BUCERIUS SUMMER
SCHOOL ON
GLOBAL GOVERNANCE

2019 Conference Report

Redefining Governance: The New Normal, Geopolitics, Digitalization, and Climate Change

18 – 30 August 2019

Compiled and edited by Dr Cornelius Adebahr,
Political Analyst and Consultant, Berlin
cornelius@adebahr.eu

Contents

1 Executive Summary

It's 2019 and illiberalism has become part of the 'New Normal', a term that was initially coined to describe the world shaken by the 2008 financial crisis. The idea was that market volatility was here to stay, despite the attempts of governments and central banks alike to contain the damage. Now, it seems that the 2016 eruption of populist forces in the two 'heartlands' of democracy, the Brexit vote in the United Kingdom and the election of Donald Trump in the United States, has created a new normal in politics.

While not synonymous, illiberalism and populism often go hand in hand, with their disdain for 'the ruling elites' and the knowledge they produce, including scientifically backed facts. In this environment, tackling the challenges stemming from a wide-ranging geopolitical transformation, the massive disruption brought about by digitization, and of the planet-encompassing effects of climate change becomes even more difficult – and contested.

Defying those odds regardless, 60 young women and men, coming from all corners of the globe and with considerable professional experience in politics, business, civil society, academia, and the military, embarked on two intensive weeks of discussions in Hamburg and Berlin. The 2019 Bucerius Summer School focused on crucial issues such as multilateralism and multi-alignment, the power shift towards Asia and what this means for the institutions of global governance; global finance and trade as well as geo-tech; digitization and climate change; as well as the economic and political developments in the United States, Europe and worldwide.

This report presents the essence of their deliberations, each session summarized by one volunteer rapporteur from the group. Its executive summary puts these individual reports into perspective, though without possibly doing justice to the richness of the discussions among the participants.

Broadly speaking the debates focused on three overarching themes plus a set of possible solutions:

1. What is the deeper meaning of the 'illiberal turn' for the current global order?
2. How does technological change, including the rise of artificial intelligence (AI), constitute a meta-transformation of societies and power relations?
3. Which other disruptive forces are out there, be they socio-economic like the effects of automation on the workforce, institutional as in the restructuring of global governance, or systemic such like the necessary climate adjustments.

This promising and dynamic group came up with its own solutions, discussing individual activism and the role of social businesses as well as more fundamental shifts towards an inclusive, networked approach to deal with today's complexity.

1. Most fundamentally, the present 'illiberal turn' is one of the tectonic shifts that have engulfed the world. Within democracies, increased political polarization has taken root, in particular in two-party systems where the middle ground has lost representation. Importantly for global affairs, this domestic schism also affects the foreign policy-making of governments, which have to consider citizens' sentiments to a much larger extend. This is true for "America first" policies and the Brexit debate as much as for Brazilians loathing others to advise them on how to handle the Amazon rainforest or the Chinese being told how (not) to hand out loans to third countries. It even applies to the decision-making of Germany's 'grand coalition'.

Illiberalism in democracies appears in part to be a reaction to the decades-long process of globalization, itself building on what Charles Kupchan called the Anglo-

American modernity of first *Pax Britannica* and then *Pax Americana* ruling much of the 19th and 20th centuries. Now, the rise of China, in particular, but also India and wider Asia, more generally, is disrupting the customary order of things. Instead of only one or two dominant poles, a multi-polar – or rather multi-aligned – world is emerging, in which all powers – old and new, mid-sized and great – have to find their new place, and together a new modus operandi. Also within states, a gulf has opened between the 'people from somewhere' and the 'people from anywhere', resulting in a cultural and economic backlash against globalization.

In fact, there is a paradox around America's abdication of its traditional role in global affairs. On the one hand, the forces of globalization and information technology create a convergence that is transforming the world into a "village." On the other hand, the forces of anti-globalization and protectionism, including violent manifestations of intolerance and even terrorism, are creating fundamental disruptions. Taken together, these two trends threaten to create new divisions between the haves and the have-nots, between the North and the South.

As a consequence, a restructuring of global governance institutions is overdue, which should – while we're at this – also include gender considerations. Such redefinition calls for a more comprehensive approach than the current one, which very often favors a single – white, male – mindset. Yet, rather than just adding another – female, non-white – view, it is important to bring various perspectives together to create more holistic policies. Crucially, whether in Western countries or in more conservative cultures, men must be more involved in the reflection and discussion on gender to avoid the disruption and fragmentation of society.

2. Digital technology and all the comes with it – from AI to social media – is another disruptive force that already has an effect on people's everyday lives. With regard to AI, one central question focuses on its transparency and the accountability for its results. If no one can explain how exactly the algorithms for a particular AI work, there is no way to deal with it in legal or political terms. This begins with social media companies that need a regulatory framework for oversight, given their own use of algorithms as well as the data they collect. Also at the global level, the 'digital highways' that are being created need agreed norms and standards rather than unilateral measures pursued by individual states, such as through a digital services tax. More generally, the future development of AI and digitization should not be handled solely by programmers; instead, governments, researchers, and society more broadly need to be part of this technological change.

For social media, there is obviously much more room for maneuver – and need to legislate – at the national level. Here, so called "bubbles" in political discourse have occurred within societies through a mix of cognitive patterns such as the 'bandwagon effect' (numerous followers create an impression of credibility) and 'confirmation bias' (information fitting an existing world view is given preference over challenging facts and figures). These can easily be influence through disinformation campaigns, i.e. deliberate attempts to mislead, as well as active hate speech. Yet if good journalism providing robust, reliable and accurate information shall be the answer to such threats rather than censorship, then it needs consumers willing to pay for their news – pointing to the importance of individual responsibility.

More generally, modern technologies – like old ones – are often Janus-faced in that they can be used, by governments and companies alike, both positively and negatively. This is also relevant when it comes to lethal autonomous weapons systems and potential arms control mechanisms. The former currently under development are based on programmed descriptions and would work without much human supervision,

posing important ethical questions. Small arms, in contrast, are already easily available and create a death toll much larger than that of nuclear weapons. At the strategic level, the recent end of a crucial missile limitation treaty was considered a "wake-up call", especially for those countries that are not only responsible for international security via their UN Security Council membership but happen to be major arms exporters at the same time. Even if governments are often constrained by economic concerns, public opinion in democracies was thought to have a direct and constraining effect.

3. Both illiberalism and digitization also have enormous socio-economic effects, in particular on the 'future of work'. Nearly half of all current jobs are vulnerable to automation based on digitization and AI; four out of five of today's school children will work in jobs that currently do not exist. This does not necessarily mean that there will be a spike in unemployment: the example of the banking sector shows that jobs lost due to the introduction of ATMs were compensated in the areas of credit and financial services. However, the trend itself will have serious knock-on effects by reducing the middle layer of routine jobs that are most likely to be replaced.

This will in turn deepen the polarization of the workforce between high- and low-skill professions, with consequences for young people aiming to qualify for the jobs of the future. The world's 'demographic dividend', i.e. the largest global youth population in history, actually bears huge opportunities. However, failure to invest in their skills carries significant risks of unemployment, extremism, and increased migration. What is more, the necessary individual 'upskilling' of elder workers may not be supported by all employees, creating frictions and frustrations that populists can easily exploit.

The problem therefore is not so much globalization itself, but the failure of governments to mitigate the negative impacts such as via retraining programs. To take back control of the narrative, centrists and moderates need to make concrete proposals how to deal with the coming socio-economic revolution. This extends to issues of migration, which is not only a moral imperative (when it comes to refugees) but also an economic necessity for most countries. Immigrants should be considered a long-term investment in a society's economic well-being, as they work hard to earn their living, and their children and grandchildren would integrate well into a society if allowed to. Nonetheless, increased mobility around the globe does of course create a huge challenge for social inclusion.

Even more consequential, in the long run, will indeed be the effects of climate change. Yet these seem to grab the headlines only in the wake of – yet another – natural disaster or on the occasion of – yet another – international gathering trying to hammer out a plan of action to combat climate change. As it happened, the summer school took place exactly one year after Greta Thunberg began her school strike that led to the global Fridays for Future movement, and shortly before the UN 2019 Climate Summit, thus providing enough media attention to the challenge.

In essence, climate change is a problem of economic growth and how it is achieved. Energy is the building block of today's economy and is usually created by burning fossil; the latter emits the carbon dioxide (CO_2) that endangers the habitability of the planet. Though CO_2 has been in the atmosphere for the last 800,000 years, and the planet's temperatures have fluctuated since the beginning of time, its current concentration is unprecedented in human history.

However, the implementation of the 2015 Paris Climate Accord to reduce global CO_2 emissions, for example, is often hampered by attitudes and opinions even if these run counter to acknowledged wisdom. This was underlined by the example of Brazil, from where news of raging fires in the Amazon reached the group during their meetings.

Rather than accept help to contain the burning of the 'world's lungs', Brazilian politicians chose to tap into the popular image of the river as a national treasure to deride any outside interference as improper, even post-colonial meddling into domestic affairs. So, there is less of a knowledge problem but an implementation problem when it comes to the necessary transformation from a fossil-based economy to a fossil-free economy built on renewable energy.

Also China, India, and other new powers feel less of a need to listen to 'world opinion' if it is contrary to their own views. China, in particular, is asked – but refuses – to fill the gap left in the global order by a more isolationist, protectionist United States. Rather than simply abiding by those demands, Beijing uses its growing power to establish itself as a 'norm maker', not a 'norm taker'. Likewise, rather than going for a reform of the global multilateral system, India has so far opted to join various 'mini-lateral' clubs with like-minded (or not) actors like Russia, Brazil, South Africa and even China. Africa, in contrast, has not got much attention so far. By 2050, however, the continent will boast the world's biggest population, making it too big to ignore. Before then, however, African countries will have to improve their collective leadership, regional integration, and economic diplomacy to make the rise of Africa a success.

Most European states, in contrast, currently are experiencing some sort of domestic political instability. This makes states less willing or able to cooperate, as it becomes more difficult to find unified positions if societies are polarized and leaders weakened. As a consequence, the EU has a hard time governing in areas where Brussels does not have a strong mandate but instead relies on voluntary cooperation among member states, such as in security, migration, and economic policy.

4. So, how can the world deal with these looming challenges if some states are unwilling and others unable to do so? One assessment is to look beyond individual cases and problems to find the causes in failing systems. Rather than going for easy answers – build a wall to keep migrants out, or ban all air traffic because of its CO_2 emissions – one has to look into the design of appropriate products and systems. Secondly, digital technology can help provide solutions that we cannot yet think of in our (still) analogous minds, in particular when pooled with a business approach to tackling social problems. Thirdly, international networks at all levels – government, business, and civil society – are necessary to establish the expertise, provide the resources, and engage with communities on ground to bring about major transformations.

Most importantly, however, it is individual activism – standing up, voting, and organizing – that can help to fight back the dark forces. Because when it comes to bringing a change in the world, everyone can make a difference!

The Summer School's participants already have the open professional minds and the global spirit that it takes to address these challenges. Time for them to assume the institutional positions and operational means to put their ideas in practice.

Berlin, September 2019

2 Session reports

2.1 The Illiberal Surge: The New Normal?

Speaker: *Charles A. Kupchan*, Professor of International Affairs, Georgetown University, Senior Fellow, Council on Foreign Relations, Washington, D.C.

Rapporteur: *Snigdha Poonam*, India

Session 1: Monday, August 19

Tectonic shifts like the global rebalancing of power due to globalization have helped bring about an "illiberal turn". Digitalization more broadly but also social media in particular have brought new disruptive forces to the fore even in countries hitherto considered stable democracies. In order to deal with the coming socio-economic revolution, centrists and moderates need to take back control of the narrative making concrete proposals how to deal with the future of work, immigration reforms, and socioeconomic integration.

Today, an increased sense of insecurity prevails even in Western countries, Charles Kupchan opened up his remarks by pointing to his family's immigrant experience in the United States nearly one hundred years ago. Just consider some of the events that have made news across the world in the past few weeks. US President Donald Trump posted a tweet asking four Congresswomen of color to "go back" to where they come from. In the United Kingdom, Boris Johnson, a champion of the Vote Leave campaign as part of Brexit, was appointed Prime Minister. In continental Europe, uncertainty about migrants' intake deepened even as dozens of asylum seekers waited in boats. In India, Hindu nationalist Bharatiya Janata Party returned to power with an overwhelming majority.

Kupchan attributed this "illiberal turn" to a set of "tectonic shifts" with global repercussions. The first and most important of them, he pointed out, was the change in the balance of power brought by globalization. Pre-1850s, the world was led by five unrelated empires; since then, it has been first Pax Britannica, then Pax Americana. Modernity, as it happens, was built by Anglo American powers or, to be more specific, white Christian men. Today, for the first time, the world finds itself without a captain. America is hardly open for business, while in Britain the Conservative Party is driving the country into a brick wall. The influence of China is growing day by day. "We are living in a multi-polar world today," he elaborated.

Globally, as liberal conversations centered on issues outside the realm of the mainstream – migrants, women's rights, LGBT rights, climate change – the majority groups in many parts of the world, from white supremacists to Hindu nationalists, reacted in a backlash. As the liberal democratic core established by the West stumbled, further upheaval has come in the form of the digital age. Digitization has changed everything, from how we communicate to how we earn a living. "People feel insecure, uncertain, fearful. Many respond by turning towards populism," Kupchan argued.

The two-party electoral system in some countries made the voter discourse more polarized than ever. As it happens, in the United States and Great Britain, angry voters have only one of the two parties to go to. Many Americans voted for Donald Trump

because he promised them economic security and resumption of old economic status. In continental Europe with its multi-party democracy, voters have alternative venues. This helped keep the rise of far-right parties somewhat in check, though not across the board. In Italy, the country's most popular politician, the anti-immigrant, anti-EU Matteo Salvini, aims to establish a pan-European anti-immigration movement. "Changing Europe is a big goal," Salvini said in an interview with *Time* magazine last year. He added: "But, I think, it is on our fingertips."

Charles Kupchan reminded his audience at the Summer School that experts and intellectuals underestimate the degree to which societies are susceptible to base political instincts. Social media fuels these instincts through what he termed an "opposition to informed awareness." He referred to Brazil where political figures have used YouTube's recommendation engine to attract people to far-right. Once a marginal player in national politics, Jair Bolsonaro channeled his popularity on far-right social media sites into becoming the elected President of Brazil last year at a time of sweeping demands for regime change. "If social media didn't exist, I wouldn't be here. Jair Bolsonaro wouldn't be president," said Maurício Martins, a senior leader of Bolsonaro's party, in an interview to the *New York Times* in August.

This illiberal surge cannot, for now, be considered a passing phenomenon; at least, the trends are not reversing yet. In particular the early stages of the digital age raise further – very fundamental - questions: What comes with further automation? What after artificial intelligence (AI)? If unemployment and wage stagnation will get worse, what are the displaced workers going to do? "The problem is not immigration or free trade," Kupchan noted, but "the socio-economic revolution that is just beginning."

In principle, there are two ways of looking at the future. One would refer to the past when, however, things were not any better than they are today. With reference to a somewhat glorified image of a multilateral, internationalist America now threatened by Trump's policies, Kupchan argued that the United States had not been part of any strategic alliance between 1793 and the founding of NATO in 1949. The other way would be to fight for the future we want. Taking the phenomena of Trump and Johnson as an early warning, Kupchan suggested that the political class should now tackle the underlying problems, from the future of work to immigration reforms to better socioeconomic integration.

Both centrists and moderates would need to take back control of the narrative currently run by the populists. The citizens, Charles Kupchan said rounding off the talk, have their work laid out for them. "Activism, voting, organizing. If you wait too long, the system becomes corrupted. We haven't fought back enough."

2.2   Rethinking Leadership in the 21st Century

Speaker: *Kate Hampton*, CEO, Children's Investment Fund Foundation, London

Rapporteur: *Paula Kift*, Germany

Session 2:   Monday, August 19

What does leadership look like in the twenty-first century when we confront both the largest youth population in human history and a rapidly changing climate threatening the prosperity of all? In her passionate afternoon keynote, Kate Hampton tackled this question from her perspective as CEO of the Children's Investment Fund Foundation (CIFF), a London-based philanthropy with an endowment of over 2 billion GBP.

The demographic dividend, resulting from the largest global youth population in history, bears huge opportunities. Malala Yousafzai and Greta Thunberg are just two examples of how remarkable young people, and particularly young women, can be in the face of adversity. But in order to capitalize on the great resource that the current global youth population can be, we need to both massively invest in human capital and gender equality, an issue which spans from expanding access to contraception to creating career opportunities for all. Not investing in the global youth population bears significant risks, with the threat of rising extremism, on one hand, and mass migration caused by climate change, on the other hand.

The lively discussion that ensued tackled questions such as the use of new technologies to track the impact of social investments, but also the challenge of how to offset the carbon footprint that is inevitably associated with successfully leading a philanthropy. Under Hampton's leadership CIFF, for instance, started tracking and counterbalancing its carbon emissions.

Though philanthropy in and of itself can sometimes be considered part of the problem – as one discussant suggested, "every billionaire is a policy failure", no matter if the money is then invested for good – the discussion left participants with a better understanding of one of the many avenues available for impacting positive global change.

2.3 Multi-Alignment in a Networked World: The Case of India and Beyond

Speaker: *Shashi Tharoor*, Member of the Indian Parliament, Chairman of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on External Affairs, New Delhi

Rapporteur: *Nikita Singla*, India

Session 3: Monday, August 19

The session touched upon the rise of an increasingly networked world with powerful populist and illiberal political forces, marked by a paradox of convergence and disruption; the changing nature of foreign policy, which is becoming less foreign and more domestic; and the push from countries like India and China to make their space in the international arena traditionally dominated by the West.

The past years have seen the rise of far-right, populist, and illiberal forces across the world. Starting from the United States, the anchor of the liberal order, and spreading to Central and South America, across the Atlantic to Europe – where right-wing political parties have witnessed electoral success recently – this trend has created ramifications in China, Afghanistan, Iran and much beyond. In the UK, Brexit gives "Shakespeare's famous lines an additional twist every day with the variations of – to go or not to go or how to go".

Today's world is marked by a paradox of convergence and disruption following America's abdication of its traditional role in global affairs. On the one hand, convergence is created by the forces of globalization and the information technology revolution transforming the world into "one village, one market, one audience." Disruption, on the other hand, is marked by an increase in terrorism, a rise in violent manifestations of intolerance, and the forces of anti-globalization and protectionism. Taken together, these two trends threaten to create new divisions between the haves and the have-nots, between the North and the South – they are pulling us together while they are driving us apart.

This era is also seeing a change in foreign policy itself, which is no longer confined to the 'foreign' sphere but can also have very domestic implications. As former UK Prime Minister Theresa May charged, "if you call yourself a global citizen, you absolutely have no idea what citizenship means. If you are a citizen of the globe, you are a citizen of nowhere". In reality, the world is increasingly full of people who feel at home anywhere and there are others who need to feel rooted somewhere. This clash between people from somewhere and people from anywhere, which in many ways was assumed to have disappeared, is resulting into a cultural backlash, complementing the economic backlash against globalization. Backlash has come in the form of a greater sense of rootedness, belonging and authenticity. Countries like Turkey and India are two examples: Just as Turkey's President Recep Erdogan wants a more Islamist Turkey rooted in Islamic values and culture, India's Prime Minister Narendra Modi similarly wants a centrally majoritarian Hindu India. Importantly, both claim to be far more authentic representatives of their nations and cultures than their respective competitors at the domestic level.

Overall, the geopolitical architecture is changing as institutions of global governance expand well beyond the United Nations. Selective inter-governmental mechanisms like the G8/G7 or the G20, military alliances like NATO and other sub-regional groupings

all prove this point. India too is a good example with its increasing membership in such clubs, whether in cooperation with Russia and China (RIC), with Brazil and South Africa (as IBSA), or with those four countries together (the famous BRICS that again become BASIC if Russia is left out of environmental negotiations). This shows India's great ability to partake in different networks pursuing its objectives with various allies and partners, showing a possible shift from non-alignment to multi-alignment and beyond South-South to global cooperation.

We are no longer in a world of superpowers, Shashi Tharoor argued, but in an increasingly inter-connected world in which we are all working through multiple networks: "A generation ago, the United States led the world in pretty much everything. Today, even if it's not a clear decline of the West, it's a clear rise of the rest". We are moving from a traditional dominance of one superpower to a more balanced – or imbalanced – distribution of power. New powers are rising, and new alliances are forming. Countries like China and India are demonstrating their capacity for global influence, which could potentially lead to clashes in the international arena. "Global governance is like an Englishman talking about the weather: everyone talks about it, but no one does anything about it," Tharoor lamented.

It is time to focus on shaping the principal institutions of global governance which, at the inter-governmental level, have not changed since the end of the World War II. Western countries have for the longest time dominated the international financial "Bretton Woods" organizations. Many countries feel that these structures have not given them an opportunity to participate in a manner commensurate to their capacity. "You are either at the table or on the menu", Tharoor quipped. The decision of the BRICS countries to set up their own bank – the New Development Bank, or NDB – speaks of China's and India's way of saying that, in the absence of a level playing field in international finance cooperation, they go off and construct their own turf. This has brought some equity in power sharing that did not exist in the Bretton Woods system.

Finally, the geopolitics of 2019 is very different from that of 1945. The emergence of new and powerful countries demands a restructuring of the international system and networks. However, we still need to address a number of looming challenges: How to deal with a transforming global economy and with the shift of economic power and relative wealth from the West to the East? How to deal with the growing influence of non-state actors? How to deal with ageing populations? How to deal with climate change and increasing food, energy and water constraints? How are countries going to be fighting for these resources that so far existed in abundance for all of us?

Historically, emerging multi-polar systems have been more unstable than bipolar or unipolar ones. Global policy makers will have to simultaneously cope with a demand for more multinational cooperation and resistance of the international financial systems as well as a backlash against globalization – all of this when nuclear powers will not come to cooperate under the old rules. Multiple actors, if properly accommodated, could add strength to our ageing post-WWII systems or they could fragment our international systems and reduce international cooperation and even lead to international conflict.

Managing cooperative relationships in today's networked world is more crucial than ever.

2.4 Geo-Tech: Navigating the Heady Mix of Trade, Tech and Politics

Speakers: *Stephen Harper*, Former Prime Minister of Canada, Calgary;
Carl Bildt, Former Prime Minister of Sweden, Stockholm;
Marietje Schaake, former Member of the European Parliament, Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe (ALDE), Brussels

Rapporteur: *Stephanie Hunt*, Australia

Session 4: Monday, August 19

This panel discussion touched on the challenges posed by globalization in a world where technologies are rapidly advancing. It dealt with the security implications as well as the possible erosion of certain moral and/or liberal values if such technologies are used with other purposes. The panelists looked at this predominantly from Western and liberal democracies' perspective, but commentary from the participants included consideration from other geographies and political ideologies.

After much of the morning discussing whether there was an illiberal surge in the world, this panel commenced with a clear position against any inevitable derogation of globalization. Globalization was facing certain challenges because large portions of the Western population feel as if they have not benefited from it. Those pursuing globalization need to justify this with results for their people. With social media creating such fragmentation of polarizing political views, increasingly, people feel as if there are clear losers and winners. Globalization is also being challenged by trading partners whose economic strategies are not compatible, but are dependent on each other for imports and exports. The discussion quickly moved from trade to tech.

The conversation then turned to focus on security issues with new technologies, particularly from a country that abides by different rules and where the divide between company and state is more elusive. Panelists discussed the risks of including technologies from such companies in liberal markets. One panelist confirmed that Canada has been alive to such concerns for over a decade, particularly related to devices for telecommunications, while noting that risks may have intensified with new technologies. Would modern technologies become tools of free exchange of information or a way to exert government control? The feeling in the room was that modern technologies could be used, both positively and negatively, and this would depend on the objectives of governments and companies applying them.

Participants then discussed the use of facial recognition. While initially, this was described as a threat to individual freedoms, this view was tempered with one participant's view that in some countries, this is not opposed by the people. This perspective could apply convincingly if the facial recognition is limited to certain high-risk zones and only used for the purposes of protecting people for identifiable individuals posing significant risk. However, even in those instances, there would need to be checks and balances.

Panelists added that a positive example of modern technology is found in the sector of food production. Some countries are working on developing artificial intelligence to increase the sustainability and effectiveness of food production. Considering the ever-increasing global population, such new technologies are of undeniable importance.

On a more cautious take, the panelists noted the risks of governments using technology to further monitor and punish individual behavior by way of a social credit points systems under which the government can take points from the individual for what it defines as 'anti-social behavior'. Contributing a different take on this, a participant suggested that this could be widely accepted by the people in her country to increase social orderliness.

The panel also delved into foreign investment and loans on non-favorable terms from recently developed nations to developed and developing nations. This posed a challenge for the European Union to manage because it touched on an issue of member states' competence: national security. Each state was taking a slightly different approach to this, based on national interest, factoring in their perception of risk, as well as some states focusing more on short-term-gain related considerations. One participant recalled the room about certain critical infrastructure (such as a crucial port) being at risk of being taken over from countries in Africa in this very manner.

Another participant from Africa suggested that such criticism from some European countries was hypocritical. He asked how debt for equity swaps differed from the property transfers to European nations following colonization. Debt for equity swaps signify that the borrowing country has defaulted on their repayment of the loan and (either in accordance with the original loan contract or in an effort to restructure the loan after the event), a foreign creditor appropriates the creditor country's property or land (e.g. a port). In this vein, panelists referred to this kind of debt repayment as a new form of colonialism. While foreign investment and foreign loans can certainly be beneficial to the relevant economy, especially developing economies and countries, this may not be so if the investor or lender country has the intention of greater hegemony or expansion, given the high risk of debt-traps.

The panelists concluded that in an increasingly digitized world, countries need to be more accountable. Such hegemony must be questioned and new technologies used by governments over their people should be examined and ultimately transparent.

2.5 Crisis as the New Normal? Emerging Challenges to Cooperative Security in Europe

Speakers: *Dominik Jankowski*, Political Adviser and Head of the Political Section, Permanent Delegation of the Republic of Poland to NATO, Brussels
Ulrich Kühn, Deputy Head, Arms Control and Emerging Technologies, IFSH – Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy, Hamburg
Marietje Schaake, former Member of the European Parliament, Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe (ALDE), Brussels
Chelsey Slack, Deputy Head of Cyber Defense at NATO Headquarters, Brussels

Rapporteur: *Paulo Alexandre de Toledo Alves*, Brazil

Session 5: Tuesday, August 20

Crisis. The world is in debt. Global Markets are falling apart. Nationalist movements are raising in many countries. The Internet and the virtual world have become a new 'multi-verse' arena of parallel universes. The world lacks leadership and existing agreements on arms control – including in the nuclear field – are losing relevance or lapsing altogether. What would Europe's new role be facing the current international security agenda?

A state of crisis can have two motivations, political or in-built bias, as the many examples discussed show. The deteriorating relations between China and United States, both in trade but also security, have left Europe on the side. Concerns have been raised about the durability of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and more broadly about the use of nuclear deterrence. Some argue that a third world war has so far been avoided due the existence of nuclear weapons, yet it is uncertain for how long the status quo can be preserved. In particular, the ongoing digital transformation including the emergence of Artificial Intelligence (AI) also impacts existing nuclear strategies, since new technologies tend to be less regulated. That being said, norms, standard procedures and alignments on safety should be on the international agenda, building on a consensus among states rather than having individual (powerful) countries interfering in other states' sovereignty.

Cyberspace security also has implications on real life, as it breaks the boundaries between countries and challenges states to cooperate. Multiple stakeholders should be involved in discussions on cybersecurity, from private to public, from local to regional and global. Europe can lead global regulation on cybersecurity, with its 2018 General Data Protection Regulation emerging as an example of cooperative regulation.

More broadly, the issue of regulation raises important questions: What should it strive to secure? Which arena should it address? When is the moment to regulate? And, finally, why should there be regulation in the first place? Personal data should be the basis for any regulation, and every individual plays an important role in securing their own data. With regard to the arena, state sovereignty continues to pose a challenge for cooperation, even among EU member states, so sometimes local and regional regulation can take preference if global regulation appears unachievable.

Obviously, technology always moves faster than regulators can. However, it is never too late to regulate, but it should build on fundamental principles that can later be specified further, with tech companies playing an important role in the latter process. Nonetheless, the "why" question rather leads to more questions than answers: How should the cyberspace of the future look like? And how to foster stability?

Security issues no longer exist only in the physical world. The virtual world is a new and sometimes frightening arena. Everything is connected. You can turn on the heater or the lights in your apartment from anywhere in the world. AI already is the present and no longer the future. Jobs are moving from the middle of the pyramid to the bottom and to the top, leaving the middle an empty space populated by technology. We are living in constant change at a speed never seen before. If we will survive and how, depends on us as individuals, on our behavior and on our capacity for cooperation and learning.

2.6   The Danger of New Arms Races

Speaker: Dominik Jankovski

Rapporteur: *Serkan Uyar*, Turkey

Session 6:   Tuesday, August 20

This breakout session focused on several issues. First, speakers and participants opined on the danger of new lethal autonomous weapon systems (LAWS). Then, they discussed the factors and stakeholders of new arms races and how these could be controlled and regulated.

The danger of new LAWS was the starting point of the session. These kinds of weapons systems independently search and engage their targets with high precision, based on programmed descriptions and constrictions and without much human interaction or supervision. How exactly to control these systems should be the main focus of governments and citizens. As one speaker distilled the group's concerns in Albert Einstein's famous words: "I know not with what weapons the Third World War will be fought, but World War Four will be fought with sticks and stones."

In addition, the discussion explored the different factors and stakeholders of the new arms races. Some of the participants emphasized that the main arms producers are companies from veto-wielding UN members and other dominant EU countries. This means that the countries causing the arms races are also the potential problem-solvers. In fact, the defense contractors aiming at new fields to feed their gears together with the media looking for catchy stories can have a great effect on these countries' governments. So, this web of relations between different stakeholders has created a stalemate but, for the future of a peaceful world, we need to find solutions with the help of NGOs and citizens.

Lastly, participants and the speaker reached a conclusion about being optimistic for the future and doing something to support both civil society and individual efforts. Governments are constrained by economic concerns, but the direct reaction from citizens to arms producers can create a huge effect and form public opinion. Besides, multi-alignment and a more insecure environment can boost arms races. Also, at the state level, governments should always keep communication lines open, even with their adversaries. Hence, there needs to be some regulations on arms races.

The effects of the new arms races could be severe for the world. It is high time for all sides to get serious in finding a way out of the current crisis, not least by rediscovering the instruments of diplomacy. Calls to step back from the brink should be heeded before we enter the next nuclear arms race – one that might well be the last.

2.7   Arms Control and Non-proliferation in Retreat

Speaker: *Ulrich Kühn*, Deputy Head, Arms Control and Emerging Technologies, IFSH – Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy, Hamburg

Rapporteur: *Arun Raj*, India

Session 7:   Tuesday, August 20

The agenda for this year's summer school included some of the most sensitive security related issues of our time: arms control and non-proliferation. Participants of this breakout session discussed both traditional and new forms of governance, investigating the role of nation states as well as the UN system, plausible reasons behind countries investing heavily in military-related activities, the role of multilateral institutions in shaping the global order, the effectiveness of various signed treaties, the responsibility of regional organizations as well as civil society – and the way forward.

In the field of weapons of mass destruction, cooperation between the UN, its member states, regional organizations and multilateral initiatives has become critical. This also applies to the carnage caused by small arms and light weapons (SALW), which then-UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan had once equally described as 'weapons of mass destruction'.

The death toll from small arms dwarfs that of all other weapons systems – and in most years greatly exceeds the toll of the nuclear bombs that devastated Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The argument was supported by the number of deaths through SALW killing one person every two minutes somewhere in the world, both in nations plagued by civil strife (where most victims tend to be civilians) and through crime- or drug-related homicides, suicides and gun accidents. These deaths are, in many cases, caused by illicit SALW coming from a number of sources, including criminal brokering, weapons left over from conflicts, illegal manufacturing, leakages from military and police stockpiles, smuggling and theft. The cultural aspect in the United States was also touched upon by the group during the discussion on small arms.

On nuclear weapons, it is important to recall the objective of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), which is not only to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons and to further the goal of achieving nuclear disarmament, but also to promote cooperation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. The group noted that a total of 191 States have joined the Treaty; however, four nuclear weapon countries have remained outside of the treaty. Against this background, participants discussed the kind of global nuclear order needed at the moment, and how to bring all countries to a consensus, given their diverse economic and political situations. The group also mulled over the possible influence of democratic vs. dictatorial leadership, especially in nuclear-capable countries.

Later, the discussion moved to the economic problems and endemic crime and corruption contributing to deteriorating levels of confidence in democracy. One concern was regional destabilization driven by political unrest and humanitarian crises, including a large outflux of refugees. The group argued that insecurity and instability were pervasive due to the presence of organized criminal gangs and non-state armed groups in many countries, which could be one of the factors of regional destabilization. The discussion also briefly touched upon the growing violence linked to identity politics, based on ethnic and/or religious polarization; and increased activity by transnational

violent jihadist groups, such as Boko Haram in Nigeria and other terror groups' activities with religious polarization. Attention was also given to the role of the media, and how easily propaganda can politicize long-standing issues between different countries.

To achieve the security needed for a society's well-being, it is pertinent to cooperate on defense and security-related issues to solve problems, build trust and, in the long run, prevent conflict. An unspoken taboo may continue to prevent the use of nuclear weapons, yet organized criminal activities, hybrid wars, terrorist activities, and many other actors not playing by rules are disrupting global peace on a daily basis. With the efficacy of existing treaties questioned, the international community is currently working on unwritten rules. If the investment in arms were to be utilized for peace-building, conflict management and education, then the peace dividend might result in a new normal on global peace and refined global governance.

2.8 Cyber Security Threats

Speaker: *Chelsey Slack*, Deputy Head of Cyber Defense at NATO Headquarters, Brussels

Rapporteur: *Yeseul Kim*, South Korea

Session 8: Tuesday, August 20

In this breakout session, we had a chance to talk about cybersecurity issues varying from personal threats through social engineering or identity theft to state-level cyber warfare and how institutions are now trying to solve the issues in more collaborative manners.

Participants shared their own experiences of cyber threats from working for both public and private institutions. Some also voiced their concern about authoritarian regimes misusing telecommunication technology by cutting Internet access arbitrarily or spreading misinformation online.

From these interventions, the discussion turned to the role of international law and institutions dealing with interstate conflicts such as International Court of Justice and the International Criminal Court. Chelsey Slack gave participants precious insights into NATO's cyber defense, constantly emphasizing that cybersecurity issue is a governance issue, not just technical question. Therefore, strong executive guidance is what's needed to solve the problems.

Similarly, in a private company it is important to emphasize the role of risk management education and corporate-level policy making when it comes to dealing with the cyber threats and cybersecurity. The introduction of a chief information officer (CIO) position might also mitigate the high risks that companies can face when it comes to the cybersecurity. As Chelsey Slack stressed, this helps to address some of the human factors, such as assigning responsibilities and maintaining liability, that are obviously critical to a safe and secure cyberspace. In addition, more practical measures can also be introduced, such as strengthening government practices, enabling the public attribution of cyber threats, and punishing the perpetrators of any attacks.

Here, constantly developing UN norms and, more broadly, further developing international laws can also be effective countermeasures to cyber threats. Above all, those working on cybersecurity should keep some basic principles such as resilience, sustainability and security by design in mind, as Chelsey Slack reminded the group. That said, the group also agreed on the role and importance of education at every level – technical, social and humane.

2.9 Global Security Architecture in Upheaval – Searching for New Pillars to Uphold the Nuclear Non-Proliferation System

Speaker: *Niels Annen*, Minister of State, Federal Foreign Office, Berlin
Rapporteur: *Roberta Mulas*, Italy
Session 9: Tuesday, August 20

The session focused on the situation and prospects of nuclear governance after the effective termination of the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces (INF) treaty. It touched both on the reasons for this development and on the German priorities in such a context. Some attention was also given to the question of extending arms control to new weapons technologies.

An important theme of the discussion revolved around the responsibility for the recent demise of the INF. On the one hand some people maintained that Russia should be squarely assigned the blame, having developed new missile systems that contravene the treaty, thus attempting to change the existing balance of power. On the other hand, it was argued that Washington being able to test its own INF-non-compliant vectors just a few days after the treaty's termination signaled that the United States had been intent on overcoming the agreed limitations itself. China's increased defense spending was also critically considered, as its missile programs, both conventional and nuclear, have created a situation calling for the establishment of innovative agreements engaging Beijing in nuclear governance instruments. In this regard the matter of verification was considered especially important, as an instrument to create transparency and therefore trust.

The end of the INF was described as a "wake-up call" that is expected to reinvigorate the currently dormant movement for further nuclear restraint. Without such a movement, there would not have been the Cold War push to conclude non-proliferation, arms control and disarmament agreements. In this respect the activities of ICAN, the Nobel peace prize-winning NGO that lobbied in favor of the Nuclear Ban Treaty was considered a positive sign for the state of civil society in this field (notwithstanding Germany's difficulties vis-à-vis the treaty given it relies on NATO's nuclear protection). For Germany and other states, the current lack of US leadership is problematic, as nuclear governance has been highly dependent on the participation of the then-two superpowers and Washington in particular. Therefore, more should be done to ensure that the New START Treaty between Russia and the United States does not face the same fate as the INF and, more broadly, to reaffirm a global commitment to arms control, non-proliferation and disarmament.

A further element of discussion concerned the need to adapt the current governance architecture to new weapons technologies through the adoption of new agreements. It was argued that human beings should remain accountable for the control of lethal weapons, despite the pressures created by the technical characteristics of autonomous weapons and by the states' desire to reap the benefits of such technologies. Whereas that risks giving way to a new global arms race, it was argued that the Cold War experience should highlight that security agreements are possible, even in situations of competition and tension.

2.10 Global Finance and Trade: Risks and Challenges

Speakers: *Heribert Dieter*, Senior Associate, Research Division Global Issues, German Institute for International and Security Affairs (SWP), Berlin
Sunjoy Joshi, Chairman, Observer Research Foundation, New Delhi
Manfred Lahnstein, Former Federal Minister of Finance, Chairman of the Board of Trustees, Zeit-Stiftung, Hamburg
Anna Caroline Müller, Legal Affairs Officer, Intellectual Property, Government Procurement and Competition Policy Division, World Trade Organization, Geneva

Rapporteur: *Rob Folley*, United States
Session 10: Wednesday, August 21

The role of international economic institutions in countering rising populism – which is often accompanied by unsound economic reasoning – is more important than ever. Disillusionment stemming from globalization did not begin with US President Donald Trump, but rather originated in the decades leading up to and following the global financial crisis, when governments failed to mitigate the negative impacts of globalization on their constituents. Trump's effort to "shake things up" need not be bad per se, but trade should not be treated as zero sum. Moreover, there is urgent need to reform the institutions of global trade to address trade's impact on climate change, sustainability, gender, digitalization and rising inequality.

Manfred Lahnstein underscored the threat to the global trading system from rising populism in many countries – which is often accompanied by unsound economic reasoning. Many populist leaders reject the multilateral, rules-based global trading system, and the premise that 'free trade is a rising tide that lifts all boats'. However, while many populists denounce established economic theories about the benefits of free trade, it is hard to contest Ricardo's law of comparative advantage. Economic institutions – like the world trade organization (WTO) – present an "indispensable counterweight" to the populist threat, but they must be reformed. He was pessimistic that the G20 was up to the challenge, however, predicting that trade would be increasingly fragmented and distorted by multi- or plurilateral agreements, most of which will bypass poorer developing countries.

Heribert Dieter concurred with Lahnstein, noting that blue collar workers in the United States and Europe have missed out on the benefits of globalization, which increasingly accrue to an ever shrinking few. In the case of Germany, he noted a recent study of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) linking high corporate savings and Germany's large current account surplus to growing income inequality. However, the problem was not globalization itself, but the failure of governments to mitigate the negative impacts such as via retraining programs. Societies are "willing to shed a little efficiency for more social cohesion" and this will be reflected in government trade policies going forward.

Anna Caroline Müller acknowledged the need for WTO reform, warning that the United States' decision to block the appointment of new judges to the appellate body could incapacitate the WTO by the end of the year. Moreover, a trend toward national governments casting trade disputes in national security terms also threatened the existing system's ability to mediate disputes.

Turning to the financial sector, Lahnstein warned that regulations and measures setup to prevent a repeat of the 2008 financial crisis were gradually eroding. The risks to financial stability presented by non-traditional financial institutions (e.g. fintech instruments and companies) and cryptocurrencies have not been effectively mitigated. Moreover, governments must address the environmental implications of cryptocurrencies, which in 2018 consumed an amount of electricity similar to that of the Czech Republic.

Finally, on risks to the global economy and the financial sector, panelists highlighted China's unwillingness to address unfair trading practices and allow reciprocal market access, as well as Brexit. Donald Trump's efforts to "shake things up" vis-à-vis China were not wrong per se, but trade could not be seen as zero sum. There is an urgent need for institutional reform, e.g. at the WTO, in order to ensure the architecture of the global economy is fit to tackle new challenges, from the impact of trade on climate change and sustainable development to gender, digitalization, and inequality.

Sunjoy Joshi said there was an ongoing struggle for the domination of "digital highways" and the right to shape norms and standards. Countries were increasingly pursuing unilateral measures, e.g. France with the introduction of a digital services tax. He warned that even if President Trump did not win a second term in 2020, the protectionist trend would continue so that multinational companies would increasingly be forced to "untangle" established global supply chains. Dieter predicted that perceptions of a weak economy could bring about a "self-engineered" global recession in 2019-20, even though the economic fundamentals – stable, steady growth and low unemployment – remained in balance. He highlighted an undervalued Euro due to loose monetary policy, and rising debt in China as key risks to financial stability.

2.11 Digitalization, Artificial Intelligence and Future of Work

Speakers: *Kirsten Rulf*, Head of Unit, Digital Policy, Federal Chancellery of Germany, Berlin
Dani Sandu, Researcher, Social and Political Sciences Department, European University Institute, Florence
Tatiana Tropina, Senior Researcher, Max Plank Institute of Foreign and International Criminal Law, Freiburg

Rapporteur: *Maria Rueter*, Germany

Session 11: Wednesday, August 21

This session covered a broad range of implications of new digital technologies on societies as well as the role of government, the rising power of private companies, and an urgent need for changes in the education system. The most prominent examples of digital technologies discussed were Artificial Intelligence (AI) and industrial automation.

One of the main questions regarding AI focuses on transparency and accountability for its results. One of the speakers argued that, if an AI model is not transparent – i.e. it is unclear how the algorithm works and how it arrives at decisions – then it is difficult to explain the process' results. Yet, how can companies be held accountable for the outcomes of these models?

As the development of AI happens within private companies, the latter's power and control over technology is growing. In contrast to government leaders, however, company bosses are not elected by citizens, underlining another disconnect between technology and society.

There is no simple answer to this conundrum of control, but participants debated several options during the session:
- To establish general AI rules in light of human rights, e.g. a code of conduct;
- To introduce an enforcing mechanism (such as penalties) for AI technology when failures cause a negative impact on human life;
- To focus on sector-specific regulation of AI, e.g., in areas of healthcare, energy, e-commerce, banking, insurance etc.;
- To introduce regional and global industrial standards on AI technology.

The joint conclusion of the audience was that AI development cannot be handled solely by programmers, but governments, researchers, and broader society need to be part of this technological change.

Another significant technological and especially societal change is happening due to automation. Given many different statistics about the effects of automation, Dani Sandu pointed out the importance to link the numbers with context. According to one study, 47 percent of current jobs are vulnerable to automation. This number does not, however, consider any changes in task profile and responsibility. For example, for the number of bank tellers in the United States has actually risen after the introduction of ATM (from 100.000 in 1960 to about 550.000 in the early 2000s). The reason for this growth were the expanding tasks bank tellers had to fulfil in new areas like credits and financial services.

Due to the high speed of technological change, the effects of automation will not be equal for all sectors of the labor market. Most of the jobs targeted by automation are mid-skill routine activities, which usually cause a high cost burden to a company's

efficiency. At the same time, the reduction of the middle layer routine jobs enforces polarization of the workforce between high- and low-skill professions. This is when a governance model is required allowing, on the one side, to retrain and relocate the workforce towards the upper job profiles and, on the other side, to increase wages in the low-skill sector.

As a possible response, the concept of a universal basic income (UBI) was debated. The UBI creates an opportunity and freedom for every individual to select a job based on their competences and priorities but without any pressure to survive, thus mitigating inequality. In addition, the development of new jobs is important. For example, in the mining sector in Sweden, the number of employees could be increased by shifting more responsibility to workers and transitioning more intense work to machines. This also shows the first elements of the Future of Work.

Another important factor being discussed was the speed of the technological change. According to Kirsten Rulf, the digitalization of electricity was accepted within 40 years, electric cars are being accepted within 25 years, and acceptance of the mobile phone came about in only five years. This enormous speed of change makes it very difficult for governments to find the right answers to the issues arising from new technologies. Moreover, technological implementation depends also on the national mentality: Denmark, for example, followed the "just do it" attitude and successfully introduced paperless governmental processes across the country, making these intuitive and user-friendly to all cohorts of the population. In this context, Kirsten Rulf emphasized the need to increase the understanding of new technologies by 'spreading the word': Because "today we are lacking a public opinion on new technologies like AI or autonomous cars", we need to shift the knowledge from "small clubs" towards the bigger general audience.

The difficulty of understanding new technologies is directly linked to the topic of education. According to Dani Sandu's research, 80 percent of children in second grade will work in jobs that currently do not exist. This makes it very difficult for schools to prepare children with the skills required for their future.

New technologies like AI and automation create a lot of risks, but also opportunities. As Dani Sandu said, "Technology is neither good nor bad, but how we use it". Along with technological change also the mindset of society needs to adapt. This can only be possible if all relevant actors of modern society – governments, public institutions, NGOs, research institutes, private companies and the broader public itself – are involved and driving this change.

2.12 The Challenge of Long-term Climate Change

Speaker: *Mojib Latif*, Head of the Research Unit: Marine Meteorology, GEOMAR, Helmholtz Centre for Ocean Research, Kiel
Rapporteur: *Lilia Rizk*, Morocco
Session 12:   Wednesday, August 21

Climate Change is one of the biggest challenges mankind is facing, and the window of opportunity to help reverse its effects is slowly closing. Climate Change is intricately linked to economic growth based on resource depletion, whose limits the world is quickly approaching given phenomena such as overfishing and deforestation. To solve the issues that humankind is facing, we have to rethink the way we use our resources.

Climate Change is essentially an energy problem, as energy is the building block of our economy. Over 90 percent of the energy used is from fossil fuels such as coal, oil and natural gas. Burning fossil fuels to meet produce energy leads to the emission of carbon dioxide (CO_2) into the atmosphere, which creates an imbalance that directly affects the climate and impacts on the habitability of the planet.

Earth has been able to maintain habitable temperatures because of the composition of its atmosphere, made up of 78 percent Nitrogen, 21 percent Oxygen, and 0.9 percent Argon. This leaves one tenth of one percent of gases such as CO_2, nitrogen dioxide and other gases that create rising planetary temperatures through the greenhouse effect (i.e. they trap heat on the earth's surface which, without CO_2 or methane, for instance, would be below 0°C). Though CO_2 has been in the atmosphere for the last 800,000 years, and the planet's temperatures have fluctuated since the beginning of time, its current concentration is unprecedented in human history.

Because the change in atmosphere is not visible, it does not put pressure on action. Already in 1896, scientists predicted an influence of carbonic acids in the air on temperatures by four to five degrees Celsius. If CO_2 concentrations continue to rise, then the planet will continue to warm, as there is a direct correlation between CO_2 levels in the atmosphere and increasing temperatures on the Earth's surface.

We have known about the Climate Change phenomenon for over half a century, so it is safe to acknowledge there is less of a knowledge problem but an implementation problem. Skeptics argue that there is no proof that humankind is influencing the climate. However, many experiments and simulation exercises have made clear that climate change is human induced because of the increase of greenhouse gases linked to human activity.

It is still possible to limit global warming by reducing emissions and becoming carbon neutral in order to limit the increase of global temperature to below 2°C. The planet needs a transformation from a fossil-based economy to a fossil-free economy built on renewable energy. This requires a mind change, because – as Albert Einstein noted early on – "we cannot solve our problems with the same thinking we used when we created them."

2.13 Entering the 2020 Presidential Campaign: US Political and Foreign Policy Outlook

Speakers: *Sevgi Balkan-Sahin*, Assistant Professor, Department of International Relations, Ça University Turkey, Yenice, Tarsus
Josef Braml, Head of Program, USA/Transatlantic Relations, German Council on Foreign Relations, Berlin
Erjon Kruja, Political Officer, US Embassy Brussels, Brussels
Charles Landow, Research Director, Office of Secretary Robert E. Rubin; Adjunct Instructor of Political Science, University of Nebraska, Omaha

Rapporteur: *Alexandra Borisova*, Russia

Session 13: Thursday, August 22

The four panelists touched upon some of the crucial problems concerning the forthcoming US elections in 2020 and more broadly upon American influence on global governance. They addressed Donald Trump's presidency, his rise to power and his chances for re-election, as well as how domestic politics and US foreign policy impact on security and global values abroad.

Speaking of the US 2020 election, two groups quickly emerged: some panelists were convinced that Trump's foreign policies would prevent him from re-election, others argued that Americans would not usually care about external issues unless the economy was harmed. Hence the president could well be confirmed in office, regardless of current polls and a fair amount of public discontent with his rule.

The group discussed in detail if Trump was successful in 'making America great again' i.e. whether his domestic economic and trade reforms brought wealth to the voters, as he had promised, or whether his short-term achievements would lead to a recession at home and the deterioration of multilateral agreements around the globe, in effect re-enforcing isolationist sentiments in the country. The panelists also discussed the president's consistency in foreign policy. They specifically emphasized the dangers of leaving the Iran nuclear deal, of the recognition of Jerusalem as Israel's capital, of the US withdrawal from the Paris agreement on Climate Change, and of the general increase of American militarism.

Special interest was given to a discussion of US trade policies, which – the group agreed – was closely tied to both domestic and international issues. Launching the trade war was supposed to limit Chinese capacities and at the same time garner votes at home by bringing jobs back to the US. However, exerting financial pressure even on US allies while raising the US defense budget may in fact, and somewhat counterproductively, lead to an uptick in militarism worldwide.

Another extremely sensitive issue touched upon was migration, when in fact never in history so many people had gathered on the US' borders. One of the panelists argued that, while the whole world order had changed and migration posed new threats, US laws had not changed fundamentally. So, the whole system was trying to adjust itself to this new reality, with Trump's politics being just an extreme response. Still, more generally, Trump could not "change American DNA" so soon – migrants would still be welcome in the US. Moreover, some experts consider them to be America's "secret weapon", as they would work very hard to earn their living, and their children and grandchildren would work even harder. Accepting migrants could therefore be seen as some kind of long-term investment in society and economic well-being.

The panel also discussed different aspects of the Democratic party's perspectives for the 2020 elections. The most prominent one was that the Democrats still do not have either a strong argument or a strong candidate. Back in 2016, candidates Hillary Clinton and Bernhard Sanders were not consistent enough to beat up Trump with his aggressive trade policy proposals; now, candidates Joe Biden and Kamela Harris will be 'politically killed' during the forthcoming election campaign before they can even change that situation. The Democrat's incapacity (so far) to come up with a strong initiative and candidate, combined with Trump's trade policy, changes the rules of the game in global governance to the brutally realistic model, when old allies may become adversaries. The Democratic party, if it wants to win, will be forced to broaden its agenda to include infrastructure initiatives while staying pretty close to the current protectionist agenda on trade.

The perception of information has also changed. It influences not only the migration issue, where the election campaign could potentially bring an outburst of ideas, but the way how people see the media in general. Trump is setting agenda every hour, by posting his opinion on Twitter. This easily beats professional journalism which would cover hot topics in a more balanced manner.

During the discussion the group picked up several problematic issues, from the US political system and its checks and balances to specific issues such as birth control, religion, and lobbyism, to universal values and rights. Participants discussed the potential of swing-state voters in the forthcoming elections and also passive groups and minorities which can be brought to electoral process. Trump will certainly play on this diversity, trying to tear those fractions apart.

Based on such differences, the group concluded, the USA would remain politically divided with or without Trump. This chimed well with the issue of long-term strategic legacy brought up by the audience. They argued that it's a common mistake to attribute unpleasant politics to a certain personality, whereas, looking at figures, one can easily see many current trends actually stem from earlier times, be it under Barack Obama or George W. Bush.

Finally, the discussion also touched upon sensitive and volatile regions in the Middle East and Asia, focusing in particular on the (actual and potential) use of weapons of mass destruction (WMD), the United States' withdrawal from the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, and the potential for escalation in Iran and North Korea. Participants also discussed the consequences of US military involvement around the world, seeing a 'win-lose strategy' of political realism at play instead of a 'win-win' for the recipient countries and for the world order in general.

2.14 After the European Elections: EU Political and Foreign Policy Outlook

Speakers: *Kinga Brudzinska*, Senior Research Fellow, Future of Europe Program, GLOBSEC Policy Institute, Bratislava,
Jana Puglierin, Head of Program, Alfred von Oppenheim Center for European Policy Studies, German Council on Foreign Relations, Berlin
Jan Techau, Director of the European Program and Senior Fellow, The German Marshall Fund of the United States, Berlin

Rapporteur: *Sebastian Pfeffer*, Germany

Session 14: Thursday, August 22

United or divided? By and large, this is a summary of both the current state of the EU and its future. Hardly anyone will question that the EU is facing stormy times, as Europeans struggle to work together on common challenges: the EU's democratic deficit is unresolved, a European identity is forming only slowly, and member states can always act and leave Brussels on the side, if they so decide. Still, the EU continues to be a success story, neither at the end nor obsolete. It needs far-reaching reform, and until this happens, the nation states remain the most important actors.

Is the EU regaining popular support, as Kinga Brudzinska ("stop being pessimistic") argued? 44 percent see it in a more positive light nowadays, a big improvement since the financial crisis. And is the outcome of the European election in May this year, framed as a battle between the EU's supporters and opponents, even a good signal? The opponents gained support but did not win. Even if the two traditional blocks lost their majority, the biggest winners were the greens and the liberals. One could argue that there is a light at the end of the tunnel. Even the majority of critics does not want to dissolve the EU, 'only' to change it. So perhaps Europe has become more liberal and greener, and – especially after the deterrent example of Brexit – more united than is often assumed.

Or are the EU's fundamental problems greater after all? "We are at a make-or-break moment", Jana Puglierin said. In this reading, the member states are caught between domestic political problems and international challenges. One the one hand, the EU needs to be a united player on the international stage, able to shape the global environment or being shaped by it. On the other hand, major foreign policy events have hit the EU as it was trying to absorb domestic challenges. Most European states are experiencing domestic political instability, while established parties see themselves challenged by populist movements. This can lead to a situation in which states are less able to cooperate: societies are more polarized, it becomes more difficult to find unified positions, and leaders are weakened. In such a situation, the danger increases that cooperation often will no longer succeed beyond the lowest common denominator.

From this point of view, it is no wonder that the EU's biggest problems lie in areas where it does not have a strong mandate. As the United States is retreating, the European security architecture risks falling apart; already, there are numerous crisis around Europe. China is systematically buying itself into Europe, while the world is facing a potential economic meltdown in combination with a currency crisis. All these challenges require, for example, more cooperation and more integration in the areas of security, migration and economic policy. According to Jan Techau, this highlights a

fundamental flaw in the current EU debate, because "where the mandate is clear, the EU works very fine."

Optimists could see these crises as an opportunity, knowing that it would not be the first time in history for the EU to deepen integration under pressure. However, the pessimists will ask when this pressure is too great and the EU will break up. Moreover, deeper integration in the aforementioned areas is particularly difficult, as it would encroach on the sovereignty of member states. Given some rather nationalistic developments, this seems unlikely to happen.

So how to deal with the greatest challenges? Because "member states prefer to work outside EU structures", as Jana said, one could try to make these formats more European. The Normandy Format would be an example, where France and Germany work closely together with Russia and Ukraine to resolve conflict between the latter two. This pattern will probably intensify after Brexit because member states will want to cooperate with Britain bilaterally or in small groups. It seems to be rational to focus more on the intergovernmental cooperation than on the European 'super-state' which so far has not helped overcome the EU's democratic deficit. As Jan pointed out, the *Spitzenkandidaten* process was an attempt to reshape power relations in Europe, but it failed because it was seen as an attack on the democratic legitimacy of member states.

With little prospects for deeper reform, the member states will – and must, some would say – remain the most important actors of European integration. Especially in times of crisis, diplomacy goes where the power is: in Paris, Berlin, and other capitals. Yet precisely because the EU does not yet have a strong mandate on a lot of crucial topics, larger member states must take special care to include the smaller ones in their decisions. Because in the end, the question of whether Europe is united or divided is not so much one of institutions as of perceptions and emotions.

2.15 The View from Inside: Coordinating the German Policy Agenda in Times of Change

Speaker: *Wolfgang Schmidt*, State Secretary, Federal Ministry of Finance, Berlin

Rapporteur: *Markus Lubawinski*, Germany

Session 15: Friday, August 23

Only briefly touching upon economic questions related to Brexit, the next EU Multiannual Financial Framework 2021-2027, and export promotions, the session focused on the role of the Federal Ministry of Finance within Germany's current grand coalition government. In particular, the group discussed the future of the Social Democratic Party (SPD) in an increasingly fragmented and emotionally charged domestic political environment.

The Ministry has two main responsibilities within the German government. It not only watches over Germany's international economic and financial policy and fiscal strategies. Headed by Olaf Scholz from the SPD, it also serves as the „Vice-Chancellery" in an equal partnership with Chancellor Angela Merkel's Christian Democratic Union (CDU). In this capacity, the ministry assumes a coordinating role among the SPD-led federal ministries, parliamentary groups and German Länder and participates in weekly meetings with the CDU-led ministries. These mechanisms not only ensure consistent government policies but also promote Germany's role as a stable anchor within the EU against the backdrop of a likely hard Brexit, right-wing movements, a north-south divide and growing trade tensions.

The work of the grand coalition is embedded in an environment of growing volatility. A decline in public support for both the CDU and the SPD as the traditional center-right and center-left parties has caused an increase in political fragmentation. This fragmentation is reflected in Germany's current seven-party-system as well as its variety of two- and three-party coalitions at the regional level. What is more, the sovereign debt crisis and later the migration crisis, together with social media trends and the perception of growing social inequality, have propelled the right-wing populist Alternative for Germany (AfD) onto the political stage. This has contributed to an increasingly charged public discourse, dominated by the AfD and the pro-European Green Party and revolving around issues of identity, migration, and climate change.

In this context, the Social Democrats are striving to develop ideas beyond the grand coalition. This comprises, first and foremost, the reintroduction of a concise SPD-narrative about social cohesion and mobility into a political debate that has been paralyzed by the CDU's asymmetrical demobilization strategy of adopting traditional socio-democratic positions. But it also includes the adoption of a convincing policy package to tackle climate change, which may end up as a prerequisite for the SPD to remain in the coalition government beyond 2019. Do not campaign any differently than you intend to govern, Wolfgang Schmidt warned: This will be one of the main challenges for the new SPD leadership duo, which is to be elected in November.

In short, the session illustrated the extent to which the global governance system also hinges upon the range of policy alternatives and the competitive nature of party politics at the domestic level.

2.16 Competition and Cooperation: How Germany Can Take Responsibility

Speaker: *Andreas Michaelis*, State Secretary, Federal Foreign Office

Rapporteur: *Winnie Munene*

Session 16:   Friday, August 23

The Summer School touched upon the most urgent cross-border challenges of our time: geopolitical implications of the rise of Asia, security issues in the Middle East as well as in Afghanistan and Pakistan, the development paths of both Europe and Africa, political negotiations to combat climate change, and the global dialogue on human rights. In light of these political tensions and instabilities, Germany has demonstrated leadership, not least by taking in more than one million refugees and investing in their integration and settlement in the country.

German foreign as well as development policy is geared to improving living conditions in the European Union as well as reducing poverty and strengthening democracy around the globe. Africa is a key region, but Germany also works extremely closely with countries in Asia, Southeast Europe, and Latin America.

However, it is unclear whether Germany is willing to assume the responsibility that comes with such a global role. According to the State Secretary, the country cannot escape the question of reshaping reality after its own historical experiences. That is why they are committed to ensuring such injustices are not witnessed again.

This even has implications for identity, as some argued. Rather than juxtaposing a national and a European identity, the latter can exist alongside regional or national identities. Thus, adding a dose of 'European patriotism' is a key focus. When it comes to Brexit, Germany and the EU have prepared policies and trade proposals for the eventuality that the United Kingdom would leave the club, with or without a deal.

Germany is focused on increasing developments in Africa, South America and the Asia-Pacific through different government agencies like the German Technical Cooperation agency, GIZ. Germany is also looking East for investment options and greater collaboration, considering the effects of global climate change and the role of various industries.

As it happens, sovereignty is under threat in many countries from the secondary effects of sanctions administered by the United States. Washington thus influences EU policy – whether on energy ties with Russia or trade with Iran – by threatening to sanction European companies. For Germany, thus, America's new political approach also impacts on the broader political environment.

For Germany, mutually beneficial relationship with its neighbors, across the EU and globally are the focus of its foreign policies. When it comes to international priorities, the EU comes first, second and third, so a win for the EU overall is also considered good for Germany.

2.17 Free Media Today: How to Deal with Hate Speech, Disinformation, and Fake News

Speakers: *Maria Adebahr*, Spokesperson, Federal Foreign Office, Berlin
Moritz Holzgraefe, Head of Governmental Affairs, Axel Springer SE, Berlin
Alastair King-Smith, Co-ordinator, Global Campaign for Media Freedom, UK Foreign and Commonwealth Office, London
Joachim Knodt, Personal Secretary to the German Ambassador, German Embassy to Russia, Moscow

Rapporteur: *Manisha Pande*, India

Session 17: Friday, August 23

Fake news and hate speech are among the foremost areas of concern for democracies today. This session looked at some of the ways in which Germany is dealing with these twin problems.

At the outset, Maria Adebahr clarified that she preferred using the word 'misinformation' instead of 'fake news' because it underscores an inherent deliberate attempt to mislead. Two speakers, Moritz Holzgraefe and Alastair King-Smith agreed, adding that 'misinformation' had to be distinguished from an ill-informed opinion or an honest mistake. The principal aim here is to deceive and manipulate an audience.

Moritz Holzgraefe acknowledged that the main producer of 'fake news' was Russia. Given the thin line between a deliberate attempt to mislead and an ill-informed belief, regulating 'fake news' becomes all the more difficult. The task at hand is more complex than, say, regulating hate speech. While a certain set of parameters made it easy to check hate speech – bigotry directed at minorities or communities, neo-Nazi utterances, etc. – it was often tough to flag misinformation campaigns on the Internet.

The discussions then veered towards Germany's Network Enforcement Act, which was enacted on 1 January 2018. It is considered one of the toughest laws against online hate speech and penalizes social media networks like Facebook for not acting on complaints of hate speech. Questions were raised on whether such a law could lead to censorship, and if the de-platforming of ultra-right and neo-Nazi voices could lead to them gaining only more prominence. There are no easy answers to these questions, and Maria Adebahr stated that one had to look at these issues on a case-by-case basis. She stated that in Germany's case, so far, they had not witnessed an overcompensation by networks to pull down pages or censor posts.

Another key area of discussion were media accountability and dwindling trust in news outlets among the public. Alastair King-Smith argued that media independence had come under immense pressure because of its reliance on advertising. The way out is perhaps for news consumers to begin paying for news so as to reduce news media's dependence on corporations and governments for ad money.

Panelists broadly agreed that to effectively fight misinformation campaigns a strong media ecosystem was needed that can rectify false information. The moderator, Georg Mascolo, stated that the public must demand correct information and analysis from journalists: "You pay not just for correct news but also sound judgement." He added that it is worthwhile to look at all the journalists predicting that Trump would not win or that Brexit would not happen, and hold them accountable.

Perhaps the best way to counter misinformation is not through laws but more robust, reliable and accurate information. Journalists play a pivotal role in ensuring that.

2.18   Democratic Discourse in an Era of Trolls and Fake News

Speaker: *Husain Haqqani*, Director for South and Central Asia, Hudson Institute, Washington, DC

Rapporteur: *Agne Kaarlep*, Estonia

Session 18:   Friday, August 23

This session on how social media has shaped democratic discourse explored one of the Summer School's main themes: digitization's impact on societies. It focused on the multitude of ways the new mediums have been harnessed to deliberately advance the goals of autocratic regimes as well as how cognitive patterns contribute to taking political discourse to the extremes. This reduces the space for healthy interaction where mutual understanding is possible.

In his introduction, Hussein Haqqani emphasized how the digital age is fundamentally different from the times of print media. Then, a certain quality could be preserved by the limitation of daily or weekly deadlines. Even with the advent of television and radio, the pace of both producing as well as consuming news was limited to the mediums of the era. With the rise of social media, the rules of the games have changed.

As promising as it came about, social media has brought forward an unprecedented disruption in the production and consumption patterns of news. This is further exacerbated by the ways in which social media plays into our underlying cognitive biases. In particular, the bandwagon effect creates the impression of credibility of information merely through the existence of numerous followers; while confirmation bias means that any information fitting the existing world view is perceived as truthful while facts and figures challenging it would get ignored. Both of these cognitive patterns contribute to the creation of so called "bubbles" in political discourse.

Social media was posited also to be beneficial for social change by providing an avenue for direct democracy and convening power at scale, noting the Arab Spring as an example. This being said, Haqqani was clear to emphasize that the abuse of the medium by far-right groups and especially dictatorships to advance their agenda is far more pervasive than the positive change social media creates.

The medium provides for various groups to advance their messages via data analytics, search engine optimization and microtargeting which can be used to target messaging to an increasingly narrow segment. Haqqani emphasized that this is particularly successful in ensuring that single-issue voters, e.g. those who base their choice on one concern such as climate change or gender, are directed to vote for smaller parties. This leads to a loss of votes in a two-party system while creating increasing diversity and multiplication of actors in a multiparty system. Both pose further challenges to forming stable governing coalitions.

While in countries like Hungary and Turkey social media still continues to provide, to a certain extent, a democratizing force, it was posited that this is merely the case because these autocrats have failed to harness the power of social media to advance their goals. An obvious trailblazer in this area is Russia where the state-funded Internet Research Agency, also known colloquially as a troll farm, produces and spreads disinformation across the globe. A model which is now being replicated across multiple jurisdictions across the world, including India with the ruling Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) setting up their own troll farm, and Venezuela where government kiosks across the capital city are recruiting people to become internet trolls. Another testament to the power of social media's ability to influence political outcomes is Jair Bolsonaro's win of

the Brazil's presidential election in 2018, when people were chanting the names of leading Silicon Valley giants such as Facebook and Twitter, which the candidate had skillfully used to rally his supporters.

Trolling, however, is not confined only to impact election results but can be equally successful in ruining individual reputations. Driven by the veil of anonymity offered by the Internet, trolling directed at individuals is pervasive. Various examples of individuals targeted with a wave of abuse for their political views include the case of Tina Urso, a Maltese activist who stood up against the practice of selling her country's citizenship to the highest bidder.

All of this taken together – the fact that social media has fundamentally changed the way we consume information, the state of information overload feeding our cognitive biases, and state sponsored trolling to spread multiple 'truths' – has led to increasing societal polarization. As a result, the voices of the extremes are amplified, and political divisions emerge over single issues leaving limited flexibility for cross-party cooperation. Individual trust in democracy is undermined by social media creating 'alternative facts'.

With many social media companies' revenues and profits exceeding the economic power of entire countries, their power needs to be curbed by strengthening antitrust laws. Already, companies like Google, Amazon, Facebook, and Apple – the so called GAFA – are fast moving into a variety of sectors, including by acquiring submarine cables. Once private companies control the backbone of internet infrastructure, their power over states and elected governments will only increase.

In terms of solutions to these complex problems, Haqqani posited that the age of the 'wild, wild west' of the Internet needs to come to an end. Strong regulation balancing freedom of expression with adequate rules is needed. One key element of such a regulatory framework needs to be oversight of social media companies' processes, algorithms as well as potential limitations to how much data they are able to collect. This needs to err on the side of oversight while steering clear of censorship and control.

2.19 Art. Architecture. International Politics: Transit Spaces

Speakers: *Hans-Jürgen Commerell*, Director, ANCB The Metropolitan Laboratory – Aedes Network Campus Berlin, Berlin;
Dunya Bouchi, Managing Director, ANCB The Metropolitan Laboratory – Aedes Network Campus Berlin, Berlin;
Miriam Mlecek, Program Manager, ANCB The Metropolitan Laboratory – Aedes Network Campus Berlin, Berlin;
Benjamin Tallis, Senior Researcher, Institute for International Relations, Prague;
Barbara Holzer, Architect, Director, Holzer Kobler Architekturen, Zurich;
Gabi Schillig, Artist and Architect, Studio for Dialogical Spaces Berlin / Professor for Spatial and Exhibition Design, Berlin University of Arts, Berlin

Rapporteur: *Riyo Tanaka*, Japan
Session 19: Saturday, August 24

When the Summer School discussed global concerns over security, climate change, and social discourse at different times, the issue of 'transit space' was always present but hardly directly addressed. In a political sense, transit space can be defined as the relationship between people and territory. In response to the increased possibility of mobility, more and more people have the desire to move around. This fluidity of people has become a crucial political problem, as people are spending more time in temporary spaces.

Some may consider transit space to be their home, while others consider it a threat. Some may want greater or smaller amounts of transit space, while others may even want to remove it from their lives entirely. This mobility has the potential to pose a huge challenge for commanding economic dynamism alongside social inclusion, sustainability, and social justice.

Border crossings are one example of transit space. Not everyone can pass through borders, and some people are stuck at borders. Borders can divide different countries from each other, but also work to divide countries internally; a border is a key means in which space, facilities and movement are divided in a social context. A border is the result of cultural, social and economic processes, but in turns acts to create them.

The concept of the word "Transit" was particularly important to those who were born in Germany in the 1960s. At this time, for those in West Berlin, there was a very strong awareness of transit. After the wall was built in 1961, people from West Germany travelling to West Berlin had to use a special "transit route" (Transitstrecke) crossing East German territory to reach the West Berlin enclave. Once en route, there was a limited timeframe of around three hours in which they needed to reach Berlin to prove they had not strayed from the path. From the 1960s to 1970s, there was another significant 'transit' movement of people in Germany. In this period, the substantial Turkish population of West Germany began transporting German products to Turkey two or three times per year because of the availability of the 'Ford Transit'; a new car with a simple engine system. Starting in Germany, they drove through Austria and Yugoslavia, then on to Greece before finally arriving in Turkey.

The idea of living in a container also has a very special meaning in Germany after about one million refugees from Afghanistan and Syria arrived there in 2015. As a

result, container villages have emerged across Germany. But how can we change the image of containers from a space for immigrants to something different? A large exhibition in Essen 25 years ago, entitled "Transit," aimed at making people aware of the many so called "guest workers" who came to Germany from countries such as Turkey, Italy or Spain in the 1960s and 1970s. At some point, many of those migrants decided not to return to their home countries and instead remain in Germany. This changed the ideas surrounding "Transit" for many Germans, who realized their misconceptions over the concept in the early 1990s. During this time, Germans had to start thinking about the kinds of migration goals that Germany should envisage. In fact, they had to – and still have to – acknowledge that theirs is an immigrant country, not just a temporary home for "guest workers".

There has been a shift in our understanding of spatial reconfiguration towards territories, transparencies, and corridors all over the world. The concept of transparencies has thus more broadly become an approach to investigating the interaction and interconnectedness between places, institutions, and actors across the many concepts of borders. Urban social reviews define transit spaces as non-places, which significantly impact not only citizen communities but also broader society and culture. If we cross borders by car in Europe for instance, we might have sensitive experiences resulting from changes in the material environment (such as road surface type and the corresponding in vibrations of car tires), or begin to sense the different regimes that exist over the border.

Architecture is a physical space defined by the potential of buildings and cities, how they can change, how flexible their use is in the future, and their meaning in wider society. The locations of buildings, and the materials used in architecture to present ideas are in the first instance considered to inspire people. One example is Frankie & Johnny in Berlin-Treptow, a students' home converting over 420 former shipping containers into dormitories. In this new form of modern living, balconies and plants optimize the spaces and initiate communication between people. Another example of such a container-turned-to-housing scheme is the CUXHAVEN Masterplan, which transformed the old fishing port in 2018.

In urban planning, integrating new structures into existing structures or incorporating extensions and temporary structures into permanent structures is also crucial – yet such developments take time. In Switzerland, considered to be one of the most expensive countries in the world, about 30 percent of city houses are publicly owned and affordable, so the political contribution is very important for housing and space.

Physical borders already exist between us. With information technology, we can also see the recreation of the offline world via the Internet, for example by viewing data on where people are going, and even where people are meeting in the digital spaces of the Internet. The need to connect such kinds of digital data with people is precisely where digital security is heading, based on the flow of the smooth procedures of the online world, which contrast with the difficulties and friction of the offline world. While using the Internet, being physically in the space is also important.

Knowing who we are is important, and art can help to facilitate our communication with others. We should keep trying to find a common language of understanding to tackle challenges for a better future. These challenges are not always solved by the knowledge of experts, but by the goodwill arising from mutual understanding.

2.20 Emerging Powers and Global Governance: A China-Led World Order?

Speakers:	*Matthieu Burnay*, Assistant Professor in Global Law and Chinese Law, Queen Mary University, London
	Maya Malkani, Deputy Director for Regional Security Affairs, Office of Indo-Pacific Security Affairs, Office of the Secretary of Defense, US Department of Defense, Arlington
	Yixiang Xu, New Research Initiative Fellow, American Institute for Contemporary German Studies (AICGS), Johns Hopkins University, Washington, D.C.
Rapporteur:	*Elizabeth Laruni*, United Kingdom
Session 20:	Monday, August 26

The world faces an increasingly confident China, offering a new option to the disintegrating global liberal order led by the United States. But is China able and willing to fill this gap?

The world is facing an increasingly dominant China which is harnessing its political, social and economic influence in the Asia Pacific region and internationally. In this pursuit, China is offering a new option in response to the changing world power dynamics. With the fragility of the post-war global liberal order, and the United States adopting a foreign policy aligned with isolationism and protectionism, participants were asked to consider whether China was able and willing to fill the gap.

The presenters discussed China's growing 'discourse power' linked to the 'Belt and Road' initiative, its growing activism on commerce, as well as its nuclear and arctic ambitions. These were attributed to China no longer seeing itself as a 'norm taker' but a 'norm maker'. In this regard, China could be seen as taking the steps to fill the gap left by receding Western powers.

To increase its global heft, China is deploying a multiplicity of tactics. These include the creation of a worldwide network of global trade and of new institutions such as the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB) directly competing with established international institutions created after the war. Moreover, China's domestic policies reflect an increasing rejection of western values, as recent measures relating to the detention of dissidents signify an authoritarian revival. Under President Xi Jinping, China has afforded little tolerance for dissident beliefs. Within the international sphere, the U.S has been at the forefront of criticizing China citing China's policies on internet surveillance policies, market competition practices and lack of compliance with international rules and regulations.

However, there are limitations to China's global ambitions, including Beijing's lack of understanding of regional dynamics. Chinese entrepreneurs, many of them educated abroad, are struggling to influence institutions in China as well as in their host countries. Additionally, the Chinese government is unwilling to assert itself militarily particularly in areas such as the Middle East where it could directly compete with American dominance. Taking a leading military role on the international stage is an expense which China is unwilling to meet – for now.

Whether China is ready and willing to take a leading role in global governance is still open for debate. However, what is clear is that China is no longer willing to be just a signatory to international rules and regulations. Instead, Beijing sees itself as playing the role of a norm maker on the international stage.

2.21 Emerging Powers and Global Governance: The role of Africa and Latin America in a Rapidly Evolving World Order

Speakers: *Fernando Brancoli*, Assistant Professor, International Security and Strategic Studies, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ), Rio de Janeiro;
Roan Gopaldas, Director, Signal Risk, Fellow at the GIBS Business School, University of Pretoria, Pretoria;
Melanie Mueller, Research Associate, German Institute for International and Security Affairs (SWP), Berlin

Rapporteur: *Clara Deniz Buelhoff*, Germany
Session 21:   Monday, August 26

The speakers shed light on why players from the global south should not be ignored when considering the future of the world order. In 2000, Africa was perceived as a hopeless continent, but became Africa Rising and 'the hopeful continent' a decade later. Yet between Afro-optimism and Afro-pessimism there still is not enough room for navigating the grey areas and certainly not enough appreciation of African initiative. Brazil, in contrast, has spent the last 20 years trying to find a place in the liberal order, based on a culturally specific adaptation of international norms. With the rise to power of President Jair Bolsonaro, however, Brazil has become an illiberal democracy. It is still regarded as an emerging power but with a more uncertain future.

The African continent, where the average age gap between constituents and their leaders is 40 years, hosts some of the fastest growing markets in the world. Their great potential for trade and investment has prompted regional and global rivalry for security and investment. While there is talk of emerging and submerging markets, not much attention is paid to where Africa features in this constellation. By 2050, however, Africa will be the continent with the world's biggest population, making it too big to ignore.

Africa has been affected by policies shaped in the West, though this has changed with China now playing a prominent role on the continent. Recently renewed interest in the continent has been fueled in large part by the US-China rivalry. Initially characterized by benign neglect toward African countries, the Trump administration unveiled the first outlines of an Africa policy at the end of 2018.

Asian countries indeed have become more assertive than in the past, with China, India, and Japan all having strong Africa policies. China established a Forum on China-Africa Cooperation (FOCAC) 20 years ago and put African leaders first, which served to change the nature of international cooperation with Africa more widely. This is also linked to sub-regional competition, which is spilling over into the Indian Ocean. While China brings money and know-how especially toward improving infrastructure in African countries, its predatory lending approach, as seen in the example of Sri Lanka, has drawn a great deal of criticism as well. Nonetheless, to many African countries it seems advantageous to engage with China as collaboration is less bureaucratic and not based on the same conditionalities that other players impose.

The volume of Asia-Africa growth is around two billion dollars, with a lot of investment going into maritime routes and digital connectivity. For Japan and India, this is led by the private sector, whereas Chinese investment comes mainly through government initiatives. Beyond these, Russia has re-emerged on the scene, aiming to adopt a niche

strategy centered on hard power and energy and maneuvering where there are power vacuums. The Gulf countries follow a similar route.

The EU, for its part, has been weakened by internal rifts and challenges to European integration. Both France and Britain, the two member states with the most far-reaching colonial history, are too preoccupied with internal issues. Britain's foreign policy approach toward African countries in the past has been rather patronizing, which may no longer work now that other players have taken an interest in the continent as well. Germany proposed a "Marshall Plan" for Africa and made the continent a topic of its G20 presidency in 2017. However, its footprint in economic cooperation with African countries is not very advanced. Instead, migration has played a big role in European cooperation with African countries, which has drawn justified criticism that the EU was trying to pay African leaders to externalize European borders.

With all this, there are three areas for African countries to focus on: Collective leadership, regional integration and economic diplomacy. Africa's impact on the world stage is diluted by internal division so far, while the cost of doing business is high, and trade between countries is more difficult than imports from China. Additionally, increased trade and investment from China will most likely lead to more competition between African states, further hampering regional integration, such as between Kenya and Tanzania.

South Africa, in contrast, lost much of its importance during the Zuma presidency (2008-18). Once known for its strong commitment to human rights and as the African voice at the global level, Jacob Zuma strengthened cooperation with the emerging powers through the BRICS format at the expense of global and regional governance (e.g. by withdrawing from the International Criminal Court and weakening the AU's voice). Currently, Pretoria holds a two-year non-permanent seat on the UN Security Council, acting as a 'swing state' between the West and countries like Russia and China, while also bringing up African topics such as the crisis in South Sudan.

The African Union (AU) as the pan-continental organization of regional integration used to be slow and bureaucratic but has recently been improving. Integrating 55 member states is arduous, and different regions are confronted with different challenges: For Western Africa, migration plays an important role, whereas Southern Africa battles with high youth unemployment. Additionally, in a similar vein to the EU, the selfish interests of national leaders further hamper integration. Given that strong personal leadership is very much embedded in African political culture, the AU's lack of a charismatic leader means that it still does not have the global weight that some feel it should have.

As for economic diplomacy, Kenya's example is encouraging, as the country works with several partners maintaining a strong negotiation position and brokering deals on their own terms. Other positive examples for economic cooperation include Ghana and Rwanda, while Niger has used the focus on migration to leverage more development aid and economic cooperation. Morocco tried to join the Economic Community of Western African States (ECOWAS), and other North African countries have started to look more to their southern neighbors.

Coming to Latin America, the focus was on Brazil. The current fires in the Amazon rainforest – being one of the worst so far in terms of damage – have precipitated a struggle inside the Brazilian government on how to deal with the issue that is symptomatic in some ways for the antagonisms in Brazilian politics more generally. Brazil has soured its relationship with Germany and Norway when Bolsonaro stated these countries should plant their own forests instead of donating money to Brazil. The President and his ministers argue that international norms are used to diminish Brazil's

power, with other countries using environmental considerations merely as a pretext. President Macron of France in particular was accused of a colonialist attitude when he said that "the Amazon belongs to the world".

In fact, the Paris Climate Accord and its objective to limit carbon dioxide emissions is thought to be directed at Brazil. Many actors in Brazilian politics, from government and civil society alike, have long considered the Amazon as a national treasure that outsiders are aiming to appropriate. This interpretation provides a platform to legitimize bypassing international norms. That is why US President Trump, who regards international norms in a similarly dismissive way, is now considered an important ally of the Brazilian government. Brazilian ministries have stated that climate change is a hoax and that Brazil needs to distance itself from the structures and norms related to it, as they do not represent Brazil's interests. In sum, Brazil is currently trying to posit itself as an illiberal democracy.

A different, and certainly currently less dominant perspective of Brazil as a non-anta-gonistic international actor had begun under President Fernando Henrique Cardoso from the center-right and been continued by Presidents Lula da Silva and Dilma Rousseff from the center-left. The fundamental idea is that Brazil should be open to arguments and concepts from the outside, but digest them into 'Brazilianized' versions, which is essentially what Brazil has attempted to do over the last 20 years preceding Bolsonaro. For example, Brazilian forces have taken the lead for the UN Mission in Haiti, including bringing in soccer players to support the liaison with local communities. The Brazilian approach to development has also differed from Western countries, with a strong appreciation for the importance of discourse. With regards to the Amazon forest, specifically the Ministry of Foreign Affair ran a course of consulting with the indigenous populations and considering a civilian perspective on the protection of Amazon forests. While international collaboration should not be blocked, the Brazilian view had to be added to international efforts in the Amazon.

Recently, Germany has effectively attempted to bypass the Bolsonaro government by dealing directly with state governments still wanting to engage with international actors. In fact, many of the tools that are currently used to fight the rainforest fires were bought with foreign money. And although Brazil is still perceived as an emerging leader, the last years have not been very positive for the country on the world stage and it has slipped somewhat from the agenda.

Brazil has also been trying to tackle corruption which is a very prominent debate at the moment – not least if one remembers the highly corruptive measures that both the United States and European countries had no qualms in using when dealing with Latin America. As such, the narratives about corruption not only in Brazil but on the continent at large play an interesting role at the moment.

2.22   Artificial Intelligence

Speaker: *H.E. Omar Bin Sultan Al Olama*, Minister of State, Artificial Intelligence, United Arab Emirates

Rapporteur: *Sheryl Foo*, Singapore

Session 22:   Monday, August 26

Omar Bin Sultan Al Olama highlighted the critical role of emerging technologies such as artificial intelligence (AI) in global governance. It is viewed as a turnkey technology in key economic sectors to improve the UAE's global standing and regional leadership in what has been termed "the fourth Industrial Revolution". Against the backdrop of his country's transition from a traditional to an electronic government and its ambitious goal of becoming an AI state by 2021, the speaker discussed the UAE's governance of the technology, including data origination, oversight, and gender.

The main driver of the UAE's approach to emerging technologies such as AI and blockchain is to promote pragmatic, equitable governance to harvest the benefits of such technology while minimizing its harms. In fact, the UAE has a particular historical experience on technology, as the country went backwards from being an exporter of technologies around 600 years ago to becoming one of the least advanced civilizations. While the rest of the world was developing, experiencing fundamental transitions such as the Enlightenment, the region suffered a decline including because key technologies such as the Gutenberg printing press were banned for 200 years.

Today, AI holds a similar promise but also peril, affecting everyone, everywhere. The governance of AI is made even more complex with the challenges stemming from globalization, migration, climate change, and international security that a nation must be ready to tackle.

Presenting the Emirates' lessons learned on technology governance serves to outline how a nation can transform itself to become technology-ready while diversifying its economy. For example, one way to integrate AI into the policy agenda is to regularly hold roundtables discussing opportunities and synergies with relevant government units – with the task to deploy the discussed policies within six months. Moreover, constant interaction with the private sector is key to understanding the complexity of an ever-evolving technology.

The UAE also considers itself a technological catalyst for the wider region, believing that equality and progress for all in the region will create prosperity for the nation. For example, the successful "One Million" program has taught more than one million Egyptians, Jordanians, and Uzbeks how to code.

In the global AI discourse, a key debate is on 'technological unemployment'. From Dubai's perspective, however, the integration of AI in governance should create a new job for every job lost. To support the crucial upskilling of employees, a dedicated AI fund has been created that is filled from cost savings in all government and semi-government institutions. As Dubai is an international destination for migrant workers such as in the construction sector, the government is also increasing inclusivity by improving pension and remittance programs for these low-skilled expats.

Another important aspect of the new technology age are gendered perspectives in managing and creating data. In the UAE, 80 percent of space program employees are female, as are 63 percent of government staff. The specific AI challenge here is to mitigate what has been called the "garbage-in, garbage-out" problem, i.e. if the data

fed into a system are biased, its outcome will also be biased. Globally, this has been an issue with the majority of coders being White Caucasian males and creating algorithms that are subconsciously biased towards their social group. For example, in facial recognition technology, there is a higher percentage of Caucasian faces recognized compared to Asian or middle eastern ethnicities, and the problem is exacerbated by gender due to the lack of female programmers. The UAE, in contrast, is predisposed towards data diversity given its international workforce: More than 200 nationalities are represented in the economy while its airports see more than 19 million passengers annually. Creating the right ecosystem for AI requires a gendered perspective and the government recognizes this, fully utilizing its strengths to ensure a diverse data process.

Ultimately, governance of AI requires oversight and most importantly, agility. Due to the multiplicity of applications of the technology, there are different rules and it is also difficult to pinpoint a specific policy. Cohesive integration of the government is critical in governing AI, which is why the UAE recently created the position of minister for AI, providing oversight on AI as a technology across government agencies. The speaker stressed that his government aimed to govern the specific uses of AI, not the technology itself. And that it was also always learning from the global community, for example through Dubai's annual Global AI Forum, a key initiative allowing the government to put together the right playbook to manage the uncertainty of AI.

2.23   Women in Global Governance

Speakers: *Aleksandra Dier*, Gender Coordinator, Counter-Terrorism Executive Directorate, United Nations Security Council, New York
Clarissa Rios Rojas, Founder and Director, Ekpa'palek International Development, The Hague
Mariam Wardak, Founder, Her Afghanistan, Kabul

Rapporteur: *Caroline Boué*, France

Session 23: Tuesday, August 27

In this session, participants discussed how global governance could be redefined to include gender considerations. As the 20th anniversary of the Women, Peace and Security framework will be celebrated in 2020, the implementation of the relevant UN Security Council resolutions is still a challenge. Also, the #Metoo movement, spreading worldwide in October 2017, was a reminder that sexual assault and harassment, especially in the workplace, still represent appalling facts. Current trends show as well that the most challenging gender gaps to close are in the economic and political dimensions. Three words can summarize how women and gender must be considered in the redefinition of global governance: participation, inclusivity, and a comprehensive approach.

Aleksandra Dier set the scene with her view on redefining governance by integrating women and gender in all policy responses: "it's not just about numbers, it's not just about women, and it's not just about women's issues". Going beyond numbers means that women are not only present, but can also participate; going beyond women means that gender does not equal women and thus, gender reflection must include men, boys and girls as well; and going beyond women's issues means to address gender aspects in any policy, which therefore calls for a comprehensive approach.

Since the adoption of UN Security Council Resolution 1325 on Women, Peace, and Security in 2000, a lot of focus has been given to women's participation in peace negotiations and in post-conflict reconstruction. However, this participation has not always led to quality of exchange, as a misconception emerged between giving women a voice versus actually listening to what they had to say. Broadly speaking, women's representation in different spheres – whether political, economic, or social – does not necessarily mean that they will be heard. In addition, achieving equal representation of men and women, thanks to quotas for instance, can also be harmful and counterproductive if the nomination of a woman for a given position does not rely on solid qualifications but on family reputation for instance. When considering women's participation, it is therefore important to have credible messengers who can impact the policy process.

Inclusivity is also crucial if we want to address gender in global governance. As there is often a conflation between women and gender, two fundamental definitions were given: "Sex" refers to the biological characteristics which are genetic, so this term refers to the constant state of being either male or female. "Gender" refers to the socially and culturally constructed attributes associated with being male or female, which can change over time. So, talking about gender is not only talking about women; it is also talking about men, and about boys and girls and the images of future roles they grow up with. When trying to address a particular policy, it is crucial to conduct a gender analysis. This systematic gathering and examination of information on gender

differences and social relations is decisive in order to identify and understand inequities based on gender.

Finally, including gender considerations in global governance calls for a more comprehensive approach. Gender is not solely about sexual violence. It is a matter of gender equality, meaning equal rights, responsibilities, and opportunities that should not depend on whether one is born male or female. A change of mindset needs to occur in order to be more gender-sensitive and operate a change in social norms, to redefine them. This definitely means engaging more with men on this topic, focusing not only on women empowerment but also on masculinity and its definition in today's world. Whether it is in Western countries or in more conservative cultures, men must be more involved in the reflection and discussion on gender to avoid the disruption and fragmentation of society.

Looking through a gender lens at the challenges posed by global governance increases the chances to find more inclusive and sustainable solutions. This cannot happen without the commitment of political leadership to redouble its efforts to ensure that gender is one of the top priorities. Funding dedicated to gender organizations involved in peacebuilding projects and women's programs cannot be diverted anymore to finance other burning issues such as counter-terrorism and countering violent extremism. It is only by taking the gender issue as a crosscutting topic which positively affects other aspects of global governance that we will be able to build a more gender-sensitive world.

2.24 Innovative Architecture and Social Design Concepts for Humanitarian Needs

Speaker: *Daniel Kerber*, Founder and CEO, More Than Shelters, Berlin, Germany

Rapporteur: *Rod Solaimani*, United States

Session 24: Wednesday, August 28

This breakout session delved into the discussion around various design concepts for humanitarian needs. Specifically, it considered the actual process of how to design social innovations in complex settings. Participants were introduced to the methodologies employed by *More Than Shelters* in the context of the Za'atari refugee camp in Jordan, and were asked to weigh the impact of not only the solutions (products) introduced but also the processes (design) that created them.

70 percent of environments in the world are built informally. In all of these instances, there is a dynamic and organic process that is unique to each situation.

To date, most housing solutions in response to refugee and transient populations have been inadequate in terms of providing a sustainable and dignified life due to their overly simplified nature. The century-old approach utilized today almost entirely focuses on delivering, as quickly as possible, a human warehousing facility. Two decades ago, refugee camps on average operated for twelve to 18 months and were then shut down. The aim was to create a village for tens of thousands of people, and the systems in place were incredibly efficient at delivering this outcome. Presently, refugee camps are in operation for 15 to 20 years, and the average length of stay for a camp resident is twelve years.

The outdated approach of grids, tents, grouping by arrival, and maintaining a less than ideal environment to encourage refugees to move on is no longer the answer. In the case of Za'atari, humanitarian aid workers ignored the importance of designing an environment that reflected its residents, their culture, family structure, and social and professional aspirations, even within a seemingly desperate context. This oversight led to riots and the camp being burned down – not once, but twice – before outside mediators came in to address the unrest.

Beyond humanitarian crises, it can be argued that many of the challenges humanity faces today are caused or protracted by failing systems – hence the need to look into designing appropriate products and systems. *More Than Shelters* became part of the mediation process to explore how to transform a refugee camp of 85,000 into a sustainable habitat and a dignified space. Their methodology is defined by four phases: expedition, imagination, realization, and cultivation. "Expedition" involves a mapping of all key individuals, institutions, problems, and opportunities. The ethos here is to first and foremost understand the situation before acting. "Imagination" begins to outline the process that could potentially produce a solution, not the solution itself. The organization frames this as evolving from ego-systems to collective ecosystems. It also requires process commitment from the "cohort" that will be responsible for co-creating the journey.

The third phase – realization – moves into prototyping and co-designing the steps needed to take the proposed ideas into actualization. Lastly, "cultivation" focuses on ensuring that members of the community can carry on the project without external input. Emphasis is placed on manuals, hand over, and creating a shared knowledge

base that can promote, grow, and replicate the system. The underlying question here is: How do you shift a population of dependent beneficiaries to active citizens?

More Than Shelters is one example of how re-thinking our approach to intractable problems is an understudied and under-appreciated area. More often than not, priority is given to hastily constructing a temporary solution, then moving on to the next crisis. The complexity of each situation is being sacrificed in order to implement a simple solution. Daniel Kerber and his staff, when in a situation that is beyond their capacity, will reduce scale but they refuse to reduce complexity. More importantly, the thought and energy that goes into designing the process to arrive at the solution should not be papered over in the hurried search for a simple answer.

This approach to problems entails a level of patience and political capital that politicians often cannot afford. In a world driven by quick wins, long term sustainable solutions are a rarity. Participants debated the implications of taking this particular approach into other fields and the potential impact it could have.

2.25 Ecosystem for Social Entrepreneurship in Bosnia and Herzegovina

Speaker: *Vesna Bajšanski-Agić*, Executive Director, Mozaik Foundation, Sarajevo

Rapporteur: *Mitja Mertens*, Germany

Session 25: Wednesday, August 28

Key strategies to improve the ecosystem for social entrepreneurship in Bosnia and Herzegovina – and beyond – include using economically viable projects to empower youth. Such projects should rely on international networks and fully seize the opportunities of digitalization.

Empowering youth is key especially in countries like Bosnia and Herzegovina where youth unemployment, particularly among women, exceeds 50 percent. NGOs such as Mozaik, which has implemented thousands of youth-led community actions, therefore have to react to calls from local communities to re-focus on job creation by running and supporting social businesses. Recent success stories empowering youth throughout the country include offering local household services on fair terms, exporting agricultural products to fast-growing economies, and selling microgreens produced by disabled people. Successful managers have not only created dozens of new jobs; they can also serve as role models encouraging and attracting future social entrepreneurs.

The economic viability of social projects is indispensable for mid-term success. Ways to reduce economic risks for the financing organization include a pre-selection of projects based on different indicators, including the innovativeness of ideas, the level of grass-roots support, and the manager's ability to raise third-party funds. Managers passing the pre-selection phase should be entitled not only to funding but also to mentoring so as to allow for market survival and the creation of sustainable jobs. Successful projects can contribute to wider societal change by committing dividends to a social cause, thereby even further multiplying the initial investment.

International networks are central not only to acquire outside funds and expertise, e.g. via *pro bono* consultancy. They are also useful to overcome local and regional obstacles, establish best practices and fight cases of corruption by naming and shaming. Digital solutions help establish these networks, set up fora to share expertise among project managers, and provide practical advice on a range of issues including taxation and accounting. Digitalization also helps overcome multiple borders whether between communities, regions or even countries, as stories of both success and failure are invaluable for social entrepreneurship worldwide.

2.26   Creating Access to Clean Drinking Water

Speaker: *Nobert Latim*, Founding Member, Viva Con Agua Uganda, Kampala

Rapporteur: *Arjun S. Kadian*, India

Session 26:   Wednesday, August 28

Apart from other pressing issues in global governance, the summer school included topics which have far and wide social impact on large populations across different nations. Gender issues, mass housing projects and ensuring access to clean drinking water to people are a few of those issues discussed. Access to clean drinking water is an issue for people in Asia, Africa and Southern America where a majority of the world's population lives. Viva Con Agua (VCA) is a network of people who do multiple projects and use creative tools to increase awareness, fundraise and ensure 'water for all'.

The interface between business and social issues is quite a unique one and indeed a wise approach to solving many problems that plague our society. It is interesting how VCA calls itself a 'For Profit' company, adding that it is a 'All Profit' organization benefitting all stakeholders. VCA's approach to solving the clean water crisis blends in art and creativity to connect with people *en masse*, asks people to join the network and build a business, and uses profits from these businesses to ensure access to clean drinking water.

Branding is key behind successful projects and VCA is a good learning model for it. One approach that VCA uses is having volunteers in music festivals wherein VCA volunteers would carry flags bearing the organization logo and traverse the festival grounds with bins in which they collect plastic cups from the festival goers; it is worth noting that each cup is worth one Euro. This cup collection is a fundraising activity for VCA's various water projects and also plays a latent role of encouraging people to responsibly dispose of their plastic. At other places, it does creative arts projects, graffiti, or dances, and even takes help from sports celebrities to push the message across.

Yet, like suggested, you need a proper business model to push your cause. The *Viva Con Agua* water is one of the more successful businesses VCA has run since 2010. Another business they support in Germany is called Goldeimer toilet paper. Profits from both these projects help fund the VCA Association which takes on projects in third countries as well as at home to spread the message of clean water, sanitation practices and hygiene.

As a global network VCA runs projects in Germany, Austria, the Netherlands and Uganda among other places. The project in Uganda aims at increasing awareness through workshops, football and dance. Digital outreach has been used to ensure the message reaches all, with the hash tags #WeLoveYouganda and #Football4Wash making this sensitization a success. One of the key projects VCA Uganda is engaged in is *Purifaaya*, a ceramic water filter made of clay and sand dust which works for as many as 48 months.

The VCA network partners with people, and sensitizes them, on the importance of clean water and its impact on health of children and adults. It also offers solutions by making people adopt better practices at work as well as play.

The key points to retain from the discussion are the following:

   a) Solutions to social problems are capital intensive.

b) Business enterprises can bring in expertise and innovation in solving problems.

c) Business for the social good has shown tremendous potential in solving social issues.

d) Creativity along with innovative exercises increases mass appeal and outreach.

e) Solutions to most social problems are found from the bottom up, hence engaging a maximum number of people is in the best interest of organizations to make these programs a success.

Engaging with the community, as Norbert Latim pointed out, and building networks on ground both help a lot in making their projects a success. Because when it comes to bringing a change in the world, everyone can make a difference!

2.27 Tackling Social Problems with Business Solutions

Speaker: *Vesna Bajšanski-Agić*, Executive Director, Mozaik Foundation, Sarajevo;
Daniel Kerber, Founder and CEO, MORE THAN SHELTER, Berlin;
Norbert Latim, Founding Member, Viva con Agua Uganda, Kampala

Rapporteur: *Jane Michel*, Germany

Session 27: Wednesday, August 28

Prior to the panel discussion the speakers had individually shared their experiences with using business approaches to tackle social problems like access to clean water, youth unemployment and the need for appropriate shelter in refugee settings. The general discussion focused on the broader lessons to be drawn from social business and social innovation. Participants and speakers discussed the importance of partnership to find innovations that can help to solve social problems, the future of water and how new technologies could help to overcome water scarcity, and how we can foster systemic changes in the way we do business.

Social change and social innovation need a strong ecosystem where diverse partners collaborate to create social innovation. Partnership across sectors – between government departments, the private sector and civil society – is crucial to co-create new solutions that can tackle social and ecological problems. The key is to identify individuals within the structures of government or private companies who have the drive, the motivation, and the willingness to bring along change. In that way co-creation can happen and sustainable gains and impact can be achieved.

Such collective efforts include a (new) important responsibility of the private sector to contribute to a healthy society. This goes beyond the marketing-driven corporate social responsibility (CSR) many firms have adopted. Indeed, some trends show that for instance ecological factors or other social aspects are slowly becoming integral parts of business models instead of being seen as CSR activities outside the core business. Hence, the zeitgeist might be changing, but will it change quick enough? Individual responsibility as well as the values and principles of employees can make the difference. As employees we have a responsibility too. Speaking out when we experience unethical means and approaches in our company, even leaving a company that operates opposed to our values, can change the status quo. Because in the end, all companies are as good as their employees are.

The desired systematic change can only occur when both favorable policies at the macro level and social innovators and entrepreneurs at the micro level changing the way business is done are working together. Opportunities to scale up and foster economic, social and ecological sustainable business need to be supported by top-down and bottom-up approaches.

At the end, the main challenge remains complexity in an ever faster moving world, hence "how do we make complexity less complicated" (Daniel Kerber) is going to be the key question to achieve sustainable impact.

2.28 Europe's Role in Global Climate Governance

Speaker: *Sven Giegold*, Member of the European Parliament, Group of the Greens/European Free Alliance, Brussels

Rapporteur: *Bastian Wick*, Germany

Session 28: Thursday, August 29

Europe has huge historical responsibility for climate protection: without industrialization emerging from European countries and the United States, there would not be human-induced climate change. This challenge can only be solved through international cooperation. The EU must therefore refine its environmental targets, build alliances on a global level and promote massive incentives for green investments in the public and private sector.

The world has about five to ten years left to mitigate the effects of climate change. After this period, the global community can most probably only adapt to the consequences of a radically changing climate. Sven Giegold highlighted that we are currently heading to a 'four-degree world', i.e. a rise of average earth surface temperatures by 4°C rather than the 2°C officially aimed at. According to scientists, in such a scenario one or more tipping points could possibly lead to an irreversible change in the climate system.

The world is thus facing a situation of real urgency. Against this background, the EU is playing a crucial role in global climate governance. It has to adopt the right instruments to fulfil its commitments made in the Paris Agreement of 2015. The current target to cut greenhouse gas emissions by 40 percent in 2030 compared to 1990 is not enough to keep global warming below 2°C. Instead, Europeans have to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions by 55 percent in 2030, requiring substantial efforts in the transport and energy sector, in building insulation as well as in food production. Right now, there is a political majority in the EU supporting a 50 percent cut, which should be used to define concrete instruments to achieve those climate commitments.

Further, the EU has to look for 'coalitions of the willing' at the global level to come forward with binding instruments. A 50 percent EU emission cut target in 2030 would allow China to agree to more ambitious objectives herself, resulting in an earlier peak of emissions. And even if countries like the United States and Brazil cannot be approached on governmental level, the EU should strengthen cooperation on the state and regional level to fight climate change.

Additionally, environmental aspects have to be given a higher significance in multilateral organizations and institutions. So far, the WTO framework completely disregards the environmental footprint of trade agreements, and the World Bank Group has not yet fully decarbonized its investment portfolio.

As the global economy is slowing and companies are reluctant to invest, the world community has to use all disposable means to provide massive funding for the greening of our industries. Thus, the new EU Commission should pursue a so called "green-deal policy" promoting massive incentives for green investments to reduce global emissions. Such a policy should also include the financing of green investments in EU member states like Poland that are still very dependent on the burning of fossil fuel resources. This critical moment could become an opportunity and the climate story could turn into an economic innovation story as more and more companies are seizing green investments as a promising innovation strategy.

Ultimately, Sven Giegold emphasized that there is still a possible pathway for a two-degree world, but only if public pressure continues. The elections to the European

Parliament have shown that, for the first time, citizens put environmental issues on top of their priorities. Concurrently, the topic gains ground through the Fridays for Future movement. This initiative is very important as more and more people are protesting against the relatively cheap burning of fossil fuels, thus showing that the population as a whole wants change.

The subsequent discussion touched upon questions of how to finance and redistribute the costs of climate change. Those countries most affected can usually not be held responsible for the changing climate and its effects on the population. This problem of global justice cannot be solved as long as the countries that have triggered climate change are not willing to pay for the costs incurred by those countries that have to fight and minimize the consequences of a higher sea level or recurring droughts. Still, one way to support countries to fight the causes of climate change while lowering their own greenhouse gas emissions is to reduce the costs of renewable energies and alternative technologies through development banks.