnational Challenges
and Governance, American University

Amitav Acharya, Conor Seyle,
Blake Berger, Goueun Lee,
and Kate Tennis



AMITAV ACHARYA
UNESCO CHAIR IN TRANSNATIONAL CHALLENGES AND GOVERNANCE





WHY GOVERN?
**THE STRATEGIC, FUNCTIONAL, AND NORMATIVE
LOGICS OF GLOBAL GOVERNANCE**

**by Amitav Acharya, Conor Seyle,
Blake Berger, Goueun Lee,
and Kate Tennis**

SEPTEMBER 2014

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Global governance is a key subject of discussion for practitioners and researchers of international relations in the 21st century. As global governance institutions proliferate, new questions are arising related to understanding the structures and rationales of institutions.
- One line of questioning centers around why national or international entities would agree to be subject to institutions or regimes of global governance. As global systems proliferate, what are the demands that lead to the creation of these systems, and what differences in institutional structure are visible in transnational governance?
- The conference “Why Govern? The Strategic, Functional and Normative Logics of Global Governance” was organized to address these and other questions, and was held at American University on October 3–5, 2013. It was organized by the UNESCO Chair in Transnational Challenges and Governance and its network (Transnational Challenges and Emerging Nations Dialogue), and the One Earth Future Foundation, of Broomfield, Colorado.
- 28 international relations scholars spent two days in discussion. The following key themes emerged:
 - Demand for global governance can be based on strategic, practical, and normative bases, but these different demand systems often overlap.
 - Demand is not consistent across issues or over time; often, institutions that were created in response to one type of demand evolve as different pressures arise. Understanding the trajectory and longevity of organizational development may be influenced significantly by understanding the demand structures that led to the creation of the system.
 - Global governance has been impacted by both materially strong and materially weak actors. Often, materially weak actors have been more engaged in the creation and support of global governing systems than materially powerful states such as the United States.
 - In order to develop a deeper understanding of the role of demand in global governance, more data is needed on the structure and impact of demand.

- 
- Global governance appears to be defined in part by creative fragmentation; frequently, governing institutions have followed a trajectory that moved away from centralized institutional structures to more distributed regime complexes, due in part to stakeholder demand for more complex systems.
 - Regionalism may offer an important complement to the discussion of global governance; regional institutions have been both precursors of the formation of larger systems and fallbacks for fragmenting institutions. A greater focus on regional institutions may be useful in understanding global systems as well.
 - This discussion generated specific policy recommendations geared towards researchers and practitioners interested in global governance. These include:
 - Developing better tools for monitoring the demand for global governance institutions, perhaps through the development of a formal index or other projects that would develop more concrete information and new data sources tracking demand.
 - Developing a Global Governance Clearinghouse, a centralized place for information-sharing about global governance, that would provide information about the demand, structure, and potential effectiveness of different global systems.
 - Developing research materials that would address how the different structures and relationships between actors relate to the performance of different governance systems, as well as the role of regionalism.
 - Developing a concrete strategy for policy engagement with the role of creative fragmentation; a policy roundtable or other form of systematic engagement with the question of how fragmentation can be structured to maximize the effectiveness of regime complexes could be useful.

WHY GOVERN? THE STRATEGIC, FUNCTIONAL, AND NORMATIVE LOGICS OF GLOBAL GOVERNANCE

Conference Summary and Policy Recommendations

Global governance is one of the most critical subjects in international relations scholarship and policymaking today. With intensified globalization, and the proliferation of collective action problems the world is facing in diverse areas such as security, climate, and economic relations, the need for the creation and sustenance of legitimate global governance structures is increasingly acknowledged. Yet, while most policymakers think global governance is a good thing, many aspects of global governance are poorly understood and often contested. The spread of global governance structures and institutions remains remarkably uneven across different issue areas; contestations abound over the reform of existing global governance institutions and processes and the creation of new ones.

The conference “Why Govern? The Strategic, Functional, and Normative Logics of Global Governance,” held at American University in Washington, D.C. October 3–5, 2013, explored why global governance remains a contested and uneven enterprise. The conference was organized by the UNESCO Chair in Transnational Challenges and Governance and the network of the Transnational Challenges and Emerging Nations Dialogue at American University with support from the One Earth Future Foundation of Broomfield, Colorado. The conference addressed two main questions. The first was why there is a growing demand for global governance, and relatedly, what explains the changing, differing, and sometimes competing reasons for that demand? Second, to what extent do the varied rationales for global governance shape the design and efficacy of global governance institutions? Systematic investigation into these questions, we believe, is important not only in understanding contestations about global governance, but also in reforming and advancing global governance in world politics.

A review of key themes and a summary of the conference follow. The full agenda and list of participants at the conference are provided in Appendices 1 and 2.

Key Themes

Participants spoke from a variety of perspectives and engaged with a variety of specific global governance domains. The summaries provide specific information about individual presentations. However, across the diverse discussions some common themes arose.

One starting point for the discussion, built into the framing document, was the idea that **demand for global governance can be characterized as strategic (relating to demand for material power), functional (relating to demand for a solution to a specific problem), or normative (relating to**

normative values that call for global governance). Across panels and presentations, speakers acknowledged the roles of all three sources of demand in the formation and transformation of global governance systems. At the same time, speakers acknowledged that the distinctions between these sources are blurry, and institutions frequently meet multiple demands simultaneously.

A second theme was that demand matters. **Demand is not consistent across issues or over time. Often, institutions created in response to one type of demand evolve as different pressures arise.** It appears that perceptions of the responsiveness, effectiveness, and legitimacy of global institutions may reflect the specific demands of stakeholders. Related to the question of what sources of demand exist, several panelists spoke to the idea that institutions created in response to one category of demand might transform to meet other categories of demand in order to remain relevant. Several speakers (including Kathryn Sikkink, Alexander Betts, and Eamon Aloyo) described institutional changes that started with a functional demand for problem-specific solutions but led to institutions being structured to meet normative demands for the support of human rights or other normative goods.

A third theme emerged in the consensus that **global governance systems have been supported more by materially weak actors than by stronger actors.** Many felt that the US role in the creation of global governance architecture has been more limited and less positive, and that the contributions of others, including Europeans, developing countries, and weaker actors, have been less appreciated but more substantial and extensive than is usually believed. This was especially clear in relation to the topics of human rights (Sikkink), global institutions (Eric Helleiner), and liberal norms (Miles Kahler). This observation also applies to the emerging norms of global environmental governance (Sikina Jinnah) and internet governance (Derrick Cogburn), where the US role is under intense global scrutiny due to recent developments around National Security Agency surveillance.

Global governance systems have been supported more by materially weak actors than by stronger actors.

The fourth major theme was that **more data on the subject of demand is needed.** Engaging in discussion about the specific types and impacts of stakeholder demand is complicated by the fact that systemic data about demand for global governance is not available. Several speakers acknowledged this, and Andrew Mack called for more data on both the performance of global institutions and the distribution of types of demand.

A fifth major theme, one with significant policy relevance, was the role of **creative fragmentation** in global governance. In essence, creative fragmentation implies that existing structures of global governance, whether in finance, trade, or security and human rights, are facing new challenges leading to demands for major restructuring. But without presaging the end of global governance, these contestations might lead to the creation of new, more inclusive structures that might end up strengthening global governance.

There is some discussion of this in earlier academic literature; for example, during the Renaissance, fragmentation (of the old order) was just as creative. More recently, economist Joseph Schumpeter's notion of creative destruction focuses on the role of the markets as a creative force. But this project refers to much more than markets and includes the roles of demanders and agents, and does so in a more qualitative sense. Creative fragmentation may mean old, established institutions declining or giving way to new institutions and forms of governance, including hybrid forms (a point made by Kahler). Regionalism may be regarded as a form of creative fragmentation. Creative fragmentation may also mean that the existing global governance architecture is, or can become, less US-centric. Studying and debating the problems facing existing global institutions due to the changing nature of demand, and assessing how pressures for change that appear to be inevitable fragmentation might create opportunities for reform, emerge as key steps in managing the future of global governance.

Regionalism may be an important complement to the study of global governance.

The final theme emerging from the discussion was the idea that **the study of regionalism may be an important complement to the study of global governance.** Regionalism is not only a key determinant of the demand for global governance itself, in that it can lead to an increase or decrease, but it is one of the major signposts of creative fragmentation in global governance. Until

now, the role of regional bodies in global governance has not received sufficient attention, with the attention seeming to have focused almost entirely on existing global institutions or newer ones like the G-20. But the relationship between regionalism and universalism is changing. For much of the post-WWII period, regional bodies were seen as either competitors to global institutions or at best as supplements to them. However, regionalism can also serve as an early warning mechanism for the atrophy of global institutions, even when regionalism does not offer a conscious challenge to the authority of those institutions; regionalism in this sense reflects a developing awareness of crisis. Moreover, regionalism can be a vanguard of policy ideas to reform and strengthen global governance. Regional groups can offer sites for experimenting with ideas and policy initiatives that can later be applied at the global level, and which many global institutions are too consensus-bound to even seriously attempt. In addition, emerging powers can use regional platforms as testing grounds for preparing for their roles in global governance.





PANEL 1: RECONCEPTUALIZING GLOBAL GOVERNANCE

Moderator

Dean James Goldgeier, School of International Service,
American University

Panelists

Amitav Acharya, Professor of International Relations,
UNESCO Chair in Transnational Challenges and
Governance, and Chair of the ASEAN Studies Center at
American University

Daniel Deudney, Associate Professor of Political Science at
Johns Hopkins University

Discussants

Miles Kahler, Rohr Professor of Pacific International
Relations and Distinguished Professor of Political Science,
University of California, San Diego

Tamar Gutner, Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and
Graduate Education, School of International Service,
American University

THIS PANEL presentation and discussion emphasized the need to analyze global governance conceptually and discussed where to begin developing a framework to examine its impact. Amitav Acharya began his presentation by asserting the need to not only research the variations and contestations within global governance, but to address the uneven spread of global governance structure, the question of who demands global governance, and why this demand should not be taken for granted. Acharya additionally stressed that differing definitions still exist for global governance as a concept, and that there is a need to further develop and come to a consensus on a definition.

In developing a framework in which to examine global governance, Acharya put forward three main logics/sources/imperatives for global governance. The first was strategic power: the traditional conceptualization of power, emphasizing the material aspect. The second was functional: the nature of the issue area. The third was normative: ideology is important. Additionally, Acharya outlined the roles of two other sets of factors: domestic politics and regime type, and regionalism and regional interdependence. Both sets of factors were part of the overall framework of the conference and of the resulting edited volume investigating what causes demand for global governance. In addressing the differing logics, the framework seeks to analyze key questions such as whether powerful actors are more likely to support and seek global governance, what new or changing norms produce greater demand for global governance, whether the growth of transnational civil societies spurs global governance, and whether democracies are more supportive of global governance.

Differing definitions still exist for global governance as a concept; there is a need to further develop and come to a consensus on a definition.

One key is analyzing the quality of global governance, and as Acharya addressed, even a definition of the concept of quality is up for debate. In putting forward a framework for analyzing quality, three concepts emerge. The first is efficacy: whether the institution or organization is able to solve or address the problems, and whether it has been able to meet its goals. The second is the durability and resilience,

and the third is the legitimacy of the global governance. While the quality of global governance is not the core of the book, the volume hopes to examine whether demand says anything about the quality, and whether there are additional or multiple logics present.

Deudney, presented “Planetary Geopolitics: The Decline of World Government, and the Rise of Regimes, Global Governance, and Social Movements,” which provided insight into the interconnection between globalization, increasing interdependence, and the need to reconceptualize the international system, the state of global governance, and its structure. Presenting a historical analysis, Deudney stressed how the material shift in human nature and the evolution of technological advancement have shaped the world, creating new networks of machine and human agency. Through these new networks, human interaction has become far more complex and continues to be amplified by technology, changing the fundamental nature of state borders and the concept of civilization. The main variable in Deudney’s framework is increased interaction through globalization and interdependence, which will change the polity’s “operating manuals” from a realist stance to a liberalist one. As Deudney explained, this current operating manual is changing as well because of the shifting international context and environmental deterioration.

Increasing globalization and interdependence require the existing concept of state sovereignty to change. Highlighting the work of David Mitrany and John Huey, the functionalist theory of integration, global governance, and state sovereignty would alter and advance through emerging areas of low politics and continued spillover to high politics; this would occur simultaneously with the growth of international social movements, producing new delegations of sectorial authorities that would develop in the world system and exhibit a more authoritative form of governance. Theorizing global governance, then, requires a shift in focus towards centering on the public and the examination of the type of shared understanding needed for the development of a community, which as Deudney advanced, are based on the shared material contexts. The type of global governance structure that Deudney theorized needs to emerge is one structured along a unit veto system, and also one through which state actors can generate shared understanding over a range of issues.

The discussion of the papers, led by Miles Kahler, Rohr Professor of Pacific International Relations and Distinguished Professor of Political Science at the University of San Diego, and Tamar Gutner, Associate Professor of International Relations and Associate Dean at the School of International Service. During the discussion, two key points emerged. The first point, raised by the panelists and during the question-and-answer session, was the need to come to a consensus on the definition of global governance. In beginning to define global governance, substantive points were raised: first, the need to examine who the demanders are and to go beyond the nation-state in terms of actors; second, the need to separate demand from supply; third, the need to distinguish global governance as a process or as an outcome; and fourth, how to bring nuance into the definition, as global governance is neither positive nor negative.

Increasing globalization and interdependence require the existing concept of state sovereignty to change.

The second overarching point highlighted the need to examine the variations in supply and demand in a historical analysis of global governance. Analyzing global governance through this lens, as Kahler emphasized, would bring to light the nexus between the increase in demand and interdependence, the variations in global governance and areas of contention within, and which normative values are involved and how they evolve. In addressing the normative values related to global governance, Randolph Persaud, Associate Professor at the School of International Service, emphasized the need to reexamine the connection between neoliberalism and global governance.



PANEL 2: THEORIES AND APPROACHES

Moderator

Patrick Jackson, Associate Dean and Professor of International Relations of the School of International Service, American University

Panelists

Miles Kahler, Rohr Professor of Pacific International Relations and Distinguished Professor of Political Science, University of California, San Diego

Patrick Jackson, presenting a paper by Rodney Bruce Hall, Professor, University of Macau

Eamon Aloyo, One Earth Future Foundation

Discussant

David Bosco, Assistant Professor at the School of International Service, American University

THE SECOND PANEL presentation and discussion focused on theoretical approaches and applications to analyzing and testing global governance. Kahler’s presentation and paper, “Who’s Liberal Now? Rising Powers and Global Norms,” provided a theoretical framework of the normative ideas that have constituted liberalism, a historical overview of how liberalism developed, the role of liberalism and variants in United States domestic and foreign policy, and what the rise of emerging powers, such as China, means for the United States and international security and economic order.

In defining liberalism, Kahler cited John Gray’s four characteristics of liberal norms, comprising individualism, egalitarianism, universalism, and meliorism, which are present in one manner or another in the variations of liberalism worldwide. Supplementing this definition, Kahler cited Alan Ryan’s addition of rule of law, limited government, and sanctity of property into its definition. In tracing the emergence of liberalism, Kahler examined how liberalism arose as a movement of opposition against the 19th-century aristocratic order. Further shaping the evolution of liberalism were internationally-oriented businesses and transnational civil society organizations that advocated for the international liberal order.

The development of liberalism, as Kahler explained, contained two compromises: first, the existence of international hierarchy and liberal imperialism, and second, the recognition of the nation-state. These two compromises shaped who the members of the international liberal order would be and who would be left out, and also manifested in the question of what kinds of international organizations could supersede the nation-state. Kahler demonstrated that US policy, both foreign and domestic, should not define the concept of liberalism, and as a corollary, that US policy has not necessarily conformed to liberalism but has been primarily an outgrowth of American domestic politics. The US has advanced a particular variant of liberalism that has emphasized first the universalism and transformative nature of liberalism, advocating for the malleability of societies to become liberal; second, the power of international business and corporations; and third, liberalism intertwined with both moralism and religion. Additionally, Kahler contended that there has been a shrinking and a transformation of the US demand for liberal norms in the international setting.

In looking towards the emergence of the Large Emerging Economies (LEEs)—such as China, India, and Brazil—Kahler examined how these states have risen and their individual relationships to liberalism. Interpreting the rise of the LEEs, these states, rather than subverting and undermining the liberal order, have been preserving the existing Bretton Woods system of national economic autonomy in the international system. While the LEEs have largely preserved the existing liberal regime, China’s relationship to global governance has been a tenuous one, and one not supportive of international courts and new forms of global governance. In concluding, Kahler emphasized two points: first, that the US is an uncertain anchor of the liberal order, highlighting the American drift from the liberal mainstream and the increasing leadership coming from Europe and the middle powers, and second, that the LEEs are unlikely to overturn the liberal norm and are resistant to the pressure to reorder their own domestic political economies.

Patrick Jackson presented Rodney Bruce Hall’s paper, which examined the constructivist contribution to the field of global governance. Jackson emphasized how constructivism has benefited the study of

global governance by going beyond information sharing to contribute to the research by including a variety of actors in the analysis and by considering norms and public interests. Hall's paper provided a literature review of constructivism and its development, international organizations, and global governance, and the theory's contribution to differing realms of governance. Jackson discussed that what was missing was a rationalist account of the study of international institutions and global governance, and that one must consider social purpose, otherwise the research is incomplete. A simple behavior analysis misses the dimension of social purpose and needs to consider accountability. Rationalism and constructivism should be viewed as complementary to each other.

Further unpacking the concept of global governance, Jackson emphasized the need to distinguish between the two types of global authority and between norms that are universal and norms that are local. Connecting liberalism to global governance, the universal appeal of liberalism has been pushed by the United States culturally as well, for example through film, demonstrating and framing that illiberal regimes can be pushed towards liberalism.

The demand for global governance is directly connected to the type of power and the spheres of authority the actor attempts to influence.

The third paper, "Demand for Global Governance, Spheres of Authority and Types of Power," was presented by political scientist Eamon Aloyo. This paper analyzed the ways a range of actors can use different types of power to realize their demands for global governance. They argued that the demand for global governance is directly connected to the type of power and the spheres of authority the actor attempts to influence. The paper presented a possible definition for global governance that focuses on regulation, and asserted that in order to be considered global, the organization must contain either 50% of the states or 50% of the world's population.

Aloyo and French showed that actors use specific types of power to influence certain spheres of authority or justice. By using these spheres, the analysis is able to take into consideration the type of power an actor wields and the type of organization or institution the actor intends to influence. The authors drew on a typology of power, specifically emphasizing coercive and soft power. In drawing on the global governance theoretical framework, Aloyo and French put forward three propositions on why actor demands connect to the type of power: first, strategic; second, functional; and third, normative.

In demonstrating how actors use soft power in demanding global governance, Aloyo and French analyzed the creation of the International Criminal Court (ICC) and the roles that Trinidad and Tobago and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs)—specifically Amnesty International—had in its founding. The authors described how Trinidad and Tobago advocated establishing the ICC for functional reasons, and how alternatively NGOs pushed for its creation for normative reasons. In concluding, Aloyo presented three policy implications: first, materially weak actors strategically use nonmaterial types of power; second, materially weak actors should coordinate; and third, opposition from materially powerful actors does not always preclude materially weak actors from realizing demands. In addition, further emphasizing the need to go beyond the nation-state as the unit of analysis, Aloyo stressed that individuals really do matter in the analysis.

Discussant David Bosco addressed the strengths and areas for improvement in the three papers. He pointed out that Hall's paper should look beyond the demand model and also should provide a clearer definition of which actors are actually demanding global governance and the underlying dynamics. Bosco highlighted that Kahler's historical analysis was insightful and brought the supply side into the equation, but further needed to provide a definition for the liberal order and clarify the role of sovereignty in the international system as well as whether US intervention internationally would be beneficial. Additionally, Bosco questioned whether the US has really left the liberal order, and argued that the US could be considered more liberal than it was before. Jackson, during the question-and-answer session, said that it was during the Cold War that the US and the international community were aligned in liberal normative agreement, but that the two have since drifted.

Discussing Aloyo and French's paper, Bosco stressed that the paper's account of the ICC's creation should be contested and revised, and that more attention needed to be brought to the ad hoc councils that formed during the organization's establishment. Bosco additionally highlighted that attention should be paid to how these organizations are affected and what role power plays in the efficacy and legitimacy of the organization. In the question-and answer-session, Acharya commented that the paper should examine the work of Sikkink and should also broaden the scope of the research to analyze how the great powers lost control over the ICC.

During the question-and-answer session, conference participants continued to highlight areas for improvement, debate issues of contention, and raise policy implications. In discussing Kahler's paper, Eric Helleiner, Professor of Political Science at the University of Waterloo, observed that the paper's definition of liberalism could be divided into three variations—18th, 19th, and 20th century. Ramesh Thakur, Professor of International Relations at the Australian National University, added that the volume should examine the distinction between international liberal norms and global liberal norms and how this manifests in differing practices and institutions, and should further analyze what is considered non-liberal and illiberal. In challenging the great convergence thesis on the impact of liberalism on democratization and the rise of the middle class, Acharya highlighted that Singapore is an example of an instance in which the premise has fallen short and that ideas regarding the middle class should be reexamined. One of the policy implications addressed was the US position on not signing on to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, and how this position undermines American standing in terms of their pushing Beijing to sign on and abide by those same rules.



PANEL 3: HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE ENVIRONMENT

Moderator

Judith Shapiro, professor from the Global Environmental Politics Program at the School of International Service, American University

Panelists

Kathryn Sikkink, Regents Professor and the McKnight Presidential Chair in Political Science, University of Minnesota

Sikina Jinnah, Assistant Professor, School of International Service, American University

Discussant

Michael Schroeder, Professorial Lecturer at the School of International Service and Interim Director of the Global Governance, Politics, and Security Program, American University and David Hunter, Professor of Law, Washington College of Law, American University

THIS PANEL'S presentations and discussion focused on issues of human rights and the environment within the framework of global governance. The first presenter was Kathryn Sikkink, who argued that human rights protection is one of the main answers to the question “Why govern?” Human rights issues have been constitutive of the norms of many global and regional governance arrangements, especially in Europe and Latin America. Furthering the argument presented by Chris Reus-Smit that the struggle for human rights played a central role in the creation of a global system of sovereign states, Sikkink argued that there was a new wave of rights which demanded global protection as a global backup for when states violated rights. Therefore, these human rights demands were the drivers for the creation of global and regional organizations.

To support her argument, Sikkink focused on issues in which demand for rights played a significant role: the drafting of the UN Charter and the formation of the Organization of American States and the American Declaration of Human Rights. In addition, Sikkink examined the development of two human rights institutions: a regional institution, the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, and a global organization, the ICC. One of the two main arguments that arose from this examination was that it is primarily normative demands that lead to the global governance outcomes. In human rights, it is harder to pinpoint strategic or functional demands. The second main argument was that normative demands do not come exclusively, or primarily, from the Global North. This argument challenged the notion that the US was the only source of liberal demands.

Human rights issues have been constitutive of the norms of many global and regional governance arrangements.

Sikkink concluded by stating that the area of human rights has seen the emergence of more laws, governance, and enforcement than an issue like the environment has, despite the fact that the human rights issue does not have a common interest or collective action problem as the latter does. Moreover, advances that can be found in other non-rights areas can be attributed to the attractiveness of the human rights norms that are constitutive of the order. Therefore, thinking about rights as constitutive of governing arrangements would help advance this project.

The second presenter, Sikina Jinnah, focused on the issue of governing climate change. For Jinnah, the most fundamental driver for global governance on climate change can be found in its functional demand. Climate change is a collective action problem and thus brings with it the need for long-term collective action as well as the problem of free-riding. Also, there are asymmetries in climate change; the countries expected to face the largest impacts are the least capable of responding and have contributed least to the problem, while many countries with the capability to respond have shown the least political will to do so. However, these functional demands are not being met in the current United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), the central institutional and normative node of global climate governance. Despite that, countries continue to engage in the UNFCCC process, which suggests that there are other demands that drive climate change governance, i.e. strategic, normative, and functional ones (beyond problem-solving). By examining and analyzing the various demands from the core constituencies in UNFCCC politics—great powers, middle powers, emerging economies, least-developed countries, the private sector, and civil society—Jinnah argued that demand varies across and within constituencies. The variance in demand can be explained in

part by domestic political structures and leadership vacuums in understanding of normative demands, economic interests for strategic demands, and severe impacts and access to government benefits for functional demands.

During the discussion session, Schroeder commented that Sikkink's paper highlighted the role of NGOs, the actor-centered demand, and its push for creating a sustained global process. David Hunter, commented on differentiating the thinking between global climate governance and climate governance at the UNFCCC, as the demands and strategic motivations of countries may vary depending on the two frames. In relation, Hunter emphasized two points: that some of the demands for governance are driven by the structure of the UNFCCC, as the structure shapes and limits the ongoing dialogue on climate change, and that there are issue linkages within the UNFCCC which influence demands. Hunter noted in Sikkink's presentation the similarity in sub-set of movements between human rights movements in Latin American countries and the climate justice movement. Acharya called into question the distinction between regional and global actors/action in reference to Sikkink's work. A common theme that ran through both presentations was the powerful demonstration of the demands that arise against the liberal hegemonic order, which was remarked upon by Acharya.



PANEL 4: GLOBAL ECONOMIC GOVERNANCE

Moderator

Daniel Bernhofen, Professor at the School of International Service, American University

Panelists

Eric Helleiner, Faculty of Arts Chair in International Political Economy, University of Waterloo and Balsillie School of International Affairs

Susan K. Sell, Professor of Political Science and International Affairs, George Washington University

Discussants

Randy Henning, Professor at the School of International Service, American University

Gary Hufbauer, Peterson Institute for International Economics

THIS PANEL discussion covered two key themes in global economic governance: first, Eric Helleiner analyzed fiscal governance; second, Susan Sell examined trade governance. Helleiner's discussion of fiscal governance highlighted two contradictory trends evident since the 2008 financial crisis: increased supply of fiscal governance combined with decreased demand. Supply of fiscal governance was increased first through the International Monetary Fund (IMF). In the years leading up to the crisis, the IMF had been perceived as being in decline. In the US it was believed that its lending practices contributed to moral hazard problems, and in emerging markets its conditionality was widely disliked, especially in the wake of the 1997–98 East Asian financial crisis. However, as the 2008 financial crisis deepened, the G-20 leaders voted in 2008 and 2009 to increase the funds available to the organization, to decrease conditionality, and to increase allocation of drawing rights. This dramatically boosted the supply of economic governance available.

The financial crisis did little to reform the IMF, the largest provider of global fiscal governance.

However, despite increased resources and improved terms, demand for IMF loans actually fell during this period. This unexpected countervailing trend may have been the result of a few factors. First, for domestic political reasons, countries avoided borrowing because it carried a stigma. This was especially true in East Asia and Latin America, where countries had additionally had the foresight to build up reserves prior to the crisis, and thus avoided the need to take out stigmatized IMF loans. But even those countries that did find themselves in need of loans preferred to avoid the IMF, instead often turning to the US Federal Reserve for funds that were quick and free of conditionality and stigma. This functionally placed the US Federal Reserve in the position of lender-of-last-resort, unilaterally providing liquidity to mitigate the impacts of the crisis as the stake of the US in the global economy was large enough to motivate this intervention.

Moreover, as the IMF refused to respond to calls from the Global South for governance reform, the desirability of its loans was further reduced in many emerging economies. Though the G-20 leaders initially made rhetorical gestures indicating their willingness to increase the voice of states from the Global South, they never made good on these promises. By 2011, they had passed limited reforms, but the US Congress never approved them. As a result, the financial crisis did little to reform the IMF, the largest provider of global fiscal governance. Instead, solutions were generated bilaterally and regionally, and were often only short term. The most robust solutions were developed regionally, in East Asia and by Brazil, Russia, India, and China. However, this fragmentation served to undermine—rather than support—global governance writ large. Moreover, the US, the largest provider of liquidity during the crisis, was hesitant to institutionalize its role, preferring to continue lending on a discretionary basis.

Financial regulatory governance followed the same pattern: increased supply of governance was combined with reduced demand. This can be seen most clearly by analyzing the development of the Financial Stability Board (FSB), which was created in the wake of the crisis to improve financial regulation. The FSB was an extension of the preceding Financial Stability Forum, which had been created following the Asian financial crisis and which coalesced the major international economic governance bodies with the European Central Bank and financial authorities from the G-7 countries.

However, the institution suffered from a lack of resources and from US opposition until the 2008 crisis. As demands for global regulation increased at home, the US and others finally threw their collective weight behind the enhancement of the organization through the formation of the FSB, creating a new body with expanded membership, a detailed mandate, and a prominent role in developing post-crisis financial regulatory reforms. Timothy Geithner, former US Treasury Secretary, was initially so enthusiastic about the institution that he hailed it as the “fourth pillar” of economic governance, alongside the IMF, the World Bank, and the World Trade Organization (WTO).

Unfortunately, the organization lacked teeth. Despite its robust mandate, it was crippled by a lack of enforcement capacity. Although some advocated making it a treaty-based organization with a WTO-style dispute settlement mechanism, others strongly opposed the idea of delegating this authority to an international body. In the discussion of the paper, Gary Hufbauer, Reginald Jones Senior Fellow at the Peterson Institute for International Economics, argued that “the FSB was born a wimp and will always be a wimp.”

Why was the largest financial crisis in recent history met with such weak reforms to global financial regulatory governance? As regulation became politicized domestically, and governments recognized that bailouts and other response measures were going to have to be handled unilaterally, there was a growing distrust of any shift of regulatory authority to the supranational level. The result has been an increased preference for host country regulations and domestic solutions. Helleiner argued that these developments undermine and fragment the global system of economic governance rather than strengthen it.

Why was the largest financial crisis in recent history met with such weak reforms to global financial regulatory governance?

Sell’s presentation focused on trade governance and highlighted parallel trends, most notably the tendency towards the fragmentation of global governance. Starting by recognizing the role trade plays in lifting people out of poverty, Sell described this fragmentation in trade governance as an extremely worrying trend and argued that the demand for trade governance comes from a few different sources. There is the functional demand for coordination combined with the power politics demands of great powers for concessions from other countries. There has also been a strong normative component supported by belief in the superiority of capitalism and free trade. Sometimes, however, these demands can contradict one another. Functional demands for free trade backed by power politics may overlook normative claims about the social purpose of trade. These contradictions create friction points around which WTO negotiations have often broken down.

The interests of the US strongly influenced the structure of the original post-WWII General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, with its focus on promoting capitalism, developing overseas markets, and lifting post-war economies out of poverty while simultaneously protecting domestic industries such as agriculture and textile production. This uneasy arrangement persisted with minor disruptions until the Uruguay Round, when a variety of new issues were added to the trade agenda. A broad quid pro quo was established whereby developing economies would accept an Agreement

on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPs) in exchange for the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) countries opening their markets to trade in textile and agricultural products. Since the negotiations also established the new WTO institutions, organizations were pressured into accepting these agreements if they wanted to join the new regime. Unfortunately, years after the agreement, OECD countries have yet to uphold their end of the bargain.

The Doha Round was initiated with the goal of addressing grievances developing countries had stemming from the Uruguay Round of negotiations. Most notably, the impact of TRIPs on limiting access to HIV/AIDS care was strongly criticized, leading to the Doha Declaration on the TRIPs Agreement and Public Health. Developing countries also pushed for reduced agricultural subsidies in OECD countries. In the context of a continued stalemate on a variety of issues, the focus of the negotiations has turned to the more limited agenda of trade facilitation and the removal of red tape.

In response to the malfunctioning global system, many states have resorted to new modes and forums for negotiation. Forum shifting has occurred both vertically and horizontally. Countries have shifted vertically from global-level negotiations to bilateral and multilateral trade agreements. Though perhaps more efficient, the result has often been the diminution of the bargaining power of developing states, which are tied in to much more extensive treaty commitments than they would prefer. Horizontal forum shifting has also been prevalent, moving stagnant agenda items into forums where they are likely to receive more support from like-minded states. Unfortunately, this often comes at the cost of transparency and multilateral engagement.

In response to the malfunctioning global system, many states have resorted to new modes and forums for negotiation.

In terms of negotiating the future challenges of global trade governance, Sell advocated an approach that takes seriously the social purpose of trade, and that recognizes the domestic concerns and constraints faced by developing states. The vast majority of the world's population is poor, and they are more concerned with access to agricultural markets for their goods

and with access to generic life-saving drugs than they are with the institutional rules or arrangements of decision making. Trade negotiations are ongoing and long term, and the process is therefore extremely important. Deals reached today may be inadequate to address future challenges—as was made all too clear by the emergence of the HIV/AIDS pandemic and its implications on intellectual property rules negotiated prior to its emergence. Moreover, Sell highlighted that “legitimacy is a process, not a thing.” Legitimacy cannot be achieved in global trade governance unless there is room for contestation, especially by those who were marginalized when the rules were first created, and it must be based on a clear articulation of the social purpose of trade that must be protected and advocated above institutional rules.

The discussion of the papers, led by Randy Henning, Professor at the School of International Service, and by Gary Hufbauer, raised a variety of interesting questions: what qualifies as global governance? How global must it be to qualify? What actors can be involved? Alternative forums of governance were discussed in both papers, but were generally viewed as fragmenting global governance rather than supporting it. Sikkink pointed out that this was the opposite of the conclusion reached by Robert

Keohane, who assumes that regime complex models can actually be a superior solution. Sell's response was that in the realm of trade governance, complex forums may be effective in terms of reaching agreements, but they reduce transparency and decrease the ability of developing states to be heard. Moreover, an exclusive focus on global regimes may lead us to ignore differentiated outcomes in regional forums: Henning noted in his discussion of financial governance that if we looked at EU institutions after the crisis, we would see extremely high levels of demand for global governance. How do we interpret cases where regional solutions are politically more tenable? Does fragmented demand for governance undermine or support the demand for governance globally?



PANEL 5: HUMAN SECURITY

Moderator

Amitav Acharya, Professor of International Relations,
School of International Service, American University

Panelists

Alexander Betts, University Lecturer, University of Oxford

Andrew Mack, Director of the Human Security Report
Project (HSRP), Simon Fraser University

Ramesh Thakur, Director of the Centre for Nuclear Non-
Proliferation and Disarmament, Crawford School of Public
Policy, The Australian National University.

Discussants

Randolph Persaud, Associate Professor of International
Relations, School of International Service, American
University

Elizabeth Ferris, co-director of the Brookings-LSE Project
on Internal Displacement and a senior fellow in foreign
policy

Boaz Atzili, Assistant Professor at the School of
International Service, American University

THE THREE PRESENTATIONS in this panel discussed global governance of threats to global security and focused on areas where the strongest benefits of governance accrue to individuals in conflict areas—those who generally have only weak power resources to advocate for themselves globally. As such, the power demands for governance have often been weaker than the normative demands.

Alexander Betts led a discussion of the global refugee regime which was built directly on Acharya’s framework of analysis, focusing on three types of demand for global governance: political, functional, and normative. Betts’ central claim was related to the complementarities of demand: where global governance regimes are founded on only one source of demand, or where the sources of demand are contradictory, the regimes will be inherently unstable. In contrast, where all three forms of demand are present and complementary, the regime will be strong and sustainable. In addition, his hierarchy of demand hypothesis stated that while functional and normative sources of demand can open up opportunities for reform, they must be supported by power-based sources of demand in order to persist. By the same token, power-based sources of demand may be enough to trigger change, but this change will be uneven and selective unless it is backed by normative or functional imperatives.

To support these arguments, Betts presented a within-case analysis of the history of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), focusing on six historical junctures of reform within which the organization’s mandate was altered. Each of these junctures differed in the sources of demand for reform and in the sustainability and robustness of the reforms once they were initiated. The first two changes to the mandate were prompted by functional needs but later achieved complementary power-based mandates: the first was the need to prolong its existence past the immediate post-WWII context; the second was the need to expand its geographical scope. The extension to the UNHCR’s period of existence was initially proposed for pragmatic reasons, but as the institution proved its worth to the US in the Cold War context, it obtained a powerful ally that supported its efforts. Similarly, while the initial demand to expand in geographical scope was a functional response to refugee-generating conflicts farther afield, over time they obtained the support of the international state system and finally had their mandate expanded in the 1967 Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees update made to the 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees.

Where global governance regimes are founded on only one source of demand, or where the sources of demand are contradictory, the regimes will be inherently unstable.

The next two changes were initiated by power-political shifts, including support for regional solutions in the 1980s and the shift towards a humanitarian relief mandate in the 1990s. The UNHCR’s creation of regional solutions in the 1980s was encouraged almost exclusively by the US, the emerging global hegemon. While these solutions were highly successful at the time, they did not become an enduring part of the organization’s mandate and have not been replicated. The shift towards engaging in repatriation work was similarly backed by a variety of states in the international system demanding governance for the repatriation of people dislocated during the Cold War. Though the organization was successful in meeting those challenges, this new role has been widely challenged and has still failed to obtain the same backing as its traditional protection mandate.

Finally, the last two shifts in the UNHCR’s mandate have been heavily normatively driven and have lacked power-political support, and as a result they have had unstable legacies. Demand for the inclusion of internally-displaced persons under its mandate was generated almost exclusively by normative calls made by nongovernmental actors, and was never fully institutionalized through formal channels. Similarly, in the 2000s, the UNHCR turned its gaze towards victims of natural disaster and climate change, largely due to normative demands. But again, this branch of operations, though expanded, has not received the support of the most powerful actors in the international system, and thus has been unsustainable.

When do states respond to NGO demand, and when do NGOs or other “normative” actors get a larger voice because they are associated with powerful states?

A key issue raised in the discussion by both Miles Kahler and Elizabeth Ferris was how difficult it is to distinguish between sources of demand for governance and between demand and supply of governance: when do states respond to NGO demand, and when do NGOs or other “normative” actors get a larger voice because they are associated with powerful states? Ferris raised the possibility that US preferences were influential in

shaping each of these junctures, not just those identified as power-politics driven. Furthermore, how do we judge the actions of global governance organizations? Especially to the degree that they reflect the desires of powerful states, in Acharya’s words, do we expect them to be “good, bad, or indifferent?”

The presentation made by Andrew Mack focused on the role of UN initiatives in reducing instances of violence in the post-Cold War era. Mack charted the emergence of UN activism to promote global security and made a case for its effectiveness to date despite its recognized inefficiencies. Mack further highlighted the issue of data collection as the biggest barrier to continued activism in this area.

The end of the Cold War marked a significant shift not only in the structure of global politics, but also in the role of the UN. Civil wars became the dominant focus of the UN system in this new era, and conflict in general has steadily declined since the start of the post-Cold War era, which Mack attributed to the renewed ability of the UN to initiate security-related policy initiatives. Mack argued that although they have been marked by numerous failures and inefficiencies, in aggregate, UN security initiatives have been effective and their sheer number has guaranteed a measure of success.

One specific UN initiative of note has been the International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding (ID), created in 2008, which is a multi-stakeholder process aimed at addressing the security and development challenges faced by post-conflict and fragile states. Though the intent was to put the fragile states in the driver’s seat of the institution, the ID has largely broken down along North/South lines. Interestingly, one of the points of contention has been the perceived need for data collection to support evidence-based policy. A caucus group of fragile states known as the g7+ has strongly opposed the use of cross-national surveys and other data collection tools.

This methodological breakdown is surprising to outside observers, but is rooted in the g7+ group's insistence that cross-national survey methods will ignore the unique national contexts of fragility.

Moreover, there is evidence that similar cross-national initiatives (most notably the UN's Millennium Development Goals) have been biased against struggling regions such as sub-Saharan Africa. There are also fears that being labeled as having bad governance would lead to decreased access to aid resources. Mack argued that these fears are legitimate, and yet a compromise must be reached whereby sensitive and well-designed metrics can be collected but must be supported by qualitative country-specific research. The alternative is for the ID to stagnate, which would be unfortunate given the important role the UN and its institutions have played in reducing global conflict.

In his discussion of this paper, Boaz Atzili raised concerns about the interpretation of the declining rates of violence globally, questioning to what degree these are actually the result of UN activism. Might they just be the byproduct of a general decline in violence over the past thousand years, as suggested by Steven Pinker and Joshua Goldstein? And to what extent have interstate wars really diminished in relevance? Finally, Acharya raised the concern that the ID might be an example of fragmentation in global governance. What would the broader meaning be for the global governance of conflict prevention?

Thakur addressed similar questions relating to the prevention of war and specifically to humanitarian crises and atrocities. However, in contrast to Mack, Thakur focused more on political barriers to effective governance than on informational ones. Thakur argued that global governance fills five analytical gaps: knowledge, norms, policies, institutions, and compliance. Thakur used this framework to highlight challenges in the global governance of humanitarian atrocities such as genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes, and ethnic cleansing.

Once norms are generated, the next step is developing policy.

Regarding the body of knowledge on atrocities, there is a great deal of information about the predisposing risk factors for humanitarian atrocities, but they are often too broad to be actionable. We lack an understanding of what causes the critical shift from predisposition to risk to being triggered to commit atrocities. For example, we know that the majority of atrocities take place within the context of armed conflict. But action cannot be taken on these grounds, because it is not true that the majority of armed conflicts lead to atrocities. Better early warning and response mechanisms are needed. Only once such knowledge is generated can new norms about global governance emerge. In the area of atrocity prevention, the Protection of Civilians and the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) are the two clearest examples of a shift towards viewing sovereignty and intervention as complementary rather than contradictory. Both demonstrate a commitment at the UN level to protect lives, rather than just rights.

Once norms are generated, the next step is developing policy. In the case of R2P, the road from

norm (2001) to globally endorsed policy (2005) was a complicated and politically charged journey. Though many argue that the 2005 World Summit Outcome Document represented a watered-down version of R2P—“R2P lite”—Thakur outlined that in fact it just brought R2P in line with existing international norms. The document contained unambiguous acceptance of the state’s responsibility to protect citizens from atrocities, and a promise to take action, even though a Security Council mandate is required. One of the largest challenges is bridging demands for peace versus justice.

R2P has been institutionalized through a variety of structures, most notably the UN Joint Office of the Special Adviser on the Prevention of Genocide and the Special Adviser on the Responsibility to Protect, but also in a range of national and local offices. Thakur argued that atrocity prevention could often be best supported by civil society groups, and that these groups must be integrated into the institutional architecture.

Finally, the issue of compliance is potentially the most challenging. Intervention is not an either/or matter: military intervention should be the last resort, not the only available option, and while such intervention should not be taken off of the table, it is important to consider alternatives. The ICC has also been important in enforcing atrocity prevention, but it has met with a number of valid critiques. First, the importance of the special prosecutor should not be overlooked. Second, it has disproportionately neglected Africa (for example, the Western officials potentially responsible for war crimes in Iraq). Selective universal justice is an oxymoron. Finally, there are problematic links between law and politics. The UN Security Council votes on the referral of members to the ICC despite many members not having joined the ICC.

Persaud praised the framework presented by Thakur, but noted a few reservations: in practicality, he doubted whether it was feasible to predict the “point of inflection” at which a crisis becomes an atrocity, and he worried about trying too many intermediate steps before committing to military action in cases of atrocities. Persaud also raised the question of how the role of leadership fits into this framework for understanding global governance.



PANEL 6: GLOBAL HEALTH, CIVICS, AND CYBERSPACE

Moderator

Conor Seyle, Associate Director for Research and Development, One Earth Future Foundation

Panelists

David P. Fidler, Louis Calamaras Professor of Law, Indiana University Maurer School of Law

Hakan Altınay, Nonresident Senior Fellow, Brookings Institution

Derrick L. Cogburn, Associate Professor, School of International Service, American University

Discussant

Aaron Boesenecker, Assistant Professor at the School of International Service, American University

THIS PANEL session focused on three issue areas of global governance: health, civics, and cyberspace. The panel’s first presenter, David P. Fidler, explored health as a global governance issue, suggesting that health is traditionally viewed as a low politics problem. He argued that the three demand factors—strategic, functional, and normative—are interrelated (and named demand dyads), and that the dynamic between the demands changes over time and depending on the type of health issue.

Fidler explained that the demand for governance in health first emerged in the latter half of the 19th century, and by 1948 the World Health Organization (WHO) was established. The WHO pushing the agenda of “health for all” at that time was driven largely by interrelated normative and strategic demands. However, this agenda was not successful, and since the 1990s there has been a new demand for global health governance. One notable aspect of the recent revolution in global health governance is the role the Gates Foundation plays. The Gates Foundation has had great impact on the three demand factors, and has the power to change the context of global health governance. Since the revolution, Fidler pointed out, there has been a search for a new architecture of global health governance, including the reform of the WHO. In addition, health is now on the agenda of the G-20 along with climate change. In reviewing the trajectory of global health governance in terms of three demand factors, Fidler suggested that there are some identifiable patterns: shifts in the three interrelated demand factors have led to an increase in interest in health issues by greater powers, an evolution of functional capabilities, and changes in the normative landscape; there has been a “demand cascade” which has in turn been sustained by competition among the different demands. In conclusion, Fidler argued that the prospects for reforming global health governance are rather gloomy, complicated by problems such as the decreased interest of great powers, a halt in functional innovations, the disappearance of normative diversification, and the increased influence of the Gates Foundation.

***Communication can
elicit evolutionary
norms for cooperation
and civics.***

The second issue in global civics was addressed by Hakan Altinay. Altinay argued that the greater interdependencies of today call for global civics, a meta-narrative and normative framework which overcome the global veil of ignorance. Today’s interdependency has led to our lives being influenced by others we do not know, and this must be taken into consideration when we think of Global Governance 2.0, a shift from the previous version, Global Governance 1.0, which occurs without the help of anyone, as in the example of civil aviation. Altinay explained that Global Governance 2.0 requires all people to have far more understanding of what is going on around the world, for example on issues of climate change and responses to mass atrocities. For instance, in a mass atrocity people are exposed to each other’s grief through internet communication and it becomes difficult to remain indifferent. Altinay argued that in such cases people cannot remain oblivious to demands from around the world, as there is a responsibility toward people with whom we share our destinies. Altinay suggested that norms are key in thinking about global civics, and that communication can elicit evolutionary norms for cooperation and civics. Last, Altinay pointed out that the demand is in the future, and Global Governance 2.0 cannot be achieved without global civics.

The last issue for this session focused on cyberspace. Derrick Cogburn explored the medium through which cyberspace becomes enabled—the internet—and framed the discussion in terms of internet governance.

The need for internet governance arises from the disjuncture between the increase in the number of users and the extent of their use of internet and a lack of understanding the meaning of internet. Cogburn explained that the enormously complicated underlying process of internet is the focus of global internet governance. Governing the global internet is a challenging process, as domain names and IP addresses are scarce resources that are distributed globally, and it is further complicated by the question of who controls the root zone files. To meet this challenge, several governance mechanisms have been established, such as the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers, the International Telecommunications Union, the Global Alliance on Information and Communication Technologies and Development, and the Internet Governance Forum. Cogburn explained that the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers has been at the center of internet governance. Another key point made was that the common feature of these internet governance arrangements is the large amount of interest and engagement in multi-stakeholderism. Cogburn concluded by stating that the existing mechanisms to govern the internet work extremely well but are still unable to satisfy the demands, thus the efforts to improve global internet governance are ongoing.

In the discussion session, Aaron Boesenecker provided comments on all three presentations. The common threads binding all three presentations were the ideas of fragmentation, a question of actors (i.e., who the demanders are), and norms. On Fidler’s presentation, Boesenecker remarked that the politics of contestations are an important part of the discussion on demand dyads, and have a role in revolutionizing health governance, which involves both innovations and fragmentations. Boesenecker commented that Altinay’s work highlights the importance of norms in global governance, and suggested further investigation into the actors who will lead the shift to Global Governance 2.0, the processes of contestation in discussing norms, and the relationship between global civics and rules for governance. On Cogburn’s presentation, Boesenecker observed that the discussion on current fragmentation in global internet governance can be strengthened by including the various perspectives of each group of actors.

The enormously complicated underlying process of internet is the focus of global internet governance.

The discussion involving all participants provided several key insights. In referring to the influential role that the Gates Foundation, as a nonstate actor, plays in global health governance, Acharya questioned whether this can be considered a case of power shift from one hegemon to a private hegemon. Fidler added that the shift may be explained by the state hegemon allowing the private hegemon to take its place. Related to this idea, Deudney suggested that the project should include a comment on the role of private actors with wealth and how they are dominant players in the global ecosystem of regimes and organizations. Also, as this panel session highlighted the idea of fragmentation and contestation in international governance, Gutner remarked that the project might be able to bring in other global governance issue areas that are currently left out, and that the relationship between powerful actors and norms could be further explored.

Working Luncheon

The working luncheon began with Marcel Arsenault, Chairman and Founder of the One Earth Future Foundation, addressing the conference participants on his vision for the foundation, the need to foster a lasting legacy, and a mandate to invest in the ideas that will shape the future. One debate that arose during the luncheon focused on the relationship between the study of international relations and global governance and the need to come to a consensus on the definition of global governance. Among the scholars in attendance there was wide agreement that the study of global governance is still lacking theoretically and in academic institutions. A major area of common agreement and a key point throughout the conference was the need to go beyond nation-state centric analysis to focus on other actors and examine both norm entrepreneurs and norm followers.

In concluding the luncheon, several key policy implications were addressed. The first was the need to produce policy-relevant research and get it into the hands of policymakers. Second, as Gutner and Deudney emphasized, some international institutions have been stretched far too thin and have gone beyond what their original mandates intended. Global governance being found lacking in terms of dealing with world problems may be a result of institutions having been overburdened by an expansive scope of activities.

Next Steps: Five Policy Ideas

Although the “Why Govern?” conference was not explicitly geared toward formulating specific policy guidelines, several issues were identified that could be used as the basis for generating policy ideas and debate over global governance.

First and foremost, **assessing demand matters in terms of making global governance more responsive and legitimate to the stakeholders.** The demand for global governance is neither linear nor uniform across issue areas. Hence, taking stock of the sense of demand is critical to the ability of policymakers to formulate appropriate and workable structures of global governance.

It is important to identify what causes the demand for global governance, who the key demanders are, why they seek what they seek, and to what extent their demand influences and shapes the provisioning of global public goods. These questions, which were indeed central to the conference, have not received serious systematic attention in the academic and policy literature on global governance. Research on the demand side of global governance has been scarce, especially in relation to issues such as who the global governors are and what the institutions of global governance are. While these questions are important, answers to them cannot be complete without an examination of the demand side of global governance.

An unfortunate consequence of this neglect of demand is that too often, policy initiatives undertaken in order to reform and restructure global governance end up failing efficiency and legitimacy tests. This is especially the case when many of the existing “suppliers” of global governance, whether they are individual powers like the US or institutions dominated by such powers, suffer from a “democratic deficit” and use their own interests, preferences, and even ideologies to manage and shape reform. Since demand is not just a utilitarian element, but one that has social purpose, it is all the more important to find a closer fit between the demand and supply of global governance as an important corrective to the current situation.

Many recent attempts to reform global governance structures, for example the changes made to the IMF’s voting allocations or the membership of the G-20, show a disjuncture between the perspectives of the demanders and the suppliers (or would-be suppliers, such as some of the emerging powers). While national governments and think-tanks conduct opinion surveys to assess the demand, they usually focus on domestic public goods, not international ones. International opinion surveys conducted by think-tanks usually look for trends of relative standing in countries like the US, China, and Japan; examples include the polls on the perceptions of major powers conducted by the Chicago Council on Global Affairs, or the examination of the perceptions Indians have of the major powers that was conducted by the Lowy Institute for International Policy.¹

Companies routinely demand surveys to assess the market for their private goods, but such surveys are rarely done by international institutions in delivering their public goods. Yet, the method private companies use to assess the targets of and audiences for their products could be used by think-tanks and international institutions to make their roles in global governance more responsive and efficient. New ways of regularly assessing demand—including surveys and **the creation of a Global Governance Demand Monitoring System or Index**, which would utilize inputs (perhaps through self-reporting) from its diverse constituents, including governments, NGOs, the private sector, regional bodies, etc., and incorporate them into existing or new governance structures—would not only enhance the legitimacy of global governance initiatives, but would also make them more effective. Giving more consideration to the demand side of global governance is also important in addressing the legitimacy-efficacy dilemma whereby attempts to expand the participation in decision-making in global governance structures might make them more complex and risk undermining their efficiency, whereas keeping participation limited might lead to enhanced efficiency but make them seem unrepresentative and undemocratic.

Second, strengthening global governance by developing an accurate picture of demand is contingent upon the availability of reliable and usable information. Accessibility of information cannot always be taken for granted; many issues of global governance are complex and fluid, and they are often related to events in remote areas where travel and access to information are scarce. Generating real-time, reliable, and accurate information on humanitarian emergencies, the vast majority of which occur in the developing world, is particularly challenging, as the papers by Mack and Thakur demonstrated. In other cases, data remains contested, as with climate change. Hence **projects that generate reliable and actionable information, either by supporting or creating data sources (as the Human Security Report project led by Andrew Mack does) are important.**

Moreover, it is not enough to just collect information on casualty figures or on the extent and causes of climate change; that information should be supplemented by research on the adequacy of measures to mitigate global threats—in other words, on governance measures. Hence, **the initiative to develop a Human Security Governance Index, drawing on a recent effort in India, should be explored.** A single global database, while important, might not capture the nuances of the myriad regional and local challenges and might not serve the needs of national and regional authorities. Therefore **there is a need to supplement this with regional indexes and databases, such as the Human Security Governance Index and the Human Security Mapping in Conflict Zones project which has been done on a regional and local basis in India.**²

Such initiatives constitute an important area of policy suggestion from this conference. Such data should not be generated for its own sake, but should be made available quickly to global decision makers, both through internet-based sources and more direct “when asked for or required” forms for policymakers, including those who may not have enough in-house capacity to generate them. A related problem is that in some cases, there is multiplicity of sources; lacking ways to compare sources while different information providers all compete to highlight their own output and prove their own points can result in information from alternative sources being obscured. This problem is compounded by the fact that almost all the information providers are normatively oriented, with their own purposes, agendas, and interests in certain outcomes. In such cases, objectivity can be hard to come by. In these cases, data comparison and synthesis become vital, and there are, as yet, not many agencies that perform this function. **An overall Global Governance Information Clearinghouse, dealing with specific or multiple issue areas, could be an important contribution to strengthening global governance.**

A third policy issue that emerged was a consideration of the roles of powerful states relative to those of materially weaker actors in global governance. The forthcoming edited volume will explore this theme further. Overall, this demonstrates something interesting about the role of power in global governance and the future of the “American-led liberal hegemonic order.” A key policy implication is that those concerned with the future of global governance, both state and nonstate, should not conflate that future with the immediate question of the so-called US decline, but should instead focus on specific ways to reform and strengthen global governance with or without American dominance of the global order.

The two issues are not the same. The idea, as argued by John Ikenberry in his influential book *Liberal Leviathan: the Origins, Crisis, and Transformation of the American World Order*, that there formerly existed an American-led liberal hegemonic order which provided the public goods that underpinned many existing global governance structures, has a mythical quality about it. The fact that global governance can be demanded and managed by actors other than the US, including other liberal Western actors and non-Western actors, creates more hope for an orderly transition from the unipolar moment than there is commonly assumed to be. But **the international community should actively explore the various combinations of agents and actors in global governance, including mixed or hybrid forms of agencies and structures**, that depend not on the hegemony of a single nation, but on coalitions and networks that cut across the divides that have hitherto been North-South, East-West.

As discussed, one key theme to emerge from the discussion was the focus on creative fragmentation. Because the study of such fragmentation is not well developed, it is difficult to identify specific policy recommendations from the acknowledgment of this theme. Some scholars, such as Lisbiet Hooghe and Gary Marks, have argued that fragmented systems may be more flexible and responsive to stakeholder needs relative to larger and more centralized systems, while others have argued that they may be inefficient and susceptible to hampering the distribution of public goods. The discussion in this workshop suggested that regardless of effectiveness, a move towards fragmented systems may reflect the demand of institutional stakeholders. More discussion is needed about where fragmented systems are useful and how they may apply in a variety of different issue areas. One policy recommendation is therefore **a call for a global institutional roundtable on how fragmentation can be turned into opportunity for the regeneration of global governance**. While more research is certainly needed about the role of fragmentation in perceptions of effectiveness and legitimacy, the results of this workshop suggested that fragmentation should be acknowledged as a feature in global governance.

The roles of regional bodies in global governance were also covered. As discussed in the key themes, regional institutions face many of the same structural challenges and stakeholder demands that global institutions face. Regional bodies can represent laboratories for different structures and approaches for meeting transnational demand, and can be both precursors to larger global institutions and the products of the fragmentation of such institutions. As such, greater focus on regional institutions in the study of global governance could provide lessons about the growth, development, and outcomes of transnational governing regimes. One practical recommendation is that **further research into the variety of ways in which regional groups can contribute to global governance would be valuable, and policymakers in global institutions should look for lessons from regional institutions that are dealing with issues similar to those in their own areas of concern**.

NOTES

- ¹ Mattoo, Amitabh with Rory Medcalf, “How the World Looks from India,” *The Hindu*, May 20, 2013. Available at: <http://www.thehindu.com/opinion/op-ed/how-the-world-looks-from-india/article4730431.ece>.
- ² A case for such a regionalized Human Security Index and Human Security Governance Index, and Human Security Mapping in Conflict Zones, was made by Amitav Acharya in his speech at the *Informal Thematic Debate of the 65th Session of the United Nations General Assembly on Human Security* on April 14, 2011. See: <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2011/ga11072.doc.htm>, and <http://www.un.org/en/ga/president/65/initiatives/Human%20Security/Amitav%20Acharya%20UNGA%20Human%20Security%20Debate%20Presentation.pdf>. See also: Acharya, Amitav, with Subrat K. Singhdeo and M. Rajaretnam, Eds., *Human Security: From Concept to Practice* (Singapore and London: World Scientific, 2011).

The One Earth Future Foundation was founded in 2007 with the goal of supporting research and practice in the area of peace and governance. OEF provides active operational, research, and strategic support, allowing our programs to focus deeply on complex problems and create constructive alternatives to violent conflict.

Research materials from OEF envision improved governance structures and policy options, analyze and document the performance of existing governance institutions, and provide intellectual support to the field operations of our implementation projects. Our active field projects apply our research outputs to existing governance challenges, particularly those causing threats to peace and security. Our approach is flexible, imaginative, and yet carefully grounded in intellectual and practical analysis that informs policy-oriented applications.

The OEF conference report series provides a synthetic review of the discussion that happens at OEF-sponsored events.



ONE EARTH FUTURE FOUNDATION
525 Zang Street, Suite A
Broomfield, CO 80021 USA
Ph. +1.303.533.1715 Fax +1 303.309.0386



ONE EARTH FUTURE FOUNDATION
525 Zang Street, Suite A
Broomfield, CO 80021 USA
Ph. +1.303.533.1715 Fax +1 303.309.0386