Part I

Introduction

Managing Global Issues:
An Introduction

P. J. Simmons and Chantal de Jonge Oudraat

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES AND FINANCIAL CONTAGION, civil conflicts and regional security, carbon sinks and ozone layers, patent infringement and human rights infringement, biodiversity and biological weaponry, refugee flights and capital flows. Diverse and, at first glance, unrelated, these topics share a common identity. They are all global concerns that cannot be successfully addressed unilaterally, bilaterally, or even regionally. They and a swelling roster of topics are the stuff of almost ceaseless international discourse that sometimes inaugurates cooperation and sometimes dissolves in discord. Over the last generation, the international community has scored a number of impressive victories in dealing with issues requiring extensive cooperation across borders. But overall, the track record is decidedly mixed, while the number of challenges is increasing.

In this book, sixteen respected experts investigate a number of global challenges in areas where changing settings are altering familiar assumptions about who sets policy, how, and with what results. Collectively, their essays amount to coloring outside the neat lines that define academic disciplines and diplomatic practice and too frequently insulate both scholars and practitioners from others with complementary knowledge and concerns.

The intent is not to examine particular issues so much as successful and failed attempts to manage them. The goal is to draw practical lessons from the recent past for their relevance to the near future. The forecast is for more such global challenges, more difficult to compartmentalize, more demanding of innovative responses. Early lessons like the ones our authors extract can help shape policies that have yet to be formulated for threats already with us and for many that are still indistinct.

SHRINKING PLANET, PROLIFERATING ISSUES

Depending on the size of your globe, there have always been global issues—from Attila the Hun's rampages to the Black Death to the European colonizers' grab for Africa. Until relatively recently, most such matters fell under the general rubric of security—military, political, and economic. If states could or had to deal with these challenges, they designated high-level representatives to do the dealing. At formal encounters, behind closed doors, the envoys attempted to make the world "safe for democracy" or "determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war."[1]

But the familiar ordering of international dealings is giving way to a very different modus operandi as the pressures of globalization reshape the nature of policy challenges, the efficacy of traditional responses, and the attributes of actors needed as problem solvers. Globalization—a magnified version of interdependence—is occurring on multiple fronts: *economic* (including the spread of consensus around a basic economic model and vast increases in international trade and capital flows); *political and social* (including increased democratization, expanding civil society, the spread of ideas, information, and people); *technological* (brought about by revolutions in information and telecommunications technologies); and *environmental and biological* (including transboundary flows of materials that affect human health and well-being, from climate-changing gases to viruses).[2] Although various forms of interdependence have been present for centuries, contemporary globalization is marked by an unprecedented degree of integration of markets, states, and technologies—all of which are "enabling individuals, corporations and nation-states to reach around the world farther, faster, deeper and cheaper than ever before."[3] The implications of such pervasive mutations for the work of managing global issues are profound.

Crowding In

One change is numerical. Clubby gatherings of ministers and central bankers from the affluent Atlantic states and Japan could once make the rules for world trade and finance and make them stick. But UN membership has grown 370 percent since 1945, and powerful nations increasingly find themselves challenged by assertive coalitions of lesser states. The claims of these newer arrivals can complicate even such seemingly simple matters as the allocation of orbital slots for communications satellites. When only a few countries launched satellites, it was easy to divide the pie. Now, with governments often fronting for the thousands of commercial enterprises in the field, the bargaining over lucrative berths in space is anything but routine.

Places at the bargaining tables, moreover, are no longer limited to sovereign states. They are also occupied by multinational enterprises, technical experts, and, with increasing frequency, independent organizations that may even have served as cata-

lysts for the gathering. Thousands of highly motivated, skillful, and often antagonistic private groups—businesses, labor unions, and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs)—dedicated to causes as varied as Tibetan independence, fossil fuels, debt relief, children's rights, and the gospel of Ayn Rand not only throng the corridors of power but penetrate the conference rooms as well.

In environmental affairs, particularly, the power of NGOs to thrust issues into the spotlight and force the pace of negotiation has been not just novel but astonishing. They, not just the governments that signed it, were principal authors of the 1992 Rio Framework (Rio) Convention on Global Climate Change. Some see NGOs as hugely productive forces—the most effective grass-roots agents of many otherwise top-down multilateral assistance initiatives. Others find them obstructionist if not obscurantist. Tariff reductions on manufactured goods, for example, were far easier to negotiate when the parties were like-minded countries that had shared the traumas of the Great Depression and World War II. Iconoclastic NGOs that inserted labor and human rights issues and environmental concerns into the equation of global commerce have undone the older consensus. Similarly, government ministers lost their freedom to operate in cozy confidentiality in 1997 when protesters disrupted and helped to scuttle negotiations on what was to have been the Multilateral Agreement on Investment (MAI).

The near-monopoly on information once enjoyed by government officials has also blurred into the cacophony of the wired world. Journalists who used to get by on a communiqué and a background, not-for-attribution briefing may now have ringside seats or multiple ringside sources inside any international assembly. More significantly, inside information has moved outside and into the hands and analytical competence of corporations, citizens' groups, scholars, and others able and often eager to put their own spin on the data and disseminate it more widely. Technology—fax machines and the Internet—has strengthened governments, but it has empowered legions of free agents, jostling for position and the chance to influence policy.

Linking Up, Down, and Sideways

These added participants—known in the literature and throughout this book as nonstate actors—may enrich the process, but they do not simplify it. Simplicity, in any case, is bound to be elusive in dealing with issues that are not only complex in and of themselves—development assistance, refugee relief, and nuclear nonproliferation, for example—but that add layers of difficulty as they intertwine with other issues. Development, once quantified in gross domestic product (GDP) or miles of roadway or rates of infant mortality, has become inseparable from concerns for environmental sustainability. Intellectual property rights—drug patents—are sacrosanct, except when the lives of AIDS victims in poor countries are at stake.

Globalization is spinning new strands of complexity, stitching issues and actors together in a world where economic, humanitarian, health, and environmental concerns respect no national frontiers. Domestic conflicts drive refugees from their homes and across national borders, sometimes in desperate, disorderly flights that threaten to destabilize whole regions such as the upper Congo in the aftermath of the Rwandan genocide of 1994. "As with 'chaos' theories, and in weather systems," Keohane and Nye have commented, "small events in one place can have catalytic effects, so that consequences later and elsewhere are vast."[4] Ozone-depleting chemicals consumed in the United States raise anxiety levels in Chile, Argentina, and Australia where a thinning shield against ultraviolet rays threatens a higher incidence of skin cancer. Diseased food from one continent may reach consumers in another before contamination is detected.

New kinds of links are also making the formerly internal affairs of states into international issues. "Since 1990 the Security Council has declared a formal threat to international peace and security 61 times, after having done so only six times in the preceding 45 years," Jessica Mathews observed in 1997. She continued: "[I]t is not that security has been abruptly and terribly threatened: rather, the change reflects the broadened scope of what the international community now feels it should poke its nose into."[5] Now a Bosnian Serb accused of overseeing multiple rapes is taken before an international tribunal in another country to answer for alleged war crimes.

Globalization's synthesizing effect creates more connections across distances and disciplines and more occasions where people and issues mingle at greater and greater depth. Its attributes include mounting speed of exchanges (not just capital and information but also diseases and cures), swelling scale of all kinds of activity (financial, criminal, and technological, and all three together), and constantly expanding scope of both opportunities and risks. All of this makes the protection and advancement of human welfare more complicated.

Raising the Bar

Complexity is generally unsettling. The impulse to undo a Gordian knot with one swift swordstroke is understandable. In a nuclear world of 189 nations, six billion people, and trillion-dollar economies, however, quick, neat solutions are impractical and even potentially self-defeating. Banning arms flows to a war-torn country, for instance, would seem to offer a promising response to genuine threats. In practice, though, the action may paradoxically expand opportunities for criminals to circumvent restrictions and supply combatants with weapons.[6] The shortages created by arms embargoes increase the price of goods and thus, the profit margins—luring suppliers willing to ignore restrictions. The same is true, on a grander scale, of short-

ages created by international campaigns to dry up the flow of opium, cocaine, and their derivatives. Such efforts may cut supply but also raise profits and unintentionally encourage both smuggling and commerce in other drugs to satisfy hungry, illicit markets.

As intricate international dealings become labyrinthine, globalization drives not just the pace of transactions and their multiplicity but the twisting turns of the follow-through as well. In some respects, the easy part is over. Conventional negotiation—tying norms and goals into discrete issue packages—begins to looks like child's play compared to the exacting demands of setting standards and reaching accords where technical intricacies and disparate interests proliferate. Trade negotiations that once concentrated on reciprocal lowering of border tariffs have now become arenas for debates over workers' rights, environmental protection, and claims of equity—issues that penetrate deeply into domestic affairs. What were once issues of coordination mutate into clashes of values.

Even more daunting, though, is ensuring compliance with proliferating agreements ranging from the highly specialized (the UN Agreement on the Conservation and Management of Straddling and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks) to the highly general (the 1995 intergovernmental pledge to reduce poverty by half by 2015). Banning landmines, for instance, is an easier and cheaper goal to proclaim than detecting and removing them. Nations far more law-abiding than Iraq resist verification measures on the production or destruction of chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons because the intrusive activities undercut sovereignty and may expose corporate or state secrets. Controlling the output of pollutants, whether from cruise ships at sea or from furnaces on land, depends on enlisting, rewarding, and punishing private enterprises that have entrenched interests in business as usual. Controlling transnational criminal organizations is proving a task beyond the means and ingenuity even of the states most harmed by their activities. For customs and immigration inspectors in 1999 at the United States' 301 ports of entry and 3,700 terminals, globalization was a nightmare of "475 million people, 125 million vehicles, and 21.4 million import shipments. . . . Intercepting the ripples of danger in this tidal wave of commerce is about as likely as winning a lottery."[7] The chances are no better in Singapore where mechanization enables stevedores in eight hours, on average, to unload 3,000 of the over one million freight containers that pass through the port each month.[8]

The threats are real. Collective response, however, is uneven, uncertain, in some cases unformed. Financial volatility is no longer controlled by central banks or national boundaries, but international emergency rescue mechanisms still operate more ad hoc than as systems. Multilateral agreements among states take years to negotiate, often resulting in inadequate lowest-common-denominator solutions. For most issues covered in this book, effective implementation of such accords requires target-

ing the behavior of multiple actors, including individuals, businesses, and criminals. But successful monitoring and regulating of private actors can be a political or logistical ordeal. To complicate matters, sometimes the would-be enforcers disagree intensely about which actors to target. To curb transnational organized crime, for instance, should the emphasis be on changing the behavior of states, the crooks, or the consumers of illegal goods and services? Effective solutions in these circumstances require action on multiple fronts, which are easier to prescribe than to perform.

VARIETIES OF GOVERNANCE

New players, thorny problems, spillover effects, and the magnitude of cross-border flows together inflate the difficulty of coherent action at almost all levels of international affairs. These variables are, in a sense, products of the technologies and intergovernmental decisions that have brought countries and markets and people inexorably into both collision and cooperation. At the same time, these offshoots of escalating interdependence strongly influence the direction in which globalization will move—either toward tighter teamwork in meeting multiple challenges or toward division. This book does not seek to predict the direction of the future. Its authors, though, make clear that the stakes are rising, that the hazards for global statesmanship are profound and novel, and that collective responses to different issues in differing circumstances have been uneven.

Most of the tasks that our authors describe—whether keeping the peace after intrastate conflict, reversing climate change and widespread species extinction, tackling deeply entrenched corruption, or alleviating poverty and disease—necessarily demand long-term planning and sustained engagement as the foundation of successful implementation and compliance. Governments, however, tend to demand quick results. Keeping them involved for the long haul will require modifying mindsets to respond as diligently to enduring complexity on a global scale as to crises along the way. It also calls for changing institutional cultures within governments to create new connections across bureaucracies so that in-house dealings can mirror the multifarious linkages among global issues.

Those are problems for government, but governance is not government. Rather, the term signifies a diverse range of cooperative problem-solving arrangements, state and nonstate, to manage collective affairs. "It includes formal institutions and regimes empowered to enforce compliance, as well as informal arrangements that people and institutions either have agreed to or perceive to be in their interest."[9] Governance is the use of "mechanisms for steering social systems towards their goals."[10] It takes place through "laws, norms, markets, and architecture," not necessarily or exclusively the field of action of governments alone but rather in association with one

another, with multinational bodies, with corporate and sometimes academic research entities and with NGOs. Such collective activity, structured or improvised, produces governance, sometimes without governmental authority.[11]

Over 2,000 multilateral agreements (among three or more states) already exist, establishing norms and rules that govern a broad range of global issues from maritime transport to fish stocks.[12] Of these arrangements, only some have near-universal participation—such as the International Treaty to Ban Landmines, the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, and the Non-Proliferation Treaty. The remainder are minilateral accords among a smaller set of partners, such as the Basel agreements on standards for banking adequacy; or regional, such as the North American Free Trade Agreement. In addition, a multitude of bilateral agreements, such as the 1972 U.S.-Soviet Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, have varying effect on global issues. Moreover, unilateral actions can also shape global practices. Y2K standards set by the United States quickly became internationally accepted.[13] For some issues such as weapons of mass destruction, elaborate institutional frameworks and binding rules exist. For others such as corruption, institutions and rules are far less developed.[14] In the description given by Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye, multiple "islands of governance" engage in problem solving—islands that, while more "densely concentrated among developed states, . . . often have global extension."[15]

Some of the products of past multilateral cooperation have proved so beneficial that the process is taken for granted in many areas. Global agreements on international trade that reduced tariffs significantly have helped trade flows grow at an average annual rate of six percent since 1947. International cooperation on telecommunications has built today's global information infrastructure, ordering the airwaves and the framework within which national networks connect. Multilateral assistance—initially premised on Cold War economic and political security concerns—has become a humanitarian given, a powerful instrument for cutting infant mortality, child malnutrition, and the incidence of such diseases as polio and smallpox. The negotiation and spread of international norms on basic human rights and labor rights contributed to an overall improvement in the treatment of individuals by governments and employers around the world. And the decision by state leaders to heed scientists' warnings and negotiate an agreement on the Earth's ozone layer checked a looming threat to human health and well-being. The benefits of cooperative action in many areas are as significant as the attendant progress in overcoming intense philosophical disagreements about how to shape international cooperation in a world of sovereign states.

Agreements among governments do not hold the monopoly on governance. Business leaders, citizen activists and NGOs, individual government elites, international organizations, and others have launched supplementary rule-making and problem-solving actions—alone and in partnerships that leapfrog national boundaries and

sectoral lines. Coalitions of private actors monitor and enforce their own negotiated rules, as through the Worldwide Responsible Apparel Manufacturing Principles. Hybrid decision-making forums include the World Commission on Dams, whose commissioners include representatives from government, private industry, and NGOs. Some global private authorities, such as private bond-rating agencies, in effect force governments to accept their rules. Canadian leaders responded quickly after Moody's Investors Service threatened to downgrade the country's rating if it did not align its deficit-to-GDP ratio with global expectations.[16] Government elites compare techniques and then imitate each other—the result sometimes being common, even higher criteria on issues of global concern such as human rights. The Israeli Supreme Court has long researched U.S. Supreme Court precedents before ruling on freedom of speech, privacy rights, and other matters.[17] NGOs, private foundations, and businesses—beyond serving merely as contract agents for states and international organizations—increasingly provide services, money, normative values, and even leadership where governments and international organizations do not. One example is the Medicines for Malaria Venture that seeks to redress private sector underinvestment in vaccine research and production.

Transnational governance, however, is only as good as the effort that goes into matching laudable principles with actual practice. Nothing guarantees that all things multilateral will always prove benign. In reality, international regimes can bend to suit the priorities of the powerful: for example, the protectionist interests of the United States in textile trade or of the European Union (EU) in agriculture. Ideological or other coalitions can steer a global body away from its responsibilities as occurred when the International Labor Organization (ILO) in the mid-1970s routinely ignored Soviet and East European violations of international labor rights law. Governance strategies developed by private, self-selected groups can strain the limits of democratic accountability and give rise to complaints, for instance, about the unelected NGOs that worked with the World Bank to shape guidelines for the development of an oil pipeline in Chad. Understandably then, scholars and practitioners hold legitimate, fundamentally different views on how best (and who best) to approach the governance of global issues.

Innovation is the one common thread in this diverse assortment of management modes and approaches to governance. It has turned the "islands of governance" into an archipelago, connecting many of them along cooperative causeways. The concept of governance as something larger than government is itself relatively new. Its practical application has been more than a little uncertain. But there is no returning to the simplicities of an earlier age, and there are few roadmaps to show the way to a successful passage through the burgeoning complexity of global issues. Through a scholarly mining of the record of governance across a large range of fields for the nuggets of insight that can improve performance in the future, this book aims to provide one such map.

SURVEYING COMMON GROUND

This book tries to bridge disciplines in much the same way that its authors believe states must try to do. The exercise of producing it was a challenge from the start. Experts from different fields speak their own languages. What might be a fascinating insight from environmental management, for example, becomes a dull study of detail to a trade expert if issue-specific jargon obscures the point. In other cases, language can mislead: Certain already vague buzzwords like "civil society" have very different connotations in different fields.

An additional challenge was that the theoretical underpinnings for such a broad-based study—encompassing all phases of managing global problems—are scattered across a voluminous literature. The literature on global governance has ill-defined boundaries overlapping work on international relations theory, political science, multilateralism, international organizations, globalization, and other related topics.[18] Nearly all the relevant practical literature focuses on single-issue areas or specific regimes.[19] Very few studies in comparative governance address multiple issue areas; those that do are highly concentrated in a few fields (economics, environment, and arms control.)[20] Even those tend to focus on only single aspects of governance such as negotiations, sanctions, or the role of a particular set of actors.[21] As a result, lessons learned in one domain are seldom transposed to others. Furthermore, most studies have focused on interstate cooperation, with few works on the emergence of non-state-centric approaches to global problems.[22]

To draw comparative lessons, we invited sixteen experts to assess successes and failures of cooperation in the fields they know best based on a common set of questions. Following a common framework, these contributors distinguished among four related but analytically distinct components of governance: agenda setting, negotiation, implementation and compliance, and reactions to noncompliance. While these phases do not always occur sequentially and often blur together, this simple division greatly facilitates communication across fields.[23] We gave the authors a Herculean task: describe for nonexperts the nature of the principal governance issues in their respective fields; review the record of success and failure in problem solving; identify which actors, techniques, and types of regimes were most effective in each phase; and explain the factors that determined the overall outcomes. We asked authors to analyze intergovernmental efforts larger than bilateral ones, as well as any noteworthy alternative approaches involving nonstate actors or state/nonstate partnerships. In two concluding chapters, we sum up the authors' insights and offer our own analysis.

- *Actors.* Throughout this book we distinguish among five broad categories of actors. *States* include associations of them (such as G-8, G-10, EU). We define *international organizations* as including intergovernmental bodies (such as UN organizations, Bretton Woods institutions, development banks, treaty secretari-

ats, and regional organizations) as well as hybrids.[24] The latter comprise some mix of government agencies, individual experts, NGOs, and private corporate actors (such as the International Organization for Standardization, the International Labor Organization, and the International Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers.) We use *business* and *private sector* interchangeably to describe for-profit entities and nonprofit associations promoting business interests (such as the International Chamber of Commerce.) We use *NGOs* and *civil society* to include the diverse universe of interest groups, advocacy groups, and citizens' associations representing public, if sometimes specialized, interests.[25] Finally, we use *experts* to refer to government and nongovernment individuals with specialized technical, regulatory, or scientific knowledge who advise or make decisions in global rule making and regulation; and we use *epistemic communities* to refer to transnational groups of experts who meet sporadically and conduct common discourse based on shared knowledge.[26] These groupings are admittedly somewhat artificial given the diverse cast of characters and the networks they are forming—but they provide a useful categorization.

- *Agenda Setting.* Agenda setting involves raising an issue's profile on the international stage and in some cases framing specific goals for negotiation and action. Effective agenda setting is largely measured by the actions taken to deal with the problem. An issue may emerge following a carefully prepared strategy or unintentionally, as the result of some catalytic event or crisis, or as a side effect of some other issue. We were chiefly concerned with understanding which actors and techniques are successful in pushing issues into the international spotlight, and why.

- *Negotiation.* Negotiation is the stage in which participants exchange information on issues, stake out their positions, and may enter into coalitions to move debate toward agreed action. It is the point at which intentions are transformed into stated goals, norms, or commitments. The scope and complexity of intergovernmental negotiations have increased enormously in recent decades—because of the dramatic increase in the number of states active in the international system, the presence of more authoritative nonstate actors, and the greatly expanded substantive content of issues brought to the bargaining table. In addition, negotiations are taking place in hybrid decision-making forums and even exclusively among private actors. We asked authors to examine three questions: (1) What role do different types of actors play in negotiations? (2) How are negotiating instruments and strategies selected and employed? (3) What outcomes are achieved, and how effective are these outcomes in addressing the problems at hand?

- *Implementation and Compliance.* In this phase of governance, actors translate the intent behind agreements into action. *Implementation* takes in the broad range of activities that state and nonstate actors undertake to promote actions and behavioral changes in accordance with agreements. Within that range are the incorpo-

ration of governance norms into domestic laws, reforms within a corporation, NGO actions to push states or corporations to implement norms and comply with rules, programs of international organizations to improve states' capacity for implementation, and many other activities.

Compliance broadly describes the condition of state or nonstate parties' actual adherence to binding or nonbinding rules or to aspirational goals. Sometimes, achieving compliance may necessitate undertaking strenuous implementation measures; in other cases, compliance might come accidentally, or where governance merely codified existing practice, compliance might simply represent business as usual. Within this phase, actors use a range of techniques to monitor, review, and verify implementation and compliance. The term *monitoring* is used both to describe efforts to gather information and data about compliance and to describe efforts to collect data about developments within the issue or problem itself. *Verification* is a more limited concept to describe the process of certifying that a party or target is in compliance. Our chief concern in this phase was to evaluate the role and weight of various actors and to identify techniques and mechanisms that work best in influencing targeted actors to undertake desired actions or change behavior.

- *Reactions to Noncompliance.* Reactions to noncompliance—including incentives, technical assistance, diplomacy, public shaming, economic sanctions, and military force—are rarely formalized in intergovernmental or private agreements. It is unusual for such pacts to specify who is responsible for determining noncompliance and what should happen if parties do not abide by agreed-upon rules. When such provisions do exist, they tend to be vague. We asked authors to examine three questions: (1) What roles do the different types of international actors play in formulating and implementing responses to noncompliance? (2) What strategies are employed? (3) Which strategies are most effective?

IMPROVING THE ODDS

This book's underlying concern is *effectiveness*—the approaches that solve or help to solve problems. Effectiveness goes beyond formal compliance; parties may come into compliance with agreements effortlessly for a time and without undertaking any measures that change behavior or contribute to solving the problem. Agreements themselves may not be ambitious enough to provide more than temporary or cosmetic relief of global problems.

This book points to a grab bag of options. Sometimes effectiveness comes from a few powerful states acting first—rather than 189 trying to march in step. Other times it means a network of several governments working alongside business and civil society leaders to forge new means to address an issue. Or, it can mean a

transnational advocacy group publicizing an issue and prompting changes in behavior absent a formal treaty.

Throughout their studies, the authors tried to answer the same, bottom-line question: What works? It would be rash to claim that they found formulas, magic or otherwise, but the inquiries reveal patterns, good and bad, that point toward approaches that may be required for the future. The authors concur that global issues management is the product of many hands trying to move many levers—not always in sync and not always with the desired results. The complexity of international issues, their overlapping nature, and the turmoil of the arena in which they surface defy tidy theorizing about effective management.

Instead, observers seeking to decipher the action and even the outcome need to know and weigh nuances of policy and politics and the roles played by a large and shifting cast of states and actors. The value to be derived from subjecting a range of global issues to a comparative scrutiny, as this book attempts, does not lie only in learning what has already been tried. The exercise can also serve as a stimulus to creative thinking and experimentation. Given the magnitude of the challenges this book describes, both are needed.

NOTES

1. Preamble to the Charter of the United Nations.
2. See Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Global Public Policy Program, at <http://www.ceip.org>. See also Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye Jr., "Introduction," in Joseph S. Nye Jr. and John D. Donahue, eds., *Governance in a Globalizing World* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2000), pp. 4–7.
3. Thomas L. Friedman, *The Lexus and the Olive Tree* (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1999), pp. 7–8. For description of various forms of interdependence or globalism, see Keohane and Nye, "Introduction," esp. pp. 2–12.
4. Keohane and Nye, "Introduction," p. 11.
5. Jessica Tuchman Mathews, "Power Shift," *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 76, no. 1 (January/February 1997), pp. 59–60.
6. See Phil Williams, Chapter 3, in this volume.
7. Stephen E. Flynn, "Beyond Border Control," *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 79, no. 6 (November/December 2000), p. 57.
8. Stephen E. Flynn, "The Global Drug Trade Versus the Nation-State: Why the Thugs Are Winning," in Maryann K. Cusimano, ed., *Beyond Sovereignty: Issues for a Global Agenda* (New York: Bedford/St. Martin's Press, 2000), p. 52.
9. Commission on Global Governance, *Our Global Neighborhood* (Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press, 1995), p. 2. The UN Development Program (UNDP) defines governance as "the exercise of political, economic and administrative authority in the management of a country's affairs at all levels. Governance is a neutral concept comprising the

complex mechanisms, processes, relationships and institutions through which citizens and groups articulate their interests, exercise their rights and obligations and mediate their differences." See UNDP, *Governance for Sustainable Human Development* (New York: UNDP, January 1997). Oran Young defines governance in terms of "a social function centered on the making of collective choices regarding matters of common concern to the members of human groups." See Oran R. Young, *Global Governance: Drawing Insights from the Environmental Experience*, Occasional Paper (Hanover, N.H: Dickey Center, Dartmouth College, 1995), p. 1.

10. James Rosenau, "Toward an Ontology for Global Governance," in Martin Hewson and Timothy J. Sinclair, eds., *Approaches to Global Governance Theory* (Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 1999), p. 296.

11. Keohane and Nye, "Introduction," p. 12.

12. Union of International Associations, ed., *Yearbook of International Organizations: Guide to Global Civil Society Networks, 2000–2001* (Munich: K. G. Saur Verlag, 2000), p. 2406.

13. Keohane and Nye, "Introduction," p. 21.

14. When analyzing and measuring levels of institutional development, one might consider whether the following exist: (1) generally accepted principles and norms; (2) codes of conduct; (3) partnerships and networks; (4) consultation and negotiating mechanisms; (5) legally nonbinding agreements; (6) legally binding agreements; (7) international organizations; (8) monitoring mechanisms; (9) verification mechanisms; and (10) enforcement mechanisms.

15. Keohane and Nye, "Introduction," p. 20.

16. Friedman, *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*, pp. 91–2.

17. See, for example, Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye Jr., *Power and Interdependence* (Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman, and Co., 1989); and Robert W. Cox and Harold Jacobson, *The Anatomy of Influence: Decision Making in International Organization* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1973). More recently, see Anne-Marie Slaughter, "The Real New World Order," *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 76, no. 5 (September/October 1997), pp. 183–97.

18. Suggested additional reading on governance appears at the end of this chapter. See the literature review on global governance in Craig Murphy, "Global Governance: Poorly Done and Poorly Understood," *International Affairs*, vol. 76, no. 4 (October 2000), pp. 789–803. See also John Gerard Ruggie, *Multilateralism Matters: The Theory and Praxis of an Institutional Form* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993); and Nye and Donahue, eds., *Governance in a Globalizing World*. For a searchable database on global governance literature, visit the Managing Global Issues Information Network at <http://www.ceip.org>.

19. We use the term *regime* to describe a wide range of "sets of norms and rules spelling out the range of admissible behavior of different kinds of actors." See Peter Mayer, Volker Rittberger, and Michael Zuern, "Regime Theory: State of the Art and Perspectives," in Volker Rittberger, ed., *Regime Theory and International Relations* (Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press, 1995), p. 403. These sets of norms and rules may be formalized in treaties or they may be based on informal—legally nonbinding—agreements and understandings. Regimes may include international organizations—that is, material entities

possessing offices, personnel, budgets, equipment, and often legal personality—but are not limited to them. They may also comprise other institutions such as consultative mechanisms, negotiating bodies, partnerships, and networks. For a discussion on regime definitions and classifications, see also Marc A. Levy, Oran R. Young, and Michael Zuern, "The Study of International Regimes," *European Journal of International Relations*, vol. 1, no. 3 (September 1995), p. 274.

20. One notable exception is John Braithwaite and Peter Drahos, *Global Business Regulation* (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2000)—the product of a remarkable ten-year effort to analyze multiple actors in all phases of governance for thirteen issue areas.

21. Major comparative works across issue areas on one aspect of governance include Fen Osler Hampson, *Multilateral Negotiations: Lessons from Arms Control, Trade, and the Environment* (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995); and Abram Chayes and Antonia Handler Chayes, *The New Sovereignty: Compliance with International Regulatory Agreements* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1995). Representative analyses of the role of particular actors in governance across issue areas include Margaret Keck and Kathryn Sikkink, *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1998); and Ann M. Florini, *The Third Force: The Rise of Transnational Civil Society* (Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2000). On implementation in the environment field, see David G. Victor, Kal Raustiala, and Eugene B. Skolnikoff, eds., *The Implementation and Effectiveness of International Environmental Commitments: Theory and Practice* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1998); and Oran Young, ed., *The Effectiveness of International Environmental Regimes: Causal Connections and Behavioral Mechanisms* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1999). For a detailed listing of recommended readings on managing global issues, see the suggested additional reading at the end of this chapter.

22. See Wolfgang Reinicke, *Global Public Policy: Governing Without Government?* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 1998); Cusimano, ed., *Beyond Sovereignty*; Wolfgang Reinicke and Francis Deng, *Critical Choices: The United Nations, Networks, and the Future of Global Governance* (Ottawa: International Development Research Centre, 2000); and Nye and Donahue, eds., *Governance in a Globalizing World*.

23. In many cases, such as the international movement to reverse depletion of the ozone layer, or the arms control field, analysts can consider these four components as "phases" that occur sequentially: a period of awareness building on the severity of a problem generates public pressure and political will to act; and an international treaty is negotiated and implemented, with subsequent efforts to enforce legally binding obligations by signatories. In other cases, the four components seem to blur together, and these distinctions are more difficult to make.

24. The United Nations comprises six "principal organs": the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), the Trusteeship Council, the International Court of Justice, and the Secretariat. Each of these organs has a specific mandate under the 1945 UN Charter. Numerous subsidiary bodies and specialized agencies operate under UN auspices to compose the UN system. These specialized agencies, each with its own constitution, membership, and budget, include bodies like the World

Health Organization (WHO), the Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO), the UN Environment Program (UNEP), and the UN Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

The Bretton Woods institutions are the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank Group, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), and the GATT's successor organization, the World Trade Organization (WTO). Similarly, development banks such as the Inter-American Development Bank, the Asian Development Bank, and the African Development Bank are lending institutions composed of member nations, operating under a charter and with a professional staff.

Under our definition, the Secretariat of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES), for example, would be considered an international organization. The ILO is a subsidiary organization of the United Nations. However, its tripartite structure of governments, employers, and workers makes it a hybrid international organization.

Like all international organizations, regional organizations also differ in their mandates and level of cooperation. Such is the case, for example, among the EU, the Organization of American States (OAS), the Organization of African Unity (OAU), and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). While the EU has an exceptionally high degree of supranational political and economic integration, it is fundamentally an intergovernmental international organization.

25. P. J. Simmons, "Learning to Live with NGOs," *Foreign Policy*, no. 112 (Fall 1998), p. 83.
26. Braithwaite and Drahos, *Global Business Regulation*, pp. 24, 29. See also Peter Haas, "Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination," *International Organization*, vol. 46, no. 1 (Winter 1992), pp. 1–35.

SUGGESTED ADDITIONAL READING

Additional suggested readings on governance of specific global issues are listed at the end of each chapter.

Governance and International Cooperation

Axelrod, Robert. *The Evolution of Cooperation*. New York: Penguin Books, 1990.

Cox, Robert W., with Timothy J. Sinclair. *Approaches to World Order*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Hasenclever, Andreas, Peter Mayer, and Volker Rittberger. *Theories of International Regimes*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Hewson, Martin, and Timothy J. Sinclair, eds. *Approaches to Global Governance Theory*. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 1999.

Katzenstein, Peter J., Robert O. Keohane, and Stephen D. Krasner, eds. *Exploration and Contestation in the Study of World Politics*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1999.

Keohane, Robert O. *International Institutions and State Power: Essays in International Relations Theory*. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1989.

Krasner, Stephen D. *International Regimes*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1983.

Levy, Marc A., Oran R. Young, and Michael Zürn. "The Study of International Regimes." *European Journal of International Relations*, vol. 1, no. 3 (Fall 1995), pp. 267–330.

Murphy, Craig N. "Global Governance: Poorly Done and Poorly Understood." *International Affairs*, vol. 76, no. 4 (October 2000), pp. 789–803.

Rittberger, Volker, ed. *Regime Theory and International Relations*. Oxford, U.K.: Clarendon Press, 1993.

Rosenau, James N., and Ernst-Otto Czempiel, eds. *Governance Without Government: Order and Change in World Politics*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Ruggie, John Gerard. *Multilateralism Matters: The Theory and Praxis of an Institutional Form*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1993.

Sandler, Todd. *Global Challenges: An Approach to Environmental, Political, and Economic Problems*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Slaughter, Anne-Marie, Andrew S. Tulumello, and Stepan Wood. "International Law and International Relations Theory: A New Generation of Interdisciplinary Scholarship." *American Journal of International Law*, vol. 92, no. 3 (July 1998), pp. 367–97.

Young, Oran R. *Governance in World Affairs*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1999.

Zacher, Mark W. *The United Nations and Global Commerce*. New York: United Nations, Department of Public Information, 1999.

How Globalization Affects Governance

Boli, John, and Frank J. Lechner, eds. *The Globalization Reader*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 1999.

Cusimano, Maryann K. *Beyond Sovereignty: Issues for a Global Agenda*. Boston, Mass.: Bedford/St. Martins, 2000.

Edwards, Michael. *Future Positive: International Cooperation in the 21st Century*. London: Earthscan, 1999.

Florini, Ann M. *The New Rules for Running the World* (forthcoming).

Friedman, Thomas L. *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1999.

Globalization, Governance, and Civil Society. Tokyo: Japan Center for International Exchange, 1998.

Held, David, et al. *Global Transformations: Politics, Economics, and Culture*. Cambridge, U.K.: Polity Press, 1999.

Homer-Dixon, Thomas. *The Ingenuity Gap*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2000.

Kaul, Inge, Isabelle Grunberg, and Marc A. Stern, eds. *Global Public Goods: International Cooperation in the 21st Century*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Kennedy, Paul. *Preparing for the Twenty-first Century*. New York: Random House, 1993.

Lechner, Frank J., and John Boli, eds. *The Globalization Reader*. Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell, 2000.

Mathews, Jessica. "Power Shift." *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 76, no. 1 (January/February 1997), pp. 50–66.

Nye, Joseph S., Jr., and John D. Donahue, eds. *Governance in a Globalizing World*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2000.

Our Global Neighborhood: The Report of the Commission on Global Governance. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Prakash, Aseem, and Jeffrey Hart. *Globalization and Governance*. New York: Routledge, 1999.

Reimagining the Future: Toward Democratic Governance. Victoria, Australia: Department of Politics, La Trobe University, 2000.

Reinicke, Wolfgang. *Global Public Policy: Governing Without Government?* Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 1998.

Rosenau, James N. *Along the Domestic-Foreign Frontier: Exploring Governance in a Turbulent World*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Simai, Mihaly. *The Future of Global Governance: Managing Risk and Change in the International System*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Institute of Peace, 1994.

Smith, Gordon, and Moises Naím. *Altered States: Globalization, Sovereignty, and Governance*. Ottawa: International Development Research Centre, 2000.

Comparative Studies Across Global Issues

All Phases of Governance

Braithwaite, John, and Peter Drahos. *Global Business Regulation*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Negotiations

Hampson, Fen Osler. *Multilateral Negotiations: Lessons from Arms Control, Trade, and the Environment*. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995.

Implementation and Compliance

Chayes, Abram, and Antonia Handler Chayes. *The New Sovereignty: Compliance with International Regulatory Agreements*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1995.

Downs, George W., David M. Rocke, and Peter Barsoom. "Is the Good News About Compliance Good News About Cooperation?" *International Organization*, vol. 50, no. 3 (Summer 1996), pp. 379–406.

Shelton, Dinah, ed. *Commitment and Compliance: The Role of Non-binding Norms in the International Legal System*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Verification. London: Verification Research, Training, and Information Centre (VERTIC), Annual Yearbook.

Sanctions

Cortright, David, and George Lopez. *The Sanctions Decade: Assessing UN Strategies in the 1990s*. Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner, 2000.

Crawford, Neta C., and Audie Klotz, eds. *How Sanctions Work: Lessons from South Africa*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999.

de Jonge Oudraat, Chantal. "Making Economic Sanctions Work." *Survival*, vol. 42, no. 3 (Autumn 2000), pp. 105–27.

Haas, Richard N., and Meghan L. O'Sullivan, eds. *Honey and Vinegar: Incentives, Sanctions, and Foreign Policy*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2000.

Hufbauer, Gary Clyde, Jeffrey J. Schott, and Kimberly Ann Elliott. *Economic Sanctions Reconsidered*. Washington, D.C.: Institute for International Economics, 1990.

Weiss, Thomas G., David Cortright, George Lopez, and Larry Minear. *Political Gain and Civilian Pain: Humanitarian Impacts of Economic Sanctions*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman and Littlefield, 1997.

Actors in Governance

All Actors

Braithwaite, John, and Peter Drahos. *Global Business Regulation*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Mathews, Jessica. "Power Shift." *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 76, no. 1 (January/February 1997), pp. 50–66.

Reinicke, Wolfgang, and Francis Deng. *Critical Choices: The United Nations, Networks, and the Future of Global Governance*. Ottawa: International Development Research Centre, 2000.

States

Strange, Susan. *The Retreat of the State: The Diffusion of Power in the World Economy*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

World Bank. *World Development Report 1997: The State in a Changing World*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

International Organizations

Diehl, Paul F, ed. *The Politics of Global Governance: International Organizations in an Interdependent World*. Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner, 2001.

Jacobson, Harold K. *Networks of Interdependence: International Organizations and the Global Political System*. New York: Knopf, 1984.

Keohane, Robert O. *International Institutions and State Power: Essays in International Relations Theory*. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1989.

Murphy, Craig. *International Organization and Industrial Change: Global Governance Since 1850*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Paolini, Albert J., P. Jarvis, and Christian Reus-Smith. *Between Sovereignty and Global Governance: The United Nations, the State and Civil Society*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998.

Proceedings of the 92nd Annual Meeting: The Challenge of Non-state Actors. Washington, D.C.: American Society of International Law, 1998.

Reinalda, Bob, and Bertjan Verbeek, eds. *Autonomous Policy Making by International Organizations*. New York: Routledge, 1998.

Zacher, Mark W. *The United Nations and Global Commerce*. New York: UN Department of Public Information, 1999.

Nongovernmental Organizations

Boli, John, and George Thomas, eds. *Constructing World Culture: International Nongovernmental Organizations since 1875*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1999.

Charnovitz, Steve. "Two Centuries of Participation: NGOs and International Governance." *Michigan Journal of International Law*, vol. 18, no. 2 (Winter 1997), pp. 183–286.

Edwards, Michael. *NGO Rights and Responsibilities: A New Deal for Global Governance*. London: Foreign Policy Centre, 2000.

Florini, Ann M., ed. *The Third Force: The Rise of Transnational Civil Society*. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2000.

Higgott, Richard A., Geoffrey R. D. Underhill, and Andreas Bieler, eds. *Non-state Actors and Authority in the Global System*. London: Routledge, 2000.

Keck, Margaret, and Kathryn Sikkink. *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1998.

Mathews, Jessica. "Power Shift." *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 76, no. 1 (January/February 1997), pp. 50–66.

O'Brien, Robert, Anne Marie Goetz, Jan Aart Scholte, and Marc Williams. *Contesting Global Governance: Multilateral Economic Institutions and Global Social Movements*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Risse-Kappen, Thomas, ed. *Bringing Transnational Relations Back In: Non-state Actors, Domestic Structures and International Institutions*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Wapner, Paul. *Environmental Activism and World Civic Politics*. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 1997.

Weiss, Thomas G., and Leon Gordenker, eds. *NGOs, the U.N., and Global Governance*. Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner, 1996.

Private Sector

Cutler, A. Claire, Virginia Haufler, and Tony Porter, eds. *Private Authority and International Affairs*. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 1999.

Haufler, Virginia. *A Public Role for the Private Sector: Industry Self-Regulation in a Global Economy*. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2001.

Mitchell, John, ed. *Companies in a World of Conflict*. London: Earthscan, 1998.

Experts

Braithwaite, John, and Peter Drahos. *Global Business Regulation*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Haas, Peter. "Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination." *International Organization*, vol. 46, no. 1 (Winter 1992), pp. 1–35.

The United States and Multilateralism

Karns, Margaret P., and Karen A. Mingst, eds. *The United States and Multilateral Institutions: Patterns of Changing Instrumentality and Influence*. Boston, Mass.: Unwin Hyman, 1990.

Maynes, Charles William, and Richard S. Williamson, eds. *U.S. Foreign Policy and the United Nations System*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1996.

Patrick, Stewart, and Shepard Forman, eds. *Multilateralism and U.S. Foreign Policy*. Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner, 2001.

Washburn, John L. "United Nations Relations with the United States." *Global Governance*, vol. 2, no. 1 (January 1996), pp. 81–96.

For a searchable database on governance literature, visit the Carnegie Endowment's Managing Global Issues Information Network at <http://www.ceip.org>.