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“Civil society has a certain view of government. Government has a certain view of civil society. Unless you actually start working together, you don’t really realize your relative strengths.” -Kofi Annan

PART I
GLOBAL GOVERNANCE

1.1. INTRODUCTION

The international community today faces enormous challenges in dealing with economic governance--challenges related to the growing interdependence of economies and civil society, the continued impoverishment of much of the world and the unused human potential that entails, and the increased realization of the threats to the environment and thus to planetary survival. While the world has become much more highly integrated economically, the mechanisms for managing the system in a stable, sustainable way have lagged behind. Today's much higher level of economic integration and resulting interdependence are in part due to improved communications. When the post-war system of global governance was being conceived and negotiated, television, computers, and international telephone systems had barely been introduced. The conduct of business, multimedia, methods of production, tastes, and life-styles have since changed out of all recognition. That all this global economic integration has come to pass is in part a tribute to the relative order and stability of post-war economic governance, as well as to new technologies. Enormous opportunities are being created for societies and individuals to advance.

Yet the structures of global governance required for pursuing public policy obligations in an interdependent world are underdeveloped. A further concern is that the integration of markets does not necessarily occur harmoniously. Different systems of commercial law making, tax, social welfare, bureaucratic decision-making, corporate governance, labour law, and much else have a bearing on how firms compete with those from other countries through trade and direct investment. Without good, clear rules that are widely accepted, there is ‘systems friction’ based on a sense of unfairness or incomprehension.
In the attempts to codify and progressively develop the present state and future direction of international law in the field of sustainable development and global citizenship, it is imperative that the international community continues to uphold public governance. Without this, the globalizing society faces a much more uncertain, insecure and inequitable future.

There is an inevitable tension between the democratic ideal of universal participation and the need for speedy, efficient decision-making, as well as between the respective claims of statehood, population, and wealth. The tension has increased as the number of states has grown while global economic decision-making, far from reflecting a polycentric world, has become concentrated in the hands of the few countries. Whatever the democratic legitimacy of current intergovernmental arrangements for global economic governance, a fresh approach to the question is required by the shifting centre of gravity of the world economy. Taken as a whole, the present study concentrates on creating a global attention that can provide leadership in economic, socio-cultural, and political fields.

1.2. PAPER DESIGN

The following article takes a critical stance towards this conceptualization of global governance as a descriptive term. This article tries to free the concept of global governance from its descriptive bonds. I hold that global governance represents less a description of a corresponding world to be observed, but a legitimizing or justifying claim of certain policy options assumed to be better designed to the new circumstances of a globalising world.

The purpose of this paper is to demonstrate that global governance can be understood from several perspectives. This has done so by focusing on three themes: state sovereignty, globalization and world citizenship. The paper is divided into three parts. The first part gives introduction and meaning and principles of global governance. The second part explains the new global agendas with special reference to regionalism, multilateralism and the sovereignty. It also concentrates on the role of UN in strengthening global governance and global citizenship issues. The third part examines the global governance and the civil society, problems of governance and measures to overcome from them. It concludes with a note on importance of global governance at present day world.

1.3. GLOBAL GOVERNANCE:

1.3.1. Meaning

There is no universally accepted definition of ‘governance’, but this term is often used to refer to interpretations of order, stability and politico-economic management. The Commission on Global Governance has, for instance, defined governance as ‘the sum of the many ways individuals and institutions, public and private, manage their common affairs’. It has posited that governance is ‘a continuing process through which conflicting and diverse interests may be accommodated and co-operative action may be taken’.
Traditionally, governance has been associated with "governing," or with political authority, institutions, and, ultimately, control. Governance in this particular sense denotes formal political institutions that aim to coordinate and control interdependent social relations and that have the ability to enforce decisions. However, authors like James Rosenau have also used "governance" to denote the regulation of interdependent relations in the absence of overarching political authority, such as in the international system.

Thus, global governance may be defined as: the complex of formal and informal institutions, mechanisms, relationships, and processes between and among states, markets, citizens and organizations, both inter- and non-governmental, through which collective interests on the global plane are articulated, rights and obligations are established, and differences are mediated."

**PART II**

**GLOBAL GOVERNANCE AND WORLD CITIZENSHIP**

In the next fifty years, the world's population will increase by fifty percent, from 6 billion people to 10 billion. The 3-billion-person increase will occur solely in developing countries, while the number of people living in advanced industrial countries will be about the same in 2050 as it is today—roughly 1 billion people.

These trends mean that the industrial countries associated with "the West" (including Japan) will become an ever smaller minority of the world's population, with their share of the world's population falling from 17 percent to 11 percent. By contrast, the number of people in developing countries will increase in population by sixty percent, from 5 to 8 billion people. This means that the global majority from the developing countries today will total about 90 percent of humanity by 2050.

The implications of these demographic and economic facts are that the structures, mechanisms, and processes of global economic governance must be realigned to better correspond to the current realities of the global economy and global society, not to mention the patterns that will change over the next half-century.

**2.1. THE NEW GLOBAL AGENDA**

It is not just a matter of population and economic weight. It is also a matter of how globalization has changed the way countries interact economically. Globalization is not merely the internationalization of trade and financial flows between national economies interacting at arm's length. Globalization, in fact, has fundamentally transformed the nature of international economic interaction.
The world’s economies now penetrate each other's internal domains because large, modern firms are no longer merely factories but global networks that function seamlessly across borders. Intra-industry and intra-firm trade have increased as a proportion of total trade. The integration of world financial markets has created what is essentially a single global capital market. Migration and the outsourcing of activities have transformed and linked labor markets globally. And modern transportation and communication linkages in effect have shrunk geographic distance. As a result of these factors, porous borders have changed the meaning of the boundaries that define nations.

These transformations in the nature of international economic interactions put new demands on the mechanisms, institutions, and policies of global economic governance. In particular, political and policy attention must be focused on the inter-face issues between finance, trade, development, and poverty reduction as well as between economic, social, environmental, and governance issues. This translates into a need to focus on the inter-relationship between the principal international institutions dealing with each in these various “domains” and on the complementarities, synergies, and interactions among them.

2.1.1. Governance and Knowledge Management

A more knowledge-intensive approach to governance will redefine how the public sector relates internally to its own agencies and its own employees. Stripped down to its bare essentials, e-government is concerned with leveraging and distributing knowledge more effectively – government-to-citizen (G2C), government to-business (G2B) and inter-departmentally within government (G2G). As the business of modern government gets more complex and knowledge-intensive, the potential for cost and service benefits associated with streamlining Knowledge Management becomes greater.

Modern government remains paper-based. Handling this paper is very important, because it contains a large amount of knowledge. When you set about establishing a new Knowledge Management system you want to ensure that it adequately captures this paper-based information. However, digitizing paper-based archives and moving tacit knowledge from the minds of experienced staff members into a Knowledge Management system is a time intensive process, often complicated by people who are reluctant to share what they know in a formal way. Even relatively limited public sector projects can have demanding Knowledge Management requirements.

This emphasis upon a people-driven approach to successful Knowledge Management is significant for a number of reasons. Firstly, it represents a dramatic departure from seeing Knowledge Management purely as a category of technology-driven fixes. Secondly, it has served to focus senior-level attention on the need for process change to support Knowledge Management objectives. It is the latter which is set to have far-reaching consequences for the nature of governance in Asia.
2.1.2. Regionalism

Now I come to my second point which has to do with globalization and global governance. We have used the word globalization in the last few days without defining it. So let me give you my own definition. Globalization is the tendency for an increasing number of actors to consider the whole world as their relevant chessboard, or theater of operations to use the military term. This is clearly the case for many economic agents and for many non-governmental organizations. (And by the way, all the demonstrators in Seattle who are themselves against globalization are actors of globalization. It is one of the paradoxes of the situation.) Many issues are global by their very nature, such as environmental issues and transnational crime. And we all know that globalization goes along with the increasing importance of civil society, a Western concept.

2.1.3. Informal Multi-lateralism

A third reason for a more broad-based global governance structure is that demographic and economic growth and globalization are associated with global cultural shifts. While many of the trappings of Western consumer culture have influenced the rest of the world, it would be parochial for the West to think that Western formulations of progress and modernity are universally held. There is in fact an increasing global presence of cultural expression from the non-Western world—Africa, Arab-Islam, Asia, and Latin America. The world is becoming increasingly and overtly multicultural, as it becomes increasingly multi-polar, economically.

Different cultures—with their distinctive perspectives on nature and the environment, community and individualism, and cooperation and competition—can have sharply different views on policy issues and on such basic questions as the role of the state. The broad goals and instruments of international economic, social, and environmental policies are determined in part by the perceptions of what represents progress and modernization. Distinctive visions of modernism and progress can help shape the future. Global governance mechanisms need to be vehicles for voicing and hearing those perspectives rather than excluding them.

2.1.4. State and Governance: The Question of Sovereignty

There is no doubt that globalisation has had some effects on state behaviour. Rapid changes in the technology of transport and communications have made it necessary for policy makers to devise new ways of responding to both domestic and global problems. In this sense, globalisation is a restructuring process that cannot be ignored by policy makers. However, states, especially the great powers, still determine the environment in which other international actors operate.

Explaining how globalisation relates to global governance requires a re-iteration of discussion of sovereignty. Sovereignty not only defines the identities and capabilities of groups in world politics but also limits the ability of outsiders to interfere in domestic affairs. Thus, sovereignty determines agency or the capacity for independent action in world politics. In this sense, sovereignty and self-determination are interrelated.
Self-determination provides a theory to explain when state boundaries are legitimate and when not, thus implying guidelines to use for deciding whether they should be honoured or not. The pursuit of self-determination legitimizes sovereignty. Like sovereignty, what self-determination involves has changed over time. A monarch could, literally, claim that his military capacities presented a fait accompli without worrying too much about whether he had the right to rule: he was, materially, self-determining. The French and American revolutions challenged this position and spread the notion that sovereignty ought to be popular. Then the twentieth century produced two competing norms regarding ‘who’ the ‘self’ is in self-determination, each norm embodied in an international treaty. The Treaty of Versailles promoted ethnic self-determination and thereby legitimated sovereignty based on the nationalist norm.

However, later international treaties, including the charters of the UN and the Organisation of African Unity, promoted state self-determination, thereby legitimating sovereignty based largely on the territorial norm. What these conceptions shared was the idea that a group ought to be able to determine its own future, and that sovereignty was necessary to enable true autonomy.

With globalisation, the interpretation of sovereignty and state capacity for independent action in world politics has been affected by two factors. The first is that values, which are associated with the West, have been universalised and depoliticized. This has made possible the second factor, namely the change in international norms relating to development trajectories. There are no longer alternative paths to successful development. Modernisation theory, discarded decades earlier, has made a comeback.

A. Dilemmas of Global Governance

Globalisation has prompted observers to claim that the earth has become a global village. However, if the earth is a global village, it is one where only some inhabitants retain their traditions, cultures, rituals and symbols. Western-derived rules and standards have constructed the so-called global village. The interests and values of non-Westerners are largely ignored, except mainly as tourist attractions. The 'global' values, which are trumpeted under the banner of globalisation, were not arrived at through reflection and consensus in the international society. They are the norms, symbols and standards that have been promoted by the powerful Western countries largely for their own benefit.

According to the huge literature on global governance and public perceptions of globalisation processes, the sovereign state is increasingly losing control over central aspects of governing. Theoretically, global governance offers an analytical concept to subsume various efforts at the global level to come to terms with this loss of control and to balance the uncontrolled processes of globalisation. In this perspective, the concept of global governance is used to describe certain developments and institutions beyond the state which try to regulate and control the new forces of globalisation.
2.2. THE UN AND FUTURE OF GLOBAL GOVERNANCE

The United Nations has played a key role in strengthening global governance by consistently promoting the participation of civil society in the processes of dialogue and deliberation leading to new forms of political regulation. In this regard, the following are imperative to observe:

- International norms and standards
- Human rights
- Civil society
- Promotion of multilateralism.

In such an inclusive and participatory environment it was only natural that interaction between civil society and the UN system steadily expanded and diversified. The last decade was indeed marked both by an explosion in the traditional patterns of consultation with non-state actors and by the experimentation of innovative forms of partnership and collaboration. As a result of the growing complexity of this relationship, however, the system that had evolved over several years for facilitating the interaction between the United Nations and Civil Society began to show signs of strain.

A. Third World and the Global Governance

What generally concerns Third World states is that most of the power within the UN is held by Western countries, which dominate the international system politically, economically, technologically and militarily. Western countries also have the means to promote their values and norms more effectively than the non-Western states. That is why Samuel Huntington has argued: ‘The West in effect is using international institutions, military power and economic resources to run the world in ways that will maintain Western predominance, protect Western interests and promote Western political and economic values’.

The exigencies of global governance in this millennium require the UN to rethink its norms, structures, procedures and practices. If the UN were to make a difference to global governance, it would need to address more seriously the imperative for democratization in its agencies, taking account of growing demands for transparency and popular participation. Greater openness cannot be achieved without creative efforts to recast sovereignty.

2.3. GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP: A NEW PARADIGM OF RIGHTS, RESPONSIBILITIES AND AUTHORITY

We are living in a new world. Today's world order is more open, complex, diverse, interconnected and risky than ever before. Contemporary global order is increasingly the outcome of multiple, interlocking patterns of transnational interaction shaped both by state and non-state actors. Critical problems cut across national territorial jurisdictions and are being debated by a variety of civic associations in a widening public space. Global threats, such as financial volatility, environmental disasters, terrorism, drugs and contagious diseases, affect people's lives everywhere and are of such a magnitude that no country can address them on its own.
Globalization dramatically increases the interrelation of the national and global spheres. But globalization is not only an economic or technological process. It is also a political, social and cultural phenomenon. It is not only capitals and goods that are being exchanged in the global arena. It is also information, values, symbols and ideas. It is not only markets and financial flows that are increasingly integrated. Flexible partnerships and networks are also enhancing the capacity of civic associations and social movements to participate and influence.

The influence of civil society in the management of global change, in turn, could never have reached their present breadth and scope without the concomitant rise of citizen action. The growth of private action for the public good is a recent, massive, almost universal phenomenon. The 'global associational revolution' expanded and strengthened democracy at the national level. This was - and still is in many places - a conflictive, uneven process. The trend towards more informed, participatory and responsible societies seems, however, both widespread and irreversible. Global governance - as well as globalization - is a highly contested process where the space for political action by states and non-state actors is greatly extended.

A. Achieving Global Citizenship

International solutions to global problems can only be obtained if people accept the decisions that are taken as legitimate and act so as to implement them. The reduction of greenhouse gases will occur if people are willing to use new types of non-polluting energy (and pay for them in higher costs). International control of trafficking in illicit drugs will only be possible if demand for these drugs is reduced. International public management will only be possible if people continue to be willing to pay for international institutions. In short, world citizenship is a necessary pre-condition as well as a consequence of international action to deal with the commons.

The rights, responsibilities and authority underlying world citizenship, as a complement to national citizenship, have yet to be set out. The Universal Declaration on Human Rights still defines individual rights in terms of the State, not the international system. International programmatic statements like the Platform for Action adopted by the Fourth World Conference on Women are only now beginning to target some responsibilities to individuals. It would be important to set out more clearly the relationship of the individual to world order in terms of rights and obligations, both to show its importance and its complementarily with the kinds of citizenship that have been taught in schools (and the Boy Scouts) for generations. The debate on the content of world citizenship would help place other discussions of global governance in context. It would help determine what international authority could mean.

Perhaps the greatest defect is that the discourse on global governance does not focus on the relationship between the individual and the new suprastate machinery in the terms that define citizenship. It does not consider how new world-based identity is being created and it does not look at how attitudes like civic competence can be developed with a world focus.
When events and structural changes seem to overwhelm existing concepts and paradigms, it is often useful to go back to first principles. Aristotle in his *Politics* and Almond and Verba in their *Civic Culture* went back to the individual to build their paradigms. It is perhaps opportune to do this now in the context of global governance and begin a discourse on the meaning of world citizenship.

**PART III**

**A UNIFIED CIVIL SOCIETY**

We judge that the problems we have identified are not due to globalization as such but to deficiencies in its governance. Global markets have grown rapidly without the parallel development of economic and social institutions necessary for their smooth and equitable functioning. At the same time, there is concern about the unfairness of key global rules on trade and finance and their asymmetric effects on rich and poor countries.

An additional concern is the failure of current international policies to respond adequately to the challenges posed by globalization. Market opening measures and financial and economic considerations predominate over social ones. Official Development Assistance (ODA) falls far short of the minimum amounts required even for achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and tackling growing global problems. The multilateral system responsible for designing and implementing international policies is also under-performing. It lacks policy coherence as a whole and is not sufficiently democratic, transparent and accountable.

These rules and policies are the outcome of a system of global governance largely shaped by powerful countries and powerful players. There is a serious democratic deficit at the heart of the system. Most developing countries still have very limited influence in global negotiations on rules and in determining the policies of key financial and economic institutions. Similarly, workers and the poor have little or no voice in this governance process.

**3.1. GLOBAL GOVERNANCE AND CIVIL SOCIETY**

Civil society is not only diverse and complex. It is also deeply divided on its political options and tactical approaches to several issues. This is not in itself a problem, insofar as democracy is, intrinsically, a conflictive space. However, contrary to an often idealized self-image, civil society is not the realm of 'good values and intentions' in contrast to the logic of power and interests ascribed to national states. Civic and community groups may also advocate for causes that are deeply controversial and, in some instances, incompatible with universally-accepted norms and principles.

Civil society's capacity to influence is also reinforced by the impact of the mass media on the conduct of public affairs and the increasing plurality of available sources of information. These converging trends create an environment in which political pressure and social demands are being directly expressed to power-holders, bypassing the traditional structures of political
representation. The following points are posed to determine interrelationship between global governance and civil society.

1. Combine support for civil society’s role in global governance with the preservation of national sovereignty and equity in international relations.

   Civil society has a capacity to act on its own that is not dependent on any authorization or mandate. There is a growing recognition, based on experience, that collaboration and partnership involving multiple actors increases the available stock of ideas, capacities and resources to deal with a given problem. The key question, then, is how to overcome still existing mutual prejudices and misconceptions so that governments do not associate greater civil society influence with the undermining of their sovereignty and the widening of the power imbalances between the North and the South.

   Enhancing the capacities and resources of Southern civil society is a pre-condition for correcting existing distortions and inequalities. Paradoxically, Northern domination within civil society can only be reinforced by the restrictions imposed by the governments of some developing countries on their domestic civic sector. Hence the critical importance of promoting collaborative patterns of dialogue and partnership between State and civil society at the national level.

   In the same way that civil society can act without asking for any kind of permission or authorization there may also be legitimate limits to their direct participation in the intergovernmental decision-making process. Too much emphasis on gaining power to influence decisions may be counter-productive, generating a backlash.

2. Relating emerging world public opinion with global civil society.

   There is no alternative to democracy. In the same way that democracy was gradually strengthened in the domestic sphere through the interaction of many actors, also at the level of international relations democracy can only be achieved and sustained through argument and debate.

   This is exactly what civil society, in its cultural and social diversity does best. Unilateralist approaches or the clash of opposing viewpoints undermine the United Nations and international law. The risks of division and deadlock within the international system are real.

3.2. PROBLEMS OF GLOBAL GOVERNANCE

   Until recently, the dominant mode of social organization has been the modern nation-state. The conditions for an orderly conduct of social activity have been provided by the state as the modern solution to the problem of the realization of historical progress and order in the sense of the achievement of a common good. The state, formulated in the principle of sovereignty, has been “the crucial modern political articulation of all spatiotemporal relations”.

At first sight, global governance is directed against a set of global problems. Economic, security, and environmental issues are observed to be in need of global management and submitted to global mechanisms and institutions. In this view, the outside of global governance consists in any resistance to the global management of the respective issue-areas. Since the initiatives and measures of global governance are meant to produce solutions to the issue-areas at hand, any forces that might challenge the governance effort are treated as undesirable disruptions. The necessity to sustain governance in order to cope with the identified problem areas leaves no place for the possibility of resistance to a global governance system. The implication of this functional logic is not only that any resistance is placed outside of global governance, but “that it is something to be overcome with effective governance”. With the starting point that asks the question of how global problems can be handled, the discourse on global governance is so pre-occupied with the question of how order is possible that it finally ends up in a single encompassing logic that leaves no place beyond governance where alternatives could be formulated or resistance could occur.

In addition to the exclusive logic of the global governance discourse in regard to the domain of global mechanisms, the conceptual configuration of global governance creates a second, even more severe distinction of inside/outside concerning the content and scope of the envisaged regulation. The appeal to global governance brings forward the claim to create a new administration of things for the global. Therefore, as already mentioned, it defines a set of global problems that should be handled globally. To do this, the discourse on global governance stresses the need for the construction of consensus and the avoidance of creating ‘battlegrounds’ as essential to the proper operation of the governance system. However, what falls by the wayside is a concept of politics which is concerned about questions of which affairs are to be pursued, how problems are to be identified, and who possesses the competence to interpret a certain state of affairs as something. Global governance is functionally happening, while increasingly ‘the bridge between governance and politics becomes obscured.’ Global governance takes place after the relevant issues are identified and the course of action is selected. Inside the global governance system, the type of problems and the form of solutions that should guide governance are already identified and are waiting for implementation. Any form of politics is supposed to stay outside, because it would undermine the effective operation of the governance system. In this way, governance becomes somewhat ‘post-political’, because it is something that takes place after values are chosen, goals are set and political deliberations have designed the future path to a better world. Because political struggles and contests would be counterproductive to the emerging consensus of global regulation, governance itself has to become a sort of boundary for the political.
3.3. MEASURES TO IMPROVE GLOBAL GOVERNANCE

To overcome from the problems of global governance and global citizenship, the following measures can be taken.

1. Give civil society organizations a formal role in the governance structure.
2. Support the role of civil society organizations through continuous, transparent communications and information sharing efforts.
3. Given the complexities inherent in involving civil society in international institutions.
4. Provide resources to civil society organizations that can maximize their participation and improve their effectiveness in influencing key decisions and processes.
5. Ensure that civil society representatives truly represent their constituencies.
6. Develop knowledge management strategies in order to improve the processes of knowledge acquisition, sharing and utilization, to lessen the cost of these processes.
7. Continuously measure and evaluate performance according to a set of performance indicators, and to benchmark their own performance to best practices of other organizations.
8. Ensure such principles of good governance as openness, transparency and participation of staff, stakeholders and citizens in the processes of knowledge acquisition, sharing and utilization.
9. Include knowledge management performance indicators as well as indicators of good governance in performance measurement systems.
10. Encourage active participation of stakeholders and citizens in development of performance measurement and knowledge management systems.

It is thus, the success of global governance depends on the focus on people, a democratic and effective state, sustainable development, productive and equitable markets, fair rules, and globalization with solidarity, greater accountability to people, deeper partnerships and an effective United Nations.

3.4. CONCLUSION

Global governance, which is essentially a product of liberal thinking, concerns so-called global values, norms, standards and rules. Today the basic challenge of globalization is about sustainable development and, through equity cooperative behavior the fulfillment of the social and economic rights for all. The global governance order and Security can’t be defined only for the richest; and dealing with poverty and equity means that the trade regime (efficient and long time established) and the economic strategic consensus, had to compose with these problems, through a real concern, evaluation of the effects of the trade regime on social and economic rights–with if necessary new rules or exceptions–and that international public aid or international distributive mechanisms reach the enforcement of these rights.
Global governance does not end uniteness. Even though the discursive formation of
global governance is intended to overcome the inside/outside distinction of the sovereign state,
the conceptual configuration implied by global governance creates new boundaries of
inside/outside. The claim to a new inside implicitly accompanying the discourses on global
governance comes up with two serious shortcomings: First, the all-encompassing logic allows
nothing to roam outside the governance grid, since everything beyond global governance would
move to dysgovernance. And second, the concept of global governance comes up with pre-
defined values and goals, thereby excluding any political deliberation and contest from its own
agenda. To overcome these shortcomings, a ‘therapeutical re-description’ would be necessary to
confront the a-political conception of global governance which interprets the dissolution of
territorial-bounded politics as the disappearance of politics itself.

Perhaps the strongest force for change is a change in mindset which globalization itself is
bringing about: Improvements in communication and the lowering of transportation costs have
brought with them an increasing familiarity with those in other countries. There is a growing
recognition that we live in a single planet, that we are increasingly interdependent.
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