Global Governance and Global Politics

Manuel Castells, *University of Southern California, Los Angeles*

The world is undergoing a process of structural transformation in multiple dimensions: technological, economic, cultural, and institutional. This creates as many opportunities as it induces perils. Perhaps the most fundamental problem we now face is *the crisis of political institutions in charge of managing the transition*. We know the problems, we understand the issues, and in many countries there is enough political will to tackle the questions to be addressed. However, the organizational and institutional tools of governance are either insufficient or inadequate. Furthermore, the crisis of governance is related to a crisis of political legitimacy, characterized by increasing distance between citizens and their representatives. Both crises feed into each other, threatening with political paralysis and opening the way both for authoritarian policies and for demagogic revolts.

Social movements and grassroots organizations, as well as a variety of social actors, are trying to fill the current void of representation and legitimate policy making. A global civil society is in the making. However, its contribution to solving the problems of our world is limited because of the segmentation of the interests and values underlying its diverse components. Their connection to national and international institutions is complex and problematic. In other words, the transition from a reactive civil society to a proactive reform of institutions of governance faces formidable obstacles. This lecture aims at identifying the factors underlying the political crisis of global governance, as well as at pinpointing the trends that foreshadow pathways for reconstructing democratic policy making under the new conditions of globalization, cultural transformation, and a technological paradigm shift.

Manuel Castells *is the Wallis Annenberg Chair Professor of Communication and Society at the University of Southern California, Los Angeles. He is also professor emeritus of sociology and planning, University of California at Berkeley, and distinguished visiting professor of technology and society at MIT. He is the author of 21 books, including the trilogy* The Information Age: Economy, Society, and Culture *(Blackwell, 1996–2004), translated in 20 languages.*

The Crisis of Political Legitimacy

In April 2004, a report issued by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), and directed by Dante Caputo, on "Democracy in Latin America" found that 54.7% of people surveyed would prefer an authoritarian regime if it would better help alleviate poverty and economic difficulties. Only 43% of Latin Americans fully supported democracy, while 30.5% conditioned their support to their living conditions, and another 26.5% were critical of democracy. These attitudes came from a continent that has suffered for decades from the lack of democracy. Yet, the widespread popular feeling is that instead of a democratic culture, what has arisen in Latin America is an electoral culture manipulated by the political elites. These findings are not specific to Latin America. Indeed, in recent years, considerable evidence points to the increasing alienation of citizens vis á vis their political representatives, and the institutions of representation. Such a trend seems to be present worldwide, with the significant exception of Scandinavian democracies. These were the findings of the two worldwide surveys of representative samples of the world population that Gallup conducted in 1999 for the Millennium Assembly of the United Nations and in 2002 for the World Economic Forum. In the 1999 survey, 62.1% of the 57,000 persons interviewed in 60 countries believed that their countries were not governed by the will of their people. When asked to select a term that would better describe their perception of the government, their main choices were "corrupt" and "bureaucratic." The sample included citizens in the United States and Western Europe. In the 2002 survey, the percentage of people who thought they were not governed by their will was 52% in North America and 61% in the European Union. Fifty-one percent of people in the world found little or no trust in parliaments, a proportion that increased to 59% in the European Union. The least trusted institutions were multinational companies, parliaments, political parties, and governments. The most trusted institutions were the armed forces, NGOs, and the United Nations. Similar results can be found for European democracies in the Euro barometer. The World Values Survey, directed by Ronald Inglehart at the University of Michigan, also showed that from 1997–2001 in the countries included in the survey of political attitudes, the majority of citizens thought that their "government was run by a few big interests looking out for themselves." In the U.S., this proportion in 2000 was 63.2%. On the other hand, on the basis of evidence provided by a variety of surveys, a high percentage of people feel able to change the world. But they feel empowered not through the political system but through autonomous mobilization. This search for political alternatives is changing the political landscape, although not always in the direction of democracy. In country after country around the world, in the last decade people have turned to political outsiders, punished the incumbent leaders, or voted in dwindling numbers. In California, according to polls directed by Mark Baldassare for the Public Policy Institute of California in 1998 and 2000, 70% of citizens believed that "government is run by a few big interests looking out for themselves," and 39% thought that "quite a few people in government are crooked." This attitude undoubtedly influenced the public decision to recall and replace California's elected governor was used in California with an outsider who promised to "terminate" the professional political class, despite being a candidate of the Republican Party. The voter revolts in France and the Netherlands in 2003 had similar tones. While ideologies change in each context, the common trend is the rejection of the political establishment and the expression of political protest.

This widespread crisis of political legitimacy threatens to undo the democratic system, and with it, the ability to

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096505055678 Published online by Cambridge University Press

manage the problems and issues of a world in turmoil. But unless we acknowledge the crisis and understand its roots, the rejection of populism and demagogy will not be taken as the defence of our principles but as the proof of our hypocrisy. At the source of this crisis are a number of well known factors concerning the emphasis on simplified image making induced by media politics: domination of interest groups due to the system of campaign financing; expensive media and marketing politics that push parties to use illegal financing, and, at times, corruption; and what John Thompson has labelled scandal politics, based on character assassination and exposure or fabrication of wrong doing as a weapon of choice. But I contend that the crisis of legitimacy has a deeper structural underpinning: the increasing inability of the political system anchored in the nation state to represent citizens in the effective practice of global governance and the ascendance of global governance as an increasingly essential component of national and local governance.

In this lecture I will develop this argument and I show how the emergence of a global civil society is related to the attempt by the people to regain political control under the new conditions of power making and governance.

Globalization and the State

The concept of globalization is that we live in societies in which the core functions are determined by globally articulated processes that have the capacity to operate as a unit on a planetary scale in real or chosen time. Communication and transportation technologies, the globally inter-related media, and the worldwide diffusion of the Internet and other computer networks, as well as the spread of wireless communication, are the material backbone of a global interdependence that, of course, was not technogically driven but technologically mediated. It is not necessary to analyze here the origins and features of the process of globalization—a number of academic works, some of which are cited in the references, have settled the issue.

In this lecture the reality of the process of globalization is just an empirical starting point. This includes:

- The existence of a global economy, meaning: a) global interdependency of financial markets; b) internationalization of production, management, and distribution of goods and services around a core of multinational corporations and their ancillary networks; c) largely as a result of b, international trade (reflecting the internationalization of production) as a key component of economic growth; d) internationalization of science, technology, and know-how at the source of productivity and competitiveness for firms, regions, and countries; e) segmented internationalization of the labor force, with the formation of a demand-driven global labor market for the high end of talent and a supply-driven international migration of labor for all levels of skill.
- A global media system, characterized by the interrelation of global and local processes of communication in an interdependent, multilayered system. The global media system is at the heart of the emergence of globally diffused, locally appropriated cultural processes.
- The management of the environment as a planetary issue characterized by the irreversible damage caused by unsustainable development, and the need to counter this deterioration with a global, long term conservation strategy.
- The globalization of human rights, and the emergence of the issue of social justice for the planet at large.
- Global security as a shared problem, e.g., proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, global terrorism, and the practice of the politics of fear under the pretext of fighting terrorism.

Overall, the critical issues conditioning everyday life for people and their governments in every country are largely produced and shaped by globally interdependent processes that go beyond the realm of countries as defined by the territories under the sovereignty of a given state. Under such conditions, a number of processes constitute the new landscape of global politics. There is a growing gap between the space where the issues are defined (global) and the space where the issues are managed (the nation-state). This is at the source of four distinct, while related, political crises that affect the institutions of national governance:

- Crisis of efficiency: problems cannot be adequately managed, e.g., major environmental issues, such as global warming; regulation of financial markets; or counter-terrorism intelligence.
- Crisis of legitimacy: political representation based on democracy in the nation state becomes simply a vote of confidence on the ability of the nation state to manage its interests in the global web of policy making. It cannot be a specific mandate, given the variable geometry of policy making and the unpredictability of the issues. Political representation is increasingly distant, with greater between citizens and their representatives. This crisis of legitimacy is exasperated by the practice of media politics and the politics of scandal as the privileged mechanisms to access power. Image making substitutes for issue debating, partly due to the fact that major issues can no longer be decided in the national space.
- Crisis of identity: as people see their nation and their culture increasingly disjointed from the mechanisms of political decision making in a global, multinational network, their claim of autonomy takes the form of resistance identity and cultural identity politics as opposed to their political identity as citizens.
- Crisis of equity: The process of market-led globalization often increases inequality between countries, and between social groups within countries, because of its ability to induce faster economic growth in some areas while bypassing others. In the absence of a global regulatory environment that compensates for growing inequality, existing welfare states come under stress as a result of economic competitiveness, and countries without welfare states have greater difficulty compensating for structurally induced inequality because of the lesser capacity of national institutions to act as compensatory mechanisms.

As a result of these crises, and of the difficulties for governments to act upon them, non-governmental actors become the voices and the movements that defend the needs, interests, and values of people at large, thus undermining even further the central role of governments in responding to the stress induced by globalization and structural transition.

New Projects of Governance: Utopias, Ideologies, and the Pragmatic Emergence of Global Governance in the form of the Network State

The increasing inability of nation states to confront and manage the globalization of the issues central to their governance leads to alternative projects of governance proposed by various actors. The most relevant of these projects are:

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096505055678 Published online by Cambridge University Press

a) The constitution of a world government, on the basis of current international institutions, creating a system of institutional relationships between current nation states and international institutions, and leading to a human rights-founded world constitution with institutions of global governance established over a period of time. This is Jürgen Habermas´dream. Indeed, the federalist project for the European Union, put forward by the German Green Party and other influential forces and leaders in Germany (e.g., Ulrich Beck, Joshka Fischer), is a transition step to the world government. However, as both Habermas and Beck acknowledge, what they call a cosmopolitan system of governance could only be the result of the rise of a cosmopolitan culture in civil societies around the world. In fact, public opinion data and political trends point in the opposite direction, in Europe as elsewhere. There is considerable reluctance in Europe to surrender more attributes of national sovereignty, and this is unthinkable in decisive countries such as the United States, China, Russia, India, Japan, and Brazil. Thus, for global governance to succeed it must find ways other than from the mechanical transposition of the federal state to the international stage.

b) Nation states are confronted with increasing managerial difficulties in the age of global networks. Two often dovetailing solutions have recently arisen to deal with this issue:

- The market takes care of economic growth and equilibrium, with minimal supervision and correction from government.
- The global civil society, made up of NGOs and other forms of aggregation of interests, organizes popular expression and representation, connecting to the government as the processor of these projects and demands in the institutional system.

Therefore, the *de facto* system of governance is broadening through citizen participation in the political dimension, and through public/partnerships in the management of the economy and of major global issues (e.g., social rights, the environment).

c) In the extreme, neo-anarchist tendencies in contemporary social movements seek the dissolution of the state and its replacement by Internet-enacted networks of people, NGOs, and grassroots organizations in all levels of society.

However, nation states, in spite of their multidimensional crisis, do not disappear, they adapt to the new context, and their pragmatic transformation is the real agent of change in today's landscape of politics and policy making. This transformation is influenced, and fought over, by the alternative projects and models I have mentioned: they are cultural/ideational material on which political and social interests work to enact the transformation of the state. By nation states I mean the institutional set comprising a national government: the parliament, the political party system, the judiciary, and the state bureaucracy. In each country, this entire system transforms itself in respond to the crises, by three main mechanisms:

i) By associating with each other and forming diverse networks of states falling into three categories: multipurpose and constitutionally defined, such as the European Union; focused on a set of issues, generally trade issues, e.g., Mercosur or NAFTA; or spaces of coordination and debate, e.g., APEC or ASEAN. In the strongest networks, the states share sovereignty.

ii) By building an increasingly dense network of international institutions and supranational organizations to deal with global issues. These constitute two types: general purpose institutions, e.g., United Nations; and specialized institutions, e.g., WTO, IMF, World Bank, NATO, etc. There are also ad hoc international semi-institutions defined around a set of issues, e.g., the treaties on the global environment and their institutions.

iii) By decentralizing power and resources in the hope of increasing legitimacy, and by connecting with people's identity, through devolution of power to regional governments, to local governments, and to NGOs that extend the decision making process in the civil society.

All in all, *the emerging network state* is characterized by:

- shared sovereignty and responsibility
- flexibility of procedures of governance
- greater diversity of times and spaces in the relationship between governments and citizens

However, the whole system develops in a pragmatic way, by ad hoc decisions, ushering in often contradictory rules and institutions, and making the system of political representation much more obscure and removed from political control. Efficiency improves but the legitimacy of the nation state suffers, although overall political legitimacy may improve if local and regional institutions play their role. Yet, the growing autonomy of the local and regional state may bring the different levels of the state into contradiction against each other. It remains that the response of nation states to the crises of global governance is the constitution of a new form of state, the network state. In turn, this form of state induces new problems.

The Problems of the Solution: The Contradictions of the Network State

The practice of global governance through ad hoc networks, has a number of major problems derived from the contradiction between the historically constructed nature of the institutions that come into the network, and the new functions and mechanisms they have to assume in the network, while still relating to their nation-bound societies.

A *coordination problem*, with three aspects: organizational, technical, and political.

Organizational: agencies rooted in the protection of their turf, and in their privileged commanding position vis á vis their societies cannot have the same structure, reward systems, and operational principles, as those agencies whose fundamental role is to find synergy with other agencies.

Technical: protocols of communication do not work; the introduction of the Internet disorganizes rather than relates agencies. Agencies are resistant to networking technology that implies networking of their practice.

Political: coordination is not only horizontal between agencies, but also vertical in two senses: networking with their political decision makers, thus losing their bureaucratic autonomy; networking with their citizen constituencies, then being forced to democratize.

An ideological problem: coordinating a common policy means a common language and a set of shared values, for instance against market fundamentalism in the regulation of markets, or acceptance of sustainable development in environmental policy, or priority of human rights over the *raison d'etat* in security policy.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096505055678 Published online by Cambridge University Press

A geopolitical problem. Nation states still see the networks of governance as a negotiating table to impose their interests. There is a stalemate in the intergovernmental decision making processes because the culture of cooperation is still not there. The overarching principles are the domination of the personal/political/social interests in the commanding heights of each nation state. Global governance is seen as a field of opportunity to maximize each nation state's own interests, rather than a new context for political institutions to govern. In fact, the further the globalization process proceeds, the more the contradictions it generates (identity crises, economic crises, security crises) lead to a revival of nationalism, and to the primacy of sovereignty. Although this is a general trend for all countries, the key issue nowadays is American unilateralism, the policy of preemptive action, and putting national security first without concern for the destabilization of the world at large. This American hegemonism must be seen, however, as a specific policy of the Bush administration and its surrounding circle of neoconservatives. This was not the policy of previous administrations. While the damage wrought by Bush unilateralism may last for some time, it is essential to differentiate structural, long-term trends, and short-term aberrations in the policy of a major power, even if we know that aberrations may change the course of history. In other words: our world is multilateral, but Bush, at least until 2004, did not seem to know it. And the neoconservatives, who know it, are trying to reverse the trend for the benefit of their own ideological agenda. However, Bush may come to understand that his legacy will depend on returning to multilateralism. If this would be the case, the neoconservatives would be sacrificed on the new altar of a moral America. Yet, as long as these geopolitical contradictions persist, it is impossible for the world to shift from a pragmatic, ad hoc networking form of negotiated decision making to a system of constitutionally accepted networked global governance.

Tentative Paths Towards the Reconstruction of Democratic Governance in a Global Context

The reconstruction of a democratic political order on the international scene cannot be based on a multilateral agreement on the characteristics of a new world order. This would imply that the problem has been solved. We are at the preliminary stage: agreeing on how to manage disagreements. The most urgent issue in global governance is how to govern in a process of shared sovereignty assuming current disagreement; thus instituting processes of bargaining and control, with feedbacks in real time, on various dimensions: political, organizational, procedural, technical. If we start from observed practice in recent years, procedures to tackling problems of global governance include:

- Public/private partnerships.
- The development of a global civil society, with an increasing role for non-governmental actors in managing issues at the international level, thus bridging legitimacy in public opinion with global issues management.
- The emergence of the global movement for global justice that has forced a debate on issues and on mechanisms of representation.
- The redefinition of the role and organization of international institutions, and particularly of the United Nations, introducing into their practice public/private partnerships (e.g., UN Global Compact), particularly with multinational companies, and reaching out to the global civil society and to the global network of local governments.
- Attempts at defining a Universal Charts of Rights, leading to the formation of a Global Social Contract, as in the project of the International Labor Organization (ILO). There is a fragmented, global constitutional process, with treaties on the environment, on social rights, on labor rights, on children's rights, on women's rights, and on human rights at large. This has no teeth in itself, but then NGOs and civil society take it up, becoming the actors that process the principles into the media, then in the political system.
- Attempt to build new institutions on specific issues, e.g., The International Penal Court (albeit undermined by the refusal of the U.S., Russia, China, and India to acknowledge its jurisdiction); the Climate Change overseeing institutions; the WTO competition authority, etc.
- Media exposure and media campaigns as the inducers of a new culture, ultimately impacting the political system.
- Internet as a global, horizontal means of communication provides a public space, both as an organizing tool, and as a means for debate, dialogue, and collective decision making. Wireless communication increases autonomy of networks of communication.

Indeed, before 9/11, 2001, significant progress was being made toward the multilateral management of global issues, based on networking between national governments, international institutions, and the civil society. The threat of terrorism and the politics of fear practiced by several governments have temporarily derailed the prospects of international cooperation. But citizens around the world are not giving up, and in some cases, as in Spain in March 2004, they are transforming the political climate, inducing the conditions to restart cooperation and dialogue as predominant ways to tackle our problems, including security issues. Ultimately, the power of global civil society acting on public opinion via the media may overcome the resistance of state apparatuses to limit their power in exchange for increasing their legitimacy, and, ultimately, their efficiency.

The Multidimensional Global Civil Society

The crisis of legitimacy and the increasing difficulty of managing the world's problems on a global scale have induced the rise of a global civil society. However, this generic label lumps together several forms of organization and action, which are quite different, and even contradictory in their goals and effects. A distinction must be made between:

Grassroots organizations, community groups, labor unions, and interest groups, that, in every country, defend local or sectorial interests as well as specific values against or beyond the formal political process. Some analysts, particularly Robert Putnam, argue that this form of civic engagement is on the decline, as individualism ascends as the predominant culture of our societies. In fact, the reality is highly diverse in different areas of the world. For instance, community organizations have become a very important part of the social landscape in almost every Latin American country. The difference is that the sources of social organization are increasingly diversified: religion, particularly non-Catholic religious groups, plays a major role. In some cases, criminal organizations build their support networks in poor communities in exchange for patronage and forced protection. Or, people in the community, or women groups, or ecologists, or ethnic groups organize to have their

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096505055678 Published online by Cambridge University Press

voice heard and assert their identity. However, traditional forms of political and ideological sources of voluntary associations seem on the decline almost everywhere, although the patronage system continues to surround each major political party. Overall, this process amounts to a shift from the political system to informal and formal associations of interests and values as the source of collective action and sociopolitical influence. This is a strengthening of the local civil society to face the problems resulting from unchecked globalization. Properly speaking, this is not the global civil society, although it constitutes a milieu of organization, projects, and practices that nurture the growth of the global civil society.

A second trend is represented by the rise of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) with a global or international frame of reference in their action and goals. This is what most experts would name as the global civil society. These are private organizations (albeit often supported or partly financed by public institutions) that address global problems outside government channels. Often they affirm values that are universally recognized, but politically manipulated by governments in their own interest. In other words, international NGOs claim to be the enforcers of the unenforced human rights. A case in point is Amnesty International, whose influence stems from the fact that it is an equal opportunity critic of all cases of political, ideological, or religious repression, regardless of the political interest at stake. These are fundamental, uncompromising values that defy argument: torture is always wrong. The notion here is that even to fight evil, adopting evil practices is to offer victory to the very sources of destruction we are against. The affirmation of human rights on a comprehensive, global scale gives birth to thousands of NGOs that cover the entire span of the human experience, from poverty to illnesses, from hunger to epidemics, from women's rights to the defense of children, and from banning land mines to saving the whales. Médecins Sans Frontières, Oxfam, Greenpeace, and so many others, are well known examples. The annual reports prepared on the matter by the London School of Economics' center for the study of the global civil society provide ample evidence of the quantitative importance and qualitative relevance of this growing trend that has already altered the social and political management of global and local issues around the world. To understand the characteristics of the international NGOs, three features must be emphasized:

1) In contrast to political parties, these NGOs have considerable popularity and legitimacy, which translates to substantial funding through donations and widespread volunteer work.

2) NGOs focus on practical matters, specific cases, concrete expressions of human solidarity: saving children from famine, freeing a political prisoner with name and face, stopping the lapidation of a woman, blocking the destruction of indigenous culture by unsustainable development in one particular spot of the planet. What is fundamental here is that the classical political argument of rationalizing every decision in terms of the overall picture of politics is denied. Goals do not justify the means. The purpose is to act to undo evil or to do good in one specific instance. The positive output must be considered in itself, not as a way of moving in a positive direction. Because people have come to distrust the logic of instrumental politics, the method of direct action on direct outputs finds increasing support.

3) The key tactics of NGOs to achieve results, and build support for their causes, is media politics. It is through the media that they reach the public mind and mobilize people in support of these causes. So doing, they put pressure on governments beholden to the voters or on corporations fearful of consumer's reactions. Thus, the media become the battleground for NGO campaigns. Since these are global campaigns, global media are the key target. The globalization of communication leads to the globalization of media politics. The public space of the global civil society is the global space of communication structured around interdependent media.

The third type of reality that concurs to the formation of the global civil society is made of social movements that aim at controlling the process of globalization, and in doing so they build networks of action and organization to induce a global social movement for global justice, as the movement calls itself (what the media labelled, incorrectly, the anti-globalization movement). The Zapatistas, for instance, were a social movement insurging against the economic, social, and cultural effects of globalization (represented by NAFTA) on the Mexican Indians and on the Mexican people at large. To survive and assert their rights, they called upon global solidarity, becoming one of the harbingers of the global network of indigenous movements, itself a component of the much broader global movement. In other words, the movement for global justice is not just one movement: it is concurrently a global trend of local resistance, a connection between many of these movements in a global network of debate and coordination of action, and a formalization of some of these movements in a permanent, but changing, network of social initiatives aimed at influencing the character of the ongoing process of globalization. Such a process is now characterized by social movements as being in the hands of corporate interests and their surrogate governments. Yet, the movement for global justice, inspired by the motto "another world is possible," is not a sum of nationally bound struggles. It is a global network of opposition to the values and interests currently dominant in the globalization process. Its nodes grow and shrink alternately, depending on the conditions under which each society relates to globalization and its political manifestations. This is a movement that, in spite of the attempts by some of the moment's elites to build a program for a new world order, is better described by what it opposes than by a unified ideology. It is essentially a democratic movement that calls for new forms of political representation of people's will and interests in the process of global governance. In spite of its extreme internal diversity, the movement indeed voices a common critique of the management of the world by international institutions made up exclusively from national governments. It is an expression of the crisis of legitimacy, transformed into oppositional political action.

There is a fourth type, the *movement of public opinion*, made up of turbulences of information in a diversified media system, and of the emergence of spontaneous, ad hoc mobilizations using horizontal, autonomous communications systems. A meaningful example was the spontaneous mobilization of thousands of youth in Spain in March 2004, against the manipulation of information by the Aznar government in the days following the barbarian massacre conducted in Madrid by Al Qaeda. Using instant electronic communication through SMSs, their publicity campaign reached enough of the electorate to change the result of the election. In the U.S. context, the success of the Howard

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096505055678 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Dean campaign in 2003, in spite of the limitations of his candidacy and his eventual demise, showed the potential of the Internet as a medium of autonomous organization independent from a command and control center, as it is the case in practically all political campaigns. The implications of this phenomenon at the global level, as exemplified by the simultaneous peace demonstrations around the world on February 15, 2003, are full of political meaning. Internet and wireless communication, by enacting a global, horizontal means of communication, provide a public space, both as an organizing tool, and as a forum for debate, dialogue, and collective decision making. The global civil society now has the technological means to exist independent from political institutions and the mass media. However, the ability of social movements to change public perception still depends, to a large extent, on their communication strategies vis á vis the mass media.

In the last analysis, the will of the people speaks. And people decide their will on the issues that affect their lives, as well as the future of humankind, from the messages and debates that take place in the public sphere. The public sphere in our time is largely dependent on the communication media system, which includes not only television, radio, and the print press, but a whole variety of multimedia and communications systems, among which the Internet is of increasing importance. There is a shift from a public sphere anchored around the institutions of society to a public sphere constituted around the media system. This is neither good nor bad, but this shift does have considerable consequences on the practice of democracy, and on the relationship between civil society and the state.

The media system nowadays is simultaneously local and global. It is organized around a few media business groups of global reach. But, at the same time, it is dependent on state regulations, and focused on narrowcasting on specific audiences. By acting within the media system, particularly by creating events that send powerful images and messages, transnational activists induce a debate on the hows, whys, and whats of globalization, and on societal choices. It is through media politics that nonstate actors influence people and foster social change. Ultimately, the transformation of consciousness does have consequences on political behavior, on voting patterns, and on the orientations of governments. Here again, I do not make value judgments about how positive the choices thus influenced will be. But it is at the level of media politics where it appears societies can be moved in a different direction from those already institutionalized in the political system.

Thus it is essential for state actors, and for intergovernmental institutions, such as the United Nations, to meet civil society not only around institutional mechanisms and procedures of political representation, but in public debates in the global public sphere built around the media communication system. To some extent, the series of major conferences that the UN organized in the 1990s on several major issues of humankind (from the condition of women to environmental conservation), while not very effective in terms of designing policy, were essential in fostering a global dialogue, in raising public awareness, and in providing the platform on which the global civil society could come to the forefront of the policy debate. Therefore, for the states and international institutions to meet the demands and projects of the global civil society, they must stimulate the consolidation of this media-based public sphere, stimulate the dialogue with specific initiatives, and record, on an ongoing basis, this dialogue's contributions, so that they can inform policy making in the UN itself. Harnessing the power of the world's public opinion is as important as broadening institutional, political participation, in the fruitful, synergistic connection between the government-based international institutions and the global civil society.

Conclusion—Global Governance Without a World Government: Global Civil Society and the Network State

The term global civil society refers to a highly diverse field of social practice and organization. I have tried to identify the main components of this diversity. To engage an informed debate on the relationship between civil society and global governance, we need to take a step further in the analysis. We need some conceptual precision to clarify the debate.

Without going into the intellectual history, the concept of civil society can be related to three theoretical traditions, each one rooted in the practice of societies at different moments. The first, best represented by Locke, considers civil society the organizational and institutional defense of individual rights against the intrusion of the state. Civil society is in opposition to the state. Interestingly enough, the approach of many social movements to the practice of civil society reflects this old, liberal tradition, albeit extending the notion of individual rights to collective human rights.

The second tradition, that we could associate to Tocqueville, refers to the process of self-management of the issues arising in social life by people themselves, organized autonomously from the state, but within the framework of a democratic system of governance. In this case, epitomized by the North American tradition of community organization and civic engagement, civil society is complementary to government in the conduct of public affairs. It thrives under the protection of the democratic state, and in return nurtures democratic politics by making citizens responsible for the management of their own lives without becoming dependent on the government.

The third tradition, most often cited in progressive circles, but probably the most misunderstood, is Gramsci's conceptualization of the civil society, as formulated in *Quaderni de Carcere*. It stems, like the second tradition, from the belief in the importance of people's autonomous organization, as in the works of labor unions, farmers cooperatives, community organizations, churches, and the like. But for Gramsci these organizations constitute themselves as civil society, on the basis of their connection to the state. So, the Gramscian civil society is this intermediate space between the state and its citizens, in which the state institutions and people's organization may interact, exchange, and negotiate interests and values, in a form of extended co-governance. For Gramsci this is precisely the interest of the civil society, as it provides the channel for the transformation of the state without engaging in a frontal assault of the state apparatus to seize power. In this tradition, civil society is the channel to reform the state and its policies, using the organized pressure from society, without limiting the process of democratic representation to elections and formal politics. Scandinavian democracies come closer than any other to this model, and seem to work more efficiently than any other institutional systems in the world. But what we must retain from this excursus is that civil society, at least in the Gramscian tradition, is not defined against the state, or outside the state, but by its organized relationship to the state. This is the difference between society and civil society; between social

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096505055678 Published online by Cambridge University Press

movements and civil society; between civic associations and social movements.

The practice of civil society changes with its context. In our historical context, the key issue, I argued here, is that governments are national, while the main issues to be managed are global. States have set up their networks of global governance, but civic organizations have remained in their territorially bounded turfs.

Social movements have gone global, overcoming the limits of the nation state, but in so doing have made difficult their constitution as the civil society's partner of the global networks of governance. Thus, the formation of a global civil society, in the Gramscian tradition, amounts to identifying the mechanisms and processes of connection between people's autonomous organizations and the network state in its different levels and domains. In our societies, the forms of organization and aggregation of interests are diversified, and ephemeral. Cultural codes are constantly forming and reforming. But there is still one fundamental lesson from the Gramscian approach to civil society that retains its meaning in our societies: *there is no civil society (in contrast to social movements or actions of people's protest) without forms of articulation with the state*. The civil society is a bridge between society and the state, a channel able to transform the state through a representative citizenship that transcends, without denying, the procedures constitutionally coded in political institutions.

Identifying the issue is easier than providing solutions to the problem, although it is a first and necessary step. Furthermore, to propose specific forms of articulation between state and society in the space of the global civil society is a task that goes way beyond the limits and purpose of this lecture. But I will try to illustrate how best to advance in the practical treatment of the issue.

The key question is the following: which are the forms of articulation between the dynamics of societies and the institutions of the state in the process of networked global governance? I summarize here some of the observed trends that could be the beginning of this institutional and cultural transformation of the international political system. This is not a program, an agenda, or a proposal. This is what I see growing in the practice of people and institutions around the world.

First, there are a number of processes that do not seem to address the fundamental question of the autonomous linkage between state and society. The decentralization of the state in the forms of subsidies and support to NGOs seems to lead, more often than not, to new forms of clientelism and patronage. The integration of the values of the movement into the state through the constitution of progressive governments may confront the oldest dilemma in the relationship between social change and institutionalization: how to preserve the autonomy of social movements when governments need to respond to a much broader range of interests in society and in the world at large? On the other hand, the growing influence of neoanarchism (explicit of implicit) in the "anti-globalization movement," or the radicalization of specific identities within the movement (e.g., indigenous identities), increase the separation between the state and society, at least vis á vis the mobilized sectors of society. The radical autonomy of social movements may be a source of social change and cultural innovation, but it will find difficulties in opening the path for the constitution of civil society.

Thus, maybe the issue must be tackled differently, starting both from the state and from civil society, rather than giving priority to one or the other of this tense, but creative couple. Here are the premises for the building of this new relationship.

The global state does not exist, because there is no global citizenship. The process of global governance is enacted in practice by the global network state. The network state, in its changing forms of representation and articulation is the state of the global age. This state must link the state actors with interests in each particular process of governance. This implies enlightened multilateralism. Any attempt at using multilateral institutions to impose unilateral interests or policies destroys the basis of trust on which a shared global governance can be built. Procedural rules are essential.

On the other hand, the civil society constitutes itself at various levels by setting up forms of articulation of society with each level of the state: local, regional, national, international. So, governments acting together at the international level have already submitted to the rules of engagement negotiated with their own civil society institutions. However, this is not enough. Because there are global problems in which social actors are directly involved, without necessarily acting upon governments (e.g., human rights, environment, etc.), social organizations or social actors must have mechanisms and processes of direct connection with the international institutions, e.g., with the United Nations. And subnational levels of government should also have access to higher levels of international cooperation and negotiation. It is this complex network of connections between forms of social organization and levels of political institutions that constitute the global civil society.

In practical terms, this means concurrent development of the system of international institutions, the autonomous expressions of societies, and the mechanisms of their relationship.

This starts with the strengthening of the United Nations and related institutions and with the enlightened decision by governments to enhance the autonomy of the UN and other international institutions. This would be the equivalent, in the old context of the nation state, of asserting the independence of the judiciary once it has been appointed.

On the other hand, society needs to have the means for the growth of its autonomy vis á vis the state, not only institutionally, but culturally. The autonomy of society depends on the extent and strength of its public civic consciousness. In our time, this depends essentially on the process of public communication at the roots of the formation of the public mind. This means institutional and political measures must lead to the following policies:

- Preserve freedom of the Internet as a horizontal, global means of autonomous communication. This should extend to the formation of wireless communication networks.
- Assert freedom of information and communication in the new technological context, for instance through the creation of an independent International Free Communication Council to protect people against the manipulation of information or abuse of media power. This is not to go back to the statist project of the "New information order" proposed by Unesco years ago. Rather, here I propose reproducing at the international level institutions such as the French Conseil de l´Audiovisuel, to protect the most fundamental source of civil and political rights in our form of society.
- Similarly, the international institutions themselves should practice online transparency of their deliberations and policy making, so that the public can be aware of who runs the world and for what. No more closed meetings except when necessary for security reasons.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096505055678 Published online by Cambridge University Press

If international institutions are developed and their autonomy safeguarded, if societies are equipped with autonomous means of information and communication, if mechanisms for the participation of social organizations, social movements, and citizens at large, in their diversity, are set up at all levels of the international institutional system, and if governments agree to respect the rule of law in this international system, then there is an opportunity to upgrade democracy and political management at the global level where our lives are decided.

Granted, it is unlikely that all states would accept this new global democracy. Yet, such states may well become the new form of failed states. The political outcasts would not be designated by the superpowers, in terms of their own interests, but stigmatized by the global civil society acting on behalf of the values of humanity.

References

Beck, Ulrich. 2003. "Las instituciones de gobernanza mundial en la sociedad mundial de riesgo." In *Guerra y paz en el siglo XXI: una perspectiva europea*, eds., Manuel Castells and Narcis Serra.Tusquets Editores.

Calderon, Fernando, ed. 2003. *Es sostenible la globalizacion en America Latina?* 2 volumes. Fondo de Cultura Economica.

Calvo, Enrique Gil. 2003. "El miedo es el mensaje. Riesgo, incertidumbre y medios de comunicación." Alianza Editorial.

Caputo, Dante. 2004. "La democracia en America Latina." Pograma de Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo.

Castells, Manuel. 2003. *The Power of Identity, 2nd edition.* London: Blackwell.

———. 2001. *The Internet Galaxy.* New York: Oxford University Press.

———, ed. 2004. *The Network Society: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.

Castells, Manuell, Mireia Fernandez, Jack Lin-chuan Qiu, and Araba Sey. 2004. "The Mobile Communication Society." Los Angeles: Annenberg Research Network on International Communication, University of Southern California. Research Monograph.

Clark, John D. *Civil Society and the Battle for Ethical Globalization*. West Hartford, CT: Kumarian Press.

Gramsci, Antonio. 1975. *Quaderni del Carcere*. Torino: Einaudi.

Habermas, Jürgen. 1998. *Die postnationale Konstellation*. Suhrkamp.

Held, David, et al. 1999. *Global Transformations*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Held, David, et al., eds. 2003. *The Global Transformation Reader*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Held, David. 2004. *The Global Covenant*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Inglehart, Ronald, ed. 2003. *Mass Values and Social Change: Findings from the Values Survey*. Boston: Brill Academic.

Jacquet, Pierre, Jean Pisani-Ferry, Laurence Tubiana, eds. 2002. *Gouvernance Mondiale*. La Documentation Francaise.

Juris, Jeff. 2004. "Networks, Globalization and Political Culture: the Movement for Global Justice." Berkeley: University of California. Ph.D. Dissertation in Anthropology.

Kaldor, Mary, et al., eds. 2001–2004. *Global Civil Society*. Annual report of the Center for the Study of Civil Society of the London School of Economics.

Kaldor, Mary. 2003. The *Global Civil Society*. London: Routledge.

———. 2001. *New and Old Wars: Organized Violence in the Global Era*. Tusquets.

Keohane, Robert O. 2002. *Power and Governance in a Partially Globalized World*. London: Routledge.

Norris, Pippa. 2000. *Virtuous Circle: Political Communications in Postindustrial Societies*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Nye, Joseph, and John Donahue, eds. *Governance in a Globalizing World*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Nye, Joseph. 2002. *The Paradox of American Power*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Price, Monroe. 2003. *Media and Sovereignty*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Putnam, Robert. 2001. *Bowling Alone. America's Declining Social Capital*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Stiglitz, Joseph. 2002. *Globalization and Its Discontents*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Thompson, John. 2000. *Political Scandal: Power and Visibility in the Media Age*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Volkmer, Ingrid. 2003. "The Global Network Society and the Global Public Sphere." *Journal of Development* 46:9–16.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096505055678 Published online by Cambridge University Press