

Beyond global governance: in search of the global public interest

Pr. Riadh BOURICHE

Professeur en sciences politiques

Faculty of Political Science

University of Constantine 03 – Salah Boubnider

Abstract

During recent years, many analysts have criticized global governance. These critical analyzes have been accentuated by the observation of limits in the results of this governance, and the contemporary challenges it was becoming increasingly difficult for players in the international system to respond effectively and / or legitimate. Following this, many discussions and proposals have been developed for example the weight of some states in international organizations, or on trimming the role, tasks and means of formal bodies of global governance... We want to know if global governance ensures that the global public interest is served. For that, we begin, in a first point, to describe the role of institutions in international policy in the context of global governance. The second point is dedicated to a brief presentation of the mapping global governance. In the third point, we show that it is necessary to remove the governance.

Keywords: global governance, institutions, international policy.

Résumé

Au cours des dernières années, de nombreux analystes ont critiqué la gouvernance mondiale. Ces analyses critiques ont été accentuées par l'observation de limites dans les résultats de cette gouvernance et par les défis contemporains auxquels il devenait de plus en plus difficile pour les acteurs du système international de réagir efficacement et / ou légitimement. Suite à cela, de nombreuses discussions et propositions ont été développées, par exemple sur le poids de certains États dans les organisations internationales, ou sur la réduction du rôle, des tâches et des moyens des organes formels de gouvernance mondiale ... Nous voulons savoir si la gouvernance mondiale respecte l'intérêt du public. Pour cela, nous commençons, dans un premier point, à décrire le rôle des institutions dans la politique internationale dans le contexte de la gouvernance mondiale. Le deuxième point est consacré à une brève présentation de la cartographie de la gouvernance mondiale. Dans le troisième point, nous montrons qu'il est nécessaire de revoir la gouvernance.

Mots-clés: gouvernance mondiale, institutions, politique internationale.

1. Introduction

Analysts who criticize global governance talk about the issue of the crisis of global governance, leading to a questioning of the legitimacy of governance as originally proposed by international organizations like the World Bank. The World Bank tended to promote the passage of the implicit "government" to "governance" with the consequent reduction principle of the rule of "governing" to "governed" in global governance. But for various reasons (limits of governance, resistance of states ...) this passage was not successful at the final stage of governance.

Because of these findings of crisis, the issue of governance is caused to be reconsidered, particularly with regard to reactions of state actors, in a new perspective of complex international system.

If we consider that the idea of the redesign of global governance is a speech which is not followed by acts and effects, or if we reconsider the role of the state in global governance, from "governed" to "co-ruler", these reflections can cause a return of the state and therefore a distance from the pole governance or indicate a redefinition of global governance itself.

In this article, we want to know if global governance ensures that the global public interest is served. For that, we begin, in a first point, to describe the role of institutions in international policy in the context of global governance. The second point is dedicated to a brief presentation of the mapping global governance. In the third point, we show that it is necessary to remove the governance.

2. Global Governance and the role of institutions in international policy

The emerging pattern of global governance comprises a rich mixture of actors and processes. Each has a view of what should be subject to international regulation, discussion or engagement. The new challenges created by globalization are compellingly illustrated by the international financial system. Liberalization and integration into global capital markets has dramatically increased the vulnerability of countries to volatile movements of capital across borders. Globalization has also affected domestic politics and thereby the capacity of governments

to manage these new forces. Economic liberalization and integration has led to greater income inequality within countries without strong welfare states as the incomes of increasingly demanded skilled workers rise while those of unskilled labour drop¹.

The twenty-first century began with a wide set of reflections on the need for more effective international cooperation and coordination. Policy-makers in all over the world have begun to ask what kinds of institutions are needed to manage the challenges associated with globalization. Answers have been provided by a new industry of expert, high level groups and each has propounded new institutions, reforms to existing institutions, and a continuing attention and evolution of global governance.

The financial crises of the 1990s demonstrated the capacity of private sector actors such as banks, investment houses, security brokerages, hedge funds and asset managers to create turmoil. As these actors create profit centres out of currency derivatives, and emerging market security trading departments, and take the large positions in leveraged instruments on proprietary accounts. These actors are also powerful lobbyists and participants in the debate about how to govern the global financial system. Global governance creates an international arena for lobbying and the representation of vested interests. The risk is that powerful private interests begin to gain a double voice whereby their interests are represented by their own governments with whom they lobby very effectively, and also directly in international negotiations by their own private representatives.

A further set of actors which have become particularly prominent in the new arena of global governance are non-governmental organizations, often referred to as global civil society. The groups included under this title (Amnesty International, Worldwide Fund for Nature, Oxfam) do not claim to represent countries or geographical groups. They bring principles and values to the attention of policy-makers and firms. They also play a role in monitoring global governance, analysing and reporting on various issues.

A rather different community of NGOs is now also becoming increasingly involved in the debate and implementation of global governance. More locally based' NGOs, predominately in developing countries, are being drawn into the fray. These groups claim to represent local constituencies. Many operate to plug gaps in their own country's government. Some try to make up for the fact that their government fails to represent a certain section of the population. Others

attempt to make up for a government's lack of capacity to deliver assistance or services. Some are repressed by their government. Others work closely with their government.

Increasingly these groups are being included in discussions with international aid donors, international organizations and in other arenas of global governance. Their entry has been catalysed by a number of shifts in thinking about both aid and governance. Now, it is recognized that good policies and outcomes require good politics.

A key issue raised by the emergence of NGOs in global governance is who chooses which NGOs to include or consult in national or international negotiations. At the national level, if the government plays a key role, critics allege that genuine consultation is not taking place. Where outsiders play a role, governments argue that their sovereignty and their own processes of democracy are being subverted. Where the local representatives of international organizations are involved, they risk becoming powerful gate-keepers who use their power to favour some groups over others to cement and further their own position. At the international level all these problems are replicated. For these reasons, the new involvement of NGOs poses important new challenges to the legitimacy and accountability of international institutions.

Global governance is a contested terrain at best. Some would say that the very term obscures more than it describes, proposing or assuming a global community which does not really exist and a form of management or government that is not really about governing (Streeten, 2001).

In this system, the underlying power and hierarchy of states and the most powerful transnational corporations are unavoidable, even in the so-called technocratic expert arrangements to which policy-makers seem increasingly attracted. The alternative, as some see it, is to consider democratizing global governance. The practical problem for advocates of global democracy lies in how such values might be implemented. Should they advocate using existing institutions such as the IMF, the World Bank and the WTO, however unfairly or unaccountably constituted, to push a further agenda of conditionality in the area of human rights? Critics argue that the institutions are not adequately legitimate. Developing countries have too little voice within them and the institutions are too unaccountable and too unrepresentative to impose further conditionality.

Finally, the global governance debate is focused heavily on the reform and creation of international institutions, and the need for these agencies to consult and to include non-governmental organizations, and global civil society. Yet, global governance is increasingly being undertaken in a variety of networks, coalitions and informal arrangements which lie a little further beyond the public gaze and the direct control of governments. It is these forms of governance that need sustained and focused attention to bring to light whose interests they further and to whom they are accountable².

3. Mapping global governance

The state, as an institutional form, emerged as the winner of a long competition between different ways to organize political authority (Spruyt, 1994; Philpott, 1999). States became and still are the main providers of governance services to society. In the contemporary world, states are expected to perform a range of functions for the benefit of their populations and their legitimacy can be questioned if they do not. Some of these tasks are considered mandatory regardless of contingent factors such as cultural tradition and level of economic development. States are required to respect basic human rights while carrying out their activities.

Governments often fail to perform those functions. We can distinguish three reasons for this failure³:

- the presence of external effects: Governments cannot perform certain tasks adequately because of the interference of factors originating outside their jurisdiction.
- resource deficiency: Governments fail because their material, organizational or epistemic resources are not sufficient to perform adequately particular functions.
- Unwillingness: Governments have no interest in carrying out specific functions for their populations or significant sectors of them, or do not perceive the existence of a problem.

Interdependence and resource deficiency are problems of capacity, while unwillingness is a problem of motivation. The various forms of state failure generate a demand for governance, but there is no reason to expect that alternative structures will automatically arise to meet this demand. Contemporary global governance is characterized by a high degree of diversity and complexity. Governance arrangements can take public, private or hybrid forms. They can involve substantial delegation of functions or reflect the desire not to create and empower independent bodies. They

can involve many of the stakeholders in the decision-making process or convey the overwhelming power of a few.

Many scholars of global governance are concerned with the possibilities and conditions of its improvement. Some focus on the capacity of governance arrangements to solve problems that led to their creation, and ask which institutional designs are more conducive to effectiveness (Miles et al., 2001). Others stress the need to strengthen the mechanisms for participation and accountability in global policy-making, and explore ways to increase the congruence between the input and the output sides of global governance, that is, those who are entitled to participate in decision-making, and those who are affected by the taken decisions (Held, 1995). Grasping the multidimensional and intertwined nature of existing arrangements, and in particular the elusive role of private authority is an important step towards the conception and construction of institution capable of simultaneously attaining these crucial goals: improving the performance of global governance and increasing its public accountability.

4. Looking for a global governance system restored

Any reflection on the establishment of true global governance is therefore a question on how to reintegrate all human beings without exception in the social dialogue, the foundation of living together. There is a close link between the search for peace and security, respect for people and eradication of extreme poverty. This is because extreme poverty is primarily a violation of human rights that any proposed construction of a new global governance based on respect for human rights and an ethic responsibility must be part of the prospect of its eradication.

In a system of renovated global governance, the participation of the poor is essential not only to prepare the big decisions that help to eradicate poverty but at least much because the poorest, through experience, have to do proposals in research for a world more just and more respectful of people. For that, we must seek new forms of participatory democracy, including the poorest⁴.

We must therefore endeavor to seek an alternative development model valuing other forms of wealth. It is vital to properly articulate the goals of economic development, environmental improvement and social cohesion. This is the meaning of the concept of sustainable development.

Amartya Sen points out that a central problem is "the need for an integrated formulation (...) The elimination of poverty and the consolidation and enhancement of the environment could be considered part of an integrated task"⁵. Concretely, this means that programs of environmental protection could be used to provide decent jobs and training for the most disadvantaged populations, respecting local cultures.

Currently, the approaches are most often separated and even opposed. Inventing a model of sustainable development involves making the best use of secular values experienced by many people, that the Western development model has stifled. Instead of encouraging the simple conformation to the dominant model, the development programs promoted by international institutions and governments could encourage the simultaneous affirmation and development of culture on the one hand, and the merging of knowledge and cultures on the other hand. The World Bank recently published a collection of sixty stories describing how African communities build their capacity to lead their own development in the context of globalization. These stories show that communities are willing and eager to combine their knowledge with knowledge and modern technology to achieve better results.

Finally, we need to redefine a new governance program with the objectives for economic development, environmental, improvement, and social cohesion. According to Xavier Godinot⁶, this program cannot be defined without participation of those whose voices are not heard and NGOs in which they chose to speak freely. In fact, it is introduced, within the bodies of public representation, a new partner. This partner is formed by those who have no voice because of extreme poverty.

For their part, Pierre Jacquet, Jean Pisani-Ferry and Laurence Tubiana highlight four priority for renovation of governance⁷:

- **Establish a legitimate political body of global governance**
- **Rebalance the institutional architecture,**
- **Involve civil society**
- **Integrate poor countries through a development pact.**

5. Conclusion

Eradicating poverty is an important and difficult objective that requires global action: economic, social, cultural, scientific, political, ethical and spiritual, involving all sections of society. But there cannot be good governance without global alliance of all, especially the poorest for a pluralistic, caring and responsible world.

We can ask if the proliferation of rule systems, the disaggregation of authority and the greater density of the global stage enhance or diminish the effectiveness of the overall system of global governance. We can also ask if while there doubtless will be pockets of ineffectiveness and breakdown, the emergent system will make for more humane and sensitive governance.

It is not to say that the best will be achieved immediately. Besides, a lot of tension will probably be still present for some time. But the collective will to preserve and use the new, horizontal forms of authority is not lacking and that is not a trivial conclusion.

Références

- ¹ Ngair Woods, The Role of Institutions, in David Held & Anthony McGrew, *Governing Globalization*, First published in 2002 by Polity Press, UK, pp. 25-45.
- ² Ibid.
- ³ Mathias Koenig-Arcibugi, Mapping Global Governance, in David Held & Anthony McGrew, *Governing Globalization*, First published in 2002 by Polity Press, UK, pp. 46-69
- ⁴ Xavier Godinot, Extrême pauvreté et gouvernance mondiale, in série Cahiers de propositions, Forum pour une nouvelle gouvernance mondiale, décembre 2010.
- ⁵ Amartya Sen, Environment and Poverty : One World or Two, Presentation given at the International Conference on Energy, Environment and Development, organized by Veolia Environment Institute and The Energy and Resource Institute, December 16, 2006 in Bangalore, India.
- ⁶ Xavier Godinot, op.cit.
- ⁷ Jacquet, Pierre, Jean Pisani-Ferry et Laurence Tubiana (2002), Les institutions économiques de la mondialisation, in *Gouvernance mondiale*, rapport du Conseil d'analyse économique, La documentation française.