

KFAS–Stanford Sustainable Democracy Roundtable

출장보고서

2023. 9. 26

KDI 산업시장정책연구부

1 출장 배경 및 목적

- KFAS-Stanford Sustainable Democracy Roundtable 주최 측의 요청으로 동 행사 참석 및 토론
 - 지속가능 민주주의 원탁회의는 한국고등교육재단(Korea Foundation for Advanced Studies)과 스탠포드대학 아시아태평양연구센터(Stanford Walter H. Shorenstein Asia-Pacific Research Center)가 공동 주최하는 전문가 회의임
 - 미국과 한국의 정치학, 국제관계, 사회학, 경제학을 포함한 광범한 분야의 학자 및 전문가들이 모여 민주주의와 시장경제의 지속적 발전방향을 논의

2 출장 개요

- 출장지 및 기간
 - 출장지: 미국 스탠포드 대학 아시아태평양연구센터
 - 출장기간: 2023년 8월 28일(월) ~ 9월 1일(금)
- 출장자 (총 1명)

소속	성명	직위
KDI 산업시장정책연구부	안상훈	선임연구위원

- 주요활동
 - 8월 29일 및 8월 20일 양일에 걸쳐 총 5개 세션 및 최종 정리 세션의 원탁회의 참석자로서 전체 토론 참석

3 출장 일정

8월 28일 인천공항 출발 및 현지 도착

Day 1: Monday, August 28

Afternoon Arrival

6:00pm Reception & welcome dinner at Riace (200 Sheridan Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94306)

8월 29일 원탁회의 (2일차)

Day 2: Tuesday, August 29

8:30-8:45am Registration (Redwood Room, Faculty Club, Stanford University)

8:45-9:00am Opening Remarks

Gi-Wook Shin , Director, Shorenstein APARC, Stanford University

Choi Byung-il , President, KFAS

9:00-10:00am Session 1 | “Where We Stand Now”

- How would you diagnose the current state of liberal democracy?
- What are notable global trends in liberal democracy?
- How do you envision the next 10 years of democracy from global perspectives?

Speaker: Francis Fukuyama , Professor, Stanford University

Moderator: Choi Byung-il , President, KFAS

10:15-12:15pm Session 2 | “Looking into Backbone: Institutions”

- Should the judiciary serve as the final arbiter of a country’s disputes?
- Is the party system the one and only? Can direct citizen action serve as an alternative?
- Is liberal democracy necessarily better than other political regimes in terms of livelihood or quality of life?

Moderator: Kim Sunhyuk , Professor, Korea University

1:30-3:30pm Session 3 | “Under the Microscope: Pathology”

- Can liberal democracy be saved from digital media?
- Under the assumption that polarization is incurable, how should a highly polarized society live with it?
- Is populism necessarily pernicious for democracy?

Moderator: Mike McFaul , Director, FSI, Stanford University

4:00-5:15pm Session 4 | “Scoring Cards: Performance”

- Research Presentation

Presenter: Robb Willer , Professor, Stanford University

Moderator: Gi-Wook Shin , Director, APARC, Stanford University

8월 30일 원탁회의 (3일차)

Day 3: Wednesday, August 30

10:15-12:00pm Session 5 | “Prescribing for Democratic Malaise”

- What are key takeaways from the discussion?
- What are policy prescriptions for the democratic malaise facing the world?

Moderator: Song Jiyeoun , Professor, Seoul National University

12:00-12:30pm Wrap-up

- What is the next step? What would be possible dates/venues for the next iteration?
- What are specific plans for the final output?

12:30-2:00pm Farewell luncheon

8월 31일 현지 출발 익일(9월 1일) 인천공항 도착

4 활동 내용

원탁회의 참석자 명단

○ 미국측

Joan CHO, Assistant Professor of East Asian Studies and by courtesy, Government, Wesleyan University

Sang-hun CHOE, Seoul Bureau Chief, New York Times

Francis FUKUYAMA, Senior Fellow, FSI/Director, Ford Dorsey MIP Program, Stanford University

Aram HUR, Kim Koo Chair in Korean Studies & Assistant Professor of Political

Science, The Fletcher School, Tufts University

Didi KUO, Associate Director for Research, CDDRL, Stanford University
Mike MCFAUL, Director, FSI, Stanford University
Joe MERNYK, PhD Student, Department of Sociology, Stanford University
Kerstin NORRIS, MA Student, Center for East Asian Studies, Stanford University
Nate PERSILY, Professor, Stanford Law School/Senior Fellow, FSI, Stanford University
Gi-Wook SHIN, Professor, Department of Sociology/Director, APARC, Stanford University
Kathryn STONER, Senior Fellow, FSI/Director, CDDRL, Stanford University
Kiyoteru TSUTSUI, Professor, Department of Sociology/Director, APARC Japan Program, Stanford University
Robb WILLER, Professor, Department of Sociology, Stanford University

○ 한국측

AHN Sanghoon, Senior Fellow, Korea Development Institute
CHOI Byung-il, President, Korea Foundation for Advanced Studies
CHOI Donghyun, Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, Brown University
HA Shang-eung, Professor, Department of Political Science, Sogang University
HONG Jiyeon, Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, University of Michigan
HONG Seongjae, Student (MA), Department of Political Science and International Relations, Seoul National University
KIM Jaeyeon, Senior Quantitative Researcher, Code for America
KIM Sunhyuk, Professor, Department of Public Administration, Korea University

LEE Munseob, Assistant Professor, UC San Diego School of Global Policy and Strategy
OH Seung-Youn, Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, Bryn Mawr College
RHO Sungmin, Associate Professor, Department of Political Science and International Relations, Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies
SONG Jiewuh, Associate Professor, Department of Political Science & International Relations, Seoul National University
SONG Jiyeoun, Professor, Graduate School of International Studies, Seoul National University
YOU Hye Young, Associate Professor in Politics and School of Politics and International Affairs (SPIA), Princeton University.

□ 원탁회의 주요 토의 주제

○ Session 1: “Where We Stand Now”

After the prolonged heated ideological battle of the Cold War came to an end with the fall of the Berlin Wall, Francis Fukuyama triumphantly declared “the end of history.” The ensuing hyper-globalization was thought to accelerate the convergence of the non-western world to liberal democracy. To the contrary, liberal democracy failed to prevail, but kept the ebb and flow pattern. Recently, this trend has become more distinct. Authoritarian regimes keep challenging legitimacy and performance of liberal democracy, proclaiming that their systems work better for the people. Through “democratic recession,” a la Larry Diamond, history has come back.

Prior to the onset of the Cold War, Joseph Schumpeter identified the

two necessary conditions to democracy: capable select leaders and good government with a well-trained bureaucracy. As the next course of history witnessed, thriving market economy proved the decisive factor to determine the fate of the Cold War. Thanks to the trinity of leaders, institutions, and economic performance, liberal democracy survived the Cold War of the 20th century. Can it survive the test of time through the New Cold War of the 21st century?

Even more worrisome fact is that pundits observe the rise of anti-democratic forces in the heartland of democracy, the U.S. The very health of liberal democracy as we know it is being questioned. Martin Wolf questions “In an age of populist demagoguery, ‘illiberal democracy,’ personalized autocracy and China’s institutionalized despotism, will democratic capitalism – the marriage between liberal democracy and market capitalism – endure?” Government by the people seems increasingly vulnerable to the illiberal populism, while elected political leaders turn institutions into their personal interests, driving wedge between the society and the political faction.

According to the V-Dem Report 2023, the outlook for liberal democracy is grim. For the first time in more than two decades, there are more autocracies than liberal democracies. The number of democratizing countries went down to 14 last year, in comparison to 43 in 2002. At the same time, V-Dem reported a new record of 42 countries are in transition to autocracy, or “autocratizing.” Regardless whether one agrees with this conclusion, it deserves serious thought why this trend is being observed and what should be done about it.

Against this backdrop, this session is designed to lay the groundwork for deep thinking about the state of liberal democracy and its future.

Even the U.S., the bedrock and undoubted champion of liberal democracy, is under threat. Democracy in Korea, a poster child of the third wave democratization, is also in troubled waters.

Participants from the U.S. and Korea are to ask themselves questions of where we are, where we are headed in terms of how strongly committed our respective countries are to defending political rights/civil liberties. Specifically, this session sets the stage for insightful discussion about the three fundamental questions: current state of liberal democracy; global trends in liberal democracy; and next ten years outlook from global perspectives.

Libertas quae sera tamen (Liberty, even when it comes late).

o Session 2: “Looking into Backbone: Institutions”

Democracy relies on well-designed institutions that collaborate and maintain a delicate balance. This session aims to examine the current status of democracy by reevaluating its fundamental institutional elements and principles.

First, both the United States and South Korea uphold the principle of “separation of powers” and embrace the concept of “checks and balances” among the three branches of government. However, in recent years, the political sphere has increasingly relied on courts to resolve social conflicts, attributing this trend to the separation of powers, the rule of law, and the expertise of the judiciary.

Nevertheless, this growing judicialization poses concerns. Unelected judges, who may lack a deep understanding of the everyday realities of

citizens, are often entrusted with resolving critical political and social issues. In South Korea, this trend extends further to the “prosecutorialization” of politics, where the Prosecutor’s Office intervenes to settle partisan disputes. Should the judiciary serve as the ultimate arbiter of a nation’s disputes? Is this arrangement suitable for democracy in both the short and long term?

Second, electoral representation is a fundamental aspect of modern democracy, with political parties playing a central role. Political parties, organized around societal identities and divisions, compete for political power, forming the fundamental backbone of democratic governance. However, in cases where political parties repeatedly fail to deliver on the demands of voters, should we cling steadfastly to the belief that the party system is the sole domain of representation in a democracy?

South Korea’s history is marked by frequent civic mobilization, wherein citizens voice their dissent and demand solutions to pressing issues. How should political parties adapt and engage with social movements? Should civil society and civic activism be regarded as secondary and supplementary to political parties, despite the latter’s flaws and lack of institutionalization? Are social movements “abnormal” occurrences that arise only when traditional party politics falter? Considering the significant advancements in information and communication technologies, is it accurate to claim that civic activism is limited to raising issues and asking questions, rather than resolving problems?

Third, as democracies face challenges while authoritarian regimes gain ground, the performance of a political regime becomes crucial for acquiring and sustaining legitimacy and public support. The ability to deliver positive outcomes, such as improved livelihoods and a higher

quality of life, is pivotal in countering authoritarian nostalgia and strengthening democratic legitimacy. Performance encompasses various dimensions, including the protection of individual rights, the rule of law, accountability, openness, inclusivity, and economic prosperity.

However, citizens in flawed democracies, particularly those teetering on the edge of consolidation or deconsolidation, may question whether liberal democracy truly offers a superior quality of life compared to alternative political regimes. Are there clear answers to this question? What insights can we glean from the experiences of South Korea and the United States regarding the comparative performance of democratic and authoritarian regimes? When democracies lag behind autocracies in terms of quality of life, what alternative justifications for democracy can be presented? Is authoritarian performance sustainable, and if so, for how long? What steps can democracies take to address these challenges?

- Session 3: “Under the Microscope: Pathology”

Can liberal democracy be saved from digital media?

- How has the rise of social media (and now AI) affected the relationship between the public and governments?
- How has the prevalence of misinformation affected the pursuit of liberal democracy, fair elections, and representation, especially with the rise of AI?
- How do we govern social media (and misinformation) while also promoting and preserving liberal values such as freedom of speech or the right to privacy?

Under the assumption that some level of polarization is incurable, how should a highly polarized society live with it?

- What is the relationship between polarization and misinformation?
How do we remedy these trends, especially if there is growing public distrust of the government?

- How should we approach some of the most contentious topics (such as abortion access rights, climate change, LGBTQ equality, voting rights, etc.) in a polarized society and government?

Is populism necessarily pernicious for democracy?

- What has been the impact of populism on democracies across the globe?

- How has the emergence of social media influenced the rise of populism?

- What is the relationship between populism and “strong man” authoritarianism, and how does this relationship affect democratic institutions?

- How do we reconcile populist ideals with liberal democratic values, especially those of diversity and inclusion?