COUNCIL *on*
FOREIGN
RELATIONS

International Institutions and
Global Governance Program

Challenges of Global Governance Amid the COVID-19 Pandemic

Tom Bernes, Lars Brozus, Michal Hatuel-Radoshitzky, Ari Heistein, Ettore Greco, Patrycja Sasnal, Igor Yurgens, Sergey Kulik, Yarik Turianskyi, Steven Gruzd, Elizabeth Sidiropoulos, Neuma Grobbelaar, Selim Yenel, Carlos Javier Regazzoni, Chen Dongxiao, Lu Chuanying, Kriti Kapur, Shoba Suri, Philips Vermonte, Yose Rizal Damuri, Shafiah Muhibat, and Mely Caballero-Anthony

May 2020

Contents

PART I: THE BROADER IMPLICATIONS OF THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC FOR GLOBAL GOVERNANCE

COVID-19: The Failure of G20

Tom Bernes, Distinguished Fellow, Centre for International Governance Innovation (Canada)

The world faced its last major global crisis twelve years ago. Out of it emerged the Group of Twenty (G20)—an informal forum for world leaders to address the economic challenges threatening the world economy at that time. Most observers gave the new body high marks for averting a global economic collapse and saw it as an important innovation in global governance. Leaders called it their premier forum for economic cooperation.

Since that time, the bold ambitions of some for the G20 have faded as the forum has proved unable to shift from crisis fighting to managing a forward-thinking agenda. Some commentators saw this failure as inevitable but satisfied themselves with thinking that the forum existed, should the world face another global crisis. The current crisis is many times greater than that of 2008 and 2009. But the response of the G20 to date has been tepid and, unlike in the last crisis, totally inadequate to the challenge. The forces that have contributed to this may doom the future of the G20 and create a vacuum that has destabilizing effects on multilateral cooperation and global governance for years to come.

The G20, so successful twelve years ago, is failing today. In 2008, leaders saw themselves and the world on the brink of the abyss and firmly believed that the only resolution lay in multilateral cooperation because the problem was global: no country was immune from the forces at work. But that is also true in the current crisis, yet it is not leading to the same result. What has changed?

The G20 emerged as the principal forum for economic cooperation, replacing the Group of Seven (G7), because the global economy had changed significantly and the role of the G7 countries in that global economy had shrunk. The G7 was no longer able to dictate global policy. China and emerging markets had become so economically important that they had to be involved in global economic decision-making.

At the center of both groupings and the multilateral institutions that underpinned the global economic order was the United States. Even as its absolute power slowly diminished over the seventy years since the end of World War II, the United States remained the undisputed leader—until recently. It provided much of the intellectual drive to craft the multilateral rules-based system that still governs the world today.

Despite designing a system that was clearly to its perceived advantage, Washington was also benevolent. It used the Federal Reserve to buttress the global system when needed—as it is again doing in the current crisis. In trade, although the United States was and largely still is a closed economy, it was able to offer access to its market to leverage global trade liberalization to the benefit of the global economy. Even on climate change, U.S. President Barack Obama worked with China to leverage a deal at the 2014 G20 Brisbane summit and to move that agenda forward.

But then came the 2016 U.S. presidential election. The country shifted from being the global leader to becoming the biggest impediment to multilateral cooperation. Reneging on its environmental commitments and promoting a disastrous trade policy agenda that entails demolishing a rules-

based system in favor of a force-based system are but two of the most prominent examples. Progress on a range of policies within the G20 ground to a halt under the nationalistic policies that put the United States at odds with most of its traditional allies.

Other leaders, fearful of the wrath of President Donald J. Trump and reprisals for any disagreement, chose to shrink their agendas for international cooperation. G20 meetings became largely photo opportunities and a time for addressing side bilateral issues.

Then came the COVID-19 crisis. Surely this was the issue on which the G20 could reestablish its leadership, given that success could only be achieved on a global basis. The G20, however, was paralyzed.

The United States could have turned to the G20 to help define a global response. It turned inward instead. The Trump administration chose to define the issue in terms of them versus us. China was arguably in no position to lead. Saudi Arabia, which chairs the G20 this year, does not have the leadership capacity to address an issue of this magnitude. When G20 leaders finally met virtually, all Trump could say at his press conference a few hours later was to recite the names of the G20 leaders.

In fairness, the G20 finance minister process has led to a commitment to suspend debt service payments from the poorest countries for six months. G20 central banks have responded significantly in containing financial panic. These actions, however, are at best limited against the largest crisis to face the world in almost a hundred years.

All countries face immense challenges, but emerging markets and developing countries face the greatest of them proportionally because they do not have the health-care systems and fiscal resources of the developed world. The developed world has responded, appropriately, implementing precedent-shattering fiscal and monetary policy responses in their respective countries. To assist the rest of the world, however, they have agreed on only minor tinkering with International Monetary Fund (IMF) programs. The United States has rejected a major issuance of IMF's special drawing rights—an international reserve asset that can play a role in providing liquidity and supplementing IMF member countries' official reserves—making the move impossible given that the United States holds a veto. The United States is also moving to cripple the World Health Organization (WHO), on which many of these countries depend, by freezing its contribution.

The G20 could have responded on a number of fronts—many at minimal cost. Maurice Obstfeld and Adam Posen propose a number of policies: expanding international health cooperation; lifting export restrictions on critical medicines, medical supplies, and basic foodstuffs; ending the disruption of supply chains; avoiding use of intellectual property to interfere with fast disbursement of relevant medicines and eventually a vaccine; resisting and managing excessive U.S. dollar appreciation, which is damaging to many countries and ultimately, the United States; and significantly strengthening international financial safety nets. Instead, ritualized pledges are repeated and pious hopes expressed.

The situational risks extend beyond the current crisis for the future of global cooperation and governance. It is not too late for the G20 to respond. Failure to do so could lead to the loss of millions of lives and economic setbacks to living standards around the world. Nationalistic and inward-looking policies will only exacerbate this. Where will the leadership come from?

It is unlikely to come from the United States, certainly not before an election result in November that could change things. China, for all its achievements and potential, is not yet in a position to provide it. The question has arisen as to whether an alliance of Canada, France, Germany, Japan, and other EU members (the Nordic countries in particular) could provide collective leadership. But the history of the last three years suggests that in the face of U.S. hostility (or just as possibly China),

countries are unlikely to do so. In any event, what they might do is severely limited. Former Australian Prime Minister Kevin Rudd has suggested that such an alliance of countries, perhaps including others such as Singapore, might at least work together to reform, fund, and politically defend the current multilateral system to the extent possible—for instance, by ensuring WHO funding or buttressing the dispute settlement mechanisms of the World Trade Organization. This would be a holding action for the time being.

A new U.S. presidential administration, if elected in November to take office the following January, could begin to repair some of the damage of the last few years. This would not come overnight, however. The forces of nationalism and a loss of confidence in multilateral institutions have gained a new impetus that will take time to blunt. The COVID-19 crisis plays to these fears. The G20 needs to start thinking now of the agenda for next year if it is to regain lost ground and move forward.

If U.S. policy does not change, then the world faces a period of a further unraveling of the multilateral institutions and system that has achieved so much over the last seventy years—a continuing erosion in global growth and living standards and a more dangerous world.

The impotence of the G20 in these circumstances is all too clear. It needs to start thinking today not only of global reforms that will be needed as the world emerges from the current crisis but also how to convince domestic voters that national interests are enhanced, not threatened, by a strong multilateral system. It will also need to consider how to reform itself to reduce the inertia that has come to characterize it over the last ten years.

The Difficulty of Anticipating Global Challenges: The Lessons of COVID-19

Lars Brozus, Deputy Head of the Americas Research Division, German Institute for International and Security Affairs (Germany)

"Why didn't we see it coming?" is frequently asked in reference to the COVID-19 pandemic. The question has considerable merit in light of the many surprising global challenges in the last decade. Half a dozen major unanticipated developments shocked the world:

- The eurozone crisis in 2010 set off huge cuts to the social security systems of several European countries, pushing them into austerity and alienating parts of the population from the idea of supranational integration.
- The popular revolts in the Middle East and North Africa in 2011 unseated several authoritarian rulers but also triggered protracted civil wars with antagonistic outside interventions in Libya, Syria, and Yemen, exposing the dominance of national interests over international peacemaking efforts.
- Russia's annexation of Crimea in 2014 and its enduring support for insurgents in eastern Ukraine intensified mistrust between NATO and Russia, leading to Russia's suspension from the Group of Eight and damaging cooperation on a number of global issues.
- The climax of the refugee and migration crisis in the summer of 2015 was followed by a rise of mostly right-wing populism in many parts of Europe that champions nation-oriented chauvinistic policy ideas and is deeply suspicious of the liberal international order.
- The UK's Brexit decision in 2016 polarized the country and was won by the "take back control" supporters, accelerating the use of nationalism as a viable political strategy while weakening the EU.
- The election of U.S. President Donald J. Trump in 2016, who ran on a platform of economic nationalism and anti-globalism, subverted international regimes such as the Paris Agreement and international institutions such as the United Nations.

Policymakers in particular fear situations in which they need to react to fast-moving events and decide on policies without knowing the effects—with one exception: they will be blamed if things go wrong. Turning inward to a national level and away from global cooperation appears to be the default reaction. Failure to anticipate and prepare for relevant international events contributes to the weakening of the principles and institutions of global governance.

There are several reasons for this failure. Analysts could be placing too much emphasis on linear conceptions of political developments in their everyday work, discounting the possibility of momentous surprises. It could also be a matter of priorities. Often there exists an official document or a paper from a research institute published years ago on a future situation-turned-reality

that was not given enough attention at the time. The global spread of a virus has been a frequent scenario in governmental risk assessments.

All of these elements are part of the answer, but the core issue is the discrepancy between policy prescriptions based on the analysis of expected developments—particularly risks—on the one hand, and the logic of everyday policymaking on the other. Although analysts can get better at anticipating future events, policymakers will still need to decide where to set national priorities in regard to preventing risks. Transcending shortsighted national approaches and developing collective strategic empathy could help mitigate this discrepancy, contributing to effective global governance.

ANTICIPATING THE FUTURE

Foresight is supposed to make policymakers aware of important future developments for which policy options should be available beforehand. The analytical task is to identify developments that could become relevant for national and global affairs. These range from the political consequences of innovations in technology (such as social media and election manipulation or drones and military strategy) to constantly monitoring relevant governance indicators (such as economic development, environmental conditions, or the spread of diseases). Interpreting what these developments and indicators signal is the basis of policy recommendations that explain what actions should be taken to avoid a looming crisis or manage an expected risk.

Many national governments, such as Germany, have recently invested in early warning capabilities. However, it is far from certain that fewer surprises will automatically result. After all, the track record of previous peeks into the future is not especially impressive. Notorious examples include widely circulated predictions in the 1960s and 1970s about imminent resource scarcity because of overpopulation, which reportedly threatened the existence of humankind. Previous estimates of economic development have had to be regularly corrected. Environmental and climate research, too, has repeatedly revised its assumptions about the future in recent decades. Further, although it was no secret that public dissatisfaction with corruption, mismanagement, and state repression in the Middle East and North Africa increased significantly in the 2000s, the popular uprisings in almost every country between Morocco in the West and Yemen in the East surprised many experts. The history of predictions is plagued by false positives and false negatives.

This does not mean that prediction cannot be improved, as Philip Tetlock's work on forecast accuracy demonstrates. But it does explain why policymakers are often skeptical of policy prescriptions based on analysts' outlook on the future. To be sure, unlike forecasts, foresight is not intended to predict concrete events but rather to draw attention to potentially relevant developments. Policymakers' assumptions that more foresight will result in fewer surprises are therefore somewhat misguided. However, they will still be disappointed if the forewarning they expect— perhaps in return for investing in early warning—is not issued.

PRESCRIPTIVE POLICY VERSUS EVERYDAY POLICYMAKING

But even if accuracy could increase dramatically, the conflict between policy prescriptions and the logic of everyday policymaking would remain. In addition to analytically well-founded advice, policymaking is influenced by numerous other factors. Ideological convictions or expectations regarding the effects of certain policies on the economy or on public opinion, plus a host of other interests, all play a role. That such considerations influence decisions is hardly avoidable and not necessarily illegitimate. However, it limits the importance of future-oriented policy recommendations that seem essential from an analyst's point of view.

The inertia of governments to prepare adequately for predicted risks such as a pandemic can therefore not always be attributed to ignorance. A critical impediment is the logic of the policy-making process. In general, everyday politics is dominated not by considering hypothetical futures but by the interplay of consolidated interests, political competitiveness, and more urgent matters on the daily agenda. It is notoriously difficult to build political majorities for costly and far-reaching measures such as protection against a pandemic that might occur only in ten, twenty, or thirty years. Any administration needs to be convinced that it can rely on future political support to carry out such projects. Organizing the necessary majorities for massive state intervention becomes easier only in a readily perceived crisis situation. As long as a challenge is just presumed, but not yet fully visible, adequate preparation is rare. The COVID-19 pandemic on the one hand and climate change on the other exemplify the difference.

POLITICIZATION, MULTI-PERSPECTIVITY, AND COLLECTIVE STRATEGIC EMPATHY

Motivating policymakers to pay attention to foresight and risk assessment requires more than additional facts or sophisticated expertise. Integrating their perceptions and interests into the process might increase ownership and political relevance. However, too little attention may be left for relevant risks and events beyond the political horizon if policymaker concerns dominate. In addition, it is tempting in a competitive political environment to question the neutrality of analysis and policy recommendations. In everyday politics, this happens frequently. Experts for parliamentary hearings or commissions of inquiry are rarely selected without party-based political considerations. Politicization thus risks compromising analytical impartiality.

Therefore, although politicization needs to be contained to protect the integrity of recommendations, care should be taken to preserve their political relevance. In this respect, multi-perspectivity could be a useful tool. In forecast tournaments, teams with a high degree of diversity tend to outperform control groups. These teams successfully navigate the deceptive waters of groupthink. Policymakers should find it much more difficult to discount predictive advice that in terms of accuracy consistently scores above average.

Traditionally, foresight has been a sovereign task of the nation-state. Systematic multilateral cooperation is rare. Given the dominance of national perspectives, future analysis typically includes blind spots. Cooperation with partners from different regions and varied cultural heritage helps broaden and enhance the awareness of relevant international and global developments. To increase the diversity of perspectives, nonstate actors could also be included in the analysis. Often they are an important additional source of information. Of course, the conflicts on which thematic and geographical issues focus would not simply vanish. However, a multilateral process could support shared understanding of the various worldviews, interests and preferences, thereby fostering multi-perspectivity and collective strategic empathy: seeing the world—and possible challenges it might face—through the eyes of others. This approach could be tested within the framework of the Alliance for Multilateralism. Experimenting with and practicing cooperative foresight would be an important contribution to making global governance more risk sensitive and ultimately effective.

Global Governance and COVID-19: Why International Cooperation Still Matters

Michal Hatuel-Radoshitzky, Research Fellow, Institute for National Security Studies (Israel)
Ari Heistein, Research Fellow and Chief of Staff to the Director, Institute for National Security Studies (Israel)

As populations across the globe grapple with diverse repercussions of the novel coronavirus, or COVID-19, one element common to all cities, provinces, and states is the sense of uncertainty as to what lies ahead. Given the profound and broad implications of the pandemic both directly, on public health and the global economy, and, indirectly, on priorities and worldviews, the outbreak warrants an evaluation of the future of global integration and the significance of global governance going forward.

In the face of a general lockdown of many of the world's economies and emergency rules expanding government powers, conventional wisdom often refers to the decline of globalization and rise of an illiberal world order. Although assertions that globalization has suffered a severe blow since the onset of COVID-19 seem to speak for themselves, assessing such an argument from a more nuanced perspective with a view to the contribution of international organizations and institutions in the globalized world order sheds light on the current state of affairs. The implications of such a critical view is that more can and should be done in the future to better equip the current international system to address issues affecting citizens of a globalized world.

Minding the clear limitations of human ability to foresee how exactly events might unfold, forecasts predicting the beginning of the end of globalization risk repeating the same mistake as those who saw it as an unstoppable force when it was in ascendance. In other words, despite current trends, this force has already proven that it is not unidirectional. It is undeniable that much of the world's momentum appears to be moving away from internationalism—as seen in Brexit, U.S. President Donald J. Trump's America First policies, and the U.S. withdrawal from international agreements and UN bodies—but such developments should not exclusively inform perception of what the future holds. It is true that COVID-19 has thus far led to a heightened risk awareness regarding participation in the interconnected world system, but the length of time and the extent to which this paradigm will guide the future conduct of companies and consumers remains unclear.

Indeed, the immediate response of states across the globe to the spread of COVID-19 has been to close borders; however, the fundamental factors that led to an interconnected world will remain relevant. Information technology, social media, electronic payment systems, sophisti-

cated shipping systems, multinational companies, and complex international business structures are part and parcel of life in the twenty-first century and are unlikely to disappear. Furthermore, although the virus has stopped many from walking down Main Street or sending their children to school across town, it has not prevented and has perhaps even encouraged continued engagement in more global fora and with contacts around the globe in virtual online spaces (which risks other sorts of viruses—but not those that put physical health in jeopardy). When considering the theory professing the demise of globalization, it is worth recalling that not long ago, before COVID-19, populist currents around the world had already led experts to prematurely eulogize this international order as a casualty of rising nationalistic leaders and the backlash against migration.

Despite the damage to globalization caused by COVID-19, and keeping in mind that states will likely prioritize their immediate need to manage health and economic crises that local populations face, the question of the necessity and added value of coordinating a global response to COVID-19 naturally surfaces. In that context, the benefits of international cooperation and information sharing are unlikely to recede along with the pandemic. The outbreak's aftershocks will leave shared global problems that are likely to linger: movement restrictions, high levels of unemployment, rising dissatisfaction with governing institutions, and open-ended measures adopted by authoritarian regimes to suppress civil liberties, assume more power, and insert loyalists into sensitive positions under the fog of COVID-19.

Notably, even before the outbreak of this virus, the ability of the UN Security Council to effectively produce resolutions on issues related to peace and security was limited. Nevertheless, a comparison of earlier Security Council responses in similar situations demonstrates that in the past, great-power competition was not quite so debilitating. Two clear examples of the Security Council's success in global health are exemplified in the passing of Resolution 1308 in 2000 on HIV/AIDS—when the United States was at the helm of a unipolar international system—and Resolution 2177 in 2014 on the Ebola crisis in West Africa. Both resolutions underscored that the control of outbreaks of major infectious diseases requires urgent action and an immediate need for a coordinated international response to the pandemic.

In contrast, the spread of COVID-19 appears to have further soured the already competitive power dynamics between the United States and China, most poignantly demonstrated by U.S. insistence on referring to COVID-19 as the Wuhan or Chinese virus and the Chinese government's propagating baseless allegations that the United States was responsible for spreading the virus. This war of words may appear marginal in dealing with the tangible and deadly results of the virus outbreak but it was the U.S. insistence on terminology that rendered UN Security Council efforts to reach a resolution on COVID-19 dead on arrival. Not only was this international response comparatively poorer than to those previous pandemics, but also the great power friction caused by the pandemic may reinforce the very factors that made the Security Council so dysfunctional. Significantly, within the multipolar setting of 2020, the spread of COVID-19 has exacerbated already strained U.S.-China relations as well as relations between the United States and its long-standing allies, as demonstrated by President Trump's announcement—without prior coordination with the European Union—of a European travel ban.

In contrast to the Security Council, the UN's World Health Organization (WHO) is playing a prominent role leading the international response to the pandemic. This includes distributing

millions of tests to identify cases, sharing research-based information to diagnose and manage cases, supplying protective equipment to keep health workers safe, educating the public about the virus through online courses, and disseminating situation reports regarding the global spread of the virus. The WHO's performance, however, has been marred by its pandering to China in its fact-finding report and its unwitting dissemination of Chinese misinformation regarding the risk the disease posed. The latter undoubtedly harmed global preparedness in the early days of the outbreak by failing to convey the seriousness of the virus and the situation.

It is therefore important to consider how to better manage international cooperation in a world that will continue to be deeply interconnected, but whose current international institutions are underperforming, which may render them increasingly irrelevant. The U.S. response to all this —announcing the halting of funds to WHO—is the opposite of much-needed action-oriented and effective international leadership. This is because the world is in the midst of an unfolding crisis; another wave of the epidemic outbreak cannot be ruled out even in countries that appear to have effectively dealt with the first; and, as it stands, no alternative international organizations are better structured or empowered to coordinate a global response to COVID-19. Furthermore, international power vacuums are likely to be filled by disruptive actors. If the United States has claims against China's rising influence over international bodies, it is unlikely to remedy those complaints—in this case a failure to convey accurate information on the gravity of the pandemic—by abandoning those organizations and perhaps even seeking to create parallel institutions excluding the sources of information.

Current and future global challenges demand far better international cooperation and significantly more decisive action to avoid worst-case scenarios. Given the lack of action by important international political bodies in dealing with COVID-19 efforts and resources ought to be channeled to more flexible, technocratic international organizations that have the knowledge, access, and proven ability to provide rapid response to unfolding events. Considering that such organizations are not hermetically sealed off from the political environments in which they exist and operate, reforms should be articulated toward improving transparency and mechanisms to demand accountability on critical decisions. Although great-power competition is likely to be a feature of global dynamics for the foreseeable future, such steps would contribute to minimizing the risks of the dysfunction embodied and reinforced by the current international response to COVID-19.

G20 in the Spotlight: The Fight Against COVID-19

Ettore Greco, Executive Vice President, Institute of International Affairs (Italy)

The human cost of the COVID-19 outbreak is enormous. The pandemic is also pushing countries across the globe into a deep economic recession that is expected to be worse than the financial crisis of 2008, even under relatively optimistic scenarios in which trade rebounds in 2021. A recent UN World Food Program report also warns that the number of people suffering acute hunger worldwide could double unless urgent measures are taken.

At stake is the international system of multilateral cooperation, not least because it has so far failed to provide an adequate collective response to the outbreak. Many national governments have enacted similar measures—such as lockdowns, travel bans, and social distancing—to cope with the health crisis, but efforts to ensure desperately needed international coordination have been limited. The Group of Twenty (G20), which includes the world's leading economies, has the potential to play a central role in alleviating this crisis. It could provide the political impetus needed to galvanize global solidarity in the fight against the outbreak and reinforce the mandates and instruments of global governance. Were it to do so, the G20 could make a crucial contribution to the preservation, and possibly revitalization, of the global multilateral system.

The COVID-19 emergency having laid bare various adverse aspects of interdependence, several national leaders have indulged in beggar-thy-neighbor policies. The resulting climate of mistrust has become a serious obstacle to collaborative initiatives, even goals of obvious common interest such as an effective vaccine. The crisis has also exacerbated geopolitical rivalries, especially between the United States and China, whose bilateral relations are critical to global stability.

The COVID-19 outbreak has also exposed structural weaknesses in the global governance system that need to be addressed. Multilateral organizations such as the World Health Organization have come under attack from various quarters for alleged inefficiencies and missteps. However, significant initiatives have aimed at fostering a more concerted and coordinated international response. One example at the regional level is the substantial package of measures adopted at the April 23 European Union summit. These measures are expected to strengthen the EU's cohesion and solidarity in tackling the far-reaching economic effects of the pandemic and may pave the way for unprecedented forms of EU-wide fiscal integration. In another example of significant global solidarity, at a meeting on April 15, G20 countries agreed to suspend debt service payments owed by some of the poorest countries through the end of 2020.

More generally, given the global nature of the COVID-19 shock and its economic effects, the G20, whose members contribute about 90 percent of global economic output, need to play an increasingly prominent and active role in fostering and coordinating international efforts to deal with the outbreak, including providing guidelines for the post crisis recovery. One of the body's main responsibilities is ensuring policy coordination and preventing major powers from pursuing disruptive competitive behaviors in times of crisis. This is the essential function it was

able to perform at the early stages of the 2008 financial crisis. To some extent, and provided that geopolitical tensions between the most powerful international players do not spiral out of control, the G20 could prove a vital instrument to help fill the leadership vacuum on display at the global level. The high-level politics of G20 diplomacy could provide opportunities even for leaders who make no mystery of their skepticism about—if not outright aversion to—multilateral cooperation, such as U.S. President Donald J. Trump, to strike deals that advance vital national interests. This is evident in the recent G20 oil supply agreement that aims to stabilize an energy market deeply shaken by an unprecedented demand collapse.

In the current circumstances, and taking into consideration the G20's record, The G20 should focus on six main tasks:

*Promoting new, badly needed international measures in the fight against COVID-19.*The body could, in particular, facilitate data and information sharing on both the evolution of the pandemic in various regions and the health measures enacted or being developed. By doing so, it would play a fundamental confidence-building role. It should also coordinate efforts to provide funds to build lacking health system structures and capacities in developing countries, including setting up a special taskforce, as former UK Prime Minister Gordon Brown proposed.

Promoting cooperation to preserve supply chains. Little hope exists for the G20 to resume its traditional promotion of a free-trade agenda anytime soon given the profound disagreements among member states and persistent trade tensions. Reform of the World Trade Organization also appears a more remote perspective than ever. However, the group should promote cooperation to preserve essential supply chains and prevent the erection of new disruptive barriers. Ensuring a smooth flow of medical equipment—a critical component of the anti-pandemic strategy—would also contribute to restoring mutual confidence.

Going beyond its current debt relief efforts. The G20-endorsed debt relief initiative for the poorest countries should be considered as a first step only. Given that the financial situation of the targeted countries is widely expected to deteriorate in the coming months, other much more incisive debt-relief measures, including outright debt cancellation, will need to be taken. The G20 could play a crucial role in building consensus among leading economies around such objectives and in inducing private lenders to take analogous steps.

Continuing its role of maintaining global financial stability. The International Monetary Fund (IMF) and other international financial institutions have repeatedly warned of a new global financial crisis. New vulnerabilities are likely to emerge in the wake of the pandemic. The G20 has a unique responsibility in maintaining global financial stability by exercising the monitoring, supervisory, and regulatory functions of the Financial Stability Board. It would also be a critical player should the need emerge for new rules to stabilize the financial system. Other long-lasting goals on the G20 agenda, such as reform of IMF governance, including its quota system, and coordination between development financial institutions have acquired even greater relevance since the outbreak of the pandemic.

Helping promote the stability of global commodity prices. As mentioned, the G20 has been involved in the efforts to deal with the recent oil price shock. Those efforts, which have a critical monetary policy component, seem to have had a relatively limited effect on energy markets, which could remain highly

volatile for a prolonged period. More broadly, the fall in commodity prices may undermine the economic and social systems of several developing countries. The stability of global commodity markets will therefore need to remain high on the G20 agenda.

Serving as a forum in which to discuss issues that have been at the center of ongoing U.S.-China disputes. Some U.S.-China disputes are strictly bilateral and can be addressed only through bilateral diplomacy. Others, however, could find multilateral resolutions or at least be alleviated by multilateral agreements. This applies to several policy sectors, including trade, finance, and technological competition, all fields in which the G20 has tried to develop a distinctively prominent global role. In this respect, G20 diplomacy should also be seen as an instrument to facilitate a rapprochement between Washington and Beijing. A case in point is the flurry of allegations between the two countries about the respective responsibilities in dealing with—or even in triggering—the pandemic. G20 success in promoting common stances and initiatives, along the lines sketched out, to address the COVID-19 challenge would contribute to lessening tensions between the two powers, reducing the global risks associated with the possible further aggravation of their geopolitical rivalry.

Mistaking Panacea for Pathogens: The Case for Existential Multilateralism

Patrycja Sasnal, Head of Research, Polish Institute of International Affairs (Poland)

At least three implications of COVID-19 for global governance deserve a closer look. First, multilateralism is taking a hit for the deficiencies of globalization, and the two phenomena are being confused in the public debate. Second, the pandemic helps update the gradation and classification of global threats, forming a distinct category of existential threats. Third, information and expertise, alongside multilateralism, appear to be proper tools to confront existential threats.

MULTILATERALISM IS NOT GLOBALIZATION

Many authors predict that a wave of deglobalization or nationalism will follow the COVID-19 pandemic. Indeed, according to a recent YouGov poll, 43 percent of respondents from eight European countries and the United States think that globalization should be reduced. Countries have closed their borders in an attempt to stop the spread of the pandemic, international value chains are disrupted, and some are calling for the return home of basic goods production. Simultaneously, a global campaign of defamation against international organizations has gathered steam. The World Health Organization (WHO) is being accused of inaction and a pro-China bias, and the European Union of ignoring the needs of its member states. These coupled with regular criticism of the United Nations make it clear that multilateralism is being questioned.

Criticism of globalization—understood as the increase of trade around the world, especially by large companies to maximize profit—is healthy and necessary. Even when taken broadly as development of closer economic, cultural, and political relations among countries, globalization does need corrections. But it is not synonymous with multilateralism. The two are often confused.

The public narrative has become so saturated with these general terms that there is often no reflection on what they actually mean. Multilateralism is a method of coordinating national policies in groups of three or more states through ad hoc arrangements or institutions. It relates to globalization as does a method to a process. Multilateralism is the sine qua non of globalization, as it is of the UN convention on genocide or the European Parliament, but not vice versa.

Blaming multilateral approaches for the deficiencies of globalization or the spread of the pandemic is politically dangerous because it diminishes social trust in international cooperation, the only tool capable of addressing a special category of threats: the global existential ones.

The majority of the global population only fears a handful of international threats. According to a Eurobarometer poll, the greatest EU concerns are immigration (34 percent), climate change (24 percent), the economic situation (18 percent), and terrorism (15 percent). According to a Pew survey, the top three concerns in Asia-Pacific and Latin America are cyberattacks, climate change, and terrorism. In most polls, Africans fear economic hardship the most, but the 2019 Afrobarometer also found that a majority think climate change is making their lives worse. According to an early Pew survey after the pandemic in the United States, Americans feared infectious diseases the most (79 percent) followed by terrorism (73 percent), nuclear weapons (73 percent), cyberattacks (72 percent), a rising China (62 percent), and climate change (60 percent).

These first-tier global challenges—climate change, terrorism, mass migration, infectious diseases, nuclear weapons, economic hardship, and cyberattacks—are not only substantively but also qualitatively different. That quality rests neither on the number of victims nor on the kind of perpetrator (state, individual, or natural) but instead on the potential to threaten the existence of humanity. Three threats have this potential: climate change, highly infectious diseases, and nuclear weapons. Of course, abstract scenarios are easily imagined in which human existence is endangered because of a massive cyberattack, mass migration, or vicious artificial intelligence that leads to a conflict in which nuclear weapons are used and humanity kills itself. Such potential futures, though, require a chain of events, whereas the three existential menaces are present and direct. Unlike other threats, they are all global and equal. No community is immune from them or their aftermath. All three can reach a tipping point, after which the danger spirals out of control.

This set of existential threats is not conventionally recognized. The term *existential threat* has proliferated in political debates to mean anything across a spectrum of minor and major challenges: the opiate crisis to the policies of the Donald J. Trump administration. In twentieth-century politics, the expression was barely used despite the omnipresent danger of the nuclear bomb. For the past two decades, it has been mostly associated with terrorism. Terrorism, however, is not a threat to human existence—not even to Middle Easterners, where 95 percent of deaths from terrorist attacks occur. Classing mass migration as an existential threat is even more preposterous given how little insecurity migrants have brought to already stable host countries. Similarly, little suggests that inequality or economic hardship are existential threats, though their complex forms and far-reaching consequences render them categories of their own.

The distinction between existential and other international threats matters for multilateralism and global governance in light of the functional difference in the roles of the state in fighting them. The former can be taken on only by international efforts. Other concerns can be fought in other ways: a unilateral national decision to act internally or on another state; or a national bottom-up societal effort to reduce terrorism, disrupt cyber capabilities, or influence local migration patterns. Climate change, nuclear weapons, and infectious diseases, however, require global multilateral efforts to prevent their destructive potential from manifesting itself.

REVIVING TRUST IN INFORMATION AND SCIENCE

National responses to the pandemic have often been provisional—decisions of utmost importance to civil liberties are taken without proper argumentation or scientific judgment, because none is available. Not in living memory have governments watched each other as closely as now on decisions such as when and how to lock down and open societies and economies—at least in Europe. Since the pandemic, hunger for information and knowledge seems to have increased exponentially in international relations and the global public sphere because specific epidemiological expertise was needed—such that was available to only a few. Perhaps for the first time on such a scale, information is seen as directly correlated with human well-being. What scientists know about the virus—the way it is transmitted, how it mutates, how strong the antibodies are—is no longer seen as abstractly affecting our individual lives but directly affecting them.

The shortening of this perception chain is an opportunity for the scientific and analytical community to revive trust in experts by learning from the experience of life scientists. Medicine advanced as a result of interdisciplinary and international teams, and innovative fast publishing procedures (short communications and case reports). Given the importance of information to physical, political, and social life, further plans are being enacted to make scientific publications available for free, something social scientists should ponder as well.

The pandemic also exposes the weight of information in politics. First, information has been critical to assessing how effectively governments are responding to COVID-19. Without reliable statistical information from the health sector, it is impossible to analyze the scale of the pandemic, and therefore say anything about the measures authorities have taken. The Open Data Inventory 2018/19, which assesses the coverage and openness of official statistics, including health data, finds them open and covered only in Europe, North America, and a handful of other countries. Second, states have used the pandemic to spread propaganda and misinformation. China and Russia have a lot to answer for here by vilifying the European Union and the United States, as do Iran (which blamed the virus on the United States) and several Gulf states (which blamed Iran).

EXISTENTIAL MULTILATERALISM

The Indian novelist Arundhati Roy sees the pandemic as a portal between the old and new world. In international politics, this may translate into a passage from the post-1989 preoccupation with terrorism and economic growth based on consumption and exploitation to new existential politics. Little can be said about the future with certainty except that it will face global existential threats: climate change, infectious diseases, nuclear war. Because of the nature of these menaces, they cannot be mitigated save by multinational, informed, and expert governance.

Such existential multilateralism can be championed by Europeans, whose regional system rests on multilateralism and who had recently intended to reinvigorate international cooperation by forming the Alliance for Multilateralism. The grouping should work toward making the UN General Assembly and UN Security Council recognize and prioritize the existential threat category. Europeans have also

masterminded the WHO Solidarity clinical trial initiative to find an effective treatment for COVID-19. If successful, this project alone will do more good for global governance than a hundred UN General Assemblies.

COVID-19 and Rebalancing the Global Agenda

Igor Yurgens, Chairman, Institute for Contemporary Development (Russia)
Sergey Kulik, Director for International Studies, Institute of Contemporary Development (Russia)

As the COVID-19 crisis continues, any predictions or recommendations as to its further course are inevitably tentative and approximate. Its scale and, more important, its duration can only be guessed at. The uncertainties include how deep the crisis will be in the sectors hardest hit by the lockdown, how much unemployment will rise, and whether governments will claim a bigger role in the economy. How these and other issues will play out globally or in any particular nation is not yet clear.

What is clear is that failures in protecting global health security will seriously affect the economy, politics, and the public sphere. Efforts to improve global governance will need to be made against a background of increased pessimism, xenophobia, irrationalism, disinformation, a crisis of confidence at all levels of government, and a crippled economy. Value-added chains and businesses that move goods and services across national boundaries are already severely affected.

Notably, the pandemic has given a powerful impetus to confrontation in relations between the United States and China. Each has been quick to blame the other for creating a threat to all mankind. This confrontation directly threatens economic globalization and hinders efforts to improve institutions of global governance.

All these elements make it even more difficult to reformat institutions, which have not been able to adequately meet the task of organizing a collective response to current challenges. On the other hand, the daunting threats, both present and future, are now more clear than before. Although the leading powers have failed to demonstrate much-needed solidarity, nonstate actors have the opportunity to step up and assume more responsibility.

Institutional renewal should be based on rethinking the priorities of international politics. Existential threats call for correcting the imbalance in policymaking and policy research. In addition to the continuing and still-prevalent emphasis on the threat of nuclear holocaust and the more recent interest in mitigating climate change, the challenges of biosecurity need to be moved to the top of the global agenda. Biosecurity is still marginal in the priorities of analysis and forecasting of emerging threats. Many official national security documents simply ignore them. When these challenges are mentioned, as Russia's national security strategy does, the approach is more declaratory and less specific.

Advancements in biotechnologies can have both beneficial and harmful effects on national and global security. Institutions of global governance therefore face the task of developing new rules to place limits or ban research in certain areas of biotechnology and biomedicine and on market supply of their products, as well as of creating the tools of appropriate, agile, and comprehensive control and verification.

In avoiding overemphasis on military security and armed conflicts and a lack of adequate attention to the new, nontraditional threats, global health security must now be regarded as a critical priority. The COVID-19 pandemic has made this quite clear. Both national governments and international organizations may rightly be faulted for paying too little attention to global health security. Specialized agencies with responsibilities in this area have also demonstrated serious shortcomings, especially the World Health Organization (WHO).

Success in ensuring global health security when an epidemic escalates to a pandemic depends, first, on timely and effective government responses where the epidemic first appears; second, on the effectiveness of international mechanisms; and, third, on other governments' stepping up to their responsibilities in regard to a robust health infrastructure. A proper analysis and evaluation of these three components will take time, but even now it is obvious that gaping holes need to be addressed in all of them.

The WHO in particular needs to address flaws in its mechanisms, including project financing, bureaucratic inertia, and tensions between headquarters and regional offices, among others. Member states and the WHO should consider increasing shares of nationally assessed contributions to adequately reduce the organization's dependence on voluntary donations. The substantial imbalances between the two reflect the scarcity of national governments' interest in global health challenges. COVID-19 could reverse this, despite the worldwide economic and financial crunch.

Decisive action is needed to ensure that the WHO and other specialized agencies, as well as the global health system as a whole, work effectively and in a concerted way with national governments. Here, future obligations of national governments, particularly financial commitments, should be allocated and enforced more strictly than they are now.

So far, such commitments can be changed quickly and under various pretexts. It is therefore important, though currently more difficult, to fix resources, both state and nonstate, that would provide funding for a foreseeable period. To address this task with at least some success, interaction and coordination of efforts by leading actors and international agencies are essential.

Stricter national compliance with the 2005 International Health Regulations (IHR) should also be required. The IHR obligates national authorities to report and exchange information on potential threats to ensure timely responses. In the absence of enforcement mechanisms, however, COVID-19 has revealed serious flaws in this regard.

The Group of Seven–Group of Eight has contributed significantly to progress in global health security, particularly in the period of Russia's participation. In addition to supporting specialized agencies, the group advanced initiatives, interacted with state and private donors, and helped promote a certain degree of international discipline. The group's potential and power have recently changed substantially, however. It could be helpful to establish an informal forum focusing more on health security challenges and reenergizing efforts to shape an integrated approach to global health risk management. Other functioning platforms, such as the Group of Twenty, should also give much more attention to the tasks for overcoming these and related challenges.

National governments need to be adequately ready to meet and mitigate the more serious effects of COVID-19 in developing countries as the situation evolves. Even before the pandemic, infectious diseases accounted for almost half of all deaths in poorer countries. COVID-19 is likely

to make the situation worse. This is another major challenge for global risk management. In addition, food security should also be placed higher on the international agenda. Approximately 70 percent of infections originate in food supply chains.

The WHO and national governments should more closely consider and fix preparedness gaps made apparent in the Global Health Security Index, a comprehensive assessment and benchmarking of health security and related capabilities across 195 countries. The tools and methods of evaluating national government actions should be reexamined and expanded to offer more robust monitoring of both warning signs and compliance of national governments with international obligations.

The pandemic also calls for serious reconsideration in areas that are directly, partially, or unrelated to global health security. For example, disruptions in supply chains suggest the need to get rid of overdependence on major producers and suppliers.

As the COVID-19 pandemic unfolds, it is more and more clear that stoppages and disruptions of supply chains could lead to persistent troubles. It is quite probable that foreign businesses have new incentives to gradually phase out excessive dependence on China, including pharmaceutical supplies. Russia, for instance, gets 60 percent of its raw materials for pharmaceutical production from China (and 20 percent from India), and Russia also depends substantially on pharmaceutical end products.

To call COVID-19 a globalization killer, at least for now, appears to be an exaggeration. The crisis could also give a second wind to globalization. The closing of borders, disruption of transborder flows, surge of nationalism, limitation of civil rights, and greater resort to tools of social mobilization and control are all closely associated with the crisis and serve to further it. In both developed and developing countries, people tend to see the pandemic as a time of trial—but also as something that will pass. When the threat recedes and a postcrisis reality emerges, a public demand for demobilization and a return to peacetime practices will inevitably make itself felt.

Nevertheless, the world needs to prepare itself for a rebalancing of the global agenda and a reformatting of international institutions to make them more agile, effective, and transparent. Unless this is done, the opportunity for a Globalization 2.0 may be missed. "Where there's a will, there's a way"—but only if it has institutional mechanisms to make it a reality.

COVID-19 Responses Expose Gaps in Global Governance

Yarik Turianskyi, Deputy Programme Head for African Governance and Diplomacy, South African Institute of International Affairs (South Africa)
Steven Gruzd, Head of the African Governance and Diplomacy Programme, South African Institute of International Affairs (South Africa)
Elizabeth Sidiropoulos, Chief Executive, South African Institute of International Affairs (South Africa)
Neuma Grobbelaar, Director of Research, South African Institute of International Affairs (South Africa)

The world has not experienced the simultaneous and indiscriminate social, health, governance, and economic harm brought on by the COVID-19 virus in more than a hundred years. In the midst of this visceral crisis, the instruments and interventions to combat the disease are falling woefully short. Thus far, the pandemic has exposed not only how far the world is from effective and unified global governance, but also a crisis of confidence in the institutions expected to guide international action and cooperation. Moreover, farsighted and enlightened leadership that emboldens collective action and effective, accountable institutions remains elusive. This is particularly apparent at the World Health Organization (WHO).

The only global health body currently tasked with promoting health worldwide and battling global health emergencies, the WHO is only as strong and effective at its members allow it to be. Criticism about its role in managing COVID-19 therefore needs to be assessed against the measures its members have taken to strengthen and capacitate it to fulfil its mandate.

The WHO is under the spotlight for its perceived slowness to declare the outbreak a pandemic, the initially relaxed approach to international travel restrictions that spurred the spread of the pandemic, contradictory messaging about social distancing and the use of masks, and allegations of undue influence by China.

The most vocal critic has been the United States, which has so far experienced not only unprecedented job losses but also the most cases and related deaths. It is also by far the single largest financial contributor to the WHO and was scheduled to contribute $115.8 million in 2020. It has, however, decided to withdraw its financial support with immediate effect, pending a review into what it calls the body's "role in severely mismanaging and covering up the spread of the coronavirus."

This announcement could read as yet another sign that the United States has given up its role as the guarantor of a rules-based, accountable global governance system. Certainly the statement closely echoes the United States' actions in regard to a range of global institutions and cooperative frameworks and treaties, from the paralysis of the World Trade Organization's dispute settlement mechanism to withdrawing from the Paris Agreement.

Indeed, other governments have also been vocal about the need for a closer review of the WHO, though expressing at the same time the need to continue to support it during the pandemic. An outlier is Australian Prime Minister Scott Morrison, who proposed giving the WHO, or another body, "powers equivalent to those of a weapons inspector to avoid another catastrophic pandemic."

But it is not clear how effective such a body, and presumably the international treaty and associated global governance frameworks, would be. The stalemate at the 2020 Review Conference of the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons (the postponement of which is itself a result of the COVID-19 pandemic) and the track record in Iran despite numerous inspections by the International Atomic Energy Agency are indications that this might not be the most effective way forward.

Most would agree that the time has arrived for a total overhaul of the principles and related commitments that underpin the global governance system. The current global political polarization makes this extremely difficult to realize, however. A realistic approach is therefore needed on what improvements might be possible at the WHO in the next few years, as is exploring what room might exist for an informal process among like-minded states and other actors to begin to consider radical architectural reform.

In the interim, the pandemic should not divert attention from the underlying challenges of global public health, which include the imperatives of stronger and more resilient health systems nationally, regionally, and globally. Whatever immediate interventions are undertaken to deal with COVID-19 should therefore aim to also strengthen national and regional health capacities for the future. Equally, COVID-19 has highlighted that global health emergencies have economic, financial, and social justice elements and that other global institutions need to be part of the response.

The UN Security Council is arguably the critical guarantor of global stability and rulemaking within the world's most representative global body. Except in rare circumstances, global health has not been on the agenda of the Security Council because it has not been regarded as a hard security threat. However, COVID-19 has brought the world to a standstill and raised the specter of significant social and economic instability. The world is yet again facing a tragedy nearing proportions similar to the one that preceded the establishment of the United Nations in 1945. Perhaps it is time to consider a redefinition of what maintenance of international peace and security entails, although the concern among many states, especially in the developing world, would be that expanding the mandate of the Security Council in such a way would mean expanding the veto power of the five permanent members.

One of the important lessons of the Ebola outbreak in 2014 in West Africa was the crucial role trust plays between the national health authorities and citizens in helping combat disease. Trust was enabled by the ability to maintain neutrality across political divides.

In general, trust in public bodies, whether national, regional, or global, is essential to any effective coordinated global response to a crisis. At the global level, such trust has to exist between the institutions mandated to deal with the challenge and states, regional bodies, and private-sector actors. The current polarized response is symptomatic of the dearth of trust in global institutions.

Four measures could be immediately implemented to address the gaps and shortcomings in the response to COVID-19 and to restore the credibility of the global institutions that are supposed to secure global public goods—goods where the benefits and/or costs potentially extend to all countries, people, and generations, and which are non-exclusionary.

The COVID 19 crisis shows that farsighted political leadership—from the United Nations, development finance institutions, and clubs such as the Group of Seven and Group of Twenty (G20)—is essential to ensuring a coordinated and effective policy response to a global crisis. Important immediate elements to such a response include better financial coordination beyond the measures the International Monetary Fund and the G20 have taken so far; flexible financial mechanisms for rapid response measures against the socioeconomic effects of COVID-19; much more technical and financial

support to the WHO; and more scientific and health collaboration, especially on vaccines and drugs, between states and drug companies.

Farsighted leadership also means letting go of the financial stranglehold that drug companies and other manufacturers exercise over the development and manufacturing of COVID-19 vaccines, drugs, and medical equipment. A range of other immediate actions include stepping up the manufacturing of affordable personal protective equipment, medical equipment, and ventilators, and removing trade barriers to enable movement of goods, especially to hard-hit countries in both the developed and developing world.

Consistent messaging and health advice around the world are also critical to consistent application of evidence-based rules and guidelines, such as the wearing of face masks in public places. Relatedly, supporting the generation of reliable data on the spread of the virus is essential to ensuring accountable and effective actions and establishing clear protocols on preventing future global outbreaks.

A careful and independent review is needed on how to address the shortcomings in the WHO's performance. Doing so entails enhancing its capacity to perform the role it is supposed to exercise. This requires, among other things, that members support the expansion of the WHO mandate to be more proactive where a communicable health challenge is suspected. This could help facilitate rapid response missions and independent verification of findings without fear or favor and enforce more frequent and rapid information sharing by states to enable timely actions. This will require states to increase their fixed contributions to the WHO, not only to address the gap created by the absent support from the United States, but also to position the WHO in such a way that it is technically more competent and able to do its job. (It is not enough that less than 30 percent of the WHO's budget comes from fixed contributions of member states.) In addition, where instruments have been created to help finance pandemics, such as the WHO Contingency Fund for Emergencies, member states should adequately fund them.

Responding to the pandemic offers an opportunity to restore confidence in the value of global cooperation, to address the resource and accountability gaps beyond those global institutions tasked directly with the fight against the pandemic, and to ensure that they are infused by a stronger scientific ethos and a capable, effective leadership and technical corps that eschews petty politicking in favor of securing the global public good.

The Effects of COVID-19 and How to Prepare for the Future

Selim Yenel, President, Global Relations Forum (Turkey)

The disease caused by the novel coronavirus, or COVID-19, is the most significant example of globalization. It has changed the world and permeated all aspects of life. It has also made people more aware that their lives are tied to those of others around the world, from economic well-being to health and hygiene. All other aspects of life are suspended.

COVID-19's harm to global health and economics now trumps all other problems. The media hardly reports on the dire situations in Syria, Yemen, and other conflict hot spots. Challenges such as migration do not make the front pages.

The world has a new dichotomy, which some call a trade-off. The balance between bolstering health and the economy has changed the discussion between freedom and security, although they are also closely related. Promoting health is a priority, but the economy is suffering on a massive scale, making it more difficult to make appropriate policy decisions. However, the safety and health of people should not disrupt their freedom. They need to know that certain precautions are only temporary.

Even when this pandemic is brought under control, the control will likely be disparate, changing from country to country. This unevenness could further complicate national economies because those that have contained the virus will hesitate to open their borders—China's COVID-19 response being an excellent example. Therefore, the financial suffering of millions could continue.

PRELIMINARY OBSERVATIONS

Much about COVID-19 remains unknown. What is known about COVID-19 is that it spreads more quickly and expansively than other similar diseases. No consensus has been reached on recommendations for containment. Despite World Health Organization (WHO) guidelines, each country has taken its own independent measures. National responses include implementing quarantines, closing borders, preventing international transportation, and delaying or cancelling sport and cultural events, among others. Yet these policies failed to prevent the number of cases and deaths from increasing.

Global solidarity is lacking. Countries, states, cities, and even small communities have locked down. Each nation is on its own. Cooperation, collaboration, and solidarity have melted away in the face of local concerns. The world has witnessed a breakdown of support within the European Union and even among the states of the United States. Most emerging and developing countries have been left to fend for themselves.

National and international responses have been inadequate. The pandemic has demonstrated that national and international preventive measures as well as cooperation are wanting. Previously, when a

crisis struck, the United States and other Western countries took the lead in finding a way out. No semblance of such action is evident now. International institutions and national governments have failed colossally. The absence of global leadership in the face of a worldwide pandemic is difficult to fathom. International and regional organizations and forums such as the Group of Seven, Group of Twenty, or the BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa) have all failed to rise to the challenge.

International guidance lacked because many national governments either minimized or outright rejected the crisis. Even when the WHO declared COVID-19 a pandemic, denial about the real threat continued in several of the world's most powerful countries. Many leaders thought they could prevail over the virus given their geography, and experts struggled to convince them otherwise. Even when cases and deaths piled up, many governments were still reluctant to believe the severity and contagiousness of the virus. Ignorance is not bliss; it is dangerous.

Transparency has been absent. Because facts are being suppressed, wild assertions and outright false and misleading news are spreading in some countries, causing panic and making preventive measures ineffective. Disagreements on how to contain and treat the virus have only increased confusion in preventing further spread. Disinformation campaigns on social media further exploit the situation and increase disorientation.

Economic uncertainty is growing. The aviation sector was the first to be damaged by the pandemic, and after it, tourism, sports, and cultural events. Closed borders hindered commerce. A chain reaction resulted in a downward spiral in almost all economic categories. Unemployment rose everywhere. Economic recovery will require an increased state role to redress suffering. International financial institutions will be essential to funding these efforts.

Racism and xenophobia are on the rise. As the virus spread from China, racist and xenophobic attitudes toward people of Asian descent and appearance have been prevalent in other countries. Many have been ostracized after being accused as the originators of the pandemic.

Working and studying remotely could become a staple in everyone's lives. Physical workplaces could shrink and, as a result, savings could develop. However, employees' rights have to be protected in these new circumstances. This crisis is pushing the digital economy into the forefront, which produces its own challenges.

The world needs leaders and trust in science. Every global crisis can produce great leaders who are honest and unafraid to tell the truth. This is exactly what the world needs when expertise has been sidelined by disinformation on social media. If convergence in national preventive policies today increases, it is because of the hard truths the pandemic has wrought. Science is making a comeback. Climate change mitigation is a silver lining. As lockdowns spread worldwide, travel is restricted and industries are shutting down or adapting to new consumption behaviors, reducing human harm to the environment.

PREPARING FOR THE FUTURE

COVID-19 is wreaking havoc across the globe, and this outbreak is the shape of things to come. Other natural or manmade disasters will occur in the future and have local, regional, and global repercussions.

Assuming a goal of health for everyone, steps need to be taken to increase cooperation between national and international health agencies. The following measures should be taken to help resolve the current pandemic.

Governments should implement substantial targeted financial market measures. National governments need to shift their economies to war footing. National and international leaders should concentrate on providing the necessary tools for health workers. New budgets should be immediately drawn up to support the industries that have economically suffered the most, particularly small and medium-sized industries, which are the most vulnerable. The liberal world economy could need to make way for more interventionist policies.

Countries need to start preparing without delay for the next disaster. Steps should be considered for mitigating climate change and other possible disasters as well as for global health issues, particularly on how to explain the reasoning for these measures to the public. The world's future will depend on how nations cooperate globally, synchronize efforts, and maximize potential.

Governments and international institutions should emphasize disaster education programs. To prevent panic or complacency, education should start at an early age to inform how to respond and act during disasters. Society should be kept abreast of preparations and ready to deal with any calamity. Proper education in hygiene and personal behavior as well as common sense will be crucial for humanity's survival. Knowledge should be respected.

Governments should be transparent and take responsibility for their actions. Once the pandemic is under control, a general assessment and self-criticism on what took place will be needed. China has a responsibility to fully explain the virus's origin and why measures were delayed. It has made efforts to provide data and assistance to several countries, but if it wants to restore its global image, it should be completely transparent. Two contagious diseases have now emerged from China in less than two decades. It needs to change its habits and enforce more stringent hygiene measures.

Global and national health authorities need to act responsibly and transparently and demonstrate that they are on top of matters to establish trust. COVID-19 cases and deaths should not be hidden. Relying on experts would make measures taken more credible. Medical suppliers and social media users also need to act responsibly to prevent widespread abuse of the vulnerable in this crisis.

The United Nations and WHO should reestablish guidelines on how to approach future disasters. After the pandemic subsides, the different experiences of each country need to be consolidated and evaluated to form a comprehensive set of lessons learned. Institutions such as the United Nations and WHO should help in this approach to future disasters, whether natural or manmade.

The UN General Assembly should organize a special session on how to manage global disasters and should establish a process with future surveillance and monitoring policies to take swift, coordinated action on any future pandemic. International financial institutions should prepare emergency economic packages to support countries that have suffered the most. Political differences need to be overcome, especially those between the biggest economies.

Changes in everyone's lives, permanent or not, will depend on how long the crisis lasts. Solidarity, transparency, and international collaboration are the most essential elements to overcoming adversities. Relying on science is absolutely necessary. National and global leaders need to heed warnings from experts. A new era is just beginning and the sooner the world is ready for the next disaster, the quicker it will be able to overcome it. Otherwise, the next crisis will rearrange everyone's lives just as COVID-19 is doing now.

PART II: COVID-19 AND GLOBAL HEALTH GOVERNANCE

How COVID-19 Could Send Latin America Back in Time

Carlos Javier Regazzoni, Director of the Global Health and Human Security
Committee, Argentine Council on Foreign Relations (Argentina)

Emerging countries desperately need money, equipment, and professional assistance to contain the COVID-19 pandemic, save thousands of lives, and prevent large portions of their populations from falling into catastrophic poverty. This aid can only come from wealthy countries already struggling to cope with the novel respiratory infectious disease. In Latin America, internal political turmoil, severe governance problems, and ambiguous foreign policy will hamper this indispensable aid and international collaboration.

The strategic culture of Argentina has been characterized by a "recurring pattern of making foreign policy decisions to shore up" domestic political support without accepting the consequences of its international actions. The same could be said for many (if not all) Latin American nations. These problematic dynamics have affected International Monetary Fund policies in local economies, commercial relationships with the European Union, and other multilateral collaborations with the West and Asia. If Latin American countries are to successfully respond to the COVID-19 crisis, these dynamics, especially procrastination on domestic political conflicts, will need to be replaced be a renewed commitment to international cooperation.

THE RICH SHOULD NOT FORGET THE POOR

First detected in Wuhan, the capital of central China's Hubei province, COVID-19 then spread to the rest of Asia, Europe, Africa, and the United States. Until now, global focus on its effects has concentrated on the most powerful economies in the world. It remains to be seen what will happen when the full effects reach less-prosperous shores. History shows us how widely regional effects can diverge: during the 1918 flu pandemic, the death rate was thirty-one times higher in the central provinces of India than in the U.S. state of Wisconsin. Nearly 50 percent of that variance can be independently explained by per capita income. Studies further showed that a 10 percent increase in per capita income was associated with a 10 percent decrease in mortality. This should raise the alarm about the potential consequences of COVID-19 in Latin America, Africa, and India, and points to wealth disparities as a central problem behind globalization, and for any possible global health governance response.

In Latin America, COVID-19 was initially a high-income disease linked to international travel, but has now spread aggressively to the low-income population. Its harms will be amplified by the high numbers of elderly people living in poverty, the more than 15 percent of the general population living in shantytowns, and the extremely fragile health-care systems throughout Latin America. Govern-

ments, in most cases already facing chronic fiscal deficits and uncertain economic growth, have mobilized their scarce resources to abate an unendurable recession fueled by adverse international conditions and the local consequences of mandatory social distancing. Latin American governments, however, will not be able to domestically solve a problem that is global in nature. This is a test for global governance, and, if the international system fails, the world will certainly be confronted with another round of intense and long-lasting impoverishment among Latin American nations.

FIGHT GLOBAL, NOT LOCAL

Emerging countries are fighting this pandemic alone, and their efforts will be hampered by inadequate economic means and health-care capacity. Richer nations are focused on containing their local outbreaks, but this is a global crisis. Using the 1918 flu pandemic model, if the same outbreak were to occur today, emerging countries would bear 92 percent of the world's deaths. The next few months will determine whether COVID-19 fulfills that prophecy, but by then it may be too late for the world to change course. Unusually busy gravediggers in Villa Formosa in Sao Paulo, Brazil; retirees crowded at the doors of banks to get their meager pensions in Buenos Aires, Argentina; and corpses in the streets of poor neighborhoods in Guayaquil, Ecuador, suggest that this gloomy outcome is well on its way.

The COVID-19 pandemic will forever change the world order. Even the most powerful nations will be unable to meet the unprecedented health and social challenges alone. This universal interdependence further suggests the need and responsibility to collaborate. Effective globalization depends on continuous progress toward democratization and development, and the failure of one will cause the other to collapse as well.

Countries in Latin America should restructure existing domestic and regional health governance institutions. Regional governments should prioritize and build up outbreak tracing and disease modeling on a national, regional, and global level to promote early warning and collaboration across borders. Additionally, development plans will need to be designed with an eye toward regional health-care goals. International organizations can play a role in these reforms by creating appropriate incentives. For example, many countries struggle to be admitted into the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). Tying membership accession to the OECD's guiding principles and promotion of social welfare, scientific research, innovation empowerment, and cross-country health and science collaboration could create more incentives for establishing regional and global collaboration. The role of institutions such as the Pan-American Health Organization should also be reinforced by close collaboration with international science institutions based in North America, Asia, and Europe.

Additionally, although border restrictions have been widely implemented to restrict the spread of COVID-19, the longer they remain in place, the more they will undermine years of regional integration. Further, the need for crossing borders does not stop at individuals. Global programs are needed to fuel the transfer of health-care technology as well. Broadly speaking, this epidemic is fought mostly with primitive weapons (quarantine and cordon sanitaire); a modern approach based on information technology and artificial intelligence will be necessary to facilitate the required collective behaviors. If these behaviors are not implemented soon, much of the progress in many republics will be reversed.

Such efforts need the leadership of rich nations together with a spirit of collaboration with emerging countries.

THE WORLD NEEDS A LEADER

The world is in disarray and requires a clear global vision of what needs to be done. In his dialogue "The Statesman," Plato develops the idea that God from time to time lets humans alone govern the world, to the point where catastrophe follows excessively indulgent human behaviors. But "beholding it in its troubles, and anxious for it lest it sinks racked by storms and confusion . . . he takes control of the helm once more." COVID-19 has exposed the well-recognized and deep disorders of this world, disorders that need to be repaired. Nothing will prove more effective than values-based leadership, science, and collaboration.

It is time to consider what COVID-19 "reveals about the political systems that respond to it," at both the national and the global level. If it is true that "the need to control plagues helped create the modern state," then a failure to command the current crisis globally would seriously harm the world order. This outcome could vary greatly in its effects, leaving some regions in better shape than others. In the end, though, the great dream of a globalization that promotes a common human destiny would remain unfulfilled. For Latin America, it would certainly mean falling back to a more primitive age.

Toward a Resilient Global Public Health Cooperation Framework

Chen Dongxiao, President, Shanghai Institutes for International Studies (China)
Lu Chuanying, Senior Fellow, Institute for Global Governance Studies, Shanghai Institutes for International Studies (China)

The COVID-19 pandemic is both a world health crisis and a stress test for global health cooperation, exposing a glaring deficit in global health governance. As the virus continues its march across the world, it is time for the world to build an effective and resilient global public health system.

LEADERSHIP, COORDINATION, AND GOVERNANCE IN SHORT SUPPLY

The crisis has revealed a global health leadership vacuum. Given the limited resources at its disposal and even less political support from national governments, the World Health Organization (WHO) is unable to fulfill its anticipated role of leading international antivirus efforts. In the absence of effective multilateral coordination in a global pandemic, governments are obliged to rely on themselves; countries with limited health resources and capabilities are largely left to their own devices.

International containment efforts are undermined by virus-induced politicization and stigmatization. The spread of a largely unknown respiratory virus has far outpaced traditional containment efforts. Conspiracy theories about it only fan the flames of racism and xenophobia. The blame game and finger pointing have poisoned great power relations, further hobbling global antivirus efforts and potentially sparking broad and deep economic and social crises.

Science is being subordinated by politics. A science-based approach is critical to containment efforts against infectious diseases. In the current crisis, however, scientific knowledge and advice have been neither fully respected nor heeded. Political, economic, and security considerations have led to suboptimal policies and caused immeasurable losses.

Megacity health systems are under strain, further undermining containment efforts. Increasing population density and mobility resulting from deepening globalization are presenting new challenges for pandemic containment. Although megacities have advanced health-care services and public health emergency capabilities, decision-makers need to fully consider the political, economic, social, and security ramifications of any major restrictive measures amid health emergencies, making city governance all the more difficult in times of crisis.

ELEMENTS OF AN EFFECTIVE AND RESILIENT HEALTH COOPERA-TION FRAMEWORK

The world needs an updated global health security concept. Infectious diseases may be caused by environmental change and pathogens, but their extent and magnitude are exacerbated by an outdated health security concept and the absence of effective health cooperation. In a globalized world, no country can stay immune to a global pandemic or fight one alone. The world is in dire need of an updated global health security concept to help overcome the cycle of neglect and panic. Health security for all humanity can only be achieved when nations can act on an urgent sense of shared fate, mutual obligations, and greater solidarity.

Nations should reaffirm the centrality of the United Nations and the WHO and further empower them to create an effective and robust public health governance architecture. In a world of proliferating public health threats, it takes considerable strategic foresight and political will on the part of national leaders to erect a robust governance architecture in which extensive and effective health cooperation can be carried out under the principles of equality and mutual respect. A global health security strategy is needed whereby policies and mechanisms for global health crises can be established through consultation and coordination. The centrality of the United Nations and the WHO, its specialized health agency, should be reaffirmed and further empowered in global health governance. Simultaneously, new channels for global health cooperation should be explored. The leadership vacuum must be filled to facilitate collective action on epidemic prevention, monitoring, and response.

Nations should enhance the WHO's International Health Regulations (IHR) to strengthen national public health capabilities. Given the complexities of the global health landscape, the IHR needs to be revised to strengthen its enforcement mechanisms. National governments should honor their commitments under the IHR by increasing health investments and personnel training, improving interagency coordination, establishing new health partnerships, and enhancing health emergency preparedness. The United Nations and its specialized agencies should increase financial and technical assistance to developing countries, just as developed countries and the developing world need to overcome their disagreements to jointly build a robust global public health system.

Nations should improve funding mechanisms for global public health. Inadequate funding is an outstanding problem for global health security and a major contributing factor to inadequate emergency preparedness in low- and middle-income countries. Funding mechanisms need to be put in place to increase investments in national public health security in such nations. At the same time, a global public health emergency reserve fund and corresponding rapid disbursement mechanism should be set up to facilitate rapid response and early intervention in the event of a major health emergency.

The WHO should strengthen monitoring, warning, and joint responses to global health threats. The WHO's Global Outbreak Alert and Response Network initiative (GOARN) should be improved to pave the way for a global public health emergency alert and response system so that monitoring

and information sharing can be conducted on a global scale to foster closer international coordination. Meanwhile, a health emergency joint-action program should be established for global health emergencies, under which national contingents of first responders can conduct joint simulation exercises on a regular basis to evaluate national, regional, and global preparedness and response capabilities. To improve the efficiency of such a program, related deployment and authorization mechanisms need to be introduced so that multilateral assistance will be readily available when cross-border and global health crises occur.

Countries should optimize their public health resource reserves and allocation systems to build a worldwide medical product stockpile and resilient supply chain. Public health resources should be increased to create a global strategic stockpile. At the same time, the world also needs a reliable and resilient global medical product supply chain. It should be coupled with sound logistics and management to ensure the worldwide availability of urgently needed medical materials in the event of a health crisis. International scientific collaboration should be increased to facilitate technological innovation in drug resistance research. Countries should establish a public health technology bank to ensure the reliable supply of diagnostic kits, vaccines, and treatments.

The COVID-19 pandemic has proven once again that all nations share weal and woe. China should continue to support the WHO's active leadership in the global coronavirus combat, and stand ready to work with the health body and other countries to make greater contributions to global health security.

COVID-19: Public Health Is a Question of National Security

Kriti Kapur, Junior Fellow, Observer Research Foundation (India)
Shoba Suri, Senior Fellow, Observer Research Foundation (India)

Throughout history, the spread of infectious disease has killed millions, sickened billions, and cost trillions of dollars of global economic output. As the world now struggles to combat the novel coronavirus, it faces the grim reality that it is not just developing countries, but developed ones, that require revitalized and better-coordinated health systems. It is now clear that COVID-19 is a deadly contagion that threatens the livelihoods of all, regardless of socioeconomic status.

Pandemics and epidemics have increased in recent years, catalyzed by globalization, climate change, and rapidly growing populations. Although countries pledged to develop health-care capacity at a global, national, and local level in the wake of previous epidemics, few have achieved the necessary provisions. The resources devoted to mitigating health risks have remained anemic. When health crises hit, they have been managed with dedication and the allocation of essential funds, but are often forgotten after the risks fade. This has left the world vulnerable to pandemics. In 2006, the World Bank estimated that a normal virulent flu could reduce global economic output by almost 5 percent, effectively causing a global recession, assuming the efforts to limit the disease were as ineffective as previous attempts.

The COVID-19 pandemic, thought to have begun in November 2019, has spread to more than two hundred countries and territories, affecting the health of more than 2.5 million people and the well-being of countless others. The UN Trade and Development agency estimates that the slowdown associated with COVID-19 could cost the global economy up to $2 trillion.

Six months after the novel coronavirus first appeared to have infected humans, several deficiencies in the global response became clear. Recent months have seen considerable misinformation and disinformation circulating among global partners, which has limited the world's ability to efficiently and effectively respond to the crisis.

COVID-19: WHAT WAS DONE AND WHAT THE WORLD SHOULD DO

The first need is the development of a well-rounded health-care system, covering the critical aspects of universal health coverage. After that, how multilateral agencies, policymakers, societies, and individuals coordinate and communicate during a crisis is vital.

Transparency and Knowledge Sharing

The primary flaw in the COVID-19 response has been the opacity in knowledge sharing. China is the first country to claim to have successfully flattened the curve. Research suggests that China's non-pharmaceutical interventions, such as travel bans, social distancing, isolation, and contact tracing, were effective in containing the outbreak.

The same study, however, indicates that had China taken more ardent measures to contain the spread of the virus earlier, the number of cases could have been curtailed by almost 95 percent. China's actions and inactions led to an explosion in global infections. It repeated claims against human-to-human transmission, delayed sharing critical information, suppressed research about the virus, and allowed travel within the country despite knowing the threat.

Effective global health governance depends on national transparency and coordination. One approach to efficient management during a pandemic is clarifying the definition of transparency to encourage communication. In an era of globalization, each country has a responsibility toward the regional and global communities it benefits from.

Strengthening Global Mechanisms

During health crises, the world looks to the primary global health agency, the World Health Organization (WHO), for guidance. Surprisingly, the WHO's response to COVID-19 was lacking. Although the body had once warned that caution and vigilance were necessary against any future Sudden Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS)-like disease, it ignored this advice in late 2019 when managing the mysterious pneumonia in Wuhan, China. For months, it failed to recommend travel restrictions or bans. This lackluster response meant that the window of opportunity to tackle the pandemic was missed, raising questions about the WHO's credibility.

The world needs an unbiased and strict monitoring mechanism to protect people's rights and health. The WHO seems caught in the crossfire of a political battle among global powers, which has limited its ability to act effectively. Prudent and proactive emergency responses are needed to tackle any health emergency that may emerge. An appropriate and active auditing system to ensure that multilateral agencies as well as countries and policymakers are held accountable for their actions is essential.

Medical Advancement and Innovation

In 2005, Bill Gates warned that, due to inadequate investment in epidemic prevention, a highly contagious infection, rather than war, would be the most likely cause of millions of deaths worldwide. The expansive spread of COVID-19 and its asymptomatic nature underscores Gates's alarm.

A critical pillar of tackling a pandemic is innovation and advancement in medical research. This has been sorely lacking. Such advancements have seen meager monetary support, and have been duly ignored by heads of state. In 2005, China was warned against the use of wet markets because the conditions lead to a higher probability of infections transferring from animals to humans. The increasing popularity of consuming exotic animals in China and the prevalence of SARS-like viruses in these animals was referred to as a ticking time bomb. These warnings were ignored.

Preparedness for an epidemic requires a trilateral design. First, scientists need to rapidly create the epidemiological, genomic, and clinical data of the disease. Second, international actors and states need to record the progress of disease containment, focusing on monitoring a state's capacity to tackle the situation. Third, tracking the progress on vaccinations and diagnostics is essential to identifying barriers in production and equitable distribution. Global leaders, multilateral institutions, private organizations, and donors should ensure adequate investment in medical research, vaccine development, and epidemiological and genome mapping to strengthen the efficacy of the health system to contain widespread diseases.

Capacity Building

COVID-19 has rendered some of the better health systems in the world inoperable. A country's first line of defense is the capability of its health system to detect and control contagious diseases. Underinvestment in preparedness and reliance on treatment rather than a preemptive response has proven costly in terms of lives and dollars.

Addressing a swiftly spreading pandemic requires having readily available high volumes of medical facilities and health workers proportionate to the population. Most countries have not devoted the necessary funds or consideration to developing these requirements. Immediate action and attention from policymakers is needed.

Consequently, given the world's vast population, community-level capacity building is also needed. Communities should be prepared to educate, provide for, and undertake strict measures to curb the spread of infectious diseases. Governments should educate and prepare communities by conducting routine simulations. In addition to devoting the necessary domestic resources for infrastructure development, governments should also invest in preparedness to maintain global and national security.

Global Coordination

A pandemic that has infected millions of people cannot be mitigated using unilateral approaches. The novel coronavirus has led countries to ban not only the movement of people but also the equipment needed to combat and contain it, such as personal protective equipment. Governments are primarily responsible for their populations, but a global crisis calls for solidarity.

Countries should build their national health systems and promote medical research and innovation. Countries also need to develop systems that share necessary epidemiological and genomic data, vaccines, and other medical countermeasures. At this crucial time, policymakers and communities should support each other and the vulnerable groups around them.

A pandemic is a global problem that requires a global resolution. Administrative setbacks, lack of coordination, and deficient communication can cost the world the valuable time needed to save lives.

Enhancing International and Regional Cooperation to Mitigate the Effects of the COVID-19 Pandemic: A View From Indonesia

Philips Vermonte, Executive Director, Centre for Strategic and International Studies (Indonesia)
Yose Rizal Damuri, Head of Economics Department, Centre for Strategic and International Studies (Indonesia)
Shafiah Muhibat, Head of International Relations Department, Centre for Strategic and International Studies (Indonesia)

The COVID-19 pandemic has forced countries to face a twofold challenge: protecting the health of their populations and of their economies. To meet this challenge, they and the world need to bolster cooperative efforts on two parallel fronts: strengthening international economic cooperation and enhancing the implementation of global health regulations.

ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES OF THE PANDEMIC

COVID-19's immediate economic consequences are severe and wide-ranging. Countries that implement mass quarantine and lockdowns have seen their economic activities dwindle and their unemployment rates soar. The situation is even more serious in developing countries that have massive informal sectors. Many are also struggling to handle the increased unemployment resulting from inadequate social protection systems.

The uncertainty surrounding the duration and intensity of the pandemic will only prolong the economic consequences. The economic shutdown, together with dwindling demand due to a loss of employment and inevitable consumption delays, is greatly diminishing business revenue. These in turn pressure banking and financial institutions, and any financial crisis will make the economic recovery more difficult. Even under a best-case scenario, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) estimates economic growth to drop to 2.4 percent in 2020 and predicts a recovery only next year—provided the outbreak is mild and can be contained. The current uncertainty makes the situation difficult to predict. If the pandemic continues, the OECD's more pessimistic modeling forecasts global economic growth at only 1.5 percent, warning many major economies (such as Japan and the eurozone) of a recession, indicating a prolonged economic recovery.

Given all this, international cooperation is needed more than ever, in at least four areas.

The World Health Organization (WHO) and major powers should help facilitate global resource-pooling and technical assistance to countries with limited capacities. The pandemic makes it clear that countries are competing to secure supplies of medical equipment. Such competition exacerbates the crisis.

The major powers and international financial institutions should provide economic assistance to poorer countries, which face dire economic consequences. When demand is dwindling, government intervention

can help. Unfortunately, most developing country governments do not have the fiscal space for such interventions. The World Bank has prepared a $14 billion package of fast-track financing to assist countries in their efforts to prevent, detect, and respond to the rapid spread of COVID-19. Many developing countries, though, need even more financial resources to sustain their economies during the outbreak. Additional and faster multilateral commitments are needed.

National governments should coordinate fiscal interventions. Individual countries have begun to initiate economic stimulus packages. The United States, for example, implemented a $2 trillion program. Smaller countries have launched their own. All of these programs, however, will have global economic consequences, especially when a program is as large as that of the United States. This can adversely affect global financial and capital markets and hamper prospects for economic recovery. An internationally coordinated economic stimulus program is needed to keep harmful effects to a minimum.

National governments, multilateral and regional forums, and international institutions should increase cooperation and keep nationalism and protectionism at bay. In a crisis, economic nationalism and protectionism tend to increase. Countries should practice the opposite and take cooperation even further, including increasing international trade. Cutting tariff and nontariff barriers facilitates the logistics of necessary products to deal with the pandemic and to support immediate economic needs. It also prompts faster recovery by promoting demand and ensuring supply.

International cooperation can be facilitated at various multilateral and regional forums. The Group of Twenty Leaders' Statement in March calling for greater cooperation in safeguarding the global economy was an encouraging sign. It needs, though, to be translated into concrete action in close collaboration with other international institutions. The World Bank could also provide a platform for greater assistance to poorer countries. In addition, countries should accelerate all trade initiatives currently being discussed at the World Trade Organization.

Members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), together with other countries in the East Asia and Pacific region, could play a more important role in promoting cooperation, partly because they have been better at containing COVID-19 and have suffered less economic damage. The region has a long history of economic cooperation, including the recent conclusion of one of the world's biggest trade agreements, the Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AND HEALTH REGULATIONS

Once the dust from COVID-19 settles, international health regulation frameworks need to be reexamined to account for the lessons learned from the collective experiences in fighting the pandemic.

COVID-19's effects have become so far reaching that almost no country can deal with it alone. Four issues are especially important to consider.

Existing international frameworks for global health cooperation should address interconnectivity. The current pandemic shows that countries with both strong and weak health systems are almost equally vulnerable. The sources of this vulnerability are domestic and international, and are intertwined, given the globalized nature of the world today. Existing frameworks should reflect that.

The International Health Regulations (IHR), adopted during the fifty-eighth World Health Assembly in 2005, is one such framework—a benchmark against which to examine countries' capacity and readiness to prevent, detect, and respond to public health threats.

The IHR requires all member states to embed the framework into their national surveillance systems, which are examined annually by the WHO joint external evaluation (JEE), an independent team of experts. The JEE also requires member countries to define their national action plans for health security.

The IHR, however, has no enforcement mechanism. A stronger global surveillance system for certain aspects of the IHR needs to be devised, particularly for matters on which inadequate capacities would endanger member countries. One such aspect is the ability to detect, respond to, and inform domestic health events—an infectious disease breakout, for example. Failure to share related information in a timely manner could have catastrophic consequences.

The Global Health Security Agenda's (GHSA) role should be expanded. Under the GHSA, member countries make new, concrete commitments to improve their capacity to prevent, detect, and respond to infectious disease threats. It also provides support through collaboration and information sharing to help countries fulfill the requirements defined by the IHR. This coalition of committed countries should be expanded, and assistance from advanced-capacity nations increased. A more robust and independent assessment mechanism such as the World Bank's Health Security Financing Assessment Tool and the WHO's joint external evaluation should be put in place to help member countries increase their readiness.

Regional organizations need to increase their investment in infrastructure, capacity-building, and human resources development in public health and health security. Relative to global organizations, which are often too complex, regional organizations are better situated to understand the national contexts of their member states, and therefore to lead the way to better and more efficient cooperation. Regional organizations could also help support the implementation of existing global frameworks such as the IHR or GHSA.

ASEAN's dialogue partnerships is one example. The partnership helps connect ASEAN with ten parties through initiatives such as the ASEAN Plus Three, which connects ASEAN with China, South Korea, and Japan. During this crisis, dialogue partners have been responsive and quick to act. For example, the Special ASEAN-China Foreign Ministers' Meeting on Coronavirus Disease convened twelve foreign ministers as early as February 20 to seek a coordinated effort to combating COVID-19.

ASEAN's health ministers also convened a video conference to intensify regional cooperation. The conference was also attended by officials from the WHO regional offices for Southeast Asia and Western Pacific. Linking regional organizations with the WHO through its regional offices will be the way forward.

National governments and regional and international organizations should focus on the eight core areas identified in the IHR. IHR's eight core areas are policy and legislation, coordination, surveillance, preparedness and readiness, response, risk communication, human resources, and fully functioning labs. Enhancing cooperation, increasing investment, and syncing collaboration in these areas will help contain this pandemic and make the world better prepared for the next one.

COVID-19 and Global Governance: Waking Up to a Safe New World

Mely Caballero-Anthony, Head of the Centre for Non-Traditional Security Studies, S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (Singapore)

The COVID-19 pandemic has infected millions and killed more than two hundred thousand globally. After months of shutting borders and imposing lockdowns in desperate efforts to stop the spread of the disease, countries are now starting to ease restrictions and reopen for business.

COVID-19 is a once-in-a-lifetime threat to humanity that has inflicted immeasurable suffering on billions of people. Yet, as the collateral damage unfolds, the response has been astounding for at least two reasons.

First, the difference in national responses to COVID-19, even among developed countries, could not be more stark. Most of the Group of Seven (G7) nations, where rapid responses to prevent and stop the virus were expected, instead demonstrated denial, inaction, and delay. The numbers tell the story: the United States, France, Italy, Japan, and the United Kingdom are responsible for almost two-thirds of the total cases of infection and deaths. Meanwhile, the governments in Hong Kong, New Zealand, Singapore, South Korea, and Taiwan have fared much better and are now setting standards for pandemic preparedness and rapid and effective responses.

Second, some countries are politicizing the pandemic. The United States, Germany, Japan, and the United Kingdom are blaming China for its lack of transparency and want to hold it accountable for allowing the virus to spread globally. Speculations about the origins of the virus are adding further political controversies. U.S. President Donald J. Trump accused the World Health Organization (WHO) of being slow to warn the world about the real threat level and for being an apologist for China. Japanese Deputy Prime Minister Taro Aso even referred to the WHO as CHO, the China Health Organization. Trump went a step further and halted U.S. funds to the WHO. His decision is part of his strategy to deflect responsibility for his administration's mishandling of the crisis. Other world leaders' proposals for a postmortem of WHO actions reflect a palpable disquiet with its management of the pandemic.

SECURITY AND THE POLITICS OF GLOBAL HEALTH GOVERNANCE

The pandemic has highlighted the lack of appreciation by leaders and policymakers for the increasing threat of emerging infectious diseases to national security. Outbreaks of highly pathogenic pandemics like COVID-19 are regarded as black swan events—low probability and high

impact. Not since the 9/11 terrorist attacks in the United States has the importance of preparing for black swan events become so consequential to national security planning around the globe.

The entrenched views of what constitutes a threat to national security are often skewed toward military threats such as weapons of mass destruction. Thus, military and defense expenditures trump improvements in health-care systems. It is not surprising that even in less-developed countries, defense and military expenditures are much higher than health-care systems, which make up only about 10 percent of total government expenditure. Moreover, interest in biosecurity is focused more on preventing biological threats coming from deliberate and malicious use of dangerous pathogens than on emerging infectious diseases.

The pandemic is also a reminder that health security is critical to national security, and that countries with weak health systems are poorly equipped to mount a strong defense against the massive onslaught of an unseen enemy. Pouring funds into building up sophisticated military surveillance capabilities is no match for and of little value to the much-needed global and national diseases surveillance systems that can prevent, detect, trace, and respond to a rapidly spreading virus with lethal potency.

In the aftermath of COVID-19, it may do well for countries to bring health security—the freedom from diseases and access for all to primary health care—back to mainstream national security thinking, which currently prioritizes military threats over others. In this time of crisis, the world should heed UN Secretary-General Antonio Guterres's urgent plea to "end the sickness of war and fight the disease that is ravaging our world. . . . Time to put armed conflict on lockdown and focus together on the true fight of our lives."

SECURITY AND GLOBAL ECONOMIC GOVERNANCE

The rapid spread of COVID-19 has dealt a devastating blow to people's lives and economic security. As businesses shut and international travel came to a halt, COVID-19 was no longer just a health crisis but also an economic crisis of global proportion. The International Monetary Fund considers this economic crisis more severe than the 2008 global financial crisis, and the worst recession since the Great Depression of the 1930s.

The failure to avert the twofold crises is a failure of global leadership and governance. Increasing U.S.-China tensions are also hampering efforts to deal with the crisis. The nature of global leadership required to deal with this global health crisis, however, is predicated on effective leadership at the national level. Arguably, the Trump administration's prevarication and lack of action, as well as the lack of transparency by the Chinese government and its local administration, have had global consequences, costing lives and jeopardizing economic security.

COVID-19 exposes the deep fault lines in international economic governance, which is marked by widening income disparities. The lockdowns have seriously disrupted food and manufacturing supply chains and increased the insecurities of employment in the gig economy. The pandemic has also heightened the vulnerabilities of migrant workers, whose protection and well-being are

not necessarily guaranteed given that global norms of social protection are not widely institutionalized. The only bright spot is the major advances in digital technologies that enable greater interconnectedness via online platforms. Were it not for these technological developments, the lockdowns would have had even more severe consequences.

The development of stronger national health systems can not only improve basic health-care services, but also strengthen the economic resilience of both developed and developing countries. An infectious disease outbreak in one state can easily spiral into a global health emergency and cripple national, regional, and global economies. Asian countries that bore the scars from outbreaks such as Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) in 2003 and H1N1 in 2009 have made health security and economic cooperation important components of regional partnerships. For example, Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) countries and ASEAN Plus Three (China, Japan, and South Korea) have established programs on information sharing, capacity building in technical expertise, and a regional task force for highly pathogenic pandemics.

ENVISIONING A POST-COVID WORLD

The world faces a long road ahead to ending COVID-19. David Nabarro, the WHO's COVID-19 envoy, has stressed that until a reliable vaccine is found and can be made available, which could take eighteen months, people need to learn to live with the virus. Much needs to be done to make the world COVID-ready, particularly given the latest warning of the U.S. Centers for Disease Control that a second wave of the pandemic could occur and be more fatal.

At the national level, pandemic fatigue must not be allowed to set in at a time when medical services have to be scaled up to contain and mitigate the spread of the virus. This requires sustained vigilance and increased efforts in detecting, isolating, and treating COVID-19 cases. The examples set by Germany and South Korea in conducting thousands of readily available tests daily are instructive.

Given that countries differ in their capacity to deal with pandemics, the importance of multilateral cooperation cannot be overemphasised. At the regional level, existing frameworks of cooperation such as information and data sharing of disease surveillance and control should be strengthened. Capacity-building programs that need to be addressed include both ramping up scientific and medical expertise, laboratories, and diagnostics, and training a highly qualified health-care workforce, among others. Countries should also increase high-level collaboration and partnerships to pool expertise, akin to establishing a global corps of medical experts.

Among ASEAN and ASEAN Plus Three countries, three areas of cooperation are noteworthy. First is the creation of an ASEAN response fund for health emergencies to address shortages of medical supplies such as test kits and personal protective equipment, as well as funding research into vaccines and other therapeutics. Second is the establishment of a regional stockpile for essential medical supplies that can be readily deployed for emergency needs. Third is preservation of open markets for trade and investments, which ensures the resilience of supply chains for essential goods such as food, medicines, medical supplies, and other essential products.

Keeping supply chains open in a health emergency is critical, especially seeing how other countries have suffered due to a lack of access to vital medical goods. Doing so necessitates lifting export bans and eliminating tariffs and other trade barriers. This is a life-saving agenda that policymakers around the world need to immediately focus on.

In the fight against this pandemic, international institutions are essential pillars of global health governance. International support for the WHO should therefore continue, despite its shortcomings. Concerted efforts for reform of the WHO should be an imperative going forward. In these extraordinary times, good health is good politics and international cooperation and solidarity is the only game in town.