

## 《ENGLISH SUMMARY》

### **General Picture of Global Governance: Its Multi-layered Structure**

By Takehiko Yamamoto

Professor Emeritus, Waseda University

In this article, general picture of global governance will be described from the angle of multi-layered structure of governance in world politics, economies and social interactions between and among the international actors. Global governance is often defined in terms of what it is neither a world government nor the chaos and anarchy associated with a Hobbesian 'state of war of all against war'. In his edited book published in 1992, James Rosenau defined global governance in general terms as 'an order that lacks a centralized authority with the capacity to enforce decisions on a global scale.' Such collective security arrangements as the peace keeping operations (PKOs) in the United Nations, however, well organized and operated in some cases especially since the early 1990's when the global Cold War ended. It should be, therefore, said that global and/or regional governance system in security and functional affairs as well has been regained their original purposes and taken their own roles in a large momentum.

It is certain that the progress of globalization has brought about and expanded the discrepancies in world economy especially in terms of North-South conflict and disintegration in economic and social development, on the one hand. However, the issues like global and regional governance in environmental issues beyond national frontiers have raised the common needs for trans-boundary cooperation in keeping the global and/or regional commons for all of the human-being, on the other. In both aspects of conflict and cooperation in current world affairs, we are able to find out the multi-layered facets of global governance; that is, global governance, regional governance, national governance, local governance, corporate governance and civil governance. These six facets of governance from global to civic level are, need-less-to-say, complicatedly intertwined each other in each issue area. In this article, some cases related to multi-layered aspects of global governance are analyzed respectively.

In conclusion, the article touched upon the possibilities and difficulties of building an appropriate and acceptable system of global governance for all actors. Especially, it emphasized the difficulties to construct the edifice for keeping the value for human rights, legitimate political authority, multilateralism, and approach 'from below'.

## **International Norms and Multilateral Negotiations —A Comparison Analysis of GATT and WTO Rounds—**

By Satoshi Oyane  
Professor, Doshisha University

How are international norms established, and how do they transform? A numbers of theoretical and empirical studies have sought to identify the factors affecting this issue, and they have been argued that the bureaucracies of international organizations, NGOs, and so on, play particularly important roles. However, do these roles constitute the normal track in the process of developing international norms? Is it not in fact the case that international norms generally develop through multilateral negotiations among governments? In this paper, I analyze systematically multilateral negotiations, a field in which little research has been conducted, and investigate factors that cause international norms to develop or that development to stagnate.

In multilateral negotiations, coalitions among nations and issue-linkages among negotiating issues are emerged. This results in negotiations becoming less complex and makes it easier for international agreement to be reached. In international negotiations, established international norms (in the case of GATT/WTO, the way that free trade norms and development norms are integrated) affect the nature of coalitions and issue-linkages. This in turn impacts on international norms, which probably affects the way international norms develop. In this paper, I analyze and compare three cases: (1) the period from the first Round of GATT until the Tokyo Round, (2) the Uruguay Round, and (3) the WTO Doha Round.

According to this analysis, the Uruguay Round and the Doha Round were contrastive. The former achieved success in the development of international norms, and the latter lacked progress. The main factor was that while the former had widely established free trade as the norm in many countries, the latter saw a split between countries emphasizing the free trade norm and countries giving weight to the development norm. As a result, while both rounds saw increases in both coalitions among nations and issue-linkages, these had contrasting forms, so the Uruguay Round led to the remarkable international agreement whereas the Doha Round saw negotiations result in deadlock.

**Cross-over between a Global Tax and Global Environmental  
Governance in Climate Financing Governance:  
—Present and Future of Green Climate Fund—**

By Takehiko Uemura

Professor, Yokohama City University

This paper strives to demonstrate as to how deep the potential of a global tax would be in making climate financing governance just and effective. A global tax is defined as a system of taxation that globally imposes taxes on global assets and activities. While it intends to reduce negative impacts of the global activities, it is set to redistribute the revenue raised for the purpose of both providing and realizing global public goods.

A global tax could generate huge finance necessary for tackling climate change. While it is estimated \$195 billion required annually to tackle climate change, implementation of global financial transaction tax could generate \$655 billion per year, for instance. A global tax could also democratize global governance that is often regarded as “governance of 1%, by 1%, for 1%”. It is because once a global tax is to be implemented, governance must be changed to be transparent and democratic in order to fulfill accountability to both countless and diversified tax payers.

The paper tries to show these potentials by examining climate financing governance, especially one of the Green Climate Fund (GCF) that aims at financing \$100 billion per year for dealing with climate change. The executive board of GCF is the key to be examined. Not only is the number of the board equal between the North and the South, GCF also creates “active observers” and the “Private Sector Advisory Group”, allowing civil society and corporations to participate in the board, giving their voices in the heart of the decision-making of the board. GCF has also established the “Independent Evaluation Unit” under the board, which can be seen as positive in terms of accomplishing accountability.

The basic reason for this sort of governance structure lies in that GCF aims at financing huge amount of money, therefore, GCF has to collect finance from various sectors, using by all means, including a global tax. By introducing a global tax, not only could GCF meet the financial demand, but it could also lead to establish more effective and just climate financing governance than the current one.

## **The European Union as a Community of Gift**

By Tadashi Yamamoto

Associate Professor, The University of Kitakyushu

How the European Union can be described as a political organization? Some arguments have been presented to answer this. This article is on the presumption that the Union is an inter-state community of “gift”.

The concept of gift, developed by Marcel Mauss, a French sociologist, has offered a core assumption for making stable relationship. According to the concept, the key for such kind of relations is to give, receive and give in return. Mauss had referred to the inter-group relations or the necessity of gift by state. He didn't refer to inter-state relations, but it is possible to suppose that the concept can be applied as an element which affects them.

It is not easy to explain how behaviors based on gift affect inter-state relations. The reason is that third parties aren't be able to grasp the adequacy of such behaviors in general. But at least it seems that the member states of the Union have a convention of gift among them.

One example of this is their contributions to the Union budget. The budget of the Union is not only a large some but also distributed to various policy areas. Member states of the Union have contributed for many years despite of their inability to measure accurately the effect. The decision-making by the qualified majority voting is another example. In this voting system laws at the Union level have been made without unanimity of the representatives of the member states. Each state may fail to organize 'blocking minorities', though all states have given consent to use it.

Two examples above suggest that member states have 'paid out of their pockets', making the Union a stable inter-state community. This article investigates why the studies of International Relations have not been attentive to the concept and why the Union as a Community may be wobbling in recent years besides.

## **Human Security in Southeast Asia—Focus on APEC and ASEAN—**

By Naoko Nagao

Part-time Lecturer, Soka University

This article explores the concept of human security in Southeast Asia. The human security was put forward by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in 1994. UNDP said that human security consists of two aspects “freedom from want” and “freedom from fear”. Japan and Canada actively promote the each aspect of human security. Some countries in Southeast Asia also accept and endorse the human security. How do they understand it? What is the difference between Japan, Canada and Southeast Asia? The aim of this article is to clarify these questions. This article focuses on public documents of Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) and Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and examines the documents to see how they use the human security and what they recognize threats to human security. As a result of the research, this article argues that four features of human security in the documents, (1) indistinct definition and relation to human rights, (2) linkage to their fundamental goals, (3) to avoid setting human security as a security concept, (4) diverse threats to human security and targeting people in the inner region for human security. Based on these characteristic points, human security in APEC and ASEAN differs from Japan and Canada in following respects. Both of Japan and Canada take human security as a concept dealing with foreign affairs and emphasis on overseas aid. In contrast, APEC and ASEAN stress the importance of mutual cooperation in Southeast Asia. Diplomatic issues are not subject for their human security. Through the experience of the Asian financial crisis in 1997, SARS and 2004 Indian Ocean earthquake and tsunami, people-centered approaches attract regional attention. The approaches try to look at the matters from the standpoint of the weak. This article concludes that APEC and ASEAN have a unique perspective on human security and regard it as a concept solves transnational matters that cause immeasurable damage to people in Southeast Asia.

## グローバル・ガバナンス 第1号 2014年

---

2015年 6月 22日

発行所 グローバル・ガバナンス学会・事務局  
〒567-8570 大阪府茨城市岩倉町2-150  
立命館大学 地域情報研究所気付  
電話・FAX 075-665-2324  
E メールアドレス： [secretariat@ml.globalgovernance.jp](mailto:secretariat@ml.globalgovernance.jp)

発行者 グローバル・ガバナンス学会

制作 株式会社 志學社  
〒101-0041 東京都千代田区神田須田町2-15 215ビル4階  
電話 03-6206-0480

---

© Satoshi Oyane, Printed in Japan

落丁・乱丁の場合は弊社にご連絡下さい。送料弊社負担にてお取替え致します。  
ISBN978-4-904180-43-3