



COUNCIL on
FOREIGN
RELATIONS

International Institutions and Global Governance Program



The
Stanley
Foundation

The Fifth Annual Princeton Workshop on Global Governance “Order and Disorder in Today’s Global Order”

June 4-5, 2015

This workshop is the fifth in an annual series on global governance co-sponsored by the Project on the Future of Multilateralism (WWS) at Princeton University, the Global Summitry Project at the Munk School of Global Affairs, University of Toronto, The International Institutions and Global Governance Program, Council on Foreign Relations and the Stanley Foundation. This year the Workshop returns to Princeton and will take place at the Woodrow Wilson School, beginning at 9.30 on Thursday 4th June and ending at lunchtime on Friday 5th June. The format will be brief (maximum 8 minute) opening remarks by panelists followed by free-flowing discussion.

Over the last number of years, beginning in 2010, this Workshop has brought together academicians, international and national officials media and policy experts to explore the evolving state of global governance and global summitry. While the Workshop has shifted from a more academic to a more policy approach, as the agendas describe, the Princeton Workshop has always sought to expose the current state of global institutions and policy making that make up global governance and global summitry.

This year we believe will be no different. We hope there will be intense dialogue around the current state of global institutions and global governance decision-making.

The theme for the Workshop this year is the state of order and disorder in the global system. As Richard Haass of the Council on Foreign Relations has written recently:

Indeed, with US hegemony waning but no successor waiting to pick up the baton, the likeliest future is one in which the current international system gives way to a disorderly one with a larger number of power centers acting with increasing autonomy, paying less heed to US interests and preferences. This will cause new problems even as it makes existing ones more difficult to solve. In short, the post-Cold War order is unraveling, and while not perfect, it will be missed.

The panels this year are designed to critically examine the apparent rising disorder - from the return of geopolitics, to the rise of counter-hegemonic internationalism, to the threats and actions of jihadism. Is the old order passing away and a disorderly world replacing the previous global order? What are the consequences for all actors in the global system with the possible rise in disorder?

Day One: Thursday, June 4

Robertson Hall, Room 016 (lower level)

From 9.30: Coffee

10.00 - 10.15: Sponsors and Opening Remarks

Alan Alexandroff (Munk School, University of Toronto)

John Ikenberry (Princeton University)

Stewart Patrick (Council on Foreign Relations)

Keith Porter (The Stanley Foundation)

10:15– 11:45: Panel One: Has Geopolitics ended Global Governance

Many commentators and experts have pointed to the return of geopolitics and the impact of this ‘return’ on global governance. Martin Indyk and our own panelist Bruce Jones recently launched a new Brookings initiative [called ‘Order from Chaos’](#). They have described the consequences of the return this way:

For a quarter century, the world has experienced an era of growing global interdependence and relative peace and prosperity, brought about largely through the leadership of the United States and in the absence of genuine geopolitical competition. Now, though, several fundamental challenges to that order have emerged: in Europe, Russia seeks to undo the post-Cold War settlement through aggression; in Asia, the rise of an assertive China is generating friction; and in the Middle East, the American-led order is collapsing.

Is global governance undermined by Russia’s actions in the Ukraine and possibly elsewhere in Eastern Europe, including newly built NATO states? What are the US and EU responses to the actions by Russia in the Ukraine? And where does that leave serious global governance issues including, among others, nuclear non-proliferation and economic and international financial management?

And what should US strategy be toward China and East relations generally? Is it really the case that China is unwilling to play a ‘responsible stakeholder’ role in the global system?

Chair: John Ikenberry (Princeton University)

Daniel Deudney (Johns Hopkins University)

David Gordon (Eurasia Group)

Michael Mastanduno (Dartmouth College)

Andrew Moravcsik (Princeton University)

11.45 - 12.00: Break

12.00 – 13.30: Panel Two: The World of Order and Disorder - Global Economic Governance

There would appear to be a significant divide among experts and officials over whether the global economic institutions and the behavior of the great powers especially the G20 Leaders and their officials successfully navigated the global financial crisis. Of the group Dan is the most positive over the efforts of the G20 and the success in avoiding a new great depression. Eric and Jonathan suggest that it was the US Federal Reserve that ‘saved everyone’s bacon’ at the time of the crisis. Eric at the time hoped for a major financial and economic institutional restructuring of the global economy but little occurred notwithstanding the potential for global economic ‘meltdown’.

Seven years later and the global economy seems to be struggling along. Growth in many of the established powers – EU and Japan - remains anemic and now some of the large emerging market countries have experienced a significant slowing in their economies. Many suggest the financial institutional reforms are inadequate and the G20 economic efforts (Brisbane Action Plan) are unlikely to provide the economic stimulus required for the global economy. Persistently low interest rates seem to be distorting the global economy.

What is the state of the global economy and why? Does the decline in US economic leadership explain the dearth of collaboration? Or possibly the failure of the G20? And if the G20 is unable to achieve greater cooperation where can greater collaboration come from?

Chair: Alan S Alexandroff (Munk School of Global Affairs)

Dan Drezner (Tufts University)

Henry Farrell (George Washington University)

Eric Helleiner (University of Waterloo)

Jonathan Kirshner (Cornell University)

13.30-14.30: Lunch

14.30 – 16.00: Panel Three: Is Liberal Internationalism Doomed – the Counter-Hegemonic Internationalism

Chair: John Ikenberry (Princeton University)

Miles Kahler (American University)

Julia Morse (Princeton University)

Mihaela Papa (Tufts University)

Tom Wright (Brookings Institution)

16.00 – 16.15: Break

16.15 – 17:45: Panel Four: Geopolitics in Asia

The geopolitical tensions in this region contrast perhaps significantly from those identified in Panel One. These tensions revolve around the Great Powers most particularly the China-US relationship arguably the most important relationship in the early 21st century. In a rather classic mode there are traditional tensions in the South China Sea with various territorial claims including the rather expansive China claims based on the 9-dash line. These tensions include US allies such as the Philippines but more recent 'friends', namely Vietnam. For quite separate reasons there continue to be tensions over competing claims in the East China Sea that draw in close US allies the Republic of Korea and most especially Japan. These competing claims among China, Taiwan, Korea and Japan are made more complicated for the United States by the competing claims among US allies.

Nevertheless these tensions have the prospect of drawing the US into direct opposition to China and its potential military actions.

If these traditional tensions are not sufficient there are strong trade and investment tensions between the US and China. Across a host of possible trade and investment agreements in East Asia, the US and China appear to be in competition. As President Obama stated in his most recent State of the Union, “China wants to write the rules for the world’s fastest-growing region. That would put our workers and businesses at a disadvantage. Why would we let that happen? We should write the rules”. The US has raised concerns over China’s New Silk Road Project – ‘One belt, One road’ that China has earmarked recently some \$62 billion for its policy banks. The US raised opposition over the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB), and China and the US have promoted different trade and investment agreements including the Trans Pacific Partnership (TPP), the Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership (RCEP), The Free Trade Agreement of the Asia Pacific (FTAAP).

President Xi will undertake his first State visit to the United States in September. Can these leaders, or how can the leaders build greater cooperation – and over what – in this Great Power relationship of great consequence? Is this a moment for sidestepping the issues of growing competition? Or by necessity must these leaders tackle these key security, trade and investment issues? And if so, how?

Chair: Alan S Alexandroff (The Munk School of Global Affairs)

Victor Cha (Georgetown University)

He Fan (Chinese Academy of Social Sciences)

Scott Kennedy (Center for Strategic and International Studies)

Hongying Wang (University of Waterloo)

19:00: Drinks

Prospect House (First Floor - Library)

19:30: Dinner and the Keynote Address (First Floor - Presidential Dining Room)

Charles Kupchan, Senior Director for European Affairs, National Security Council

Day Two: Friday, June 5th

Robertson Hall, Room 016 (lower level)

8:00 – 10:00: Breakfast and Special Workshop – Climate Change Governance

In 2011 Bob Keohane and David Victor identified new multilateral constructs especially for climate change governance. As they argued at the time: “Serious international cooperation is emerging “bottom up” because integrated “top down” institutions have been too difficult to craft.” Today, the rage in policymaking for climate change governance is ‘bottom up’ strategies for managing climate change. But do ‘bottom up’ systems actually work? In new research by David and Charles Sabel they argue that such constructs work only when accompanied with institutions that are specifically designed to promote an “experimentalist” approach to governance. This style of governance, which can be particularly effective in conditions of high uncertainty, involves setting provisional goals and actively promoting diverse efforts to solve problems. It requires that big, complex problems be decomposed into smaller units where firms and regulators and other key players can focus. And it requires active learning. The run up to COP21 Paris is doing well on some of these fronts—such as decomposition—but so far has done little to build the needed institutions.

Introduction – Robert Keohane (Princeton University): Fragmented Governance Systems

David Victor (UCSD) – The Requirements for “Bottom-up Governance” – the case of climate change governance

Matthew Hoffmann (University of Toronto) – A Reaction on Climate Change Governance

Workshop Discussion

10:00 – 11.30: Panel Five: Can Paris Bring the World Together? COP21 – Do We Need It?

The December 2015 gathering will either generate an effective universal governance framework on climate change or it will not. And even if a framework does surface, there is still the question of whether it will address climate change adequately to limit global warming to 2 degrees Celsius or less.

A fundamental task of global governance is to tackle problems unsolvable by individual states. The epic danger of climate change may make it the ultimate test for global governance. Are we failing the test? In an age with an allergic reaction to treaties and multilateral agreements (particularly in, but not limited to, the US Congress), should we be grateful the UNFCCC even exists? Expectations for Paris are undergoing frequent re-calibration, but should we also be re-calculating our expectations for the universal project overall?

Conversely, the travails of the UNFCC and the COP process seem, finally, to be spawning new actions and collaborations among a variety of national, sub state, and non-state actors. Should we view this as a vast laboratory for innovation in governance? What principles, expectations, and benchmarks apply to these experiments? In the case of climate change, do we even have time for this experimentation?

Are there other examples of diffuse approaches to managing global challenges? If so, are there lessons to be learned for climate governance? If the UNFCCC and COP processes are to remain relevant, to what extent do they need to create effective and efficient interfaces with the groundswell of actors at other levels? Do those actors have any incentives or obligations to cooperate with the UNFCCC and COP processes?

Chair: Jennifer Smyser (The Stanley Foundation)

Jennifer Hadden (University of Maryland)

Robert Keohane (Princeton University)

John Odell (USC/CIGI)

David Victor (UCSD)

11.30 -11:45 - coffee break

11.45 – 13.15: Panel Six: Order and Disorder – The Rise of Transnational Threats

The rise of a decentralized global jihadi movement poses challenges to a multilateral system of global governance organized around the principle of state sovereignty. Contemporary structures of international cooperation are straining to adapt to the networked, metastasizing nature of transnational terrorism. The quandaries for policymakers are both analytical and practical. They must have a clear understanding of the nature and scope of the jihadist threat, including the motivations of and linkages (where they exist) among extremists groups as diffuse as the Islamic State, Boko Haram, AQIM, AQAP, and AQIS. Based on this understanding, policymakers must seek to design more effective coalitions and institutions capable of advancing several objectives: reducing the support for and attraction of violent extremism; improving anti-terrorist capabilities (and the commitment to use them) within vulnerable states; cutting the financial taproots of jihadist movements; stemming the flow of foreign terrorist fighters; deepening intelligence and law enforcement cooperation; and (where warranted) launching military attacks to eliminate jihadi leaders or reverse the territorial gains of extremist groups.

The guiding questions for this session include: How has the jihadist threat evolved, and what is its future trajectory likely to be? Do the United States and its (erstwhile) partners share the same definition of—much less approach to containing—transnational terrorism? What should be the balance between reliance on unilateral action, multilateral coalitions, alliances, regional bodies, and the United Nations in pursuing counterterrorism goals? What international strategies and interventions have proven effective in the past? How do counterterrorist financing methods need to adapt in the wake of territorial gains by jihadist movements? What does experience suggest about the most promising strategies on CVE?

Chair: Stewart Patrick (CFR)

Amitav Acharya (American University)

Alistair Millar (Global Center on Cooperative Security)

Paul Pillar (Georgetown University)

13:20 – 13:30 - Closing Remarks