

Searching for a Global Peace and Security Architecture for the 21st Century: Overview and Way Forward

A Report prepared by the Herbert C. Kelman Institute for Interactive Conflict Transformation based on the results of the workshop "A Global Architecture for Peace and Security" held in NYC on 28-29 September, 2015 and organized by the Chumir Foundation for Ethics in Leadership, in cooperation with the Kelman Institute and the International Crisis Group. By Alice Ackermann, with Augustin Nicolescou & Wilfried Graf.

Summary of Proceedings

On 29-30 September 2015, a two-day workshop took place in New York on "Searching for a Global Peace and Security Architecture for the 21st Century: Challenges and Perspectives." Participants representing academe, diplomacy, and non-governmental organizations debated critical issues related to structures, processes and policies of a future global peace and security architecture.

Proceeding from the basic premise that today's global system is in need of a world order that ensures peace and security for the long-term, participants referred to several transitions in history and political efforts toward the re-establishment of a stable 'governing order', in particular exploring the Congress of Vienna which gave rise to the Concert of Europe system in 1815, and which lasted nearly a hundred years.

There were differences of opinion as to how such a 21st century world order should be constructed: whether it is to be a new Concert of Powers with an initial membership of four, or alternatively 6 great power states; a G-20 with an expanded agenda; or a new institutional arrangement, similar to the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE), the predecessor of today's OSCE.

There would also be the need for a Track 1.5/Track 2 process in order to prepare the ground for such a 'Concert of Major Powers' arrangement. It was agreed that regardless of what institutional arrangement be adopted, that it would act complementarity to existing institutions, such as the UN Security Council.

While the Concert system adopted mechanism regulating the relations of major European powers after the defeat of Napoleon, in doing so it had to address a series of complex questions that are still of relevance today - What political order is most likely to ensure peace and stability? How can the re-emergence of great power rivalry, holding the potential for instability and violent conflict, be prevented? How can one (re-) integrate former great powers in such a manner that they do not threaten existing structures?

Participants acknowledged that in today's international environment with its ever-increasing complexities, challenges and security threats, the tasks at hand are even more daunting than they were in 1815. These range from managing conflictual relations between the United States and

Russia and accepting the emergence of China as a political player with an international agenda, to drawing in other influential collective actors, such as the European Union (EU), or states such as India or Brazil. Participants also agreed that states still matter, although they are ever more often in competition with non-state actors of various kinds, whether multinational corporations, international NGOs, or armed non state actors. Making use of various tracks of engagement between state and non-state actors for purposes of dialogue facilitation was deemed essential in building a secure and peaceful world order. Ensuring prosperity and the welfare of citizens, managing climate change and the global economy, which is increasingly under duress, as well as burden-sharing in the delivery of common and public goods were also the subject of debate in envisioning a new global peace and security architecture.

As to norms and values guiding a 21st century architecture, it was agreed that unlike Europe of 1815, there is no universal value system at present. However, there are precedents as to states accepting common norms and values in institutional settings, such as within the United Nations. Some participants supported norms and values proposed in one of the working papers that could guide interaction among a new 21st Century Concert of Powers, including for example, recognizing a sense of urgency for co-operation and a common sense of responsibility; accepting equality among member states; renouncing the unilateral use of military force; and abiding by international law.

Discussions also focused on identity-driven processes such as the perseverance of national and ethnic identities and issues of self-determination, and interpretations thereof, that are likely to remain a challenge to any future peace and security architecture. The European experience of a supranational identity may offer some insights. Also psychologically-driven processes, whether on the individual or societal levels, were seen as meriting consideration, including addressing differences in interpretation as to intentions of political leaders and the conflicting narratives that exist at present, reducing anxieties that states and leaders may have of each other, and reestablishing mutual trust. The importance of thinking about conditions that are conducive to peace as well as enhancing the capacity of individuals to understand peace processes in a non-linear way are also crucial dynamics in our efforts toward creating sustainable peace.

Food-for-Thought for the 2015 Vienna Congress

In the lead-up to Vienna, the New York workshop identified commonalities of ideas and visions as well as divergent opinions. In particular the new framework for a 21st century architecture and its corresponding elements require further debate, likely to be a guiding theme at the Congress of Vienna 2015. Discussions at the Workshop demonstrated that among various models available, a preferred one for consideration could be a 'Concert' of small group of major powers, convening regularly to discuss the most pertinent international problems and corresponding burden-sharing arrangements with respect to the management of spheres of influence (essential to avoid great power conflict and regional conflicts), and the delivery of global public goods. Such a Concert would also act in ways that is complementarity to existing international institutions with similar mandates so as to avoid competition or conflicting responsibilities. On the eve of the Congress of Vienna 2015, it is also recommended to draft a 'mission statement' on the event that provides guidance to the delegates, experts, and other observers, as to the tasks in front of them and those ahead for the future.

Among a plethora of questions for consideration at the 2015 Vienna Congress, one or more of the following are recommended to guide the discussions, subject to the finalization of the Vienna Programme currently in progress.

Possible Questions for Consideration:

1. What should be the elements of the framework for a 21st Century Global Architecture for Peace and Security?

Discussions could possibly focus on the following sub-questions:

a. Institutional Arrangements

Should there be a new institutional arrangement, either in the form of a "Concert of Powers", or a Track 1.5/Track 2 format that allows for linkages and dialogue between states and non-state actors?

Could it take the form of a hybrid system in which participating states, along with non-state actors in a given setting, engage in a process of dialogue and problem-solving found primarily in a Track 1.5/Track 2 approach?

Or should there be an institutional arrangement for which precedents already exist, such as a G-20 with an expanded agenda or an informal conference mechanism, such as that of the former CSCE?

Could an existing structure, such as the G20, act as the convener for such a "Concert of Powers" forum which is apart from, or in addition to its usual activities?

b. Organizational Structure and other Issues

Depending on the outcome of (a) institutional arrangements, what kind of organizational structure is envisioned as to mandate, membership?

c. Co-operation 'Within' and 'Without' (including norms and values)

What are the guiding principles for co-operation within (i.e. norms and values) and without, such as with non-members? There are norms and values that can be identified with regard to the *process* – that is, the manner in which the dialogue process and interaction in the "Concert of Powers" forum is undertaken, as well as the norms and values governing external behavior of states. If the latter is contested, can norms and values be agreed upon in order to ensure a constructive process and thereby work towards greater consensus on those values and norms that are in dispute?

d. Co-operation with Non-State Actors

What are the guiding principles and institutional arrangements for co-operation with non-state actors, including in the area of crisis and conflict prevention and resolution? How can non-state actors be integrated into the "Concert of Powers" dialogue process?

e. Toolbox for Crisis and Conflict Management

What instruments will be adopted for crisis and conflict management and for dealing with protracted and existing conflicts? How will it manage conflict that might break out between its members?

Can the dialogue process be one in which every avenue short of the use of force (which is often very polarizing) is explored, leaving the question of the use of force to other settings, in particular the UN Security Council?

f. Burden-sharing

How is burden-sharing of the common and public goods to be achieved? What mechanisms/instruments will have to be adopted? Resolution of the many global challenges – whether refugees and migration, climate change, etc. – require

substantive co-operation as no single state, no matter how powerful, can address these problems on its own.

2. How can claims over “spheres of influence” be handled, including support for self-determination conflicts? Consider the following scenarios:
 - a. As a prerequisite condition to the creation of a new global peace and security system, or joining such a system?
 - b. By the 'members', once another member or non-member seeks a sphere of influence or seeks to 'invade' the sphere of influence of another member? How to address a state's 'ambitions' toward spheres of influence?
3. If one were to make an inventory as to what changes emerging powers are seeking, what would be on that list? What changes are emerging powers seeking in the international order? How might those changes be accommodated in a new global architecture? What concessions would be needed?
4. How can divergent ideologies and narratives, including those that provide domestic legitimacy for pursuing national interests (including by use of force) be dealt with constructively? Is a better understanding among actors of their competing narratives a way to foster more constructive relations which holds the potential to establish the necessary trust for greater and more effective co-operation?
5. How will a global peace and security system deal with regional and other types of conflicts and the settlement thereof? What mechanisms for complementarity co-operation, involving state and non-state actors can be developed and implemented?
6. How can burden-sharing, not only in the delivery but also the protection of common and public goods, be assured within a framework for a global peace and security architecture?

The Way Forward

It might be recommended that the 2015 Congress of Vienna also deliberate on the 'way forward' as to follow-on Congress events. One option would be to have a first annual event in 2016 with an agenda of coming up with 'the model' of a new framework for a global peace and security architecture, taking into account the current status of major state relations. Deliberations on a new framework would have to take into account issues such as corresponding mandate and informal working group structures that can recommend institutional procedures.. A subsequent event in 2017 could be to inaugurate this 'new' institutional arrangement. Subsequent events could then focus on particular themes, perhaps those of some urgency, for which a new "Concert" has taken on 'guardianship'.

Proposed Schedule of Follow-on Events:

- 2016: Creating the New Framework for Global Peace and Security: Elements of the 'Model'; Working Group(s) to be established
 - 2017: The Vienna Inauguration of the "new" Institutional Arrangement
 - 2018: Thematic Meeting: Regional Conflict Resolution
 - 2019: Thematic Meeting: Population Demographics and Migration Flows
 - 2020: Thematic Protecting the Global Commons (Water)
- etc.