Leibniz-Gemeinschaft

Final report

Contested World Orders

Leibniz-Institutes: WZB, HSFK/PRIF, GIGA
Reference number: SAW-2012-WZB-3
Project period: 2012 - 2015
Contact partners:

Prof. Dr. Michael Zürn (content)
michael.zuern@wzb.eu

Susanne Breda (administration)
susanne.breda@wzb.eu

Index

Executive Summary

The project ‘Contested World Orders’ was about international authority and its contestation. International politics has become heavily institutionalized and international institutions have increased their political authority. But this authority does not go uncontested. First, especially in the 1990s, the increased institutionalization of world politics witnessed the rising activism of transnational social movements and non-governmental organizations (NGOs). Second, especially since the 2000s, the economic growth of major developing countries such as China and India saw the emergence of ‘rising powers’ who sought greater roles in international institutions while criticizing aspects of their policies and structures. To analyze these trends, a collaborative research network was established with researchers from three Leibniz institutes. These were the German Institute of Global and Area Studies (GIGA), the Peace Research Institute Frankfurt (PRIF) and the Berlin Social Science Center (WZB). Central to this collaboration was the pursuit of a common research program, guided by regular inter-institute workshops and culminating in a joint book manuscript in the form of an edited collection. This inter-institutional collaboration was strengthened further by scholarly exchanges and research stays between the three institutes. At the same time, this collaborative research was enriched by the findings of individual and intra-institutional research endeavors, such as construction at the WZB of a longitudinal database on international authority. In this way, research on international authority and its contestation by state and non-state actors went hand in hand.

The results of these efforts are presented in this report, along with a list of publications demonstrating their scholarly dissemination. Substantively, the project reveals several findings of general significance. *First*, international authority has grown over time. At least in terms of their formal rules, international authority expanded significantly since the Second World War. Especially since 1990, states equipped international organizations (IOs) with unprecedented levels of competences and high degrees of autonomy. *Second*, international authority as such is hardly contested by rising powers and, even less so, by transnational NGOs. We see neither a generalized rejection of political authority located at the level of international institutions nor a systematic, cross-cutting preference of rising powers and NGOs to have less international authority and less regulation. *Third*, BRICS have a tendency to defend the intergovernmental status quo sometimes against attempts of the established powers to form strong supranational institutions with a significant role for non-state actors and even individuals. Overall, BRICS also display a tendency towards rules that allow a greater degree of governmental autonomy in economic decision making, and have opposed the extension of liberal economic commitments in several institutions. *Fourth*, regarding the interaction of rising powers with transnational NGOs, rising power governments in general defend a representation monopoly of governments in the international realm. They prefer to restrict NGO influence to the domestic level. Rather than encouraging them to act as independent political actors, NGOs are at best welcomed as advisers to national governmental delegations.

Put together, these findings reveal a picture in which international authority has become strongly contested, even as the necessity for strong international institutions is widely shared among state and non-state actors. Despite many signs of conflict and tension over international authority, it is possible that contestation offers the chance for positive change. It is in the spirit of exploring both the points of tension as well as agreement in the existing order that the Contested World Orders project should be read.

Research Questions and Objectives

The point of departure of the Contested World Orders project is the observation that, in recent years, increasingly authoritative international institutions have elicited new forms of political contestation. While by no means limited to new actors, this contestation is most vividly associated with two groups.

First, major challengers and new demands for international institutions have been identified with the transnational mobilization of social movements and non-governmental organizations (NGOs). Between 1989 and 2009 the number of NGOs accredited at the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations increased fourfold. Moreover, visible protests and demonstrations targeting organizations such as the G7 or WTO became regular features of international political contestation. Many of these groups call for the strengthening of international institutions, but are also associated with calls for democratization, transparency and accountability within these institutions. Others are even more critical and challenge their legitimacy completely.

Second, more recently, 'rising powers' such as Brazil, China and India are seen as changing the international distribution of power and posing new demands for existing international institutions. In this context a more traditional discourse has emerged, focused on claims around the end of United States hegemony, the return of multipolarity, and the transition from an Atlantic to a Pacific century. Power transitions are often associated with fundamental conflicts over world order and with posing new challenges for international institutions which are reflective of the preferences of established powers.

Against this background of international institutions of growing importance, there is a widespread perception that both rising powers as well as transnational NGOs have far-reaching implications for the world order in material, institutional, and ideational terms. In this project we explore the proposition that these implications can only be understood if they are studied *in relation to each other*. While the increasing influence of transnational NGOs and the new rising powers has been the subject of academic research, there are very few systematic analyses which take both phenomena into account and study their interrelation. Those who takes states, and especially, the 'great powers', as the most important actors in international politics tend to see the role of non-state actors as secondary and focus instead on power shifts in the international state system. On the other hand, those focused on the emergence of a global society and the role of NGOs tend to see the rise of new powers as a footnote in the ongoing development of transnationalization.

The project aims to unite these two separate discourses and to study the interactions between the two different sets of actors. In particular, the project focuses on the demands and criticism that rising powers and NGOs address at international institutions, examining their commonalities and differences. The project thus aims to systematically assess the forms of contestation addressed at international institutions, as well as their implications for these institutions' authority and legitimacy.

We analyzed the interests in and demands for change in world order from the side of rising powers and transnational NGOs using a common analytical approach. We also observed that the object of contestation of both rising powers and NGOs are typically the policies and institutional structures of international institutions. In other words, the growing political and epistemic authority of international institutions generates conflict, discontent, and contestation. In order to inquire into the patterns of international authority and analyze its effects on states' and non-state actors' contestation behavior, one of the main goals of the project was to develop a novel and comprehensive database on the evolution and varying levels of international authority, both across international organizations, and within them over time. In that context, we investigated questions about the evolution of authority, whether authority varies

systematically across issue areas or global and regional organizations, or whether particular functions of IOs are equipped with different levels of formal authority. In this way, we tackle both the increased authority of international institutions as well as its contestation by new important actors.

Against this background, we explored research questions as follows:

- In what respects have international institutions acquired political authority and how has this changed over time?
- What aspects of international institutions are contested by rising powers and transnational NGOs?
- Do rising powers' and transnational NGOs' demands intersect or diverge?
- Do their demands have a systemic nature or do we observe variance over different policy fields and forms of international institutions?
- To what extent do they constitute a 'threat' to the self-described 'liberal' world order identified with Western powers?
- What factors account for rising power behavior—do they form part of a systemic process of balancing against the hegemon, as realism would suggest, or do they behave according to domestic imperatives, as liberalism claims?
- What differences and similarities do these contestations demonstrate, particularly with regard to underlying norms and concepts of legitimacy?
- What are the repercussions of these contestations for the authority of international institutions?

Development of the Research

We developed this research agenda in two themes working in parallel. First, we investigated international authority. Second, we investigated its contestation by rising powers and NGOs.

We investigated the questions of *international authority* in several steps. The first step involved the conceptualization and operationalization of international authority. Authority is a central though contested concept both in political philosophy and in empirical social science. Notwithstanding its many definitions, all classical concepts of authority have something in common: those who recognize authority defer their own judgment or choice without being necessarily forced or persuaded to do so. Based on this conception, we extend existing approaches to international authority by arguing that an international institution has authority when the direct and indirect addressees recognize, in principle or in practice, that an institution can make competent judgments and decisions that are binding at least for some states. Accordingly, the first dimension of our authority concept relates to an organization's autonomy vis-à-vis its state parties. The level of bindingness – as the second dimension of authority – can vary from requests to commands that may be legally binding or not, and that may be backed up by force or not. Importantly, an organization's authority can vary along the functions it performs, such as when certain IOs have intrusive monitoring provisions but weak sanctioning rules. To capture this variation, we conceive of authority as being exercised to various degrees across central functions of the policy cycle, which represent the planning and adoption of rules and policies, their implementation, as well as their evaluation. These are: agenda setting and rule making (negotiation and adoption of policies), monitoring, norm interpretation\dispute settlement and enforcement (implementation), and finally evaluation and knowledge generation. Our sample comprises 36 International Organizations, which are representative of the population of active IOs, as composed in the International Governmental Organization dataset[1] and that are selected according the following criteria: multi-purpose or single-purpose IOs and global or regional IOs.

In the second step we developed a comprehensive coding scheme to measure international authority. Specifically, our coding scheme, which comprises more than 150 items, collects information for each of the seven policy functions and is structured according to three principal questions. First, does the IO have the right to carry out any of these functions? Second, who carries out these functions (IO body, member state, other actor, including non-state actors)? Third, how is the function carried out and how "authoritative" is it? To gather the relevant information on each item, we coded all constitutive treaties and charters of IOs, their amendments, as well as all relevant secondary legislative documents (e.g. Rules of Procedure). The coding process took 2,5 years and during that process 7 student assistants, in total, collected and coded the relevant documents. Finally, we also collected information on the regulatory scope of IOs, which depends on the number of issues covered. The resulting raw information was structured and stored in a relational database to facilitate the retrieval of information and the eventual sharing of the data. Moreover, the relational database built in the language MySQL offers the opportunity to incorporate data on the level of contestation of select IOs, developed by our national project partners, and allow scholars to quantitatively assess the relationship between IO authority and different forms of contestation. In that respect, the International Authority Database provides a common platform for the project partners to share data.

In the third project phase we aggregated our data based on a theoretically derived aggregation scheme, developed an authority measure for all 36 IOs, ran descriptive analyses, and used the resulting score to inform the study of rising powers' and NGO contestation behavior (see Stephen and Zürn forthcoming, below pages 13-14).

Regarding changes in our original plan, we underestimated the amount of time for the development of the coding scheme. Although we initially planned to finalize the coding scheme within one year of the project's start, we finally spent almost 2 years. However, the effort invested in the comprehensive coding instrument was worth it, because the coding process itself, including the selection and retrieval of legal documents, could then be implemented without any problems.

We presented our database during a conference in December 2015 on the Authority of International Institutions, held at the WZB. The mostly international participants, from the United States, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, and Scandinavia, gave valuable feedback on our data and we discussed several future extensions and cross-national cooperation projects.

We investigated the question of the *contestation* of international authority in several steps. The first step involved the conceptualization of our dependent variable, the methodological approaches to be employed, and the construction of a common research strategy. This took place during a series of workshops in 2013-2014 hosted at the WZB. The goal was to bridge the research foci and expertise of the respective institutions towards a common research focus. The ultimate goal was the preparation, alongside individual publications, of a top-quality edited book (currently before publishers).

In contrast to the dominant literature, we concluded, first, that the demands of NGOs and rising powers need to be studied systematically across different issue areas and international institutions. For this purpose, a theoretical framework paper was written by authors from the WZB in close collaboration with the other research partners. This paper highlighted three research questions of central interest to the project: a) the extent of support or opposition of NGOs and BRICS for the aggregation of political authority by international institutions, b)

[1] Pevehouse, J. C., Nordstrom, T. and Warnke, K. (200) The COW-2 International Organizations Dataset Version 2.0. *Conflict Management and Peace Science.* Volume 21, pp.101-119.

their support or opposition to the institutionalization of liberal policies and principles, and c) the distance of the actors' preferences from the institutional status quo.

The project therefore proceeded on this understanding that the contestation of world order needs to be broken down into the study of the plurality of its constituent world orders. We looked at a comparable sample of contesting actors in different fields and international institutions in world politics, their demands, and their justification of their demands. The project sought to go beyond broad systemic generalizations to focus more specifically at how conflicts play out at the level of specific institutional contexts. In order to account systematically for contested world orders, we need to look concretely at the working of issue-area specific international institutions and the demands put forward to them. We thus studied different issue areas with a common framework, but with plural methodologies, most of the studies combining qualitative and quantitative approaches. It should be noted that the initial conceptual work, and the formulation of a common research approach, took longer than initially envisaged.

Based on the expertise of contributing authors, we chose eight international institutions as the focus for our study, providing variation in their liberal policy content, levels of international authority, and issue area. These were the Group of Seven industrialized countries (G7), the International Monetary Fund, the Non-Proliferation Treaty, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the United Nations General Assembly, the United Nations Human Rights Council, and the World Trade Organization. Regular authors' workshops in Berlin and Hamburg provided important opportunities to share findings, cross-check our assumptions, and work collaboratively on solving problems that arose in the research for each contribution.

Prior to the finalization of our joint book manuscript, it was decided to host a final authors' workshop at the WZB in July 2016, and to invite external guests to read and comment on both the construction of the project in general, and on each of the chapter contributions in particular. For this two day workshop external guests from Latin America, India, Europe, and the United States provided important feedback on our approach.

Results and Discussion

Our major results can be grouped into two themes: on international authority, and on the contestation of international authority.

In the project on international authority, our resulting authority measure is based on the formal rules and regulations that specify the degree of autonomy of IOs and the level of the bindingness of their decisions and actions. Concerning our results, we find that the formal authority of IOs grows over time. At two historically important events, international authority even grew exponentially: at the end of World War II and the end of the Cold War. Especially since 1990, states equip international organizations with unprecedented levels of competences and high degrees of autonomy. This is a new descriptive insight, as our project is the first to have data on the temporal variation of international authority.

Concerning the variation of formal authority across IOs, we find that the European Union is the most authoritative IO, followed by the United Nations. This is in line with other datasets on IO authority (Hooghe & Marks, 2015[2]; Tallberg, et al., 2013[3]). Regional multi-purpose IOs,

[2] Hooghe, L, and Marks, G. (2015). Delegation and pooling in international organizations. *The Review of International Organizations*. Volume 10, Issue 3, pp 305-328.

such as the Andean Community or the African Union, have also high levels of authority. Economic IOs, such as the IMF or the WTO have high levels of authority, whereas the World Bank has a surprisingly low score. Judging just from the legal texts that create and equip it with competences, the World Bank is a formally weak institution, which does not resonate well with its publicly perceived level of authority. This finding highlights the need to further inquire into possible variation between formal and informal authority. As a result, the theorization, conceptualization, and measurement of informal authority will constitute a further research project.

Finally, IO authority also strongly varies across policy functions. Unlike other data, our measure can display the variation in authority across the seven policy functions. Agenda setting authority has strongly increased from the end of the Cold War until today. Knowledge generation, rule making, and norm interpretation have witnessed similar developments. Rulemaking constantly became more authoritative and more and more IOs adopted a set of binding policy instruments where secretariats influence their content and choice, and states have fewer means to oppose such instruments, because, for instance, ratification is no longer a requirement for their entry into force. Another strong trend is the adoption of adjudication mechanisms to resolve disputes over treaty interpretation and compliance. Interestingly, compliance monitoring and sanctioning by IOs have rather stalled from the mid-1960s. At the height of superpower confrontation, organizations would rather have strong enforcement and monitoring provisions than other policy functions. With the end of the Cold War, these two functions of IOs receded to the benefit of binding rule making, binding adjudication through international or organization-specific courts, and the production and dissemination of knowledge about substantial global problems and their governance.

In the project on contestation, one key finding speaks to the debate about the impact of contestation on the authority of international institutions. Our results indicate that international authority as such is hardly contested by rising powers and, even less so, by transnational NGOs. We see neither a generalized rejection of political authority located at the level of international institutions nor a systematic, cross-cutting preference of rising powers and NGOs to have less international authority and less regulation. To be sure, in international trade the rising powers commonly push for international institutions that give them more room to take into account developmental goals, and the BRICS states similarly argue in favor of a R2P interpretation which limits the use of international authority against sovereign states to very exceptional cases. In the negotiations for the UNHRC, Russia, China, India and South Africa also aimed at limiting international authority. In all these three cases, however, there are no signs for a principled rejection of international authority by BRICS. For instance, the UNHRC negotiations ended in a new institutional set-up agreed upon by a clear majority including the majority of the BRICS that is considered at least as effective as the older United Nations Human Rights Commission. Moreover, there are issue areas in which rising powers not only accept international authority in principle, but ask for more international regulation. This is true for instance in financial regulation and increasingly for environmental regulation as well. NGOs also tend to advocate more rather than less international political authority through in order that complex political challenges can be addressed with comprehensive regulatory approaches.

Second, we find significant evidence that rising powers champion substantive rules that allow a greater degree of governmental autonomy in economic decision making, and have opposed the extension of liberal economic commitments in several institutions. They all ask for a version of liberalism which is more embedded and less neo-liberal. This is even more true for the majority of campaign NGOs, whose primary concern is to challenge unfair and inequitable features of neoliberalism. Especially Brazil and India have been staunch opponents of

[3] Tallberg, J., et al. (2013). *The Opening Up of International Organizations*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

extending the liberalization mandate of the WTO to include deeper regulatory harmonization, focusing instead on the more traditional trade agenda of market access, particularly in agricultural markets. Rising powers are also associated with more context-specific approaches to human rights and the issue of Security Council interventions, opposing changing the human rights regime into a strongly universalized direction. In these cases, it is the established powers that want to change the status quo and develop international institutions further, while rising powers defend the status quo.

Third, rising powers display strong commitments to identities as 'developing countries', and their voting in the General Assembly shows strong commitment to the positions of the G77 plus China. In the use of traditional Third World symbols, rising powers find allies in many NGOs of the North and South, who claim to speak for the needs of developing countries and the global poor. Voting in the General Assembly indicates a significant convergence of rising power preferences which coincides with their institutionalization as BRICS, IBSA, and BASIC in the current decade. In fact, the BRICS now vote almost as cohesively as the G7 members in the General Assembly.

Regarding the interaction of rising power governments and transnational NGOs, we find that rising powers tend to support restricted forms of participation and access for NGOs in international institutions. While rising powers and Southern NGOs often take similar positions on substantative issues, they do not march together. Rising powers in general defend a representation monopoly of governments in the international realm. They therefore hardly coalesce openly with transnational NGOs, and not even with Southern NGOs. In line with neoliberal thinking and especially in the economic realm, established powers often even use representatives of multinational firms and other economic interest groups as governance partners. The coalitions between established powers and Western non-state actors seems to be therefore more stable and influential than coalition-building between rising powers and Southern NGOs, in spite of the fact that they often have compatible positions.

In general, our analysis shows that an established and ritualized confrontation that cuts across different issues does not exist between BRICS and NGOS on the one side and established power on the other. To the contrary, coalition-building varies from issue area to issue area and from institution to institution. Two types of conflict coalitions with shifting memberships can thereby be observed. On the one hand, there are conflicts about the institutional design and the voting rights. These conflicts follow very often the logic of institutionalized inequality in the decision-making procedures. In these cases, the most contested issue is the distribution of decision-making positions within a given institution. In all the cases of institutionalized inequality, those established powers who have privileged positions stand against some of those who challenge international authority. In the case of the UNSC, for instance, the P5 including China and Russia on the side of the established powers defend their veto positions and are very hesitant in giving this privilege to others like India, Brazil, South Africa, or Germany. The same is true for the status divide established and codified in the NPT regime. The challengers consist of those powers which do not have a privileged institutional position. A similar pattern applies to cases like the G-summits, the IMF and the QUAD within the WTO. In all these cases, demands for a change in the membership of "executive bodies" are asked for. In all the cases of institutionalized inequality, it is the issue-area specific distribution of institutionalized privileges that structure the conflicts -- it is not the Western established powers versus BRICS.

Partners

The WZB
The WZB team was directed by Prof. Dr. Michael Zürn. Dr. Matthew Stephen coordinated the project. Dr. Matthew Stephen, Dr. Alexandros Tokhi, Dr. Martin Binder, Dr. Sophie Eisentraut, and Autumn Lockwood Payton, PhD, all participated in the project and authored or co-authored a total of seven chapters of the edited volume. In addition to the overall coordination of the project and hosting of regular inter-institutional workshops, the WZB members of the project guided its thematic development and sketched its focus in WZB Discussion Paper, published in 2014. Additionally, project members from the WZB published ten of the project publications listed below.

The GIGA
The GIGA team was directed by Prof. Dr. Detlef Nolte and Dr. Miriam Prys-Hansen. Until January 2015, Dr. Kristina Hahn was responsible for the coordination of the project at the GIGA, from March until August 2015 Milan Röseler took on the position of project coordinator. Prof. Dr. Anja Jetschke and Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Hein as well as Malte Lellmann (research assistant) were also part of the CWO team at the GIGA. During the working period from 2012 to 2015 the team met regularly and discussed its research process, as well as strategies to disseminate the results. In addition to discussing the framework paper of the project at various stages, researchers at the GIGA conducted three case studies, which were conducted in the context of the project. Besides its regular members, the GIGA team was joined by guest researchers (listed below) that stayed at the GIGA, took part in the project meetings and contributed to the research process.

Contributions from the GIGA
Within the framework the Contested World Orders project the GIGA and its members have worked on different scientific articles, participated in international conferences and held public lectures and discussions. Furthermore the GIGA invited international scholars to Hamburg. These guest researchers actively participated in the project and contributed to the its international visibility. All these contributions are centered around the project's main topic of changes in the global order and specifically the role of rising powers and NGOs in it. The main outputs are three case studies as contributions to the book project, which is edited by Matthew D. Stephen and Michael Zürn.

As envisaged by the project plan, the GIGA invited a total of three international guest researchers to Hamburg. These researchers participated in the work of the project, held public lectures and contributed to the international visibility of the GIGAs' research.

- Kathryn Hochstetler, Professor of Political Science at the University of Waterloo. Stay from 4th to 29th November 2013. Professor Hochstetler regularly participated in the Contested World Orders project meetings and fruitfully commented on the research process. Furthermore she held two lectures at the GIGA, one on "Responsibilities in Transition: Emerging Powers in the Climate Change Negotiations" and another in cooperation with of the GIGA doctoral program on "Research in Practice: From initial project idea to final product". Kathryn Hochstetler is a member of the GIGA's academic advisory board.
- Cilfford Bob, Professor of Political Science at the Duquesne University. Stay on 13th of July 2015. Professor Bob participated in the project workshop, where he commented on the research process, and held a public lecture on the topic of "Rights as Weapons of Political Conflict".
- Laurence Whitehead, Professor at the University of Oxford. Stay from 6th June to 5th July 2015. Together with Professor Amrita Narlikar and Professor Detlef Nolte Professor Whitehead participated in a GIGA Forum where he discussed the topic "The

BIG – Brazil, India and Germany – and the Future of Global Governance: Perspectives for Trilateral Cooperation". Moreover Professor Whitehead held a lecture on "Anti-Democracy Promotion and the Legacies of the 'Arab Spring'".

- Diana Tussie, Professor at the FLASCO-Argentina. Stay from 8th August to 5th September 2015. On 27th August 2015 Professor Tussie held a lecture on "Power Shifts and Regional Building: South America in a Post-Hegemonic Moment".

Furthermore, the GIGA was engaged in an exchange among the Contested World Orders partners:

- From 20th October to 21st November 2014 Matthew D. Stephen, research fellow at the WZB, stayed at the GIGA. During his stay he held a lecture on the topic of "New Pressures on the WTO: The Rise of Illiberal Trading States" and regularly participated in the team meetings.
- On 13th and 14th July 2015 the GIGA coordinated a project meeting of the entire Contested World Orders team. At the meeting the researcher from the WZB, the PRIF and the GIGA discussed the research process and their case studies.
- The GIGA researchers participated in the project meetings in Berlin that were organized by the WZB. During these meetings the case studies were presented and discussed by the entire project team.

Achievements

Within the Contested World Orders project the GIGA team made distinctive contributions to scientific debates and used its infrastructure to make its research visible for the public. The case studies on the UN Security Council, World Health Governance and the climate change regime are the core outputs of the project. The public lectures and discussions held at the GIGA contributed to visibility of project and made the findings accessible for an interested audience. Thanks to the guest researchers, who were invited to join the Contested World Orders team, the GIGA could exchange its findings and ideas with the international scientific community and strengthen its international ties. All in all, the Contested World Orders project made strong contributions to the academic discourse, was committed to knowledge transfer activities and made the project internationally visible.

PRIF / HSFK

PRIF's team was directed by Prof. Dr. Klaus Dieter Wolf and Prof. Dr. Harald Müller. Dr. Dirk Peters was responsible for coordinating the project at PRIF throughout its entire duration, except for half a year between May and November 2012, when Dr. Annegret Flohr substituted for him. Dr. Flohr was also a member of the core project team at PRIF (until January 2015) as was Dr. Melanie Coni-Zimmer. This core team worked together on everything related to the edited volume which constituted the chief collaborative outcome of the Contested World Orders project (individual case studies, discussion of framework and of methodological and practical problems). Furthermore, they cooperated with PRIF researchers who worked on contestation of international institutions by rising powers and non-state actors in the context of other projects. These included, among others, an international research project on "Global Norm Evolution and the Responsibility to Protect" which examined the role of rising powers in the contestation and evolution of the R2P norm; and the research project "'Rogue States', 'Outlaws' and 'Pariahs': Dissidence Between Delegitimization and Justification", which examined the interaction of dissident state and non-state actors with established orders.

Contributions from PRIF

PRIF researchers made two main types of contributions to the Contested World Order project. They contributed to the core project through three case studies and their participation in developing the analytical framework and drawing out comparative conclusions from all case

studies. Secondly, they contributed to network-building by engaging not only with the core teams of researchers from GIGA and WZB but also by disseminating the results at international conferences and through publications and by engaging in exchange with project teams that worked on similar topics, both at PRIF and internationally.

PRIF researchers have also examined other cases with a view to the questions raised by the Contested World Orders project and in close exchange with the Contested World Orders core team. Most of these studies have been presented at international conferences and are currently being revised to be submitted for publication or they have already been published as indicated.

- Saskia Scholz and Klaus Dieter Wolf examined the contestation of norms in the area of Global Health Governance, taking into account the role of rising powers and non-state actors and complementing the contribution by Wolfgang Hein (GIGA) to the core project. Their study has been published as PRIF Report No. 131 (2015).
- Dirk Peters and Alexandra Zierold studied contestation at the IMF, complementing the project study by Alexandros Tokhi (WZB) with an approach that is based on qualitative methods and focusing especially on the positions of rising powers in the quota reform process. Their paper has been presented at the workshop "Institutionalized Inequalities" which was part of the EISA's 2016 European Workshops in International Studies in Tübingen.
- Dirk Peters also examined the controversies surrounding the decision-making procedures of the WTO, a study he presented at the 7th ECPR General Conference in Bordeaux 2013.
- Klaus Dieter Wolf did a study on "The Contestation (and Acceptance) of Private Transnational Authority" that he presented at the 7th ECPR General Conference in Bordeaux 2013 as well.
- Evgeniya Bakalova examined the peculiar way in which Russia engaged with democratic norms and presented her results at the 57th Annual ISA Convention 2016 in Atltanta.

PRIF also invited a guest researcher, Clifford Bob, Professor of Political Science at the Duquesne University. He stayed at PRIF in July 2015 to discuss his work on the contestation of international norms. He participated in a workshop with PhD students where he discussed their draft papers with them (15 July) and he delivered a talk on "Norm Assassination: The Rise of Targeted Killing and the Fall of Anti-Assassination Norms" (21 July 2015) As part of his stay he also travelled to GIGA at Hamburg and delivered a public lecture there on "Rights as Weapons of Political Conflict" (13 July).

Moreover, PRIF actively engaged in exchange with its Contested World Orders project partners. PRIF researchers participated in all project workshops in Berlin and in the project workshop in Hamburg, where the framework paper, the case studies and conclusions from the project were discussed. Furthermore, Carmen Wunderlich stayed at WZB in May and June 2014 to work on her study and discuss it with colleagues there. Klaus Dieter Wolf also stayed at WZB from July to September 2016 after the final workshop of the project to contribute to the concluding chapter of the envisaged project volume.

Achievements

Among the key achievements of the PRIF team within the Contested World Orders project are the creation of knowledge about a central process of current international politics; and the furthering of scientific debate through the international dissemination of research results and network building among and beyond the participating three Leibniz institutions.

The case studies contributed by PRIF (private transnational authority, non-proliferation, G7) cover unique constellations of institutional authority and institutional integration or exclusion

of rising powers and non-state actors. Thus they provide insights that complement the results of the other case studies and contribute to the ability to draw general conclusions from the overall project. PRIF researchers have examined the questions raised in the Contested World Order project also in other contexts and presented their results not only in the context of project workshops but also at international conferences. They have been successful in building and solidifying a research network through intensive exchange within the group of the three Leibniz institutions that make up the project. But they have also extended this network by engaging other PRIF researchers outside the core team as well as collaborators in international research projects in discussions about the Contested World Orders framework and the results of the project. Through this, through conference participation and through their publications they have given the project and cooperation within the Leibniz Association international visibility.

Qualifikationsarbeiten

- Wunderlich, Carmen 2015: Black Sheep or Sheep in Wolf's Clothing? 'Rogue States' as Norm makers. Inaugural Dissertation, Johann Wolfgang Goethe University Frankfurt. PRIF-based qualifying thesis.

List of Publications

- Miriam Prys. *Redefining Regional Power in International Relations: Indian and South African perspectives*. London, New York: Routledge, 2012.
- Daniel Flemes, Dirk Nabers, Detlef Nolte (eds.) *Macht, Führung und Regionale Ordnung: Theorien und Forschungsperspektiven.* Baden-Baden: Nomos, 2012.
- Anja Jetschke / Philomena Murray (2012) "Diffusing Regional Integration: The EU and East Asia." *West European Politics*, 35(1): 174-191.
- Michael Zürn, Matthias Ecker-Ehrhardt, Martin Binder (2012) "International Political Authority and Its Politicization." *International Theory* 4 (1): 69–106.
- Matthew D. Stephen (2012) "Rising Regional Powers and International Institutions: The Foreign Policy Orientations of India, Brazil and South Africa." *Global Society* 26 (3): 289-309.
- Matthew D. Stephen (2013) "The Concept and Role of Middle Powers During Global Rebalancing." *Seton Hall Journal of Diplomacy and International Relations* 14 (2): 36–52.
- Matthew D. Stephen (2013) "Neue Mächte: Aufstrebende Staaten Gestalten Die Weltpolitik Mit." *WZB Mitteilungen* 141: 1–4.
- Evgeniya Bakalova, Hans-Joachim Spanger, in cooperation with Jasmin Melanie Neumann (2013) *Development Cooperation or Competition? Russia as a Re-emerging Donor*, PRIF Report No. 123, Frankfurt am Main.
- Matthew D. Stephen and Michael Zürn (2014) *Contested World Orders: Rising Powers, Non-State Actors, and the Politics of Authority Beyond the Nation-state*. *WZB Discussion Paper,* SP IV 2014-107, Berlin.
- Matthew D. Stephen (2014) "India, Emerging Powers and Global Human Rights: Yes, But…." In *Shifting Power and Human Rights Diplomacy: India*, edited by Doutje Lettinga and Lars van Troost, 55–64. Amsterdam: Amnesty International.
- Matthew D. Stephen (2014) "Die Zeit, Einige Dinge Zu Tun. Was Chinas Ökonomischer Und Politischer Aufstieg Für Den Rest Der Welt Bedeutet." *WZB Mitteilungen* 144: 6–9.

- Matthew D. Stephen (2014) “The Rise of New World Players: In Global Governance, a Balance of Power Is Re-Emerging.” *WZB Report*, 15–17.
- Matthew D. Stephen (2014) “Rising Powers, Global Capitalism and Liberal Global Governance: A Historical Materialist Account of the BRICs Challenge.” *European Journal of International Relations* 20 (4): 912–938.
- Matthias Dembinski, Dirk Peters (2014) *Institutional Justice as a Condition for the Regional Acceptance of Global Order. The African Union and the Protection of Civilians*, PRIF Report No. 130, Frankfurt am Main.
- Matthew D. Stephen (2015) “‘Can You Pass the Salt?’ The Legitimacy of International Institutions and Indirect Speech.” *European Journal of International Relations* 21 (4): 768–792.
- Michael Zürn, Alexandros Tokhi, Martin Binder, Xaver Keller, and Autumn Lockwood Payton (2015) *The International Authority Database*, Working Paper.
- Miriam Prys-Hansen, Malte Lellmann, Milan Röseler (2015) „Die Bedeutung der Klimafinanzierung für den Pariser Klimagipfel“ GIGA *Focus* Global, Hamburg.
- Wolfgang Hein (2015) “Business and Transnational Norm-Building in Post-Westphalian Global Politics.” *International Journal of Business Governance and Ethics*, 10 (3/4): 208 – 229
- Saskia Scholz, Klaus Dieter Wolf (2015) “Transformation of an Order through Reversal of a Norm-Hierarchy. The Protection of Intellectual Property and the Right to Health”, *PRIF Report* No. 131, Frankfurt am Main.
- Harald Müller, Carsten Rauch (2015) “Make Concert, Not War: Power Change, Conflict Constellations, and the Chance to Avoid Another 1914", in: Herberg-Rothe, Andreas (ed.), *Lessons from World War I for the Rise of Asia*, Stuttgart: ibidem, S. 39-68.
- Carsten Rauch (2015) „Realität oder Chimäre: Indiens Aufstieg in der Weltpolitik“, HSFK-Report Nr. 4/2015, Frankfurt am Main.
- Wolfgang Hein (forthcoming, WZB Discussion Paper October 2016) “Intellectual Property Rights and Health: The Constraints of WHO Authority and the Rise of Global Health Governance as an Element of Contestation”.
- Miriam Prys, Thorsten Wojczewski (forthcoming): “Rising Powers, NGOs and North-South Relations in Global Climate Governance: The Case of Climate Finance”. *Politikon: South African Journal of Political Studies.*
- Matthew D. Stephen (forthcoming, 2017) “Emerging Powers and Emerging Trends in Global Governance”. *Global Governance*.
- Michael Zürn (book, in preparation): *A Theory of Contested Global Governance*
- Matthew Stephen and Michael Zuern. eds. (forthcoming). *Contested World Orders: Rising Powers, Non-State Actors, and the Politics of Authority Beyond the Nation-state.*

  <u>Contributions to the edited volume:</u>

  - Matthew D. Stephen, Michael Zürn, “Contested World Orders: Rising Powers, Non-governmental Organizations, and the Politics of Authority Beyond the Nation-state”
  - Pascal Abb, Anja Jetschke, “The devil lies in the details: The positions of the BRICS countries toward R2P and UN Security Council reform”

- Martin Binder, Sophie Eisentraut, “Negotiating the UN Human Rights Council - Rising powers, established powers and NGOs”
- Martin Binder, Autumn Lockwood Payton, “Cleavages in World Politics. An Analysis of Rising Power Voting Behavior in the UN General Assembly”
- Melanie Coni-Zimmer, Annegret Flohr and Klaus Dieter Wolf, “Transnational Private Authority and its Contestation”
- Harald Müller and Alexandros Tokhi, “The Contestation of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Regime”
- Dirk Peters, “The G7 between rising powers and non-state actors after the Cold War”
- Miriam Prys-Hansen, Kristina Hahn, Malte Lellmann, Milan Röseler, “Contestation in the UNFCCC: The case of climate finance”
- Alexandros Tokhi, “The Contestation of the IMF”
- Matthew Stephen, “Contestation Overshoot: Rising Powers, NGOs and the Failure of the WTO Doha Round“
- Michael Zürn, Klaus Dieter Wolf, Matthew D. Stephen, “Conclusion: Contested World Orders–Continuity or Change?”

Data Release

Our sample has important overlap with the sample of other scholars working in the field (Jonas Tallberg, Gary Marks & Liesbet Hooghe). This allows us therefore to more easily share and integrate the respective data projects. Moreover, the relational database we constructed creates novel collaboration opportunities. Since relational databases consist of linked modules containing information, additional ones can be integrated without extra effort. For instance, one could define the relationships between IOs and transnational actors by specifying whether, how, and in how many IO activities these actors are involved (Tallberg *et al.* 2013). The possibility to extend, as well as relational database's analytic flexibility, enables the collaborating researchers to integrate data and derive more comprehensive data sets that address various dimensions of international authority. Finally, relational databases offer technical possibilities that allow researchers to work simultaneously on the database without generating synchronization and consistency problems.

Sufficient measures are taken to secure the existing data by hosting the relational database on the WZB servers. Furthermore, the relational database allows us to easily go online with our information and offer to the wider public access to our research results and the comprehensive information pertaining to IO authority.

Media Coverage/Events

54th Annual ISA Convention - The Politics of International Diffusion: Regional and Global Dimensions

3-6 April 2013, San Francisco, California

- Paper presentation by Dirk Peters: *“Conflicts about Voting Rules in International Organizations: The Role of Justice Concerns”*
- Paper presentation by Annegret Flohr: *“Corporate Grievance Mechanisms: Private in Form but (very) Public in Function?”*

7th ECPR General Conference
4-7 September 2013, Sciences Po, Bourdeaux

- Panel P066: *"Contested World Orders I: Authority and Contestation of International Institutions"*
  Panel Chair: Miriam Prys
  - Paper presentation by Dirk Peters: *"Contested Notions of Justice: Debating Decision-Making Rules in International Organizations"*
- Panel P067: *"Contested World Orders II: Agents of Contestation in Global Governance"*
  Panel Chair: Matthew Stephen
  Panel Co-Chair: Michael Zuern
  - Paper presentation by Kristina Hahn and Miriam Prys-Hansen: *"Becoming Agents of Contestation: NGOs in the International Trade and Climate Change Regime"* (The paper is co-authored by Kristina Hahn, Miriam Prys and Klaus Dingwerth.)
  - Paper presentation by Klaus Dieter Wolf: *"The Contestation (and Acceptance) of Private Transnational Authority"*
  - Paper presentation by Alexandros Tokhi and Sophie Eisentraut: *"The Contestation of the IAEA by Authoritarian Regimes"*

Institute for Democracy and Human Rights Lunchtime Seminar Series
30 October 2013, University of Sydney

- Paper presentation by Matthew Stephen: *"The Most Acceptable Hypocrisy: Legitimacy and Euphemism at the United Nations Security Council"*

Workshop - "Middle Powers in a Changing World System"
15 November 2013, Munck School of Global Affairs, University of Toronto

- Paper presentation by Matthew Stephen: *"Rethinking Middle Powers"*

55th ISA Annual Conference - Spaces and Places Geopolitics in an Era of Globalization
26-29 March 2014, Toronto, Canada

- Panel: *"Authority of International Organizations"*
  Chair: Duncan Snidal
  - Paper presentation by Michael Zürn, Martin Binder, Alexandros Tokhi, Autumn Lockwood Payton and Xaver Keller: *"The Database on International Authority"*

Guest Lecture by Matthew Stephen - "Contested World Orders"
16 July 2014, GIGA - Hamburg

FLACSO-ISA Joint Conference - Global and Regional Powers in a Changing World
23-25 July 2014, Buenos Aires

- Paper presentation by Matthew Stephen: *"Adjusted to the Rhythms: How Rising Powers Challenge Global Governance from Within"*

World International Studies Committee 4th Global International Studies Conference
6-9 August 2014, Goethe University

- Paper presentation by Matthew Stephen: *"Rising Powers, Global Capitalism, and Liberal Global Governance"*

DVPW Annual Conference - International Relations Section
25-27 September 2014, University of Magdeburg

- Paper presentation at the German Political Science Association (DVPW) by Matthew Stephen: *"New Pressures on the WTO: The Rise of Illiberal Trading States"*

Guest Lecture by Matthew Stephen - "New Pressures on the WTO: The Rise of Illiberal Trading States"
20 November 2014, GIGA - Hamburg

8th Annual Conference on the Political Economy of International Organizations (PEIO)
12 February 2015, Berlin
- Presentation by Matthew Stephen at the Poster Session: *"New Pressures on the WTO: The Rise of Illiberal Trading States"*

56th Annual ISA Conference - "Global IR and Regional Worlds"
18-21 February 2015, New Orleans, Louisiana
- Draft presentation by Miriam Prys-Hansen on a case study on climate finance.
- Panel FA09: *"Rising Powers, NGOs and Contestation in Global Governance"*
  Chair: Matthew David Stephen (WZB Berlin Social Science Center)
  Discussant: Andrew J. Hurrell (University of Oxford)
  - Paper presentation by Matthew Stephen: *"Rising Powers and Elite NGOs at the World Trade Organization: Agents of Contestation?"*
  - *Paper presentation by Harald Müller and Alexandros Tokhi: "The Contestation of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Regime"*

Lecture by Prof. Clifford Bob – "Rights as Weapons of Political Conflict"
13 July 2015, GIGA - Hamburg

Guest Lecture by Matthew Stephen - "Rising Powers and the Future of Global Governance"
12 November 2015, Charles University in Prague, Department of International Relations

Workshop - International Authority
10-11 December 2015, WZB Berlin Social Science Center, Berlin
- Roundtable discussion with David Lake, Xinyuan Dai, Mikael Madsen, Michael Zürn: *"Why We Study Authority"*
- Panel: *"IO Authority Data I"*
  - Paper presentation by Martin Binder, Alexandros Tokhi, Autumn Lockwood Payton and Xaver Keller: *"International Authority Database"*

57th Annual ISA Convention
16-19 March 2016, Atlanta
- Paper presentation by Evgeniya Bakalova: *"Normative Revisionism and Decoupling: The Curious Case of Russia and Democratic Norms"*

3rd European Workshops in International Studies (EWIS)
6-8 April 2016, Tübingen
- Workshop on "Institutionalized Inequalities – How International Organizations Shape Global Order"
  Convenors: Caroline Fehl (Peace Research Institute Frankfurt (PRIF - HSFK), Katja Freistein (Centre for Global Cooperation Research)

- Paper presentation by Dirk Peters/Alexandra Zierold: *"Talking Reform and Stabilizing Inequality: The Discourse on Quotas in the International Monetary Fund".*
- Paper presentation by Matthew Stephen *"Legitimacy in Time: Design, Drift and Decoupling at the UN Security Council."*

International Author's Workshop - Contested World Orders
14-15 July 2016, WZB Berlin Social Science Center, Berlin

- International authors' workshop for the Contested World Orders edited volume. International guests included Paulo Esteves (BRICS Policy Center, Brazil), Monica Hirst (FLACSO, Brazil), Miles Kahler (American University, USA), Dries Lesage (Ghent Institute for International Studies, Belgium), Siddharth Mallavarapu (South Asia University, India), Paul Mertenskötter and Thomas Streinz (both New York University, USA).

American Political Science Association Annual Meeting - "Great Transformations"
1-4 September 2016, Philadelphia

- Paper presentation by Matthew Stephen (with Benjamin Faude): *"After Western Hegemony: Rising Powers and International Institutional Change"*