This article scrutinizes, firstly, the concept of ‘global governance,’ and by its elucidation, we illuminate the concept of ‘governance.’ In regard to this elucidation, we refer to some issues of global warming and its solutions, poor South dependency and its transformation, and analyze theoretical bases of dependency theory, world system theory, peace studies, neo-liberalism and constructivism in international relations theory. Through such a pathway, secondly, we analyze the different connotations of ‘globalization’ and ‘globalism’ in confronting with neo-liberal theorist Robert Keohane, and shed light on the ambiguity of his concept ‘globalism.’ After the unilateral ruling of the United States, its magisterial attitude has been blamed and it has been exposed the criticism of anti-Americanism. Globalization has been considered as Americanization, and it is the reason that anti-Americanism has occurred. However, Koehane and his co-editor Peter Katzenstein, a theorist of constructivism, are reluctant to admit such a present condition. Leaving behind the light of his own countenance of Americanism, we think about, thirdly, globalization has entered into another phase to promote ‘virtualization’ and governance by networks, and globalization has inspired a shift in activities away from the state, i.e. the ‘hollowing out of the sate’ in the globalized society. It is true that the age of anarchical society of state-centric framework was over, and the trilogy of multiple actors, such as nation states, TNCs and NGOs, is forming the governance by networks. However, among tiers of global, regional, national and local level, especially in the framework of national level, we cannot but think the state, i.e. the central government remains to be the administrative core and take an important role of governance. Accordingly, in our conclusion, the present governing framework is composed of ‘governance including government,’ instead of James Rosenau’s coinage of ‘governance without government.’
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Introduction

In this paper, we would like to consider, firstly, the concept of ‘governance’ involved in a new process of governing from a broad perspective comparing with different connotations of ‘globalization’ and ‘globalism.’ Secondly, we will compare some theories of ‘global governance’ with each other. Thirdly, we will scrutinize the relationship between government and governance, and mutual relationships among actors of governing, who participate on multi-level activities in the global and transnational level, the domestic and national level, and the local and sub-national level. When we take an example of the problem of pollution and environment, including carbon dioxide, acid rain and yellow sand, we cannot identify where its boundary is. Indeed, this problem has become the transnational issue calling for cross-border solutions. If we want to solve such serious cross-border problems, we have to shed light on a framework of co-solutions by multiple cross-border actors which includes not only governments (public sector) of sovereign nation states, but also non-governmental actors (private sectors) of transnational corporations (TNCs), non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and not-for-profit organizations (NPOs). The trilogy of three major sectors has been and is going on its activities beyond the borders. Such cross-border problems would be solved only by mutual cooperation and collaboration of positive actors, i.e. collective action and co-governance of diverse stakeholders.

However, it is the fact that we have no clear definition of ‘governance’ or ‘global governance’ arrangement as a frame of reference which would bring a common good of understanding for our global society. While there is no consensus over the term ‘governance’ or ‘global governance,’ there has been existed multiple actors, ranging from local producers to TNCs, from local NPOs and transnational NGOs to the World Bank or other some transnational organizations, from a large number of sovereign nation states to the transnational consortia like the United Nations, WTO or IMF. Such an understanding of ‘governance’ or ‘global governance’ allows us that there are more diverse and lateral forms of decision-making than the traditional state-centric, top-down perspective that dominated much of the post war period. Now we may emphasize while there is no single model or no single form of ‘governance’ or ‘global governance,’ nor is there a single structure or sets of structures, but there are broad, dynamic processes of interactive decision-making that are constantly evolving and responding to changing circumstances cross the world. The most important question for us here is what actors promote or inhibit their successful collective actions at the four dimensions of global, regional, national, sub-national or local level to address an ever-growing set of challenges (Wilkinson and Hughes, 2002; Sandler, 2004; Soederberg, 2006).
1 What is Global Governance?

1-1 Understanding Global Governance

Under the term ‘globalization,’ we see before our very eyes exactly the opposite two interactive forces at work on a global scale. Whereas one of them fosters all the activities in the direction that accelerate centralization, integration, and unification which bring about the dynamics of convergence, the other involves all the tendencies toward decentralization, localization, and fragmentation which bring forth the opposite dynamics of deviation. When we think about the dynamism of globalization, we should take account of these two opposite strands of convergence and deviation which have mutually synergetic effects and influences.

Meanwhile, global governance has been variously treated as a rhetorical expression, or it has been dismissed out of hand. The realist orthodoxy has been and remains wedded to an understanding of world politics that perceives sovereign nation states as the most significant actors, and attributes little to the role of other transnational organizations or non-state and non-governmental organizations. Through its lens, global governance should be understood only as a function of the transnational distribution of power, or as a result of behavioral practices, norms, rules and decision-making procedures that have developed over time.

In his incisive book, Hedley Bull pointed out that global society consists of the elements of transnational solidarity and conflict cutting across the divisions among sovereign nation states. He accepted the anarchy framework which is made up of the domain of self-help. He defined international relations as the politics of autonomous states without ‘a common superior’ (Bull, 1977). For this reason, he used the connotative term ‘anarchical society’ to indicate the presence of world order by bargaining among sovereign independent nation states without a common superior. As he suggested that it does not have only a hierarchal ruling order, but it should not be a chaos full of conflicts and antagonism, today’s global and transnational society is duplicating the dynamics of deviation and convergence among actors.

As already mentioned above, however, its components of actors are not only autonomous sovereign nation states, but also non-governmental actors of TNCs, NGOs and NPOs. When we define actors who are accelerating dynamics of global deviation and convergence, we have to take account that they include multiple actors of autonomous sovereign states and other non-governmental actors.

While, there is another standpoint that global governance is deemed synonymous with the development of transnational organizations that has sought to establish institutions and moments of authority designed to coordinate activities across state boundaries. According to this standpoint, which is opposite to the lens of anarchical society, globalization has entailed the emergence of global governance by making institutions that seeks to regulate and manage various areas of transnational activities. The report of Commission on Global Governance emphasizes, “It [Governance] is a continuing process through which conflicting or diverse interests may be accommodated and co-operative action may be taken. It includes formal institutions and regimes empowered to enforce compliance, as well as informal arrangements that people and institutions either have agreed to or perceive to be in their interest” (Commission on Global Governance, 1995: 2).

According to this report, global governance should be viewed primarily as formal institutions or regimes of intergovernmental relationships and organizations; and as also informal arrangements involving transnational corporations and global markets, and non-governmental organizations, citizen’s movements.

Throughout the 1990s and in the beginning of 2000s, we have been shaken up by the profound changes and transformations in governments, public administrations, political systems and institutions, ways of trade of goods and exchange of currencies, ways of conveying information, ways of governing process, and ways of participation of the civic people. These profound changes and transformations have been accompanied to globalization such as notable aspects of the integration of markets by the proliferation of worldwide trade, investments and information flows, the rapid spread of communication technologies including the internet, mobile phone systems and satellite communications which allow people on different sides of the globe to communicate instantaneously and to speed up and deepen impact of interregional flows and patterns of social integration. Such notable aspects of globalization have brought about the phenomenon of ‘de-territorialization’ to promote cross-border interactions and to grow interdependence between national and transnational actors, and to expand mutual influences of political, economic, social, and cultural relations in every corner of the world.

By the stretching and deepening of social relations across the world, such day-to-day activities have been increasingly influenced by events happening on the other side of the globe, and the practices and decisions of local groups or communities might prove to have their ability to broaden significant global reverberations. In short, while globalization has been and is continuing to advance the intensifications of interactions and interconnections that have led to the shrinking changes and transformations in our global world, we have been and are seeking the emergence of multiple arrangements of global governance that can cope with such changes and transformations, and regulate and manage a variety of transnational activities by a multitude of actors (Scholte, 2001; Held and McGrew, 2002; Held and McGrew, 2007a; Held and Mepham, 2007; Holton, 2005; Holton, 2008).
1-2 Interrogative Shadow of Globalization

Such positive sides of globalization have, as a matter of course, its negative sides, for example, global warming resulting from greenhouse gasses (GHG), depletion of ozone layer resulting from chlorofluorocarbons (CFC) gasses, air pollution resulting from carbon dioxide, acid fallout and yellow sand. These destructive and wasteful substances have caused a great deal of damages as a penetration of trans-boundary environmental pollution into other countries and areas, and resulted in global ecological destruction. The failure of sustainable development since the middle of 1970s has given rise to a new form of green politics and suggested the need to reexamine the discursive framework which seeks to define strategies for change and renewal. Then, the problem with sustainable development seems to be lodged with how to organize the global discourse coalition to shed new light on the dynamics of environmental conflicts and illuminate a remarkable continuity attended by specific actors including nation states and NGOs (Hajer, 1995; Fischer and Hajer, 1999).

As such a global discourse coalition, IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change) has been continuing to cope with the issue of climate change and endeavored to make and fix the global standard of assessment since 1988. As is broadly known, in 2007, IPCC was awarded of the Nobel Peace Prize with the former Vice President of the United States, Al Gore, for their efforts to build up and disseminate greater knowledge about climate change brought by human beings themselves, and to lay the foundations for the measure that are needed to counteract such changes. After his defeat in the presidency fought with Bush, Gore has been full of activity as the leader of his organization Save Our Selves, and he made the film “An Inconvenient Truth,” an American Academy Award-winning documentary film in an effort to raise awareness about climate change and global warming.

Whereas IPCC is the organization for research and assessment, UNFCCC (United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change) was concluded as the treaty organization by the Earth Summit held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, in 1992. UNFCCC headquarters is located in Bonn, Germany, and has continued its activities to arrange conditions and bring about ratchet effects to global warming. The third Conference of Parties (COP3) of UNFCCC was held in Kyoto, Japan, in 1997. The conference adopted the Kyoto Protocol to set the numerical target of allowance of carbon dioxide which has a legal binding force to member states. Though the numerical target ought to be decrease the amount of carbon dioxide in each country, it has been trivialized as the numerical target of emission trading among member states.

Up to now, the United States and some other countries have been continuing to oppose to the Kyoto Protocol for the very simple reason that the numerical target is too high to achieve. The United States government has maintained its attitude to stand in opposition to the Kyoto Protocol for the reason that China or India are not obliged to make sure their numerical reduction target, while they are rapidly industrializing, realizing their rapid economic development, and increasing their amount of oil consumption and exhaustion of GHG.

On December 3, 2007, Australia ratified the Kyoto Protocol, and thereafter, only one country which has not yet ratified this protocol is the United States among advanced countries. Between December 3–14, 2007, COP13 was held in Bali, Indonesia, and discussed the new numerical standard to be the post Kyoto Protocol, but unfortunately this conference could not agree with the new numerical standard. For the United States and Japan ferociously opposed to make any explicit new standard which forces to observe by the conclusion and ratification. Since the early 1970s, Japan has been contributing to settle the problem of environmental pollution by its own making efforts of technological development and to hold the Kyoto Conference of COP 3 to set the elucidated numerical target. However, in the COP 13, its behavior hung together with the United States as a junior partner without expressing its own standpoint.

In marked contrast with Japan, in 2005, EU introduced the new emission trading system (ETS), the cap system of ‘grandfathering,’ which is to decide the ceiling of emission trading according to achievements of decreasing the quantity of GHG in each private corporation. If an enterprise could not conform to the cap with GHG, it is obliged to pay a fine. The state of California of the United States has decided to introduce this ‘grandfathering’ system in 2012. After the next American presidency, November 2008, whether the winner would be Democrats or Republicans, new American regime would not be avoidable to change the course of its environmental policy to proceed at a common pace with EU. Nevertheless, Japanese Ministry of the Environment would like to make a different scheme to introduce the ‘benchmarking’ system to assess according to performances of energy conservation in each field of industry. The EU Commission proposed the ‘auction’ system, January 2008, which private corporations buy emission quotas by the open tendering, instead of the ‘grandfathering’ system which private corporations of the high quantity of emission can get much more emission quotas. Up to now, Japan has been grappling with the environmental problem for itself, but it should escape from being isolation and take the leading position for making a new framework of green politics of European countries.

2 How World System is Structured?
2-1 Dependency or Dependence: Revisited

In addition, globalization has accelerated much more deepening of desperate poverty in underdeveloped countries and areas, especially in the Global South. Throughout the post war period, in particular, mankind has been confronted unprecedented challenge of the dramatic rapid growth of the world population from 2.5 billion in 1950 to 6.5 billion in
2007. This extraordinary overpopulation has placed much more pressure on the planet resources than ever before. Natural resources, water resources, forest resources, energy resources and food have been and are being consumed at heretofore unimagined levels. As is commonly known, UNCTAD (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development), founded in 1964 and of which headquarter is located in Geneva, Switzerland, has been contributing to the transnational debate on globalization and the management of its consequences for developing countries, especially on the debt problems of developing and underdeveloped countries, and promoting public policies to be conductive to stable economic growth and sustainable and successful development at the national, regional and transnational level.

In 1950, Paul Prebisch, the director of ECLA (UN Economic Commission for Latin America) and the later secretary general of UNCTAD, presented the Prebisch-Singer thesis. This thesis was not produced by the collaborative research with Hans Singer, but both economists came to almost the same conclusion through each bypath of different analysis. The thesis argued that prices of primary products such as agricultural goods and raw materials have a tendency to fall much more than prices of manufactured secondary products by the deterioration in the term of trade. That is the reason why the center of industrialized countries has reinforced the export oriented economy of primary products and the distortional imbalanced development in the periphery of developing and underdeveloped countries of Latin America, Asia, and Africa. Almost benefit of imbalanced trade is transferred to the wealthy developed countries, and developing countries cannot earn enough by the exchange of export benefit and import payment. Accordingly, developing and underdeveloped countries are inevitably dragged into the dependency of economic development on developed countries like the United States or European countries. Their thesis introduced the conclusion that to break through the condition of center-periphery relation, the periphery has to choose the self sustaining development pathway instead of purchasing the imported manufactured products and bring growth through the way of internal development. Its driving engine should be the import substitution industrialization instead of relying on the export oriented economy of primary products.

In the late 1960s and throughout the 1970s, UNCTAD discussed the North-South problem of uneven distribution and exploitation of the poor South by the rich North. Keeping pace with this conference, advocates of new dependency theory, whose leading members were such neo-marxists as Samir Amin or Andre G. Frank and so on, asserted that their viewpoints are considerably different from the Prebisch-Singer thesis, and repeated to denounce the specialization of natural resources as exportable primary goods or products and the compulsion of import substitution industrialization to the South by advanced countries of the North. Because, even if the import substitution industrialization in the South is succeeded, the structured world system of uneven exchange and uneven distribution would be maintained, relations of which have been already structured as the center-periphery or core-margin relation and the dominant-dependent or metropolitan-satellite relation brought by the coerced unequal development and the fixation of the concept: ‘dependency’ and ‘dependence’ or ‘the development of underdevelopment.’ However, they could not propose anything except that it is necessary for the South to grope for its independent development (Thomas and Wilkin, 1997; Amin, 1997; Amin, 1998; Frank, 1998; Grugel and Hout, 1999).

By contrast, Immanuel Wallerstein, advocate of world system theory, redefined dependency theory as such that there has been and is the ‘external’ beyond and outside the center-periphery structure, and capitalism has been existed by including just the ‘external’ as a ‘new periphery.’ As long as there are cleavages in the modern world such as race, class, nation, ethnicity and gender, the ‘external’ would continue to exist and to be included as a ‘new periphery.’ From the historical point of view, since its emergence in the 16th century Western Europe as the capitalist world economy just after the collapse of feudalism based on agricultural productions, the modern world system has expanded by incorporating non-capitalized parts of the ‘external’ into a ‘new periphery.’ Accordingly, he argued that an inherent feature of the world system is destined to be a lasting division of the world in ‘core;’ ‘semi-periphery’ and ‘periphery’ and ‘external.’ He explained that the structure of the world economy has been based on the division of labor all over the world by using his oxymoron based on his specific circulation theory just as Kondratieff cycles, commodity chains, income-pooling households, interstate system, hegemonic cycles and geo-culture, some of which were his own coinages. He placed an emphasis on that the modern world system has been maintained by national states and their interstate system in the core areas created as politico-economic guarantors to enclose their own benefits. However, the interstate system has been existed not as a single unit, but it has been taking a role of so-called safety networks for the world system. The world system has its character of continuing and long-lasting structures, but it has been and is constantly changing. He insisted that his world system analysis is not a theory, but a protest against neglected issues, i.e. an anti-systemic movement, so that he pointed out the United States is a ‘hegemon in decline,’ and he has continued to denounce its behavior before and after September 11, 2001, together with Noam Chomsky, etc. (Wallerstein, 1974; Wallerstein, 1979; Wallerstein, 1980; Wallerstein, 1984; Wallerstein, 1989; Wallerstein, 2004).

Although there are a number of factors and reasons of poverty in addition to what advocates of new dependence theory and Wallerstein emphasized, it is true that an enforced structure of underdevelopment brought by globalization is one of the major factors and reasons of the world poverty, and the vast majority of the population of the world poverty is still now seen with our eyes in the Global South. Therefore, a strategy of poverty reduction should not be to entrust the market operation as freely and fully as possible with the minimal state interference by so called the market fundamentalism. As for its prescription, neo-liberal strategy wants to encourage massive flows of speculative capital across borders, cut public expenditures, balance budgets, lower corporate taxes, deregulate businesses, encourage
foreign ownership and foreign control and secure private property monopolies. While neo-liberal strategy wants to accumulate wealth to the metropolitan center of the globe or newly-born riches of oil producing countries in the Middle East or other areas like Russia, poverty reduction strategy wants to do with only by redistributing maximized wealth of economic growth gained by the uneven exchange to the poor South by implementing foreign aids as Singer’s plan recommended.

Indeed, the battle against world hunger and poverty would be fought by increasing foreign aids to developing and underdeveloped countries and areas to offset the disproportionate gain of developed countries. However, if developed countries implement ODA to exchange, for example, rare-metals in African underdeveloped countries, such foreign aids would deepen cleavages between upper riches or elites and lower poor people, i.e. between the center of the chosen Haves and the periphery of the deserted Not-haves within each African underdeveloped country. We do repeat again that such a way leads only to bring out another center-periphery problem or another North-South problem in an African country. In its turn, such a present condition would be continued to exist as the South-South problem between relatively wealthy countries and poorer countries and between Haves and Not-haves.

Furthermore, there is another possibility to introduce the Tobin-Spahn tax. For the last decade, whether this tax should be introduced or not has been examined in Belgium, France, Canada, Australia, Brazil, Argentina, and member countries of APEC (Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation). This tax plan is to put a low rate tax on a short term speculation and trading in currencies, to produce funds and to take measures for solving problems such as environmental pollution, poverty, population explosion, peace and security. If accumulated funds by making use of this tax were to put practical use, this tax would be able to take a role of distributing funds to fight with poverty in many African and Asian underdeveloped countries and areas. It would be, of course, necessary to found an organization to coordinate the distribution of funds and another monitoring organization to be on the watch for how to effectively use funds and how to greatly contribute.

2-2 Structural Violence and Anti-Americanism

New dependency theory has lost its influences in accordance with a raise of economic driving forces of NIEs (Newly Industrializing Economics) in Asia (Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore) in the late 1980s, and with catching up by BRICs (Brazil, Russia, India and China) including South Africa in the late 1990s and the early 2000s. It is needless to say the bulk of driving forces was backed up by investments and technology transfer by the United States, Japan and European countries. However, it is obviously the fact that neo-liberalist strategy of poverty reduction has not been the most effective program to mitigate the extreme poverty, but only a measure to fix and embed the structural violence in the poor South.

Galtung hopes to realize the horizontal structure of collaborative and supportive relationships. On the contrary to his hope, there is a tendency to deviation instead of convergence in every corner of the world. Such a tendency is revealed
as movements of separation and terrorism. During the post war period of nationalistic trends of independence from the domination of colonialism, statehood is a legitimate factor only in terms of nation and nationalism, and necessitates an emphasis on nation building. After the collapse of the Cold War structure in 1989, many nations have existed and exist in the situation of the lack of an ethnic core within a state. Therefore, they are prone to expect the possibility for success in effective nation building as populations require such components for the purpose of unification. Such a separatism of effective nation building should include the requirement of an ethnic group attempting formation of a separate autonomous state within an already existing lager state or for an opportunity to realize its regional autonomy, for example provinces of Tibet, Uighur and Inner Mongolia in the Republic of China.

However, almost every case has the requirement for separation and complete independent state from an already existing state, for example, ethnic groups of the province of Quebec in Canada, the Basque stretching over Spain and France, Kurds stretching over Iraq and Turkey, Kosovo in the old Yugoslavian republic, East Timor in an island of Indonesia, Chechnya in the Caucasus corridor of Russia. In fact, East Timor and six provinces of the old Yugoslavian republic (Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia, Montenegro, Macedonia) won the independence at cruel victims of the civil war. The case of independence of Palestinian state is an example which includes a delicate problem that though the Palestinian people have finished their nation building even if there were furious conflicts between Palestinian factions, they cannot confirm whether there is the possibility of state building or not, for the reason that they are wriggling out of the slough trap dug by Israel and its godfather. Afghanistan and Iraq are also squirming out of an ant lion. They are in the hole dug by the United States as a pseudo-empire of unilaterlism. To successfully escape out of deep and fierce conflicts stuck in the mud in an area such as the Balkans, any negotiation requires the commitment of a mediating state or organization with the stature to lead and to use military forces if it is necessary. Unfortunately, judge’s blood, such as the United States, is up being beside itself with the war against terrorism in the aftermath of September 11, 2001.

In the deadlock of present circumstances, it is not the United States, but the UN and its sub-organizations that can act to wedge into local conflicts or local wars, function to separate antagonistic military forces, like a case of UNMIK (United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo), and set the table of negotiation to cease conflicts. However, even the UN cannot act as brakes on terrorism, because terrorists do not come forward as one of actors who behave openly in the global society. Therefore, there is a room for American unilateral behavior to act as the world police backed up by its strong military forces, and to make a fierce attack haphazardly against areas where seem for the United States to be terrorist bases. Nevertheless, a virtually exclusive focus on terrorism and the war against terrorism in Afghanistan and Iraq has come to a high cost as well as in the former Vietnam War. In the current state of affairs, no matter how strong American military forces, it is impossible to block, sweep and eradicate terrorism perfectly out of the world. When it began the invasion operations in Afghanistan on October, 2001, the United States pronounced this operation is to sweep terrorists backed up by Afghanistan government of Islamic fundamentalist Taliban and Al Qaeda of Sunni faction fundamentalists. Besides, when it began the war of Iraq on March, 2003, the United States denounced that the development and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction would raise the specter of unimaginable devastation suddenly occurred anywhere on the world as a result of the outlaw actions of axis of evils or rogues posed by such risks as the sudden devastation from new weapons of global terrorism.

However, the United States itself has been continuing to diffuse a devastating flood of mass destruction weapons all over the world by a plausible excuse of its military interventions as the selfish-styled army of crusaders as the world police. It is the same as implementing the public policy to cope with global warming and GHG, next American president and its government would be unavoidable to withdraw from Iraq during its administration. If the withdraw of American army comes true, much fierce civil war than now would be fought between the Shiahs faction with a majority and the Sunni faction with a minority in Iraq. The Shiahs faction backed up by Iran administration of Shiahs faction would win an overwhelming victory. In the next step, the Shiahs faction which has established its ruling over both Iran and Iraq would begin the violent struggle for the hegemony over Afghanistan with the Sunni faction if the latter would establish its ruling over Pakistan in cooperation with Taliban and Al Qaida. When the interests between the Shiahs faction and the Sunni faction collide, both would at the end be losers. Because of the fear that, both would make a compromise with each other and try to come to an agreement for their coexistence by segregation.

Bearing the failure and defects of American oversea military operations on mind, Peter Katzenstein and Robert Keohane edited the book on anti-Americanism. “To understand anti-Americanism,” they rhetorically argue, “we also need to understand Americanism. The diversity of anti-Americanism is due to the diversity of America. …[T]he heterogeneity of anti-Americanism is matched by the heterogeneity of Americanism. …American symbols refer simultaneously to a variety of values, which may appeal differently to different people in different societies and, despite their contradiction, may appeal even to the same person at one time. …We need to remember that many of the conflicts in world politics that manifest different forms of anti-Americanism have strong echoes within the American polity” (Katzenstein and Keohane, 2007: 3–4).

According to such a premise, they classify the four types of anti-Americanism: liberal, social, sovereign-nationalist, radical. Firstly, liberals identify with Americans, and liberal anti-Americanism would not be to generate attack on the United States, although, in the situation of a superpower that professes universal ideals, they may be very critical of the failure of the United States to pursue actions consistent with its professed values and to reduce support for its policy.
The typical example of this type is prevalent in the liberal societies of advanced industrialized countries colonized or influenced by Great Britain, especially the Middle East. Secondly, social and Christian democrats share broadly democratic principles and values with the United States, but social democrats anti-Americanism define other values very differently from those of Americans, typically rejecting America’s lack of an extensive welfare state and its social policies of generous social protections including the death penalty, and preference for multilateral approaches over unilateral ones and the sanctity of international treaties. The typical example of this type is prevalent in continental European democratic countries.

Thirdly, sovereign-nationalists identify with their nation in spite of being threatened by the United States, sovereign-nationalist anti-Americanism resonates in politics that have strong state traditions and in which American actions are perceived as detrimental to nationalism, sovereignty, to the exercise of state power. The typical example of this type is prevalent in East Asian states, especially in China. Lastly, radical anti-Americanism defines itself in opposition to America and its values and argues for the weakening, destruction, or transformation of the political and economic institutions of the United States. The typical example of this type is characteristic of Marxist-Leninist states such as the former Soviet Union, Cuba, North Korea and Radical Muslims (Katzenstein and Keohane, 2007: 28–34, 274).

We recognize at a glance, their standpoint is very relative, eclectic and blurred, for they describe that, “These four types are not mutually exclusive. …On the contrary, several of them may bleed into one another” (Katzenstein and Keohane, 2007: 29). Now then, how the four typical types of anti-Americanism could be bled into one another? In the conclusion of their book, both of editors place an emphasis on that the logical basis of anti-Americanism exists in the polyvalence of America. However, they do not want to seek its basis in popular explanations such as power imbalances, a backlash against globalization, and conflicting identities, but they do want to seek in the polyvalence which embodies a rich variety of values such as secular science and religious fundamentalism, moralism and sexual permissiveness, rigorous science and a rich popular culture. They are only to add that, “the United States is both an open and a critical society. It is also deeply divided” (Katzenstein and Keohane, 2007: 306–307, 316).

To our regret, their way of deduction is only a preoccupation of logic like as the garbage can theory of Herbert Simon which would result into an uncertainty of the ‘organizational anarchy’ of decision making (Yamamoto, 2007: 71). In their conclusion, they repeat again their premise in the introduction, as such that the status quo of domestic America is polyvalent and simultaneously the outside of America is, as a matter of course, polyvalent, so that such a melting pot of values in America is just like a Pandora’s box pervaded through all over the world. Therefore, we cannot help reluctantly seeking the reason that their logic is ambiguous and eclectic in their theoretical basis itself.

On the one hand, Katzenstein is advocate of constructivism, and there is a very reason that his standpoint is a kind of eclecticism between conventional constructivism and critical constructivism. As for constructivism, it is based on the post-positivism that is not limited to a narrow explanation of causality by a rational choice between ends and means, but focuses on social processes of constructing identities and preferences as a prerequisite of a rational choice. Furthermore, it aims to comprehensively explain actions of actors by an elucidation of constitutive rules in the social context. Constructivism assumes a variety of aspects and is separated into at least three factions of conventional, reflexive and postmodern. The conventional one is based on the idealistic ontology which explains processes of making new norms by interactions among actors. The critical one is based on the discourse theory of reflexive interactions among actors, and has the same basis of idealistic ontology as conventional constructivism. Critical constructivism is, however, skeptical to apply to social phenomena the covering laws model, which assumes a specific situation as an applied example of general rule of causality. Katzenstein has consistently denounced postmodern constructivism, for the reason that it denies a possibility of empirical social sciences and it thinks there is no neutral truth for any science.

On the other hand, Keohane is advocate of neo-liberalism, which depends on the positivism to systematically investigate the hypothesis of causality, and has its theoretical basis of rationalism to explain actions by a rational choice of actors between ends and means. Such a rational choice approach and game theory have encouraged to be integrated into neo-realist and neo-liberal theories to explain policy choices and the behavior of states in conflict and cooperation. Neo-realist and neo-liberal theories are, as it were, fused into mutually synthesizing. In marked contrast with constructivism, neo-realist and neo-liberal theories are theories to aim at solving status-quo oriented problems. Instead, neo-realism advocates that the present ordering structure is anarchical and based on self help without a common superior. It argues in favor of the state-centric and systemic approach, and concerned with studying issues of balance of power and security, actors of which are limited to states. In opposition, neo-liberalism develops in favor of the perspective of cooperation and institutions, actors of which are composed of not only states but also TNCs and NGOs. In this sense, both theories are quite different from each other. Moreover, neo-liberalism in IR and neo-liberalism in political economy has a great similarity, but the former is not based on the market fundamentalism such as Thatcherrism. As seen above, theoretical basis of standpoint of co-editors, Katzenstein and Keohane is not so obvious and not so solid, and unavoidable to be blurred instead of expressing their consistent basis of status quo analysis.

The United States has been called as the empire from the early1990s to the early 2000s, much more precisely until September 11, 2001. In these decades, almost people of the world has thought that neo-liberal globalism is simultaneously equal to forward Americanization and to accept American cultures like as Cocacolalization or McDonaldization, which should profess universal ideals as an evangelical guidance. Neo-liberal globalism has been variously regarded as the structural adjustment model of Americanization, including the enchantment of Macworld or...
McDonaldization (Barber, 1996; Ritzer, 1996; Ritzer, 1998; Ritzer, 2001; Ritzer, 2005; Alifino, Caputo and Wybyard, 1998; Smart, 1999). Indeed, the United States has enjoyed its unilateral and hierarchical ruling as the pseudo-empire cross the world, especially after the collapse of the Cold War structure in 1989. Such a haughty ruling has permitted the rise of neo-conservatism in the Bush regime, and neo-liberal globalism has reluctantly accepted neo-conservatism as their unfavorable colleagues. However, such a naive conception has already come to the end along with the end of unilateral and hierarchical ruling by the pseudo-empire of America.

3 Perspective of Governance by Networks

3-1 ‘Virtualization’ and Interdependence on Others

For the fact that the unilateral and hierarchical ruling of the United States came to the end and a common pseudo-superior in the sense of Bull was lost, globalization has entered into another phase to promote ‘virtualization’ and governance by networks. In other words, globalization has inspired a shift in activities away from the state. In this context, Roderick Rhodes refers to the ‘hollowing out of the sate’ in the globalized society (Rhodes, 1997; Rhodes, 2000; Bevir and Rhodes, 2006). As an appropriate example of the hollowing out of the state, we can imagine the devolution of EU, member states of which have delegated a part of state sovereignty of governmental functions and currencies to the upper organization of EU. It is quite similar to the decentralization from central government to local governments in each nation state. Though we do not know whether he understands in the same way, Keohane wants to define that the term ‘interdependence’ and the term ‘globalization’ have a common basis to express a trend of transnational flows and networks, and he wants to differentiate the term ‘globalization’ from the term ‘globalism.’

He describes, on the one hand, as follows. “At one level, then, ‘interdependence’ was simply overtaken by ‘globalization’ as the fashionable language to describe increases in economic openness and integration. …Globalization moves beyond linkages between separate societies to the reorganization of social life on a transnational basis. …Interdependence refers to a state of the world, whereas globalization describes a trend of increasing transnational flows and increasingly thick networks of interdependence. For the terms to be comparable, we need to use a different term: “globalism,” which describes a state of the world. Both interdependence and globalism can be viewed as matters of degree: both can increase or decline over time. Globalization, by contrast, implies increases in globalism. It makes more sense to speak of a “decline in globalism” than a “decline in globalization” (Keohane, 2002: 14–15; Italics in original, and underline is mine). He describes, in another chapter written with Joseph Nye, “Globalization refers to the shrinkage of distance but on a large scale. It can be contrasted with localization, nationalization, or regionalization” (Keohane, 2002: 194).

On the other hand, he wants to define ‘globalism,’ which is the different concept from ‘globalization.’ “[Globalism] is also multi-dimensional. We differentiate economic, social, environmental and military globalization, each of which has political dimensions. Globalism involves thick networks of interdependence, organized on a transnational basis. Each strand of interdependence involves specific actors, whereas globalism refers to the aggregate pattern produced by all of these strands, and by their organization on a global scale” (Keohane, 2002: 15; Underline is mine). Moreover, in the chapter written with Nye, he mentions, “Globalization is the process by which globalism becomes increasingly thick. …Globalism today is America-centric, in the most of the impetus for the information revolution comes from the United States, and a large part of the content of global information networks is created in the United States. However, the ideas and information that enter global networks are downloaded in the context of national politics and local cultures, which acts as selective filters and modifies of what arrives. Political institutions are often more resistant to transnational transmission than popular culture” (Keohane, 2002: 198–199; Italics in original, and underline is mine).

According to his definition, on the one hand, the term ‘globalization’ means (1) a trend of increasing transnational flows and thick networks of interdependence, (2) linkages between separate societies to the reorganization of social life on a transnational scale, (3) increases in economic openness and integration. In addition, (4) globalization means thick increases in globalism. On the other hand, the term ‘globalism’ means (1) American-centric global information networks, (2) thick networks of interdependence organized on a transnational basis, (3) the aggregate pattern produced by all of strands and by their organization on a global scale, (4) multi-dimensional, which differentiate economic, social, environmental and military globalization, (5) both interdependence and globalism can be viewed as matters of degree.

If we make allowance for him in his context, while globalization is the broad set, which is the reflective mirror concept of such sub-divisions as regionalization, nationalization and localization, globalism is the sub-set of globalization, which has four sub-divisions separated into economic, military, environmental, social and cultural ones. Therefore, we can understand his strata of concepts, firstly, globalization is the meta-level concept of globalism, secondly, globalization has, as its reflective mirror images, its three sub-divisions composed of regionalization, nationalization, and localization, thirdly, there is another concept of globalism as the sub-dimension of the meta-level concept of globalization, and lastly, globalism has also its sub-divisions of four ramifications. However, we cannot but point out there is not any difference between his ‘globalization’ and his ‘globalism.’

In this sense, it is obvious that Keohane is contradicted in his own definition concerning with the relationship between ‘globalization’ and ‘globalism.’ No matter how scrutinizing his definition, both of the terms should be resulted
in being synonymous. If that is the case, it is not necessary for us to try to define by setting such complex and particular demarcations. Indeed, Koehane merely defines that both of globalization and globalism have thick networks of interdependence. Moreover, for him, globalism is not the sub-dimension of the meta-level concept of globalization. For the very simple reason, he does not want to describe “globalism is multi-dimensional, which is differentiated into economic, social, environmental and military globalism.” Instead, he is eager to describe “globalization is multi-dimensional, which is differentiated into economic, social, environmental and military globalization.” Hence, for Keohane, there is no reason to make a demarcation between ‘globalization’ and ‘globalism’ as the two particularly divided concepts. Though he admits that globalism is the American-centric penetration of cultures and information, he does not admit that neo-liberal globalism has been variously regarded as the structural adjustment model of Americanization which has foreseen universal ideals as an evangelical guidance. Others have been forced to accept such an American model by its political, in certain cases, military pressures. It is the major reason that anti-Americanization which has foreseen universal ideals as an evangelical guidance. Others have been forced to accept such an American model by its political, in certain cases, military pressures. It is the major reason that anti-Americanism has occurred all over the world, especially now in Islamic societies which have quite different religions and cultures from the United States.

By the way, in the new phase of globalization, we have to suppose a different kind of arrangements of global governance, one of which is the scheme of ‘virtualization.’ Globalization in the new phase has evolved into what Richard Rosecrance calls a ‘virtual state,’ which is an entity that enjoys its prosperity from dependence on others. Since his virtual state has to assume that there is a tacit confederation to defend interests between states concerned which are mutually dependent on each other. In the new phase of globalization, any state is downsizing its territorially based production capability. For example, along with the privatization of public enterprises at home, any state has no command resources and comes to be reliant its economy on mobile factors of production not only at home but also abroad. Any state has to negotiate with domestic capital and labor to lure them into its own economic sphere and stimulate its growth. Thus, any virtual state recognizes that its own production has hitherto continued at home, but now is going on not only to take place at home, but also to invest and transfer its productive core to overseas. Any virtual state has begun to set its strategy to invest in its people, i.e. social capitals, and has actually begun to invest its economic resources and social capitals into other nations and areas. He describes, therefore, “Virtualization is the result, with the risky placement of production within the confines of other nations. Since this placement is becoming more reciprocal, however, no single state emerges as master of its fate” (Rosecrance, 1999: 42).

Accordingly, virtualization has brought about a shift in activities away from the state, and the ‘hollowing out of the state’ has become a normal condition in the global society. As a result of increased dependence on others, a unilateral pseudo-master of fate such as the United States has lost its supreme right to order and rule, and the vertical and hierarchical structure between states has been superseded by the horizontal and reciprocal structure between states, TNCs, NGOs, and the like. It is convenient for us to take an example of political-economic relations. As all of us know it, no matter how the United States has become the pseudo-empire or has lost its crown, dynamics of globalization has continued to exist from the outset as an expansion of concentric circle of the world economy since the long 16th century as Wallerstein emphasized. Such political-economic relations since the dawn of the world economy have been continued as a little bit transformed up to now. Throughout the postwar period, almost all TNCs have almost always gone forward in accordance with each nation state and its central government. In turn, almost all nation states have also gone forward with TNCs as their homelands, where their headquarters are located. Nation states have schemed to enclose TNCs in their territories and to induce TNCs to obey rules and policies of their homelands. This would be an evidence of the theoretical framework of Wallerstein’s interstate system.

In the new phase of globalization, however, TNCs have become to operate much more outside of the political domain of nation states, over which their governments have little influence to control. It is needless to say that TNCs have had no political intention to ignore rules and policies of their homelands. Rather, TNCs have endeavored to obey uniform rules of their homelands. Nevertheless, such a pastoral age was over. For example, Toyota, a representative TNC of car production, has been continuing to shift from its motherland Japan into worldwide areas, while headquarter of this world enterprise is located in Toyota city, Japan. Economic behaviors and decisions of such a big TNC may have important political consequences not only in its motherland, but also in overseas areas where it has its branches and bases of production. It is quite similar to Nokia, headquarter of which is located in Helsinki, Finland. Incidentally, two decades ago, until the collapse of the Cold War structure, the term ‘Finlandization’ was used as the synonym of a dependency country because of subordinating to the old Soviet Russia, but now the same term is used as the synonym of a representative richest country, income per capita of which is the highest level all over the world.

By the way, when the interests between nation states and TNCs collide, both would be losers if they leave such a deadlock without doing anything to break out it. It is necessary for both actors to escape to fall into the hole, so that both actors, of course, want to have a round table to bargain and coordinate their interests. Such a bargaining for coordination would not be initiated by the state-centric hierarchical system, but by the mutually equal partner arrangements, which would be institutionalized as a transnational organization. It is the meaning of ‘virtualization’ to depend upon others, and dependence on others would inevitably bring about governance by networks between actors.

Taking an common example of business, it probably is, along with the expansion of capital accumulation and much more flows of labor and goods, global networks have come on the stage under the new structural and technological conditions being dependent on cross-border electronic communications, i.e. information and communication
technologies (ICT). Owing to the rapid development of such devices of ICT, for example, in a trading room of a bank or a brokerage firm, trading of foreign exchanges and stocks via internet is simultaneously dealing with correspondents in the opposite side of the globe, and it is going on without interruption for twenty-four hours. In a narrow trading room, a large amount of margin of profits is scalped by an exchange miniced into second between cross-border traders. It is true of peculiarly ‘virtual’ features of cross-border traders in the real economy in every corner of the world in the age of borderless global society. Thus, ‘virtualization’ has brought the close connections and linkages to cross-border traders, i.e. cross-border actors by such a tacit exchange of moneys and stocks through ICT in the trading room. Such a phenomenon of ‘virtual’ dependence on others and arrangements of governance by networks can be seen with our own eyes in all kind of behaviors among cross-border actors.

3-2 From Hierarchical Governance to Horizontal Governance

Governance has been traditionally and conventionally seen as a form of governing through a set of institutions under the authority of the hierarchical government, which is centered on sovereign nation states. Therefore, governance mechanisms incorporate political issues and social interests into aspects of governing by the hierarchical government, especially by the central government, which has the role of policy formulation, policy implementation, and implementation of regulation or re-regulation, organized through regulatory arrangements. In this sense, the term ‘governing’ has been also defined as a concept which has only a meaning of ruling, ordering, steering and managing by the hierarchical government, the authority of the hierarchical government, which is centered on sovereign nation states. Therefore, governance has been traditionally and conventionally seen as a form of governing through a set of institutions under the authority of the hierarchical government, which is centered on sovereign nation states. Therefore, governance mechanisms incorporate political issues and social interests into aspects of governing by the hierarchical government, especially by the central government, which has the role of policy formulation, policy implementation, and implementation of regulation or re-regulation, organized through regulatory arrangements. In this sense, the term ‘governing’ has been also defined as a concept which has only a meaning of ruling, ordering, steering and managing by the top down approach. Governability prompts us to consider how governing involves particular representations, knowledges and expertise regarding that which is to be governed.

Along with such a traditional and conventional definition of top down style of governing as a way of governance, firstly, there are governing elites who consist of the directly elected representatives by the people. They are the elected officials who are nominated as the president or the governor by carrying an election, and make public policies and implement laws as a top decision maker. In a parliamentary cabinet system in the United Kingdom, Germany or Japan, however, there is an exception of the prime minister who is not directly elected by the people, but nominated as the top decision maker by colleague members in the parliament. Secondly, there are governing elites of skilled bureaucrats who are not elected by the people, but just appointed officials, principally to be neutral and non-partisan, and have professional competence to be able to make public policies, implement laws and public service provisions through a set of institutions of the hierarchical government. Lastly, there are parliamentary members as the third governing elites, who are directly elected politicians by the people as their representatives. They pass laws in the legislature to meet many political issues and to resolve much more difficult problems which are directly or indirectly requested by the people of their adherents and voters.

In the hierarchical governing processes, these three governing elites fulfill their functions of mutual check and balance to govern among three parties concerned. Nevertheless, such functions are not perfectly sufficient, because their behaviors of governing are done as a top down implementation. In such elitist governing processes, there is no room to accept counter governing processes from the bottom by public citizens, who consist of the private non-profit sector and other community based organizations instead of ordinary people living in local communities. They are not only the objects and consumers of given public policies and public services, but also the subjects and actors of advocacy in making of public policies and in implementing them in policy processes. Moreover, there is also no room to accept other governing processes by the one more private for-profit sector of corporations and firms. A lot of their activities are fulfilling as TNCs at home and abroad, and they influence and advocate in making public policies and in implementing them as public service provisions in policy processes, especially in making and implementing economic public policies. Hence, the term ‘governing’ would be instigated to be rather transformed, which includes much more multiple governing processes, performed not only by the public sector, but also by the other two private sectors. In short, such a new way of governing, which has multiple actors as its subjects and actors no matter how they are public or private, is ‘governance’ in the real sense of the word. We can listen to Keohane in this context. He refers to multiple actors of governance as follows.

“Government is the subset that acts with authority and creates formal obligations. Governance need not necessarily be conducted exclusively by governments and the international organizations to which they delegate authority. Private firms, associations of firms, NGOs, and association of NGOs all engage in it, often in association with governmental bodies, to create governance; sometimes without governmental authority. . . .The nation state is not about to be replaced as the primary instrument of domestic and global governance. . . .Instead, we believe that the nation state is being supplemented by other actors—private and third sector—in a more geography. The nation state is the most important actor on the stage of global politics, but is not the only important actor” (Keohane, 2002: 202).

As the citation says, Keohane thinks that, in implementing global politics, nation state is the most important actor, but not the only important actor, and adds that other actors, whether they are for-profit TNCs or non-profit NGOs, can engage in and create governance without governmental authority. It sounds as if he had accepted the concept of James Rosenau, ‘governance without government.’ However, it is not so simple, because he is different from Rosenau, who insists governments still operate and are still sovereign, but some of their authority has been relocated toward subnational collectivities. Accordingly, Rosenau grasps some of the functions of governance have already been performed by activities that do not originate with governments (Rosenau, 1992: 3). In any case, Keohane gives the
taxonomy of nine cell boxes as major actors of governance, and proposes that more governance activities will occur outside the box represented by national capitals of nation states (Table 1). We may understand the term ‘national capitals’ is used as parallel with social capitals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subnational</th>
<th>Local Governments</th>
<th>Local Firms</th>
<th>Local Nonprofits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>IGOs</td>
<td>TNCs</td>
<td>NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governmental</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supranational</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Keohane, 2002: 202, partially changed)

He adds, moreover, the governance structure is ‘networked minimalism,’ for globalization is best characterized as networked rather than as a set of hierarchies. As for minimalism, he thinks governance at the global level would be acceptable only if it does not supersede national governance and if its intrusion into the autonomy of states and communities are clearly justified in terms of cooperative results (Keohane, 2002: 204). Keohane, as an advocate of neo-liberalism, puts a special emphasis on that the subjects and actors of global governance are composed of not only nation state governments, but also TNCs and NGOs. As an advocate of neo-liberalism, however, he does not forget to add that governance by non-governmental actors is limited to the extent they do not trespass upon the autonomy of nation states, and their activities are not justified if such behaviors of them would not bring about cooperative results to complement behaviors of nation state governments. This is the critical point that differentiates him from Rosenau, an advocate of network theory, who thinks governance is a more encompassing phenomenon than government.

Apart from the difference between Keohane and Rosenau, we have to pay attention to the expansion of interdependence among actors, i.e. governing by networks in the global and transnational level. In other words, along with the expansion of global and transnational interdependence, actors have been interwoven with networks of global and transnational governance. Distinctive arrangements of multilateral decision making involving nation states governments, transnational bodies and a variety of NGOs provide us with horizontal networks instead of hierarchical arrangements. Whether they arise as the negotiating or coordinating consortia between many nation states, as the buying or selling consortia of goods and commodities under the specific condition of market, or as the cooperative and collaborative consortia of activities between many NGOs and NPOs, actors have been increasingly involved in cross-border processes of their mutual reciprocal relations and networks in the global arena.

With increasing global interdependence, networks have taken place under the shadow of either political bargaining consortia or global bargaining system of market. Such mutually interwoven networks have been made at the global and transnational level and simultaneously at the domestic and national level. That is to say, governing issues at the transnational level has been equal to governing issues at the national level, and vice versa. Therefore, the behavior of government and public administration in each nation state has been intertwined in the global governance by multiple subjects and actors. Any governing administration is indispensable to adapt to deal with horizontal networks of implementation of public policies and policy transfer at home and abroad. Any central government of any nation state has had to recognize itself to deal with and cope with transnational issues. Therefore, a new process of horizontal governing by networks has brought about a change in the way of hierarchical government at home.

In other words, in face of the transformation of ways of governments, societies and peoples, not only in one nation state, but also in every advanced country cross the world under the shadow of globalization, we have been instigated to have another look at the traditional perspective of government-governance relations. In the meanwhile, the buzzword ‘from government to governance’ appeared on the stage. This buzzword has been understood that governance would take place of government. However, it does not mean to replace government with governance. Instead, it means to supplement government with governance, by replacing a part of roles and functions of government with ones of private sectors and bringing a metamorphosis of government-governance relations. In the case of public hierarchy, many policy networks have arisen as a result of encouragement that governments as the public sector have increasingly modified the way of steering of economic affairs and citizens’ life. For that, the scheme of joined-up government was introduced for the first instance in the United Kingdom.

Thus, governments in advanced countries have opted for liberalized regulation through governance. And also, many critical advocacy networks as a form of network organizations have become to rely on state tolerance and sanction of their activities in the nation state border. Once they occur, such networks would not remain to be the one-way top-down relation sanctioned by government, but would become to be the two-way exchange and bottom-up relation influenced on each other. Accordingly, in every nation state, in the hierarchical tiers of government, devolution between central government and local government has been introduced, and the framework of inter-governmental relation has been a little bit changed from the top-down command and order system to the bottom-up and coordination system. Moreover, relations between governments and business circles have been changed from the top down regulation to the coordination system by deregulation. Furthermore, relations between governments and civil society have been partially
changed from the vertical relation by order to a little bit horizontal relation, which includes the bottom-up advocacy process and the public involvement as a kind of participatory democracy. Its symbolized buzzword is ‘decentralization’ or ‘devolution’ in each national and domestic level.

Along with such a transformation of the situation, governing by networks has changed government itself. Stephen Goldsmith and William Eggers exhibit such transformed features. As they say, the hierarchical government bureaucracy is coming to an end, and a fundamentally different model, ‘governing by network,’ is emerging in its place, in which government executives redefine their core responsibilities from managing people and programs to coordinating resources for producing public value. Governing by network represents that the shape of public sectors is altering worldwide as such: networks encourage (1) the rise in the use of private firms and nonprofits to do government’s work (third party government), (2) joint-up government to streamline processes from the perspective of the customer-citizen, (3) increased citizen demands for more choices in public services. Moreover, networks enable a government (4) to explore a greater range of alternatives involving a variety of providers, (5) to concentrate on its core mission by leveraging the expertise of best providers, and enhance (6) flexibility managers can coordinate resources by using outside partners to deliver a service or accomplish a task. (7) The decentralized form of a network and the autonomy of each member allows for decision making at the most appropriate level for the citizen (Goldsmith and Eggers, 2004: 24, 38). They propose the taxonomy of four types of government and want to show us the primacy of networked government (Fig. 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public-Private</td>
<td>Outsourced Government</td>
<td>Networked Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Hierarchical Government</td>
<td>Joined-up Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Management Capabilities</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1. Models of Government.

In accordance with them, Bogason and Zølner refer to ‘network governance’ which is neither market nor government nor civil society, but a hybrid organizational form, and integrates a number of interdependent, but operationally autonomous actors in concrete negotiations based on a common regulation or norms. “They [autonomous actors] often help to produce and coordinate policy decisions, and they may achieve a certain degree of self-regulation. …Network governance goes beyond the interactions of the formal system of government without losing the capacity to include the formal system in the analysis. …We use the concept of network governance because we want to understand the needs for communication and interaction across the formal organizations boundaries of parliaments, political parties, administrative agencies, interest organizations, private enterprises, local governments, third sector organizations and citizens’ movements. These interactions may be seen as responses to demands for in-depth information, needs for personal contacts between decision-makers, calls for citizen involvement in cases of local importance, and demands for uses of the third sector to make room for alternative solutions to those of the public sector, various other public-private partnerships and so on” (Bogason and Zølner, 5; cf. Marcussen and Torfing, 2007).

To sum up these four scholars, firstly, we firstly need to note that both notions, ‘governing by network’ or ‘network governance,’ are based on interactions across the organizations including the public sector and the private sectors. In this respect, these interactions are multiple, which have responses to demands for in-depth information, needs for contacts between and with decision makers. Secondly, it combines the high level public-private partnerships (PPPs) of outsourced third party government with the network management capabilities of joined-up government. Then, in the case of governing by network, it is constructed in the governance level and is framed as the synthesis of joined-up government and PPPs realized in the government level. Thirdly, while more skilled officials are required to exist at the higher levels of government, they are responsible to enable to deliver services effectively. For that, they are obliged to be accountable not only for the process of policy implementation, but also for the result. Fourthly, by using technology such as ICT to connect the network together, it provides citizens more choices in service delivery options. Accordingly, it is inevitably requested that there are contractors and subcontractors who intermediate between the public sector and...
the private sectors, and the roles and high-level skills of contractors are to be enhanced. Lastly, it has calls for citizen involvement and demands for uses of the third sector to make room for alternative solutions in the place of the public sector. So that, the collaborative network skills of citizens as clients and stakeholders have to be cultivated and improved in much more high-level.

For practical purpose to elucidate ‘governance’ or ‘global governance,’ however, we have to start out with some formal organization, which does not exhibit the traditional vertical and hierarchical tiers, but the horizontal arrangements such as ‘networked government’ or ‘governing by network.’ That has been embedded in our common knowledge.

Though, when we think about network governance, it is still a fuzzy concept. Although widely used, Jon Pierre and B. Guy Peters place an emphasis on, the concept of ‘governance’ is far from precise and has taken on a number of alternative, and even contradictory, meanings in the literature. Premised on such an understanding, they refer to, “Much of the current debate on governance revolves around the role of political institutions in governance. We are not negative about the capacity of governments to continue to govern. Rather, we understand that the public sector no longer governs society in what had been the conventional ‘command and control’ manner, but yet it remains capable of participating in governance, and there is as essential, or even more essential, than in the past” (Pierre and Peters, 2005: 1, 3).

As they insist, we are not also negative about the capacity of governments to continue to govern, as long as governing by governments is not the conventional command and control manner. The decisive problem here is not whether governments have the capacity to govern and to participate in governance, but whether governments can practically take their role by exhibiting the capacity to govern and to participate in governance. As we have already mentioned, whereas the discussion on public administrative structure has been heavily involved in global governance and has added a function of horizontal administrative structure as a part of global and transnational consortia, the argument over governments should be whether governments, which have already participated in governance and global governance, can be able to exhibit their capacity to transform from the one-way, top-down and hierarchical arrangements to the two-way, bottom-up and horizontal arrangements.

We acknowledge, in the process of making and implementing public policy, middle and lower level officials should participate in the process as ‘inner stakeholders,’ and active and positive citizens should be accepted as participants in the process as ‘outer stakeholders’ as long as they are customers and veto players in the process of making and implementing public policy (Tsebelis, 2002; Yamamoto, 2007). This is the basis of horizontal administrative structure, and the surveillance function of stakeholders should be focused not only on the inputs of policy making process, but also on the outcomes of policy evaluating process.

In this respect, it is the same as the role and function of government which is all the more crucial for promoting democratic governance in the global society. That is why it is strictly linked with the collective management at the tier of global and transnational consortia, as a part of which any government of any nation state have to take a role and function of horizontal co-governance between other governments of other nation states. As we have repeatedly mentioned about, co-governance is not composed of only nation states, but the trilogy of nation states, TNCs and NGOs. In the global society, whether actors of co-governance are governments of nation states, TNCs, or NGOs, they are necessarily asked to exist as stakeholders one another and to be monitors one another. As long as there is no common superior like a world government in the global society, it is inevitably requested to construct a multiplicity of networks, whether inside networks or across networks between actors of the trilogy.

Moreover, when we deal with the fundamental issue how to generate legitimacy of activities between actors, we cannot depend on ‘a common superior’ which has authority to legitimize activities of actors in a sovereign nation state. Therefore, we are obliged to make common rules and norms between actors based on their networks and based on their relations of reciprocity and consensus. Then, the most decisive problem is how to construct reciprocal networks and how to maintain reciprocal legitimacy of inner and across networks. Now, concerning with global governance, we do engrave into our mind that current issue over the relation of government and governance is how to elucidate ‘governance including government,’ instead of ‘governance without government.’

Conclusion

The global public sphere has been commonly referred to as the global society in general, though advocates of cosmopolitanism wish to call it the global civil society. In fostering global governance, the global public sphere has been broadly thought as playing a central role. However, concerning with what major actors of this public sphere are, it was the conventional understanding among scholars, especially among advocates of neo-realism, that sovereign nation states are only qualified to be major actors. For the very simple reason of such a state-centric view, the global public sphere has been thought as a kind of anarchical society, in which many sovereign nation states are repeating antagonistic conflicts and negotiations for solving such conflicts with each other. In contrast, it is commonly thought that there are multiple actors at the global level and the major actors of the global public sphere are composed of the trilogy of sovereign nation states, TNCs and NGOs in principle. At present, it is the common knowledge among us that the global public sphere is composed of such a trilogy. No matter how uncertain conditions would be, there are networks of consortia of bargaining, negotiation, compromise, persuasion and consensus making between three components of the trilogy.
Up to the present, there have been oppositions to question about networks. For example, Gavin Kendall is one of them, who emphasizes networks as a series of autonomous capillary structures that primarily stretch across a bounded geographical zone, but may become international, that are freely able to interconnect with one another, but will not necessarily do so, that the connection between networks are weaker than those within networks, that networks can be different orders, and nation states can be thought of as networks, as can non-national societies, as can corporations, and so on (Kendall, 2004: 61). He wants to say networks are vulnerable and problematic to be theoretical device, because networks have no orders outside of their circle. As a matter of fact, the larger the networks and the wider networks expand, the more plausible there is a difficulty to confirm where the core of authority is located. It can be, moreover, almost impossible to identify who is responsible for a certain action. It has been often said that networks would include some actors and exclude others, because networks are prone to limit their membership. Networks, therefore, have no accountability to bear upon the global public sphere.

It is said, sometime, under the condition of chaos of dead end, hierarchical solutions by a unilateral pseudo-empire ruling would be preferable ambition for the world order. For the reason that a role of actors are difficult to identify, it would rear its head that collective bargaining consortia between sovereign nation states are better placed to contain conflict than networks. It would, however, be wrong to exclude other actors from the global public sphere. Together with sovereign nation states, collective actions by consortia of TNCs and NGOs, which are broadened circles in networks, should be given the qualification to participate in the global public sphere and its administrative management. It is, of course, needed to have possible accountability at the global level. Whether NGOs could be responsible in such an administrative management, in this respect, has been questionable among others up to the present, but if NGOs were to devote themselves to brush up their abilities and to be accountable of well-trained actors, NGOs could be enough for managing their functions and duties in the global public sphere.

Global governance, it might be said, is the notion of bearing the discursive traces, and equally, has become a conceptual centerpiece of the new buzzword of global politics. It stands to reason that 'governance' implies the setting of meta-rules for establishing political settings or solutions. There is a proper reason that along with setting such meta-rules, actual conflicts would be resolved by governing by networks, i.e. global governance. “In our increasingly interconnected world,” as David Held emphasizes, “these global problems cannot be solved by any one nation state acting alone. They call for collective and collaborative action—something that the nations of the world need to be much better at if pressing issues are to be tackled” (Held, 2007b: 197). He adds to it that there needs to be effective and accountable global governance, but this does not mean that there has to be ‘a single government’ of globalization (Held, 2005: 149).

Whether issues are political, economic, cultural, just as he describes, they would not be resolved by standing alone, so that collective and collaborative actions by networks are needed. The pathway of such collective actions is governing by networks, i.e. global governance, which has run after a crucial site for discussions of multilateralism and world order. Though there is a variety of conceptions concerning with ‘global governance,’ it will be a beneficial definition that global governance is comprised of governing by networks, major actors of which is such as nation states, TNCs and NGOs in principle. In referring to the term ‘governance,’ to repeat again, more decisive buzzword in our day should be ‘governance including government,’ instead of ‘governance without government.’
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