Contemporary Governance

David WESSELS

Governance

19

20

1989

cogovernance

1997   2

CONTEMPORARY GOVERNANCE

By David Wessels

I   Background

The contemporary world can be characterized in many ways. It is a world of cultures and science, of economic activity and ideas.   In international relations, there are powerful states, global organizations, and social movements engaged in activities ranging from military confrontations to communal celebrations. In this complex global dynamic, the term " governance" has been used often to describe emerging patterns of political behavior or to prescribe new aspects of joint and independent action to achieve societal goals.

I would like to begin this article with an historical perspective which will help to understand the contemporary relevance and significance of this term. The reason why both practitioners and analysts of world politics address the theme of governance today is because important historical changes have brought about a new situation in the contemporary world, and this requires a search for a new vocabulary.

Without going back too far in history, we can find elements of world

politics in the nineteenth century which never fit well with that ideal-type conduct known as " international relations," in which sovereign, independent nation states were thought to relate to one another through diplomatic, legal, and military means. This model of behavior suggests an all-inclusive set of actions focused on nation states and their governments, and presupposes a Euro-centric pattern of high politics. In fact, however, dynasties were being challenged by democracy and empires were being subverted by development even then.

From the perspective of technology, rapid changes in the means of transportation--on land, sea, and in the air--and of communication--from telegraph and telephone, to radio and television and computers--have provided more and more people with an ever greater capacity to come into contact with others. Other scientific and technological achievements--notably, the use of nuclear energy--have transformed man's relations not only with other people, but also with all of the natural world. The light and the shadow of such advances may be symbolized by new medical treatments to save lives contrasted with the use of atomic weapons to destroy them.

The traditionally sovereignty-free institutions related to religious, intellectual, and commercial activities adapted to these global trends in various ways, while sovereignty-bound states also transformed themselves. [1] Functional tasks which states undertook included not only military defense, but also economic planning and the delivery of welfare services. Ideological flirtations with fascism and socialism generally have been short-lived, whereas waves of democratization and the expansion of human rights have endured. States have even joined together in more, more widespread, and more intrusive international organizations: from general-purpose bodies like the League of Nations and the United Nations; to powerful institutions of

1   The terms " sovereignty-free" and " sovereignty-bound" are based on the usage of James Rosenau, <u>Turbulence in World Politics: A Theory of Change and Continuity</u> Princeton, U.S.A.: Princeton University Press, 1990 , pp. 36 <u>et</u> <u>passim.</u> Rosenau is referring to the ordinary understanding of the state in the contemporary international system as a " sovereign" entity. Today, there are many actors in world politics, and some of them experience advantages from not being " bound" by sovereignty.

trade and finance like the International Monetary Fund and World Trade Organization; to regional arrangements such as the European Union, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, and the Organization of African Unity.

While these long-term historical trends provide the background to the recent practice and understanding of governance, events in a short-term perspective give fresh insight into the particular characteristics of today's phenomenon. The growth of global interdependence has been a major feature of the second half of the twentieth century. Political and military conditions throughout the world, but especially in Europe, changed radically after the World Wars of the first half of the century and Hitler's failed attempt at hegemony. The shift to a bipolar military confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union was accompanied by unprecedented economic growth and cooperative policies among the Western European countries, as well as the United States, Japan, and other advanced economies. The directions of this economic transformation are complex: a global division of labor; regional institutional integration; financial, entrepreneurial, and technological convergence; growing gaps between rich and poor, both within countries and among countries. In international relations, however, there has been a trend toward interdependent strategies and institutionalization--complex interdependence being resolved by the establishment and evolution of regimes and multilateral institutions.

The abrupt changes in Eastern and Central Europe symbolized by the breaching of the Berlin Wall in 1989, the reunification of Germany in October 1990, and the dissolution of the Soviet Union at the end of 1991, tell only part of the story of the transformation of ideological, political, and military confrontations which had threatened the world from the late 1940s to the late 1980s. The meeting between United States President Bush and Soviet President Gorbachev in Malta in December 1989 signified not only the end of the division of Europe sealed at the Yalta Conference of 1945 but also the thawing of a Cold War between the two superpowers which had affected the far corners of the earth. Efforts at global security and cooperation were

enhanced in their bilateral relations, in the United Nations, and in other diplomatic fora.

The operation of a highly interconnected global political economy reflects all of the above changes in recent international history. But the explanation offered above suggests only one aspect of the total scene, an aspect dominated by governmental officials and the institutions which they command. Another aspect is that which is associated with markets, and which is characterized by the growth of transnational enterprises and by the existence of a financial system of global proportions, a globalized economy in which national borders seem to mean very little. Although a continuous market principle can be found in the workings of the economy, the actual way in which the market works at the global level has changed radically.

There still is considerable regulation of economic activities within the boundaries of states, but traditional concepts of national jurisdiction or even autonomy have been challenged by the rapid flow of financial resources to and from certain countries and by new patterns of production and consumption which seem to defy political boundaries. As the demise of the socialist economic bloc and of its institutional form, COMECON, illustrate, the functioning of today's global market is a powerful independent factor in determining the distribution of the world's wealth. The financial crisis affecting many countries, especially in East and Southeast Asia, from mid-1997, demonstrates this same reality. Recognition of these changed circumstances has attracted attention to the normative underpinnings of the global political economy: the sources of wealth and power are found to be in the private rather than the public domain; and the consequences of unequal distribution of wealth and power appear more unsettling than ever.

Building upon existing interdependencies, the European Union, the North American Free Trade Area, and other regional groupings have progressed toward greater integration, economically and even politically. The economic elements themselves are far more than temporary adaptations to market pressures, leading some to foresee a future regionalization of economic patterns at the global level. However, there are cross-cutting

factors of trade, technology transfer, and finance which seem to suggest a less fractured global system. And while the increased political cooperation associated with economic regionalization is noteworthy, institutional and cultural obstacles to full political union remain. Despite these disavowals, however, in the final analysis, there has been a fundamental shift in the scale and patterns of economic integration   throughout the world over the last few decades.

Statesmen and scholars, businessmen and bankers, scientists and craftsmen, laborers and farmers, citizens and refugees have encountered these historical changes of the last centuries, and of recent decades, in particular. They have tried to conceptualize these phenomena, and one of the insights they have offered is the new use of an old word: governance. Based on a common understanding of the background of today's global political economy, let us consider the theories and concepts of contemporary governance.

II   Concepts and Theories

As the previous section indicated, the background to our present world is a complex dynamic of human interactions which show some noticeable convergence in the political-economic order. A focus on processes highlights the changes which have taken place in world politics, while attention to emergent patterns reveals a functioning order. Conceptualizing this complexity is not easy, but one effort to do so has been associated with the English word " governance" . The choice of this term is neither totally arbitrary, nor obviously self-explanatory; and so I will try to situate this concept within its ideational context, as well as its historical milieu.

The word " governance" is related to both the verb " to govern" and the noun " government" . Without going into a detailed explanation of the various meanings of these terms, I would point out that they derive from the Greek and Latin words meaning " to steer" ; and they refer to various aspects of rule, regulation, control, and so on. As the title of a recent book

suggests [2] , the term " governance" is a wider, more inclusive concept than that of " government" ; we normally use the latter word to suggest more limited meanings such as institutions or a system connected to the ruling of a state. Before its present popular revival, the term " governance" was usually understood in a more general or abstract sense, and could be applied to the function of ruling in a variety of circumstances, inside and outside the state. In this article, I suggest using the neologism " cogovernance" to specify the concept more clearly. The justification for this terminology will, I hope, become apparent as I explain the history of some of the ideas which are behind the concept.

During the 1970s, the term " governability" was widely used in discussions addressed to a whole range of problems faced by states, especially democratic states (and their governments), at that time. The 1960s had been a period of considerable domestic turmoil in many countries regarded as economically advanced and politically eufunctional. While the explanations for such turmoil varied, it was widely perceived that the period from the mid-1960s to the early 1970s had been marked not only by political discontinuities, but also be social and cultural upheavals. Within and among countries, economic change was both rapid and destabilizing. Although some of the violent events of the period--the Vietnam War, the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China, war and terrorism in the Middle East, student unrest in several parts of the world--erupted in disparate places, observers suggested that there were common characteristics and an inescapable interconnectedness among them. Questions were asked about the resiliency of democracy as a political ideology and set of institutions for contemporaneous politics.

I do not want to exaggerate either the linguistic or the conceptual connection between those discussions of " governability" and the more recent treatment of " governance" . But there are overtones of caution and control in some current discourses which use the latter term which call to

2   James N. Rosenau and Ernst-Otto Czempiel eds. , <u>Governance without Government: Order and Change in World Politics</u> Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1992 .

mind some of the issues related to the former term. It may simply be a function of the root word " govern" in English, which admits of a wide range of connotations with various normative evaluations; or it may be that some of the unsettling aspects of change which were highlighted in the earlier discussions of " governability" have found their way into later treatments of problems of order examined through the concept of " governance".

For example, Nira Wickramasinghe notes that the term " good governance" began to be used by the World Bank and the United States government in the period 1985-1989. [3] In a report of the World Bank published in 1989, good governance included features such as: an efficient public service; the accountable administration of public funds; a participatory approach to decision making; respect for the law and human rights at all levels of government; a pluralistic institutional structure; and a free press. [4] However, the emphasis on participatory political forms was less evident in a later World Bank report, which emphasizes technical solutions such as public sector management, accountability, the legal framework for development, and information and transparency. In this 1992 report, the Bank identifies a " more relevant definition" of governance for Bank purposes as " the manner in which power is exercised in the management of a country's economic and social resources for development." [5] A kind of creeping negativeness, therefore, can be read into some uses of the word governance, in which there are connotations of orderliness in contrast to representativeness or democracy. [6] In a 1996 number of <u>Kokusai</u>

3 Nira Wickramasinghe, " From Human Rights to Good Governance: The Aid Regime in the 1990s," in <u>The New World Order: Sovereignty, Human Rights and the Self-Determination of Peoples</u>, ed. Mortimer Sellers Oxford, U.K.: Berg, 1996 , p. 315.

4 <u>World Bank, Sub-Saharan Africa: From Crisis to Sustainable Growth</u> Washington, D.C.: World Bank, 1989 , esp. pp. 54-62. On p. 60, the World Bank gives its definition of governance: " By governance is meant the exercise of political power to manage a nation's affairs." This is clearly a narrower definition than that used by many analysts.

5 World Bank, <u>Governance and Development</u> Washington, D.C.: World Bank, 1992 , esp. p. 3, and note 1 on p. 58.

6 The author would like to thank Inoguchi Takashi for pointing out the shift from democracy discourse to governance discourse which is found in some who are wary of greater democratization. Personal communication, September 11, 1996.

Kyooryoku Puraza, a monthly journal supported by the Japanese Foreign Ministry, Japan's Ambassador to Cambodia, Naitoo Shoohei, used the term "good governance" with a strong emphasis on technical competence in economic assistance projects and on links between domestic implementation and the wishes of the international donor. This approach skirts the issue of political conditionality for aid, while suggesting the need for accountability in its use. [7]

The use of the word governance is certainly not limited to the connotations examined above, nor to the related policy-oriented issues. Some have applied adjectives such a "international" and "global" to the term. Oran Young writes of "international governance" in protecting the environment in a stateless society, with reference to theories of regimes and institutionalism, important theoretical approaches in the contemporary study of international relations. [8] The Commission on Global Governance uses the term "global governance" with nuances of democratization, the interactions of many actors (not only states, but international organizations and private groupings of civil society) in the global political economy, and a normative call to greater cooperation to meet urgent human needs. [9] The Development and Peace Foundation (Stiftung Entwicklung und Frieden) explicates "global governance" in terms of the different levels of actions (United Nations organizations, projects of regional integration, international regimes, the nation-state, local politics, and national and global civil society), as well as the legal and ethical dimensions of its realization, particularly in the context of a reformed United Nations. [10]

7 "Guddo Gabanansu Jitsugen wo Nihon ga Riido: Naitoo Shoohei Chuu-Kanbojia Nihon Taishi ni Kiku," Japan's Lead in Realizing Good Governance: An Interview with Japan's Ambassador to Cambodia, Naitoo Shoohei Kokusai Kyooryoku Puraza Plaza for International Cooperation , Vol. 27(September 1996 , pp. 8-10

8 Oran R. Young, International Governance: Protecting the Environment in a Stateless Society Ithaca, U.S.A.: Cornell University Press, 1994 .

9 Our Global Neighborhood: The Report of the Commission on Global Governance, ed. The Commission on Global Governance New York, U.S.A.: Oxford University Press, 1995 .

10 Dirk Messner and Franz Nuscheler, Global Governance: Challenges to German Politics on the Threshold of the Twenty-First Century Development and Peace Foundation, Policy Paper 2, 1996 .

Although different issues are addressed in these various works, the analytical focus converges, and is in line with the approach found in the book edited by Rosenau and Czempiel (see note 2). Governance is seen as a broader concept than the familiar " governments" which we are familiar with. It involves many actors in a political economy which has become globalized, but in which local and individual initiative, creativity, and responsibility are important. It suggests new types and degrees of human cooperation to address changing conditions. It admits the unsatisfactory realities of our world while offering a view of how progress might be attained. It is in this context that I use the term cogovernance as a word for contemporary governance. This neologism points to the fact that there are indeed questions of rule and order which contemporary governance must address (the " governance" part of the term), but that today's world does involve and should involve the interactions of many types of actors on a wide range of issues which affect a global public, all of humanity (the " co" part of the term).

Cogovernance, therefore, is a type of political order suited to the contemporary world. It is not a denial of government or politics, or merely a vague awareness of the interconnectedness which exists among the actors at various levels of the global political economy. Building on the understanding of interdependence which has emerged in recent decades and on a commitment to cooperation in the process of addressing human needs, cogovernance identifies a dynamic of participatory rule. Global and local, international and domestic, macro and micro are viewed as effectively linked in the actual world in which we live, as well as being bound together in moral solidarity. The theoretical debate in the field of international relations could be advanced by recognizing the above meanings; perhaps use of the technical term " cogovernance" could further that project. In the next two sections of this article, I will demonstrate what this meaning of cogovernance implies by examining some particular issues and offering a typology of its contents.

III Particular Issues and Related Approaches

To illustrate its significance for an understanding of international relations, I will examine two complex issues whose dynamics are clarified by using the concept of cogovernance. First, I will discuss contemporary nationalism, and its extreme forms which are shown in ethnic conflicts. Then, I will consider the movement of people within and between countries, including its various manifestations such as labor migration, urbanization, and refugees.

Although the global political economy undoubtedly shows some tendencies toward higher and wider levels of integration, the vigor of small-scale groups and locally-based traditions continues unabated. The social or psychological bases for such vigor could be debated, including consideration of the capacity of human beings to achieve coherent identities in their interpersonal milieux. Given the scope of this chapter, I will limit my attention primarily to the modern problematique of nationalism.

Nationalisms have been powerful socio-political forces throughout the modern period, and particularly since the American and French revolutions of the eighteenth century. While these nationalisms illustrate the paradox of particularistic social and cultural patterns (in the various nations of the world) overlapping with common convergence on the institutions of the nation-state (the form of polity which, in the world as a whole, continues to exert the most influence on the lives of most people), they show a resilience in surviving or even multiplying despite the centralizing tendencies of global imperialism and world-wide technological and market forces. Ideologies of nationalism express and reinforce themselves through the institutional norms of " sovereignty" and " national self-determination" in international relations. When the empires of the twentieth century fractured after the First and Second World Wars and the downfall of Communism, the preferred successor polities have been nation-states, supported by national identities or nationalist ideologies. This alone is sufficient evidence of the geographical and political limits of an otherwise growing interdependence.

But it would be misleading to speak in dualistic terms of a triumph of nationalism over internationalism or interdependence. For the twentieth century can also be identified as the age of international organizations. The League of Nations and the United Nations are the most prominent general organizations of this type, but they are only the tip of the iceberg of tens of thousands of intergovernmental and nongovernmental organizations with prominent roles in the conduct of public life in fields as diverse as education and aviation, health and politics. [11] For example, decolonization led not only to the establishment of newly independent states in Africa and Asia, but also to institutions like the Lome Convention, the Organization of African Unity, and the regional development banks, which are aimed at bridging the boundaries between the new states and their former metropoles, as well as among the new states themselves. Similarly, the break-up of the Soviet Union was followed by the establishment of a Commonwealth of Independent States and an expanded and proactive Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. These intergovernmental, supergovernmental, and nongovernmental (but effectively crossborder) institutions illustrate how cogovernance is a reality beyond the nation-state.

Beneath the level of the nation-state, as well, a flowering of small-scale groups and local traditions in many parts of the world confirms that nationalism and the nation-state do not establish a lower limit for either socio-cultural life or political economy. For example, along with the growth of the European Union and a European identity above the nation-states of Europe, there have also been vigorous regional movements in such diverse places as Scotland and the Po Valley, the Basque country and Brittany. While reports of economic growth in China and India are often aggregated at the country level, more detailed analysis suggests that there are enormous differences among the various regions of these vast countries, with centrifugal economic and social forces at work.

---

11 <u>Yearbook of International Organizations 1996/1997</u>, 33rd edition, 3 volumes, ed. by Union of International Associations. Munich, Germany: K. G. Saur, 1996 . This reference work lists 22,191 active organizations.

The composite effect of these political currents above, below, and around the level of the nation-state is a de facto transfer of political power to a range of authorities, such as international organizations, cities, and regions (both within states and across state boundaries). Regulation of trade, provision of military defense, and establishment of standards for the legal protection of citizens continue to be influenced by the governments of states, but by no means are they dominated merely by the choices or actions of states. Political rule is not the prerogative of a self-contained " sovereign state," but the dynamic of discrete decisions and interactive processes at many levels of politicization, for which I use the term cogovernance. [12]

These trends are exemplified well in the changing dynamics of the movement of people. [13]   Migration is not a new social phenomenon, but the causes and consequences of human migration today are different from those of previous eras. Contemporary institutions such as the International Migration Organization and United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, multinational enterprises, and the mass media directly affect societal changes in this field. Some phenomena, such as urbanization, have significance mostly for local areas and individual countries. Other elements, such as international labor migration and refugee flows, are, by definition, international in character, but with strong local characteristics, as well.

As industrialization has increased throughout the world, rural areas have provided the labor force for concentrated enterprises. This has often led to depopulation of traditional agricultural regions and the expansion of urban districts. On a world scale, the growth of mega-cities within the last generation has brought about unprecedented concentrations of people, especially in developing countries. In fact, some historically developed

---

12 A summary of the issues which this political reality poses for international relations theory may be found in Yale H. Ferguson and Richard W. Mansbach, " Between Celebration and Despair: Constructive Suggestions for Future International Theory," International Studies Quarterly 1991 , 35:363-386.

13 For a comprehensive survey, see The Cambridge Survey of World Migration, ed. Robin Cohen Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1995 . Also, Aron Segal, An Atlas of International Migration London, U.K.: Hans Zell Publishers, 1993 .

industrial zones have been " hollowed out" by the shift of production processes to other areas. Both political and cultural factors account for the fact that most labor migration to meet these needs has occurred within countries. But the economic recovery of Western Europe after World War II was accompanied by a generally south to north movement of people, and has resulted in new multiculturalisms and a reinterpretation of the political significance of citizenship for the enjoyment of human rights in many European countries. [14]   Similar reconsideration of the rights of citizens and denizens have also occurred in other countries throughout the world.

The intergovernmental structures for displaced persons, asylum seekers, and refugees were established after World War II with attention to the problem of accommodating people affected by new state boundaries and by the ideological conflict between communism and liberal democracy. [15] Over time, however, movements of people were affected more directly by such factors as warfare, economic disruption, environmental crises, and large-scale human rights violations. The African Convention Governing the Specific Aspects of Refugee Problems in Africa (adopted by the Organization of African Unity, 10 September 1969) has taken some of these realities into account; and international agencies have accommodated their programs to the needs of uprooted people, regardless of the strictures of their mandates. In fact, internally displaced persons (" refugees" inside their own countries) are recognized as subjects of international concern, further obfuscating the boundary between domestic and international, and blurring the meaning of state sovereignty.

The two themes of nationalism and the movement of people in the

---

14 Yasemin N. Soysal, <u>Limits of Citizenship: Migrants and Postnational Membership in Europe</u> Chicago, U.S.A.: The University of Chicago Press, 1994 . For a review of the post-war European experience, see Anthony M. Messina, " The Not So Silent Revolution: Postwar Migration to Western Europe," <u>World Politics</u> 49.1(October 1996 , pp. 130-154

15 For a comprehensive reexamination of the global trends and institutions in this field, see Gil Loescher, <u>Beyond Charity: International Cooperation and the Global Refugee Crisis</u> New York, U.S.A.: Oxford University Press, 1993 .

contemporary world merge together in the case of Europe. [16]   The trends toward greater economic and political integration of the continent have existed from the 1950s, and have accelerated since the demise of communism and the re-identification of the integrating institution as the European Union. While national identities continue to exert a strong appeal to peoples in Europe, political upheavals and regional economic gaps have contributed to large-scale movements of people throughout the continent. The flow of people for political asylum, economic advantage, and cultural enrichment itself changes the stock of people within the various parts of the European territory, and it has modified political identities and the roles of institutions, particularly in the crucial field of human rights. [17]   In addition to the legal organs of states, social norms and supragovernmental institutions help to guarantee people the achievement of their basic rights, an effective demonstration of how cogovernance is a multi-level, multi-dimensional fact.

IV. A Typology of Cogovernance

In the previous section we considered two brief cases--nationalism and migration--in which use of the concept cogovernance has helped us to understand contemporary trends in international relations. In this brief article it would be impossible to touch on all of the issues in today's world which could be addressed with this concept, but the reader may legitimately expect an outline or typology of how the concept could be used more generally to understand the issues facing our world, and more particularly the issues facing Japan. And so, in this section, I will offer a sketch of such a

16 David Wessels, " Migration and Identity in a Uniting Europe," Occasional Paper Series 9:OP:5   Notre Dame, Indiana, U.S.A.: The Joan B. Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies, 1995 . A Japanese version of this paper is available as David Wessels, " Yooroppa Toogoo to Nashonarizumu: Gendai Yooroppa ni Okeru Aidentiti ni Kan Suru Shomondai," in N. Kimura and K. Imai eds. , Minzoku Mondai no Genzai Tokyo: Sairyuusha, 1996 , pp. 11-38.

17 David Jacobson, Rights Across Borders: Immigration and the Decline of Citizenship Baltimore, U.S.A.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996 . James F. Hollifield, Immigrants, Markets, and States: The Political Economy of Postwar Europe Cambridge, Massachusetts, U.S.A.: Harvard University Press, 1992 .

typology, with some samples of how important issues facing the world, and especially Japan, might be viewed from this perspective.

I have already noted in passing that one aspect of cogovernance is the different levels, above and below and around the nation-state, which this concept encompasses. The Commission on Global Governance used the striking metaphor of " global neighborhood" to suggest the interweaving of political affairs and civil society at the global level. [18]   To avoid any connotations of superordinate or subordinate which the term " level" might suggest, we could speak of various neighborhoods corresponding to global, nation-state, and local loci. Other neighborhoods or levels, such as cross-border " regions" could also be envisaged, but these three are sufficient for the present typology.

Given these various neighborhoods, the concept of governance which applies to them could then be considered along two principal axes of human aggregation and issue content. The human aggregation axis would stretch from a formal or institutional end to an informal or network end, along a continuum including global organization, international regime, the government of nation-states, civil society, and persons. The issue content would range across a hard to soft axis, with the continuum including military, economic, legal, social, and cultural affairs. The following chart (Chart 1) illustrates how these two axes of governance intersect, and yields a more complete image of cogovernance than many analyses which focus attention too narrowly on one or another segment of the chart.

18   Our Global Neighborhood, op. cit., note 9.

CHART 1. Axes of Governance

Of course, the dynamics of issues in international relations cannot be confined to boxes on a chart, and there would be many issues which overlap boxes. For example, many issues of international political economy today would overlap boxes B2 (regime, economic), B3 (regime, legal), C2 (government, economic), and C3 (government, legal), among others.

Another important aspect of governance is its normative evaluation. Does the rule which is exercised by political agents meet fundamental criteria of justice? Is the authority invested in these agents regarded as legitimate by others who are affected by their choices and actions? International institutions, governments, and nongovernmental organizations of all sorts face public scrutiny and are held to the standards of political ideals which are debated freely by specialists and people generally. In the contemporary world, human rights and the processes of democracy--along with such basic goals as peace, socio-economic equity, and ecological harmony--are prominent features of legitimate governance. Integrating this normative dimension into a typology of cogovernance requires us to address the question of whether certain policies, actions, and institutional arrangements may be regarded as legitimate or not.

Applying these concepts all together, a composite picture of some major issues of global governance today would include attention to the neighborhoods of political society which are involved in the issue and to the

237

normative evaluation which we might give to how that issue is being addressed. This is not meant in a deterministic sense that humanity is unable to solve the problems which it faces or is fixed in certain structural constraints. It provides, rather, an agenda for thought and action in dealing with the real problems of international relations today. Chart 2, though limited in content, is meant to suggest such an agenda and open a perspective on how the concept of cogovernance can be used in a comprehensive analysis of international relations.

CHART 2 Issues of Global Governance

Note: In Chart 2, the vertical and horizontal dimensions correspond to the axes of governance identified in Chart 1 (above). The " neighborhoods" or primary levels of the issues are identified by use of lines above and/or below the issue cited: " global" issues have an underline; " nation-state" issues

have lines above and below them; " local" issues have a line above them (see box above). The normative evaluation is summarized by upper-case letters meaning " legitimate" and lower-case letters meaning " illegitimate" (see box above).

In Chart 2, I offer a sample of how some of the issues of governance which are salient throughout the world could be situated in the typology which has been presented here. It is a sketchy presentation, but I think it is enough to enable the reader to extrapolate to a more general treatment of the issues identified therein, or how other issues of global governance might be identified within this kind of framework. For example, nuclear proliferation and the global arms trade are regarded primarily as global neighborhood problems situated at the regime point on the human aggregation axis and having military and economic components on the issue content axis. On the other hand, discrimination against women is treated as primarily a local neighborhood problem, toward the social and cultural end of the issue content axis. Political leadership is a positive element of global governance, with special significance at the level of the nation-state, situated at approximately the intersection of the government and legal points on the two axes. Reflecting its nascent existence, the international criminal court is located near the regime point on the vertical axis, rather than at the higher organizational level.

A similar sketch of some major issues of governance affecting Japan is found in Chart 3.

CHART 3Issues of Governance for Japan

Note: In Chart 3, axes of governance, neighborhoods, and the normative evaluation of the issue are shown as in Chart 2. While there are similar issues of governance in other countries, in localities and regions, or in the world as a whole, those noted here are salient to Japan.

For example, although it most seriously affects Okinawa, the issue of the location and operation of United States military bases in Japan is a country-wide problem, with organizational dimensions relating to the institutions of the U.S.-Japanese alliance; it has military and economic dimensions which are highlighted by locating it on Chart 3 in the upper-left corner. Japan's recent involvement in United Nations peacekeeping activities is viewed as a positive step at the level of the Japanese nation-state, a military issue with clear governmental involvement. A socio-cultural issue in Japanese civil

society and among the Japanese public generally is identified here as "views of history," particularly the still unsettled understanding of Japan's aggression in World War II.

I do not intend to examine the issues of Charts 2 and 3 in any detail, but will refer the reader to treatment of some of them in the chapters by Naya, Miwa, Watanuki, and Yashiro in the recent publication <u>Gabanansu to Nihon</u> [19]. This book also includes the results of a survey sponsored by the Institute of International Relations of Sophia University, which shows that among the people of Japan, there is an awareness of, though not a consensus on many of the issues of governance facing Japan and the world today. The typology of governance presented here is offered as a relevant, comprehensive way to view contemporary issues, and thus as part of a process of academic analysis and public discussion of them.

V   Concluding Remarks

In this article I have discussed the concept of cogovernance as a key to the comprehensive understanding of today's global issues. Neither the problems which confront the contemporary world nor the policies adopted to address those problems can be understood in isolation from the broader picture of issues and human aggregations in which they are embedded. While various "neighborhoods" of global politics, the nation-state, and localities are especially pertinent to the current configuration of issues, the overlapping and interaction of issue areas are highlighted in this model of cogovernance.

Political leaders, social analysts, and ordinary people are conscious of the many facets of contemporary political life which fit only awkwardly, if at all, into traditional analytical frameworks or behavioral patterns. To advance the thinking in this area, I have gone beyond the mere listing of analytical anomalies and offered a conceptual framework for the understanding of today's conditions based on cogovernance. Political life and policy debate

19 <u>Gabanansu to Nihon: Kyoochi no Mosaku</u> Governance and Japan, ed. M. Naya and D. Wessels Tokyo: Keisoo Shoboo, 1997.

have been hampered by inadequate theoretical concepts until now. Reflecting on the problems of global governance and refining the recent discourse on themes of governance have led me to offer these considerations on cogovernance as an appropriate tool with which to approach contemporary issues.

   Given the complex political identities which people form in our paradoxical global village and the uncertainties which accompany interactive changes in technology, economy, and thought, observers have noted a shift away from hitherto dominant patterns of political authority and socio-economic organization. Some have imagined a world of distinct, functionally specific organs for international cooperation. Others have opined that the global system is moving toward, if it has not already reached, a neo-feudalism, in which personal identities, the size of territorial units, and patterns of rule somehow resemble a pre-Westphalian or pre-nation-state model. Still others have decried the existence of fractured polities, or have directed attention to certain aspects of regions based on territory or civilizations rooted in religions or cultures.

   The 1995 survey of the Institute of International Relations of Sophia University [20] , taken a half-century after the end of World War II and the founding of the United Nations Organization, gives some indications of how Japanese people see themselves and situate their political ideas and actions at the current historical moment. Now, as our world approaches a new century and new millenium, we have an appropriate occasion to consider the conditions of our planet and the potential of people everywhere to participate in the building of our human future [21]   and to reconsider international

20 In addition to the book indicated in note 19, the following study also analyzes part of that survey: Watanuki Joji, " Political Generations in Post World War II Japan, With Some Comparisons to the Case of Germany," Research Papers Series A-64 Tokyo: Sophia University Institute of International Relations, 1995 .

21 A reflection on the future of human security may be found in the chapter by Hirose in the volume Gabanansu to Nihon see note 19 .For a survey and analysis of the theme of " human security" in the international relations literature, see Kurusu Kaoru, " Ningen no Anzen Hoshoo" Human Security , Kokusai Seiji International Relations , Vol. 117 March 1998 , pp. 85 102.

relations from the new perspective of contemporary governance. The contribution of the concept of cogovernance to a more comprehensive, synthetic reflection on these issues will be a standard by which to judge its relevance for theory and action.