

Prospects for the G8 Sea Island Summit

John Kirton
Director, G8 Research Group
University of Toronto
Draft of May 31, 2004

Paper prepared for a conference on “Security, Prosperity and Freedom: Why America Needs the G8,” Kelly School of Business, University of Indiana, Bloomington, Indiana, June 3–4, 2004. The author gratefully acknowledges the research contribution of Nikolai Roudev, Abby Slinger and the G8 Research Group, and the financial support of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, through the “After Anarchy” project, for the research on which this paper is in part based.

Introduction

From June 8 to 10, 2004, President George W. Bush will host the 30th annual summit of the Group of Eight major market democracies, at Sea Island, Georgia in the Cloister hotel. How successful is this Sea Island Summit likely to be?

This is an unusually difficult question to answer. The G8, unique among international institutions, is a system deliberately designed, delivered and driven by leaders, who can and do determine — even during the summit — what they want to discuss and decide. Without a formal legal charter or any international bureaucracy below, there is no one to tell these top leaders of the world’s most powerful countries what they must or should do. Among G8 leaders U.S. presidents are historically the last to plan and prepare for the annual summit, and George Bush has proven to be an all-American leader in this regard. Only once before — in 1976 — has a U.S. president hosted a summit in a presidential election year, giving few guidelines for assessing how he will and should use this high-profile display of international leadership in global governance for maximum domestic electoral effect. And that occasion — a Republican president hosting a G8 summit at an upscale resort hotel on America’s Atlantic seaboard five months before the November presidential election — produced a D– summit, and five months later the President went down to electoral defeat at home.

Within the mainstream scholarly literature, no fewer than nine major competing models now purport to explain what makes a G8 summit a high-performing success. Among these, the concert equality model, developed during the post-cold war years to explain the cadence of G8 governance for an ever more complex, globalized world, has now secured the strongest empirical support from systematic testing (Kirton 2004, 2003a). As Appendix A suggests, the model provides a portrait, not of “America the victorious” in the long cold war, but of “America the vulnerable” to shocks from elusive enemies that are everywhere, that kill Americas at home, that the United Nations system or America alone cannot defend against, and that require the full co-operation of all of America’s G8 allies to defeat. Getting the collaboration of this highly capable, continuing “coalition of the willing,” with countries all committed to democratic principles, and with leaders allowed by their citizens to act abroad in their defence, requires an America within the G8 able to listen to, learn from and adjust to what its G8 allies want. Only then does effective G8-centred global governance flow forth, and America, its G8 partners — and, arguably, the world as a whole — emerge better off.

As the Sea Island Summit approaches, the prevailing conditions on forces highlighted by the concert equality model promise that this G8 gathering will be a substantially successful summit, across an increasingly broad array of areas now on the agenda. Sea Island also has the potential to be a summit of genuinely historic significance, if President Bush, along with his G8 partners and their outside guests, can show the personal and political skills to pull off an expansive version of the highly ambitious summit centrepiece — a Greater Middle East Initiative (GMEI) to bring the democratic revolution to the last holdout region in the world. Propelling these G8 leaders toward a successful summit are several forces — the rising performance of the summit over the past 30 years, the momentum from the Evian Summit last year, the growing strength of the Sea Island preparatory process, the recent energy and terrorist shocks

reminding America and its allies of their common vulnerability, the failure of the UN or U.S. alone in response, the still predominant and equalizing capability of G8 countries, and the fidelity of Sea Island central agenda to the core G8 principles of globally promoting open democracy, individual liberty and social advance. Yet the low and falling domestic political capital of host President Bush and most of his colleagues, and the large number of visitors and issues to be dealt with in one of the shortest summits of all time, will severely test the ability of these leaders, when left alone, to be leaders, and make history in a Middle East and beyond.

The Push from the Promising Past

The G8 and America's Growing Global Governance Effectiveness, 1975–2003

The first promising sign for Sea Island is that the annual G7 and now G8 summit has shown a rising trend of performance over the past 30 years. As shown by Appendix B, since its 1975 start, the G8 has put in an increasing and recently high performance on most of its major functions (Kirton 2004). The duration of its deliberations, measured in days, jumped to three days in 1982, and leapt last year to four days if the G8 leader's back-to-back meetings in St. Petersburg and Evian are combined. Its directional function of setting new principles and norms, measured roughly by the number of words in the leaders' concluding communiqués, jumped up in 1996 to a generally sustained high level ever since. Its decisional functional of making collective commitments also did so, reaching a new peak of 206 commitments at Evian in 2003. During the past decade, the delivery of these commitments through compliance by G8 members with them has been higher than in earlier years. The G8 has also been more active since 1995 in the development of global governance, most clearly by creating and directing G8 bodies of its own. This portrait of overall rising performance is confirmed, as Appendix C shows, by the higher scores awarded by the master grader of the summits, Sir Nicholas Bayne, to the summits in recent years.

To be sure, these grades suggest that the United States has consistently put in a relatively poor performance as a summit host, and that America's best effort came long ago when Ronald Reagan hosted at Williamsburg in 1983. But a broader look across all the individual summit functions shows that American-hosted summits have been on a rising trend. This was broadly true for George Bush's Houston Summit in 1990, and even more so, especially on compliance, for Bill Clinton's Denver Summit in 1997.

The Momentum from Evian 2003

This long-term rise in G8 summit performance has intensified year since the French-hosted Evian Summit of June 1–3, 2004. As Appendix D shows, Evian produced a record high of 206 commitments, across a wide array of economic, transnational-global and political-security fields. While not nearly as potent as the US\$50 billion raised at the Canadian-hosted Kananaskis Summit in 2002, Evian did mobilize some new money to help put its commitments into effect, as Appendix E details.

Compliance with the priority commitments made at Evian suggests that promises made have been promises well kept. Appendix F indicates that at the halfway mark between the Evian and Sea Island summits, the G8 had already complied at a rate of +48% (on a scale from –100% to +100%), a major advance from the comparable figure for the Iraq-divided G8 after Kananaskis the year before. Also encouraging is the record of the primary Iraq-war political disputants, with last year's and this year's hosts, France and the US, both at an above-average +50%.

Evian also had a longer-term legacy, by creating three new G8 bodies, for fighting terrorism, for the nonproliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and for science and technology for sustainable development (see Appendix G). The Evian leaders issued several instructions to other international institutions, particularly to the multilateral bodies of the UN system (see Appendix H). Above all, it recorded the common G8 determination to respond collectively to the external shocks it recognized, from the proliferation of WMD, terrorist attacks and sinking oil tankers polluting ecologically fragile shores. Evian also looked ahead to define the Sea Island agenda, by requesting reports on terrorism and transport

security to be submitted to the 2004 Summit, and on Africa to be submitted to the British Summit in 2005.

Cascading G8 Co-operation

During the year after Evian, the G8 countries continued to co-operate, in ways that cumulatively pushed aside the transatlantic war among them over the 2003 American-led war against Iraq. To be sure, by late spring of 2004, the old divisions reappeared over the premature leak of America's GMEI, President Bush's pledges to Israeli president Ariel Sharon about the latter's Middle East Peace process, revelations of the American abuse of Iraqi prisoners and ongoing demands for the U.S. to hand over authority to a sovereign Iraqi government and the UN. But by then those divisions were overwhelmed by several stronger processes of G8 co-operation, through several "coalitions of the willing" featuring G8 partners in the first rank. These included great progress made on Iraqi debt relief, commitments of new money from G8 partners outside the coalition (led by Canada) to reconstruct Iraq, co-operation among several G8 partners in APEC's STAR program and the admission of all G8 countries save Russia to America's Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI).

Of even greater architectural significance was the cadence of co-operative, largely institutionalized plurilateral summitry the Americans had orchestrated when they chose to hold their G8 summit on June 8–10, 2004. That month would begin with all G8 leaders expect Japan's Junichiro Koizumi gathering on June 6 on the beaches of Normandy to celebrate the 60th anniversary of D-Day, then the G8 Summit immediately after, with a follow-up with a U.S.-EU Summit in Dublin and culminate with a NATO summit in Istanbul, Turkey, at the end of the month. This month of a summit a week would not only show Americans and outsiders that George Bush was indeed a global leader, but would also start by featuring French president Jacques Chirac thanking President Bush for sending American troops to fight and die for freedom in his country, before there even existed a UN to issue "permission slips." It would end on June 28–29 with Turkey — the great democratic, Muslim country and NATO ally — helping America get NATO to take responsibility for securing the liberation of Iraq after the June 30th transition of authority, just as NATO was doing in Afghanistan and has done in the past, in liberating Kosovo from genocide in 1999. With these well-choreographed reminders of the United States, France and most G8 partners fighting together for freedom of so many different global fronts, the ghost of the UN-magnified divisions of the spring of 2003 would be banished, and the common fight for freedom in the greater Middle East be put at the fore.

US Plans and Preparations: From Minimalism to the Middle Range

Also promising has been the direction of the U.S. preparatory process, especially after America assumed the presidency on January 1, 2004. President Bush began the year-long preparatory process with great skepticism about the value of the G8 summit, even the need to hold it every year, including 2004. During the summer, the Americans confirmed they would host a summit, but a very short one, in an informal setting at Sea Island on Georgia's coast. At the last French-hosted sherpa meeting in November 2003, the Americans made it clear that they wanted no G8 ministerial meetings (apart from Finance and Home Affairs) on the road to Sea Island, no new money pledged at the Sea Island Summit, and probably no invited outsiders, or in any event very few and no one who had been there before. As themes for their summit, the Americans offered the standard State Department trilogy of "Security, Prosperity and Freedom" employed for American foreign policy as a whole that year. The central agenda items that had fuelled the success of the last three summits — Africa and ecologically sustainable development — would have virtually no place. To some, this signalled a deep, even unilateralist, lack of interest in the G8 summit and system. To others, especially one close partner receiving a bilateral briefing in September, it suggested an unusually strong strategic vision, employing the G8 and other instruments, to show President Bush as the sole American leader in the lead-up to the election and a committed visionary bringing freedom to the greater Middle East.

Once America assumed the chair on January 1, 2004, it began to move away from this stark vision, and over the ensuing five months travelled a long way. As Appendix I shows, the Americans planned and mounted a very dense set of preparatory meetings, through the sherpa and foreign affairs sous-sherpa (FASS) process, as well as through the political directors, finance deputies and African personal representatives. This commitment suggested that President Bush had in mind a Sea Island Summit that would be a singular presidentially directed and delivered summit, rather than a diffuse ministerially delivered one. Yet as Appendix J shows, he did employ his ministers in G8 forums on his priorities of terrorism (Home Affairs), finance (including terrorist finance) and the GMEI, the latter by reinstating the G8 foreign ministers meeting, held on May 14 in Washington and featuring a presidential visit to the G8 foreign ministers assembled there.

America's Accommodating Agenda

As the spring unfolded, America increasingly adjusted to its partners' agenda priorities and preferred positions as well. As Appendix K indicates, by the end of May 2004, with all the ministerials and all but the last sherpa meetings concluded, the result was a wide-ranging agenda in which the priorities of America's partners featured as strongly as those of America alone.

At the first sherpa meeting of their tenure, the Americans presented to their partners an agenda composed of four major "deliverables": GMEI and the integrally linked issues of the Middle East Peace Plan (MEPP) and Iraq; transport security and terrorism, featuring the Secure and Facilitated Transport Initiative (SAFTI); further action on the nonproliferation of WMD; and action on development later labelled Private Sector Development.

The centrepiece of this quarter and the Sea Island Summit as a whole was GMEI. As the second and third sherpa meetings unfolded in subsequent months, it took the shape of a G8 general political statement of principles, a list of existing G8 members' programs in this area and a list of new G8 initiatives, collectively or jointly, on issues such as literacy, women's education, freedom of the press and finance. G8 members moved closer to consensus, to be encoded through careful drafting, that GMEI must be accompanied by progress on MEPP, but that the two would be done simultaneously, rather than holding GMEI hostage to the prior outbreak of peace between Israel and Arabs in the Middle East. A similar spirit pervaded the equally delicate and integrally linked issue of the political transition in Iraq and the achievement of security, development and democracy there once the transition came.

The second major deliverable, on transport security and terrorism, focused on SAFTI. This included initially divisive issues such as the forward deployment of immigration and customs personnel, and "full airside screening" to ensure that those who worked in the airline industry face the same screening as their passengers every time they board a plane. Also included were the Evian remit mandates on counter-terrorism capacity building assistance, a progress report on MANPADs, and an overall terrorism review (see Appendix L).

The third major deliverable concerned further action to keep WMD from falling into the hands of terrorists and other enemies. One initial element was to deny potential enemies access to the specific components they needed for a full nuclear-fuel cycle and thus nuclear weapons of their own. Another was further progress on PSI and controlling chemical, biological and radiological weapons. An important component was to expand the Kananaskis Global Partnership on Weapons and Materials of Mass Destruction to include new money for the dismantlement of WMD in Libya, which had now suddenly flipped into the camp of co-operating states. Progress on this particular item would depend in part on an adjustment on the part of Germany, which had remained adamant that it would make no new serious spending commitments at Sea Island at all.

The fourth deliverable was private sector development. This was inspired by the recently released report, *Unleashing Entrepreneurship*, co-chaired by Canadian prime minister Paul Martin and Mexican ex-president Ernesto Zedillo. To flesh it out, the Americans proposed initiatives to foster the flow of remittances from those in the rich north to their families in the poor south, and to encourage "growth index bonds," which would reward investors in poor countries according to how much the recipient country grew each year. All G8 members seemed supportive of the first initiative, while only Germany, very reluctantly, gave the second any support.

As the spring unfolded, ever more items, encouraged by the enthusiasm of America's partners, were added to the Sea Island Summit agenda. An early addition, and thus the fifth intended deliverable, had been signalled elusively by the Americans in November 2003. It was peace support, primarily in Africa, outlined in a paper co-authored by Italy and the United States. Here the now big-spending United States was prepared to put US\$670 million of its own money for programs in Africa and another US\$200 million elsewhere, and it invited its G8 partners to make contributions of their own. The G8 members, many with programs of their own for training civilian police, urged the U.S. to reinforce existing mechanisms, rather than reinvent the wheel. The U.S. seemed willing to do so, in addition to its own financial contributions, although Germany's reluctance to spend arose here again.

A sixth item was famine and food security. Floated in a fragile form by the Americans, this issue received an enthusiastic push by the partners, and led to the familiar intra-G8 debate about how the issue would be framed, what it would include and what geographic areas it would focus upon. Here G8 partners found an expansive solution, and the combined category of "Famine/Food Security" jumped onto the Sea Island agenda for discussion on the last day.

A seventh item receiving similarly expansive accommodation and synthesis was global health. From the very beginning, all G8 members, including the frugal Germans, agreed that they would act to eliminate polio by providing the funds necessary to ensure its eradication and intervening with those countries, such as Nigeria, where the disease was breaking out again. From this foundation, action against HIV/AIDS and tuberculosis, and the fate of the Genoa Summit-financed Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Malaria and Tuberculosis joined the list.

Global economic growth, a summit agenda perennial, underwent a major shift in emphasis as the sherpa preparations for Sea Island progressed. An initial American desire to focus strongly on completing the Doha Development Agenda by its intended completion date of 2005 acquired a more minor and modest place as the months went on. Rising rapidly as an agenda item was the issue of rising oil prices, which were of particular concern to voters and their leaders in North America, where elections loomed.

The political security agenda centred on the regional security priorities of Iran and North Korea, which were on the frontlines of the nonproliferation agenda as well. The Sea Island Summit would also be able to deal with any late-breaking political-security crises, especially as the Japanese successfully asked that one session be kept free for the leaders to discuss last-minute issue they might want to raise.

American accommodation and agenda expansion did have its limits, however. It remained unlikely that the environment and sustainable development would get any serious attention as subjects in their own right. There were pressures from France to return to Evian's science and technology for sustainable development, to upgrade the Global Environment Observation System of Systems (GEOSS) that a G8-centred group was advancing at lower levels, and to accept Japan's desire for an initiative of "reduce, reuse and recycle" as well as to respond to British prime minister Tony Blair's desire to address climate change directly. But the initial inter-temporal division of labour, which saw sustainable development along with Africa left almost entirely to Britain's 2005 G8 Summit, seemed to endure as far as the environment was concerned.

The Partners' Potentially Synthetic Priorities

This major expansion of the agenda reflected both an America desire to have fallback successes should its GMEI centrepiece not survive in the initially envisaged form and to adopt its partners' priorities in return for support for GMEI itself. This trend toward the expansive, big-package, synergistic solution — rather than a restrictive, mutual-veto one — also promised to emerge from the particular priorities brought by the partners into the preparatory process. For few of these distinctive positions were strongly entrenched items on key issues that were anathema to other partners. Rather, they were largely modest efforts within the bounds of the possible or, in the case of GMEI, a serious effort to find a solution to the big divisions among G8 partners that flourished on the outside.

Second-ranked Japan, an American ally with its armed forces in Iraq, was highly supportive of the U.S. agenda. At an early stage, Prime Minister Koizumi signalled solidarity by publicly stating that Sea Island would allow all G8 partners to express their commitment to the democratic reconstruction of Iraq. He also showed Japan's continuing concern with the return of Japan's abductees and their children still in North

Korea, and with North Korean nuclear proliferation, including the Korean sale of enriched uranium to Libya. Within the preparatory process, Japan was relaxed and prepared to let the U.S. set the agenda, having secured America's agreement to Japan's expressed desire for one unscheduled session. Substantively, Japan sought to advance the agenda on science and technology and research and on development for the environment, offering, as its only real initiative, one on the three R's of recycle, reduce and reuse.

Third-ranked Germans, joined the French in showing the greatest interest in shaping GMEI into something they could live with and that the Americans could accept. They were very active, issuing critical papers seeking a formula to make it work. They continued to insist on "no new spending," but were prepared to go forward on the low-cost polio front. German interest in accommodation with America was also seen over growth index bonds, where Germany was the only partner to provide even grudging support.

France approached Sea Island at the guardian of the Evian legacy, and with a desire to continue Evian's great success in ending the transatlantic war over the American-led coalition's war in Iraq. Above all, this led France to join Germany in the quest to make GMEI a Sea Island success. Here a particular challenge was the component concerning the UN resolution required to hand over authority to a new Iraqi government on June 30, and the residual responsibility that the United States would retain. France was also in the forefront of those supporting expanding the Sea Island agenda to give some of their Evian priorities a greater afterlife. In the first rank in this regard stood the issues of Africa, and famine and food security, peace support, private sector development and global health (beyond polio). Elsewhere, the French were tempted to bring to the Sea Island table two additional issues. The first was on financing for development, since Chirac had become attached to the idea of a tax on international transactions such as oil to raise the necessary funds. A second was sustainable development in general and water in particular, an issue on which Evian had made much forward movement, but that Sea Island still threatened to shut out.

Britain, the ranking American ally in Iraq, was very much focused on preparing for its presidency. It thus sought to keep alive at Sea Island items — on Africa and sustainable development — to support its intended themes and actions the following years. Thus the British were interested in famine, development finance and sustainable development. They approached the latter as a link to the water issue that had been central to France at Evian, but had disappeared from the summit agenda since. The British tried to keep it alive at the working level and might wish to upgrade it to the leaders level should the occasion arise. They signalled early on that peace support for Africa would be a priority during their presidency, during which they planned to hold the summit in Gleneagles, Scotland, early in July 2005.

Italy, another American ally in Iraq, had priorities that were less well defined. At the working level, it was highly active, weighing in across the board on technical concerns. The Italians' one large initiative was on peace support for Africa, where they co-authored the paper with the U.S.

Canada in 2004 continued to emphasize the 2002 Kananaskis legacy. Its new Prime Minister, Paul Martin, preoccupied with a looming election and burning domestic political issues and with an established international and intra-G8 reputation, saw no need to offer major new initiatives during the preparatory process itself. Prime Minister Martin was a pioneer on the polio issue, where early victory came. Canada was also pleased that the U.S. had adopted the Martin-Zedillo report as the lens through which the issue of private sector development would be addressed. On the campaign trail at home, Martin promised he would raise the issue of world oil prices at the Sea Island table, in search of some relief. There remained the possibility that he would also try to advance his pet project of creating a leaders-level G20 to reinforce the work of the G8, but the prospects were not promising that much headway would be made there.

For Russia, the big issues were action against terrorism and, defensively, how to accommodate its G8 partners' desires for reduced oil prices and nuclear nonproliferation in North Korea and Iran. Russia, with one eye to its hosting of the G8 in 2006, was also anxious to be accepted as a full partner everywhere, including securing G8 support for its membership in the World Trade Organization and at the G7 finance ministers forum.

The Pull from the Pressures Outside

The Vulnerabilities of a Shocked America and Its Allies

As the G8 preparations and partners approached the Sea Island, there were several powerful pressures pulling them from the outside toward making their summit a substantial success. The first force propelling America and its G8 allies into mutual adjustment and accommodation were the recent shocks that have reminded all G8 leaders of their individual vulnerabilities and thus common aversion to severe threats to their basic national needs.

Rearing its well-recognized head as Sea Island approached was the major vulnerability that had always reliably induced a strongly and sequentially shocked, and now hyper-sensitive G8 to co-operate in the past (Kirton 2004). As Appendix M suggests, world oil prices rose to new and prospectively sustained new highs in nominal U.S. dollars, just as American and Canadian voters began their big summer driving seasons and as the sustained economic expansion of the U.S. and Japan — as well as China, experiencing booming growth — promised to keep demand and oil prices soaring as well.

A second, and increasingly closely connected, shock-driven vulnerability came from an upsurge in terrorist attacks against G8 nationals and home-based targets. As Appendix N shows, the first five months of 2005 brought an unusually numerous and deadly succession of terrorist attacks against the G8. While Russia against bore the biggest burden, due to civil war in Chechnya, the March bombing of the Madrid train system brought terrorist mass murder to continental Europe and to a member of the EU. The Madrid bombing resulted in Spain pulling its troops out of Iraq. But all G8 members with troops in Iraq, in accordance with their sense of responsibilities as great powers, kept theirs in. This was particularly true for Britain and America, which continued to take casualties, as terrorists increasingly targeted foreign nationals working for the oil industry in Saudi Arabia as well as in Iraq.

The Poor Performance of the United Nations System

A second push from the outside came from the poor performance of the United Nations system, or of America acting alone. In the shock-scarred field of energy, neither the UN nor the U.S. on its own (even with its Strategic Petroleum Reserve) was particularly relevant, in contrast to oil-exporting Russia and Canada, which could and did promise some relief. In response to the shocks of terrorism and threats to transport security, neither the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), the International Maritime Organization (IMO), Interpol nor America alone could offer the effective response of the G8-centred Container Security Initiative (CSI), PSI, or program against MANPADs. In regard to the nonproliferation of WMD, on the eve of the Sea Island Summit the head of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) articulated the obvious by speaking eloquently of the failures and weakness of his organization in Iran, North Korea and elsewhere. And while America alone finally found physical proof that Saddam Hussein's Iraq did indeed illegally possess WMD (in the form of the chemical weapons of sarin and mustard gas) and did indeed harbour Al Qaeda-affiliated terrorists, the discovery of extensive caches in a co-operative Libya showed that, short of military invasion, America acting alone could not do the job that the current IAEA could not.

On the central crisis issue of Iraq, America realized it could no longer go it largely alone, and was eager to hand over to a UN-approved Iraqi government on June 30. But neither America nor its G8 partners were under any illusions, after the past 12 years, that the United Nations could cope without major support in many forms from the G8 great powers themselves. Only on the issue of development, such as private sector development, could the UN claim a level of normative and epistemic effectiveness that the G8 could use as a foundation for action to move ahead.

The Equally Capable G8 as Equal to the Task

A third push comes from changes in G8 capabilities. Where outside vulnerabilities flow through an inadequate UN multilateral system of hegemonic, unilateralist defences to threaten G8 members, they

often encounter a G8 club with the collective capabilities in the world beyond, and the equal capabilities among members within, to inspire the internal burden sharing that produces effective results in the world as a whole. This year, as Appendices O and P show, even without the full European Union the G8 still collectively dominates the global economy, despite the recent strong rise of communist China and democratic India.

Within the G8, while America is the G7's projected leader in gross domestic product for 2003–04, the actual figures for GDP growth in the first quarter of 2004 suggest that the United States is being outstripped by an oil-rich Russia and a now strongly recovering Japan. Similarly, very recent increases in the value of the U.S. dollar have proven weaker than the large drop over the full past year and the very recent weakness brought by mounting world oil prices. The composite picture of this combination of GDP growth and exchange rates, supported by other economic data, is of an America sufficiently aware of its vulnerabilities and modest about its capabilities and performance to search for the most positive coordinated solution among its G8 friends possible.

Common Democratic Purpose

A fourth push toward summit success comes from the fidelity of Sea Island's GMEI centrepiece with the principles of open democracy, individual liberty and social advance. Summits succeed when their agenda focuses on issues that directly invoke these core principles, which animate the G8 club, and when all G8 members have internalized them as part of their political practice and identity at home. Here, as Appendix P suggests, one impediment arises from worries that Vladimir Putin's Russia is backsliding from the G7 standards of practice in respecting freedom of the press and renouncing arbitrary arrest. However, the larger force is the way all G8 members are aware of the need to defend open democracies against Islamist-linked terrorism and to build democratic societies on the front lines of Afghanistan and even post-Saddam Iraq. The remaining challenge is whether the G8 can get those countries from the greater Middle East that are coming to the Sea Island Summit to join fully the project (see below), for, in their current practice, many are very partial democracies indeed.

Political Capital and Control

Compounding the challenge of democratic dilution through outreach is the fact that when they arrive at Sea Island, the G8 leaders will have limited freedom at home to alter national positions to produce the ambitious achievements that they and the world may want. The G8 leaders' political capital and control are collectively weak, and internally equal, thanks to exceptional American weakness and Russian strength.

As Appendix Q suggests, host George Bush has a very old and razor-thin electoral mandate, a looming election five months after the Summit and a plummeting, now minority, personal and party approval rating in the polls. A CBS News poll dated May 20–23, 2004, showed his approval rating dropping to a record low of 41%. A May 10–13 poll of likely voters by Zogby International showed rival John Kerry beating him by a margin of between 47% and 42% were the election held at that time.

Outside the United States, Canada's Paul Martin is even more electorally preoccupied and constrained, as he faces a general election on June 28 and will return with only a minority government if his latest party voter intention rating of 38% persists. Britain's Tony Blair, like Bush, has a party behind in the polls (at 32% to the opposition's Conservatives' 36% and the Liberal Democrats' 22%), even if his next election is at least a full year off. Germany's Gerhard Schroeder is also domestically unpopular, as is France's Jacques Chirac, whose party was routed by the Socialist opposition and its allies in regional elections in March.

Japan's Junichiro Koizumi is in better shape in the polls, but faces upper house elections in July 2004. The only experienced, legislatively confident, electorally secure leader with political capital in domestic public opinion is Russia's Vladimir Putin. His recent re-election by a 71% majority, a massive majority in his legislature and very high approval ratings are the inverse of the ones held by his American counterpart. President Bush and his Sea Island Summit may thus do well, particularly in areas — such as

terrorism, transport security, weapons of mass destruction, and energy — where Russia is a major player, but only if Putin is able and willing to act as a full member of the G8 club.

Constricted Participation: The Productive Sea Island Summit Format

A final impediment to success at Sea Island is the absence of the constricted participation and considerable time that allows G8 leaders to be alone to bond and act as leaders, and thus lead their summit to great achievements and historic change. The Americans' chosen setting at Sea Island, reflecting a strong attachment to the minimalist Montebello or Kananaskis model, is well suited to bring out G8 leaders' leadership at its best. But as Appendix R suggests, the Americans have designed one of the shortest summits in G8 history, and have further compromised it with ceremonial and social components that reduce the time for the leaders to be alone. Furthermore, on their first full day of summitry they will meet at noon with several invited leaders from the greater Middle East, and will have a similar meeting again with six invited African leaders on the summit's final day.

These outreach sessions and guest lists do display the skill of America in adjusting to its G8 partners' desire to keep the G8 focused on Africa, and in attracting the leaders of several consequential Middle East countries to come to Sea Island and give President Bush's America and G8 Summit a chance. Yet they leave very little time for the G8 leaders to go beyond what their sherpas and ministers have already decided on their behalf. Moreover, on the critical issues of democratic development in the Middle East and in Africa, these sessions require G8 leaders to come together — and their outside partners to come together, and the two groups to come together as well — in the same way, at the same time, on June 9 and then again, starting from scratch, on June 10. On the basis of probabilities alone, the Sea Island Summit format, let alone the difficulties in the Middle East and Africa outside, make it extraordinarily challenging for the Sea Island Summit to be the historic success in spreading freedom that President Bush so much wants. It is now very much up to him, as a statesman, as a political leader and as a person, to make Sea Island work. If he does so, the historic triumph will be largely his alone.

References and Related Reading

- Bayne, Nicholas (2003), "Impressions of the Kananaskis Summit," in Michele Fratianni, Paolo Savona and John Kirton, eds., *Sustaining Global Growth and Development: G7 and IMF Contributions and Challenges* (Ashgate: Aldershot).
- Bayne, Nicholas (2002), "Impressions of the Genoa Summit, 20–22 July, 2001," in Michele Fratianni, Paolo Savona and John Kirton, eds., *Governing Global Finance: New Challenges, G7 and IMF Contributions* (Ashgate: Aldershot).
- Bayne, Nicholas (2001), "The G7 and Multilateral Trade Liberalisation: Past performance, Future Challenges," in John Kirton and George von Furstenberg, eds., *New Directions in Global Economic Governance: Managing Globalisation in the Twenty-First Century* (Ashgate: Aldershot).
- Bayne, Nicholas (2000a), "The G7 Summit's Contribution: Past, Present and Prospective," in Karl Kaiser, John Kirton and Joseph Daniels, eds., *Shaping a New International Financial System: Challenges of Governance in a Globalizing World* (Ashgate, Aldershot).
- Bayne, Nicholas (2000b), *Hanging In There: The G7 and G8 Summit in Maturity and Renewal* (Ashgate: Aldershot).
- Bayne, Nicholas (1999), "Continuity and Leadership in an Age of Globalisation," in Michael Hodges, John Kirton and Joseph Daniels, eds., *The G8's Role in the New Millennium* (Ashgate: Aldershot).
- Fowler, Robert (2003), "Canadian Leadership and the Kananaskis G8 Summit: Toward a Less Self-Centered Policy," in David Carment, Fen Osler Hampson and Norman Hillmer, eds., *Canada Among Nations 2003: Coping with the American Colossus* (Oxford University Press: Toronto).
- Fratianni, Michele, Paolo Savona and John Kirton (2003), "Introduction, Observations and Conclusions," in Michele Fratianni, Paolo Savona and John Kirton, eds., *Governing Globalization: Corporate, Public and G8 Governance* (to be submitted to Ashgate Publishing).

- G8 Research Group (2003a), "Interim Compliance Report, 2002-03" <www.g8.utoronto.ca/evaluations/2002interimcompliance> (May 2004).
- G8 Research Group (2003b), "Final Compliance Report, 2002-03" <www.g8.utoronto.ca/evaluations/2003compliance> (May 2004).
- Kirton, John (2004), "Explaining G8 Effectiveness: A Concert of Vulnerable Equals in a Globalizing World." Paper prepared for the annual International Studies Association conference, Montreal, March 17-20 <www.g8.utoronto.ca/scholar/kirton2004/kirton_isa_040304.pdf> (May 2004).
- Kirton, John (2003), "Impressions of the G8 Foreign Ministers Meeting," Paris, May 23 <www.g8.utoronto.ca/evaluations/2003evian/assess_formin_kirton.html> (May 2004).
- Kirton, John (2003), "After Westphalia: Security and Freedom in the G8's Global Governance," in Thomas Noetzel and Marika Lerch, eds., *Security and Freedom: Foreign Policy, Domestic Politics and Political Theory Perspectives* (Nomos: Baden-Baden).
- Kirton, John (2003), "Bush Needs the G8, and It Needs Him," *Globe and Mail*, June 3, A15.
- Kirton, John (1993), "The Seven Power Summit and the New Security Agenda," in David Dewitt, David Haglund and John Kirton, eds., *Building a New Global Order: Emerging Trends in International Relations* (Oxford University Press: Toronto).
- Kirton, John (1989), "Contemporary Concert Diplomacy: The Seven-Power Summit and the Management of International Order." Paper prepared for the International Studies Association Annual Conference, March 29-April 1, London, England.
- Kirton, John and Ella Kokotsis (2003), "Producing International Commitments and Compliance without Legalization: The G7/8's Trade Performance from 1975-2002." Paper presented on a panel on "Global Trade and the Role of Informal Institutions," at the annual conference of the International Studies Association, Portland OR, February 23-March 3 <www.g8.utoronto.ca/scholar/kirton2003/KirtonPortland2003.pdf> (May 2004).
- Kirton, John and Ella Kokotsis (2003b), "The G7/8 Contribution at Kananaskis and Beyond," in Michele Fratianni, Paolo Savona and John Kirton, eds., *Sustaining Global Growth and Development: G7 and IMF Governance* (Ashgate: Aldershot).
- Whelan (2003), Interview with Susan Whelan, Minister for International Cooperation, Canada, with Professor John Kirton, Ottawa, May 15 <www.g8.utoronto.ca/oralhistory>(May 2004).

Appendix A: The Concert Equality Model of G8 Summit Performance

I. Dimensions of Performance

1. Domestic Politics
2. Deliberation
3. Direction-Setting
4. Decision making (commitments, money mobilized)
5. Delivery (compliance)
6. Development of Global Governance (within and outside G8)

II. Causes of Performance

A. Past Propulsion and Preparations

1. Past Performance of Summit and Host
2. Last Year's Performance of Summit and Host
3. G8 Members Cooperation in Past Year
4. Host Plan for Summit (how much and what)
5. Preparatory Process Convergence from Sherpas and Ministerials
6. Member's Priorities and Preferences (can closure and big bargains be made)

B. Present Pressures to Come Together

1. Shock Activated Vulnerability (do we need something done?)
2. UN/US System Failure (can the UN or U.S. do it?)
3. Predominant Equal Capability (can we do it together as the G8?)
4. Common democratic Principles (should we do it in the G8?)
5. Political Capital and Control (will our voters let us do it?)
6. Constricted Participation (will the summit format let us do it?)

Appendix B: G8 Summit Performance by Function, 1975–2004

Year	Site	Bayne Grade	# of Days	# of State-ments	# of Words	# of Commit -ments	Comp- liance Score	# of Minis- terials Created	# of Remit Man- dates	# of Leaders Bodies Cr	Ttl
	Ldg	A-	3	1	1,129	14	+57.1	0	1	1	1
<i>1976</i>	<i>Res</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1,624</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>+08.9</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>
1977	Cap	B-	2	6	2,669	29	+08.4	0	1	0	1
1978	Cap	A	2	2	2,999	35	+36.3	0	0	2	3
1979	Cap	B+	2	2	2,102	34	+82.3	0	1	3	5
1980	Prv	C+	2	5	3,996	55	+07.6	0	1	0	3
1981	Ldg	C	2	3	3,165	40	+26.6	1	1	2	4
1982	Ldg	C	3	2	1,796	23	+84.0	0	1	3	3
<i>1983</i>	<i>Res</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>2,156</i>	<i>38</i>	<i>-10.9</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>2</i>
1984	Cap	C-	3	5	3,261	31	+48.8	1	3	1	4
1985	Cap	E	3	2	3,127	24	+01.0	0	1	2	5
1986	Cap	B+	3	4	3,582	39	+58.3	1	1	1	3
1987	Prv	D	3	6	5,064	53	+93.3	0	1	0	2
1988	Prv	C-	3	2	4,872	27	-47.8	0	1	1	3
1989	Cap	B+	3	11	7,125	61	+07.8	0	1	1	2
<i>1990</i>	<i>Prv</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>7,601</i>	<i>78</i>	<i>-14.0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>5</i>
1991	Cap	B-	3	3	8,099	53	00.0	0	3	0	2
1992	Prv	D	3	4	7,528	41	+64.0	1	2	1	2
1993	Cap	C+	3	2	3,398	29	+75.0	0	5	0	2
1994	Prv	C	3	2	4,123	53	100.0	1	2	0	4
1995	Prv	B+	3	3	7,250	78	100.0	2	6	2	3
1996	Prv	B	3	5	15,289	128	+36.2	0	2	1	6
<i>1997</i>	<i>Prv</i>	<i>C-</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>12,994</i>	<i>145</i>	<i>+12.8</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>6</i>
1998	Prv	B+	3	4	6,092	73	+31.8	0	3	1	4
1999	Prv	B+	3	4	10,019	46	+38.2	1	3	1	2
2000	Res	B	3	5	13,596	105	+81.4	0	5	2	5
2001	Prv	B+	3	7	6,214	58	+49.5	1	4	1	6
2002	Res	B+	2	18	11,959	187	+35.0	1	6	3	8
2003	Prv	TBA	3		16,889	206	+65.8	0	4	2	9
<i>2004</i>	<i>Res</i>		<i>3</i>								
Av. All		C+			6,197	26	+.37	.38	2.6	1.1	3.5
Av. Cycle 1		B-			2,526	29	+.32	.14	1.0	1.1	2.6
Av. Cycle 2		C-			3,408	34	+.32	.29	1.0	1.3	3.1
Av. Cycle 3		C+			6,446	56	+.48	.57	3.1	0.9	2.9
Av. Cycle 4		B			10,880	106	+.41	.57	4.7	1.4	5.3
Av. Cycle 5		TBA			16,889	206	TBA	.00	4.0	2.0	9.0

Notes:

- Location: Ldg = Lodge on outskirts of capital city; Res = remote resort; Cap = inside capital city; Prv = provincial (not capital) city.
- Compliance scores from 1990 to 1995 measure compliance with commitments selected by Ella Kokotsis. Compliance scores from 1996 to 2002 measure compliance with G8 Research Group's selected commitments. The compliance score for 2002 is an extrapolation from the interim compliance score based on the 2002 interim-to-final compliance ratio.
- U.S.-hosted summits are in italics.

Compiled by John Kirton, November 5, 2003.

Appendix C: Overall G8 Achievements(Bayne Grades)

	Cycle 1 1975–1981	Cycle 2 1982–1988	Cycle 3 1989–1995	Cycle 4 1996–2002	Average
France	A–	C	B+	B	B
United States	D	B	D	C–	C–
United Kingdom	B–	C–	B–	B+	B–
Germany	A	E	D	B+	C
Japan	B+	B+	C+	B	B
Italy	C+	D	C	B+	C
Canada	C	C–	B+	B+	B–
Average	B–	C–	C+	B	C+

Note:

These grades are awarded for the overall importance of the co-operative agreements reached at the annual summit, including both policy co-ordination and institutional development. Bayne has specified and applied to the individual issue areas of finance and trade the criteria for judging summit success, identifying and defining the five criteria of leadership, effectiveness, durability, acceptability and consistency.

Sources:

Bayne (2000a, 19–36; 2000b, 195; 2001, 171–187; 2002, 207).

Compiled by John Kirton.

Appendix D: G8 Summit Commitments by Document, 2003 Evian

Chair's Summary	16
<i>Economics</i>	38
Growth and Responsible Market Economy	04
Corruption and Transparency	26
Trade	08
<i>Development</i>	21
Health	10
Famine	11
<i>Sustainable Development</i>	69
Sustainable Development Science	29
Marine Environment and Tanker Safety	24
Water	16
<i>Political-Security</i>	63
Weapons of Mass Destruction/Nonproliferation	02
Radioactive Sources	20
Transport Security/MANPADs	18
Terrorism	23
Total	207

Identified by Ella Kokotsis, June 3, 2003.

Appendix E: G8 Summit Money Mobilized 2003

New Money Promised

- “In keeping with our pledge at Kananaskis to provide, on a fair and equitable basis, sufficient resources to eradicate polio by 2005, we have pledged an addition US\$500 million and remain committed to playing our full part to ensure that the remaining funding gap is closed.” (Health: A G8 Action Plan)

Old Money Re-affirmed

- “We are determined to sustain and broaden our efforts towards: reaching our Kananaskis commitment of raising up to US\$20 billion over 10 years.” (Chair’s Summary)

Need for More Money and G8 Responsibility Recognized:

- “We noted that achieving these ambitious goals would require considerable efforts from both developed and developing countries, including increased resources. We welcomed the report of our Finance ministers’ discussions on our increased resources and on financing instruments. We invite them to report back to us in September on the issues raised by the financing instruments... (Chair’s Summary)
- “We tasked our relevant Ministers to examine as soon as possible the measures necessary to support a plan for the revitalization and reconstruction of the Palestinian economy, including the leveraging of private investment, within the framework of the Middle East Peace Process.” (Chair’s Summary).
- “We are providing urgent humanitarian aid and, to address the financial consequences of this situation, we are instructing our relevant Ministers to report within one month on how best to help Algeria recover.” (Chair’s Summary).
- “To these ends we direct our ministers and officials to pursue urgently with WTO partners... Deliver capacity building technical assistance to developing countries in need to help them participate fully in WTO negotiations, implement trade agreements, and respond to the trade opportunities created, in co-operation with other bilateral and multilateral donors.” (Co-operative G8 Action on Trade)
- “The CTAG will analyse and prioritise needs, and expand counter-terrorism capacity building assistance...” (Building International Political Will and Capacity to Combat Terrorism: A G8 Action Plan).

Monitoring of Possible More Needed Money with G8 Responsibility Acknowledged

- “We welcomed the progress made towards completing our commitments in Kananaskis to fill the estimated financing gap in the HIPC Trust Fund, through the pledges of \$850 million made in Paris in October 2002. We will continue to monitor the financing needs of the Trust Fund.” (Chair’s Summary).
- “We will address new needs [against famine, especially in Africa] when they are confirmed with appropriate aid commitments.” (Action Against Famine, Especially in Africa: A G8 Action Plan).
- “...whilst recognising that significant additional funds are required. We commit, with recipient countries, to fulfil our shared obligations as contained in the declaration of Commitment on HIV/AIDS for the 2001 United Nations General Assembly Special Session.” (Health: A G8 Action Plan).

Notes:

The category “Money Mobilized” deals with the G8 itself putting, being likely to put or possibly putting in the future additional financial resources from the G8 for specified purposes. To be included in this category, an item requires explicit communiqué references to financial resources (broadly defined) and to the G8’s role or responsibility in relation to these financial resources. It excludes mere communiqué notations of where the G8 is already contributing financially without any additional element that more financing might be needed (from the G8 or not) (e.g. to the International Atomic Energy Agency). It also excludes communiqué references to the new purposes to which existing G8 funds might be put (e.g., radiological accidents from the G8 Global Partnership against the Spread of Weapons and Materials of Mass Destruction). Also excluded are promises to improve the efficiency, timeliness, responsiveness, flexibility, sustainability, appropriateness and specific mix, as opposed to the overall volume, of aid (e.g., to combat famine in Africa). Also excluded are general statements that specify neither action nor level nor timing (e.g., “We undertake to work towards reversing the decline of official development assistance to agriculture...”, “We will...support efforts to ensure funding for genetic resources”).

Identified and compiled by John Kirton, July 2003.

Appendix F: Compliance with Priority Commitments, Interim, January 2004

Total	CDA	FRA	GER	ITA	JAP	RUS	UK	U.S.	Overall
									1
World Economy/Growth	0	0	1	-1	0	0	0	1	0.125
Info and Communication Technology	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1.000
Trade (Multilateral Trade Negotiations)	0	0	0	0	0	-1	0	-1	-0.250
Development (Official Development Aid)	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0.875
Debt (Heavily Indebted Poor Countries)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.000
Environment (Marine)	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0.375
Health (AIDS)	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0.875
Crime/Terrorist Finance	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.250
Terrorism (CTAG)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1.000
Transport Security	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0.375
Weapons of Mass Destruction	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1.000
Energy	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.125
Overall	0.583	0.500	0.500	0.333	0.417	0.333	0.583	0.500	

Appendix G: G8 Summit Institutionalization, 2003 Evian

G7/8 Institutions Created (3)

- “We ... created a Counter-Terrorism Action Group (CTAG)” (Chair’s Summary) ... “To this end the G8 will create a Counter-Terrorism Action Group (CTAG).” (Building International Political Will and Capacity to Combat Terrorism: A G8 Action Plan)
- “The G8 will direct a working group to identify those elements in the IAEA Code of Conduct that are of greatest relevance to prevent terrorists from gaining access to radioactive sources...” (Non Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction, Securing Radioactive Sources, A G8 Action Plan)
- “We will convene senior G8 policy and research officials and their research institutions to compare and to link programmes and priorities...” (Science and Technology for Sustainable Development: A G8 Action Plan)

G7/8 Institutions Adjusted (11)

- “We agreed to widen our dialogue to other African Leaders on NEPAD and the G8 Africa Action Plan. We invite interested countries and relevant international institutions to appoint senior representatives to join this partnership.” (Chair’s Summary)
- “We invite them [our finance ministers] to report back to us in September on the issues raised by the financing instruments, including the proposal for a new International Finance Facility.” (Chair’s Summary)
- “In this context [HIPC exogenous shocks] we have asked our Finance Ministers to review by September mechanisms to encourage good governance and the methodology for calculating the amount of ‘topping-up’ debt relief available to countries at completion point based on updated cost estimates.” (Chair’s Summary)
- “In accordance with our statement at Kananaskis, we established the G8 Nuclear Safety and Security Group and adopted its mandate and the Core Principles shared by each of us...” (Chair’s Summary)
- “We direct Finance Ministers to assess progress and identify next steps [on terrorist finance].” (Chair’s Summary, Building International Political Will and Capacity to Combat Terrorism: A G8 Action Plan)
- “To develop strengthened co-operation, we also ask Ministers to initiate a dialogue with counterparts in other countries [on terrorist finance]” (Chair’s Summary)
- “We tasked our relevant ministers to examine as soon as possible the measures necessary to support a plan for the revitalisation and reconstruction of the Palestinian economy, including the leveraging of private investment, within the framework of the Middle East Peace Process.” (Chair’s Summary)
- “We are providing urgent humanitarian aid and, to address the financial consequences of this situation, we are instructing our relevant Ministers to report within one month on how best to help Algeria recover.” (Chair’s Summary)
- “We will jointly ask ... FSF ... to work with us on these issues (corruption and transparency)...” (Fostering Growth and Promoting a Responsible Market Economy: A G8 Declaration)
- “Building on the work of the G8 Contact Group on famine, we will work actively to take this Action Plan forward in all relevant international fora.” (Action against Famine, Especially in Africa: A G8 Action Plan)
- “We direct our ministers and officials, working urgently with WTO partners, to establish a multilateral solution in the WTO to address the problems faced by these countries, rebuilding the confidence of all parties, before the Cancun Ministerial.” (Health: A G8 Action Plan)

G7/8 Institutions Approved and Continued (4)

- “We endorsed the report prepared by our Africa Personal Representatives. (Chair’s Summary)
- “We welcomed the report of the Finance Ministers’ discussions on our increased resources and on financing instruments.” (Chair’s Summary)
- “We endorse the “G8 Roma and Lyon Groups Statement on Biometric Applications for International Travel...” (Enhanced Transport Security and Control of Man-Portable Air Defence Systems [MANPADs]: A G8 Action Plan)
- “We ... support issuance in June by the Financial Action Task Force (FATF) of a revised 40 recommendations that includes strong customer and due diligence provisions, enhanced security for politically exposed persons and a requirement to make corruption and bribery a predicate offence for money laundering.” (Fighting Corruption and Improving Transparency: A G8 Declaration)

Appendix H: G8 Summit Institutional Instructions, 2003 Evian

G8 and UN (1)

- “Good governance needs to be promoted and capacity must be built for recipient countries to pursue an appropriate water policy and financial resources should be properly directed to the water sector in a more efficient and effective way, in order to achieve the goals of the Millennium Declaration and the Plan of Implementation of the World Summit on Sustainable Development...We are committed to playing a more active role in the international efforts towards achieving these goals, on the basis of the Monterrey consensus and building upon the outcomes of the Third World Water Forum and the Ministerial Conference held in Japan in March 2003...we will take the following measures individually and/or collectively, particularly taking into account the importance of proper water management in Africa, in support of the New Partnership for Africa’s Development, as stated in the G8 Africa Action Plan.” (Water: A G8 Action Plan).

G8 Alone (2)

- “We shall continue to implement the Action Plan we agreed at Kananaskis to secure safe, secure, efficient and reliable transportation worldwide.” (Enhance Transport Security and Control of Man-Portable Air Defence Systems (MANPADs): A G8 Action Plan).
- “G8 action to address famine in Africa will take place within the framework of the G8 Africa Action Plan, in support of the New Partnership for Africa’s Development.” (Action Against Famine, Especially in Africa: A G8 Action Plan).

UN Alone (5)

- “We recall the significant decisions we took last year at the Monterrey Conference on Financing for Development to increase international development assistance.” (Fighting Corruption and Improving Transparency: A G8 Declaration).
- “The multilateral system embodied in the World Trade Organization (WTO), and the current Doha Development Agenda, is thus central to the G8’s approach...We are therefore committed to delivering on schedule, by the end of 2004, the goals set out in the Doha Development Agenda...” (Co-operative G8 Action on Trade).
- “We recognize the need, as acknowledged in the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) Plan of Implementation, to support the development of cleaner, sustainable and more efficient technologies.” (Science and Technology for Sustainable Development: A G8 Action Plan).
- “We reaffirm our commitment to achieving the development goals set out in the Millennium Summit and at the World Summit on Sustainable Development. (Health: A G8 Action Plan).

Note:

“G8 Summit Institutional Momentum” is defined as public promises made at or by specified summits, conferences or action plans of international institutions, as referenced in the introductory opening passages or chapeau of each discrete document issued by, or in the name of the leaders at, the annual G8 summits. With various degrees of directness and explicit causal connection, they are specified by G8 leaders as a reference, impulse, justification or legitimation — in short as a shared institutional cause (and thus “process-tracing” proof) of the subsequently identified G8 agenda discussions, principles, commitments, mobilized monies, remit mandates and institutional development that follow in the document. Of particular importance is whether the institutions causally specified are those of the G8, of the broader United Nations system, or of other institutional systems. It can be hypothesized that the specification of both G8 and UN as “authorizing” references will lead to the greatest subsequent G8 action, followed by that of the G8 alone. Within each category, the strength of the variable is measured by the number of times reference is made to such institutional authorizations and to the number of different institutional authorizations to which reference is made.

Identified by John Kirton, July 2003.

Appendix I: G8 Sherpa and Official-Level Meetings

November 10	First Forum for Partnership with Africa, Paris
November 17	Sherpa Meeting, Paris
November 17	Counter-Terrorism Action Group (CTAG), Paris
January 26	G7 Finance Deputies, Brussels
January 29–30	Sherpa 1, Washington
February 16–17	Foreign Affairs Sous Sherpas (FASS)
March 3–4	G20 Finance Deputies, Leipzig, Germany
March 8–9/15–19	Sherpa 2, Washington
March 11	Political Directors, Washington
March 30–31	FASS
April 19–20	Sherpa 3, Washington
April 22–23	CTAG, Paris
April 22–23	Political Directors, Paris
April 26	FASS-Finance Deputies with Outreach, Washington
May 18	FASS, Sea Island
May 19–20	Sherpa 4, Sea Island

Note: Excludes African personal representatives (APRs)

Appendix J: Inter-Summit Ministerials and Equivalents, 2003–2004 Compared to 2002–2003

Post-Summit Second Half 2002

September 27 G8 Development Co-operation Ministers Meeting, Windsor, Ontario
September 27 G7 Finance Ministers and Central Bank Governors, Washington
October 25 Statement by G8 Foreign Ministers in Connection with Terrorist Hostage Taking in Moscow

Post-Summit Second Half 2003

September 20 G7 Finance Ministers, Doha
September 30? G8 Foreign Ministers at United Nations General Assembly
September ?? Inter-Sessional Summit with Evian Outside Participants
October 26–27 G20 Finance Ministers, Morelia, Mexico
November 6–7 Global Health Security Initiative, Berlin
December 15–16 G8 Labour Ministers, Stuttgart

Pre-Summit First Half 2003

February 21–22 G7 Finance Ministers, Paris
April 11–12 G8 Finance Ministers and Central Bank Governors, Washington
April 24 G8 Development Ministers, Paris
April 25–27 G8 Environment Ministers, Paris
April 29 G8 Energy Ministers, Paris
May 5 G8 Justice and Home Affairs Ministers, Paris
May 22–23 G8 Foreign Ministers, Paris
May 16–17 G7 Finance Ministers, Deauville, France
May 30–31 G8-EU Summit, St. Petersburg

June 1–3 G7/8 Summit, Evian-les-Bains, France

Pre-Summit First Half 2004

February 6–7 G7 Finance Ministers, Boca Raton, Florida
April 23–24 G7 Finance Ministers, Washington
May 10 G8 Roma/Lyon Justice and Home Affairs Ministers, Washington
May 14 G8 Foreign Ministers, Washington (with visit from President Bush)
May 22–23 G8 Finance Ministers, New York

June 8–10 G8 Summit, Sea Island, Georgia

Appendix K: The Prospective G8 Sea Island Summit Agenda

Major Items:

1. The Greater Middle East Initiative (GMEI);
 - a. General Political Statement
 - b. Existing G8 Members Programs
 - c. New G8 Initiatives: Literacy, Women's Education, Press Freedom, Financing
 - d. Outreach-Engagement Process
 - e. Middle East Peace Plan (MEPP)
 - f. Iraq Transition, Debt Relief and Democratic Development
2. Transport Security and Terrorism
 - a. Secure and Facilitated Transportation Initiative (SAFTI)
 - b. Forward Deployment of Immigration-Customs Personnel
 - c. Full Airside Screening
 - d. Report of Terrorism (Remit Mandate)
 - e. Counter-terrorism Capacity Building Assistance (Remit Mandate)
 - f. MANPADs Progress Review (Remit Mandate)
3. Nonproliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction
 - a. Full Nuclear Fuel Cycle Denial
 - b. Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI)
 - c. Chemical, Biological and Radiological Weapons
 - d. Global Partnership Progress and Expansion (Libya)
4. Private Sector Development (PSD)
 - a. Martin-Zedillo Report
 - b. Remittances
 - c. Growth Index Bonds
5. Peace Support, Principally in Africa
6. Famine/Food Security
7. Health
 - a. Polio
 - b. HIV/AIDS and the Global Fund
8. Global Economic Growth
 - a. Macroeconomics (including Oil Prices)
 - b. Microeconomics
 - c. Trade (including Doha Development Agenda)
9. Political-Security Issues:
 - a. Iran
 - b. North Korea
 - c. Late Breaking Crises

Possible Additions (Elevations)

- a. Science and Technology for Sustainable Development
- b. Global Environment Observation System of Systems (GEOSS)
- c. Global Warming (Britain)
- d. Reduce, Reuse Recycle (Japan)

Compiled by John Kirton, May 30, 2004

Appendix L: G8 Summit Remit Mandates, 2003 for 2004 and Beyond

2003–4

- “We will review progress on our [Africa] Action Plan no later than 2005 on the basis of a report.” (Chair’s Summary)
- “We agree to exchange information on national measures related to the implementation of these steps on MANPADs] by December 2003. We will review progress at our next meeting in 2004.” (Enhanced Transport Security and Control of Man-Portable Air Defence Systems [MANPADs]: A G8 Action Plan)
- “The G8 Presidency will produce a report for the 2004 Summit.” (Building International Political Will and Capacity to Combat Terrorism: A G8 Action Plan)
- “CTAG will ... by ... Seeking to increase counter-terrorism capacity building assistance and coordination by the 2004 Summit ... Encouraging regional assistance programmes including delivery through regional and donor sponsored training centres by the 2004 Summit ... Seeking to address unmet regional assistance needs by the 2004 Summit.” (Building International Political Will and Capacity to Combat Terrorism: A G8 Action Plan)
- “The G8 Presidency will produce a report [on terrorism] for the 2004 Summit.” (Building International Political Will and Capacity to Combat Terrorism: A G8 Action Plan)

Notes: Excludes deadlines and bodies to report to other than the next or subsequent G8 summits themselves. Includes injunction to complete action “by the 2004 Summit” even if no actual report “to” the Summit is demanded, as this implies that G8 leaders will be watching and will if necessary take up the item again.

Identified and compiled by Antara Haldar, June 2003.

Appendix M: World Energy Prices

Date	Crude Nominal NYME	Crude Real 2004
740000	09.07 (annual average)	34.46
810000	35.24 (annual average used)	72.61
901012	41.15 intraday (record)	
910116	32.00c	
991231	12.00c	
000630	35.00+	
021200	under 30.00	
030310	38.00c	
030430	25.00c	
030601	29.00c	
030915	27.00c	
040101	33.00c	
040330	35.00	
040430	38.00c	
040504	38.98 June	
040505	39.57	
040507	40.00+ intraday	
040507	39.77 June WTI	
040510	38.93 June	
040513	41.10 June	
040518	40.54 fut	
040515	41.38	
040517	41.55 Jun	
040525	41.72 July	

Near month settlement price for light sweet crude oil on the New York Mercantile Exchange, closing price, in US\$.

Appendix N: Shocks from Terrorism to G8 Countries/Citizens

	Country	Target	Weapon	Deaths (Injuries)
1983	Lebanon	U.S. Marine barracks, Beirut (2)	Truck bombs	370 (175)
1985	Pacific	Air India 182 from Vancouver	Air bomb	329
1988	Britain	Pan Am 103 over Lockerbie	Air bomb	28
1992	Yemen	Hotel	Attack (Al Qaeda)	2
1993	U.S.	World Trade Centre garage	Truck bomb (Al Qaeda)	6 (1,000)
1993	Somalia	Mogadishu, 2 helicopters shot	MANPADs (Al Qaeda)	18 (73)
1994	Argentina	Jewish centre	Bomb	
1995	Japan	Tokyo subway	Bioterrorism (Sarin)	12 (6,000)
1995	Saudi Arabia	U.S.-run training centre, Riyadh	Truck bomb (Al Qaeda)	7 (60)
1996	Saudi Arabia	U.S. military housing, Dahrhan	Truck bomb	19 (200)
1998	Kenya/Tanzania	American embassies	Truck bombs (Al Qaeda)	225 (4,085)
1999	Russia	Moscow apartment block	Bombs	300+
2000	Yemen	USS Cole in Aden	Suicide boat (Al Qaeda)	17 (39)
2001	U.S.	World Trade Center, Pentagon	Air suicide	2,992 (3,000)
2001	U.S.	Florida, New Jersey, Washington	Anthrax	5 (19)
2002	Pakistan	Karachi (Daniel Pearl)	Kidnapping/Murder	1
2002	Russia	Dagestan Victory Day Parade	Bomb	43
2002	Indonesia	Bali nightclubs	Bomb	202 (229)
2002	Russia	Chechnyan Headquarters, Grozny	Car bombs	72
2002	Russia	Moscow theatre hostage taking	Gas, guns	170
2003	Morocco	Casablanca	Suicide bombing	45 (100+)
2003	Russia	Iliskhan-Yurt Festival, Chechnya	Suicide bombing	17
2004	Russia	Moscow subway	Suicide bomber	39–41
2004	European Union	Madrid	Bombs on train	191 (1,800)
2004	Saudi Arabian	Yanbu (Red Sea) oil offices	Guns	7
2004	Russia	Chechnyan stadium, Grozny (assassination of president)	Bomb	14+ (50+)
2004	Russia	Shali	Ambush	2
2004	Russia	Chechnya	Rebel ambush	11
2004	Saudi Arabian	Khobar (Gulf) oil offices/residence	Gunmen	12–16

Appendix O: Relative Capability of G8 Members

Dimension	G8 Total	U.S.	JAP	GER	UK	FRA	ITA	CDA	RUS	EU
Growth 2004E		4.6%	3.4%	1.6%	3.5%	1.8%	1.2%	2.6%	NA	

Growth 2004E consists of Growth Rate Estimates of *World Economic Outlook*, published by the International Monetary Fund in April 2004.

“G10” Purchasing Power Parity

Rank	Country	2002 PPP	%G10	%G8	%G7
1.	USA	10,414	33%	46%	48%
2.	China	5,792	18.4%		
3.	Japan	3,481	11%	15%	16%
4.	India	2,778	8.8%		
5.	Germany	2,226	7%	9.7%	10.2%
6.	France	1,609	5.1%	7.0%	7.4%
7.	Britain	1,574	5.0%	6.8%	7.2%
8.	Italy	1,510	4.8%	6.6%	7.0%
8.	Russia	1,165	3.7%	5.0%	5.4%
10.	Canada	907	2.8%	4.0%	4.2%
	G10 Total	31,456			
	G8 Total	22,886			
	G7 Total	21,721			
	G8/G10	73%			
	G7/G10	69%			
	Pacific 4/G8	70%			

Note: Data are from the World Bank World Development Indicators 2004, released April 23, 2004, and based on 2002 figures. Purchasing Power Parity (PPP) is determined by pricing all goods and services at US prices and treating America as standard, rather than converting local currencies into dollars at foreign exchange rates. PPP figures cited above are in millions of US dollars.

Appendix P: Common Democratic Principles of G8 Members and Selected Invitees

Country:	Population [rank]	GDP [rank]	Democratization ^a	
			Political Rights	Civil Liberties
<i>G8 (excluding the EU)</i>				
Canada	32,207,113 [35]	\$934.1 billion [12]	1	1
France	60,180,529 [20]	\$1.558 trillion [6]	1	1 (+)
Germany	82,398,326 [13]	\$2.16 trillion [5]	1	1 (+)
Japan	127,214,499 [10]	\$3.651 trillion [3]	1	2
Russia	144,526,278 [7]	\$1.409 trillion [9]	5	5
Italy	57,998,353 [22]	\$1.455 trillion [8]	1	1(+)
United Kingdom ^b	60,094,648 [21]	\$1.528 trillion [7]	1	1(+)
United States	290,342,554 [3]	\$10.45 trillion [1]	1	1
<i>Total</i>	<i>854,962,300</i>	<i>\$23.1451 trillion</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>Average</i>	<i>106,870,287.5</i>	<i>\$2.8931375 trillion</i>	<i>1.5</i>	<i>1.625</i>
Ireland	3,924,140 [123]	\$113.7 billion [54]	1	1
Turkey	68,109,469 [16]	\$489.7 billion [17]	3 (+)	4 (+)
Nigeria	133,881,703 [9]	\$112.5 billion [55]	4	5

Notes:

a. (+) or (-) indicates a change in Political Rights or Civil Liberties since the previous survey.

b. Excluding Northern Ireland

Sources:

Freedom House, "Table of Independent Countries — 2003,"

www.freedomhouse.org/research/freeworld/2003/table.pdf (May 2004).

G20, "G20 Members (2004)," www.g20.org/public/index.php?page=members&skin=1 (May 2004).

GeoHive, "Global Statistics (2003)," www.geohive.com/global/linkg.php?xml=world&xsl=c_p_pop50 (May 2004.)

Nationmaster.com, "Map & Graph: Economy: Top 100 GDP (December 2003)," www.nationmaster.com/graph-T/eco_GDP (May 2004).

Sea Island Summit 2004, "Member Information (2004)," www.g8usa.gov/g8usa/c10466.htm (May 2004).

U.S. Census Bureau, International Data Base, "Countries Ranked by Population: 2003," www.census.gov/cgi-bin/ipc/idbrank.pl (May 2004).

World Fact Book, "Rank Order — Population (18 December 2003),"

www.odci.gov/cia/publications/factbook/rankorder/2119rank.html (May 2004).

World Facts and Figures, "GDP per capita** (30 October 2003),"

www.worldfactsandfigures.com/gdp_country_desc.php (May 2004).

Compiled by Abby Slinger, May 17, 2004.

Appendix Q: Political Control, Capital and Experience

Variable	U.S.	JAP	GER	UK	FRA	ITA	CDA	RUS	EU
Political Control:									
Legislative Majority	2			02			02	2	
Next Election (months)	05	01UH	24	12P			00	45	0
Last Election (months)	43	36						03	
Last Mandate		50%							71%
Political Capital:									
Personal Approval									
Party/Person Election		63%	26%				38%		
Leader Experience:									
Summits as Leader	3	3		6		4	0	4	
Summit Experience	3	3		3		4	8	4	

Notes:

Reference date is the time of summit, save for Personal Approval and Party/Election rates.

Time Durations are in months.

P = probable

Appendix R: Prospective Summit Schedule Efficiency

Efficiency:

Length in Hours:	42 hours (040608 @ 18h00 to 040610 @ 12h00)
Number of Bilaterals During Summit	Unknown
Number of Outsiders Attending	12 at least
Summit Hours/Number of Outsiders Ratio	3.5
Number of Sessions with Outsiders	2
Hours with Outsiders	5
Time in Social/Ceremonial Sessions	3
Hours Alone or in Bilaterals	
Working Hours Alone as G8	
Number of Documents Issued/Hours of Summit	

Schedule:

Sunday, June 6

The Normandy Nest minus Koizumi (per St. Petersburg 2003)

18h00 Bush arrives in Georgia from Normandy (having previously been to Italy and the Vatican)

Monday, June 7

Bush at Sea Island with unscheduled preparatory time

Tuesday, June 8

09h00 Arrival ceremonies start with European Union

10h00 Arrival ceremonies continue with Canada's Paul Martin

11h00 Arrival ceremonies proceed each hour in reverse order of protocol rank

19h00^a Opening dinner at The Cloister with spouses and perhaps invited family friends

Wednesday, June 9

09h00^a First summit session with all eight members

12h00 Luncheon session with invited greater Middle East leaders (Jordan, Algeria, Bahrain, Yemen, Afghanistan, Turkey)

14h00 Afternoon session

18h00 Evening session?

Thursday, June 10

09h00^a Session with invited African leaders on several issues (South Africa, Nigeria, Senegal, Algeria, Uganda, Ghana)

12h00^a Summit concludes

Note:

a. Approximate time.