

活動報告

SUPRI Project Annual Report

April 2018 - March 2019

Group 3 “Multilateralism in Asia”

Group Members:

Jonathan Luckhurst, Minoru Koide, Hartmut Lenz, Kenji Nakayama

Research Subject

“Shaping 21st Century Multilateralism: Shifting Contexts of Global and Asian-Regional Economic Governance”

This research project analyzes how multilateralism in Asia is influenced by global and Asian-regional economic governance. The Principal Investigator and Co-Investigators examine this topic through distinct theoretical lenses, especially liberal, game theoretic, and constructivist approaches. This constitutes an analytically ‘eclectic’ study (Katzenstein and Sil 2011; Lake 2013), rather than privileging a narrow framework, integrating the trend in International Relations research to reduce theoretical silos. The Principal Investigator, Jonathan Luckhurst, will research how global governance networks influence Japan’s 2019 host presidency of the Group of Twenty (G20) and subsequent G20 rotating presidencies. Co-Investigator Hartmut Lenz analyzes the impact of domestic constraints and the formalization of institutions on the successes or

failures of intergovernmental treaty negotiations, developing a model to compare the ASEAN Plus Three and EU Treaty negotiations. Co-Investigator Kenji Nakayama will focus on local multilateralism and sub-regions in Asia. Co-Investigator Minoru Koide will conduct a comparative analysis of East Asia regionalism, analyzing the significance of competing trends in regional cooperation.

The core purpose of this research is to indicate how recent shifts in global and Asian-regional governance influenced multilateral economic cooperation, by examining linkages between these global and Asian-regional influences. This constitutes an innovative, multilevel-governance approach, indicating strengths and weaknesses, in addition to complementarities and conflicting aspects, of different layers of governance. The focus of the research is the connectivities, in particular, between key contexts and actors of global and Asian-regional governance and cooperation. This includes analysis of how diverse actors influence global and regional governance, across important institutional contexts and policy areas of economic governance, particularly trade, finance, and development issues. This analysis focuses on how global and regional governance networks influence these policy areas and organizational contexts, involving state and sub-state regional officials, international organizational actors, and the increasingly significant role of non-state actors.

The literature on multilateralism, global governance, and Asian-regional governance has increased substantially since the 1990s, when James Rosenau (1992) identified increasingly complex interactions that constituted new forms of global governance in the post-Cold War context. This reflects the growing importance of formal and informal aspects of multilateralism, including key developments such as the World Trade Organization in 1995; the start of the 'ASEAN

Plus Three’ process in 1997; and the Group of Twenty (G20) summits since 2008. The proposed project would contribute to the existing scholarly literature by focusing on the multilayered, multicontextual, and heterogeneous dimensions of twenty-first century multilateralism, in terms of the organization, policy areas, and actors involved. This would provide useful insights for scholars and policy practitioners into how new contexts, issues, and actors of global and Asian-regional governance influence contemporary multilateral relations and practices.

The G20 has become the leading global economic governance forum, as a ‘hub’ of coordination between these states, leading international financial institutions, and other ‘stakeholders’ in managing diverse policy areas. The Asia-regional members have been influential in this context, with the South Koreans, Chinese, and the Japanese hosting the G20 presidency and influencing the agenda in important ways. This indicates the importance of combining analysis of global and Asian-regional economic governance, as the two have become increasingly interconnected since the global financial crisis.

Purpose, scientific significance, and originality of the research

There have been important new developments in global and Asian-regional economic governance since the global financial crisis of 2008-09. This research would help inform scholars, policymakers, international officials, and non-state actors in global and Asian-regional governance and multilateral cooperation about the effects of these developments on multilateral cooperation. The aim is to provide a coordinated and coherent analysis of key contexts of multilateral cooperation on economic governance since the global

financial crisis, to demonstrate the influence of global and regional governance networks on policy agendas and outcomes.

The four investigators will analyze different aspects of the core topic. Principal Investigator Jonathan Luckhurst examines how transnational governance networks influence G20 economic multilateralism, focusing on how state, non-state, and international institutional actors mutually constitute the G20 policy agenda. He analyzes the influence of these G20 governance networks on Asian-regional economic governance. Co-Investigator Hartmut Lenz will research how domestic constraints and the formalization of institutions influence successes or failures of intergovernmental treaty negotiations. This includes developing a model that incorporates the role of uncertainty, institutional constraints, and negotiations success. The model will compare the ASEAN Plus Three and EU Treaty negotiations. The results will help improve success rates in treaty negotiations. Co-Investigator Kenji Nakayama will focus on local multilateralism and sub-regions in Asia. He aims to examine the significance and potential of sub-regional economic zones throughout East Asia. His research, along with analyzing the actual economic situations and characteristics of both the East Asian region as a whole and the sub-regional zones, examines the driving force behind cross-border cooperation between local governments. Co-Investigator Minoru Koide will conduct a comparative analysis of East Asia regionalism, analyzing the significance of competing trends in regional cooperation, such as the Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership and the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership.

The four contributors to the project therefore cover the different levels of analysis. This includes Luckhurst's focus on the global,

deploying a combined social constructivist, discourse analytic, and sociology of professions analytical framework; Koide’s focus on the global-regional context, with a liberal institutionalist analytical framework; Lenz’s analysis of intergovernmental negotiations between state actors utilizes a game theoretic approach to intergovernmental bargaining; and Nakayama’s analysis of sub-state regional interactions, with a political-sociological focus on local actor-networks. These four levels of analysis, deploying an inclusive, ‘eclectic’ analytical framework, indicates how these global and regional governance networks contribute to Asian-regional multilateral cooperation and economic governance. The research methodology is heterogeneous or eclectic, with the four contributors analyzing distinct aspects of the research question.

The anticipated research outcomes

The four components of the research project will achieve insights that contribute to the broader conclusions of the project, about how shifting contexts of global and Asian-regional economic governance will shape twenty-first century multilateralism.

Luckhurst examines how global governance networks shape twenty-first century multilateralism, through interactions between organizations, actors, and policy issues in the global and Asian-regional contexts. This research analyzes how G20 governance networks shape contexts of global governance and Asian-regional multilateral cooperation. This includes an analysis of G20 governance networks on sustainable development governance, gender economic equity, and sustainable economic growth, to examine how discourse on ‘sustainability’ and ‘inclusivity’ has influenced G20 and Asian

policy debates. This analysis includes a particular focus on the G20's outreach engagement forums. The research for Luckhurst's contribution would include several interviews and participant observation, based on his participation in the Think20 forum and extensive contacts with actors involved in other G20 engagement processes, especially the Civil20 and Women20 forums.

This assesses how these global governance networks have influenced, and been influenced by, Asian-regional economic governance norms and practices. There is substantial evidence of a decentralizing effect in global governance authority since the 2008-09 global financial crisis, with Asian regional actors gaining influence in global economic governance, especially in sustainable development governance. This component of the project examines consequences of the increased role of Asian regional actors in global governance networks, especially G20 networks, on global development governance. It provides further insights on the consequences for Asian-regional multilateralism, especially relations between East and Southeast Asian G20 member states.

The aim of Lenz's research for the project is to understand the impact of domestic constraints and the formalization of institutions on the successes or failures of intergovernmental treaty negotiations. Lenz argues one common feature of treaty failure is that they can be reasonably called *involuntary* by the national governments, to the extent the behavior of the domestic actors who are involved in the ratification process is beyond the control of government representatives responsible for signing international agreements. This stands in sharp contrast to the fact that intergovernmental negotiations are often centered around the concept of states as unitary actors, with a single set of preferences. Nowadays it is

widely agreed that domestic politics and international relations are deeply entangled. Putnam (1988) interprets this situation as a “two-level game”. While this idea is intuitive, Iida (1993) criticizes that the model does not sufficiently describe the reasons and conditions for negotiation failure. This project’s aim is to close this gap and to explore the interconnections between governments’ negotiation strategies, formalization of institutions and domestic constraints. Therefore, it provides a detailed picture of the bargaining dynamics and increases our understanding under which conditions negotiations are more likely to succeed or fail. Specifically, Lenz answers two sets of questions:

- 1) If the unitary actor assumption is not applicable, do domestic constraints have an impact on the negotiation process and on governments’ negotiation strategies?
- 2) What is the impact of institutional settings on the negotiation process? Are these settings exogenously given or do they evolve as part of governments’ negotiation strategies?

On the basis of the highly formalized EU treaty negotiations and more informal ASEAN Plus Three negotiations, this research aims to specify under what conditions domestic actors constrain governments and how these conditions depend on institutional polity.

The contribution from Koide examines key trends in East Asia regionalism, analyzing the significance of competing influences in regional cooperation, especially the Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership and the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership. This comparative study of regionalism examines how forms of multilateral cooperation have been influenced by Asian-regional and global developments since the global financial crisis. This includes a focus on recent dynamics

in international relations, especially the rise of China, in global and regional contexts, and the consequences of the U.S. Trump Administration to Asian and global cooperation.

The comparative dimension also assesses the priorities and goals of the Chinese, Japanese, and South Korean governments in global and Asian-regional economic cooperation. This assesses key regional political and economic issues, and how state actors are adjusting to twenty-first century developments in multilateralism and economic governance. The anticipated results from this part of the project is to ascertain how global, Asian-regional, and state actors and issues shape Asian-regional economic cooperation in the post-2008 context.

Nakayama's study argues that if the East Asian economic zone actually develops at the international level, then specific industries, such as those dealing with agriculture, forestry, and fishing, will be unable to avoid having a negative impact on local economies. Thus, correspondence of some form will be needed to accompany compensation, either before or after such negative impacts have occurred. Sub-regional exchanges between locals can be thought of as having a mitigating effect on a new, non-national scale on the negative impact of expanding regional disparities that accompany the formation of free trade zones. Support for such initiatives from cooperating national and local governments would lay the groundwork for an East Asian economic zone.

However, circumstances for sub-regional economic zones are diverse, and to develop actual exchanges requires a variety of factors. As such, a more accurate analysis of the situation facing sub-regions is essential. The role of local governments in sub-regional economic zones, the most important factor in the development of the Pan-Yellow Sea Region, is crucial. Political willingness of top officials of

local governments to focus on conditions necessary for expanding trade and direct investment is also required. Even the Pan-Yellow Sea Region, which faces many challenges, is expanding and deepening cross-border cooperation between local governments, so policies to offset the limitations of intergovernmental cooperation may emerge in the future.

Sub-regional economic zones distributed throughout the East Asian region, having emerged in new, cross-border spaces along the coastal rim, are likely to develop into international actors. Whether market-driven or based on national strategies, the transformation of sub-regional economic zones into international actors foretells the organization of a new international system with multilayered and multicentric characteristics.

Project-related conference

The project leader organized a one-day international conference, with the support and cooperation of the Soka University Peace Research Institute (SUPRI), on the theme, “Prospects and Possibilities for Japan’s 2019 G20 Osaka Summit.” This was hosted at Soka University on December 10, 2018. The theme is linked to the project theme of Asian influence in global and regional economic governance, since it focused on the influence of Japan as the host of the G20 this year. The event was held shortly after the inauguration of Japan’s G20 Presidency, with its Osaka Summit due to be held on June 28-29, 2019.

The conference was organized in collaboration with the G20 Research Group of the University of Toronto; Griffith Asia Institute at Griffith University; and the Russian Presidential Academy of

National Economy and Public Administration (RANEPA). The event brought together international and Japanese scholars, representatives from the Think20 (T20) and Women20 (W20) official G20 engagement forums, and diplomats and officials from member states and international organizations.

The first panel session focused on the G20's role in global governance, especially since its inaugural summit in November 2008, during the global financial crisis (GFC). There were also thematic panels on the key issues of G20 economic governance, gender governance, and climate, energy, and sustainability governance. Two further sessions focused on the prospects and possibilities for Japan's G20 Presidency.

One conclusion from these discussions was that the G20's role has substantially shifted over the past decade, from crisis cooperation to an increasingly complex policy agenda. Some participants emphasized its importance as a global governance "hub," guiding interactions between diverse global actors and organizations on several policy areas. There was greater skepticism about whether the G20 constituted a multilateral, or plurilateral, 'club.' This was due to the perception, among some speakers, that normative divergence undermined the potential for a collective G20 sense of 'we-ness;' others also indicated the growing normative divergence among Group of Seven (G7) members since 2016.

Conference participants noted that the G20 agenda greatly expanded over the past decade, especially due to the influence of non-G7 member states. South Korea's G20 Presidency in 2010, which included sustainable development, was considered the key moment when the forum's agenda began to diversify beyond the initial priorities of its leading wealthy states, centered on financial

governance reform and an economic recovery strategy during the GFC. Policy areas such as food security, employment, climate change, and gender economic equity were subsequently incorporated in the agenda, especially through the host presidencies of Mexico, Russia, Turkey, China, and Argentina. A couple of speakers debated the potential for a greater focus on security at the G20, whether conceived in conventional military terms or linked more broadly to climate, food, energy, and other issues. This indicated how the forum influenced both narrower and broader dimensions of global security, though it remains significantly less of a focus than economic governance.

There was some debate about how the G20's agenda expansion influenced its efficiency and legitimacy, in terms of its organizational capacity to progress on a range of policy issues, hence efficiency effects; but, also, legitimacy gains from the G20 prioritizing broader issues, many of them priorities for developing-state members. This issue has been a point of contention among G20 stakeholders and experts since the GFC; arguably, the expanded G20 agenda has become too established for any significant reduction to be feasible, absent another crisis, which could lead to a narrower focus in future. Another key legitimacy and efficiency issue was the restricted G20 membership, and trade-offs between size and coordination capacities.

Several participants stressed the importance of intensifying efforts to enhance summit commitment compliance, a growing topic of debate in recent years. There have been some notable G20 failures to comply with summit commitments, including the failure to implement the fossil-fuel subsidy phase-out, pledged at its Pittsburgh Summit of September 2009. Conference speakers noted the value of the compliance analysis and reports from the G20 Research Group at the

University of Toronto and RANEPa in Moscow. One speaker noted the data indicated that holding ministerial meetings tended to raise G20 compliance scores in related policy areas. This might encourage future host presidencies to continue to increase the number of G20 ministerials, a trend among recent host presidencies.

One important issue was the truncated time-frame for Japan's G20 Presidency, due to the Osaka Summit being held in June. Many participants at our conference, as well as at the T20's Inception Conference in Tokyo on December 4-5, argued that the effectively-shortened presidency meant there should be greater emphasis on implementing the existing policy agenda, rather than adding new topics. The G20, as well as the T20 and other engagement groups, would have little time to develop ambitious new proposals or conduct new research.

On the significance of the official G20 engagement forums and other forms of outreach, participants indicated the public diplomacy benefits from these activities. Some contextualized G20 outreach within the broader global governance trend since the 1990s of increasing engagement with non-state or civil society actors. One speaker perceived a new normative principle of growing inclusivity in global governance, though several noted that the role of engagement groups like the Civil20, T20, and W20 remains ambiguous, and their forms of engagement and composition rather arbitrary.

The conference included discussions of Japan's G20 policy agenda. It was noted that only half the scheduled ministerial meetings would occur before the Osaka Summit, which might diminish progress on issue areas where relevant ministerials were held afterwards. Japanese priorities for the summit would include, for the Sherpa Track, free trade, science and technological innovation, quality infrastructure

investment for development, global health, climate change, aging populations, and promoting the Sustainable Development Goals. The Finance Track would prioritize debt sustainability and transparency, plus focus on the effects of immigration and demographic shifts on the tax base. This would constitute a continuation of key aspects of the existing G20 agenda, with some new focus on demographic issues such as aging and migration. The Buenos Aires Summit leaders’ declaration emphasized World Trade Organization reform, so the Japanese agenda on promoting free trade would likely be influenced by this inherited issue.

One speaker said that the Argentine G20 Presidency had been “bottom-up” in its agenda deliberations, incorporating suggestions and policy priorities from G20 stakeholders. It was noted that the Japanese have been more “top-down” in constructing their agenda for the Osaka Summit. However, as experienced by the Australians in 2014, when trying to narrow the scope of the agenda to their core priorities for the Brisbane Summit, it is sometimes difficult to keep tight control of the G20 agenda. This might also be counter-productive, if it undermines cooperation or decreases constructive policy inputs from G20 stakeholders.

The conference left the impression that the G20 faces an uncertain future. There were strains in relations between key G20 members during the Argentine host year, though a couple of speakers noted the relative success of the Buenos Aires Summit. Despite prior concerns about tensions between the American and Chinese governments, especially on trade, fears that a leaders’ declaration would not be agreed were unfounded. The Japanese G20 Presidency comes at a time of growing doubts about the forum’s capacities to manage global economic uncertainties, security tensions, and global environmental

threats. The coming months provide an opportunity for the Japanese hosts presidency, and other G20 governments and stakeholders, to improve multilateral cooperation across the diverse policy agenda.

Research plans of the project members

The main focus of the Principal Investigator's research over the next year will be to continue examining the role of the G20 in global economic governance, during the Japan G20 Presidency year. This includes his work as member of the T20 Task Force on the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

These T20 activities will include participating in the T20 Tokyo Summit in May 2019, also contributing to the Task Force policy report that will be presented as part of the T20 report to the G20 Osaka Summit in June. The Principal Investigator has already participated in a number of T20 activities, including the T20 Buenos Aires Summit in September 2018; as well as the T20 Inception Conference held in Tokyo in December 2018. These activities included field research on how global governance networks influence the G20, including a series of semi-structured interviews conducted during the T20 Buenos Aires Summit. These interviews formed an important part of the research for a subsequent conference paper, presented at the German Development Institute's conference, "The G20 @ 10: Benefits, Limitations and the Future of Global Club Governance in Turbulent Times." This paper is the basis for the forthcoming article, by the same name, to be published by the South African Journal of International Relations.

Principal Investigator Jonathan Luckhurst’s contribution includes the following:-

Publications

(Forthcoming) “Governance Networks in Shaping the G20 Agenda,” *South African Journal of International Relations*.

(Forthcoming) “The G20 Hub of Decentralizing Authority in Post-Crisis Global Governance,” *International Organisations Research Journal*.

(Forthcoming) “A Constructivist Approach to the G20,” in Slaughter, S. ed. *The G20 & International Relations Theory: Perspectives in Global Summitry*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Guest presentations and conference papers

Future:-

“Asian Influence on the G20’s Sustainable Development Consensus: How Decentralizing Authority is Shaping Global Governance.” International Studies Association Annual Convention, Toronto, 4-7 March 2019.

Already completed:-

“Women, Digitalization and the Future of Work: Challenges and Opportunities of Disruptive Technologies.” Invited to give keynote (on “G20 engagement groups”) at this Chatham House roundtable for Japan’s Women20 forum launch, at the British Embassy in Tokyo, 20 November 2018.

“Governance Networks in Shaping the G20 Agenda.” Invited to

present and give keynote at German Development Institute (GDI/DIE) conference on *The G20 @ 10: Benefits, Limitations and the Future of Global Club Governance in Turbulent Times*, Bonn, 23-24 October. 2018

“G20 at Ten: Navigating a Decade of Turbulence in Global Economic Governance.” Invited to present at Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration workshop *G20 and BRICS: Pursuing Multilateral Solutions to 21st Century Challenges?* Moscow, 10 October 2018.

“Gender Mainstreaming: A Strategic Approach for G20.” Invited to contribute to a Think20 Gender Economic Equity Task Force panel at the Buenos Aires Think20 Summit, 17-18 September 2018.

“No Going Back: Making Gender Equality Happen”. Invited to be a speaker at the Chatham House 2018 International Policy Forum, London, 9 July 2018.

(2018) “The Contextual Rationality of ADB—AIIB Cooperation: Shifting Practices of Global and Asian Development Governance.” International Studies Association Annual Convention, San Francisco, 4-7 April.

Co-Investigator Hartmut Lenz’s contribution includes the following:-

Paper Presentation at the 2019 Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association (MPSA), Chicago (1-4 April). Title: “The Impact of Public Opinion on Intergovernmental Treaty Negotiation”.

Abstract: This develops a game-theoretical model of the negotiation process that analyses the role of institutional constraints, public opinion and credible commitments. The derived hypothesis will be the basis for an empirical analysis of ASEAN Plus Three and EU treaty negotiations.

Political Economy Research Seminar Presentation: “Brexit the ultimate EU treaty negotiations” at Waseda University (March 2018).

Paper presented at the 2018 Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association(MPSA), Chicago (March). Title: ‘Modelling iterate negotiation within the framework of European Negotiations’. Abstract: The aim of this research is to understand how iterate negotiations in the environment of the European Union lead to further cooperation.

PSPE Research Seminar Series Presentation: “Step by Step, Effects of Public Opinion on Intergovernmental Treaty Negotiations” London School of Economics, Department of Government, (January 2018).

“Achieving Effective International Cooperation: How Institutional Formalization Shapes Intergovernmental Negotiations” (2018) *World Affairs* 181 (2), Sage Publication.

Abstract:

This article explores how formalization of institutions and domestic constraints influence the outcomes of international cooperation and negotiation processes particularly in a regional setting like the European Union (EU) or the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN). Examining different forms of institutional setup along the formal-informal continuum, this

study evaluates their impact on the successes and failures of intergovernmental negotiation processes. While some scholars have been vocal about the importance of institutional setting on negotiation outcomes, there has not yet been any systematic analysis of the impact of institutional variations on the actual negotiation process. This project specifies under what conditions domestic actors constrain governments, and how these conditions depend on institutional structures. I analyze the impact of institutional variations, concentrating on negotiation failure and deadlock situations, to form a framework that can differentiate between various bargaining situations and to understand their impact on the possibility to facilitate successful negotiation outcomes. The central argument highlights the need for more nuanced connections between institutional design, domestic constraints, and the level of formalization to understand the likelihood of success or failure of intergovernmental negotiation processes.

Co-Investigator Kenji Nakayama's contribution includes the following:-

Recent Activities

Book (Chapter)

Nakayama, K. (with T. Sadotomo) (2018). "Mekong Region and Changing Borders: A Focus on the CBTA and BCPs," in H. Taga and S. Igarashi. eds. *The New International Relations of Sub-Regionalism: Asia and Europe*. London: Routledge, pp.160-179.

Article

Nakayama, K. (2019). “East Asia’s Development and Subregional Economic Zones: Toward Activating the Rim,” in Soka University Peace Research, Vol.33. (in printing)

Presentations

Nakayama, K. (2018). “East Asia’s Development and Subregional Economic Zones: Toward Activating the Rim,” at Taiwan/Japan/Korea Peace Forum, “Prospects of Cross-strait Relations and East Asian Developments,” in Taipei, October 7.

Nakayama, K. (2018). “A Dispute Concerning Possession of the Takeshima / Tok-do and Subregional Cooperation in Japan-Korea Relations,” at KAKENHI (B, 16H05700) Seminar, “A Multi-layered Subregion and the New Security Architecture in East Asia,” in Waseda University at Tokyo, October 13.

International Seminars

(Moderator) Nakayama, K. (2018). “Prospects for Peace on the Korean Peninsula and Northeast Asia,” (Panelists: Yi Kiho (Hanshin University, South Korea), Ulv Hanssen (Soka University)), at Soka University, November 16.

(Moderator) Nakayama, K. (2018). “Improvement of Relations between Japan and China,” (Panelists: Lian Degui (Shanghai International Studies University, China), Yuji Morikawa (Nagasaki University), Nobumasa Kameyama (Keio Research Institute at SFC)), at Soka University, November 30.

(Moderator) Nakayama, K. (2018). "Inter-Korean Reconciliation under US-China Rivalry," (Panelists: Jung Kim (University of North Korean Studies, South Korea), Hideki Tamai (Soka University), Minoru Koide (Soka University)), at Soka University, December 21.

References

- Iida, K. (1993). When and how do domestic constituencies matter? Two-level games with uncertainty. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 37(3), 404-426.
- Katzenstein, P. J., & Sil, R. (2011). Toward analytic eclecticism: The political economy of an integrated Europe. In D. H. Claes & C. H. Knutsen (Eds.), *Governing the global economy: Politics, institutions, and economic development*. Abingdon/New York: Routledge.
- Lake, D. A. (2013). Theory is dead, long live theory: The end of the great debates and the rise of eclecticism in international relations. *European Journal of International Relations*, 19(3), 567-587.
- Putnam, R. D. (1988). Diplomacy and domestic politics: The logic of two-level games. *International Organization*, 42(3), 427-460.
- Rosenau, J. N. (1992). Governance, order, and change in world politics. In J. N. Rosenau & Czempiel, O.-E. (Eds.), *Governance without government: Order and change in world politics* (pp. 1-29). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.