

Global
Challenges
Foundation

Global Challenges Quarterly Report

Global governance for global citizens

new frameworks, new ideas



GLOBAL CHALLENGES QUARTERLY REPORT GLOBAL GOVERNANCE FOR GLOBAL CITIZENS – NEW FRAMEWORKS, NEW IDEAS

The views expressed in this report are those of the authors. Their statements are not necessarily endorsed by the affiliated organisations or the Global Challenges Foundation.

Quarterly report team

Project leader: Carin Ism

Project coordinator: Ben Rhee

Editor in chief: Julien Leyre

Art director: Elinor Hägg

Graphic design: Erik Johansson

Contributors

Alicia Bárcena

Executive Secretary, Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC).

Helen Clark

Former New Zealand Prime Minister, 1999-2008; former UNDP Administrator, 2009-2017.

Ghida Fakhry

Journalist.

Francesco Femia

Co-President, Center for Climate and Security.

Shiloh Fetzek

Senior Fellow for International Security, Center for Climate and Security.

Sherri Goodman

Senior Advisor for International Security, Center for Climate and Security; former U.S. Deputy Undersecretary of Defense.

Yoriko Kawaguchi

Fellow, Meiji Institute for Global Affairs, Meiji University; former Minister for Foreign Affairs, Minister of the Environment, and Member of the House of Councilors, Japan.

Graça Machel

Chancellor, African Leadership University and University of Cape Town; President, University of London School of Oriental and African Studies.

Manjana Milkoreit

Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, Purdue University.

Camilla Schippa

Director, Institute for Economics & Peace.

Hu Shuli

Editor-in-Chief, Caixin Media.

Alexandra Wandel

Director, World Future Council.

Caitlin Werrell

Co-President, Center for Climate and Security.

THE GLOBAL CHALLENGES FOUNDATION works to incite deeper understanding of the global risks that threaten humanity and catalyse ideas to tackle them. Rooted in a scientific analysis of risk, the Foundation brings together the brightest minds from academia, politics, business and civil society to forge transformative approaches to secure a better future for all.

Contents

Preface	6
Executive Summary	8
Part 1. Global Institutions	16
1.1 How could the UN be empowered to work more effectively? – <i>Helen Clark</i>	18
1.2 International governance: balancing inclusion and efficiency – <i>Yoriko Kawaguchi</i>	24
1.3 Regional collaboration: a perspective from Latin America and the Caribbean – <i>Alicia Bárcena</i>	30
1.4 Trade as a driver of international governance: China’s Belt and Road initiative – <i>Hu Shuli</i>	38
1.5 Reaping the economic benefits of peace while building peace – <i>Camilla Schippa</i>	44
1.6 Guardians for future generations: towards a sustainable and peaceful world – <i>Alexandra Wandel</i>	50
Part 2. Global Citizens	56
2.1 Global citizens call for global leaders – <i>Ghida Fakhry</i>	58
2.2 Who cares about global governance? – <i>Manjana Milkoreit</i>	66
2.3 Women’s education as a driver of global citizenship – <i>Graça Machel</i>	74
2.4 A responsibility to prepare: governing in an age of unprecedented risks and unprecedented foresight – <i>Sherri Goodman</i>	82
Continuing the conversation	91



MATS ANDERSSON

Vice-chairman, Global Challenges Foundation, Former CEO, Fourth Swedish National Pension Fund, co-founder Portfolio Decarbonization Coalition

Preface

The Global Challenges Foundation's recent collaboration with ComRes on a global opinion survey found that a majority of citizens across eight very different countries share a growing

sense of insecurity in today's world. They want world leaders to cooperate more effectively to tackle threats to humanity, particularly weapons of mass destruction, escalating political conflict and climate change.

The survey revealed strong support for both reform of the United Nations and the creation of a new global decision-making body to manage threats to humanity. Clearly, when it comes to global governance, the status quo is not working and citizens are crying out for new paradigms.

Interestingly, the ComRes survey also showed that three quarters of people in the countries featured considered themselves "global citizens" in addition to citizens of their own countries. Global citizenship in this context was defined as "the rights, responsibilities and duties that come with being part of the world". This edition of our Quarterly Risk Report explores in more depth what these "rights, responsibilities and duties" might look like in this era of global instability and anxiety — for individuals, for leaders, for businesses and global institutions.

Our contributors take on some of the big questions. These include how today's global decision-making processes can factor in the needs — and rights — of future generations so that our legacy is not a destructive one. They look at how, when faced with a global catastrophic risk such as climate change, we can embed a 'Responsibility to Prepare' into global

institutions. And how we can help these global governance institutions to have meaning for the ordinary citizens over whose lives they will exert an immeasurable influence.

These are just some of the vital topics explored in this report by expert contributors from Africa, Australasia, China, Europe, Japan, Latin America and North America. What unifies them is deep thinking about the state of the world and global governance today. The lead authors also all happen to be female, a conscious choice made by the Global Challenges Foundation to help address the gender imbalance in conversations about global governance.

As Graça Machel argues in her powerful essay on the catalytic power of female education, "We as global citizens are the sum of our parts, and it does not make sense that we would continue to tolerate the marginalisation of those who are holding up our own sky." I hope you will enjoy reading our contributors' ideas for the constructive approaches urgently needed if we are to fulfil our destiny as global citizens and surmount the serious risks that threaten all of humanity.



Mats Andersson

Vice-chairman, Global Challenges Foundation
Former CEO, Fourth Swedish National Pension Fund,
co-founder Portfolio Decarbonization Coalition

Executive summary

Julien Leyre, Global Challenges Foundation.

The first part of this report looks at institutional aspects of global governance, exploring the ways that institutions may better address today's global challenges. It opens with a contribution by Helen Clark, former New Zealand Prime Minister and former UNDP Administrator, *How could the UN be empowered to work more effectively*. The United Nations are seen as a key potential actor in addressing today's pressing challenges. However, the institution is seemingly incapable of taking appropriate action to solve ongoing crises around the world. Positive steps forward would include improving structures for collective decision-making, and empowering the UN Secretary-General to demonstrate and exert effective global leadership.

Our current system of global governance has had remarkable achievements over the past 70 years, but in light of new challenges, it is showing a number of limitations. This is the premise of the second piece, *International governance: balancing inclusion and efficiency*, by Yoriko Kawaguchi, Fellow at the Meiji Institute for Global Affairs, and

former Minister for Foreign Affairs, Minister of the Environment, and Member of the House of Councilors in Japan. With 193 UN countries holding a legitimate aspiration to be part of global decision-making, what is the best way to balance fairness and effectiveness in global governance? An important element will be the capacity to balance inclusive structures where all voices can be heard with smaller bodies – such the G20 or the World Economic Forum – where participation is more limited, but more effective decisions can be made.

In all parts of the world, a number of regional institutions have emerged to better address joint challenges and opportunities among neighbouring countries. Alicia Bárcena, Executive Secretary of the UN Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean, reflects on their growing importance in *Regional collaboration: a perspective from Latin America and the Caribbean*. Those regional institutions demonstrate that nation-states are willing to trade a measure of autonomy in exchange for greater economic integration, better management of joint projects and resources, or a stronger voice on the global stage. Latin America and the

Caribbean have not been left behind, with a range of bodies promoting regional integration and strengthening connections with the rest of the world. These initiatives are opening new channels to overcome the geographic and regulatory fragmentation of a region with great untapped potential and, beyond, contribute to the development of a more robust global governance architecture.

Trade has long been a driving force in promoting international collaboration. In light of current geopolitical changes, what new forms of economic cooperation will guide the future development of international trade and – beyond – of global governance? This is the question driving the contribution of Hu Shuli, Editor-in-Chief at Caixin media, *Trade as a driver of international governance: China's Belt and Road initiative*. Indeed, China's recent Belt and Road strategy represents an important development for global economic institutions. Unlike the rules-based order structured around the WTO, this initiative combines diplomatic coordination with project-based collaboration, investment and infrastructure partnerships, to better foster economic integration across countries.

In Reaping the economic benefits of peace while building peace, Camilla Schippa, Director at the Institute for Economics & Peace offers another

lens on the relationship between trade and global coordination, with a piece anchored in the long tradition of articulating global governance and peace. In the aftermath of conflict, private sector development is critical for peace in the long run. However, all too often, business perceives the risks in post-conflict settings as too great, locking many fragile countries in aid dependence and economic instability. Not only could business activity contribute to peace in the right settings, business can also gain significant profits from high-opportunity post-conflict contexts. Targeted investments towards identified drivers of peace in fragile states and associated governance frameworks could therefore trigger virtuous cycles where peace and prosperity mutually reinforce each other.

The consequences of today's major challenges will extend far beyond the conditions affecting the people currently alive. Bringing the voice of future generations to the table is therefore fundamental. The first part of this report concludes with a piece by Alexandra Wandel, Director at the World Future Council in Hamburg, *Guardians for future generations: towards a sustainable and peaceful world*, which examines institutional developments intended to better address this issue. In the recent years, many countries have created new roles for official figures appointed explicitly to represent the rights and

interests of those yet unborn. Giving such ‘guardians for the future’ a place in more regional, national and global forums is an important step to make sure that the major decisions we face today genuinely weigh more than the mere interests of the present.

The second part of this report

focuses on the emergence of global citizenship, considering both ongoing challenges to this notion and the new forms of engagement, responsibility and solidarity that global citizenship entails. Lebanese journalist Ghida Fakhry opens this section with *Global citizens call for global leaders*. Recently, the young and charismatic figures of Macron and Trudeau have emerged as a possible new breed of political leader, harnessing their media-savviness to set a new vision of world affairs. Their success, however, echoes that of earlier leaders whose global rise to fame largely depended on their interaction with the media – such as Castro and Kennedy – and in spite of international appeal to new globalized audiences, their political destiny remains attached to domestic challenges.

While people around the world

identify in increasing numbers as global citizens, engagement with global governance remains practically non-existent, observes Manjana Milkoreit, Assistant Professor at the Department of Political Science, Purdue University, in *Who cares about global governance*. Indeed, a range of structural and cognitive barriers

make it difficult to prioritize global challenges, identify their relevance, access decision-making forums, or simply bear the emotional burden associated with issues of existential magnitude. It is, therefore, of crucial importance that we better educate citizens about global governance, develop new models of engagement, and more clearly communicate about the role and impact of global institutions.

Education is the focus of the next contribution, *Women’s education as a driver of global citizenship*, by Graça Machel, Chancellor at the African Leadership University and the University of Cape Town, and President of the University of London School of Oriental and African Studies. Over the last three decades, the advent of the Internet age coupled with rapid globalization has enabled us to be better connected as global citizens. Despite gains in connectivity and interconnectedness across borders, societies around the world are still plagued by fragmentation and inequity. The well-coordinated action of civil society has become pivotal in countering such destructive forces. One certain solution to ensure a vibrant and engaged citizenry is to educate women and encourage their active civic participation.

The report finishes with a contribution by Sherri Goodman, Senior Advisor for International Security at the Center for Climate


and Security and former U.S. Deputy Undersecretary of Defense, co-authored by Caitlin Werrell, Francesco Femia and Shiloh Fetzek from the Center for Climate and Security. *A responsibility to prepare: governing in an age of unprecedented risks and unprecedented foresight* proposes the following argument. In the face of rapid climatic, social and technological transformations, our current world order is facing unprecedented levels of


uncertainty. However, this is balanced by considerable progress in our capacity to foresee those transformations and their possible effects. In this context, it is our strategic duty to change the way that we prepare for the future. We must anticipate the challenges of those rapid climatic, social and technological transformations, address associated risks in advance of catastrophe, and embrace our responsibility to prepare.

PART 1 – GLOBAL INSTITUTIONS

Part 1

Global institutions







HELEN CLARK

Helen Clark is a former Prime Minister of New Zealand (1999-2008) and most recently head of the UNDP (2009-2017). She also served as Minister for Conservation, Minister for Housing, Minister for Health, Minister for Labour, Minister for Arts, Culture, and Heritage, Minister in charge of the New Zealand Security Intelligence Service, Minister responsible for the Government Communications Security Bureau, Minister for Ministerial Services and Deputy Prime Minister in the New Zealand Government. She has won many awards for her long career in public life, including the Danish Peace Prize for her work on nuclear disarmament, and is a member of the Club of Madrid and the Council of World Women Leaders.

1.1. How could the UN be empowered to work more effectively?

Helen Clark, former New Zealand Prime Minister, 1999-2008; former UNDP Administrator, 2009-2017.

The United Nations are seen as a key potential actor in addressing today's pressing challenges. However, the institution is seemingly incapable of taking appropriate action to solve ongoing crises around the world. What would allow the UN to better face the challenges of this century? Positive steps forward would include improving structures for collective decision-making, and empowering the UN Secretary-General to demonstrate and exert effective global leadership.

In a world facing many grave challenges across many spheres, people look to the United Nations to play a key role in resolving them.

Yet there is broad appreciation that the UN is failing in vital areas, not least on peace and security. It is at its best in the development and humanitarian spheres, where it works with and for people and gets results. But when today's protracted crises have driven untold human misery, including the forced displacement of an unprecedented 65.6 million people, its seeming inability to act to end those is an indictment of the organisation. The UN badly needs structures and ways of working which will address the crises of this century, not those of 1945.

Some of the issues arise from structural constraints. An important one is the veto power on the Security Council given to five nations when the Charter was written in 1945. That prevents effective action on peace and security – even when an overwhelming majority of the Council itself and of Member States wants it. That veto should be removed, and replaced by a qualified voting system which allows for, at the least, decisions to be taken on a near unanimous basis.

That should be coupled with fairer representation on the Security Council. The Security Council is in effect the executive board for the UN on peace and security matters, and Europe is clearly overrepresented, while other regions are


correspondingly underrepresented. This is a long-term source of grievance, and undermines the UN's legitimacy.

The requirement for a range of key agreements to be reached unanimously is another structural element that is holding our world back. If the climate negotiations in Bali in 2007, for example, had been able to forge ahead, leaving a minority of dissenters behind, there would be much greater confidence that we can avoid reaching the tipping point in global warming at which irreversible and catastrophic change in the climate ecosystem occurs.

In addition to those structural limitations to collective decision-making, there are the many constraints placed on a Secretary General's ability to lead. The Secretariat is subjected to micro management by Member States through various committees of the General Assembly. There is little appreciation of the need for a clear line to be drawn between management and governance.

The Secretary General should have the power to take bold initiatives and run the organisation as an effective leader and chief executive must. International organisations need leaders empowered to act. Yes, there must be systems of accountability, but when they hamper action on everything from courageous diplomacy for peace to streamlining

▼▼ The UN badly needs structures and ways of working which will address the crises of this century, not those of 1945. ▼▼



management, as they do now, they become counterproductive. Worse, they can leave a Secretary General looking weak, indecisive, and hamstrung because of fear to offend Member States.

So, Member States must ease up, and give the Secretary General and their managers the space to act decisively. Coupled with that, there should be only one term served by a

Secretary-General to avoid the over-caution which is inherent in aiming to secure a second mandate from the day the first one begins.

If steps like those I've outlined aren't taken, then the UN will continue to diminish in relevance. The world needs an effective UN. The current limitations on its capacity to lead and act need to be addressed urgently.



YORIKO KAWAGUCHI

Yoriko Kawaguchi is a former Japanese diplomat and politician. Her various appointments include that of Special Advisor to the Prime Minister on Foreign Affairs (2004-2005), Minister for Foreign Affairs (2002-2004) and Minister for Environment (2000-2002). She also served as a Member of the House of Councilors for the Liberal Democratic Party from 2005 to 2013, and as an economist at the World Bank. She is currently Professor at the Meiji Institute for Global Affairs in Tokyo. On July 2008, she was appointed Co-chair of a new International Commission on Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament.

1.2. International governance: balancing inclusion and efficiency

Yoriko Kawaguchi, Fellow, Meiji Institute for Global Affairs, Meiji University; former Minister for Foreign Affairs, Minister of the Environment, and Member of the House of Councilors, Japan.

Our current system of global governance has had remarkable achievements over the past 70 years, but in light of new challenges, it is showing a number of limitations. With 193 UN countries holding a legitimate aspiration to be part of global decision-making, what is the best way to balance fairness and effectiveness in global governance? An important element will be the capacity to balance inclusive structures where all voices can be heard with smaller bodies – such the G20 or the World Economic Forum – where participation is more limited, but more effective decisions can be made.

▼▼ In the face of pressing global threats, what is the best way to achieve a right balance between inclusion and efficiency? ▼▼

The UN Security Council's resolutions have not succeeded to stop North Korea's nuclear program. All over the world, refugees have increased, reaching 65 million, of which half are children. The Doha round has stalled, resulting in the proliferation of bilateral and regional Free Trade Agreements, less efficient than a multilateral agreement.

Obviously, our international governance order needs mending, despite a decent track record. There has not been any worldwide war for the past 70 years, and the post-war liberal international economic system brought about unprecedented prosperity, raising the income level of many developing countries, including China and India. But the international community has outgrown its present governance system, partly due to its very success. It is now facing new challenges: the international community has become more interdependent, new risks are global in scale, and with progress in transportation and communication technologies, risks could spread almost instantaneously.

As countries develop, it is natural that they aspire to play a part in rule-making and have their views reflected in the global governance order. But the number of UN member countries has increased from 51 to 193 since foundation, and this increase brings new challenges.


Democracy is a widely accepted

domestic governance system in many countries. In the international setting as well, a democratic governance order is called for. But what would be a desirable democratic order when countries differ in their security, economic, political and other capabilities, and so many different countries need to come together? In the face of pressing global threats, what is the best way to achieve a right balance between inclusion and efficiency?

An important element to consider is the cost of maintaining good international governance, and who should bear this cost. The UN's Peacekeeping Operations need to be financed and staffed. The same is true with the World Trade Organization. Good international governance is an international public good which, by definition, tolerates free-riders. If all countries free-ride, the system cannot survive. Worse still, costs have risen as risks have increased.

For over 70 years after the Second World War, the U.S. bore the largest burden, with contributions from other developed countries. Now, circumstances have changed greatly, and the U.S. has relatively declined. With this power-shift, the responsibility for cost-bearing should be shared more broadly by countries aspiring to a greater voice in the international decision making.


Fortunately, real world examples demonstrate that this has been taking place. For example, the Paris



Climate Agreement stipulated that responsibility to reduce greenhouse gas emissions - and thus cost sharing - applies to developing countries on the principle of equal but differentiated responsibilities.

Beyond the question of cost sharing, a good international governance system needs to be efficient as well, because time could be a vital factor in dealing with risks. This means, the system needs to be both representative and functional. One potential model would combine a broad structure where all nations participate, and smaller structures allowing certain countries to play a larger role in decision-making, but with greater responsibility for cost bearing. Various structures already play this second role.

The G20 is a good example. The G20, at the summit level, met for the first time in 2008, following the global financial crisis, to respond and build a resilient international community. Participating countries together represent about 2/3 of the world's population, 90% of its GDP, and 80% of trade. The 12 summit meetings since then have helped leaders understand each other's thinking, given guidance on global problems and agreed on important action plans, some of them with target dates. The Hamburg Summit in 2017 covered a wide variety of issues, including trade and investment, excess capacities in the iron and steel industry, global financial systems, climate change and Africa. Now, major decisions pertaining to world problems must be endorsed by the G20 to be viable.



The G20 is an improvement over the G7 in terms of inclusiveness. However, work is still needed to create a sense of joint responsibility and, perhaps, develop agreed principles for action, so that the G20 can be more effective and action-oriented. This was the case with the G7, which agreed and acted on the decommissioning of the former Soviet nuclear submarines after the demise of the Soviet Union.

Another exemplary vehicle is the World Economic Forum. This is a forum for political, business, academic and other thought leaders from around the world. It functions as an incubator for creative thoughts and initiatives for actions to orient governments and business. For example, an initiative for water was created at Davos by the leadership of some international companies, and

influenced governments and business to act on clean water supply.

Partnership between governments and business will be more important in the years to come, because risks will become more complex, with more serious implications on our interconnected world. Governments, many of which are under serious financial constraints, cannot deal with those singlehandedly. Partnership with local governments and citizens' groups should also be strengthened for the same reasons.

The objectives of an international governance system are to achieve peace, stability, and prosperity. The most important underlying factor for this is the willingness of the nations and peoples to honor governance rules.



ALICIA BÁRCENA

Alicia Bárcena is a biologist who currently serves as the UN Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) and, since 2016, on the OECD-DAC's High Level Panel on the Future of the Development Assistance Committee under the leadership of Mary Robinson. She formerly served as undersecretary of the environment in the federal cabinet of Mexico and is a former director of Mexico's National Institute of Fisheries. She also served in both UNEP and UNDP, was founding Director of the Earth Council, and served UN Secretary-Generals Kofi Annan (as Chief of Cabinet), and Ban-Ki Moon (as Under-secretary-general of management).

1.3. Regional collaboration: a perspective from Latin America and the Caribbean

Alicia Bárcena, Executive Secretary, Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC).

In all parts of the world, a number of regional institutions have emerged to better address joint challenges and opportunities among neighbouring countries. Their existence demonstrates that nation-states are willing to trade a measure of autonomy in exchange for greater economic integration, better management of joint projects and resources, or a stronger voice on the global stage. Latin America and the Caribbean have not been left behind, with a range of bodies promoting regional integration and strengthening connections with the rest of the world.

In today's world, regional collaboration is essential to fulfill a wide range of tasks. Economic integration is perhaps the most classical example: countries forego some degree of autonomy to conduct their trade and investment policies in exchange for the benefits of a larger regional market. But regional collaboration is also needed to coordinate large-scale, multi-country infrastructure projects, to deal with intra-regional migration flows, to jointly manage shared natural resources, to adopt common approaches to shared environmental problems, and the list goes on. Regional coordination is also increasingly necessary to speak with a single voice in global debates.

It is therefore not surprising that over time all regions have developed institutions tasked with facilitating cooperation among their members. Those institutions are very diverse, on many counts. Some are truly regional in their membership, whereas others have a sub-regional scope. Some have a mainly economic focus, while others have a wider mandate including social, health or environmental policies, among others. Some have a supranational character, whereas others remain strictly intergovernmental. Some involve binding agreements that their members must legally implement, while others mostly provide a forum for political dialogue and for countries to seek voluntary coordination on topics of common

interest. Perhaps inevitably, overlaps in membership and mandate emerge, raising questions about the optimal institutional architecture for regional collaboration.

Latin America and the Caribbean

(LAC) has not been absent from the worldwide trend towards the development of regional institutions: its first economic integration bodies date from the 1960s. In the last decade, two new regional fora – the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States (CELAC) and the Union of South American Nations (UNASUR) were created to facilitate political coordination and cooperation at the region-wide and South American levels, respectively. CELAC in particular has evolved into the locus for the whole region to regularly engage key partners such as the European Union and China.

Especially since the 1990s, new bodies have emerged to promote region-to-region dialogue and cooperation. This is the case, for example, of the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation forum (APEC) and of the Forum for East Asia – Latin America Cooperation (FEALAC). Both mechanisms seek to strengthen bi-regional ties, with APEC focusing on an economic agenda and FEALAC including other areas like science, technology, transport and the environment. There is much promise in region-to-region dialogue and cooperation, to strengthen economic ties, to learn from each

other's development experiences and to discuss approaches to global issues of common interest such as the implementation of the Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development and the Paris Agreement on climate change. An innovative experience in this regard is China's "Belt and Road Initiative", which seeks to spread prosperity by better connecting Asia with Africa and Europe. The LAC region, while geographically distant, also seeks to become a part of this grand vision. How the region can integrate into, and benefit from, the Belt and Road framework will be an important topic at the upcoming meeting of CELAC and China's Foreign Ministers, to be held in Santiago (Chile) in January 2018.

Together with strengthening links with other regions, LAC has plenty to do in terms of its own regional integration agenda, especially in the economic sphere. The regional market is the most conducive to the export diversification the region needs so much to develop. For most LAC countries, the region is where the highest number of products is exported, and where most industrial exports go. It is also the most important market for the majority of the region's exporting firms, especially small and medium enterprises (SMEs). The regional space is the natural locus for the development of modern, multi-country production networks.


Regrettably, intraregional trade remains very low by international

standards, accounting for just 16% of LAC total exports. The reasons for this are manifold, including the region's vast size (over 20 million square kilometers), its difficult geography, its poor transport infrastructure, the overlapping natural resource endowments of many South American countries and the gravitational pull that the US economy exerts on Mexico and Central America.

Taken together, these are formidable obstacles to economic integration. But they are compounded by the very high fragmentation of the regional market. Several integration agreements coexist, each with their own rules on everything from product standards to government procurement and the treatment of foreign direct investment. These regulatory discrepancies impose high costs on firms (especially SMEs) exporting to, or investing in, regional markets. They also make it harder for regional value chains to develop. Economic integration continues to be mostly seen with a sub-regional lens rather than a truly regional one. Thus the great potential of a regional market with over 620 million people remains underexploited.

Against this background, action is needed on several fronts. At the regional level, coordinated efforts are required to carry out ambitious infrastructure projects to expedite the flows of people, ideas, trade and

▼▼ There is much promise in region-to-region dialogue and cooperation, to strengthen economic ties, to learn from each other's development experiences and to discuss approaches to global issues of common interest. ▼▼



investment. It is also high time to begin building bridges among LAC's different integration mechanisms. This is the key rationale behind the so-called "convergence in diversity" between the region's two largest economic integration agreements, MERCOSUR and the Pacific Alliance. Through this initiative, a common work agenda was agreed earlier this year to ease trade and investment flows between the two groupings, which together account for over 80% of the region's population and over 90% of its GDP and trade. This is a pragmatic approach that relies on incremental, bottom-up progress rather than on large formal

negotiations that today are not politically feasible.

There is much untapped potential in deepening economic integration within our region. The case for it has only grown stronger after the end of the commodity supercycle of 2003-2011. A great dose of pragmatism and a long-term vision will be essential to gradually move towards a truly integrated economic space encompassing the whole region. Through its almost 70 years of existence, ECLAC has been an enthusiastic promoter of that vision, for the benefits it will bring our region, and its broader contribution to global governance architecture.



HU SHULI

Hu Shuli is Editor-in-Chief at Caixin Media, and Professor at the School of Communications and Design at Sun Yat-sen University in Guangdong. Recognised as a pioneer of Chinese journalism with many awards to her name, Hu Shuli has focused on global economic governance and China's role in the new economic order. She has been nominated as one of several top global intellectuals by Foreign Policy Magazine, and one of Forbes most influential people.

1.4. Trade as a driver of international governance: China's Belt and Road initiative

Hu Shuli, Editor-in-Chief, Caixin Media.

Trade has long been a driving force in promoting international collaboration. In light of current geopolitical changes, what new forms of economic cooperation will guide the future of international trade and – beyond – of global governance? An important development is China's recent Belt and Road strategy. Unlike the rules-based order structured around the WTO, this initiative combines diplomatic coordination with project-based collaboration, investment and infrastructure partnerships, to better foster economic integration across countries.

Trade has always been a driving force in boosting international relations, be it in Ancient Greece, following the discovery of the New World by Columbus, or after the Industrial Revolution. Its role is even more significant in today's age of information technology.

China's recent "Belt and Road" initiative, which borrows from the idea of the ancient Silk Road trade routes, is set to complement and improve current international governance structures, particularly structures supporting international trade.

The concept of the Belt and Road differs from the British Empire's "imperial preference" system in the early 1900s, or the later U.S.-led multilateral trading system centering around the World Trade Organization (WTO). The imperial preference system favored the constituents of the British Empire, while other countries faced a range of restrictions. The WTO treats all members equally, in principle at least, through a framework of rules and protocols. However, power structures within the WTO have been evolving in recent years: as China rises, U.S. leadership relatively diminishes, causing internal tensions. There are even talks of the WTO dying after the long-stalled Doha Round negotiations. So far, however, there is no system to replace it. The Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement, one of the main candidates for succeeding to the WTO, is now struggling after the U.S. pulled out.

Unlike the WTO and Trans-Pacific


Partnership agreement, the Belt and Road program does not primarily aim to set agreed rules and protocols. Rather, it harnesses infrastructure development as a way to enhance connectivity and further boost trade and investment. It will mainly involve bilateral agreements between China and countries along land routes over Asia and Europe, and sea routes around Southeast Asia, the Middle East and Africa.

The Belt and Road Initiative does involve coordinated diplomatic efforts. Beijing hosted a Belt and Road summit in May that gathered representatives from more than 100 countries and international organizations. But no multilateral organization was founded on that occasion – rather, the summit was an opportunity to explore joint issues and align understanding among participants.

Some media reports have described the Belt and Road as China's attempt to build a "tribute system," in which the other countries pay tribute to the "Chinese empire", as in old times. That is a misreading of the initiative. China is not proposing a new trade system that seeks to knock down existing ones. Rather, the Belt and Road initiative is a vital move by China to reignite global trade after multinational value chains have gone through profound changes since the Global Financial Crisis, a decade ago.

One important driver of the Belt and Road initiative is limitations in

▼▼ Trade has always been a driving force in boosting international relations. Its role is even more significant in today's age of information technology. ▼▼



the WTO. The WTO is well suited to support relationships between developed countries, but limited when it comes to relationships with and among developing countries. The Belt and Road provides a more-flexible path between China and countries along land and sea routes, anchored in joint investment and infrastructure projects. Chinese companies going out will also help developing countries accelerate their economic development.

At a time when globalization is facing the strong head winds of protectionism, the Belt and Road initiative aims to boost economic growth and balance trade, while also gradually influencing international trade relations. For China, the significance of the Belt and Road initiative lies in the opportunity for further opening up. For the broader world, it could represent an important step towards a new phase of global cooperation.



CAMILLA SCHIPPA

Camilla Schippa is a director of the Institute for Economics and Peace in Sydney, which produces the Global Peace Index. She is also a member of the UN's expert reference group for the Global Consultation on Conflict, Violence and Disaster in the Post-2015 Development Agenda, the Club de Madrid's Shared Society expert group, and the GCERF Policy, Think & Do Tanks Constituency. She formerly served at the UN Secretariat for over a decade, and currently sits on the Board of Directors of the Centre for Armed Violence Reduction.

1.5. Reaping the economic benefits of peace while building peace

Camilla Schippa, Director, Institute for Economics & Peace.

War and violence extract huge costs from the global economy. In the aftermath of conflict, private sector development is critical for peace in the long run. However, all too often, business perceives the risks in post-conflict settings as too great, locking many fragile countries in aid dependence and economic instability. Not only could business activity build peace in the right settings, business can also gain significant profits from high-opportunity post-conflict contexts. Targeted investments towards identified drivers of peace in fragile states and associated governance frameworks could therefore trigger virtuous cycles where peace and prosperity mutually reinforce each other.

As highlighted by a recent Comres poll, risks around conflict and war are the ones that concern us the most. Usage of weapons of mass destruction is ranked as the global risk needing the most urgent response by 62% of respondents, followed by politically motivated violence (57%) and climate change (56%).

This is not surprising as the world has become less peaceful in the last decade. Global conflict and violence is at a 25 year high, with increases in the number of deaths from conflict, the levels of terrorism, and the emergence of new conflicts that, even in the most optimistic scenarios, will take years to solve and rebuild from. Consequently, the world faces its most severe humanitarian crisis since World War II, with over 65 million people now refugees, asylum seekers or internally displaced – equivalent to almost 1% of the global population.

In addition to the obvious human and social costs, this is having a dramatic impact on our economies.

In 2016 the global economy lost \$14.3 trillion to violence and conflict in purchasing power parity (PPP) terms. This is equivalent to 12.6% of the world Gross Domestic Product (GDP), or 12.6% of everything the world produces and consumes. An enormous amount of economic activity goes towards creating, containing and dealing with the consequences of violence – with a yearly cost of \$1,953 for every person on the planet.

Images of any major Syrian city in

2017 show the extent of damage in modern warfare. Not only are private houses and businesses destroyed, but critical infrastructure – electricity, water supply, telecommunications, schools and health facilities – have been turned to rubble. Yet while the economic impact of war is somewhat understood, the potential benefits from violence reduction have traditionally been overlooked.

Redirecting a mere 10% of the global economic impact of violence would be enough to address many of the most fundamental challenges of our time. After all, this would represent \$1.43 trillion. Imagine transferring such an amount to increase Official Development Assistance, and multiplying by almost 10 times the funds directed from rich to poor countries to achieve the UN's Sustainable Development Goals. Alternatively, this amount could triple the flow of resources invested to address climate change.

Most critically, we may be conditioned to think that the realization of peace will add further costs to the global economy through peacekeeping budgets and humanitarian assistance. While this is largely true in the short term, there is an overlooked part of the equation which involves not just the positive benefits that business activity can bring to peace, but also the surprising opportunities for profitable business activities in fragile and conflict-affected contexts over the medium term.

Often, opportunities for business in

▼▼ In 2016 the global economy lost \$14.3 trillion to violence and conflict, equivalent to 12.6% of the world Gross Domestic Product – a yearly cost of \$1,953 for every person on the planet. ▼▼

fragile and less peaceful, post-conflict contexts are under-appreciated. But post-conflict and fragile states are among the fastest growing economies in the world. More than half the countries projected to deliver economic growth of more than 5% in 2018 are either fragile or extremely fragile.

Research by the World Bank and the Institute for Economics & Peace shows that while many post-conflict and fragile states carry higher levels of risk, the rate of return on capital is on-average three times higher than the global average. Interestingly, data suggests that the risk premium in many of these countries may be overpriced. According to the World Bank's Enterprise Business Survey, average business losses to crime were US\$15,957 in very high peace countries compared to US\$9,478 in very low and US\$7,921 in low peace countries.

Policymakers should encourage key financial institutions to address these market failures where they exist, and potentially incentivize investment in key countries in order to demonstrate the potential benefits to other investors. Financial instruments

such as development impact or social impact bonds have a role to play here.

These facts ought to throw into sharp relief the potential virtuous cycle between business and peace. While there are important circumstances where business activity can create the conditions for conflict, as in the case of extractives, there is a counter-narrative that is also important to acknowledge – business can play a positive role for societal peacefulness and reap significant financial returns.

Improving governance and the business environment go hand in hand. Business can improve based on government action to provide regulatory certainty and macroeconomic stability, control corruption, and protect property rights. These factors have important systemic and societal benefit for other drivers of peace. Realizing this virtuous cycle may be the key to lowering the \$14.3 trillion yearly economic losses from violence and to building long term peace, all the while boosting business profits – a tantalizing win-win scenario.



ALEXANDRA WANDEL

Alexandra Wandel is Director and Vice-Chair of the Management Board of the World Future Council. The World Future Council consists of 50 respected personalities from around the globe. They represent governments, parliaments, the arts, civil society, academia and the business world. Together they form a voice for the rights of future generations. The World Future Council seeks to pass on a healthy planet and just societies to our children and grandchildren, and does this through in-depth research, capacity-building and knowledge transfer of future just policy solutions. More about these initiatives can be found at www.futurejustice.org.

1.6. Guardians for future generations: towards a sustainable and peaceful world

Alexandra Wandel, Director, World Future Council.

The consequences of today's major challenges will extend far beyond the conditions affecting the people currently alive. Bringing the voice of future generations to the table is therefore fundamental. Many countries are already making steps in this direction, creating new roles for official figures appointed explicitly to represent the rights and interests of those yet unborn. Giving such 'guardians for the future' a place in more regional, national and global forums is an important step to make sure that the major decisions we face today genuinely weigh more than the mere interests of the present.

Climate change, nuclear threats and the destruction of healthy ecosystems are all alarming signs that humanity is living at the expense of future generations. Yet generations to be born cannot stand up for their rights. It is therefore our duty and responsibility to ensure the well-being of both present and future generations.

Since 1946, the international community has marked the need to recognize the interests of future generations in numerous international treaties and conventions, most recently in the Paris Climate Agreement and in the 2030 Agenda for sustainable development. At a national level, over twenty constitutions enshrine the needs of future generations. Yet, short-term interests often continue to take priority over long-term needs. Despite our best intentions, our decisions – or lack of them – continue to threaten the lives of those in the future.

Bringing the voice of future generations to the negotiating table is fundamental. Additional, innovative and far reaching measures that go beyond pure rhetoric are needed if we are to truly deliver our commitments to future generations.

A number of countries have already developed mechanisms to recognize future generations. The need for an Ombudsman for Future Generations was recognized and accepted by the Hungarian Parliament as early

as 2007. The office has established a direct link between the interests of future generations and basic constitutional rights, such as the right to a healthy environment and general well-being. A Future Generations Commissioner, acting as a guardian for the interests of future generations, was established in Wales as part of the landmark Well-being of Future Generations Act in 2015. The Commissioner works across the public bodies of Wales to help implement seven well-being goals – to improve lives today, and tomorrow. On behalf of the Auditor General of Canada, the Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development provides parliamentarians with objective, independent analysis and recommendations on the federal government's efforts to protect the environment and foster sustainable development. These three offices form part of the Network of Institutions for Future Generations, an international collaboration of similar offices counting 9 members. Other initiatives include an Ombudsman for Children in Norway and a proposed Ombudsman for Mother Earth in Bolivia, a former Commissioner for Future Generations in Israel, as well as Commissioners for Environment and Sustainability in general (Australian Capital Territory, Canada and New Zealand), and a Committee for the Future working within the Finnish Parliament.

As a way to systematically grow on

▼▼ Bringing the voice of future generations to the negotiating table is fundamental. ▼▼

these initiatives, the World Future Council is proposing to establish a new type of public figure: Guardians for Future Generations. Acting as advocates for the common interests of present and future generations, these Guardians could help to introduce a long-term perspective into policy making. They would work as a catalyst for sustainable development implementation and bring checks and balances to political institutions.

These would be appointed at global, national and local levels. The guardian would work alongside government, either as a parliamentary commissioner, a legal ombudsperson, a trustee or an auditor, as best fits each governance structure. They would provide advice, analysis, policy recommendations and facilitate collaboration across the separate pillars of government to overcome short-term, single issue thinking. Implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals would be one area of their focus.

As well as seeking to establish Guardians for Future Generations at national and regional levels, the World Future Council focused efforts to secure a UN Commissioner or Guardian for Future Generations. The 2013 UN Secretary-General report, 'Intergenerational Solidarity and the Needs of Future

Generations', set a convincing case for action on implementing intergenerational justice. The report proposes a High Commissioner for Future Generations as its primary proposal. The role would act as an advocate, offering support and advice where requested, undertake research and foster expertise on policy practices, while interacting with Member States, UN entities, and others. Current UN organs and agencies, including the High Level Political Forum which provides an institutional home for the SDGs, could benefit from additional, innovative tools to fully understand and overcome some of the complex challenges of our time.

As we already live well beyond the carrying capacity of the earth, a fundamental change is urgently needed if lives and livelihoods are to be maintained and cultivated. But our democracies have become a dictatorship of the present, with no-one representing the interests of future generations. Our ancestors thought differently, the most famous example being the Native American principle that the impact of any decision on the 7th generation to come had to be taken into account. Establishing guardians for future generations is not a new idea: rather, it marks the return of a longstanding principle to help build a safe, sustainable and shared future for all.

Part 2

Global citizens







GHIDA FAKHRY

Ghida Fakhry is an international broadcast journalist and U.S.-based contributor to the Huffington Post. She writes about international affairs and U.S. foreign policy and is a regular moderator for high-level events, including the UN's Alliance of Civilizations and most recently the WB-IMF Spring meetings 2017. She was previously senior news and programs presenter for Aljazeera English.

2.1. Global citizens call for global leaders

Ghida Fakhry, journalist.

In today's globalized world, is a new global citizenry seeking global leaders? Recently, the young and charismatic figures of Macron and Trudeau have emerged as a possible new breed of political leader, harnessing their media-savviness to set a new vision of world affairs. Their success, however, echoes that of earlier leaders whose global rise to fame largely depended on their interaction with the media – such as Castro and Kennedy – and in spite of international appeal to new globalized audiences, their political destiny remains attached to domestic challenges.

Since the collapse of the Soviet Union and the nominal end of the Cold War, a new term has entered the political and journalistic lexicons: globalization, a new norm of international relations, heralding a modern, post-national era in which the Nation-State, by then barely a century old political paradigm, would be supplanted by a new political arrangement. But with its air of democratizing international relations, its recognition of economic interdependence, and a common consensus for a shared humanity, is globalization the new model of international and, eventually, supra-national relations? Or will it remain the apange of an imperialistic political, economic and cultural organization of the world, dominated by old and new powers or groupings?

More recently, globalization has seen the emergence of new political forces: popular movements of global citizenry seeking to countervail this new trend, identified as another imperialistic endeavor. So much so that G8 summit meetings often grab headlines not by what is discussed among ‘world leaders’, but by the activism of anti-G8 demonstrators.

The normative implications of globalization are unmistakable — from commerce agreements, free-trade zones and interlinked financial markets to new geopolitical alliances and potent social media networks, globalization is also shaking up liberal political systems and some

underpinnings of liberal democracy. Is the advent of a globalized world also producing global(ized) political leaders, which the media often refer to as ‘world leaders’?

Evidently, one could argue that as the world is not properly unified, there are therefore no world leaders, an idiom typically used in relation to leaders of large or powerful nations that leaves a neo-imperial aftertaste; for world leaders are, in the mainstream western dominated media landscape, western leaders, with the exceptions of Chinese, Russian and, maybe, Brazilian or South African Heads of State. Notwithstanding his influence on international affairs and worldwide name recognition, it is not clear that Fidel Castro was ever called a world leader. And yet, during his era, as today, there was a palpable thirst for true global political leaders, whose aura transcends national frontiers and political spaces; even more so nowadays, not solely because of the telecommunication revolution(s), but also in view of a new consciousness that the planet faces global perils that call for global stewardship.

With climate change, with the foray of artificial intelligence and robotization threatening our very notion of work, and with terrorism, a serious epiphenomenon alas fueled by sensationalist media coverage and fanned by politicians, world leaders simply cannot eschew global challenges.

In today's globalized world, is the global citizenry seeking global leaders? Probably yes, but with the caveat that because of the latest media revolution, today's global leaders can spring out of virtually nowhere almost overnight. And evidently, the media, new and traditional, much more than political parties, are the vector (or even engineer) of a new breed of political leaders with, possibly, global destinies.

If one could extrapolate from the emergence on their national political scene, and thereafter on the global stage, of Canada's Prime Minister Justin Trudeau and France's President Emanuel Macron, one could argue that a new breed of young, dynamic and communications savvy political leaders is on the rise. They are tapping into the power of the media, in all of its innovative and powerful forms, to counter the re-emergence of an old form of insular breed of political leaders. Setting a new vision of world affairs, they have set their sights on a wider and more responsive audience; they appeal to a large swath of the world's disillusioned citizens, using their media savviness to project a brighter and more optimistic future on the global stage. Their audience has been largely receptive: they are the Facebook and Twitter generations, forces of global engagement, who share a common sense of belonging to some sort of supra-national community. Macron and Trudeau

share common features: youthful, bold, telegenic, nonconformist; but so were John F. Kennedy or Fidel Castro half a century ago. Then as today, the media's fascination with and coruscating effect on those political figures is such that, one could argue, they 'make' those figures. Of course, the contrarian argument is that the same media produced a septuagenarian President Trump in the United States, elected on an autarkic, protectionist platform.

Notwithstanding their opposed worldview, Macron and Trump, more than Trudeau, have one striking feature in common – both have, singlehandedly and overnight, shattered the heretofore incontrovertible role of traditional political parties: Trump took hostage the Grand Old Party (Republican) which may not survive his presidency; Macron literally pulverized France's Fifth Republic political parties from the left and right. Whereas Trump, the billionaire real estate mogul and reality TV star enjoyed household name recognition prior to launching his presidential bid, Macron was an unknown, minor political figure two years before his election. In a mere 10 months, circumventing traditional political parties, he revolutionized French politics.

Because of their extraordinary political feat, both Macron and Trump must be internalizing their victories in messianic terms; the

▼▼ In today's globalized world, is the global citizenry seeking global leaders? ▼▼

win of David versus Goliath. And because of their nations' place in the world, both see themselves as global leaders. But whether or not they will appeal to citizenries beyond their national borders – globalists or isolationists – both must know that if they do not produce results for their own citizens, their fall will be as rapid as their meteoric rise to power. No matter how far their media reach may be, their approval ratings at

home have already reached historical lows. Promoting an image of global leadership may flatter their national pride, and even appeal to some of the world's global citizens, but it is unlikely to help them deal with their domestic challenges. Even as new leaders reach a global audience and exert worldwide influence, all politics may still be local - even in the era of globalization, Facebook and Twitter.



MANJANA MILKOREIT

Manjana Milkoreit is Assistant Professor in the Department of Political Science at Purdue University. Her research integrates international relations scholarship and cognitive theory to study actor motivations and policy design in global climate change politics and diplomacy. Previously, she was Postdoctoral Research Fellow at Arizona State University's Julie Ann Wrigley Global Institute of Sustainability, where she led the Imagination and Climate Futures Initiative. She is the author of *Mindmade Politics: the Cognitive Roots of International Climate Governance* (The MIT Press 2017).

2.2. Who cares about global governance?

Manjana Milkoreit, Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, Purdue University.

While people around the world identify in increasing numbers as global citizens, engagement with global governance remains practically non-existent. What could be done so that people care more? A range of structural and cognitive barriers make it difficult to prioritize global challenges, identify their relevance, access decision-making forums, or simply bear the emotional burden associated with issues of existential magnitude. It is, therefore, of crucial importance that we better educate citizens about global governance, develop new models of engagement, and more clearly communicate about the role and impact of global institutions.

Imagine a world without global institutions: no United Nations to solve international disputes, no Non-proliferation Treaty to prevent nuclear war, no Montreal Protocol to fix ozone depletion. How would your life be different then? Could you afford a personal computer, the shoes you wear, or exotic fruit, without the World Trade Organization? Do you know someone whose life might have ended without UNICEF or the World Health Organization?

According to a survey conducted in 2017 on behalf of the Global Challenges Foundation, many people consider themselves global citizens. Many also perceive the world as increasingly globalized and increasingly insecure. While they have confidence in global institutions to work on their behalf, citizen engagement with these institutions is practically non-existent. Why is that?

Scholarship suggests that citizens become interested in global institutions for two reasons only. When a global economic institution such as the World Trade Organization negatively affects their livelihoods, citizens will take to the streets, rejecting international interference with their lives. The opposite occurs during existential crises, when people in war-torn countries or experiencing natural disasters look to international organizations for help. Beyond these moments of immediate and personal distress, citizen engagement with global politics is limited to a handful

of global NGOs. More specifically, there is almost no constructive engagement, where citizens shape and influence the development of global institutions and policies.

The most obvious and important reason for this disengagement is simply lack of knowledge. Most people go through life without knowing what the IMF is or what the Montreal Protocol does. Public education rarely touches upon 'International Organizations'. The same is true of most news reporting. But even if people are made aware of complex global problems, such as climate change, and the corresponding global institutions, four additional obstacles hinder global citizenship engagement.

(1) Priorities. All political engagement takes time and energy. How much of it can you dedicate to participating in global institutions, particularly if you also want to be politically engaged at local or national levels? While surveys show that people are concerned with global issues, there are often more pressing things in their daily life. This challenge is exacerbated for people who struggle to make ends meet, worry about paying bills or tend to sick kids.

(2) Relevance. Political engagement thrives when people get fired up for a particular cause. But the link between a global issue, the relevant organization, and a person's life are

▼▼ Better forms of communication could break emotional barriers that currently stand in the way of greater citizen engagement with global institutions. ▼▼

often hard to understand. Questions such as ‘How does the Non-Proliferation-Treaty protect me if North Korea sends a missile my way?’ are abstract and far removed from daily concerns. Global organizations often find it challenging to directly communicate with citizens, as they lack the budget and expertise for such outreach. National governments can exacerbate this situation by taking credit for benefits such as trade, open borders, or environmental protection, and scapegoating global actors when things go wrong or policies fail.

(3) Access. Despite efforts to improve citizen engagement, international organizations are generally hard to access. Attending meetings is often impossible unless you are part of an accredited NGO lucky enough to receive one of the limited ‘observer’ slots. Even if you get this far, opportunities to influence the process are basically non-existent. The best mode of action here might be lobbying your own government, which has a seat at the negotiation table.

(4) Emotional Resistance. Finally, if you overcome these obstacles, your mind creates yet another. It tends to keep negative and threatening information at bay, especially when it implies a potentially existential threat. This ‘distancing’ is a self-protection mechanism that makes all engagement with global issues challenging. More generally, the shift from awareness

to care requires emotion to play in. Mobilizing emotions can be positive (excitement, hope) or negative (anger, hatred), but they need to be present for people to get engaged. These emotions are present when a problem touches a person’s deepest beliefs about justice and fairness. The experience of moral outrage over the unjust killing of people or the reckless destruction of nature for profit can be turned into engagement with global institutions.

Achieving broad public engagement with global institutions will require overcoming these structural, cognitive, and emotional barriers. There are several potentially fruitful ways forward. First, governments, learning institutions, and the media need to step up education about global institutions to create the necessary level of public awareness. Second, international organizations need new ways to involve citizens and enable access to global governance processes. Finally, all of us need to think about new ways of communicating the importance of global institutions for the survival, health, and wellbeing of every person on the planet. Better forms of communication, including through narrative and images, could not only create awareness and interest, but also break emotional barriers that currently stand in the way of greater citizen engagement with global institutions.

On an increasingly connected

planet, where the severity and urgency of global challenges are increasing, deeper public engagement with global institutions is necessary to ensure that the ever-growing task of global governance is not left to a small elite of bureaucrats, transnational corporations, and scientists. Democratizing global governance requires mechanisms that allow diverse voices from around the world to be heard and considered in global policy-making. Despite the practical challenges this would

entail, global institutions that are responsive to the concerns of the global public would be better able to achieve their mission and serve their global constituency. Meaningful public participation would increase the transparency and legitimacy of global policy-making, facilitating the work of global institutions. Finally, joining a global-scale political discourse would go a long way towards developing a shared identity for humanity, what many consider a key step towards a more peaceful and sustainable world.



GRAÇA MACHEL

Graça Machel is an African stateswoman whose decades long professional and public life is rooted in Mozambique's struggle for self-rule and international advocacy for women and children's rights. Machel sits on a large number of international boards and advisory groups, with a particular focus on education and the rights of women and children. She is a founding member of The Elders, and the Chancellor of the University of Cape Town, Chancellor of the African Leadership University and the President of SOAS. She founded and serves as President of the Foundation for Community Development and the Zizile Institute for Child Development. She is also Founder and Board Chair of the Graça Machel Trust.

2.3. Women's education as a driver of global citizenship

Graça Machel, Chancellor, African Leadership University and University of Cape Town; President, University of London School of Oriental and African Studies.

Over the last three decades, the advent of the Internet age coupled with rapid globalization has enabled us to be better connected as global citizens. Despite gains in connectivity and interconnectedness across borders, societies around the world are still plagued by fragmentation and inequity. The well-coordinated action of civil society has become pivotal in countering such destructive forces. One certain solution to ensure a vibrant and engaged citizenry is to educate women and encourage their active civic participation.

The year 1990 was perhaps the beginning of the interconnected world as we know it. It was when Tim Berners-Lee launched the world wide web, that panoptic network of networks that brought the global community closer than ever before. Quickly becoming one of the most visible forces of globalization, it has removed barriers of communication and fostered connections between people unhindered by geography. It has formed for us the modern Forum Romanum, a virtual and far-reaching platform, where voices of agreement and opposition mingle freely and a space where society evolves.

However, as this giant leap for mankind was being made, over 600 million of the world's women had never been to school. Even before this new technological world came into being, millions were already excluded from its tangible and virtual realms. A well-educated female collective, however, is necessary to the advancement of any society, especially in this tech age. While there is a considerable gender imbalance in STEM fields, there are increasing numbers of women in these fields exercising their civic duty and finding solutions to global challenges. Female scientists are developing vaccines and women tech coders are creating technologies that are changing the world in which we live. While we know women make up a minority of the world's research community, with only 30% of the

world's researchers being women, UNESCO reports that a closer look at the data exposes some surprising exceptions. For example, in Bolivia, women account for 63% researchers, compared to France with a rate of 26% or Ethiopia at 8%. We must encourage girls and young women to explore STEM subjects and support their aspirations to pursue careers in these technical fields if we want women to play a role in their governance.

Access to education, in the most holistic sense possible, must be any society's imperative. If 'women carry half the sky' then education allows women and girls to be full citizens, and enables their communities to reach their highest potential. Education equips women to fully utilize their talents in political, economic and social spheres, and opens doors to the global community where they can take center stage.

Education provides awareness of civic responsibilities and rights, which then enables citizens to see it as their duty to exercise these rights. This sense of civic mindedness and ownership over one's political fate have perhaps never been more important than now. In the complex world we find ourselves in today, forces of hate and intolerance are galvanizing. The keys to challenging this tide of divisive, destructive isolationism can be found in the powerful fruits of education and civic participation.

▼▼ The keys to challenging the tide of divisive, destructive isolationism can be found in the powerful fruits of education and civic participation. ▼▼

We have seen this power most recently unleashed in March 2017 where millions of women took to the streets in over 600 rallies in 60 countries in defence of women's rights. This unprecedented galvanization of women across the globe demonstrates how commanding they can be when equipped with the connectivity and moral imperative to become active citizens. When women come together as change agents, it becomes impossible for them to go unrecognized in the political discourse of the day or marginalized in the development of their societies.

This is not just theory. There is evidence of how powerful the tools of education and civic participation are in empowering women to hold leaders to account and becoming leaders in their own right. In Rwanda, for example, where female literacy rates actually surpass that of their male counterparts, we have seen women dominate in the nation's governing structures. In fact, in 2016, this small East African nation was the world leader in that regard, having 64% of its national legislature comprised of women. In a fantastic example of a society's ability to regenerate and reconstitute itself, Rwandese women are claiming their right to sit where the decisions are made and shaping the policies, plans and strategies for their futures and those of generations to come.

But women simply being present

at the helm is not enough; the other critical role of education is to prepare women to be the leaders their nations require. Beyond occupying leadership positions, a calibrated education in ethical leadership is just as important. The African Leadership University (ALU) is an innovative model of higher education that is preparing the African continent's leaders of today and tomorrow. They employ a unique pedagogy to empower leaders that will be prominent in global and national organizations as well as at the grassroots, inspiring creative and positive change in both formal and informal settings.

Part and parcel of ethical, civic minded education is the task of connecting to a global citizenry. If the genius of the Internet is in its global series of interconnected networks, imagine the revolution that could occur if women organized into international 'networks of networks' themselves.

There is power in networks. At the Graça Machel Trust, our approach to women's empowerment is to establish and strengthen networks that drive the advancement of women and increase their participation and visibility in key sectors of society. Based on the belief that development is hinged on the sustained participation of women in socio-economic spheres at all levels and across sectors, we have 5 networks operating across the African continent which aim to

amplify female voices throughout society at large. We build networks, underpinned by a philosophy of citizen engagement at the country level that cascade upwards to the sub-regional and continental levels. Subtly, all of these networks are galvanizing into a movement for the social and economic transformation of Africa.

Well organized networks have the reach to shape development agendas on multiple levels – national, regional, continental and global. For example, CIVICUS, the World Alliance for Citizen Participation, is a network of international partners and organizations that work towards

building a global civil society that is vibrant and free. They are also one of the biggest proponents of the advancement of women internationally. In fact, 66% of their staff is comprised of women and many of the organizations within their alliance are women-led. Literally, they are an example of women leading the charge in building a global movement, not only for themselves, but for humanity as a whole.

We as global citizens are the sum of our parts, and it does not make sense that we would continue to tolerate the marginalization of those who are holding up our own sky.



SHERRI GOODMAN

Sherri Goodman is a Senior Advisor for International Security with the Center for Climate and Security, a member of its Advisory Board and former U.S. Deputy Undersecretary of Defense (Environmental Security).

2.4. A responsibility to prepare: governing in an age of unprecedented risks and unprecedented foresight

Sherri Goodman, Senior Advisor for International Security, Center for Climate and Security;
former U.S. Deputy Undersecretary of Defense.
Caitlin Werrell & Francesco Femia, Co-Presidents, Center for Climate and Security.
Shiloh Fetzek, Senior Fellow for International Security, Center for Climate and Security.

In the face of rapid climatic, social and technological transformations, our current world order is facing unprecedented levels of uncertainty. However, this is balanced by considerable progress in our capacity to foresee those transformations and their possible effects. In this context, it is our strategic duty to change the way that we prepare for the future. We must anticipate the challenges of those rapid climatic, social and technological transformations, address associated risks in advance of catastrophe, and embrace our responsibility to prepare.

The current world order brings together sovereign nation-states as participants in a web of international and regional security institutions. This current world order is experiencing great uncertainty in the face of rapid climatic, technological and social change, as well as a growing capacity to reduce uncertainty by more accurately foreseeing unprecedented changes. A main feature of the 21st century is the ability to harness scientific and technological tools to better predict, monitor, and prepare for a range of plausible future scenarios. However, heightened predictive capacity does not, by itself, lead to preparedness. The leaders of nation-states, and of the institutions that underwrite international security, must have compelling rationales for preventing and responding to these risks in a responsible fashion – rationales that can help them transcend local political and economic pressures. Unprecedented phenomena with potential for global disruption, climate change in particular, present one such rationale.

In the face of rapid climate change, as well as other social, demographic, and technological changes, nation-states and intergovernmental security institutions have a responsibility to use their enhanced predictive capacities to manage and minimize risks. This combination of “unprecedented risk” and “unprecedented foresight” creates the strategic imperative for a Responsibility to Prepare – a

responsibility to build a resilient global system against a more reliably foreseeable future, while also creating a buffer for those risks that we still cannot imagine. A failure to meet this responsibility could significantly strain the viability of state sovereignty and the international system built on it.

This responsibility builds on hard-won lessons from the Responsibility to Protect doctrine for preventing and responding to mass atrocities, which lays out means of using mediation, early warning systems, economic sanctions and, as a last resort, UN Security Council-authorized use of force, when civilian populations are at risk of mass atrocities. A Responsibility to Prepare requires a reform of existing governance institutions to ensure that critical, nontraditional risks are anticipated, analyzed and addressed robustly and rapidly by intergovernmental security institutions and the security establishments of participating nations.

A Responsibility to Prepare agenda should be developed and adopted by all nations, while adhering to the overarching principle of “climate-proofing” security institutions at international, regional and national levels – essentially incorporating climate resilience into the international security architecture. As climate change constitutes a foreseeable international security challenge, and multiplies other security threats across the world, an international agenda that addresses

▼▼ The window of opportunity to strengthen global governance in a significantly altered geostrategic environment is narrowing. ▼▼

its security implications can help inform governance reforms for managing other related risks. These reforms should include the following principles:

- **Mainstreaming.** Mainstreaming climate security could range from including climate considerations in security and intelligence decision processes within security institutions to consistently holding forums on the subject. At the UN Security Council, for example, a commitment to regular Arria Formula dialogues or other informal modes of conversation, as well as annual resolutions for addressing critical climate and security hotspots (such as the recent Lake Chad resolution) would help ensure that the issue is resilient to changing political winds.
- **Institutionalization.** At the international level, institutionalization could involve establishing semi-independent “Climate Security Crisis Watch Centers,” staffed by expert analysts and issuing regular recommendations to the UN Security Council. The centers could be new structures or integrated into existing early-warning systems, and could be replicated at regional or national levels.
- **Elevation.** Elevating such issues within governing bodies is critical for ensuring preparedness. Within the UN system, for example, the establishment of a senior Climate Security position, reporting directly to the UN Secretary General and communicating regularly to the UN Security Council, would go a long way toward ensuring that these issues were heard at the highest levels.
- **Integration.** Climate change affects the whole security landscape, and cannot be siloed. Integration could involve embedding climate and security analysts across issue siloes within governments and intergovernmental institutions, or creating interagency structures to facilitate such integration.
- **Rapid response.** Developing scaled warning systems that identify long, medium and short-term risks, and that include clear “triggers” for emergency action on climate and security, would help ensure that foreseeable events are acted upon with commensurate levels of urgency. This is particularly important for low probability/high impact risks, and creating a governance capacity to prepare for “unknown unknowns” or “black swans.”
- **Contingencies for unintended consequences.** Despite best efforts, unintended consequences of solutions to these risks may inevitably arise. Governments should seek to identify these

▼▼ In the 21st century we cannot lean on the excuse that we did not see the threat coming. We do see it coming. That foresight makes the Responsibility to Prepare a strategic imperative. ▼▼

potential eventualities and develop contingencies for addressing them.

Such an agenda – focused as it is on reforming security institutions – would ensure that critical, nontraditional challenges are appropriately managed as global security risks, rather than niche concerns. A practical fulfilment of the goals and principles articulated in this Responsibility to Prepare framework would increase the likelihood of a more stable global governance systems in the face of rapid but foreseeable change. However, the window of opportunity to strengthen global governance in a significantly altered geostrategic environment is narrowing. Delaying action may result in diminishing returns, and, in the worst-case

scenarios, difficult and potentially inhumane choices in the face of continued strains on natural resources and political will. This scenario is preventable.

Whether the response to climate risks from the international security community will be commensurate to the threat remains to be seen. However, in the 21st century, we cannot lean on the excuse that we did not see the threat coming. We do see it coming. That foresight makes the Responsibility to Prepare a strategic imperative.

This article is an abridged version of a recently-released report by the Center for Climate and Security: “A Responsibility to Prepare: Governing in an Age of Unprecedented Risk and Unprecedented Foresight”

Continuing the conversation

We hope the conversation will continue. You can help us by simply sharing this report with a friend or colleague. We're looking for partners around the world to join future publications, organise events, workshops and talks, or more generally support our engagement effort.

For more information, visit our website:

www.globalchallenges.org

ADDITIONAL CONTACT INFO

The Global Challenges Foundation:

Norrskén House – Postbox 14
Birger Jarlgatan 57C
113 56 Stockholm
Sweden

info@globalchallenges.org
+46 (0) 709 98 97 97

