

Second Annual Workshop:

Rivalry and Partnership – The Struggle for a New Global Governance Leadership

14-15 January 2011

Co-sponsored by:

**Project on the Future of Multilateralism (WWS)**  
**International Institutions and Global Governance Program (CFR)**  
**The Stanley Foundation**  
**Munk School of Global Affairs**

The narrative emerging from the previous Princeton Workshop, January 8-9, 2010 (What We have Learned: ‘New Foundations for Global Governance’ Conference) led to a series of follow on questions which we seek to explore in January 2011. These questions include:

- What is America’s role in supporting and reforming global governance as pursued by its new Administration?
- Does ‘declinism’ characterize American leadership or do we see renewal and engagement as declared by the Obama Administration?
- If the anticipated shift in the distribution of power in the global system proves to be less marked than some feared, will the United States seek to maintain its hegemonic role – with its benefits - or will the US seek greater partnership in global governance leadership?
- Will the dynamics of power distribution and redistribution lead to rivalry and competition among the global governance leaders including the large emerging market countries, especially China, or will the global governance challenges and the tight interdependence, bring a more ‘concert-like’ approach to leadership?
- Will these global governance challenges generate a new architecture – formal and institutionalized – to overcome collective action problem? Or will global governance leadership lean increasingly to informal and ad hoc gatherings consisting of like-minded actors focused on specific global governance problems?
- Will the inadequacy of like-mindedness drive much of the decision-making away from the global level to the regional level? And if regional governance grows how can it tackle existential problems such as proliferation and climate change?

This second annual workshop is designed to tackle these questions. Like the first workshop, this one will focus on the wide array of global governance challenges and opportunities confronting the international community as we enter the second decade of the twenty-first century. And like the first workshop, this one seeks to review the events, institutions and analysis of global governance and identify the next stage of the scholarly and political agenda.

The workshop will be organized in a series of panels. We will ask two of the panelists to prepare short memos in advance and have them distributed to all participants setting out the issues of the

panel. The Chair will prepare a set of questions and lead all the panelists in the early discussion that will then expand to take in the entire room.

DAY ONE: Friday, January 14, 2011

**Welcoming Remarks** – 14:00-14:15

**Panel One: Tensions in the Structure of Global Governance Leadership - US, the BRICs and Europe** - 14:15-16:15

This panel focuses on the redistribution of power in the international system and its consequences for global governance and global governance leadership. The panel will explore the power transition and specifically the uncertain role of China in the provision of global governance. What will be the logic and character of post-American hegemonic governance? Is collective leadership in the UNSC and the G20 possible or will it be infused with rivalry, competition, and non-competition? Is there no prospect for a more concert-like collective leadership based on collaboration and collective decision-making in global governance?

The rise of the large emerging market countries, especially the rise of China, and the enlargement of the G8 to the G20 to tackle the global financial crisis underscores the shift in the distribution of power in the global system. Amidst these transformations, where does the leadership of the United States stand? Historically, the United States has taken an ambivalent approach to global governance, at times taking the lead in building international institutions, while reserving many rights and privileges to protect its sovereignty and freedom of action. Will the American desire to rehabilitate its leadership role with the Obama Administration be accompanied by an insistence on continued hegemonic privileges, or will the U.S. accept fewer advantages and embrace flatter and more equal decision-making structures even in the face of new rising powers?

**Chair:** G. John Ikenberry

**Panelists - Setting out the Issues:**

Stewart Patrick, CFR  
Bruce Jentleson, Duke

**Panelists:**

Steve Weber (Berkeley)  
Daniel Deudney (Hopkins)  
Steve Clemons (NAF)  
Elizabeth Economy, CFR

**DAY TWO:** Saturday, January 15, 2011

Panel Two: The Consequences of the Seoul G20 Summit – Uncertain Transition?

8:30-10:00

This panel will look at the transition from G8 to G20. How successful has this been – with respect to the principal focus of the G20 – finance and economics – but also with respect to larger issues of peace and security and global governance challenges such as development, food security, health and climate change?

Can we characterize the Seoul summit as successful? Has the G20 transitioned from a crisis committee to a more permanent steering club? And what are the prospects for France?

**Chair: John Kirton**

Panelists - Setting Out the Issues:

Lim Won-Hyuk - (KDI)

Lee Dong-hwi – (IFANS)

Panelists:

Amitav Acharya (American University)

Patrick Cirillo, (IMF)

Andrew Cooper (CIGI, U of Waterloo)

Jacques Mistral (IFRI)

Marcel Biato (Brazilian Ambassador)

Panel Three: Competing Paradigms – Universality versus Clubs – The Legitimacy Challenge – UN Climate Change – Cop 15 & 16 and the MEF, IMF and the Bretton Woods System

10:15-11:45

This panel explores the alternative organizing logics of global governance – and the questions of legitimacy and effectiveness that follow. Charges of “illegitimacy” dogged the G7/8 and now again with the G20 we hear the familiar charges that the enlarged leadership fails to reflect all regions and types of states. In the extreme, of course, there is a view that universality alone – General Assembly, etc. - is the only basis for international decision-making. Given the growing salience of the Gx system, there is also a debate about the legitimacy and effectiveness of informal, self-identifying leadership clubs as opposed to the more formal institutionalized systems of NATO, the United Nations, and Bretton Woods.

**Chair: Stewart Patrick**

Panelists - Setting out the Issues:

Dan Drezner (Fletcher School, Tufts)

Panelists:

Miles Kahler (UCSD)  
Robert Keohane (Princeton)  
Michael Levi (CFR)  
Andrew Moravcsik (Princeton)

**Lunch -12:00-13:00**

**Panel Four: How Big a Tent? – Like-Mindedness and Diversity at the High Table – NATO, IAEA, G8 and G20**

13:15-14:45

One of the biggest dilemmas of global governance is how quickly to expand membership in major forums of multilateral cooperation to accommodate emerging powers--and the preconditions for such expansion. On the one hand, there is broad recognition that many global challenges cannot be addressed without significant contributions from rising powers. On the other, today's emerging and established powers do not always see eye to eye on the normative underpinnings of world order, including the standards of domestic political legitimacy and the rules that should govern interstate relations and state conduct. This panel will debate the opportunities and risks, costs and benefits, of expanding the "tent" in a variety of institutional contexts, focusing on the value and limitations of like-mindedness in formal and informal global governance arrangements. Central to answering this question is a clear understanding of what emerging powers actually want.

**Chair: David Shorr**

Panelists - Setting Out the Issues:

Charles Kupchan (Georgetown)  
Bruce Jones (NYU)

Panelists:

Mat Burrows (NIC)  
Thomas Wright (Chicago Council on Global Affairs)  
James Goldgeier (GW)

**Panel Five: From Commitment to Compliance – The Challenge of Effectiveness – UN Security Council, IFIs & Gx – Global vs. Regional Organizations**

15:00-16:30

There are a number of think tanks and academic institutions – as well as governments at least with respect to the G8 - that are attempting to measure the “effectiveness” of global governance institutions, principally those in the Gx system. Commitment and compliance has become a more serious concern and even states are getting into the act – see Accountability Report from the G8 Muskoka summit. Here is an opportunity to explore how effectiveness has been operationalized. Are the metrics adequate? How can we best assess effectiveness?

**Chair: Alan S Alexandroff**

**Panelists – Setting out the Issues:**

Marina Lavrionova (Higher School of Economics, Moscow)

John Kirton (Munk School, University of Toronto)

**Panelists:**

Michael Barnett (George Washington University)

Arthur Stein (UCLA)

**Concluding Remarks** 16:30 – 17:00

The wrap up gives partners the opportunity to speak about next steps.

John Ikenberry (Princeton)

Alan S Alexandroff (Munk School, University of Toronto)

David Shorr (The Stanley Foundation)

Stewart Patrick (CFR)