

Vysoká škola ekonomická v Praze  
Recenzované studie

**Working Papers**  
**Fakulty mezinárodních vztahů**

12/2008

**Global Civil Society**  
**Conceptual Questions**

Tomáš Rohrbacher

**Faculty of International Relations  
Working Papers**

12/2008

**Global Civil Society  
Conceptual Questions**

Tomáš Rohrbacher

Volume II



Vysoká škola ekonomická v Praze  
Working Papers Fakulty mezinárodních vztahů  
**Výzkumný záměr MSM6138439909**

---

Tato studie byla vypracována v rámci Výzkumného záměru Fakulty mezinárodních vztahů Vysoké školy ekonomické v Praze MSM6138439909 „Governance v kontextu globalizované ekonomiky a společnosti“. Studie procházejí recenzním řízením.

**Název:** Working Papers Fakulty mezinárodních vztahů  
**Četnost vydávání:** Vychází minimálně desetkrát ročně  
**Vydavatel:** Vysoká škola ekonomická v Praze  
Nakladatelství Oeconomica  
Náměstí Winstona Churchilla 4, 130 67 Praha 3, IČO: 61 38 43 99  
**Evidenční číslo MK ČR:** E 17794  
**ISSN tištěné verze:** 1802-6591  
**ISSN on-line verze:** 1802-6583  
**ISBN tištěné verze:**  
**Vedoucí projektu:** Prof. Ing. Eva Cihelková, CSc.  
Vysoká škola ekonomická v Praze, Fakulta mezinárodních vztahů  
Náměstí Winstona Churchilla 4, 130 67 Praha 3  
+420 224 095 270, +420 224 095 248, +420 224 095 230  
<http://vz.fmv.vse.cz/>

## VÝKONNÁ RADA

**Eva Cihelková** (předsedkyně)

Vysoká škola ekonomická v Praze

**Vladimíra Dvořáková**

Vysoká škola ekonomická v Praze

**Olga Hasprová**

Technická univerzita v Liberci

**Zuzana Lehmannová**

Vysoká škola ekonomická v Praze

**Marcela Palíšková**

Nakladatelství C. H. Beck, Praha

**Judita Štouračová**

Vysoká škola mezinárodních  
a veřejných vztahů, Praha

**Dana Zadražilová**

Vysoká škola ekonomická v Praze

## REDAKČNÍ RADA

**Regina Axelrod**

Adelphi university, New York, USA

**Peter Bugge**

Aarhus University, Aarhus, Dánsko

**Petr Cimler**

Vysoká škola ekonomická v Praze

**Peter Čajka**

Univerzita Mateja Bela,  
Bánská Bystrica, Slovensko

**Zbyněk Dubský**

Vysoká škola ekonomická v Praze

**Bernd Hallier**

EHI Retail Institute, Köln,  
Německo

**Jaroslav Jakš**

Metropolitní univerzita Praha

**Vladimír Jeníček**

Vysoká škola ekonomická v Praze

**Eva Karpová**

Vysoká škola ekonomická v Praze

**Jaroslav Kundera**

Uniwersytet Wrocławski, Wrocław,  
Polsko

**Lubor Lacina**

Mendelova zemědělská a lesnická  
univerzita, Brno

**Václava Pánková**

Vysoká škola ekonomická v Praze

**Lenka Pražská**

emeritní profesor

**Mikuláš Sabo**

Ekonomická Univerzita  
v Bratislave, Slovensko

**Margarita Shivergueva**

Nov b'lgarski universitet, Sofie,  
Bulharsko

**Leonid Strowskij**

Ural'skij gosudarstvennyj  
techničeskij universitet,  
Jekatěrinburg, Rusko

**Peter Terem**

Univerzita Mateja Bela,  
Bánská Bystrica, Slovensko

**Milan Vošta**

Vysoká škola ekonomická v Praze

## ŠÉFREDAKTOR

**Jakub Krč**

Vysoká škola ekonomická v Praze

## **Global Civil Society Conceptual Questions**

Tomáš Rohrbacher (rohrbat@vse.cz)

### **Summary:**

This Working Paper aims to map the discourse concerning global civil society and thus outline a theoretical framework of this concept. Drawing on historical premises of emerging civil society bounded to a territory of national state, this paper tries to find out how are these premises applicable on civil society in global scale. It examines the evolution of global civil society, from social movements through global NGO's, towards to contemporary global governance network system which is evidently becoming to include global civil society actors. The paper avoids neither disputable aspects of functions of global civil society or criticisms aimed both at certain actors of global civil society and the concept itself. This Working Paper should be a base for further examination of the concept of global civil society, its actors and its role in the system of global governance.

**Keywords:** globalization, civil society, social movements, global governance.

## **Globální občanská společnost**

### **Konceptuální otázky**

Tomáš Rohrbacher (rohrbat@vse.cz)

### **Abstrakt:**

Tento Working Paper má za cíl zmapovat diskurs týkající se tématu globální občanské společnosti a nastítnit tak teoretický rámec tohoto konceptu. Vychází z historických předpokladů vzniku občanské společnosti úzce vázané na národní stát a snaží se zjistit, jakým způsobem jsou tyto předpoklady aplikovatelné na občanskou společnost v globálním měřítku. Zkoumá vývoj globální občanské společnosti od sociálních hnutí, přes globální neziskové organizace k současnému síťovému systému global governance, jehož součástí se globální občanská společnost zjevně stává. Nevyhýbá se však ani sporným aspektům fungování globální občanské společnosti a kritickým výtkám, které směřují jak ke konkrétním aktérům globální občanské společnosti, tak ke konceptu samotnému. Tento Working Paper by měl být základem pro další zkoumání konceptu globální občanské společnosti, jejích aktérů i jejího postavení v systému global governance.

**Klíčová slova:** globalizace, občanská společnost, sociální hnutí, global governance.

**JEL: A10**

## Content

Introduction.....	7
1. Civil society concept.....	8
2. From social movements to global civil society.....	9
3. What about state?.....	10
4. Market and market relations.....	12
5. Global governance.....	13
6. Threats and opportunities.....	14
Conclusion.....	15
References.....	16

## Introduction

It is broadly discussed that globalization creates conditions for emerging of whole-world market places and within them acting transnational corporations, for unprecedented rapid spread of information of all kind or even faster transfer of capital flows. At the same time this interconnectedness in economical, informational, or even still further value-based aspects of today's world means weakening of national-state boundaries and therefore perhaps traditional civil society, bounded to these states. This process has been present for the last half-century but was further accelerated after the fall of "Iron Curtain" which meant both the end of existence of bipolar world and the beginning of building of democratic institutions and rooting of civil society in recently totalitarian countries of Soviet sphere. In other words, globalization has several dimensions (economical, informational, political, cultural etc.) and global civil society can be understood as one of these dimensions which deserve to be further examined.

It is obvious that transnational civil society existed before 1989 (and even in the countries of Soviet block where local activists and dissidents cooperated with western individuals or organizations, some of them later becoming important leaders of social changes in communist countries – e.g. Havel, Walesa (Kaldor 2003: 5)), but probably first after this year we can truly talk about emerging global civil society. In these days, global civil society is in focus of various scholars, some of them defending this concept, others claiming that it is only an empty shell. Bartelson (2006: 372, 385) points out that „no one seems to know exactly *what* global civil society is, only *that* it is,“ suggesting to use „world society“ instead, as more coherent concept. It seems to be clear that the approach to global civil society have to be different from the disputes about “traditional” civil society. It is because of different conditions in which is global civil society being formed: different role of national states and their governments, different actors on global scene, different “global” problems to be solved. While traditional civil society was being formed within the boundaries of national states, creating a space for public participation, the sphere of global civil society is much larger and more complex.

The collapse of block division of the world enabled significant changes in interconnectedness of many spheres – economical, political, and cultural. It is characterized by “increasingly powerful transnational NGO networks and global social movements that have already changed forever the terms of public debate on globalization.” (Edwards 2001: 145). This debate is rotating around newly emerged cleavage and is performed by „those who emphasize parochial and particularistic concerns, often around preservation of traditional identities, and those who could be described as cosmopolitans, who emphasize international or global principles and values and who favor tolerance and diversity“ (Kaldor

2000: 109). This new cleavage obviously depends on the relationship to globalization.

While traditional civil society had to be related to state, global civil society creates complex networks on multiple levels and with both horizontal and vertical structure. The process of emerging of global civil society is parallel with emerging of global network state (Castells 2008: 89) which means that traditional civil society is changing along with changes of national state and that global civil society has another basis and is shaped by different environment. National states are no more centers of power as they were in the past while there is no new center of power being formed. Although there are many intergovernmental and other supranational organizations, we are not witnessing emergence of global government center. Instead we can talk about global governance as a new system of execution of power which involves new actors including civil society organizations or social movements – members of global civil society.

## **1. Civil society concept**

This can raise question if and how is the concept of civil society transferable on global level while many definitions of civil society bind the existence of civil society to national state as a territorially functioning form of political authority (Kaldor 2003: 16). There are many approaches in defining civil society reaching back to Plato, John Locke or Adam Smith. Most of these authors distinguish civil and uncivil society, while the civil society is based on rules, citizen virtues and non-violent problem resolving. Civility (“good behavior”) is facing uncivilized, barbarian world (Keane 1998), (Benessaieh 2003). It is obvious that in this approach civil society is not divided from state. Later, when states incorporated above mentioned values in its essence, the understanding of civil society changes. It is understood as a realm between state and family, in which opinion clashes mediated by institutions, in which individuals are socialized, take place (Kaldor 2003: 18), including market relations. Clear division between state and civil society appears while state is maintaining an important role in creating of the environment for civil society which is seen as „cultural, social, economic, and ethical arrangements outside the state but inside its boundaries“ (Benessaieh 2003: 106). For Castells (2008: 78, 79) state is important as well when considering civil society but he as well admits a shift in its role and functioning. And as Bartelson (2006: 377, 385) argues, „[t]he civilizing process postulated by the early theorists of civil society was not expected to stop at the boundaries of individual nations and domestic political communities“ adding that global civil society has similar functions as civil society had in times of forming of national states.

It is clear that if we narrow our focus on organizational structure by which I mean especially NGOs or more informal social movements, we can find quite robust evidence that global civil society exists. Greenpeace, Transparency International, Oxfam and many others are representatives of global NGOs fulfilling their missions on global level and being partners or opposition to governments or even intergovernmental and supranational organizations or multinational corporations. But there is of course another dimension, much more normative, concerning values, identities and norms shared by the actors of global civil society which deserve deeper insight. Therefore it is necessary to employ both positive (descriptive) and normative (prescriptive) approaches. Focus on description of functioning of organizations or movements cannot lack their mission, value orientation or expected development because civil society has to be understood more as a dynamic process rather than final setting. Therefore it would be a mistake to understand civil society as a static structure and to concentrate only on actors; the focus should be made on processes and their dynamics instead.

## **2. From social movements to global civil society**

According to Kaldor (2003), the emerging of global civil society goes back to peace and human-rights movements which appeared around 1968 and which were followed later in the eighties by social movements. Since those times cooperation took place between western movements and activists from behind the “Iron Curtain” while their common issues were protests against nuclear weapons and other forms of armament connected with the Cold War, and struggle for peaceful, on democratic rules and respect to human rights based world constellation. Furthermore, in the nineties the openness of politics grew, and some of the social movements became more professional and transformed themselves into non-governmental organizations, including the transnational ones (Kaldor 2003: 88). As Etzioni (2004: 344) notes: „Since the end of the Cold War there has been a sharp growth in the number and membership of transnational networks, INGOs, interpersonal bonds, and even citizenship.“ New kind of citizenship appeared – transnational citizenship, at least within European Union, with cosmopolitan awareness and consciousness.

1989 meant further strengthening of global powers, exerting pressure on national states and awakening new demands concerning human and political rights. Traditional social movements were replaced by internationally acting NGOs connected into networks, and global social movements whose expansion was further supported by simplified and accelerated spread of information enabled by development of modern communication technologies. At this stage the globalization processes gained greater intensity and thus further supported emerging of global civil society (Kaldor 2003: 138).

As well as other organizational structures, organizations of civil society had to react on changing conditions. Professionalization of non-profit sphere which is in these days more obvious especially in countries of former Soviet block may result in a shift from idealistic, value-oriented way of functioning and understanding of NGOs: organizations compete in order to get clients, financial sources and media space, they are professionally run by managers, their size and structure is similar to large business-sector units and their employees are lawyers and economists rather than enthusiastic adventurers. On the other hand, these changes can bring higher efficiency and improve outcomes of non-profit sector.

Etzioni (2004: 341-2) sees three “elements” of the global civil society: (1) NGOs, (2) informal transnational networks, (3) social movements. Social movements were probably the first actor of civil societies with international scale and are important subset of global civil society. Already in 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century there were internationally oriented movements: anarchists, communists, socialists etc. (Chandler 2004: 329), some of them were later institutionalized. That is an important characteristic of social movements – they don’t have institutional structure, contrary to NGOs, while many NGOs were established by institutionalization of social movements.

For many authors (Kaldor 2000, 2003, Klein 2002, Keane 2003, Edwards 2001), the most visible evidence of existing global civil society were protests in Seattle, Prague, Genoa and other cities, above all as a re-birth of social movements with global scale. For Kaldor, “what happened in Seattle ... [was]... a form of global political contestation, an expression of global civil society” Although it was rather a spectacle full of violence, it started a „hard debate [...] about the very nature of the global system“ (Kaldor 2000: 106). Chandler (2004: 333) emphasizes another problematic aspect of these movements: their agenda is often shaped by external sources, e.g. by meetings of WTO. That responds the fact that besides the shared values, “converging resistances to corporate and elite-led economic globalization” is important for constitution of global civil society (Benessaieh 2003: 107). Castells as well argues that global social movements can be „better described by what [they oppose] than by unified ideology“ (Castells 2008: 85). Also it is interesting to notice that paradoxically the struggles against certain aspects of globalization force the movements and NGOs to become global and thus further strengthen globalization processes.

### **3. What about state?**

Critics of the concept of global civil society point out that civil society can be established only within national state and since there is no such state on global level, global civil society can not emerge (Kaldor 2003: 109). Etzioni (2004: 341, 343) argues that for proper functioning, global civil society needs global state because state is playing an important role in establishing civil society but he

admits that perhaps certain form of “global authority with statelike features” could be sufficient. Global society could fulfill better its functions if there was some statelike actor. Without such authority it is difficult to call values and norms of civil society into action: “global civil society is good, but not good enough” (Etzioni 2004: 346).

The concept of global civil society has to be different from the “traditional” one for two reasons: (1) different conditions and (2) different framework in which the global civil society is emerging compared to the “traditional” civil society. By different conditions I mean especially new information and communication technologies, and global problems to be solved (financial, environmental, safety etc.). The framework can be understood as international system – new actors and new roles of both these new actors and the old ones (especially national states). I mean that global state is not necessary for existence of global civil society, at least for its certain spheres.

New conditions and new framework in which civil societies bounded to state territory are functioning are quite different from those in which they were established. The role of a state has changed significantly and states were made to transfer some of their functions to other actors. They are an important but still only one of many actors in decision-making process, they are a part of governance. But this change does not endanger civil society. In fact, this shift strengthened the role of civil society and thus created greater pressure on accountability and transparency of the state mechanisms. And that is the reason why civil society can emerge on global level without essentially needing global state, although it is clear that certain aspects of global governance are necessary for its functioning. But this is the difference between traditional civil society and global civil society: the former one mostly distanced itself from the states government; the latter one seems to be an essential part of global governance. As Kaldor (2000: 108) put it:

*“[N]owadays it may no longer be possible to sustain a civil society within the territorial confines of the state. The binary distinction between civil society (the domestic) and anarchy and barbarism (the international), which was associated with the rise of the modern state with its clear territorial boundaries is breaking down.”*

Therefore it is obvious that process of creating global civil society must have other basis: different state and not only state. While Beck (2003) is talking about post-national state, Castells (2008: 88) introduces network state „characterized by shared sovereignty and responsibility, flexibility of procedures of governance, and greater diversity in the relationship between governments and citizens in terms of time and space.“

It is important to understand that global civil society does not replace traditional civil society existing within the state borders. In fact it is a way of strengthening

of local and national forms of civil society, enabling them to be heard in global space. As Rumford put it, “civil society can be transnational or global as well as local and national” (Rumford 2003: 28); all those forms can exist parallelly, supporting each other. Global civil society can be seen as a response to the problems evoked by globalization. But at the other hand, the stronger the forces that enable existence of civil society, the more transnationalized the “uncivil” elements (Rumford 2003: 29) which endanger civil society.

For Etzioni (2004: 349) „there are considerable limitations on how far global civil society can evolve without a global state“ which is disregarding the fact that there are NGOs or other structures of global society that demand only legal status, and sometimes not even that (social movements, virtual networks). He argues that transnational communitarian bodies push on states and intergovernmental organizations, but these are already weak and unable to take actions (Etzioni 2004: 349). That is true, as well as the fact that „global civil society cannot provide adequate governance without government“ (Etzioni 2004: 352) but probably not good reason for establishing „global state“. Instead, actors of global civil society should be involved in global governance as well as other actors. And claiming that “well-formed nation-states – which often do a rather poor job on numerous social fronts – have been much more effective in dealing with national problems than has the stateless transnational system“ (Etzioni 2004: 352) could be true in past but is disputable today and will probably be useless in future.

It is clear that there are obstacles in involving certain groups of people which were not that evident on the level of states. Language and access to modern communication technologies can exclude many people from participation on global level and are therefore limiting factor, raising questions of legitimacy. Although recently it showed up, for example in Myanmar, that even mobile phones can be used to spread information about local problems almost immediately around the world. Lower prices of modern means of communication enable wider use of these technologies for more people. Castells (2008: 86) as well emphasizes the role of new technologies and means of communication (blogs, mobile phones, YouTube, Facebook etc.) which grant global civil society with greater independence on political institutions and mass media. But still it is necessary to be aware of problems appearing as a consequence of such exclusion which can be threatening for civil society both on local and global level.

#### **4. Market and market relations**

The problem exists with exclusion or inclusion of market relations and their actors. Liberals tend to include business into the realm of civil society, strongly excluding state; neo-Marxists place civil society both outside the state and the

market. Civil society is seen as a counterweight to the state for most approaches but its relation to markets is more ambivalent. Keane's (2003) approach to global civil society is pointing out interdependence of markets and civil society. It is obvious that market relations are contained within civil society but are not its purpose and center and therefore profit-seeking organizations should be excluded from civil society although their relations with civil society actors are often crucial. I mean that this distinction is necessary if global civil society is to have at least certain cohesion.

Global civil society is especially by neo-Marxists seen as an antagonist to the "prevailing world order" (Benessaïeh 2003: 109), creating resistance to neo-liberalism mostly represented by anti-systemic social movements and at the same time stabilizing disturbances caused by economic globalization and trying to provide neo-liberalism with certain legitimacy (Benessaïeh: 109, 111).

For Kaldor (2000: 107), global civil society is primarily constituted by „those independent NGOs and social movements that operate across national boundaries“. This definition would lack global scale and would more describe transnational civil society which is a lower level on the scale local – transnational – global. But more importantly she excludes market from global civil society realm, arguing that global civil society operates „between the state, the market, and the family" (Kaldor: 107). Therefore global civil society contains market relations but subjects for which is market the primary realm of their activities should be excluded.

## **5. Global governance**

The changes in the role of state and its relations to other actors including civil society are crucial for principles of governance on global level. Castells (2008: 83) argues that as a consequence of globalization „nongovernmental actors become the advocates of the needs, interests, and values of people at large, thus further undermining the role of governments.“ The shift from government “associated with national administration and internal organization” (Rumford 2003: 31) to governance means that new actors are being invited to decision-making process. This is happening on global level while for European Union it is an aim “to develop forms of governance in which civil society organizations play a central role“ (Rumford 2003: 31). Distinction between civil society and “government” on global level is weaker and more vague (Bartelson 2006: 384), and the fact that there is no global government can lead to even greater role of global civil society on this level.

While for criticisms global civil society means lack of accountability and legitimacy (Chandler 2004), for its proponents it means a way of democratizing global governance. The problem is that democratic deficit and the lack of

legitimacy is mostly compared with state level, disregarding from the fact that the state may remain these attributes but is not any more able to solve the problems aroused on global level. Of course, that does not mean that there should be no struggle for further democratization and transparency.

## 6. Threats and opportunities

It is clear that global civil society is not homogenous, that the interconnectedness has different levels and that the issues vary. Benessaieh (2003: 112) argues that „the degree of identity cohesion, shared values, and strategic goals appears lower in networks than in social movements.“ The reason is that networks involve different actors, often with different purposes and aims: non-profit organizations, social movements, churches, trade unions etc. The structure of global networks depend on their aim; those willing to influence global policy-making negotiate with global institutions, such as WTO, are more international, those willing to make change on local level are more bounded to local communities and only cooperate internationally – exchange information etc. (Edwards 2001: 145). But this diversity is a characteristic for global civil society, while maintaining high potential for all actors:

*„It seems that, from anarchist squatters in Italy to the Landless Peasant’s Movement in Brazil, the smaller or more marginal the struggle, the more pregnant with possibility it is and the more it transgresses traditional political boundaries, whether conceptual or spatial“ (Chandler 2004: 328).*

There are of course problems global civil society is suffering with in this sense: the inequality between Northern and Southern NGOs which is caused by different level of access to communication technologies, possibilities to travel or language skills; sometimes low accountability caused by the long-distance between local communities and their global representatives because of lacking “formal structures to facilitate supra-national civic participation” (Edwards 2001: 146, 148). This is a serious problem because insufficient communication between local and global levels of civil society may cause disregard to real problems that should be solved and can be even threatening for fostering local participation, leading to above mentioned empty shell with global scope but lacking real local linkage and effects. Solution demands “stronger links between local, national and global action” (Edwards 2001: 148).

Etzioni (2004: 345) describing global civil society as “transnational communitarian bodies” claims that these “play a key role in developing transnational values and norms through transnational moral dialogues.“ Through global civil society we can hear voices of many individuals and organized groups who are willing and able to take part in discussion about issues as the environment, human rights, freedom and democracy and thus creating an

opinion opposition or parallel streams of thoughts to the attitudes of politicians, international governmental organizations or transnational corporations and trying to influence their actions. Social movements and NGOs are important participants in global discourse, struggling for addressing, discussing and solving global problems.

*„Globalization, particularly when conceived in predominantly economic terms, tends to be seen as a series of processes contributing to social destabilization and the ‘crisis’ of the nation-state by undermining the traditional basis of community, belonging, citizenship and identity. At the same time, civil society is advanced as a remedy to the ‘crisis’ through its evocation of inclusion, cohesion and unity“ (Rumford 2003: 37).*

On the other hand, Bartelson (2006: 389) suggests that the concept of global civil society is too idealistic, arguing that „this focus implies power politics will cease to exist the day the system finally is transcended by a global civil society.“ But civil society is mostly understood as never ending dynamic process, permanent struggle; that it can in fact never be finally established. Furthermore, it does not seem to be an aim of global civil society actors neither shared opinion of scholars defending the concept that the state system will cease to exist.

## **Conclusion**

In this paper I tried to briefly outline the functions of global civil society as well as the values it is built on. I tried not to skip criticisms which rightly point out deficiencies of the concept itself and the actions of global civil society actors as well. Global civil society is still a vague concept needing further examination and more solid theoretical background. It is necessary to think about global civil society as something qualitatively different than traditional civil society. Alike Castells (2008: 85), describing social movements suggests that they are not „the sum of nationally bound struggles.“ But disregarding the blurred theoretical outline global civil society is proving its existence. It actively presents and defends values and norms, such as human rights, gender equality, respect to the environment and others. It is pointing out on problems, raising questions and asking for accountability of decision makers and thus raising legitimacy of decisions. Global civil society helps to create global consciousness which means that individuals see each other as a part of society in worldwide scale, creating new dimension of social relations (Kaldor 2003: 112). This consciousness brings wider responsibility of individuals, reaching far beyond the borders of community or state, forming global responsibility because effects of our actions are more than ever able to influence events on distant places (or at least we can be faster aware of these consequences). As Castells (2008: 81) put it: „Not everything or everyone is globalized, but the global networks that structure the

planet affect everything and everyone“. Global civil society may help to solve the global problems and help to globalize actions for this purpose.

## References

- BARTELSON, J. (2006): Making Sense of Global Civil Society. *European Journal of International Relations*, 12, pp. 371-395.
- BECK, U. (2003): Understanding the real Europe. *Dissent*, 50:3, p. 32-38.
- BENESSAIEH, A. (2003): Seven theses on global society. *Cultural Dynamics*, 15:1, pp. 103-126.
- CASTELLS, M. (2008): The New Public Sphere: Global Civil Society, Communication Networks, and Global Governance. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 616, pp. 78-93.
- EDWARDS, M. (2001): Global civil society and community exchanges: a different form of movement. *Environment and Urbanization*, 13, pp. 145-149.
- ETZIONI, A. (2004): The Capabilities and Limits of the Global Civil Society. *Millennium – Journal of International Studies*, 33, pp. 341-354.
- CHANDLER, D. (2004): Building Global Civil Society 'From Below'?. *Millennium – Journal of International Studies*, 33, pp. 313-340.
- KALDOR, M. (2000): Civilising Globalisation? The Implications of the Battle in Seattle. *Millennium – Journal of International Studies*, 29, pp. 105-114.
- KALDOR, M. (2003): *Global Civil Society. An Answer to War*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- KEANE, J. (1998): *Civil Society. Old Images, New Visions*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- KEANE, J. (2003): *Global Civil Society?* Cambridge: University Press.
- KLEIN, N. (2002): *Fences and Windows*. Picador. New York.
- RUMFORD, Ch. (2003): European Civil Society or Transnational Social Space? Conceptions of Society in Discourses of EU Citizenship, Governance and the Democratic Deficit: An Emerging Agenda. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 6:1, pp. 25-43, 339-369.



University of Economics, Prague  
Faculty of International Relations  
Náměstí Winstona Churchilla 4  
130 67 Prague 3  
<http://vz.fmv.vse.cz/>



Vydavatel: Vysoká škola ekonomická v Praze  
Nakladatelství Oeconomica

Tisk: Vysoká škola ekonomická v Praze  
Nakladatelství Oeconomica

Tato publikace neprošla redakční ani jazykovou úpravou

**ISSN 1802-6591**