

Vysoká škola ekonomická v Praze
Recenzované studie

Working Papers
Fakulty mezinárodních vztahů

2/2007

**Global Governance:
Concept of the Worldwide Changes
Identification**

Eva Cihelková

**Faculty of International Relations
Working Papers**

2/2007

**Global Governance:
Concept of the Worldwide Changes
Identification**

Eva Cihelková



October 2007



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 E 17794
Evidenční číslo MK ČR:	1802-6591
ISSN tištěné verze:	1802-6583
ISSN on-line verze:	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
Vedoucí projektu:	http://vz.fmv.vse.cz/



Global Governance: Concept of the Worldwide Changes Identification

Eva Cihelková (cihelka@vse.cz)

Summary:

The goal of this paper is to outline the approaches to global governance; to summarize the historical sources of the current debate on global governance; to specify the paradigm concept of global governance and to accept its starting definition. Thus from the first section emerges the ambiguity and even the dialectics of the approaches to global governance, from the second one emerge three types of a discussion formally connected with globalization, transnationalism and the U.N. system, from the third one normative, analytical and discursive concepts of global governance striving for the formulation of its dimensions, key characteristics as well as its assumptions; the fourth part defines the analytical concept as one of the concepts that can be used in order to identify the current social and economic transformation resulting from the changes in the world political system.

Keywords: global governance, world politics, world economy

Globální governance: koncept identifikace proměn na celosvětové úrovni

Eva Cihelková (cihelka@vse.cz)

Abstrakt:

Cílem této statě je nastínit přístupy ke globální governanci, shrnout historické zdroje současné debaty o globální governanci, specifikovat paradigmatická pojetí globální governance a přijmout její výchozí definici. Z první sekce tak vyplyne nejednotnost a dokonce protichůdnost přístupů ke globální governanci, ze druhé tři typy diskuse formálně spjaté s globalizací, transnacionalismem a systémem OSN, ze třetí pak normativní, analytické a diskurzivní koncepty globální governance, jež usilují o vyjádření jejích dimenzí, klíčových charakteristik a předpokladů; čtvrtá část definuje analytické pojetí jako jeden z konceptů, jež lze použít k identifikaci současné sociálně ekonomické transformace vyplývající z proměny světového politického systému.

Klíčová slova: globální governance, světová politika, světová ekonomika

JEL: F02, F02, P16

Reviewer: doc. RNDr. Václav Kašpar, CSc.

Content

Introduction	5
1. Approaches to global governance, their heterogeneity and dialectic	7
2. Historical sources of the current discussion on global governance	9
2.1 Globalization and global governance	10
2.2 Transnationalism and global governance	11
2.3 United Nations, their organizational reform and global governance.....	12
3. Normative, analytical and discursive concept of global governance.....	12
3.1 Normative concept of global governance.....	13
3.2 Analytical concept of global governance.....	14
3.3 Discursive/critical concept of global governance	15
Conclusion: Is the analytical concept of global governance base on three dimensions (process, structure and results) the solution?.....	16
References	19

Introduction

The end of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st century is a phase bound up with an enormous interest in governance itself but namely in a part of it – in global governance. A lot of new authors¹, institutions², specialized bodies³ and academic research networks⁴ have emerged dealing with its theoretic as well as practical aspects. Generally recognised reasons⁵, why only just governance became a subject of intensive debates between theoreticians and practitioners of governing, are these:

¹ Among *most significant foreign* authors dealing with the discussion on the issue of governance we can classify the following: Fred Bergsten, Jagdish Bhagwati, James Brassett, Vincent Cable, Deiter Heribert, Daniel Drache, Peter Drucker, Rodney B. Hall, Thomas J. Biersteker, David Held, Richard Higgott, Gary Hufbauer, John Ikenberry, David Lake, Miles Kahler, Robert Keohane, Jan Kooiman, Stephen Krasner, Andre Moravcsika, Philipp Pattberg, James Rosenau, John Ruggie, Patricia Stewart, Joseph Stiglitz, Gerry Stoper, Diane Stone, Martin Wolf and others. Among Czech authors dealing namely with the matter of strategic management belong Marta Nachtmannová, Martin Nekola, Martin Potůček, Antonín Rašek and some other members of the *Centre for Social and Economic Strategies* on the Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University; and further e.g. Božena Kadeřábková, Milan Žák from the *Centre of Economic Studies* on the University of Economics and Management; a new platform for the research of the issue governance is the *Research Plan of the Faculty of International Relations*, University of Economics, Prague, “Governance in Context of Globalised Economy and Society”.

² With the issue of governance or global governance respectively, deal e.g. the *Centre for the Study of Globalisation and Regionalisation*, University of Warwick, or *F. Kennedy School of Government*, Harvard University.

³ A specialized body for the research of global governance is represented e.g. by the *U. N. Commission on Global Governance* that is an official international commission for the implementation of global governance during the new millennium. It is financed by the U.N., the European Union, national governments, big American companies and by other organizations dealing with the issue of the new world order. It represents a group of significant political as well as business people including former heads of states. It was established in 1992 and in 1994 it published a controversial report „Our global Neighbourhood“.

⁴ The most famous research network is *GARNET – Global Governance, Regionalization and Regulation: the role of the EU*, a project financed by the European Commission within the framework of the 6th Framework Programme. A part of it are 42 research centres and universities. It is coordinated by the Centre for the Study of Globalisation and Regionalisation, University of Warwick, see above. The goal of the GARNET is to develop at a global level a multidisciplinary network of the excellent researchers, analytics and people from business by the means of expertises on key issues and topics of both global and regional governance. The partial intentions aim both to the elements of global regulation framework (trade, finance, security) which (to greater or smaller extent) reshape modern global system, and the analysis of the role of Europe (the European Union – author’s note) within this framework. By: GARNET – Network of Excellence: Global Governance, Regionalisation and Regulation: the role of the EU. <http://www.garnet-eu.org>.

⁵ These reasons were summarized e.g. by R. Higgott in its work (2004: 10).

- failures of the models of public policy in catching the changes in the relations between public sector and private sectors in general and predominantly between a state and market forces at a global level;
- redundancy in methodological nationalism in the situation, when there are problems of economic policies which cannot be managed at a national level and when the significance of common (supranational) approach to individual policies grows, e.g. in case of cross-border transport;
- change in a concept of sovereignty which is more often perceived not as one of the principles of a legal control over an exactly demarcated territory, but as a matter related to accountability (also the changes in the concept and role of international law started to be discussed in this connection);
- growing role of multilevel structures of governing in key areas of policies which is enhanced by the functions of rapidly increasing thematic and regional agencies;
- entry of non-traditional actors (non-governmental organizations and interest groups) to the process of governing which broaden and deepen the understanding of the policies as traditional, exclusive and international activities of states and their representatives.

The interest in global governance led to the opening a discussion on its nature, the fundament of which was a clash of practitioners and scientists, two major interest groups, then: the representatives of global policy (international organizations) and theoreticians. While the interest of bureaucrats arouse at a significant scale from economic theories (analytical concept of global governance – see 3.2) and focused on “the identification and assurance a welfare through collective actions taken to solve problems“, the interest of theoreticians based on a normative political theory (3.1) oriented on the issues of institutional accountability, civil representation and justice. The disharmony between the (excessive) development of global economy and (insufficient) boost of a comparable global political order can be considered as a main cause of such unclarity.

The clash of the theory and reality has reflected itself in the concentration of the debate on the position and role of international organizations. The experts, in the manner of John Ruggie (1993), traditionally focused on multilateralism as an institutional form striving for the management of transnational problems on the basis of generally adopted principles of behaviour which should be given a preference to the interests of the member countries and in the course of time they should lead to a collective confidence within the institutions among the members of different dimensions and power. The subject of their interest became the identification of strengths and weaknesses of so called “old” multilateralism, its current problems and needed reforms (transformation) as well as the future of “new” multilateralism. The discussion on the role of the

USA in the development of international organizations led to the experience that the problems of multilateralism are not a result of irresponsible behaviour of „badly-behaved hegemonic leader" breaking the rules, howbeit the role of the US foreign policy is important within the given context, but the result of a number of broader structural changes (discursive concept of global governance).

The goal of this working paper is neither the examination of the role of multilateralism in global governance, nor the problems and a needed transformation of the institutions of multilateral political or economic governance. The aim of this working paper is, on the basis of the experience of some authors and prestigious institutions to:

- illustrate the approaches to global governance;
- summarize the historical sources of the current debate on global governance;
- specify paradigmatic concept of global governance;
- accept a certain starting definition of global governance.

1. Approaches to global governance, their heterogeneity and dialectic

The works of scientists who in the last decade of the 20th century and at the beginning of the new millennium have dealt with the issue of global governance, was examined namely by Philips Pattberg⁶ in his work from the year 2006 (Pattberg 2006). The different concepts of this category are based on the different opinions of the authors on the exact meaning of its part „global“ and „governance“.

The attribute „global“ refers nearly always to the highest level of a human activity or a human activity as a whole. In this sense the term is understood as an indefinite phenomenological unit forming all existing events – political, economic and others and all the differences among things that exist inside of it.

Unlike the category „global“, the term „governance“ differs a lot according to many authors. For example according to Gerry Stoper (1998: 17) governance *„relates to the development of styles of governing in the course of which the frontiers between private and public sectors are being abolished“*. When specifying these styles of governing R. A. W. Rhodes (1997: 15) refers to *„self-organized network of organizations characterised by mutual dependence, exchange of resources, rules of a game and a certain autonomy in the relation to a state“*. Ronnie Lipschutz (1997: 83) states that one of „the key questions the human race has to face at the end of the 20th century is governance“: *Who rules? Whom does he rule? How does he rule? What kind of rule is it? What form does it take? Who makes decisions? On what basis?* For

⁶ Philipp Pattberg works at the Institute for Environmental Studies, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam and is also engaged at the London School of Economics and Political Science.

Christiana Reus-Smita (1998: 3) this question is: „*How do people manage their social relations in order to assure both the individual and collective security as well as good physical being?*“. And finally Jan Kooiman (2002: 73) understands governance simply as „*conflict solving and creating opportunities as well as structural and procedural preconditions heading towards this*“.

This heterogeneity of approaches to the examined category was also confirmed by Petr Vymětal (2007), who defined in his work the concept of governance. Let us just remind that the term governance was used in literature for marking a number of various facts:

- minimal state renewing the nature of public accountability and private interests for the assurance of public goods and services (Rhodes 1997);
- qualitatively new processes in coordination and cooperation in decentralised network including a broad spectrum of actors, starting with state bureaucracies, following regional authorities and firms and ending with the network of advocacies and other nongovernmental subjects (Rhodes 1996);
- reference by Michel Foucault under the heading ‚governance and governmentality‘ (Hindess 1997);
- emergence of new public managerial strategies from the early 1980s which introduced the practices of commercial management into a public sector and opened a discussion on the cost and efficiency of public sector (Osborne, Gaebler 1992);
- ways of governing and controlling (including the elements of accountability and transparency) transnational subjects (corporate governance) (Tricker 1984);
- good governance (in the context of economic development) of public administration as a condition for providing foreign and international assistance e.g. with the World Bank (good governance);
- multilevel decision-making process in the European Union (European governance) (Albert, Kopp-Malek 2002);
- concept of governance with the participation of everyone (participatory governance) (Grote, Gbikpi 2002);
- concept of social-cybernetic systems (Kooiman 2003);
- international order in the area of international relations with a focus on mainly international organizations and even more on international regimes which are able to solve their complex, cross-border problems.

From the above stated we can deduce that with the issue of governance deals a number of researchers with a significantly different scientific agenda as well as theoretic assumptions what leads to various determinations of the nature of the phenomenon and to various use of the category. One of the reasons for the examination of the concept of governance at present is therefore a fact that it includes a wide range of relating elements. However, this advantage is at the

same time its disadvantage. As we see further, the examination of governance at the international or global level respectively makes this term even less clear.

2. Historical sources of the current discussion on global governance

Behind the discussion on global governance is, indeed, hidden the debate on growing political influence of nongovernmental organizations which are mutually interconnected at different political levels as well as through new mechanisms of cooperation outside the national states. This debate opens the space for considerations about the transformation of the world order that changes a traditional idea about the role of the civil and nongovernmental actors in world politics. As there is neither generally recognized definition of global governance, nor a common opinion on the meaning of the term, a controversial debate is based to a large degree on empirical observations. These are completed and driven by historical basis which are former paradigm of global governance accepted on the base of disciplines of political science and international relations (see Nölke 2003).

P. Pattberg (2006: 6) states three bands of source works that are considered to be either an ideal source of global governance or their origin was accompanied by the development of a given concept. Particularly, it is the literature relating to:

- globalization and global changes heading towards processes of transformation as one of the important preconditions for the growth in the interest in social-political order existing outside a state;
- transnational relations which primordially provide an idea about a supranational order with more actors;
- the United Nations and their organizational reform that confirms the necessity of cooperation and multilateral solutions with the aim to limit the strengthening global problems.

Let us make a remark, that besides the three mentioned types of discussion formally linked with globalization, transnationalism and the U.N. system to which we will give space below, the concept of global governance has been, at the beginning of 1980s, accompanied with the efforts of renewal of the discussion on national and sub-national decision making which accents a new role of a wide circle of private participants in governing namely in the areas such as a local (regional development, restoration of towns etc. The causes for the change in the role of state are as generally known of an international or a national character. On one side it counts phenomena such as world recession, deepening globalization or a growing authority of the European Union in the 1970s. On the other side it is e.g. the development of the welfare state affecting an increasing part of a society and leading to privatization, outsourcing or co-production of the stock of public goods. From this point of view also the

debate on global governance has got its roots in both the discussions on international relations including in a long run creating of opinions on transnational policy, the concept of interdependency (Keohane, Nye 1977, 1970) or some other approaches to globalization and multilateralism as well as in the discussions on internal state affairs, new tools of management, innovative actors etc.

2.1 Globalization and global governance

The changes in political, economic, social and ecological environment of the world and the emerging new order are often connected with globalization and global governance the relations of which are, however, not so much clear. This results e.g. from the assumption of the linearity of the relation between globalization as a cause and global governance as a system reaction (political, economic or some other) of the society. Globalization as a creation of demand for global governance represents broadening, deepening and speeding the global relations in all the aspects of the current social life. These connections are the reason for government failures. The sovereignty of states is weakening, the frontiers between the national and transnational phenomenon is getting unclear and the external effects more and more influence the possibility and efficiency of the solution of problems of national states. That's why global governance appeared as a political, economic or other response of the society to the processes of globalization which differs from the way of governing at a national level. The assumption of linear continuity between globalization and global governance is, however, misleading for two reasons: the process of globalization continuously changes the conditions for efficient response of the society in the interest of problem solving and global governance in the sense of forming a government at the global level changes the conditions under which globalization develops. Thus the critical evaluations of globalization often stressed the political nature of the current transformation of the world order, namely the economic policies of the „Washington consensus“.

The opinions which are very similar to the basic statements appearing in the literature on globalization are often heard in the current discussion on the base of global governance. For instance the concept of globalization is announced as a new paradigm in the international relations. P. Pattberg, no matter how he keeps off the discussion, emphasizes several crucial preconditions of this paradigm which should be incorporated into this discussion. The statements are that

- a suitable perspective is a global rather than an international one;
- globalization leads to the structural transformation of the world order;
- new ontology is needed in order to meet the increasing number as well as the quality of the actors of the process of globalization.

2.2 Transnationalism and global governance

The second source of today's discussion on global governance represents the literature on transnational relations which occurred more than 30 years ago. It was a reflection of the 1970s, the period of transnationalism as a mainstream in international relations. In 1980s already dominated the approaches highlighting the central role of the state such as e.g. Waltzian neorealism. Although in 1990s and at the beginning of the new millennium there were stressed the topics such as the end of a state, the change in sovereignty, birth of civil society and governance without government (Ohmae 1995, Saassen 1996, Kaldor 2003), the debate on the attributes of transnationalism and centrist intergovernmental relations representing two main directions did not cease and is lead not only within the political but also within the academic circles.

According to Keohane and Nye (1971: xii) the concept of transnational relations corresponds to „a regular interaction across the national borders if at least one actor is a non-governmental actor“. Karl Kaiser (1969: 96) speaks highly of three important aspects included in the concept of transnational relations: first various national societies communicate across the national borders, second these transactions lead to a change in a given society and third the result is that those changes make the government act either against its own society or against other governments. Transnational policies can be therefore perceived as a system of institutional (mutual) relations among societies – including a wide range of nongovernmental actors affecting a domestic policy but without the inclusion of intergovernmental relations. The idea of transnational policy thus pushes „the theory at a level of international affairs“ (Risse 2002: 258). The result is then, as remarked by Pattberg, that the research interests move from the examination of traditional affairs of international relations to those such as democratic peace, non-intervention or cooperation during the anarchy of capital flows, coalition in a peaceful movement and transnational alliance of subnational governments. The theory of transnational policy thus *contests traditional borders between domestic and international policy as well as the resulting determination of the subject of studies*. Comparative policy on one hand deals with national systems and international relations but on the other hand it relates to the room between these units.

The majority of transnational approaches thus diverge from the traditional ones. As remarked by Thomas Risse-Kappen (1995: 6), „studying the political influence of transnational relations is becoming more and more complex as the concept is focused too broadly“. And this very broadness will probably lead to a fast disappearing of the concept of transnational relations from the international relations themselves. Three listed factors contribute to this: First, although the concept of transnational relations leads only to a minimum of theoretical statements their empirical verification is very difficult. Second, as centric approaches look through their economical methodological apparatus and

operate under few basic conditions transnational concepts are not able to compete with them in this respect. Third, the defence of the end of a state by leading theoreticians of transnational relations was rejected by a number of traditionalists as a too radical concept. The main heritage of transnationalism for the concept of global governance is then, that *the creation of the structure of world politics will be more a matter of political actors rather than governments themselves.*

2.3 United Nations, their organizational reform and global governance

The third basis of the current debate on global governance is the analyses of the workers of the United Nations relating to multilateralism and its organizational reform. The U.N. system represents a core of striving for „*more regular and reliable response to social and political matters which go above the possibilities of the states as the individual subjects*“ (Reus-Smit 1998). That’s why it is analyzed as the most ambitious institutional organization in the sense of multilateral management of global problems (Sellgren 1990, Hatding 1990, Kouwenhoven 1993).

The end of the cold war as well as a bipolar world arrangement was connected, in the minds of many people, with a deep transformation of the structure world politics. Great expectations were focused on international communities in the sense of setting a peace, sustainable development solving environmental crisis of modern society. Many topics became a subject of the negotiations of world conferences on the issues connected with sustainable development of states and a status of women. The discussion on global governance which started to developed as a result of the transformation of the international system in 1989-1990 as well as the expectations that within the new world order the cooperation will be reached, was rigidly grounded on a government as a *major actor* whereas international organizations, regimes cooperation or simply said multilateralism, were considered as their instruments.

3. Normative, analytical and discursive concept of global governance

Within the current considerations of the impact of global governance one can basically identify – according to Dingwert and Pattberg) - three paradigmatic concepts differing from each other by the reasoning for the use of the new concept.

- The first concept concentrates on both necessity and adequacy of political response (reactions) to the challenges of globalization. From this point of view global governance is namely a political program saying how to renew the needed managing capacity of a state in order to solve the problems of the post-modern era;
- The second concept perceives global governance in a close relationship to the phenomenon of globalization but unlike a normative concept it believes that global governance is an analytical

concept giving the sense to the transformation of the current social and political order. For this reason it emphasizes the significance of the duality of a decision-making process non-hierarchical managing ways and the inclusion of private actor in this process;

- The third concept stresses out the discursive (rational) base of the debate on the current global governance and analysis it as a concept the aim of which is to hide negative impacts of the neoliberal economic and political agenda.

3.1 Normative concept of global governance

Normative concept of global governance is a frequently used concept representing, as mentioned above, a *political program* in a broad sense. It is based on the assumption that the deepening disintegration tendencies as the consequences of globalization require an adequate political response. The means of this response is global governance overcoming the gap between growing transactions with goods, services and capital on one side and the geographical borders and the limited capacity of power execution by national governments on the other side. The insufficient capacity of the rule of a states results in not only a deficiency of the efficiency but also in the loss of democracy. These imperfections thus lead to an expectation that the redemption can be a new institutional order at a supranational level having its democratic legitimacy.

The normative concept of global governance is shared e.g. by the German Bundestag Commission for Study or the already mentioned the U.N. Commission on Global Governance. The German Bundestag Commission claimed in its report from 2002 (Deutscher Bundestag 2002: 67): „As the world becomes increasingly globalised and economic activities grow beyond national regulatory frameworks, it becomes more necessary to politically shape economic, social and environmental processes on a global scale. How the global challenges can be democratically managed has recently begun to be discussed under the heading of ‘global governance‘. To put it simply „global governance means to steer the process of globalisation politically“ and hence refers to the „orderly management of global affairs“. The group of 28 publicly known and important people, namely heads of states, international officers or leaders of transnational companies joined in the U. N. Commission on Global Governance)1995: 48-67), stresses the significance of creating and keeping global public ethics based on shared values although in this sense global governance is more a vision than a real system of values, policies and institutions through which a society manages its (public and private) matters.

The normative concept of global governance as namely a political program is given several key features which should lead to renewing at least a part of the management capacity of a state in order to find solutions to the existing problems (Pattberg 2006: 13). Global governance:

- is not a global government; it is more relevant to a confederation on the independent republics rather than to a state in the world context;
- is grounded on various forms of cooperation, coordination and decision-making that take place at different levels of the international system;
- admits necessary multipolar structures of the world politics; it gives a big stress on the development of regionalism which initiates future integration and cooperation as the key stones of the normative approach;
- reserves the inclusion of non-governmental organizations; it means an important precondition for the growth of democratic legitimacy and efficient problem solution in the global sphere.

Global governance is thus taken as a long-term concept of global integration which is grounded on traditional multilateralism, growing regionalism and the impact of a great number of various actors.

3.2 Analytical concept of global governance

According to this concept global governance is perceived as an *analytical tool* of the transformation of political organizations and problem solution at a global level. From this standpoint it includes various system of governing at different levels of a human activity but out of the sovereignty and hierarchical arrangement of a state. James Rossenau (1995, 1997, 1999) defined four key features of this concept:

- gives a special relation to non-governmental actors;
- analyses multifold spacious and functional level of policies and their interactions;
- concentrates on new ways and mechanisms of the production and support of global public goods and emphasizes the creation of new spheres of governing out of the national states and international cooperation.

The first feature is *non hierarchical* base of the process of governing where the key role played by non-governmental actors. From the discussion on sources of the existing paradigm of global governance resulted the fact that transnationalism points out the increase in a political influence of non-governmental actors. The analytical concepts develop this opinion on global governance further. Rosenau enumerates new actors of governance that are not a tool of the state or governments including transnational lobby, society of knowledge, entities without a juridical subjectivity and social movements. Although the concept is compact in the opinion that the importance of non-governmental subjects of governing grows, it differentiates with theoretical and methodological approaches and this predominantly means that a row of its main assumptions digress from the traditional concepts of international relations.

The second characteristic is a *multilevel foundation of the current social interactions and institutions of governance*. In future the two-level model of national and international relations is not sustainable. With respect to the interconnections of different levels of a political process in different time frames and in different geographical space this traditional model of international policy thus needs a reevaluation. Rosenau stated that “in a fast changing interdependent world the separation of national and international relations is problematic and trying to examine domestic relations as the aspects of comparative policy and foreign relations as the dimension of international policy is more than just an arbitrariness; it is incorrect and we cannot allow domestic-foreign borders to confuse our concept of global issues”. Besides by academicians this argument about multilevel governance is also accepted by the representatives of the European governance.

The third feature of the analytical concept is the fact that global governance exists *in various forms using various instruments and logic*. There is a countless number of mechanisms which reflects various historical circumstances, aims, structures and processes which are always supposed in the sense of governance to head towards a global coherence.

The fourth attribute of the analytical paradigm of global governance is the creation, location and duration of autonomous spheres of governing standing outside the state system. For Elke Krahnmann (2003: 323) the key feature of governance is the fragmentation of political power. Through this it is possible to define governance as an ideal type of the autonomous authority separated from the governing of the central actor. From the given assumption results that this authority is released from two characteristics: territoriality and totality. The former reflects the ability of the subject making the rules to control a given territory with the defined borders without the interference from outside. The latter covers the ability to control all aspects of economic, social and political life. Rosenau (2002: 72) defines as “a sphere of governing” as a circle of formal or informal rules of the system which generate to be kept by the part of people towards whom they are heading.

3.3 Discursive/critical concept of global governance

The third general use of the term global governance is called “a hegemonic” concept that was developed to a large extent as a reaction to the theoretic limits of the transnational historical materialism. Many theoreticians (e.g. Brand 2003, Oberbeek 2004 and others) agree that global governance is, in this sense, an attempt to conceal the base of the current neoliberal agenda.⁷ From this point of

⁷ Theoretical and methodological criticism of the given concept is dealt in details in WELLER (2003).

view the fundamental criticism emerged namely as a counterweight to a normative concept of global governance.

The discursive concept of global governance

- appeared as a consensual process the highest objective of which is to manage common relations on the basis of cooperation;
- is grounded on many actors and thus the existing plurality of interests (which is hidden by a structural base of social relations as well as hierarchical arrangement of social powers);
- is a historical concept which overlooks that governance is going through the whole history of a mankind; as a result its protagonists conceal the considerations on a global mechanism of governing, deeply incorporated into general political trends with the aim to transform the world economy where also the negative features of capitalism appear;
- is not perceived as a force going against globalization but as its ideological attribute (a tool for gaining the political influence to recreate the institutional base of world politics).

Current use of the term global governance in principle does not defy the above concepts – normative, analytical and discursive one. The heterogeneity of the definition of global governance however results not only from the theoretical approaches but also from the heterogeneity of its practical application. As there is still no generally accepted definition a number of theoreticians use its own concept of global governance. This could bridge not only new findings within the disciplines on international relations but also a kind of a bridge among various theoretical branches.

Conclusion: Is the analytical concept of global governance based on three dimensions (process, structure and results) the solution?

From the general analytical view there is a number of authors (T. A. Börzel and T. Risse, M. Koenig-Archibugi, W. M. Lafferty and others), who define global governance as *a summary of institutions, processes and interactions among various actors at all levels of a social and political system that deal with specific global problems in a non-hierarchical form while both the implicit as well as explicit norms and rules of their behaviour, including transnational sanctions, are given.* This approach is also shared by Pattberg (2006: 15-17) and it is likely to be the closest one to our approach of global governance as a concept of the identification of the (economic) changes at a global level.

The stated definition of global governance reflects the assumption that it is made up of at least three analytical dimensions:

- the first one, a procedural dimension, emphasises the activities of various subjects, the followed policies and the tools used;
- the second one, a structural dimension, stresses the distinct ‚architecture‘ of governing including the norms and rules as well as the network and the actors/coalitions of actors;
- the third one, a functional dimension focuses on the tangible as well as intangible results of governance as a working equivalent of further forms of the allocation of political sources.

In connection with the perception of global governance as a process, a structure and a result one may ask three questions that have gradually respect to a procedural, structural and functional dimension of the arrangement of governance:

- *Who participates in global governance?*
- *How is the participation of the actors organized and which subjects do share the task of governing?*
- *Which functions does the system serve?*

When answering the first question it is possible to agree with the above mentioned opinions that to a search for the solution to global problems contributes a wide scale of actors including the activities of governments together with many other agents who rule through objectives setting, orders giving and their policies applying. From this point of view global governance can be conceived in a larger or narrow sense of the word. The former includes those activities of governmental as well as nongovernmental agents at an international level which contain a non-hierarchic regime of governing such as intergovernmental talks or negotiations among the organizations themselves. The latter includes only those regimes that contain at least one nongovernmental agent e.g. an international association interested in public affairs. Pattberg is a proponent of a sort of a middle course when he claims that various regimes and coalitions co-exist with the processes that range from traditional international negotiations including nongovernmental actors in the process of rules setting and implementation measures taking to hybrid public private partnerships and fully private transnational corporations, institutions and organizations.

In context of the second question it is necessary to state that the entire task of governing is dividend among various actors. In some fields of global governance the receivers of rules can be consistent with those who make up the rules while in other fields the decisive power can be concentrated in hands of a few individuals or it can be executed by similarly thinking persons. Thus from the arrangement of global governance it should be clear either the scope and the „duality“ of the participation of the given actors of governing. A lot of examples can be found – from the decision-making in the context of the U.N. (the Resolution of the Security Council or voting in the General Assembly) to rules

making by nongovernmental actors either similar ones (trade self-regulation) or different ones such as nongovernmental organizations or transnational corporations.

The third question focuses on the result and the relating mission of global governance in the world politics. Generally, two functions of the arrangement of governance can be specified: (i) rules and policies making and (ii) the implementation of policies together with services assuring. Thus the arrangement of governance can be linked with the actors having a different level of autonomy – from a low one to a high one. In case of a low level of autonomy the role of governance is delegated to specific institutions or organizations, in case of a high level it concerns special interest groups or organizations acting on their own behalf.

Should we summarize all the above mentioned the analytical concept of governance can be understood as the approach that can be specified with respect to three concepts: the first emphasis a public character of governance and its span from the international through transnational to the fully private governance, the second characterizes the accord of those who govern with those being governed while the third focuses on the functions of governance and its scale – from a tiny autonomy (e.g. in case of delegation) to a full autonomy (e.g. a case of independent legislative bodies). In this specification global governance started to be drawn up as *an integration term* enabling assorted expert opinions to use one general language when explaining the changes in world politics (and economy, too). Since global governance is not a theory thanks to itself it is not possible to put inadequate expectations in it. The analytical concept has the ability to communicate a new view of primarily the world politics which becomes more and more complicated and its changes are more difficult to be identified but *so far it has no power to become a new paradigm* that would jeopardize the traditional centralistic stream of the international relations.

References

ALBERT, M.; KOPP-MALEK, T. (2002): The Pragmatism of Global and European Governance: Emerging Forms of the Political Beyond Westphalia. Millennium: *Journal of International Studies* 31 (3).

BÖRZEL, T. A. (1997): *Policy Networks. A New Paradigm for European Governance?* Florence: European University Institute.

BRAND, U. (2003): Nach dem Fordismus: Global Governance als der neue hegemoniale Diskurs des Internationalen Politikverständnisses. *Zeitschrift für Internationale Beziehungen* 10 (1): 143-166.

Deutscher Bundestag (2002): *Globalization of the World Economy – Challenges and Answers*. Short Version of the Final Report. Berlin: German Bundestag, 14th Legislative Period.

DINGWERTH, K.; PATTERBERG, P. (2006): Global Governance as a Perspective on World Politics. *Global Governance* 12.

GORDENKER, L.; WEISS, T. G. (1996): Pluralizing Global Governance: Analytical Approaches and Dimensions. In WEISS, T. G.; GORDENKER, Leon (eds.). *NGOs, the UN, and Global Governance*. Boulder: Westview.

GROTE, J.; GBIKPI, B., eds. (2002): *Participatory Governance. Political and Societal Implications*. Opladen: Leske&Budrich.

HELD, D.; MCGREW, A.; GOLDBLATT, D.; PERRATON, J. (1999): *Global Transformations. Politics, Economics and Culture*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

HEWSON, M.; SINCLAIR, T. J. (1999): The Emergence of Global Governance Theory. In: HEWSON, M., SINCLAIR, T. J. (eds.). *Approaches to Global Governance Theory*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

HINDESS, B. (1997): Politics and Governmentality, *Economy and Society* 26 (May).

HIGGOTT, R. (2004): *Multilateralism and the Limit of Global Governance*. CSGR Working Paper, No. 134/04. Warwick, UK: University of Warwick, Centre for the Study of Globalisation and Regionalisation.

KAISER, K. (1969): Transnationale Politik. In: CZEMPIEL, E. O. (ed.) *Die anachronistische Souveränität*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

KEOHANE, R. O.; NYE, J. S. (1970): *Transnational Relations and World Politics*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

KEOHANE, R. O.; NYE, J. S. (1971): Transnational Relations and World Politics: An Introduction. In: NYE, Joseph S. (ed.) *Transnational Relations and World Politics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

KEOHANE, R. O.; NYE, J. S. (1977): *Power and Interdependence*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

KOOIMAN, J. (2002): Governance: A Social-Political Perspective. In: *Participatory Governance. Political and Societal Implications*. Opladen: Leske&Budrich.

KOOIMAN, J. (2003): *Governing as Governance*. London: Sage.

KRAHMANN, E. (2003): National, Regional, and Global Governance: One Phenomenon or Many? *Global Governance* 9 (3): 323-346.

LIPSCHUTZ, Ronnie (1997). *From Place to Planet: Local Knowledge and Global Environmental Governance*. *Global Governance* 3 (1).

NÖLKE, A. (2003): Intra- und interdisziplinäre Vernetzung: Die Überwindung der Regierungszentrik? In: HELLMANN, G.; WOLF, K. D.; ZÜRN, M. (eds.) *Die neuen Internationalen Beziehungen. Forschungsstand und Perspektiven in Deutschland*. Baden-Baden: Nomos.

OVERBEEK, H. (2004): *Global Governance, Class, Hegemony: A Historical Materialist Perspective*. Amsterdam: Free University of Amsterdam.

OSBORNE, D.; GAEBLER, T. (1992): *Reinventing Government*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

PATTBURG, P. (2006): *Global Governance: Reconstructing a Contested Social Science Concept*. GARNET Working Paper, No. 04/06. London: London School of Economics and Political Science.

PETERS, G. B. (1996): *The Future of Governing: Four Emerging Models*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.

PIERRE, J. (2000): Introduction: Understanding Governance. In: PIERRE, Jon (ed.). *Debating Governance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

REUS-SMIT, Ch. (1998): Changing Patterns of Governance: From Absolutism to Global Multilateralism. In: PAOLINI, A. (ed.). *Between Sovereignty and Global*

Governance. The United Nations, the State and Civil Society. New York : St. Martin's Press.

RHODES, R. A. W. (1997): *Understanding Governance. Policy Networks, Governance, Reflexivity and Accountability.* Maidenhead and Philadelphia: Open University Press.

RHODES, R. A. W. (1996): The New Governance: Governing without Government. *Political Studies* 44 (4).

RISSE, T. (2002): Transnational Actors and World Politics. In: CARLSNAES, W., RISSE, T.; SIMMONS, B. A. (eds.). *Handbook of International Relations.* London: Sage.

RISSE-KAPPEN, T. (1995): Bringing Transnational Relations Back. In: RISSE-KAPPEN, T. (ed.). *Non-State Actors, Domestic Structures and International Institutions.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

ROSSENAU, J. N. (1995): Governance in the twenty-first century. *Global Governance* 1 (1): 13-43.

ROSSENAU, J. N. (1997): *Along the Domestic-Foreign Frontier: Exploring Governance in a Turbulent World.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

ROSSENAU, J. N. (1999): Toward an Ontology for Global Governance. In: HEWSON, M.; SINCLAIR, T. J. *Approaches to Global Governance Theory.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

ROSSENAU, J. N. (2002): Governance in a New Global Order. In: HELD, D.; McGrew, A. *Governing Globalization. Power, Authority and Global Governance.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

RUGGIE, J. G. (ed.) (1993): Multilateralism: the Anatomy of an Institution. In: RUGGIE, J. G. (ed.). *Multilateralism Matters: The Theory and Praxis of an Institutional Form.* New York: Columbia University Press.

STOKER, G. (1998): Governance as Theory: Five Propositions. *International Social Science Journal* 155.

TRICKER, R. I. (1984): *International Corporate Governance.* Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall.

U. N. Commission on Global Governance (1995): *Our Global Neighbourhood.* Report of the Commission. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

VYMĚTAL, P. (2007): *Governance: Defining the Concept*. Working Papers, 1/2007. Praha : Nakladatelství Oeconomica.

WELLER, Ch. (2003): Die Welt, der Diskurs und Global Governance. Zur Konstruktion eines hegemonialen Diskurses – eine Replik auf Ulrich Brandt. *Zeitschrift für Internationale Beziehungen* 10 (2): 365-382.

ZACHER, M. W. (1992): The Decaying Pillars of the Westphalian Temple: Implications for International Order and Governance. In: ROSENAU, J. N.; CZEMPIEL, E. O. (eds.) *Government: Order and Change in World Politics*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.



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