CRITICIZING GLOBAL GOVERNANCE

EDITED BY

MARKUS LEDERER AND

PHILIPP S. MÜLLER

Criticizing Global Governance

Edited by

Markus Lederer
and
Philipp S. Müller

palgrave
macmillan

For Dominic, Helena, and Marlene

This page intentionally left blank

Contents

List of Figures and Tables

Figures

Tables

This page intentionally left blank

List of Contributors

Başak Çalı is Lecturer in Human Rights at the University College London. She received her doctorate in International Law from the University of Essex in 2003. Current research interests include the relationship between human rights theory, law and policy, and the history and theory of international law and international organizations. She is currently writing a book on perceptions of human rights in Europe and coediting (with Saladin Meckled Garcia) a collection of essays entitled "The Legalisation of Human Rights: Multidisciplinary Perspectives" (Routledge, forthcoming).

Ayça Ergun is assistant professor of sociology at the Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey. She received her doctorate in Government from the University of Essex. Her research interests include state–society relations, democratization, political elite, civil society and human rights in the Southern Caucasus. She is the coeditor of the book *Black Sea Politics: Political Culture and Civil Society in an Unstable Region* (2005, IB Tauris).

Matthias Finger is currently Chair and Professor of Management of Network Industries as well as Dean of the School of Continuing Education at the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology (EPFL). He focuses on the liberalization of the main network industries' sectors— postal services, telecommunications, energy, public transport, water, and air transport—on the changes undergone by the historical operators in these sectors, and in issues of regulation and public service. He is particularly interested in the implications of the new information and communication technologies. He has written numerous articles and books on this subject and consults with public enterprises, as well as with public administrations and political authorities in Switzerland and internationally. Previously, he was a professor in the United States at Syracuse University (1989–1991) and Columbia University (1992–1994) and at the Swiss Graduate School of Public Administration (1995–2002).

Jörg Friedrichs is research associate at International University Bremen. His research interests are global governance, new medievalism, international relations theory, and the political sociology of the state. Jörg Friedrichs is currently working on a research project about the internationalization of the monopoly of force.

Fleur Johns teaches international law, international human rights law, and professional ethics at the University of Sydney Faculty of Law (Sydney, Australia). Fleur is a graduate of the University of Melbourne (B.A./LLB(Hons), 1994) and Harvard Law School (LLM, 1996; SJD 2003) and a member of the New York Bar, with experience in U.S. legal practice across Latin America. Fleur's research work focuses on international law and legal theory: in particular, questions surrounding the spatial dimensions of legal authority and the making of jurisdiction.

Rebecca Johnson serves as the academic Director for South Carolina's Washington Fellows Program and editor for the Helsinki Process on Globalization and Democracy. Her research focuses on transatlantic security cooperation in a changing global context. Dr. Johnson received her Ph.D. in government at Georgetown University in 2003.

Anna Leander is associate professor at the University of Southern Denmark, Odense, department of political science and public administration. Contact details at www.sam.sdu.dk/staff/anl.

Markus Lederer is a research fellow at the Chair of International Politics of University of Potsdam, Germany, where he teaches International Relations, Development Policy, and IPE. He holds a Ph.D. and an M.A. from the University of Munich and has studied at the Universities of Munich, Free University Berlin, Institut d'Etude Politiques Aix-en-Provence and at Columbia University New York. He has taught in Munich, Berlin, and Erfurt. His research interests include International Relations Theory, Financial Regulation (especially dirty money), and Global Governance. He is cofounder of the research and policy network *Critical Perspectives on Global Governance* (www.cpogg.org).

Philipp S. Müller is Professor for International Relations at the Graduate School for Public Administration and Public Policy of Tecnológico de Monterrey (EGAP—Tec de Monterrey). Until 2003, he was Senior Research Associate at the German Institute for International and Security Affairs in Berlin. He received his Ph.D. in International Relations, International Law, and Philosophy from Ludwig-Maximilians-University, Munich. In his research, he focuses on questions of global governance,

state transformation, e-governance, and the politics of the internet. He is cofounder of the research and policy network *Critical Perspectives on Global Governance* (www.cpogg.org).

Julie Owen practiced law for eight years at the largest law firm in Canada before obtaining her B.C.L. in European and Comparative Law (Oxon., Distinction) and then her LL.M. (Columbia, Kent Scholar). She is presently practicing in the areas of civil litigation and constitutional law at Hunter Voith Litigation Counsel in Vancouver, Canada.

Heikki Patomäki is Professor of International Relations at the University of Helsinki and also the Research Director of NIGD, the Network Institute for Global Democratisation. Until Summer 2003 he was a Professor of World Politics and Economy at the Nottingham Trent University, UK. His research interests include critical realism as a philosophy of social sciences; theories and issues of peace research and global political economy; and global democratization. His most recent books include *Democratising Globalisation: The Leverage of the Tobin Tax*, Zed Books, 2001; *After International Relations: Critical Realism and the (Re)Construction of World Politics*, Routledge, 2002; and *A Possible World: Democratic Transformation of Global Institutions* with Teivo Teivainen, Zed Books, 2004.

Andreas L. Paulus is Wissenschaftlicher Assistent (assistant professor) and lecturer at the Institute for Public International Law at the Ludwig-Maximilians-University. Paulus studied law at the Universities of Göttingen, Geneva, Munich, and Harvard. In 2000, he was awarded his doctorate by the LMU Munich. In 2003/2004, he was Visiting Assistant Professor of Law at the University of Michigan Law School. In 2003, he received the Bavarian Habilitation Scholarship Award. Paulus served as counsel of the Federal Republic of Germany in the *LaGrand* case (Germany vs. United States) and as advisor in the *Certain Property* (Liechtenstein vs. Germany) case before the International Court of Justice. His publications include various articles on international legal theory, international criminal law, and the law on the use of force.

Konrad Späth is research student in the department of international relations at the Ludwig-Maximilians-University, Munich. He is currently writing his Ph.D. thesis on the generative impact of security on political order in the context of global governance.

Robert Wai is Associate Professor at Osgoode Hall Law School, York University, Toronto, where he has taught since 1998. He completed his

LLB degree at the University of British Columbia, an M. Phil. in international relations at Oxford and his SJD doctoral degree in international law at Harvard Law School. He served as law clerk to Justice Gérard La Forest of the Supreme Court of Canada, and worked at law firms in Vancouver and New York. His current research focuses on the relationship between public and private law in areas such as international trade regulation and transnational litigation.

Preface

Challenging Global Governance plays with the grammatical indeterminacy of its meaning. And this indeterminacy has been the driving force for our project. It is also the basis of a community of scholars that has learned to speak a common (meta-) language that meets about once a year. This research and policy network "Critical Perspectives on Global Governance—CPOGG" (www.cpogg.org) aims to reflect both the theory and the practice of global governance in order to improve global public policy-making. With this book we hope to introduce you to some of this thinking.

This book was a journey during which we have accrued many debts: Funded by the Volkswagen Foundation and guided by Alfred Schmidt we set out on our first academic adventure in the summer of 2002. Our mentor and dissertation-advisor Friedrich Kratochwil (now European University Institute), David Kennedy (Harvard Law School), Thomas Risse and Andrea Liese (both Freie Universität Berlin) were extremly helpful in shaping the project and without their initial guidance CPOGG would have never been possible.

We were lucky to have the castle Amerang as a meeting place in October 2002 and thank Ortholf von Crailsheim for his hospitality that made the event special for all participants. The secludedness of the place in the Bavarian mountains played an important role in freeing our minds and in creating a community.

Otto Lampe and Thomas Fitschen from the German Foreign Ministry invited us to co-organize the next event in the German Foreign Ministry in Berlin (January 2003). This allowed us to reflect together with foreign policy makers who actually were confronted with governing globally.

In October 2003, David Kennedy organized an amazing gathering in Cambridge, where people like Janet Halley or Nathaniel Birnbaum or Karen Engle critically reflected on our critical project. The National Forest Service offered us access to their lodge in Big Sur for a workshop

in April 2004 and in November 2004 we finalized the volume at the CPOGG conference Challenging Global Governance at the Graduate School for Public Administration and Public Policy (EGAP) of Tecnológico de Monterrey in Monterrey, Mexico.

Katie Tobin played a big role in the editing process working diligently with all of us; she has been involved in the CPOGG-Community since the beginning and has gone above and beyond her call to duty. Toby Wahl from Palgrave has been a great advisor shepherding us through the process. Without him, the volume would still be a collection of articles gathering dust on our hard drives.

We thank the institutions that allowed us to pursue this project, the German Institute for Security and International Affairs, Potsdam University, and EGAP—Tecnológico de Monterrey and our partners Alexandra and Mareile.

We are also very grateful to our authors for their dedication and for their patience with us and finally we would like to thank all those individuals who participated at the various CPOGG events and from whom we learned tremendously how to challenge global governance.

We dedicate this book to our children Dominic, Helena, and Marlene.

January 2005
Markus Lederer and Philipp S. Müller

Introduction

Challenging Global Governance

Philipp S. Müller and Markus Lederer

Introduction

Just as every book on the international realm from 1991 to 2000 has referred to the end of the Cold War as a historical starting point, books in the twenty-first century refer to globalization, that is, the transformative changes in the international system (Fuchs and Kratochwil 2002). Globalization has thus created a need to find a new framework or vocabulary to describe and act in the international world. This theoretical problem is linked to the following practical and political problem: How can we legitimize political action in a post–nation-state world? Global governance addresses these twin questions. In 2003 there was an explosion of articles and books on global governance (Arts; Börzel and Risse; Held and Koenig-Archibugi; Holzinger et al.; Kahler and Lake; Messner and Nuscheler; Steffek; Weiss, etc.). As latecomers we will join this list. Why should this particular addition be interesting?

Global governance is, of course, not the only term that competes to imagine and legitimize world order. For International Relations (IR) conservationists, there still is the notion of the "Westphalian state system" or of "Uni-, Bi-, and Multipolarity"; and frameworks such as "Global Anarchical Society" (Bull 1977), "World Government" (Griffin 1999; Harris 1999), "Neo-medievalism" (Friedrichs 2001), "Empire" (Hardt and Negri 2001), and Donald Rumsfeld's dictum of the "Coalitions of the Willing" are vying for supremacy. However, global governance seems to have a chance to become the main perspective and we argue that there are three historical forces that are confronting us with the need to reconceptualize world order along such lines: the emergence of global issues, the contestation of the legitimacy of political entities, and changes in how we think and do things in the world.

The first force consists of problems in our physical world, such as global warming, the integration of global financial as well as trade flows, and cultural globalization that have all led to the emergence of the idea of global issues as legitimate arguments in policy debates on the domestic, international, and global levels.[1] The idea of global issues is being circumscribed by a number of terms such as globalization, global commons, global public goods, and global public bads. The second historical force is the crisis in our understanding of the main political institution of modernity: the nation-state both internally (blurring of the boundary between private and public spheres) and externally (blurring of the boundary between the inside and the outside). And the third force is a shift in our understanding of instrumental rationality, that is, how we get things done in the world, from institutional to functional solutions of problems.

Together, these historical forces are presenting us with the challenge of governing the post–nation-state world. The world order framework that seems to be able to address these three forces most appropriately is global governance. Therefore, as a political idea, global governance has the chance to supersede the other understandings of world order discussed earlier. In academia the concept is emerging as an important framework to imagine the global realm, and for policy makers global governance is a political vocabulary that is referred to legitimize political interventions. It has become a contemporary social practice to legitimize oneself by arguing that one practices governance at a global level. The vocabulary of (global) governance, for example, is used to argue for or against the reorganization of international organizations, the signing of new international treaties, the extension of human rights principles as a guidance book for international politics, the introduction of new public policy instruments (Private–Public Partnerships, New Public Management, etc.), and to explain foreign policy measures. Global governance is a concept that is challenging both academics and policy makers.

In what follows, this introduction asks what global governance is, however, only to show in the third part that the question of how we use the concept is much more important. The fourth part introduces strategies of criticizing global governance and in the final pages we provide you with a short road map of the book.

What is Global Governance?

It may seem like a rather straightforward question, but so far no single definition of global governance exists that is accepted by all or even by

the majority of scholars or policy makers. The reason for this is not incompetence or incoherence, but lies in the type of concept that is involved. The act of defining global governance brings about political moves; therefore unanimity cannot and, we argue, should not be achieved. However, before we can argue that a definition of global governance hides more than it shows, it is important to know some of the most important attempts to define it.

In the literature, three strategies to categorize global governance have emerged. The first offers a non-definition consisting of the denial that something like global governance exists at all, the classical position of mainstream IR; the second is to offer a positive definition that often very idealistically assumes that a new form of managing global affairs has developed that can be characterized through specific actors, instruments, or practices. The third is by juxtaposing global governance to a term with which we feel more comfortable.

Strategy of Denial

Mainstream IR theory continues to have difficulties with global governance because of its foundational conceptualization of the international system as an anarchic realm (Jahn 2000). Thus, for many, governance is nothing new per se but merely a continuation of the interdependence literature of the 1970s or of the discussion about regimes in the 1980s. Given the strongly state-centric focus of IR theory (especially regime theory) this position makes sense (Hasenclever et al. 1997; for an exception see Haufler 1993). Even those who have started to take other actors more seriously do not conceptualize them as independent agents, but still define their roles in relation to the nation-state or to the intergovernmental system of the UN (e.g., Messner and Nuscheler 1996). It is therefore no surprise that James Rosenau—an early and vivid contributor to the debate—has rather pessimistically concluded that the discussion on global governance has not really abandoned the notion of an anarchic international system and has not yet contributed to a global political order (Rosenau 2000, 189).

Strategy of Finding a Positive Definition

In total contrast to the strategy of denial is the attempt to catch all new practices that have developed within the global realm in one positive definition. The most prominent example of such an exercise is the definition of the Commission on Global Governance, which stated that global governance is "the sum of the many ways individuals and institutions,

public and private, manage their common affairs. It is a continuing process through which conflicting or diverse interests may be accommodated and co-operative action may be taken" (1995, 2f.). This all-inclusive perspective gave respectability to global governance studies as an academic field and a policy area; however, because of its over-inclusiveness it cannot suggest research avenues, operationalizable hypotheses, or policy recommendations.

A scholarly, more ambitious project is James Rosenau's analytic attempt to focus on "systems of rule at all levels of authority" (1995, 13) and on "spheres of authority" that are able to set norms on various levels. For Rosenau, global governance thus compromises "all the structures and processes necessary to maintaining a modicum of public order and movement toward the realization of collective goals at every level of community around the world" (1997, 367). As Späth in chapter 1 rightly points out in his critique of Rosenau's definition, such a broad understanding of the term allows us to account for the evolution of new instances and forms of governing but the price to pay is that the definition itself becomes so open that it is bound for theoretical overstretch.

Another way to define global governance in a positive strategy is to use the term only in relation to the empirical fact that actors other than governments have become important agents on the international scene. Because of this, a large portion of the debate over global governance is dedicated to conceptualizing which actors are influential in international life and how they exert their influence and legitimize it in relation to their principals. Substate groups or regions (Ohmae 1996), supranational organizations (Rittberger and Zangl 2003) as well as intergovernmental groups, transnational corporations (TNCs) and their associations (Fuchs 2004), individual nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) of all aspects and civil society as a whole (Higgott et al. 2000; O'Brien et al. 2000) have all been identified as relevant actors. While these actor-centered approaches have convincingly shown that new actors have indeed become relevant agents in global affairs, they nevertheless could not capture in a systematic way what positively defines global governance as a practice.[2]

Strategy of Defining Global Governance through Juxtaposition
Because many scholars dismiss defining global governance in positive terms as fruitless, some researchers have taken to juxtaposing it to a "known" and "familiar" term. Examples are seeing global governance as not government or the idea of global governance as a political answer to economic globalization.

One early notion of defining global governance in juxtaposition comes from Rosenau and Czempiel, who speak of *Governance Without Government* (Rosenau and Czempiel 1992). Similarly, Lawrence Finkelstein states that global governance is "governing, without sovereign authority, relationships that transcend national frontiers. Global governance is doing internationally what governments do at home" (Finkelstein 1995, 369). Such a perspective is, however, problematized by comparative political scientists who discuss governance mechanisms as being part of the transformation of the state itself (Pierre 2000). Thus, if one separates governance and government too strictly, one assumes that the international realm itself is not connected to the domestic one. However, as many of the following chapters show, global governance is not only a multilevel game that sometimes includes domestic institutions and sometimes does not; on the contrary, global governance very often fuses both realms in such ways that they become one.

The second juxtaposition is to argue that global governance is the political answer to an economically determined process of globalization (e.g., Messner 2001, 3f.). Most NGOs also use the term to offer an alternative to the neoliberal Zeitgeist:

> In such a situation the concept of global governance presents itself. It is combined with the demand to resolve the problems of a neoliberal globalization. The concept is presented as a progressive alternative to neoliberalism. (Brand et al. 2000, 13—own translation)

This is of no surprise as the process of globalization has raised doubts in how far a more internationalized system is of value for individuals and beneficial for the general public as a whole. The argument is that the compromise of "embedded liberalism" (Ruggie 1983) in which the increase of international trade flows was accompanied by protective measures to ensure social stability has been abandoned and no substitute seems yet at hand. Opponents of globalization such as *ATTAC* (www.attac.org) argue that global governance has the chance to become the political alternative to the economistic hegemonic project of globalization that oppresses the underprivileged classes both in the North and the political South. They, as well as many parts of the established social-democratic Left, thus argue for mechanisms that would decrease economic inequality on a global scale. On the academic side, doubts about the legitimacy of globalization had been raised at a very early stage (Messner and Nuscheler 1996; Altvater and Mahnkopf 1996), but until the first organized resistance at Seattle, Gothenburg, and Genoa neither public