

General Introduction

Major Works Collection: Global Governance II

This is the final typeset and copyedited PDF version. The chapter should be cited as:

David Coen and Tom Pogram, 'General Introduction'. In: D. Coen and T. Pogram (eds.), *Major Works Collection: Global Governance II* (London: Routledge Press, forthcoming 2017).

Corresponding authors:

David Coen, Professor of Public Policy, Department of Political Science/School of Public Policy, University College London. Email: d.coen@ucl.ac.uk

Tom Pogram, Senior Lecturer in Global Governance, Department of Political Science, University College London. Email: t.pogram@ucl.ac.uk

General Introduction

The purpose of this Major Works Series is to take stock of recent rapid developments in scholarship on what we understand as ‘global governance’, an undeniably important but still ill-defined field of analysis. Although the conceptual, analytical and theoretical boundaries of global governance remain hotly debated, it is increasingly viewed as a vital component to addressing serious public goods challenges. As Martin Wolf of the *Financial Times* suggests, humanity’s efforts to overcome the tragedy of the global commons ‘could prove to be the defining story of the century’.¹ Whether the challenge is climate change mitigation, health pandemics, financial regulation or terrorism, we need more global cooperation, not less. But what is global governance? How does its conceptualisation shape analysis of global politics? And how can it actually be harnessed to enhance human wellbeing within a rapidly globalising political reality?

This series picks up where *Global Governance: Critical Concepts in Political Science*, Volume I, published as a Routledge Major Works collection, left off in 2004. The material curated for this Volume II Major Works collection is almost all new, reflecting major advances, updated works and rapid developments in the intervening years – both in terms of scholarship and real world events. The collection showcases an exciting evolution in current global governance ‘state of the art’ beyond the earlier predominance of one discipline (international relations) and thematic domain (international political economy). In so doing, it brings together in one place a unique collection of the most important, classic and cutting-edge global governance scholarship to date.

For many observers, global governance is not working. The deepening interdependence of cross-border activity belies the relative absence of governance mechanisms capable of effectively tackling global public policy issues, including staggering levels of relative inequality and other social ills. A profound sense of governance deficit above the nation state is provoking critical reflection within the corridors of power as much as among the scholarly community. Recent years have seen some extraordinary highs and lows in global politics. From the dispiriting retreat from European cooperation symbolised by the Brexit vote in June 2016, to the extraordinary breakthrough on climate change in Paris in December 2015, these are deeply uncertain and contradictory times. The populist surge witnessed, for instance, in the election of US President Donald Trump in late 2016 has also exposed deep tensions between a rapidly globalising reality and a host of pathologies associated with unchecked globalisation.

Within academic circles, global governance has a long, if often overlooked or misunderstood, pedigree. For many years it has been subsumed under the umbrella of International Relations (IR) or understood, for all intents and purposes, to be synonymous with international organisations or a narrow political economy concern. As this collection makes clear, there is good reason to consider global governance as an object of analysis and emergent field of scholarship in its own right. For the policy-oriented researcher, this collection is intended to serve as an entry point into this debate, spotlighting key global governance scholarship which may otherwise be difficult to access or is scattered across a wide range of specialist outlets.

The global governance intellectual community remains eclectic, rooted in IR, but shaped by research activity in cognate fields such as international law, public policy, and business

management, and extending into less orthodox disciplinary and substantive domains, including political geography, disaster risk management, computer science, climatology, and health, to name but a few. This collection acknowledges the increasingly expansive horizons of global governance scholarship, even if it restricts itself largely to theory and empirical application within a plural understanding of IR, comparative politics and international law.

The four volumes in this collection bring together classical contributions to global governance scholarship as well as the most influential work animating contemporary thinking in the field. Across the following four volumes, diverse scholars directly engage with the critiques and claims which exemplify efforts to advance global governance research across issue-areas, as well as ground discussion in more systematic conceptual, theoretical and empirical approaches. We have selected contributions which provide cross-thematic coverage, including studies on international political economy (IPE), global health, and global climate regulation, as well as methodological and empirical advances in the examination of global governance structures and agents. Reflecting the steady maturation of the field, the scholarship presented here includes diverse perspectives on the positive and negative effects of global governance phenomena, their intended and unintended consequences, and the power of conceptual identification to yield valuable explanatory insight into the practical realities of global governance performance.

This introduction turns now to situating the collected material in its historical and intellectual context and tracing out the inspiration offered by the scholars presented in Volume I: *Situating Global Governance Scholarship* for the subsequent proliferation of global governance research contained in the subsequent volumes. We draw out and reflect on some of the big themes that recur throughout the collection, elaborating upon their significance for

the study of global governance. The introduction goes on to survey the various pieces contained in this collection, identifying key sub-thematics and their central theoretical and analytical contribution to global governance scholarship.

Volume I: Situating Global Governance Scholarship

It is too early to tell whether the recent groundswell in explicit global governance research constitutes a meaningful demarcation from IR scholarship. In part, it will depend upon your point of departure. As with any such stock-taking exercise, it is first necessary to understand where global governance scholarship comes from, before we embark on evaluating its contemporary features or possible future lines of flight. This is what Volume I ‘Situating Global Governance Scholarship’ seeks to achieve.

Although global governance scholars acknowledge that states retain power and privilege in the current world order, they also point to significant trends which qualify this observation. In particular, the growing density of international structures with independent material and normative capabilities, coupled with the proliferation of non-governmental, sub-state and private actors, means that states no longer have pre-eminence in shaping the direction of global politics. Global governance scholars have also challenged that most cherished of organising principles in IR: formal anarchy. The refashioning of global politics as ‘governance without government’ by Rosenau was accompanied by a reformulation of anarchy – one which identifies not so much an absence as a profound disaggregation of authority above and below the state.² This seminal contribution marked a purposive turn towards thinking seriously about global governance, also reflecting frustration in some quarters with the narrow prescriptive scope of much theorising within IR and its failure to

comprehend, let alone explain, the radical transformations underway in the post-Cold War era.

Classic Contributions to the Study of Regimes and International Relations

That said, global governance scholarship is firmly rooted in the traditions of IR. The disciplinary turn in the 1970s to international organisation and regime theory, spearheaded by Keohane and Nye, continues to provide inspiration for contemporary debate on global governance.³ Keohane and Nye's reassertion of liberal thought into mainstream IR, in particular their concern for new transnational actors such as intergovernmental organisations (IGOs) and transnational corporations, provides a touchstone for seminal and cutting-edge global governance scholarship.⁴

The body of liberal institutionalist work which Keohane and Nye launched, with an almost exclusive focus on formal mechanisms of interstate relations within public multilateral institutions, produced significant insights into scope conditions for cooperation through international organisations and the potential for effective regime management.⁵ However, its neoliberal rationalist foundations have also been criticised for reinforcing a status quo bias by screening out concerns for power asymmetries, ideology, as well as value and legitimacy conflict.

This concern of omission did find expression in an earlier, if somewhat marginalised at least in the US academy, critical and normative IR scholarship.⁶ Robert Cox set his sights on explaining change in global politics at the macro level, with emphasis on both structural and ideational forces driving systemic transformations, as opposed to the realist preoccupation with 'value-free' data and the relative distribution of power among states.⁷ Cox's distinction

between a critical theory that exposes relations of power with the hope of transforming them, versus problem-solving theory that takes the world as it is, remains a powerful reference point for IR scholars (as well as an invaluable teaching aid). The expansive conception of historical materialism, including ideas, institutions and material capabilities, introduced by Cox, coupled with an explicit concern for historicising prevailing world orders, also strongly informs later global governance scholarship.⁸

In agreement with Cox, Ruggie pointed to the inability of much mainstream statist and functionalist theory to explain change.⁹ For constructivists such as Ruggie, to explain key changes in global politics requires a consideration for the origins of state interests or preferences in a socially constructed world. Ruggie, importantly, recognised that powerful states remain key sites of power but he pushed back against the discounting of ideas, history and transformation in the international system. This was exemplified in his study of the post-World War II regimes as regimes of ‘embedded liberalism’, their multilateralism informed by US pre-eminence, but also inextricably tied to the domestic stability of participating states in the industrial world and thereby ‘conditioned by one another’.¹⁰ Regimes were not simply a reflection of power, but also reliant on a particular configuration of state-society relations, informed by the ‘shared legitimacy of a set of social objectives to which the industrial world had moved’.¹¹ Asserting that social purpose could also serve as a *normative* determinant of regime change or endurance had an important impact on the defining global governance scholarship which would emerge during the following decade.

Global Governance Signposts

Throughout the 1980s, diverse sub-fields of IR scholarship such as constructivism, international political economy, and Gramscian theory, resonated deeply, especially outside

the US IR academy. They paved the way for the critical appraisal of existing analytical toolkits which took hold in the 1990s, with scholars such as Cerny, Rosenau and Held expanding the range of possibilities, not only in terms of explaining how global governance structures actually work in practice, but also in making visible an increasingly complex and globalising governance reality.

Real world events, combined with a growing awareness of the limitations, both analytical and explanatory, of first generation rationalist theory, provoked a new wave of global governance scholarship grounded in empirical application in response to an IR scholarship prone to over-theorisation. With the old binaries of the Cold War falling away, Rosenau and others foresaw that global politics would display ever greater potential for turbulence. Their desire to make comprehensible a rapidly changing world order also resonated within the policy community, as evidenced in the publication of the 'Report of the Commission on Global Governance' in 1995.¹² Weiss has described the rise of global governance as a 'shotgun wedding between academic theory and practical policy in the 1990s'.¹³

It is worth reflecting on the origins of a global governance terminology. For many observers in the early 1990s, global governance appeared to be 'virtually everything', a compensatory descriptor for the fact that 'we really don't know what to call what is going on'.¹⁴ Its association with a political programme of managing globalisation rightly continues to raise concerns regarding inbuilt teleologies and ideological commitments.¹⁵ In a particularly probing study showcased in this collection, Eagleton-Pierce locates the origins of global governance partly in 'the universalisation of a business-centred vision of political life'.¹⁶ It is incumbent on global governance scholars to 'guard against the risk of reifying certain concepts from their historical gestation'.¹⁷ It does not necessarily follow, though, that global

governance, or any other ‘essentially contested concept’, is inextricably tied to the circumstances of its origins or any one interpretation.¹⁸

The scholarship contained in ‘Global Governance Signposts’ highlights early efforts to address these concerns, while also demarcating global governance from IR. Rosenau’s expansive definition of global governance ‘conceived to include systems of rules at all levels of human activity – from the family to the international organization – in which the pursuit of goals through the exercise of control has transnational repercussions’ marked a decisive turning point away from the arbitrary segmentation of the national and international in IR scholarship.¹⁹ At the same time, scholars have warned against an overly broad definition of global governance, suggesting that ‘flexibility has been overstretched at the cost of precision and clarity’.²⁰

Recent contributions to the debate have eschewed definition altogether, understanding global governance as a ‘set of legitimate questions about how the world is governed and ordered at all levels and in every historical period’.²¹ In other words, if scholars find the concept of global governance useful, then they should pursue the first order tasks of describing and explaining systematically how it has changed over time, and within specific historical contexts. Murphy provides a notable example of detailed global historical study, empirically tracing out the development of liberal international organisations over the past century and beyond.²² His work highlights the value of combining insights from across international organisation theory and international political economy to reflect on the dialectical nature of these two bodies of scholarship by viewing multilateral organisations in relation to the changing needs of modern industrial organisation. This research mirrored a prominent IPE

focus of much early global governance scholarship on changes in the global economic order, accelerated by processes of globalisation.²³

The global governance scholarship of the 1990s continued to expand upon regime analysis, moving the focus beyond regime formation to when and how international institutions affect collective outcomes in international society. Levy et al. provide an important stocktake of the gains made by regime analysis as well as productive future lines of inquiry, with particular attention to pre-existing constellations of actor interests, state disaggregation, state-society relations, and explaining regime growth and decay.²⁴ These regime scholars, self-identifying as neo-positivist, nevertheless also acknowledge the contribution of critical or ‘reflexivist’ scholarship and actively call for combining insights from across schools of thought.

Important contributions were also made by global political philosophers injecting a principled concern into global governance debate for the ethical cosmopolitan imperative.²⁵ If global governance remained ‘a theory in the making’ throughout this period,²⁶ scholars were also busy innovating new conceptual apparatus to make sense of state ‘enmeshment’ within increasingly complex and dynamic multi-scalar governance ecosystems.²⁷

Situating Contemporary Global Governance Debate

Intellectual plurality has emerged as a hallmark of global governance and is well-represented by the scholarship on display under ‘Situating Contemporary Global Governance Debate’. Pegram and Acuto frame the field as a productive platform upon which to open up new analytical, theoretical, empirical and discursive vistas for a pluralising (and intellectually more democratic) global political scholarship.²⁸ They also engage explicitly with the opportunities and challenges presented by intra-, cross- and trans-disciplinary integration, drawing on insights from science and technology studies. Vogel and Kagan highlight a

particularly powerful field of cross-disciplinary convergence between global politics and business regulation scholarship.²⁹ In their landmark book on the ‘Dynamics of Regulatory Change’, they propel an incipient research agenda on private authority and the transnational dynamics of business regulation into the intra-disciplinary limelight.

It is perhaps surprising that political science scholars have, in the main, not grappled more fully with a globalising governance reality. In a provocative address to the American Political Science Association, Keohane – one of the key architects of neo-positivist regime analysis – set out the case for why the political science community, preoccupied with local system governance, should as a professional and ethical imperative engage seriously with the necessity of governance ‘in a partially globalized world’, as well as the principles that would make such governance legitimate.³⁰ He also takes aim at the reductionism of some functional theory which seeks to shoehorn human social reality into a pure self-interest model with little regard for normative principles that reflective individuals often (and should be encouraged to) pursue.

Taking up the challenge of incorporating agency, context and voluntarism into a global governance framework, Avant et al., among others, have led a resurgence in agency-centric theorising and empirical application. In ‘Who Governs the Globe?’ they identify a host of political entrepreneurs within and outside state structures with the capacity and incentives to engage in a myriad of governance functions at all levels.³¹ Importantly, they bring into focus a concern for ‘global governors’ and the governed, with attention to how relationships among diverse agents, their ‘tensions and synergies’, affect their authority as well as governance outcomes. ‘Who Governs the Globe’ represents a key work which seeks to bring agency to the fore of global governance scholarship, noting how structural changes, such as

globalisation, technological change, and privatisation, have given rise to a much more diverse set of ‘global governors’, often marginalised or ignored altogether in statist and functionalist IR approaches.

Conversely, Hurrell and other critical scholars suggest that while agency-driven research is important, global governance scholars must not lose sight of the larger structural and ideational forces driving more systemic transformations.³² Alongside other scholars,³³ Hurrell directs our attention to the question: what is actually ‘global’ in global governance and what does ‘liberal’ global governance look like from ‘below’ and from ‘outside’? In doing so, he cautions scholars to be mindful of how global governance is understood and received by the relatively disempowered in the Global South and how governance programmes may serve to reinforce power hierarchies through undermining local political autonomy and self-determination by groups of people and nation states. While making a powerful case for the importance of critical theory, Hurrell also holds a mirror up to critical scholarship itself, exposing some of its limitations and potential pathways for productive critical inquiry moving forwards.

Volume II: Structures and Political Economy of Global Governance: Critical

Interventions

Volume II collects the most important innovations in populating structures with agency, explaining how global governance structures actually work in practice, and, crucially, when and why they matter. Scholarship contained under ‘Regulatory Approaches to Global Governance’ exemplifies the ongoing liberal preoccupation with rule-making and regulation above the nation state, with Abbott and Snidal providing a powerful political economy reframing of legalisation theory and its application to global institutions.³⁴ Mitchell and

Keilbach clarify the cooperation problem arising from asymmetric externalities and the impact of distribution and enforcement problems on the prospects for international agreement.³⁵ Mattli and Woods advance a sophisticated liberal account of the functioning of global regulatory governance, with attention to both demand and supply-side factors, as well as institutional context.³⁶ De Búrca et al. introduce a dynamic understanding of regulation in the form of global experimentalist governance (GXG).³⁷ Not reliant upon enforcement, GXG emphasises participation, collective problem-solving, periodic revision and the incorporation of locally generated knowledge in securing rule implementation.

GXG exemplifies efforts by regulatory scholars to innovate upon old governance orthodoxies. A concern for growing systems complexity, diversity of interests and preferences and strategic agents also animates Abbott et al.'s new theory of orchestration, marking a significant advance on principal-agent modelling of delegation behaviour.³⁸ Two other pioneering works under 'New Global Governance Approaches' seek to redefine the disciplinary and analytical boundaries of global governance research. Albert et al. call for a revival of sociological concepts in the study of global politics.³⁹ In particular, they focus on functional differentiation, as developed by Niklas Luhmann, to illuminate what they regard as a growing differentiation of functions in world politics along social, economic and political lines. For his part, Acharya challenges the ethnocentrism and exclusion of mainstream IR,⁴⁰ a concern also flagged by Hurrell, and calls for a concerted effort to reimagine IR as a truly global discipline.⁴¹ In particular, he urges global politics scholars to engage with regional worlds to generate insight into how ideas circulate among levels of governance, across diverse contexts, illuminating new patterns, theories and methods which can reinvigorate productive exchange between area studies and global political scholarship.

Turning to ‘Locating Power in Global Governance’, this section opens with Barnett and Duvall’s seminal taxonomy of power, which draws together diverse theoretical traditions to realise a highly sophisticated power analysis.⁴² The propensity of early global governance scholarship to marginalise power in the analysis has given way to more critical reappraisals of how multilateral interstate geopolitics pervades the structures and political economy of governance systems. Lake offers a valuable companion piece, specifying steps required to arrive at a better understanding of how power is exercised.⁴³ Barnett and Finnemore expand upon the power of international organisations (IOs) in global governance, especially their ability to ‘create actors, specify responsibilities and authority among them, and define the work these actors should do’.⁴⁴ They highlight the potential for IOs to assume a life of their own, in a way not always desired by their creators. Kleine introduces a theory of ‘informal governance’ – uncodified rules of behaviour running parallel to formal treaty rules – to explore how governments use IOs to head off potential defections.⁴⁵ Koenig-Archibugi and Macdonald remind us of the importance of identifying the supposed beneficiaries of global governance programmes – often vulnerable parties with limited influence.⁴⁶

In paying attention to the constituent parts of governance systems beyond the state, global governance scholarship has privileged the effect of ‘Agency and Gatekeepers’ as much as structure on global political outcomes. Slaughter, alongside scholars in international law,⁴⁷ is widely credited with launching a vast research agenda into new intergovernmental and non-state networks of regulators and experts.⁴⁸ According to these scholars, the state is not disappearing so much as disaggregating into functionally distinct parts, thus generating increasingly dense webs of exchange. Carpenter exemplifies the promise of theoretically-informed empirical research on ‘gatekeepers’ within transnational networks to reveal how and why certain issues, such as child rights or the banning of landmines, become salient on

the world stage, building on the work of Keck and Sikkink and others.⁴⁹ Green moves the focus to the domain of global environmental politics to assess when and why private actors perform regulatory roles.⁵⁰ This is an ambitious work which seeks to not only explain when private authority emerges, but also what type of private authority will emerge, drawing principally on a rational institutionalist argument highlighting the benefits of incorporating private actor expert knowledge.

A concern for how agents construct, interpret and implement global norms and issues also speaks to new research agendas focused on understanding the role of 'Values and Legitimacy in Global Governance'. Hurd argues that legitimacy itself is a form of authority (defined as 'normative belief by an actor that a rule or institution ought to be obeyed').⁵¹ By looking at only one facet of power in international affairs, Hurd (echoing Ruggie's earlier work) contends that much IR scholarship has failed to capture how authority is generated and exercised in a socially constructed world. The presence of legitimate and institutionalised forms of authority on the world stage serves as a challenge to the organising principle of anarchy. Lake takes this critique further, identifying a series of empirical patterns produced by, at least partially, functional, international authority and global governance.⁵² Lake develops the concept of relational authority to explain global political outcomes, treating authority as a social contract underpinned by the *legitimate* exercise of power. This challenge to realpolitik was also mirrored outside the academy, with then UN Secretary General Kofi Annan declaring in 1998 that '[s]overeignty implies responsibility, not just power'.⁵³ In a highly insightful piece, Eagleton-Pierce critically assesses the dynamic nature of legitimacy, the processes by which actors gain and lose it, and how the concept of global governance must also contend with relations of power defined by illegitimate authority.⁵⁴

Volume III: Global Governance and the Nation State: Transcending Methodological Nationalism

Volume III brings together the best research seeking to collapse domestic, international and transnational segmentation to develop empirical applications across political units, as well as scales of governance. The first section presents key research addressing the function, coherence and effect of ‘Architectures of Global Governance’. Such inquiry highlights the inadequacies of the Weberian state construct which pervades much local governance scholarship for explaining a governance realm which is more complex and ambiguous than domestic government. It also reveals a landscape filled with diverse formal and informal, public and private institutions and entities.

Biermann et al. pose the question: what are the consequences of fragmented governance architectures?⁵⁵ They theorise a heuristic typology of fragmentation, weigh the pros and cons of more or less fragmentation, and explore the prospects for coordination among fragmented institutions. Raustiala and Victor introduce the influential concept of ‘regime complex’, sparking a scholarly turn towards explaining the origins and configuration of increasingly dense, intersecting international institutions or ‘regime complexes’ across substantive domains, as opposed to a focus on any one enclosed regime.⁵⁶ Alter and Meunier pick up where Raustiala and Victor leave off, evaluating the effects of regime complexity on state behaviour,⁵⁷ while Keohane and Victor produce an illuminating and influential analysis of the regime complex defining climate change governance.⁵⁸

In ‘Global Governance as Multi-Level Governance’, Zürn offers a conceptual refinement of global governance based on a threefold criterion: (1) autonomy of the global level, (2) structures above the nation state, and (3) interplay of different levels through functional or

stratificatory differentiation.⁵⁹ Farrell and Newman revisit the early insights of Keohane and Nye (see Volume I) on transgovernmental networks to elaborate a ‘new politics of interdependence’ which informs multi-level governance systems.⁶⁰ Focusing on global regulatory disputes, they introduce the idea of cross-national layering whereby actors interested in affecting domestic regulatory outcomes must reckon with powerful cross-jurisdictional interdependencies. Shaffer is another scholar pioneering our understanding of multi-level governance.⁶¹ He offers us a powerful conceptual apparatus to make sense of how, why and when ‘transnational legal ordering’ prompts change in domestic legal systems. Finally, Coen and Thatcher identify the role of a particular class of intermediaries they term ‘non-majoritarian regulators (NMRs).⁶² NMRs are emblematic of a significant (consensual) delegation of regulatory power and resources by governments to third party entities. However, many of these NMRs have subsequently exploited multi-level governance arrangements to become powerful in their own right, posing a challenge to principal-agent explanations of postdelegation behaviour and its consequences.

Shaffer reminds us that ‘transnational law will ultimately meet domestic configurations of power’.⁶³ Scholars showcased in ‘Bringing the State (Back) into Global Governance’ also underscore the importance of not losing sight of state power in a globalising world order. Sassen outlines a new geography of power, one which does not conform to the territorial constraints imposed by states.⁶⁴ Notwithstanding, Sassen is careful not to claim that the state is losing control in the world economy but rather that economic globalisation is provoking new contradictions and dilemmas in the exercise of state power. Hameiri and Jones focus their attention on how the state apparatus itself is subject to powerful transformative pressures through insertion into new regional and global governance systems.⁶⁵ In contrast to functional explanations of growing global interdependence, Hameiri and Jones illuminate the

political struggle and contestation which often drives processes of globalisation viewed through the lens of state transformation. Betts and Orchard fill an important gap in the scholarship on the domestic effect of global norms, focusing attention on implementation and the complex series of steps which separate international standards and their routinised observance within the state.⁶⁶

Vogel and Kagan (see Volume I) is just one seminal contribution in recent years to have examined the implications of transnational corporate governance and a global shift toward private regulation. In ‘Transnational Governance and Business Regulation’, Bütthe and Mattli document how governments have increasingly delegated regulatory authority to private IOs with far-reaching consequences for financial systems, national economies and firms.⁶⁷ They expose the political power dimension to supposedly technical private rulemaking processes as well as the interplay of domestic and international rules in governing who wins and who loses from transnational private rulemaking. Haufler drills down on why transparency has become the mechanism of choice for ameliorating accountability governance deficits in the private extractive sector.⁶⁸ Focusing on the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI), Haufler highlights the advocacy role of intersecting transnational networks to explain the gradual institutionalisation of this private regulatory agency, notwithstanding significant political barriers. Berliner and Prakash turn their critical gaze to the efficacy of voluntary standards in influencing corporate conduct in the areas of labour rights, the environment and human rights.⁶⁹ They find that disagreement over policy design has significantly impacted both the legitimacy and the diffusion of the UN Global Compact.

Volume IV: Change and Continuity in Global Governance

Volume IV juxtaposes work dealing with the most urgent crises in global governance – such as gridlock within multilateral forums – with the best classic and innovative thinking on how global governance is being contested and reformulated in light of a rapidly transforming post-Westphalian order. The first section ‘The More Things Change...’ charts key transformations in global governance thinking and practice, often at odds with the prevailing orthodoxy. Wendt argues that rational explanations of institutional design and effect are ‘driving with the rearview mirror’ because they can only explain what has been, not what can be.⁷⁰ He challenges the assumption that optimally designed institutions will necessarily map relatively straightforwardly onto actual outcomes. Weiss and Wilkinson call for the development of ‘new, specific, and tailored analytical tools’ to study global governance phenomena.⁷¹ The key question they pose to the field is how to better comprehend what drives change or continuity in global governance. Morse and Keohane offer insight along these lines in examining a contemporary shift within multilateral institutions towards contestation.⁷² Strategic interests of diverse actors, not exclusively states, are resulting in competitive pressures within multilateral forums, stoking profound changes in the ways in which they operate.

The scholars in ‘...The More They Stay the Same’ provide a diagnosis of current pathologies of global governance gridlock, which Hale et al. identify as the inability of countries to cooperate via international institutions to address policies that span borders it.⁷³ Drezner offers the clearest statement of continuity in global governance, echoing the longstanding rationalist realist and liberal orthodoxy that great power governments remain the preeminent actor in world politics.⁷⁴ Drezner goes so far as to claim that once domestic preferences are locked in, ‘[a] great power concert is a necessary and sufficient condition for effective global governance over any transnational issue’.⁷⁵ Betts and Orchard (see Volume III) complicate

the implicit assumption of great power agreement guaranteeing actual implementation. Hale et al. offer a general explanation of the widespread phenomenon of gridlock. They argue that global governance has been a victim of its own success, with deepening interdependence generating dynamics which actually work to undo successful cooperation in the modern era, including multipolarity, more complex problems, institutional inertia and fragmentation. In a similar vein, Goldin identifies globalisation as an essentially progressive force accompanied by severe crises which, absent decisive remedy, threaten to undermine its successes.⁷⁶ Goldin discusses five key challenges for global governance in the areas of finance, pandemics, cyber security, migration and climate change, identifying opportunities and weighing up the potential for global management to succeed.

The volume closes with some of the best theoretical and applied global governance research available. Graham disaggregates the IO into a collective agent to deepen our understanding of how internal factors, such as organisational fragmentation, influence agent faithfulness to their delegated mandate.⁷⁷ Pegram explores the implications of orchestration theory, as developed by Abbott et al. (see Volume II), for human rights governance and sheds light on how such arrangements affect networked intermediaries.⁷⁸ Saz-Carranza et al. demonstrate why global governance scholarship needs to take the organisational vector seriously, drawing on insights from public management.⁷⁹ Poulsen advances a bounded rationality perspective to generate a novel explanation of bilateral investment treaty diffusion, coupling insights from behavioural economics with careful case study analysis.⁸⁰ Sell provides a compelling account of how powerful actors in health governance have exploited resources and power disparities to advance their strategic interests within increasingly complex (or ‘granular’) governance ecosystems.⁸¹ Dryzek and Stevenson offer a valuable normative evaluation of the potential for democratic precepts to offer the parameters for more effective and legitimate

earth system governance.⁸² Finally, Hale provides a compelling empirically-driven explanation for why states have chosen to support the installation of private tribunals with public judicial authority to rule on transborder contract disputes.⁸³

We hope that this volume will convince the scholarly and general reader that this is indeed a fascinating time to be doing global governance research. Demand within academic circles for renewed reflection on global governance as a public policy-oriented scholarship reflects powerful real world imperatives, as well as demands across disciplinary silos for meaningful and sustained collaboration on global public policy provision and the governance machinery required to deliver it. This is emphasised in the collection editor's call for a 'third generation' of global governance research which advances convergence across the theoretically and empirically rich, but disparate, second generation of global politics and public policy scholarship showcased in this volume.⁸⁴ Broadly, the purpose of this volume is to sharpen our vision of what we might term a 'global governance pivot', observable within and well beyond the bounds of IR; one which seeks to overcome the paradigmatic 'isms' or doctrines of realism, liberalism and constructivism through critical reflection, empirical grounding and eclectic theorisation. As attested to in this collection, there is much to be gained, and indeed much to offer, in driving forward a more rigorous research agenda which effectively mediates the theoretical and empirical challenges posed by a topic as ambitious and vital as global governance.

¹ Martin Wolf, 'The world's hunger for public goods', *Financial Times*, 24 January 2012.

² James N. Rosenau and Ernst-Otto Czempiel, *Governance without Government: Order and Change in World Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

³ Robert Keohane and Joseph S. Nye, *Power and Interdependence: World Politics in Transition* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1977).

⁴ Anne-Marie Slaughter, 'The Real New World Order', *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 76, no. 5, Sept Oct 1997, pp. 183-97; Henry Farrell and Abraham Newman, 'The New Politics of Interdependence: Cross-National Layering in Transatlantic Regulatory Disputes', *Comparative Political Studies*, vol. 48, no. 4, March 2015, pp. 1-30.

- ⁵ Oran R. Young, 'International Regimes: Problems of Concept Formation', *World Politics*, vol. 32, no. 3, April 1980, pp. 331-356; Duncan Snidal, 'Coordination Versus Prisoners Dilemma: Implications for International Cooperation and Regimes', *American Political Science Review*, vol. 79, no. 4, December 1985, pp. 923-942.
- ⁶ See Hedley Bull, *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics* (London: Macmillan, 1977; Wendt 1988; Richard Ashley, 'The Poverty of Neorealism', *International Organization*, vol. 38, no. 2, Spring 1984, pp. 225-286; Susan Strange, *Casino Capitalism* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1986).
- ⁷ Robert W. Cox, 'Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory', *Millennium*, vol. 10, no. 2, 1981, pp. 126-155.
- ⁸ Craig N. Murphy, *International Organization and Industrial Change: Global Governance Since 1850* (London: Polity Press, 1994).
- ⁹ John Ruggie, 'International regimes, transactions, and change: embedded liberalism in the postwar economic order', *International Organization*, vol. 36, no. 2, Spring 1982, pp. 379-415.
- ¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 398.
- ¹¹ *Ibid.*
- ¹² The Commission on Global Governance, *Our Global Neighbourhood* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995).
- ¹³ Thomas G. Weiss, *Thinking about Global Governance: Why People and Ideas Matter* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2011), p. 9.
- ¹⁴ Lawrence S. Finkelstein, 'What is Global Governance?' *Global Governance*, vol. 1, no. 3, Sept-Dec 1995, p. 368.
- ¹⁵ Klaus Dingwerth and Philipp Pattberg, 'Global Governance as a Perspective on World Politics', *Global Governance*, vol. 12, no. 2, April 2006, p. 196.
- ¹⁶ Matthew Eagleton-Pierce, 'The concept of governance in the spirit of capitalism', *Critical Policy Studies*, vol. 8, no. 1, 2014, p. 7.
- ¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 8.
- ¹⁸ Walter B. Gallie [1955/56], 'Essentially Contested Concepts', *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society LVI*, vol. 56, pp. 167-197.
- ¹⁹ James N. Rosenau, 'Governance in the Twenty-first Century', *Global Governance*, vol. 1, no. 1, 1995, p. 13.
- ²⁰ Klaus Dingwerth and Philipp Pattberg, 'Global Governance as a Perspective on World Politics', *Global Governance*, vol. 12, no. 2, April 2006, p. 198.
- ²¹ Thomas G. Weiss and Rorden Wilkinson, 'Change and Continuity in Global Governance', *Ethics & International Affairs*, vol. 29, no. 4, 2015, p. 405.
- ²² Craig N. Murphy, *International Organization and Industrial Change: Global Governance Since 1850* (Polity Press, 1994).
- ²³ Susan Strange, *The Retreat of the State* (Cambridge University Press, 1996).
- ²⁴ Marc A. Levy, Oran R. Young and Michael Zürn, 'The Study of International Regimes', *European Journal of International Relations*, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 267-330.
- ²⁵ David Held, *Democracy and the Global Order* (Stanford University Press, 1995).
- ²⁶ Klaus Dingwerth and Philipp Pattberg, 'Global Governance as a Perspective on World Politics', *Global Governance*, vol. 12, no. 2, April 2006, p. 199.
- ²⁷ Cerny, Philip G., 'Plurilateralism: structural differentiation and functional conflict in the post-cold war world order', *Millennium*, vol. 22, no. 1, March 1993, pp. 27-51.
- ²⁸ Tom Pegrum and Michele Acuto, 'Introduction: Global Governance in the Interregnum', *Millennium*, vol. 43, no. 2, January 2015, p. 590.
- ²⁹ David Vogel and Robert A. Kagan (eds.), *Dynamics of Regulatory Change: How Globalization Affects National Regulatory Policies* (University of California Press, 2004), pp. 1-41.
- ³⁰ Robert Keohane, 'Governance in a Partially Globalized World', *American Political Science Review*, vol. 95, no. 1, March 2001, pp. 1-13.
- ³¹ Deborah D. Avant, Martha Finnemore, and Susan K. Sell, (eds.), *Who Governs the Globe?* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).
- ³² Andrew Hurrell, 'Can the Study of Global Order be De-Centred?' Power and Region in A Multipolar Order (PRIMO) Working Paper No. 2/2015.
- ³³ See Amitav Acharya, 'Global International Relations (IR) and Regional Worlds', *International Studies Quarterly*, vol. 58, no. 4, December 2014, pp. 647-659.
- ³⁴ Kenneth Abbott and Duncan Snidal, 'Hard and Soft Law in international Governance', *International Organization*, vol. 54, no. 3, Summer 2000, pp. 421-56.
- ³⁵ Ronald B. Mitchell and Patricia Keilbach, 'Situation Structure and Institutional Design: Reciprocity, Coercion, and Exchange', *International Organization*, vol. 55, no. 1, 2001, pp. 1019-1040.
- ³⁶ Walter Mattli and Ngaire Woods, (eds.), *The Politics of Global Regulation* (Princeton University Press, 2009).

- ³⁷ Gráinne de Búrca, Robert O. Keohane and Charles Sabel, 'Global Experimentalist Governance', *British Journal of Political Science*, vol. 44(3), July 2014, 477-486.
- ³⁸ Kenneth Abbott et al., 'Orchestration: global governance through intermediaries', in: *International Organizations as Orchestrators* (Cambridge University Press, 2015), pp. 3-36.
- ³⁹ Mathias Albert, Barry Buzan and Michael Zürn (eds.), *Bringing Sociology to International Relations: World Politics as Differentiation Theory* (Cambridge University Press, 2015).
- ⁴⁰ Amitav Acharya, 'Global International Relations (IR) and Regional Worlds', *International Studies Quarterly*, vol. 58, no. 4, December 2014, pp. 647-659.
- ⁴¹ Andrew Hurrell, 'Can the Study of Global Order be De-Centred?' Power and Region in A Multipolar Order (PRIMO) Working Paper No. 2/2015.
- ⁴² Michael Barnett and Raymond Duvall, 'Power in International Politics', *International Organization*, vol. 59, no. 1, Winter 2005, pp. 39-75.
- ⁴³ David Lake, 'Rightful rules: Authority, order and the foundations of global governance', *International Studies Quarterly*, vol. 54, September 2010, pp. 687-613.
- ⁴⁴ Michael N. Barnett and Martha Finnemore, 'The Politics, Power, and Pathologies of International Organizations', *International Organization*, Vol. 53, No. 4, 1999, p. 700.
- ⁴⁵ Mareike Kleine, *Informal Governance in the European Union: How Governments Make International Organizations Work* (Cornell University Press, 2013).
- ⁴⁶ Mathias Koenig-Archibugi and Kate Macdonald, 'Accountability-by-Proxy in Transnational Non-State Governance', *Governance*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 499-522.
- ⁴⁷ See Abram Chayes and Antonio H. Chayes, *The New Sovereignty: Compliance with International Regulatory Agreements* (Boston: Harvard University Press, 1995).
- ⁴⁸ Anne-Marie Slaughter, 'The Real New World Order', *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 76, no. 5, Sept Oct 1997, pp. 183-97.
- ⁴⁹ Charli Carpenter, 'Governing the global agenda: "gatekeepers" and "issue adoption" in transnational advocacy networks', in D. Avant et al. (eds.), *Who Governs the Globe?* (Cambridge University Press, 2010), pp. 202-37; Margaret Keck and Kathryn Sikkink, *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics* (Cornell University Press, 1998).
- ⁵⁰ Jessica Green, *Rethinking Private Authority: Agents and Entrepreneurs in Global Environmental Governance* (Princeton University Press, 2013).
- ⁵¹ Ian Hurd, 'Legitimacy and Authority in International Politics', *International Organization*, vol. 53, Spring 1999, p. 379.
- ⁵² David Lake, 'Rightful rules: Authority, order and the foundations of global governance', *International Studies Quarterly*, vol. 54, September 2010, pp. 687-613.
- ⁵³ See Secretary-General reflects on 'intervention' in thirty-fifth annual Ditchley Foundation Lecture, press release SG/SM/6613, available here: www.un.org/press/en/1998/19980626.sgsm6613.html (accessed 5 January 2017).
- ⁵⁴ Matthew Eagleton-Pierce, 'The concept of governance in the spirit of capitalism', *Critical Policy Studies*, vol. 8, no. 1, 2014, pp. 5-21.
- ⁵⁵ Frank Biermann et al., 'The Fragmentation of Global Governance Architectures: A Framework for Analysis', *Global Environmental Politics*, vol. 9, no. 4, November 2009, pp. 14-40.
- ⁵⁶ David G. Victor and Kal Raustiala, 'The regime complex for plant genetic resources', *International Organization*, vol. 32, no. 2, April 2004, pp. 147-54.
- ⁵⁷ Karen Alter and Sophie Meunier, 'The Politics of International Regime Complexity', *Perspectives on Politics*, vol. 7, no. 1, March 2009, pp. 13-24.
- ⁵⁸ Robert O. Keohane and David G. Victor, 'The Regime Complex for Climate Change', *Perspective on Politics*, vol. 9, no. 1, March 2011, pp. 7-23.
- ⁵⁹ Michael Zürn, 'Global governance as multi-level governance', in Henrik Enderlein et al. (eds.) *Handbook on Multi-level Governance* (Northampton: Edward Elgar 2010), p. 81.
- ⁶⁰ Henry Farrell and Abraham Newman, 'The New Politics of Interdependence: Cross-National Layering in Transatlantic Regulatory Disputes', *Comparative Political Studies*, vol. 48, n0. 4, March 2015, pp. 1-30.
- ⁶¹ Gregory Shaffer, *Transnational Legal Ordering and State Change* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014).
- ⁶² David Coen and Mark Thatcher, 'New Governance of Markets: Regulation by Non-Majoritarian Institutions', *Governance*, vol. 25, no. 3, 2005, pp. 329-34.
- ⁶³ Gregory Shaffer, 'The Dimensions and Determinants of State Change'. In: Gregory Shaffer, *Transnational Legal Ordering and State Change* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), p. 44.
- ⁶⁴ Saskia Sassen, *Losing Control: Sovereignty in the Age of Globalization* (Columbia University Press, 1996), pp. 1-32.

-
- ⁶⁵ Shahar Hameiri and Lee Jones, 'Global Governance as State Transformation', *Political Studies*, published online 29 September 2015, pp. 1-18.
- ⁶⁶ Alexander Betts and Phil Orchard (Eds.), *Implementation and World Politics: How International Norms Change Practice* (Oxford University Press, 2014), pp. 1-28.
- ⁶⁷ Tim Büthe and Walter Mattli, 'The Rise of Private Regulation in the World Economy', in: Tim Büthe and Walter Mattli, *The New Global Rulers: The Privatization of Regulation in the World Economy* (Princeton University Press, 2011), pp. 1-17.
- ⁶⁸ Virginia Haufler, 'Disclosure as Governance: The Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative and Resource Management in the Developing World', *Global Environmental Politics*, vol. 10, no. 3, 2010, pp. 53-73.
- ⁶⁹ Daniel Berliner and Aseem Prakash, "'Bluewashing" the firm? Voluntary Regulations, Program Design, and Member Compliance with the United Nations Global Compact', *Policy Studies Journal*, vol. 43, no. 1, 2015, pp. 115-138.
- ⁷⁰ Alexander Wendt, 'Driving With the Rearview Mirror: On the Rational Science of Institutional Design', *International Organization*, vol. 55, no. 1, pp. 1019-1049.
- ⁷¹ Thomas G. Weiss and Rorden Wilkinson, 'Change and Continuity in Global Governance', *Ethics & International Affairs*, vol. 29, no. 4, 2015, p. 398.
- ⁷² Julia C. Morse and Robert O. Keohane, 'Contested Multilateralism', *Review of International Organizations*, vol. 9, no. 4, 2014, pp. 385-412.
- ⁷³ Thomas Hale, David Held and Kevin Young, *Gridlock: Why Global Cooperation is Failing When We Need It Most* (London: Polity Press, 2013).
- ⁷⁴ Daniel Drezner, 'Bringing the Great Powers Back In'. In: D. Drezner, *All Politics is Global: Explaining International Regulatory Regimes* (Princeton University Press, 2007), pp. 3-31.
- ⁷⁵ *Ibid*, p. 5.
- ⁷⁶ Ian Goldin, *Why global governance is failing, and what we can do about it* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).
- ⁷⁷ Erin R. Graham, 'International Organizations as Collective Agents: Fragmentation and the Limits of Principal Control at the World Health Organization', *European Journal of International Relations*, vol. 19, no. 1, March 2013, pp. 366-390.
- ⁷⁸ Tom Pegram, 'Global human rights governance and orchestration: National human rights institutions as intermediaries', *European Journal of International Relations*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 595-620.
- ⁷⁹ Angel Saz-Carranza et al., 'The Power Dynamics of Mandated Network Administrative Organizations', *Public Administration Review*, vol. 76, no. 3, May-June 2016, pp. 449-462.
- ⁸⁰ Lauge Poulsen, 'Bounded Rationality and the Diffusion of Modern Investment Treaties', *International Studies Quarterly*, vol. 58, no. 1, March 2014, pp. 1-14.
- ⁸¹ Susan K. Sell, 'TRIPS was never enough: vertical forum shifting, FTAs, ACTA, and TPP', *Journal of Intellectual Property Law*, vol. 18, 2011, pp. 447-478.
- ⁸² John S Dryzek and Hayley Stevenson, 'Global democracy and earth system governance', *Ecological Economics*, vol. 70, no. 11, September 2011, pp. 1865-1874.
- ⁸³ Tom Hale, 'The rule of law in the global economy: Explaining intergovernmental backing for private commercial tribunals', *European Journal of International Relations*, vol. 21, no. 3, September 2015, pp. 483-512.
- ⁸⁴ David Coen and Tom Pegram, 'Wanted: A Third Generation of Global Governance Research', *Governance*, vol. 28, no. 4, October 2015, pp. 417-420.