

Project: [The G-20 Architecture in 2020 --Securing a Legitimate Role for the G-20](#)

Meeting: "The G20 at Leaders Level"
September 2nd (2009)
Washington, D.C.



Government Networks, World Order, and the G20

Anne-Marie Slaughter

Dean, Woodrow Wilson School of Public and

Project: [The G-20 Architecture in 2020 --Securing a Legitimate Role for the G-20](#)

Meeting: "The G20 at Leaders' Meeting" (10/11)

enforcement network, which has enhanced the effectiveness of environmental regulation in all three states, particularly in the U.S. Globally, the U.S. and its EU equivalent have founded the International Network for Environmental Compliance Monitoring.

Networked World Order

To see these networks as they exist, much less to imagine what they could become, requires a deeper conceptual shift. Stop imagining the international system as a system of states – unitary entities like billiard balls or black boxes – subject to rules created by international institutions that are 'apart from' and 'above' these states. Start thinking about a world of governments, with all the different institutions that perform the basic functions of governments – legislation, adjudication, implementation – interacting both with each other domestically and also with their foreign and supranational counterparts. States still exist in this world; indeed, they are crucial actors. But they are 'disaggregated'. They relate to each other not only through the 'foreign' office, but also through regulatory, judicial, and legislative channels.

Seeing the world through the lenses of disaggregated rather than unitary states allows leaders, policymakers, analysts, or simply concerned citizens to see features of the global political system that were previously hidden. Government networks suddenly pop up everywhere.

Equally important, these different lenses make it possible to imagine a genuinely new set of possibilities for a future world order. The building blocks of this order would not be states but parts of states—courts, regulatory agencies, ministries, legislatures. The government officials within these various institutions would participate in many different types of networks, creating links across national borders and between national and supranational institutions. The result could be a world that looks like the globe hoisted by cranes at Rockefeller Center, crisscrossed by an increasingly dense web of networks.



This world would still include traditional international organizations, such as the UN and the WTO, although many of these organizations would be likely to become hosts for and sources of government networks. It would still feature states interacting as unitary states on important issues, particularly in security matters. And it would certainly still be

a world in which military and economic power mattered³ government networks are not likely to substitute for either armies or treasuries.

& at the same time, however, a world of government networks would be a more effective and potentially more just world order than either what we have today or a world government in which a set of global institutions perched 'above' nation states enforced global rules. In a networked world order, primary political authority would remain at the national level except in those cases in which national governments had explicitly delegated their authority to supranational institutions. National government officials would be increasingly enmeshed in networks of personal and institutional relations. They would each be operating both in the domestic and the international arenas, exercising their national authority to implement their transgovernmental and international obligations and representing the interests of their country while working with their foreign and supranational counterparts to disseminate and distill information, cooperate in enforcing national and international laws, harmonizing national laws and regulations, and addressing common problems.

Global Impact of Government Networks

Government networks can provide the structure of a new world order, but how do we know that they actually have or will have any impact on addressing the problems that the world needs to solve? How do they or will they contribute to increasing peace and prosperity, promoting

against benchmarked standards. This approach is gaining popularity in the United States, is increasingly prevalent in the 4 - , and is being tried at the - N. Government networks create regional and even global transmission belts for information that can readily expand to include as many nations as can usefully participate. In addition, government networks are the ideal mechanism of international cooperation that have they directly engage the participation and the credibility of the individuals who must ultimately be responsible for addressing those problems.

Given what already exists, imagine what policymakers and opinion leaders around the world could create if they began looking through the lens of the disaggregated state and decided to recognize government networks as prime mechanisms of global governance, using existing networks and creating new ones to address specific problems. They could harness the capacity of government networks for self-regulation, drawing on examples of private commercial networks that succeed in enforcing 'network norms' (against cheating and other undesirable behavior). If government networks existed not only to address specific regulatory, judicial and legislative problems but also as self-consciously constituted professional associations of regulators, judges, and legislators, they should be able to develop and enforce global standards of honesty, integrity, competence, and excellence in performing the various functions that constitute a government.

They could socialize their members in a variety of ways that would create a perceived cost in deviating from the standards.

from the 4 - to the #ommunity of @emocracies have done, government networks could condition admission on meeting specified criteria designed to reinforce network norms.⁵ A particular advantage of selective strengthening of individual government institutions this way is that it avoids the pernicious problem of labeling an entire state as bad or good, liberal or illiberal, tyrannical or democratic. It focuses instead on performance at a much more micro!level, recognizing that in any country and in any government different forces will be contending for power and privilege. It is critical to support those who are willing to practice what they preach in both their own laws and their obligations under international law.

At the same time, these networks could be empowered to provide much more technical assistance of the kind needed to build governance capacity in many countries around the world. They could be tasked with everything from developing codes of conduct to tackling specific policy problems. They could be designated interlocutors for the multitudes of non!governmental actors who must be engaged in global governance as they are in domestic governance. Vertical government networks could similarly be designed to implement international rules and strengthen domestic institutions in any number of ways. How well will they do? We cannot know until we try.

To take a concrete example, consider how government networks could help in the rebuilding of ,ra+. A global or regional network of judges could be charged with helping to rebuild the ,ra+i legal system, both through training and t hr

regulators and other executive officials of every stripe could help to rebuild basic government services, from policing to banking regulation. In all these cases the experts and targeted technical assistance would be readily available; the rebuilding efforts would be multilateral and sustainable; and the new, retrained officials would have a continuing source of technical, political, and moral support.

Self-consciously constituted government networks could also acknowledge the power of discussion and argument in helping

The Transformation of the G20

Against this backdrop, we have three basic proposals concerning the future of the G20. First is to make it a much more robust institution with deeper roots in the member countries by replicating the existing network of finance ministers with networks of other regulators, legislators, and judges. Second is to give the G20 a presence in other larger international institutions, such as the UN, the IMF, and the World Bank. And third is to take advantage of the many other networks that G20 members are simultaneously part of to promote ideas and practices supported by the G20 and to collect and bring back important information from other networks to the G20.

A Global Think Tank

The distinctive characteristic and strength of the G20 is that it is small enough to be effective but large enough to be genuinely representative of the diversity of the world's nations and cultures. At a time when global inequality continues to grow and the fundamental policy agenda of North and South are diverging—with the North focusing primarily on the security of states, and hence the threats of terrorism and 9/11 and the South on basic human security, and hence the threats of AIDS and other diseases, grinding poverty, lack of basic educational and economic infrastructure, and environmental destruction, the need for a forum in which a genuine global dialogue can take place, much less collective brainstorming and problem-solving, is paramount. The G20 offers just that, but to capitalize on that asset it should extend its reach far beyond financial crises.

- sing the 4 - #ouncil of 9 inisters as a model, or &) 4#, 1 \$% ministers and lower level regulators of all types should meet to e change best practices and air divisive issues in their particular area of e pertise. So too should judges and legislators. The point would be to create a dense web of contacts among government officials from different countries.

& starting project could be to address the thorny issue of genetically modified organisms; according to experts on this issue, the EU and the US are locked in a fierce fight fueled by domestic politics on both sides. Developing countries are caught in the middle. On the one hand, they could benefit considerably from some GM crops. On the other hand, the EU export market is sufficiently large, and the labeling requirements sufficiently stringent, that at the moment the safest strategy to ensure continued exports to the EU is to shun all GM crops. Compromises can be found, but they require a smaller and less public forum than the WTO or US-EU relations. If the US were able to find such a compromise, it would almost surely be adopted, and the US value on the global stage even more firmly established.

Develop a Presence within Larger Global Institutions

With all the calls for UN reform, and similar pressures on the WTO and the Bretton Woods institutions, the time is ripe for a US caucus within these larger institutions. Within the UN, for instance, Security Council reform is actually very unlikely. But in many ways the US is an excellent substitute. None of its members have vetoes, and ensuring middle powers together to represent the interests of the rest of the world.

time

s

s

ations. be atiora
cstaf
ij th sd teth
ed to the nia
with I ptd Te vet

are all 15 members, it would require them to genuinely convince other countries rather than simply threaten the veto.

Within the G20, a 15 caucus could tackle specific questions like an alternative sovereign debt mechanism, or generally be a cohesive voice for the G20 consensus.

Within the G20, a 15 caucus could tackle a

government networks. If they so chose, the 1% members in any other network could form a mini-caucus both to promote ideas and practices developed in the 1% through other networks and to harvest the ideas and practices developed in these other networks and bring them back to the 1%.

These existing networks are conduits – for information, ideas, cooperative strategies, communication, and even conflict. They could be much more effectively exploited as a fundamental part of the infrastructure of global governance – the capacity of actual government at the global level, but without the form. Not to even begin to exploit their potential, they must be made more visible and useful. The 1%, itself a government network, but a relatively small, flexible, and diverse one, could be a catalyst for developing and implementing governance initiatives through these networks. Indeed, the 1% could even convene networks of networks – in different issue areas, as the Task Force did with the G20 network, which combined existing networks of central bankers, securities commissioners, and insurance supervisors – or in the same issue area but stretching across different regions and groups of countries. For instance, the 1% might combine one of its meetings with the finance ministers of the G20, or of the G4, or G4+, to try out a particular set of ideas, or tackle a particular problem, or propose a set of measures for broader adoption.

Networked governance operates differently than hierarchical governance or governance in formal international institutions with fixed voting rules. It operates primarily through the transmission of information in an environment where the appetite for credible information to help address policy problems of all kinds is great where fast-changing technology and circumstance creates a need for continually updating codes of best practices and where shared information allows government officials to solve

Project: [The G-20 Architecture in 2020 --Securing a Legitimate Role for the G-20 Meeting&-G-](#)

/et world government is both infeasible and undesirable.

enmô•

Addressing the paradox at the global level is further complicated by the additional concern of accountability. The conventional reaction in the 1550s to the problem of 'world government' was instead to champion 'global governance', a much looser and less threatening concept of collective organization and regulation without coercion. A major element of global governance, in turn, has been the rise of 'global policy networks', celebrated by UN Secretary General Kofi Annan, as bringing together all public and private actors on issues critical to the global public interest.^{1B}

Global policy networks, in turn, grow out of various 'reinventing government' projects, both academic and practical. These projects focus on the many ways in which private actors now can and do perform government functions, from providing expertise to monitoring compliance with regulations to negotiating

¹ Joseph Nye, 'Five Years of Globalization', Foreign Policy, January-February 2000, pp. 5-10.

² Stephen A. Lynn, 'America The Vulnerable', Foreign Affairs, vol. 21, 1992, pp. 168.

³ David S. Sanger, 'The World When Jaws Are Loose', Newsweek, 1992, pp. 16-17.