

Introduction

David Held and Anthony McGrew

In his report to the special Millennium Summit, UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan sought to define a new role for the United Nations at the centre of 'global governance' (UN Secretary-General, 2000). Since the UN's creation in 1945 a vast nexus of global and regional institutions has evolved, surrounded by a proliferation of non-governmental agencies and advocacy networks seeking to influence the agenda and direction of international public policy. As Kofi Annan's remarks acknowledged, though world government remains a fanciful idea, there does exist an evolving global governance complex – embracing states, international institutions, transnational networks and agencies (both public and private) – which functions, with variable effect, to promote, regulate or intervene in the common affairs of humanity. Over the last five decades, its scope and impact have expanded dramatically such that its activities have become significantly politicized, as global protests against the World Trade Organization attest. Few architects of the UN system could have envisaged that postwar multilateralism would be transformed into the 'complex multilateralism' of the twenty-first century (O'Brien et al., 2000). Whether the rhetoric of global governance conceals an underlying historical continuity in the geopolitical management of world affairs remains, however, the focus of intense theoretical and political controversy.

This volume provides a critical and comprehensive assessment of this professed shift in the way world affairs are governed. It brings together contributions from theorists and analysts of global public policy to explore the relevance of the concept of global governance to an understanding of how global issues and key areas of global activity are currently regulated. It combines an elucidation of substantive theories of global governance with a systematic analysis of its structures and processes in key issue areas from humanitarian intervention to the regulation of global finance. In doing so, it maps the intellectual and empirical contours of the debate about the changing nature and form of global governance. Responding to those of a more sceptical persuasion who consider that global governance is little more than 'a theme in search of a focus', the essays provide a comprehensive assessment of the sources of and limits to the shift from national government to multilayered global governance (Groom and Powell, 1994).

Globalization and the New Political Circumstances of World Order

Any discussion of global governance must start with an understanding of the changing fabric of international society. Woven into this are the complex processes known as globalization. Globalization refers to a historical process which transforms the spatial

organization of social relations and transactions, generating transcontinental or inter-regional networks of interaction and the exercise of power (Held et al., 1999). Different historical forms of globalization can be identified, including the epoch of world discovery in the early modern period, the era of European empires and the present era shaped by the neoliberal global economic project. These different historical forms of globalization are characterized by distinctive spatio-temporal and organizational attributes; that is, particular patterns of extensity, intensity, velocity and impact in global relations, flows and networks, alongside different degrees of institutionalization, modes of stratification and reproduction. Although contemporary globalization has elements in common with its past phases, it is distinguished by unique spatio-temporal and organizational features, creating a world in which the extensive reach of global relations and networks is matched by their relative high intensity, high velocity and high impact propensity across many facets of social life, from the economic to the environmental.

To understand the implications of globalization for the governance of world affairs it is necessary to specify some of the key domains of activity and interaction in and through which global processes are evolving. The focus here is on the economic, the environmental and the political. The focus is on the economic because it is clearly a principal driving force of contemporary globalization, and no account of the nature and form of globalization can be pursued without reference to it. The focus is on the environment because it illustrates most acutely the changing scale of market failure and the new global risks faced not just by individual political communities but also by humankind as a whole. And the focus is on politics, law and security in order to highlight the changing form and context of state power, and the pressing agenda of global public issues that require more extensive and intensive forms of global regulation.

Economic globalization

Today, all countries are engaged in international trade, and in nearly all the value of trade accounts for significant proportions of their national income. The historical evidence shows that international trade has grown to unprecedented levels, both absolutely and relatively in relation to national income. Among the OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development) states, trade levels today (measured as a share of GDP) are much greater than they were in the late nineteenth century, the *belle époque* of world trade growth. World trade (merchandise and services) in 1999 was valued at over \$6.8 trillion, with exports having grown, as a percentage of world output, from 7.9 per cent in 1913 to 17.2 per cent in 1998 (Maddison, 2001; WTO, 2001).

As barriers to trade have fallen across the world, markets have become global for many goods and, increasingly, services. No economy can any longer be insulated from global competition. While national economies taken together can gain overall from increased trade, the gains are highly uneven. There are clear winners and losers, both between and within countries. An increased proportion of trade between developed and developing countries, for example, can hurt low-skilled workers in developed countries while simultaneously increasing the income of higher skilled workers. National governments may protect and compensate those who are vulnerable as a

result of structural change, but increased demands on and costs of the welfare state tend to be resisted by employers in the trading industries vulnerable to global competition (Garrett, 1998; Rodrik, 1997). The politics of trade creates complex and sometimes unstable political coalitions.

While global exports and trading relations are more important than ever in the world economy, transnational production is even more significant. Foreign direct investment reached three times as many countries in 2000 as it did in 1985 (UNCTAD, 2001, p. 4). Today, 60,000 multinational corporations (MNCs), with nearly 820,000 foreign subsidiaries, sell goods and services worth \$15,680 billion across the globe each year, and employ twice as many people today compared with 1990 (UNCTAD, 2001). Multinational corporations have taken economic interconnectedness to new levels. They account for about 25 per cent of world production and 70 per cent of world trade, while their sales are equivalent to almost half of world GDP (Held et al., 1999; UNCTAD, 2001). A quarter to a third of world trade is intrafirm trade between branches of multinationals.

The bulk of the assets of multinationals are typically found in OECD countries and in a relatively small number of developing ones (see Held and McGrew, 2000, pp. 25–7). Of total world foreign direct investment in 2000, 95 per cent went to 30 countries (UNCTAD, 2001, p. 5). Nevertheless, over the last few decades developing economies' shares of foreign investment flows (inwards and outwards) and of world exports have increased considerably (Castells, 1998; UNCTAD, 2001; UNDP, 1998). The newly industrializing economies (NIEs) of East Asia and Latin America have become an increasingly important destination for OECD investment and an increasingly significant source of OECD imports: São Paulo, it is sometimes said, is Germany's largest industrial city (Dicken, 1998). By the late 1990s almost 50 per cent of the world's total of manufacturing jobs were located in developing economies, while over 60 per cent of the exports of developing countries to the industrialized world were manufactured goods, a twelvefold increase in less than four decades (UNDP, 1998). Contemporary economic globalization, albeit highly unevenly spread, is not just an OECD phenomenon, but embraces all continents and regions.

Alongside transnational production networks, the power of global finance has become central to economic globalization. World financial flows have grown exponentially, especially since the 1970s. Daily turnover on the foreign exchange markets exceeds \$1.2 trillion, and billions of dollars of financial assets are traded globally, particularly through derivative products (BIS, 2001). Few countries today are insulated from the fluctuations of global financial markets, although their relationship to these markets differs markedly between North and South.

The 1997 East Asian crisis forcibly illustrated the impact of global financial markets. The financial disruption triggered by the collapse of the Thai baht demonstrated new levels of economic connectedness. The Asian 'tiger' economies had benefited from the rapid increase of financial flows to developing countries in the 1990s and were widely held to be positive examples to the rest of the world. But the heavy flows of short-term capital, often channelled into speculative activity, could be quickly reversed, causing currencies to fall dramatically and far in excess of any real economic imbalances. The inability of the prevailing international financial regime (the International Monetary Fund, Bank for International Settlements, etc.) to manage the turmoil created a wide-ranging debate on its future institutional architecture.

A further important structural change is arising from recurrent exchange rate crises, which have become, since the 1990s, a dominant feature of the current system. Fixed exchange rates are ceasing to be a viable policy option in the face of global capital flows of the current scale and intensity. Between 1990 and 1999 the percentage of countries operating floating exchange rate regimes increased from 21 per cent to 41 per cent (*Financial Times*, 8 Jan. 2002, p. 10). The choice faced by countries is increasingly between floating rates and monetary union – shown by the launch of the euro and discussion of dollarization in Latin America.

It is easy to misrepresent the political significance of the globalization of economic activity. National and international economic management remains feasible (Held et al., 1999; Hirst and Thompson, 1999). Many states continue to be immensely powerful and to enjoy access to a formidable range of resources, infrastructural capacity and technologies of coordination and control. The continuing lobbying of states and intergovernmental organizations (for example, the World Trade Organization (WTO)) by MNCs confirms the enduring importance of states to the mediation and regulation of global economic activity. Yet economic globalization has significant and discernible impacts which alter the balance of resources, economic and political, within and across borders, requiring more sophisticated and developed systems of global and regional regulation (see the discussion below, pp. 5–7).

Global environmental change

Economic globalization has had a substantial impact on the environment, although it is by no means the sole cause of global environmental problems. From the outset, it is important to distinguish a number of different forms of global environmental change. They include:

- encounters between previously separated ecological systems of different parts of the world;
- the overspill of the effects of environmental degradation from one state to another (involving the creation, for example, of environmental refugees);
- transboundary pollution and risks (such as acid rain and nuclear power);
- transportation and diffusion of wastes and polluting products across the globe (toxic waste trade, global relocation of dirty industries);
- pollution and degradation of the global commons (the oceans and the atmosphere);
- and, finally, the formation of global institutions, regimes, networks and treaties that seek to regulate all these forms of environmental degradation.

It needs to be stressed that until the early to mid twentieth century most forms of environmental damage – at least those that could be detected – were concentrated in particular regions and locales. Since then, the globalization of environmental degradation has accelerated as a result of a number of critical factors: fifty years of resource-intensive, high-pollution growth in the countries of the OECD; the industrialization of Russia and other states of the former Soviet Union and of Eastern Europe; the rapid industrialization of many parts of the South; and a massive rise in the global population. In addition, it is now possible to understand risk and environmental

change more deeply and with much greater accuracy: for instance, the consequences of the steady build-up of damaging gases in the earth's atmosphere (carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous and sulphur oxides, CFCs).

In response to the intensification of, and publicity surrounding, environmental issues, there has been an interlinked process of cultural and political globalization. This can be exemplified by the emergence of new scientific and epistemic communities; new environmental movements organized transnationally and with transnational concerns; and new international institutions, regimes and conventions such as those agreed in 1992 at the Earth Summit in Brazil and in subsequent follow-up meetings. Unfortunately, none of the latter have as yet been able to acquire sufficient political influence, domestic support or international authority to do more than (at best) limit the worst excesses of some of the global environmental threats.

Not all environmental problems are global, of course; such a view would be highly misleading. Nonetheless, there has been a striking shift in the physical and environmental conditions – that is, in the extent, intensity and rapid transmission of environmental problems – affecting human affairs in general. These processes have moved politics dramatically away from an activity which crystallizes first and foremost around state and interstate concerns. It is clearer than ever that the fortunes of political communities and peoples can no longer be simply understood in exclusively national or territorial terms. In the context of intense global and regional interconnectedness, the very idea of political community as an exclusive, territorially delimited unit is at best unconvincing and at worst anachronistic. In a world in which global warming connects the long-term fate of many Pacific islands to the actions of tens of millions of private motorists across the globe, the conventional territorial conception of political community appears profoundly inadequate. Globalization weaves together, in highly complex and abstract systems, the fates of households, communities and peoples in distant regions of the globe (McGrew, 1997, p. 237). While it would be a mistake to conclude that political communities are without distinctive degrees of division or cleavage at their borders, they are clearly shaped by multiple cross-border interaction networks and power systems. Thus questions are raised both about the fate of the idea of political community, and about the appropriate level for the effective regulation of human affairs: the national, the regional or the global. The proper locus of politics and the articulation of the public interest becomes a puzzling matter.

Political globalization

Economic and environmental globalization has not occurred in a political vacuum; there has been a shift in the nature and form of political organization as well. The distinctive form this has taken in the contemporary period is the emergence of 'global politics' – the increasingly extensive form of political networks and activity. Political decisions and actions in one part of the world can rapidly acquire worldwide ramifications. Sites of political action and/or decision-making can become linked through rapid communications into complex networks of political interaction. Associated with this 'stretching' of politics is a frequent intensification or deepening of global processes such that 'action at a distance' permeates the social conditions and cognitive worlds of specific places or policy communities (Giddens, 1990). Consequently, developments

at the global level – whether economic, social or environmental – can have almost instantaneous local consequences and vice versa.

The idea of global politics challenges the traditional distinctions between the domestic and the international, the territorial and the non-territorial, and the inside and the outside, as embedded in conventional conceptions of ‘the political’ (see Held et al., 1999, chs 1, 2 and 8). It also highlights the richness and complexity of the interconnections that transcend states and societies in the global order. Global politics today, moreover, is anchored not just in traditional geopolitical concerns but also in a large diversity of economic, social and ecological questions. Pollution, drugs, human rights and terrorism are among an increasing number of transnational policy issues which cut across territorial jurisdictions and existing political alignments, and which require international cooperation for their effective resolution.

Nations, peoples and organizations are linked, in addition, by many new forms of communication, which range across borders. The revolution in microelectronics, in information technology and in computers has established virtually instantaneous worldwide links which, when combined with the technologies of the telephone, television, cables, satellites and jet transportation, have dramatically altered the nature of political communication. The intimate connection between ‘physical setting’, ‘social situation’ and politics, which distinguished most political associations from premodern to modern times, has been ruptured; the new communication systems create new experiences, new modes of understanding and new frames of political reference independently of direct contact with particular peoples, issues or events. The speed with which the events of 11 September 2001 ramified across the world and made mass terrorism a global issue is one poignant example.

The development of new communication systems generates a world in which the particularities of place and individuality are constantly represented and reinterpreted through regional and global communication networks. But the relevance of these systems goes far beyond this, for they are fundamental to the possibility of organizing political action and exercising political power across vast distances (Deibert, 1997). For example, the expansion of international and transnational organizations, the extension of international rules and legal mechanisms – their construction and monitoring – have all received an impetus from the new communication systems, and organizations of all sorts depend on them as a means to further their aims.

In mapping these developments, it is important to explore the way in which the sovereign state now lies at the intersection of a vast array of international regimes and organizations that have been established to manage whole areas of transnational activity (trade, financial flows, crime and so on) and collective policy problems. The rapid growth of transnational issues and problems has involved a spread of layers of political regulation both within and across political boundaries. It has been marked by the transformation of aspects of territorially based political decision-making, the development of regional and global organizations and institutions, and the emergence of regional and global law.

This can be illustrated by a number of developments, including, most obviously, the rapid emergence of multilateral cooperation and international organizations. New forms of multilateral and transnational politics have evolved, involving governments, intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) and a wide variety of transnational pressure groups and international non-governmental organizations (INGOs). At the beginning

of the twentieth century there were just 37 IGOs and 176 INGOs, whereas in 1996 there were 1,830 IGOs and 38,243 INGOs (UIA, 1997). In addition, there has been a very substantial development in the number of international treaties in force, as well as in the number of international regimes, altering the situational context of states (Held et al., 1999, chs 1–2).

To this pattern of extensive political interconnectedness can be added the dense web of activity of the key international policy-making forums, including the summits of the UN, the G7 (Group of seven leading industrial nations), the IMF, WTO, EU, APEC (Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation), ARF (the regional forum of ASEAN, the Association of South East Asian Nations) and MERCOSUR (Southern Cone Common Market – in Latin America), as well as many other official and unofficial meetings. In the middle of the nineteenth century, there were two or three interstate conferences or congresses a year; today the number totals over 4,000. National government is increasingly locked into an array of global, regional and multilayered systems of governance – and can barely monitor it all, let alone stay in command.

Political communities can no longer be thought of, if they ever could with any validity, simply as discrete worlds or as self-enclosed political spaces; they are enmeshed in complex structures of overlapping forces, relations and networks. Clearly, these are structured by inequality and hierarchy. However, even the most powerful among them – including the most powerful states – do not remain unaffected by the changing conditions and processes of regional and global enmeshment. In particular, the idea of a political community of fate – of a self-determining collectivity – can no longer be located meaningfully only within the boundaries of a single nation-state. Some of the most fundamental forces and processes which determine the nature of life chances within and across political communities are now beyond the reach of individual nation-states.

The political world at the start of the twenty-first century is marked by a significant series of new types of political externality or ‘boundary problem’. In the past, of course, nation-states principally resolved their differences over boundary matters by pursuing reasons of state backed by diplomatic initiatives and, ultimately, by coercive means. But this geopolitical logic appears singularly inadequate and inappropriate to resolve the many complex issues, from economic regulation to resource depletion and environmental degradation, which engender – at seemingly ever greater speeds – an intermeshing of ‘national fortunes’. In all major areas of government policy, the enmeshment of national political communities in regional and global processes involves them in intensive issues of transboundary coordination and control. Political space for the development and pursuit of effective government and the accountability of political power is no longer coterminous with a delimited national territory. National communities themselves by no means make and determine decisions and policies exclusively for themselves when they decide on such issues as the regulation of health, conserving the environment and combating terrorism; and national governments by no means simply determine what is right or appropriate exclusively for their own citizens.

These new political circumstances present a unique challenge to a world order designed in accordance with the Westphalian principle of exclusive sovereign rule over a bounded territory and its associated geopolitical mechanisms for governing world affairs.

From Geopolitics to Global Governance?

Globalization poses, with renewed immediacy, the question of how world affairs are, and should be, governed (Smouts, 2001). At issue is whether the thickening institutional density, expanding jurisdiction, intensifying transnational politics and deepening impact of suprastate regulation denotes a qualitative – structural – shift in how global affairs and transboundary problems are governed. For Rosenau, and many others, these developments represent the evolving infrastructure of a fragile system of global governance – a new complex multilateralism (Rosenau, 1999). Just how far this system embodies a radical break with traditional geopolitical modes of regulating world order (hegemony and the balance of power), or whether indeed it is displacing or supplementing them, remains the source of continuing disagreement (Cox, 1997; Gill, 2000; Keohane and Nye, 2000; Rosenau, 1999, 2000a; Ruggie, 1998). Sceptics, such as Gilpin, doubt that there is any substance to these claims, arguing that global governance is at best pure rhetoric, at worst a utopian aspiration (Gilpin, 2001).

Several factors have encouraged this burgeoning discourse on global governance. First, the end of the Cold War brought to a close the era of stalemate politics within the UN and associated agencies. This created the prospect of a more active and effective international governance. It also enabled a more inclusive form of multilateralism than had been feasible in a politically and economically divided world. Moreover, it contributed to the dwindling legitimacy accorded to hierarchical or hegemonic modes of regulating world order. These modes are contested by a diverse range of transnational pressure groups, social movements and protest movements. Second, as already noted, the intensification of globalization has increased the demand for multilateral cooperation and the provision of global public goods, including financial stability, the setting of common standards in ever more areas, and environmental protection. A new infrastructure of global regulation has evolved, reaching ever more deeply into the domestic affairs of states and societies, and it remains central to the promotion and management of globalization. Third, during the last three decades there has been a significant reconfiguration of state power and authority. Governing has become a more complex and volatile process. Realizing cherished domestic political goals, delivering core policy programmes and resolving domestic crises increasingly involve the state in a negotiated order between diverse agencies, both public and private, within and beyond the state (Bergesen and Lunde, 1999). Governance, as a concept of analysis, refers to this process of social coordination with a public purpose – a process in which the state plays a strategic but not necessarily the dominant role (Pierre and Peters, 2000).

Given the absence of a world government, the concept of global governance provides a language for describing the nexus of systems of rule-making, political coordination and problem-solving which transcend states and societies (Rosenau, 2000a, 2000b). It is particularly relevant to describing the structures and processes of governing beyond the state where there exists no supreme or singular political authority. Theoretically, it is much more than simply a descriptive term: it constitutes a broad analytical approach to addressing the central questions of political life under conditions of globalization, namely: who rules, in whose interests, by what mechanisms and for what purposes?

Global Governance: Towards a New World Order?

As an analytical approach, global governance rejects the conventional state-centric conception of world politics and world order. The principal unit of analysis is taken to be global, regional or transnational systems of authoritative rule-making and implementation. As Rosenau comments,

By locating rule systems at the heart of our theoretical formulations, we can trace and assess the processes of governance wherever they may occur. That is, through focusing on rule systems we will not be confined to the world of states and will be empowered to explore issues and processes in terms of the way in which authority is created, dispersed, consolidated or otherwise employed to exercise control with respect to the numerous issues and processes that states are unable or unwilling to address. (2000a, p. 188)

At the analytical core of the global governance approach is a concern with understanding and explaining the political significance of global, regional and transnational authority structures (Boli, 1999; Smouts, 2001).

Accordingly, the focus is on the evolving system of (formal and informal) political coordination – across multiple levels from the local to the global – among public authorities (states and IGOs) and private agencies seeking to realize common purposes or resolve collective problems. Although this system transcends the classic postwar form of multilateralism, it is far from a ‘unified global system underpinned by global law enforcement’ (Cable, 1999, p. 54). It differs dramatically from the concept of world government in that it does not presuppose the idea of a central global public authority, which legislates for the common affairs of humanity. On the contrary, it is defined by diverse sources of rule-making, political authority and power.

Several observations are made in the literature concerning the institutional architecture of global governance:

- 1 It is *multilayered* in the sense that it is constituted by and through the structural enmeshment of several principal infrastructures of governance: the suprastate (such as the UN system), the regional (EU, MERCOSUR, ASEAN, etc.), the transnational (civil society, business networks and so on), and the substate (community associations, and city governments) (Scholte, 2000). Sandwiched between these layers is national government.
- 2 It is often described as polyarchic or *pluralistic* since there is no single locus of authority. This is not to imply any equality of power between the participants but simply to acknowledge that political authority is decidedly fragmented.
- 3 It has a *variable geometry* in so far as the relative political significance and regulatory capacities of these infrastructures vary considerably around the globe and from issue to issue.
- 4 The system is *structurally complex*, being composed of diverse agencies and networks with overlapping (functional and/or spatial) jurisdictions, not to mention differential power resources and competencies.
- 5 Far from national governments being sidelined in this system, they become increasingly crucial as *strategic sites* for suturing together these various infrastructures of governance and legitimizing regulation beyond the state.

A central characteristic of global governance, emphasized particularly in the existing literature, is the reconfiguration of authority between the various layers or infrastructures of governance. This is evident in the expanding jurisdiction and competencies of both suprastate (for instance, the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)) and substate institutions (such as devolved governments and autonomous regions). Although there is considerable variance from sector to sector – compare for instance the global impact of the IMF and the International Labour Organization (ILO) – for the most part the activities of suprastate bodies reach ever more deeply into the internal life of states, from food standards to banking regulation. Indeed, the most recent and comprehensive study of global regulation concluded that ‘today most citizens greatly underestimate the extent to which most nations’ shipping laws are written at the IMO [International Maritime Organization] in London, air safety laws at the ICAO [International Civil Aviation Organization] in Montreal, food standards at the FAO [Food and Agriculture Organization] in Rome, intellectual property rights in Geneva at the WTO/WIPO . . . motor vehicles standards by the ECE [Economic Commission for Europe] in Geneva’, to mention but a few sectors (Braithwaite and Drahos, 1999, p. 488).

This relocation and delegation of political authority between the various layers of governance has created what some refer to as a ‘new medievalism’ since it resembles the complexity of competing jurisdictions, porous administrative boundaries and multiple levels of political authority which characterized medieval Europe. Global governance embodies a complex patchwork of overlapping jurisdictions, generating ambiguities about the principal location of authority and political responsibility. This is particularly evident where conflicts of legal or regulatory principles occur – should global, regional, national or local rules take precedence and how is this to be decided? In the context of the European Union, with a developed supranational legal infrastructure, such conflicts are resolved through juridical mechanisms. At the global level, such mechanisms are largely absent, but where they exist in some form (as with the WTO dispute machinery or WIPO machinery on patents) they provoke concerns about democratic accountability, legitimacy and subsidiarity.

Such concerns are reinforced by what in the study of global governance is sometimes referred to as the privatization of global regulation, that is, a redrawing of the boundaries between public authority and private power. From technical standards to the disbursement of humanitarian assistance and official aid through non-governmental organizations (NGOs), private agencies have become increasingly influential in the formulation and implementation of global public policy. The International Accounting Standards Committee establishes global accounting rules, while the major bond rating agencies make critical judgements about the credit status of governments and public and private organizations around the globe. Much of this privatized governance occurs in the shadow of global public authorities, but to the extent to which corporate and private interests have captured the agendas of such bodies, like those of the WTO, the International Organization of Securities Commissions (IOSCO) and others, there is a fusion of public and private power. The current salience of public–private partnerships, such as the Global AIDS Fund and the Global Compact, articulates the expanding influence of private interests in the formulation as well as the delivery of global policies. Contemporary global governance involves a relocation of authority from public to quasi-public, and to private, agencies.

Associated with this relocation of authority is a shift in the principal modalities of global rule-making and implementation. Although much of the formal business of global governance is conducted within and through established international organizations, a growing literature indicates that significant aspects of the formulation and implementation of global public policy occur within an expanding array of political networks: transgovernmental (such as the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision (BCBS) and the Financial Action Task Force (FATF)), trisectoral (public, corporate, and NGOs), and transnational (such as Médecins Sans Frontières). These networks – which can be ad hoc or institutionalized – have become increasingly important in coordinating the work of experts and functionaries within governments, international organizations, and the corporate and the NGO sectors (further examples are the Global Water Partnership, the World Commission on Dams, the Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunization). They function to set policy agendas, disseminate information, formulate rules, establish and implement policy programmes – from measures against money laundering taken by the FATF to global initiatives to counter AIDS. Many of these networks are of a purely bureaucratic nature, but they have also become mechanisms through which civil society and corporate interests are effectively embedded in the global policy process. In part, the growth of these networks is a response to the overload and politicization of multilateral bodies, but it is also an outcome of the growing technical complexity of global policy issues and the communications revolution.

To the extent that a global communications infrastructure has facilitated the evolution of global policy networks, so too it has underwritten the effective worldwide mobilization of protest against the agencies of global governance. This contestation takes many political forms other than direct action, from advocacy (as with the Campaign to Ban Landmines, Jubilee 2000), through surveillance of corporate activities in order to police voluntary codes of conduct (CorpWatch), to resisting the terms of economic globalization (campaigns to outlaw child labour or sweatshop practices). Transnational civil society is integral to the politics of global governance.

For the advocates of the global governance perspective, geopolitical management of global affairs is becoming less plausible (and legitimate) as the sole governing principle of world order. In a highly interconnected world of diverse nation-states, in which non-state actors also wield enormous influence, hierarchical forms of managing global affairs are losing their efficacy and legitimacy.

Global Governance: Two Concepts in Search of a Theory?

Those who are sceptical of the utility of focusing on global governance do not contest the assertion that there has been a significant expansion of international regulation or that it involves a complex politics between states, civil society and international organizations. On the contrary, as Robert Gilpin contends, ‘the rapid globalization of the world economy has elevated the governance issue to the top of the international economic agenda . . . the battleground has become the entire globe, and the types as well as the number of participants have greatly expanded to include states, international organizations, and nongovernmental organizations’ (2001, pp. 378, 402). What the sceptics contest is the interpretation that global governance transcends geopolitics

or that global institutions, or transnational civil society, are autonomous sites of power in world politics.

Since the publication of Keohane and Nye's seminal study, *Power and Interdependence*, which stimulated an avalanche of literature on international regimes, the question as to why, and under what circumstances, states engage in international cooperation and institution building has been at the core of much international theory. In general terms, there are three principal explanatory accounts – with some variants¹ – of global governance: liberal institutionalist, realist and neo-Gramscian (Cox, 1993; Gill, 1992; Keohane, 1984, 1988; Krasner, 1982; Stein, 1990). Although each has an interest in explaining patterns of governance beyond the state, there are considerable differences in their analytical and epistemological frameworks. These differences reflect underlying commitments to rationalist, historicist or reflectivist interpretations of the social world, as well as to different ontological assumptions about the constituent elements of world politics: states, social forces, or ideas.

Liberal institutionalism argues that governance beyond the state is endemic since it arises from the functional benefits which, in an interdependent world, states can realize through the strategic coordination of their policies and activities. International institutions matter because they deliver important benefits to states, and their absence would undermine the achievement of domestic objectives. Accordingly, they 'empower governments rather than shackle them' (Keohane, 1984, p. 13). Crucially, they also moderate the effects of power politics and support distinctive forms of multilateral, transgovernmental and transnational politics that constrain the powerful (Ikenberry, 2001). They matter because they function as relatively autonomous mechanisms mediating between the hierarchy of state power and global public policy outcomes.

For realism, geopolitics remains essential to understanding the conduct and dynamics of global governance. Governance beyond the state is largely contingent on the policies and interests of the most powerful states (Krasner, 1982). International institutions are principally devoid of autonomous power and function largely as instruments for the advancement of the interests of the most dominant states or coalitions of states. Moreover, no convincing account of global governance can ignore, even in a globalizing era, the centrality of the inequalities of power between states. The hierarchy of power moulds the architecture as well as the substantive purposes and priorities of global governance. The present liberal world order – of free trade and unhindered capital flows – is primarily a product of US global hegemony, although it relies on the consent of other leading industrial powers. The structural power of the US is expressed in the very existence of global institutions and the liberal constitution of world order. Of course, this is not to argue that global governance is simply a transmission belt for US policy, or Western interests, since these same institutions are also arenas through which their dominance is contested. Nevertheless, in the account given by realism, geopolitics retains a disproportionate role in shaping the structures, patterns and outcomes of global governance.

Marxist and neo-Gramscian theories share with realism an emphasis on geopolitics and US hegemony in explaining the pattern and significance of global governance. However, they consider that both these factors have to be understood in the context of the structural imperatives of globalizing capitalism (Cox, 1993; 1997). As the hegemonic capitalist state, the US has a critical interest in expanding the reach and rule of globalizing capitalism. Global institutions are an instrument for sustaining and

expanding the predominance of global corporate capitalism. In this respect, the conduct and project of global governance is shaped by an unwritten constitution that structurally privileges the interests and agenda of global capital, often at the expense of the welfare of nations, communities and the natural environment (Gill, 2000; Gill and Law, 1993). However, the institutions of global governance serve more than a regulatory or managerial function, for they also provide arenas within which this unwritten global constitution is legitimized and contested. In this respect, they are sites of struggle with the potential for transforming world order.

Both realism and Marxism are highly critical of the unreflective nature of much of the existing literature on global governance. This scepticism arises from three principal considerations: that the existing literature exaggerates the autonomous power and efficacy of global institutions and civil society organizations; that as an approach to understanding how world order is managed, this literature is theoretically flawed in so far as it elides global governance with the effective sources of international order; and that in adopting a form of pluralist analysis, conventional studies of global governance fail to penetrate beyond the dynamics of global politics to the underlying structures of power. For these reasons, the sceptics conclude, the global governance perspective may be descriptively accurate but it is largely devoid of explanatory power: it is, for the most part, little more than two concepts in search of a theory.

From Distorted to Genuine Global Governance: the Normative Argument

If the explanatory value of global governance is the subject of considerable debate, so too is its normative status. There is widespread agreement in the literature that the existing system of global governance is severely deficient in many fundamental respects. In the view of many critics, the present system is a form of 'distorted',² as opposed to 'genuine', global governance (Hurrell, 2001; Murphy, 2000). However, there is little consensus as to whether more genuine global governance is either desirable, or plausible, nor agreement on what normative principles should inform its institutional design (Beitz, 1999; Cox and Sinclair, 1996; Falk, 1995; Held, 1995; Jones, 1999; Keohane, 1998; O'Neill, 2000, 2001; Pogge, 1997; Zurn, 1998).

In the normative literature, global governance is said to be distorted in so far as it promotes the interests of the most powerful states and global social forces, and restricts the realization of greater global social justice and human security. Distorted global governance is understood as a product of the mutually reinforcing dynamics of the inequalities of power between states; the structural privileging of the interests and agenda of global capital; and the technocratic nature of the global policy process (Cerny, 1999; Cutler, Haufler and Porter, 1999; Gill, 2000; Hurrell, 2001; Murphy, 2000; Woods, 1999). These factors reinforce a number of significant deficits in the governance capacity of the existing system, most especially in respect of its role in welfare, human security and poverty reduction (Bergesen and Lunde, 1999; Thomas, 2000).

Although human security and development have been (at least nominally) among the principal goals of global governance for almost five decades, the widening of both global inequalities and social exclusion articulates a growing gap between rhetoric

and performance. By contrast, the considerable success of public and private agencies in promoting economic globalization suggests that the structural constraints on global governance apply more strongly to its redistributive than its promotional functions. This problem highlights a growing disjuncture or deficit in respect of the market-enhancing and market-correcting functions of global governance. This is compounded by a growing democratic deficit. In seeking to promote or regulate the forces of globalization, states have created new suprastate layers of political authority which have weak democratic credentials and stand in an ambiguous relationship to existing systems of national accountability. Many of the participants in the global policy process, especially the leading agencies of global civil society, are also highly unrepresentative of the world's states and peoples. Under these conditions the legitimacy and accountability of global governance are decidedly problematic. Accordingly, redressing this democratic deficit and promoting global social justice are the principal ethical considerations which dominate the normative literature on global governance.

This literature embodies two distinct (and largely discrete) discourses: one concerned with the democratization of global governance, and the other with problems of global justice (Caney, 2001; Held, 1995; Jones, 1999; Pogge, 1997). The first seeks to specify the principles and institutional arrangements for making accountable those global sites and forms of power which presently operate beyond the scope of national democratic control. Several different normative conceptions of democracy beyond borders have been elaborated, including cosmopolitan democracy, radical democracy and transnational deliberative democracy (McGrew, 2002). By contrast, the discourse of global social justice is concerned primarily with the elaboration of justificatory arguments and normative principles. In particular, the emphasis is on elaborating the moral reasoning behind the pursuit of global distributive justice (Caney, 2001; Pogge, 2001). Again, there are distinctive normative perspectives in addressing this ethical challenge, including liberal cosmopolitanism, critical theory, and social cosmopolitanism (Beitz, 1999).

Both the discourse of global democracy and that of global justice inform the wider academic and political debate concerning the necessary conditions for genuine global governance. Indeed the official rhetoric of institutional reform, as well as the global politics of protest against distorted global governance, draws heavily on both these discourses (O'Brien et al., 2000; Summers, 2000; Woods, 1999; UN Secretary-General, 2000). To the extent to which global governance is becoming a significant site 'in which struggles over wealth, power and knowledge are taking place', the issue of its ultimate ethical purposes and proper institutional design is a matter both of great academic and of great political import (Murphy, 2000, p. 799). Indeed, the normative debate about transnational democracy and global social justice is increasingly central to the politics of contemporary global governance.

Governing Globalization

Together, the essays which follow explore and develop the themes elaborated in this introduction. The volume seeks to map the nature and form of contemporary global governance, to evaluate the effectiveness and legitimacy of existing global structures for dealing with the most pressing global issues, and to assess the principal descriptive

and normative theories of global governance. It is divided into three parts. Part I examines the broad implications of globalization for the institutional development and politics of global governance. Part II explores some of the most urgent issues of global public policy, assessing the limits and possibilities for effective global governance. Part III develops a series of critical reflections on the main descriptive and normative approaches to the study of global governance.

Part I opens with an essay by Ngaire Woods which seeks to analyse ‘the actors and challenges in a globalizing world which new forms of “global governance” are attempting to address’. The essay examines the institutional and organizational challenges to global governance posed by economic globalization. It discusses the politics of contemporary global governance with particular emphasis on the possibilities for reform in the context of a system in which global public policy-making is being undertaken not just by intergovernmental organizations but by a variety of networks, coalitions and informal arrangements.

This web of arrangements is analysed further in the essay by Mathias Koenig-Archibugi, which provides a novel mapping of ‘the complex structure of contemporary global governance’. In exploring the demand and supply of global governance, Mathias Koenig-Archibugi deploys a typology of the institutional structures and mechanisms which define contemporary global governance. While he concludes that ‘the heterogeneous and at times contradictory character of global governance presents a challenge to any attempt to understand its operation and evolution in theoretical terms’, the essay presents a systematic conceptual framework for making sense of this complexity.

This complexity is the principal theme in the chapter by James Rosenau, who argues that ‘world affairs can be conceptualized as governed through a bifurcated system – what can be called the two worlds of world politics – one an interstate system of states and their national governments that has long dominated the course of events, and the other a multicentric system of diverse types of other collectivities . . . who collectively form a highly complex system of global governance.’ Developing the concept of ‘spheres of authority’, Rosenau explains how governance comes about in a world that is rapidly both integrating and fragmenting – what he names ‘framgregation’ – under the pressures of globalization. Though this ‘framgregation will be with us for a long time and surely many of its tensions will intensify . . . the collective will to preserve and use the new, horizontal forms of authority is not lacking’, such that global governance, he concludes, is now central to the effective management of human affairs.

In the final contribution to part I, Jill Steans develops a feminist perspective on global governance. Since women often bear the principal ‘burdens’ of global public policy, the perspective developed in this essay offers distinctive insights into the important questions of power and purpose in the conduct of global governance. Steans elucidates ‘the gender politics at work in global governance, notably the way that women’s groups have attempted to both shape agendas and contest the dominant rules and norms’. In conclusion, Steans examines the importance of gender politics for ‘constructing an effective system of global governance, as a counterweight to the globalization of the world economic system’.

In part II the contributions illuminate further the politics of global governance, as well as its effectiveness and limits. This is achieved through an analysis of the global

public policy process with respect to several of the most critical contemporary global problems. Nana Poku's chapter discusses the global governance of AIDS, 'the single greatest threat to continual global development'. Following an examination of the institutional structures and the global politics of AIDS programmes, Poku discusses the limits and possibilities of public-private partnerships, such as the new Global AIDS Fund, concluding with the assessment that, in key respects, it is 'still far from axiomatic that the existing institutional frameworks will be empowered to deal with the multiplicity of challenges posed by the pandemic'.

The limits of global governance are also a significant theme developed in the chapter by Phil Williams and Gregory Baudin-O'Hayon. Globalization, they argue, has contributed to a disorderly world, especially evident in the phenomenal growth in transnational organized crime. By contrast, attempts to establish order through international regimes and mechanisms designed to combat these developments confront the problems of jurisdictional disputes and of limited powers and enforcement mechanisms. Despite some significant developments (especially in the aftermath of 11 September) in the legal and institutional machinery to deter and detect transnational criminal activity – from money laundering to people trafficking – the governance capacity of the system remains constrained by jurisdictional and political disputes. However, the limits of global governance might reflect the broader consideration that 'the forces of disorder might be impossible for governments to control.'

Similar constraints, as Perri 6's essay demonstrates, are evident in the transnational regulation of the internet, itself a significant vehicle for the conduct of transnational organized crime. In arguing 'that there is more transnationalization of regulation than first meets the eye', the essay develops a framework for assessing just 'how effective this regulation really is'. Arguing that horizontal regulation – governance through transnational networks of public and private agencies – is an increasingly significant feature of the governance of cyberspace, Perri 6 concludes that what 'is now required is an institutional framework for an open transnational debate about the accountability to citizens of the new clubs through which the regulation of information systems is now conducted'.

This effectively privatized form of network global governance is analysed further in the chapter by Susan Sell. In a searching examination of the global property rights regime, Sell argues that 'the 1994 Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS . . .) introduced a brand new era that extends the global reach of intellectual property regulation . . . TRIPS is a significant instance of global rule-making by a small handful of well-connected corporate players and their governments.' In many key respects, TRIPS is evidence not just of the growing significance of global governance, but also its effectiveness in terms of its capacity to shape domestic policies around the world. Moreover, it has also become a focal point for contesting globalization, particularly in respect of drugs patents and biopiracy in the South. This contest, Sell concludes, is centrally about 'redressing the imbalance between private and public interests in the context of intellectual property'. But it has a wider political resonance since it expresses the growing politicization of global governance even in its most technical and legalistic policy domains.

In the context of international finance, the balance between public and private power is a critical variable in determining the effectiveness of global governance arrangements. As Jan Aart Scholte's essay suggests, 'taming transworld financial flows

has ranked as one of the top priorities of governance in an emergent global polity.’ Yet, as he explains, despite the vital importance of this task to the stability of the world economy, and human security across the globe, ‘the effectiveness of present regulatory arrangements is found to be seriously wanting.’ The regulation of global finance, Scholte argues, illustrates the growing shift towards a new form of post-statist governance involving ‘complex networks of state, suprastate, substate, and private sector actors’ in which political authority ‘is both multilayered and dispersed’.

If taming global finance is central to ensuring global economic stability, the final chapter in part II by Michael Pugh explains both why and how the maintenance of international security has ‘moved in from the periphery of world politics’ to become a priority on the global governance agenda. Despite the dramatic failures of humanitarian intervention in Rwanda and Bosnia, the essay concludes that by the twenty-first century the ‘instruments for maintaining peace and security, order and justice had not only been institutionalized but were integral to the structure of global governance’. Irrespective of their failures or limitations, Pugh argues that peacekeeping and humanitarian missions are now crucial to the global policing and management of world order and disorder.

Explaining the sources of world order and global governance is the principal task of part III. These six chapters present a critical overview of the dominant traditions or theories of global governance: from realism to cosmopolitanism. Each chapter offers an exposition, and a reflective advocacy, of a particular theoretical tradition.

Accordingly, Robert Gilpin delivers a powerful realist critique of the concept of global governance. He contends that the institutions of global governance do not have the ‘capacity to enforce decisions. The nation-state continues to be the only institution in the contemporary world that has this capacity.’ Similarly, Alex Callinicos cuts through the rhetoric of global governance to reveal the workings of the structural power of capital and US (liberal capitalist) hegemony. Though Marxism acknowledges that global governance constitutes ‘unprecedentedly developed forms of institutionalized policy-coordination and cooperation among the main states . . . these forms represent, not the abolition, but the continuation of the economic and political conflicts that have driven global capitalism since its inception.’ In this respect, global governance is far from genuinely global: it is simply another form of political domination.

Taking issue with the more strident aspects of the realist and Marxist analyses, Anthony McGrew explores the continuing relevance of liberal internationalist theories to explaining the pattern of contemporary global governance. He argues that, despite what its many critics suggest, liberal internationalism is undergoing a theoretical renaissance. The much exaggerated crisis of liberal internationalism, evident in the growing separation between its normative aspirations and attempts to construct explanatory theory, is contributing to its rejuvenation. Far from losing its radical normative edge, the liberal literature on global distributive justice represents a fundamental critique of the existing form of global governance and world order. Having noted this, McGrew argues that there is little dialogue between the normative and the explanatory dimensions of contemporary liberal internationalism. In this respect, there is no coherent liberal internationalist theory of global governance but instead a clash of liberal internationalisms.

Just as liberal internationalism invites renewed scrutiny, so, Mark Imber argues, 'Functionalism deserves re-examination.' Functionalism, as this essay reminds us, is 'the unwritten constitution of international order'. Associated with the liberal internationalism of the interwar period, but also drawing on Fabian socialist and New Deal thinking, functionalism provided the rationale for the postwar multilateral order. As a theory of global governance it remains highly relevant, since, as Imber concludes, the UN functional agencies and programmes are after five decades still 'binding together those interests which are common, where they are common, to the extent that they are common'. Functionalism therefore remains 'our best chance for advancing environmental, medical and developmental welfare into the twenty-first century'.

In the concluding two essays, the emphasis shifts to the possible future trajectory of global governance. David Held's essay advocates a cosmopolitan approach to global governance, not just because it assists our understanding, but because 'it ought also to be embraced further in thinking about the proper form of globalization and global governance.' The chapter demonstrates that cosmopolitan principles are not utopian but on the contrary 'are at the centre of significant post-Second World War legal and political developments'. In arguing for 'greater accountability, democracy and social justice in global politics', the essay advocates a form of cosmopolitan global governance. In doing so, it also identifies in current political developments the conditions of possibility for its effective institutionalization.

In the final chapter, Robert Keohane develops this theme of institutional design by exploring, in the context of global governance, the question of 'What normative standards should institutions meet, and what categories should we use to evaluate institutions according to those standards?' Central to this normative enquiry is an attempt to address the problem of how to 'design institutions for a partially globalized world that perform valuable functions while respecting democratic values'. Drawing together the lessons from empirical political theory, Keohane presents a valuable corrective to those who argue that global governance cannot, in any meaningful sense, be democratized or made more effective in the performance of its core tasks. However, the essay concludes by cautioning that 'if global institutions are designed well, they will promote human welfare. But if we bungle the job, the results could be disastrous. Effective and humane global governance arrangements are not inevitable. They will depend on human effort and on deep thinking about politics.'

Taken together, the essays in this volume are a significant contribution to such 'deep thinking' about the current predicament and the proper form of global governance. Arguably, among the greatest ethical and political challenges of the new century is the realization of a more 'genuine' and effective system of global governance as an institutional bridge to a democratic and just world order.

Notes

- 1 For simplicity, the discussion focuses on the three principal traditions. As understood here, these embrace variants such as functionalism and constructivism. Whereas the former is normally associated with liberal theory, there is some debate as to whether the latter is a discrete school in itself (Keohane, 1988). Constructivism acknowledges that international institutions matter. Their importance lies in the development and promotion of international

norms which act not only to shape state behaviour but also to redefine states' understanding of their own national interests. International institutions are significant in two ways: they socialize states into international cooperative norms; and their cumulative impact is to reinforce a culture of cooperation in international society which moderates geopolitical modes of governing the common affairs of humanity (Finnemore, 1996; Haas, 1999; Ruggie, 1998). Milder versions of constructivism are compatible with liberal institutionalism and neo-Gramscian theory, but more radical versions challenge the rationalist and materialist assumptions of both (see Wendt, 1999).

- 2 The concept of distorted global governance borrows from Nordlinger's study of the American state which he describes as distorted because of its bias towards powerful organized interests and the corporate world. See Nordlinger, 1981.

References

- Beitz, C. R. (1999) 'Social and cosmopolitan liberalism', *International Affairs*, 75, pp. 347–77.
- Bergesen, H. and Lunde, L. (1999) *Dinosaurs or Dynamos? The United Nations and the World Bank at the Turn of the Century*, London: Earthscan.
- BIS (2001) *Quarterly Report, December*, Geneva: Bank For International Settlements.
- Boli, J. (1999) 'Conclusion: world authority structures and legitimations', in J. Boli and G. M. Thomas (eds), *Constructing World Culture: International Nongovernmental Organizations since 1875*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Braithwaite, J. and Drahos, P. (1999) *Global Business Regulation*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cable, V. (1999) *Globalization and Global Governance*, London: Royal Institute of International Affairs.
- Caney, S. (2001) 'International distributive justice', *Political Studies*, 49, pp. 974–97.
- Castells, M. (1998) *End of the Millennium*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Cerny, P. (1999) 'Globalization, governance and complexity', in A. Prakash and J. A. Hart (eds), *Globalization and Governance*, London: Routledge.
- Cox, R. (1993) 'Gramsci, hegemony and international relations', in S. Gill (ed.), *Gramsci, Historical Materialism and International Relations*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cox, R. W. (ed.) (1997) *The New Realism: Perspectives on Multilateralism and World Order*, London: Macmillan.
- Cox, R. W. and Sinclair, T. J. (eds) (1996) *Approaches to World Order*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cutler, A. C., Haufler, V. and Porter, T. (1999) *Private Authority and International Affairs*, Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Deibert, R. (1997) *Parchment, Printing and Hypermedia*, New York: Cornell University Press.
- Dicken, P. (1998) *Global Shift*, London: Paul Chapman.
- Falk, R. (1995) *On Humane Global Governance*, Cambridge: Polity.
- Finnemore, M. (1996) 'Norms, culture, and world politics: insights from sociology's institutionalism', *International Organization*, 50, pp. 325–47.
- Garrett, G. (1998) *Partisan Politics in the Global Economy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Giddens, A. (1990) *The Consequences of Modernity*, Cambridge: Polity.
- Gill, S. (1992) 'Economic globalization and the internationalization of authority: limits and contradictions', *GeoForum*, 23, pp. 269–83.
- Gill, S. (2000) 'New constitutionalism, democratization and global political economy', *Peace Research Abstracts*, 37.

- Gill, S. and Law, D. (1993) 'Global hegemony and the structural power of capital', in S. Gill (ed.), *Gramsci, Historical Materialism and International Relations*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gilpin, R. (2001) *Global Political Economy*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Groom, A. J. R. and Powell, D. (1994) 'From world politics to global governance: a theme in need of a focus', in A. J. R. Groom and M. Light (eds), *Contemporary International Relations*, London: Pinter.
- Haas, P. M. (1999) 'Social constructivism and the evolution of multilateral environmental governance', in A. Prakash and J. Hart (eds), *Globalization and Governance*, London: Routledge.
- Held, D. (1995) *Democracy and Global Order*, Cambridge: Polity.
- Held, D. and McGrew, A. (eds) (2000) *The Global Transformations Reader*, Cambridge: Polity.
- Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D. and Perraton, J. (1999) *Global Transformations: Politics, Economics and Culture*, Cambridge: Polity.
- Hirst, P. and Thompson, G. (1999) *Globalization in Question*, Cambridge: Polity.
- Hurrell, A. (2001) 'Global inequality and international institutions', in Pogge 2001.
- Ikenberry, G. J. (2001) 'America's liberal grand strategy: democracy and national security in the postwar era', in M. Cox, G. J. Ikenberry and T. Inoguchi (eds), *American Democracy Promotion*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jones, C. (1999) *Global Justice: Defending Cosmopolitanism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Keohane, R. O. (1984) *After Hegemony*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Keohane, R. O. (1988) 'International institutions: two approaches', *International Studies Quarterly*, 32, pp. 379–96.
- Keohane, R. O. (1998) 'International institutions: can interdependence work?', *Foreign Policy*, pp. 82–96.
- Keohane, R. and Nye, J. (1977) *Power and Interdependence*, Boston: Little, Brown.
- Keohane, R. and Nye, J. (2000) 'Introduction', in J. Nye and J. Donahue (eds), *Governance in a Globalizing World*, Washington DC: Brookings Institution.
- Krasner, S. D. (1982) 'Structural causes and regime consequences: regimes as intervening variables', *International Organization*, 36, pp. 185–205.
- McGrew, A. (1997) 'Democracy beyond borders? Globalization and the reconstruction of democratic theory and practice', in A. G. McGrew (ed.), *The Transformation of Democracy? Globalization and Territorial Democracy*, Cambridge: Polity.
- McGrew, A. (2002) 'Transnational democracy: theories and prospects', in A. Carter and G. Stokes (eds), *Democratic Theory Today*, Cambridge: Polity.
- Maddison, A. (2001) *The World Economy: A Millennial Perspective*, Paris: OECD.
- Murphy, C. N. (2000) 'Global governance: poorly done and poorly understood', *International Affairs*, 76, pp. 789–804.
- Newman, J. (2001) *Modernizing Governance*, London: Sage.
- Nordlinger, E. A. (1981) *On the Autonomy of the Democratic State*, Boston: Harvard University Press.
- O'Brien, R., Goetz, A. M., Scholte, J. A. and Williams, M. (2000) *Contesting Global Governance: Multilateral Economic Institutions and Global Social Movements*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- O'Neill, O. (2000) 'Bounded and cosmopolitan justice', *Review of International Studies*, 26, pp. 45–61.
- O'Neill, O. (2001) 'Agents of justice', in Pogge 2001.
- Pierre, J. and Peters, B. G. (2000) *Governance, Politics and the State*, London: Palgrave.
- Pogge, T. (1997) 'Creating supranational institutions democratically', *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 5, pp. 163–82.
- Pogge, T. W. (ed.) (2001) *Global Justice*, Oxford: Blackwell.

- Rodrik, D. (1997) *Has Globalization Gone Too Far?* Washington DC: Institute for International Economics.
- Rosenau, J. N. (1999) 'Toward an ontology for global governance', in M. Hewson and T. J. Sinclair (eds), *Approaches to Global Governance Theory*, Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Rosenau, J. N. (2000a) 'Change, complexity, and governance in globalizing space', in J. Pierre (ed.), *Debating Governance: Authority, Steering, and Democracy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rosenau, J. (2000b) 'Governance in a globalizing world', in Held and McGrew 2000.
- Ruggie, J. (1998) *Constructing the World Polity*, London: Routledge.
- Scholte, J. A. (2000) *Globalization: A Critical Introduction*, London: Macmillan.
- Smouts, M.-C. (2001) 'International cooperation: from coexistence to world governance', in M.-C. Smouts (ed.), *The New International Relations*, London: Hurst.
- Stein, A. (1990) *Why Nations Co-operate*, New York: Cornell University Press.
- Summers, L. (2000) Statement to the International Monetary and Financial Committee, IMF, Washington DC, 16 April.
- Thomas, C. (2000) *Global Governance, Development and Human Security*, London: Pluto Press.
- UIA (1997) *Yearbook of International Organizations*, Brussels: Union of International Associations.
- UN Secretary-General (2000) *Renewing the United Nations*, New York: United Nations (www.un.org).
- UNCTAD (2001) *World Investment Report*, Geneva: UNCTAD.
- UNDP (1998) *Globalization and Liberalization*, New York: UNDP.
- Wendt, A. (1999) *Social Theory of International Politics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Woods, N. (1999) 'Good governance in international organizations', *Global Governance*, 5, pp. 39–61.
- WTO (2001) *World Trade Report*, Geneva: World Trade Organization.
- Zurn, M. (1998) *Democratic Governance beyond the Nation State?* Bremen: Institut für Interkulturelle und Internationale Studien, Universität Bremen.

