Article

Beyond the Neoliberal Globalization: Reflections on Democratizing Democracy and the Multilayered Structure of Governance

Kiyoshi MATSUSHITA

Introduction

It is said that we are living in the age of "globalization." It seems that this is probably the case.

We are actually benefiting from "globalization." However, we are also facing the daily reality of various cross-border problems involving the environment, immigration, refugees, AIDS, drugs, and crime. As a 'container' the nation-state is certainly in stage of great transformation. Is globalization actually bringing about a "world without borders?" As can be seen from the border disputes our country has just recently had with China and Russia (Senkaku Islands and Hoppo Ryoudo), the utilization of diplomacy as a means to further national actions through the emphasis of nationalism is also surfacing. How should the relationship between "globalization," the "nation-state" and nationalism be considered?

Inherently, even when saying "globalization," the dominate form is actually "neoliberal globalization." This form creates a winner and loser, light and dark. And, in response to this, many critical actors are beginning to resist through a wide range and various levels of civil society movements. These various movements propose an "alter-globalization," or more specifically a "globalization from below." Within this opposing relationship of globalization, a reexamination of the present state and possibility of democratization and civil society is being sought. Both democracy and civil society are formed around the assumption of a territory-based nation-state. However, large numbers of people are currently being forced to endure suffering caused by a casting away of territorialization and nationalization caused by globalization. Democracy and civil society must be reconstructed in order to bring about regional governance as well as solve global problems stemming from globalization. This paper examines the possibility of multilayered local/ regional/global governance from the standpoint of common citizens.

I. Reconsidering Democracy in the Age of Globalization

1. Globalization and Democracy

Today, we are living in a paradoxical age. Following the end of the Cold War, liberal democracy became the established victor throughout the world. However, at that precise

moment, liberal democracy gradually began losing trust and conviction not only in "South" countries, but also in "North" countries where its roots are established. The crisis facing the representative system and participation is an indication of the decline in liberal democracy's credibility and legitimacy.

At the end of the Century, worldwide problems emerged regarding revision and construction of the political community and a sense of cohesion between people and political power. There is a wide political space between legal and systematic authority and that of the actual lives of common people. For example, this phenomenon has been apparent in Latin America since the 1990s. The process of democratization on this continent was promised more than actually carried out, with very little integration of participation and decision making by commoners seen. Instead, the continent was swept over by neoliberal policies which abandoned a large majority of the poor and excluded. Today, the greatest contradiction in Latin America is the division between the subordinate and dominate classes. In other words, there is a polarization between those who can participate in the various social systems and those who cannot.

In order to resist neoliberal globalization, local, national and regional communities around the world are carrying out democratic experiments and initiatives based on an alternative model of democracy (recall the various types of participatory political systems). This emergence of energy in proactively working towards new social contracts, which are more comprehensive and fair, is occurring precisely because of the acute strain between capitalism and democracy. Civil society and those who have been excluded from society have, in their aim to create a bottom up process in opposition to the fragmentation and divergence between politics and society, influenced the stratification of authority.

In this section, the points of issue regarding a reconsideration of 'democratization,' as well as it's deepening and potential, will be investigated through a review of the inner contradictions and limitations of liberal democracy. Today, under the structural conditions of neoliberal model globalization's sudden expansion as well as the proactive conditions regarding the rejuvenation in broad associations the actual basis for advancing such a review is reemerging.

As a premise for carrying out the above review, let us first state this section's approach towards globalization. There are many definitions of globalization. It is possible to understand globalization as "an increase in interconnections or growing interdependence on a world scale," and define it as "a compression of time and space." In this section, an approach is taken in which the effect of globalization on social hierarchy or power relationships is stressed, viewing globalization as "a historical transformation" (Mittelman approach).

Globalization changes methods of lifestyle and production (economic level transformation) and gradually shifts the field of political power from above and below, forming an international system from multi-levels (political level transformation). The previous method of lifestyle is then eroded with a new hybrid form emerging (cultural level transformation). This results in globalization alternately generating both "cooperation and resistance." Eventually, this power structure has "an uneven impacts on various strata in different regions and countries" (Mittelman, 2004: 4-5).

According to Mittelman, globalization occurs through three main processes. These are the "global division of labor and power, a new regionalism, and political resistance towards globalization" (Mittelman, 2000). The contemporary "division of labor and power" is characterized by a large scale flow of capital, technology and labor both in between and within regions. However, the form of this division varies in accordance with the particular circumstances of each (regional or local) environment. Today, a demand for an alternative (alternative globalization) to neoliberal globalization's dominance is becoming a main platform for these environments.

2．Democratizing Democracy

The growth of civil association, expansion of public space, and rapid formation of networks can be seen even within neoliberal globalization's sweep over the earth. This movement is not only about a return to a 'systematic balance of society, state and the market,' it is also interlocked with a quest for a practical and logical new generation of democracy. The development of various experiments based on the principle of "democratization of democracy" such as "participatory democracy," "deliberation democracy," and "empowering democracy" can be seen as one example of this movement (See, Avritzer, 2000; Parayil, ed.2000; Santos, ed. 2005; Kaldor et. al.,2000-2009).

Coimbra University's（Portugal）sociologist Santos and Minas Gerais Federal University's (Brazil) political scientists Avritzer note that one essence of the debate concerning democracy's hegemonic form in the 20th Century is "the abandonment of the role of social mobilization and collective action in the construction of democracy," in other words, its reliance on elitist forms of resolutions (elitist democracy). This results in excessive appraisal concerning the role of a representative mechanism, namely a form of democracy which is not tied to the mechanism of social participation (essentially a representative democracy with limited participation). This hegemonic form of democracy (elitist representative democracy) has spread across the northern hemisphere and has neglected controversies surrounding democracy in Southern countries brought forth by experiments and debates concerning democracy (Santos and Avritzer, 2005).

Points of interest regarding elitist democracy can be grouped into the following three issues: (1) the reduction of political boundaries to that of government action, (2) the concentration politics into the hands of government members, and (3) the fear of additional pressure being placed on the development of the political system by mass mobilization and collective action(Avritzer, 2002:165).

In arguing in this way, Santos and Avritzer seek to present an anti-hegemony type of democracy in opposition to the presently dominant hegemonic form. In addition, they seek to investigate the possibility of wide participation by various types of social actors in the decision making process, the inclusion of various problems from the political system which have up until now been ignored, the reestablishment of identity and affiliation, and participation on the local level.

Actions and thoughts, which give credibility to and support the modern ideal of open society, have in the last few decades, become phenomena in redefining the context and goals, meanings, and actors in social and political wars. In other words, these have become

issues in question as a result of "globalization."

Usually, the phenomena referred to as globalization is actually only one form of globalization - that of neoliberal globalization. This form is dominate and hegemonic, dealing with a new system for capital assimilation. On the one hand, this form seeks to free capital from its traditional social and political bonds, guaranteeing a certain degree of social distribution, thereby effectively "dissocializing" capital. On the other hand, however, it functions to make society as a whole obey the law of value of the market. The consequence of this dual change is an extreme unbalance in the distribution of costs and opportunities in the world system brought about by neoliberal globalization. The cause behind the sudden enlargement of social unbalance between North and South countries, as well as within countries, is found here.

However, neoliberal globalization is not the only form of globalization. Another type of globalization, an alternative anti-hegemony form, which is being created through a series of incentives, movements and organizations, is fighting against neoliberal globalization through local and global coordination, networks and alliances. Actual new struggles between South and North countries are taking place in the various domains of society, economics, politics and cultural activities. Under these certain domains, an alternative form, which is being created from an anti-neoliberal globalization stance, is appearing prominently (refer to section 3).

In particular, the theme "democratizing democracy" is emphasized, however the fundamental approach is participatory democracy. Recently, participatory democracy has acquired a new dynamism. This form is being promoted mainly by communities and social groups who are fighting against social exclusion and the trivialization of civil rights. They are seeking a high level of democracy with a more comprehensive social contract. Local initiatives are developing in cities and farming villages. It is still in an infancy stage, however, the formation of a transitional network for participatory democracy is emerging.

For example, Participatory Budgeting in Porto Alegre is currently gaining particular attention as a method of concrete and systematic institution-building in participatory democracy. The United Nations named this as one of the World Cities Best 40 Practices. Participatory budgeting is currently implemented in various forms in 144 cities in Brazil, other Latin American cities (for example, Rosario and Cordoba in Argentina and Montevideo, Uruguay), Spain (Barcelona and surrounding cities such as Sain Feliu de Llobregat), France (cities outside of Paris such as Saint-Denis and Bobigny), Italy (Grottammare), Canada (Toronto), and in Kerala and the state of Western Bengal in India (Santos, 2005:307).

One main conflict between South and North nations stems from the split between representative democracy and participatory democracy. This conflict occurs from representative democracy's intentional rejection of participatory democracy's legitimacy. This rejection can only be solved through the development of a complementary form of democracy in which these two configurations of democracy can be mutually deepened.

Santos and Avritzer (2005) present 6 points "regarding the theme of enlargement of democratic standards" for "another type of globalization." These points are summarized below:

(1) Today, the struggle for democracy is, in particular, a struggle for the "democratization of democracy." In a capitalist society, there are six large forms of power, hence of unequal relations of power: patriarchal system, exploitation, unequal differentiation of identity, fetishism of commodities, domination and unequal exchange. As an actual ideal and practice, democracy must fight with all these "time- spaces," involving different social and political processes. In this way, from a practical point of view, "There is no true democracy, there is only democratization, a process without end. "

(2) As is the case of biodiversity, "demo-diversity" must be preserved, expanded and enriched. Democracy's modern history points out that there is not only one form of democracy, but actually many different forms (Held, 1987).

(3) Representative democracy tends to be "low –intensity democracy, a tendency that has deepened in recent times." The level of democracy has over the last 20 years, particularly due to 3 reasons, been drastically lowered. First, the tension between democracy and capitalism disappeared, with democracy essentially taking on a precondition of neoliberal globalization. Second, the two markets which have formed the basis legitimacy for representative democracy – the political market and the economic market – have become intermixed. And third, there is the rupture of the relationship between authorization and accountability.

(4) The deepening of democracy is becoming more and more dependent upon a new form complementary to that of participatory democracy and representative democracy. There are two possible forms (coexistence and complementarity) in joining participatory democracy and representative democracy. To implement these forms, a democratic shift of the nation-state is imperative. The nation-state must change itself into a space of distributive and cultural experimentation. In this meaning, the new democracies must change themselves into absolutely new social movement.

(5) The strengthening of counter-hegemonic democracy must rely on articulations between the local and the global. The counter-hegemonic shift from the local to the global level is fundamental for the strengthening of participatory democracy. The counter-hegemony model is a transitional model joining between various local participatory democracy experiments, or between local participatory experiments and transitional movements and organizations that have shown interest in promoting participatory democracy. In the expansion and deepening of democracy, the strength of counter -hegemonic globalization relies heavily on the local implementation of national, regional and global networks.

(6) Democracy is always facing danger in perversion and co-optation. The only possible way to avoid such danger is through continual democratic vigilance. This vigilance comes from a democratization of democracy type of thinking.

3．Participatory Democracy and Institution-building

Local governance is a domain in which new participatory rights are embodied into law. A locally positioned new form of participatory governance, innovative strategies for strengthening civil participation and concrete institution-building are important when conceptualizing counter -hegemonic globalization and participatory democracy

　　Santos states the following regarding the connection between counter-hegemonic globalization and the "local." The dominant conception of counter -hegemonic globalization has a tendency to be limited to the activities and protests of transnational NGOs and social movements. The borderless, aggressive activism of transnational democratic movements is certainly one form of counter -hegemonic globalization. However, we should not forget these movements "developed out of the local initiatives designed to mobilize local struggles to resist trans-local, national or global powers". Without this actual resistance, the transnational democratic movements could not and would not be sustained. We are entering "an era in which the dialectics of the local and the global replaces the dichotomy between the local and the global." As such, in our time, social emancipation involves a dual movement of "de- globalization of the local" (vis-à-vis hegemonic globalization) and its "re-globalization" (as part of counter-hegemonic globalization) (Santos, 2005: xxvi).

　　Gaventa points out the importance of action in strengthening both civil participation and institutions. For both "North" and "South" nations in regards to the future direction of development, there is a widening consensus concerning a focus upon building a more responsible and effective nation-state and making citizens more proactive.　In the process of this agenda, around the world many initiatives have investigated a new form of governance. These initiatives have attempted to learn how "to connect citizens and the nation-state in a new way and reconstruct the relationship between citizens and government."

　　Gaventa focuses upon several common characteristics of these various initiatives (Gaventa, 2004: 17-18). First, these initiatives have an interest in a more active and participatory forms of citizenship. This is related to the shift towards citizens during the 1980s and beginning of the 1990s regarding the need to provide politics and services which resulted from the idea of "citizens as consumers."

　　Second, they have concern with inclusion. There especially an interest in increasing participation of people who have until now been excluded or marginalized such as the poor, those of different races and ethnic minorities, young people and the elderly.

　　Third, there is also an interest in the integration of various stakeholders into a new form of partnership. This partnership would make it possible for a broad "ownership" regarding decisions and projects.

　　Forth, there is an interest in fair, lawful and mature deliberation. Such deliberation helps legitimize the policy decision making process and includes utilization of supporting knowledge and deliberation.

　　And, fifth, there is an interest in the formation of broad accountability. This allows various partners to hold those who creating the systems and policies accountable, including the formation of social, law, financial and political accountability.

II. The Regional/Local Response Towards the Possibility of a self-sustaining Regionalism

1．New Regionalism's Role

　　In recent years various forms of regional integration have been taking place not only

in developed countries but also in regions surrounding developing countries. New theoretical interest in regionalism is also strengthening. What type of mutual relationship does modern regionalism have with globalization? Is it possible to bring about a transformation in globalization? How can regionalism have a corresponding relationship with local movements? Let's look at these questions with the goal of searching for a possible way in which runaway neoliberal globalization can be controlled and embedded into civil society.

At the same time I would also like to consider the connections of various cross-border problems with regionalism and its development. For example, various phenomena such as environmental degradation, sudden outbreaks of infectious diseases, illegal immigration, and various forms of cross-border crime continue have become seen as dangerous threats to the security of nation-states and society, as well as regional and international communities. These phenomena are often "non-traditional security" issues, taking on non-state, nonmilitary characteristics and factors, and crossing borders. Even the reconstruction and institution-building of "collapsed states" and "failed states" requires cross-border cooperation. Presently, with this chain of complex multi-layered burdens from the global to the regional level having become apparent, there is an increasing need and demand to "tame" globalization. In such an action, practical and logical cooperation regarding democratic governance from the global to the local level is required. This affects local perspectives (governance) as well as the new possibility of regionalism at the same time. That is to say, the role of regionalism is gaining attention from the perspective of controlling neoliberal globalization from the position of citizens and embedding globalization into "civil society" in addition to its role as an oppositional force pushing for the restructuring of the neoliberal form.

2．Non-traditional Security

Today, various types of non-traditional security problems (NTS) are rapidly emerging. These NTS issues cannot be dealt with effectively only on the national level. The nation-state is still the decision-making actor regarding many security issues. However, with NTS issues, non-state actors also often play important roles in certain situations. In terms of effectiveness, regional organizations can at times even have a comparative advantage compared to nation-states. Regional organizations are decision-making actors. Nonetheless, decisions regarding which problems "effect security" are still based around the concept of national security rather than human security. However, in regards to institutional capacity building, which affects efforts in dealing with NTS issues, the utilization of regional resources and the role of non-state networks are increasing.

These arguments, which place NTS issues as threats towards security, or more specifically tend to make these "securitization" issues bring about many problems. First, there is a conceptual problem with NTS issues, concerning the implications regarding the field of security studies and international relations. The meaning of security is no longer confined to the conventional military dimension of state and inter-state relations are no longer limited to strategic balance of power issues.

The second problem with the "securitization" of NTS issues concerns the meanings of

policy responses by nation-states or non-state actors, as well as their movement towards governance. An important question is "whether securitization should be the way to go to respond to non-traditional security concerns, and at what level － national or regional? ＂ These questions need to be asked. In asking them, there are additional issues related to these. That is to say, "NTS issues should be securitized, why, how, and by whom? How should state and non-state actors respond to these issues once they are'securitized'and what are the indicators between state and non-state interests in responding to NTS challenges? Are regional responses more effective than domestic ones? ＂ (Caballero-Anthony, 2008: 188).

Separate from regional organizations, important roles are also carried out by NGOs and international institutions as securitization actors. As the example in the securitization of Indonesia's poverty problem shows, during the 1997 crisis, NGOs and civil society groups "entered the arena" and became the main securitization actors by intervening and providing resources (food and health care) when the state failed to meet the emergency needs of the poor. This securitization certainly increased tensions between the state and NGOs. However, in democratic, developing nations such as Indonesia, despite the competing interests, NGOs do not directly clash with the interests of the state. They have become able to intervene in order to securitize a certain portion of society in which they hold an interest and draw upon their own resources to fulfill such goals. Therefore, if NTS issues are dealt with effectively, a better alternative plan can lead to the construction of institutional capacity at the governance level, which will enable future NTS issues effecting regions to be appropriately dealt with (Caballero-Anthony, 2008: 205).

3．Regionalism and Governance

Regional integration projects sometimes dig away at the various rights of laborers and citizens, placing them at the periphery of regionalism. Rather than raising the position of laborers and citizens, many regional agreements tend to erode their rights, strengthening the position of businesses instead. Thus, there is a need to investigate the development of alternative regional project development.

This problem is linked to the issue of how to reign in run-away neoliberal globalization. "New regionalism" is also one channel which considers development, security and peace, and ecological sustainability to be the most fundamental values and stresses experimentation in political intervention. New regionalism highlights the strong foundation of local opposition against from which future political structures are conceptualized.

Globalism holds the meaning of increasingly penetrating and dominating the development of markets worldwide. These markets are the economies of citizens. This process is clearly lacking a certain type of "nationhood." In other words, in contrast to a local production structure, the process of globalization gives world markets supremacy leading to sudden expansion of western style consumerism. However, the two processes of globalization and regionalization are integrated in the large scale process of this global structural change. From this, a new possibility in which regionalism can succeed as one method in bringing about change by stopping the process of globalization in order to keep a

certain area from regional domination and to protect cultural variation, or alternatively, to bring about a reversal in political resolve can emerge(Hettne,1996).

Here the concept of governance is developing in international politics. Governance is connected to the complex of power, control and authority. Global governance is connected to public policy, choices and public service, and it embraces participation and empowerment. This essentially includes institutions and civilian integration systems which uncover these continual expressions of principles and values. Global governance is related to the concrete and cooperative adjustment of "problem-solving" on a global level. These are various disciplines (laws, rules, customs and behaviors), and in a similar way are also the formal and informal institutions and practices created by various actors (national government, intergovernmental organizations, NGOs, private sector, other civil society actors) to manage collective problems. In this way, governance is connected to the complex body of states, market, civilians, (both intergovernmental and nongovernmental) organizations, formal and informal institutions, mechanisms, relations and processes. Through these, complex interests are joined, rights and obligations are established, and differences are reconciled.

Global governance is not a single model or form. It not only continuously develops the changing environment, it also is the wide decision making dynamic and complex process which responds to those changes. A report by the Global Governance Commission emphasizes the following. The challenge of global governance is to set up a global system of rules in which "the management of global affairs is responsive to the interests of all peoples in a sustainable future." These rules are "guided by basic human values," and make global organizations "conform to the reality of global diversity" (Global Governance Commission Report, 1995: xⅶ).

Attention must be given to the actual and potential roles played by local level governance in the in the realization of global governance. Accordingly, there are many opinions regarding the possibility of proactive regionalism from a regional governance approach.

Concerning regional governance, according to Falk, who takes an idealistic stance, philosophically, regionalism can be effective as a means of "mitigating pathological anarchism." In other words, it is thought that "from a world order perspective, regionalism is to help create a new equilibrium in politics that balances the protection of the vulnerable and the interests of humanity as a whole (including future generations) against the integrative , technological dynamism associated with globalism" (Falk, 1995:14).

Hirst and Thomspon also point to regionalism's role as a countervailing power against neoliberal globalism's reconstruction. In their opinion, regionalist arrangements have an important role to play in the governance of an open international economy , alongside multilateral, national and regional (that is,sub-national) attempts at regulation. Such type of governance is needed, because the market by itself cannot provide the level of "interconnection and cooperation" which guarantees the functions of today's complex international division of labor (Hirst and Thompson, 1996:121).

In addition to the above researchers, Hettne expresses interest in inter-regionalism which provides the foundations for the coexistence of regional political communities. In

other words, the possibility of global racial communities should not be excluded but, theoretically, regional political communities should come beforehand. That is to say, "Coexisting regional communities is- i.e. trans- regionalism or even inter-regionalism- may be the best world order we can hope for in the intermediate term. In the long term there is a possible line from trans-regionalism over inter-regionalism and to multiregionalism." So, Hettne focuses on trans- and inter- regionalism as structural extensions of the 'regionalized condition' which are empirically identifiable (Hettne, 2003:39).

In this way, interest and expectations in regionalism and regional governance are considered important regarding the possibility of regionalistic decision-making as a method to secure political independence from the market power held by the nation-state, and as a way to accumulate political resources and further civilian interests through increased interstate cooperation. In this background, as can typically be seen from the nontraditional security (NTS) issues stated earlier, there is a fluidization of security needs and ideas which differ from the past.

III Cross-border Civil Society
: Development and Possibility of New Social Movements and NGOs

1. Expansion of Civil Society as a Space of Debate

Civil Society is "the space of an uncoerced human association," and this space filled by "the set of relational networks" (Michael Waltzer,1995:7). When the actual definition of civil society is pulled back at this abstract level, it is "the values, ideas and government policies, and corporate actions are publicly tested." It "is not a site of harmony, homogeneity, and conformity. There is a politics of civil society, which involves struggles over who legitimately participates in civil society, which ideas become dominate, the purposes of civil society, and how it relates to state and market actors" (Howell and Pearce, 2002: 234).

In this way, it is important to acknowledge the concept of "civil society" as a multiple, pluralistic, multilayered space or "site," as well as a "domain of debate" is important. Thus, the differentiation posed by Robert Cox of the concepts of a "bottom-up type" of civil society ("open civil society") and a "top-down type" ("the current type of civil society") is very meaningful.

The concept of civil society, similar to the concept of democracy, was fundamentally considered and conceived at the nation-state level. However, today the practical and logical discussion of the widening of cross-border civil society as a regulating space for neoliberal globalization has become indispensible. As spaces for opposition, the possibility of civil society is actually beginning to occur in the form of formal and informal networks not only at the local level but all the way to the global level.

"Various resistance campaigns are attempting to rebuild political community and social solidarity on a temporal and spatial scale appropriate for a globalizing age. Those campaigns largely emanate from civil society, and while some states serve as courtesans for markets forces, states may also resist globalizing structures. If so, and more as a matter of potential than as a current pattern, the efforts of civil societies and states can invigorate

one another in mutual attempt to remap globalization ˮ (Mittelman, 2008:20).

Globalization is broken up into dimensions with global currents received and interpreted in various forms by multiple local schisms. This leads to the emergence of various, unique reactions towards globalization. Civil society movements and civil society organizations (CSOs) are beginning to react independently towards the problems created by globalization. In this way, the emergence of regionalism as a base for civil society and the growth of regional civil society can be seen.

It is in this way Mittelman's expectation of the "resistance's" potential tilts towards actualization. Recently, intergovernmental meetings, and opposition summits and resistance have simultaneously increased rapidly. In such cases, the dialogue of civil society makes possible the formation of actual differences by nongovernmental organizations regarding the decision making process of governments or it can affect the actual implementation of decisions. Many intergovernmental organizations have been criticized for lacking transparency, accountability and therefore democratic legitimacy.

2．**Formation of Multilevel Civil Society and Opened Regional Space**

In this section, we will focus on the role of regional level as an actual and potential space when putting effective global governance into practice. Regional governance is neither inconsistent with global governance nor does it reject global governance. On the contrary, it has the potential to strengthen global governance. Today, a new current of multilateral governance which gives more distinguished roles to regions is being emerging. However, this new current has a series of problems that must be resolved. "Good" global governance does not imply only political jurisdiction. It also implies the creation of the most appropriate partnerships in between the state, regional and global levels of actors, and intergovernmental and nongovernmental categories of actors (Thakur and Langenhove, 2008:25).

Regional integration projects need to increase the active participation of civil society and local governments. One of the places for regional governance is actually within the multilateral framework designed for global governance. However, only after regional integration has moved passed economic integration, and received sufficient support from civil society, will it fight the dark sides of globalization and contribute towards its development (Thakur and Langenhove, 2008:37).

In East Asia, regional cooperation and the formation of civil society have emerged as important issues. As such, here let's take a look at this region as an example, particularly that of China, where global actors have been emerging at a rapid rate. Compared to the EU, regional integration in East Asia has been slow due to various reasons. However, regional integration of East Asia has been occurring without much formal institutionalization and it should be noted that the end of the Cold War opened up new possibilities for interactions within sub-regions.

From the perspective of China, construction of regional cooperation has three main characteristics. First, "it is a government led form of integration moving towards a type of regional unification of government and public sectors in which private funds support the government's vision." Second, "it is a pluralistic and multilayered form of regional

cooperation leading the way in the field of nontraditional security regarding, among others, economic, information and telecommunications and cross-border crime issues." And third, "it is China's enormous western development and the entire relationship front to back" forming its strategy for unification of Asia (Aoyama, 2007: 115).

As became clear during the previous discussion of NTS issues, the second characteristic, "nontraditional security," is no longer limited to a traditional militaristic dimension of nation-state, and interrelations between nation-states are not limited to a balance of strategic power. As such, pluralistic and multilayered cooperative relationships on the peripheral civil society and NGO level are made possible by being caught up in the field of nontraditional security, making development of the field of NTS a large step towards the construction of regional general cooperation.

However, a more historical and theoretical conception of the regional integration in East Asia is also possible. Moori emphasizes that in terms of the regionalism of East Asia, "There is a need for a theory or model based on the historical route and geopolitical characteristics of Asia." In addition, she proposes the following "fundamental concepts" when designing an "East Asian Community" (Moori, 2007: 25-26).

First, such a community "should be a community of the nation-state, citizens and 'people' living there. …and be based on the civil society of the regional community and atmosphere."

Second, in East Asia, "immaturity as a region, hardened nationalism of nation-states and expansion of problematic areas caused by globalization" are prominent, leading the community to become multilayered in accordance to each individual field (education and welfare, information sharing, major disasters and environmental destruction, the fight against terrorism etc).

Third, Moori emphasizes the need for conceptualizing regional collaboration together with conquering nationalism and working on confidence building, with a "regional public fund" being established from such collaboration. She also states that, "more than anything the regional public fund should not be something provided by strong countries, rather it should based around the ideal of being shared and provided by the entire region."

As seen from the above discussion, regional cooperation and the formation and expansion of civil society have a very close synergistic relationship. From the local level to the regional space, confidence building and the creation of a "regional public fund" on the civil society level form the basis for the creation of civil society. Of course, there are some conditions and problems concerning the guarantee in stability of regional civil society's hardened foundation. These include the growth of civil association on the local/national level as well as the expansion of public space. There are also problems in the inner portions of civil association (for example, the problem of legitimacy, unbalance of power between large organizations and small grass roots projects, the gap between North and South, etc).

3．World Social Forum (WSF)

"The movement for an alternative globalization" is increasingly bringing out historical meaning within diverse generations. This movement is a response to the recent steps of

global capitalism as a new political reality adjusting to principle in demand for a new form of opposition and movement towards new social openness. It is comprised of extremely colorful social movements and NGOs with new social agents and actual practices also emerging from within. These groups are active in new frameworks and are interweaving local, national and global battles. New social theories and analytical concepts are being sought in order to treat these new social movements appropriately. The counter-hegemonic globalization "not only challenges the various disciplines of the conventional social science, but also challenges as well scientific knowledge as the sole producer of social and political rationality." This proposes "not only analytical and theoretical questions, but also epistemological problems." In other words, there is an aim to fulfill utopia ("another world is possible") within a utopia lacking neoliberal world (TINA: "there is no alternative") (Santos, 2005a).

In order to think about these problems, let's look at the World Social Forum (WSF), which is gaining a lot of attention today. WSF was started in 2001 in Porto Alegre by commoners as an oppositional forum to the Davos Forum (World Economic Forum) (20,000 participants). WSF brings together various constituents with characteristic as a political and social space for representative global resistance. In addition, it doesn't necessarily represent a specific group or speak with one common voice. Rather, WSF has become a horizontally open space for movement towards symbolic and concrete reform of world order. It holds the ideal of "another world is possible" and represents a consensus to fight against an imperialistic, neoliberal type of world.

At WSF a wide variety of themes and problems including war and peace, democracy, environment, discrimination, abuse and oppression, migration, food, water, disease, farming, trade, debt, labor and gender have been discussed. Here, we will first introduce the "World Social Forum: Charter of Principles" (Fisher and Ponniah, 2003: 354-357) and focus on characteristics which emerge.

"The World Social Forum is an open meeting place for reflective thinking, democratic debate of ideas, formulation of proposals, free exchange of experiences and interlinking for effective action, by groups and movements of civil society that are opposed to neoliberalism and to domination of the world by capital and any form of imperialism, and are committed to building a planetary society directed towards fruitful relationships among Mankind and between it and the Earth" (Charter 1).

WSF is a "world process" based around a declaration of "another world is possible," (Charter 3) which seeks to "become a permanent process of seeking and building alternatives" (Charter 2).

WSF, stands "in opposition to a process of globalization commanded by the large multinational corporations and by the governments and international institutions at the service of those corporations' interests," and works to crystallize and "ensure that globalization in solidarity will prevail as a new stage in world history." It also supports "a democratic international system and institutions at the service of social justice, equality and sovereignty of peoples" (Charter 4). However WSF "intends neither to be a body representing world civil society" (Charter 5).

WSF "is a plural, diversified, non-confessional, non-governmental and non-party

context" which "interrelates organizations and movement engaged in concrete action at levels from the local to the international to build another world" (Charter 8).

It is "a diversity of genders, ethnicities, cultures, generations and physical abilities" and "will always be a forum open to pluralism and to the diversity of activities and ways of engaging of the organizations and movements that decide to participate in it." "Neither party representations nor military organizations" are allowed to participate in the forum, however, "governmental leaders and members members of legislatures" may be invited to the forum in a "personal capacity" if they are willing to obey the principals of the Charter (Charter 9).

WSF "upholds respect for Human Rights, the practices of real democracy, participatory democracy, peaceful relations, in equality and solidarity among people, ethnicities, genders and peoples" (Charter 10).

WSF is a "forum for debate" in addition to being a "movement of ideas" which carefully considers and reports the outcome concerning "alternatives proposed to solve the problems of exclusion and social inequality" (Chapter 11).

The forum "will increase the capacity for non-violent social resistance to the process of dehumanization the world is undergoing and the violence used by the State" and work to strengthen "humanizing measures"(Charter 13).

WSF is "a process" in promoting actions to deal with "planetary citizenship" issues from the regional to the international level (Chapter 14).

The characteristics in the Charter suggest a difference between the "alternative globalization movement," which became prominent in the 90s, and that of traditional social movements. In addition, WSF informs people of the worsening conditions of social unfairness, social exclusion and environmental destruction brought about by the process of neoliberal globalization. The forum also provides a valuable space for free deliberation from which contemplation and action necessary to create a new social order can be carried out.

The first characteristic of this alternative globalization movement is the method of thinking and ideas. The alternative globalization movement is not simply an opposition movement against neoliberal globalization. Rather, it rejects the vertical and uniform integration of differences by neoliberal globalization, accepting only horizontal solidarity.

A second characteristic is the change in movement actors. Social movement bodies, which previously were seen as being peripheral, emerge here as actors, deepening connections with established social movements. The farmer movement network represented by "Vía Campesina (farmer's road)" is one example. Vía Campesina is a cross-border coalition movement centered around Brazil's "landless farmers movement (MST)," India and France, which has now become an international network with currently over 50 million producers from over 60 countries.

Another example is the indigenous movement symbolized by the Zapatista Army of National Liberation (EZLN). The "water war" which took place in 2000 and brought about indigenous movement led by Bolivian indigenous groups attempting to recover their indigenous rights to resources is also a well known example.

A third characteristic of the alternative globalization movement is the formation of organizations in decentralized networks. The resistance is diverse and diffuse, expanding horizontally. It is a nonhierarchical network commanding local knowledge in order to oppose oppressive power.

In this way, WSF has both presented and put into practice many new characteristics. However, in the 10 years since its founding, various fissures and points of debate have also started to emerge. According to Moori (2008: 8-11), three fissures became prominent at the Nairobi Forum (7th WSF, 2007).

The first is the division between "visualized people" vs. "non-visualized people." For example, for many people living in slums as well as those from grass roots movements participation is financially difficult, causing them to be excluded from the forum. This led to criticism regarding to whom and to what degree the "open space" of the forum is actually for.

The second division was the split between NGO and social movement groups. Criticism centered on the fact that not only were people from grass roots movements unable to sufficiently participate at the Nairobi Forum, but large international NGOs had actually gained good space and held many events. In addition, these larger NGOs were criticized for settling as reformers rather than revolutionists.

The third division arose between "moderate forces" and "radical forces." "Moderate" members aspire for grassroots democracy and participatory democracy, using WSF as a place to foster ideas and space to oppose neoliberal globalization. "Radical forces," however, question whether an "alternative world" actually converges naturally from the start through free deliberation and exchange. As such, WSF has become involved in a clash between moderates who insist on WSF a "space" and radial forces who are attempting to turn it into a "movement." Such conflict within WSF, however, is unavoidable due to the diversity and expansion of its participating members. The 9th forum (2009) was held in Belem, Brazil with 133,000 representatives from organizations in 142 countries participating. At the 9th forum, the position of "radical forces" was symbolically expressed by the remarks of Samir Amin.

"I believe that now we have to raise the question of political strategies. We don't necessarily have to unite as one organization, but rather we must find a meeting point within our diversity. Various fronts, diverse cultural reference, diverse transformation goals, different types of struggles…But, the political question is central to all of this and we must dare to say so."

Conclusion

The spread of the neoliberal "revolution" is a process of both national and global building blocks. The neoliberal values concerning globalization and economic expansion effect every society, particularly the weak states of peripheral regions, strengthening the pathology of "modernization/colonization of world life."

If civil society is a multiple, plural and multilateral space, a "debating domain" of association, then it can be said that WSF is becoming a "new public space" for the possibility in a formation of cross-border civil society. The dominate neoliberal world order

cannot only be change on the local and national level. In other words, a cohesion of diverse and multilevel movements from local opposition to transnational cooperation are needed in order to fight effectively for global social transformation. Participatory process is needed at all dimensions of public space, meaning at the local, national and international level. Coalition and cooperation between local opposition and movements, which are the foundation of civil society, from the local to global multi-level governance is obviously ideal to ensure such participation. The method and conditions for this are not yet sufficiently clear, however, issues raised and deliberated at the World Social Forum (WSF) are helping bring about such clarity and in the process, contributing to the search in the possibility for multi-level local, regional and global governance.

References

Aoyama, Risa (2007). "Cyugoku no Chiikigaikou to Higashiajia-kyoudoutai" (China's regional diplomacy and the East Asian Community – Building pluralistic, multilayered regional cooperative relations), in Yamamoto,Takehiko and Amako, Satoshi (eds.). *Higashi-ajiakyoudoutai no Kouchiku 1;*Aratana Chiikikeisei (Construction of an East Asian Community 1 A new regional formation), Iwanami Shoten.

Avritzer, Leonardo(2002). *Democracy and the Public Space in Latin America*, Princeton University Press.

———— (2005). "Modes of Democratic Deliberation: Participatory Budgeting in Brazil," in Santos, Boaventura de Sousa (ed.). *Democratizing Democracy: Beyond the Liberal Democratic Canon*, London, Verso.

Biel, Robert (2000). *The New Imperialism: Crisis and Contradictions in North／South Relations*, Zed Books.

Bøås, M., Marchand, M. and Shaw T. (2003). "The Weave-World: The Regional Interweaving of Economies, Ideas and Identities,"in Söderbaum and Shaw (eds.). *Theories of New Regionalism*, Palgrave.

Buzan, Barry (2003). "Regional Security Complex Theory in the Post-Cold War World", in Söderbaum, and Shaw (eds.). *Theories of New Regionalism*, Palgrave.

Caballero-Anthony, Mely (2008). "Non-traditional security in Asia: The many faces of securitization," in Cooper, Hughes, and Lombaerde (eds.). *Regionalisation and Global Governance: The taming of Globalisation?*, Routledge.

Commission on Global Governance (1995). *Our Global Neighborhood*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Cooper, Andrew F., Christopher W. Hughes and Philippe De Lombaerde (eds.) (2008). *Regionalisation and Global Governance: The taming of globalization?*, Routledge.

Cooper, Hughes,and Lombaerde (2008). "Introduction：Reginalisation and the taming of Globalisation ？ ",in Cooper, Hughes, and Lombaerde, (eds.). *Regionalisation and Global Governance: The taming of Globalisation?*, Routlege.

Cox, Robert W. (1994). "The Crisis in World Order and the Challenge to International Organization", in *Cooperation and Conflict*, 29 (2).

Falk, Richard (1995). On Humane Governance: Toward a New Global Politics – The World Models Project Report of the Global Civilization Initiative, Pennsylvania State University Press.

———— (1995). "Regionalism and World Order after the Cold War," *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, 49-1.

―― (2003). "Regionalism and World Order: The Changing Global Setting" ,in Söderbaum, and Shaw (eds.). *Theories of New Regionalism*, Palgrave.

Farrell, Mary (2005). "The Global Politics of Regionalism: Introducction", in Mary Farrell, Björn Hettne, and Luk Van Langenhove (eds.). *Global Politics of Regionalism: Theory and Practice*, London, Pluto Press.

Fisher, William F. and Ponniah, Thomas, eds. (2003). Another World is Possible: Popular Alternative to Globalization at the World Social Forum, London and New York, Zed Books.

Gamble, Andrew and Payne, Anthony (1996). *Regionalism and World Order*, London, Routledge.

―― (2003). "The World Order Approach",in Söderbaum, and Shaw (eds.). *Theories of New Regionalism*, Palgrave.

Graham, Kennedy (2008). "Regionalisation and response to armed conflict, with special focus on conflict prevention and peacekeeping",in Cooper, Hughes, and Lombaerde, (eds.). *Regionalisation and Global Governance: The taming of Globalisation?*, Routlege.

Grugel, Jean and Hout, Wil (1999). Regionalism Across the North-South Divide: State strategies and globalization, London and New York, Routledge.

―― (1999). "Regions, regionalism and the South", in Grugel and Hout (1999). *Regionalism Across the North-South Divide: State strategies and globalization*.

Gaventa, John (2004). "Strengthening Participatory Approaches to Local Governance: Learning the Lessons from Abroad," *National Civic Review*, (Winter).

Harvey, David (2005). A Brief History of Neoliberalism, Oxford University Press.

Held, David (1987). *Models of Democracy*, Cambridge, Polity Press.

Held, David and McGrew, Anthony (2002). *Globalization ／ Anti-globalization*, Cambridge, Polity Press.

Held, David and Koenig-Archibugi, Mathias (2003). *Taming Globalization: Frontiers of Governance*, Cambridge, Polity.

Herkenrath, Mark (2007). "The Regional and Local Shaping of World Society: An Introdction", in Herkenrath, Mark (ed.). *The Regional and Local Shaping of World Society*, The World Society Foundation, Zurich (A series edited by World Society Foundation, World Society Studies, Volume Ⅱ , Zurich).

Herkenrath, Mark (2007a). "Civil Society: Local and Regional Responses to Global Challenges ― An Introduction", in Herkenrath, Mark (ed.). *Civil Society: Local and Regional Responses to Global Challenges*, (A series edited by World Society Foundation, World Society Studies, Volume Ⅰ , Zurich).

Hettne, Björn (1996). *Globalization, the New Regionalism and East Asia*, United Nations University Global Seminar '96 , Shonan Session, Japan.
（http://www.unu.edu/unupress/globalism.htl）

―― (1999). "The New Regionalism: A Prologue", in Hettne, Björn, Andras,Inoai, and Sunkel, Osvald (eds.). *Globalism and the New Regionalism*, Macmillan Press and St. Martin's Press.

―― (2003). "The New Regionalism Revisited",in Söderbaum and Shaw (eds.). *Theories of New Regionalism*, Palgrave.

Hettne, Björn, Andras,Inoai, and Sunkel, Osvald (eds.) (1999). *Globalism and the New Regionalism*, Macmillan Press and St. Martin's Press.

Hettne, Björn and Söderbaum, Fredrik (2008). "The future of regionalism: Old divides, new frontiers", in Cooper, Hughes, and Lombaerde, (eds.). *Regionalisation and Global Governance: The taming of Globalisation?*, Routlege.

Hirst, Paul and Thompson, Grahame (1996). Globalization in Question, the International

Economy and the Possibilities of Governance, Polity Press.

Hout, Wil (1999). "Theories of International relations and the new regionalism", in Grugel and Hout, *Regionalism Across the North-South Divide: State strategies and globalization*.

Howell, Jude and Pearce, Jenny (2002). *Civil Society and Development: A Critical Exploration*, Lynne Rinner Publishers.

Hveem, Helge (2003). "The Regional Project in Global Governance"in Söderbaum, and Shaw (eds.). *Theories of New Regionalism*, Palgrave.

Kaldor, Mary *et. al.*, (2001～2009). *Global Civil Society*, Oxford University Press, SAGE Publications.

Kaldor, Mary (2003). *Global Civil Society: An Answer to War* ,Cambridge, Polity Press.

Kaldor, Mary and Luckman, Robin (2001). "Global Transformation and New Conflict", *IDS Bulletin*, Vol.32, No.2.

Mittelman, James(1999). "Rethinking the 'New Regionalism' in the Contextof Globalization", in Hettne, Björn, Andras, Inoai, and Sunkel, Osvald (eds.). *Globalism and the New Regionalism*, Macmillan Press and St. Martin's Press.

―――― (2000). The Globalization Syndrome: Transformation and Resistance. Princeton, Princeton University Press.

―――― (2004). Whither Globalization? : The Vortex of Knowledge and Ideology, Routledge.

Moori, Kazuko (2007). "Souron'Higashiajia-kyoudoutai'wo Sekkeisuru―Gendai-Ajiagaku eno Charennji "(Designing a General Theory of an "East Asian Community" -The Challenge of Modern Asian Studies)," in Yamamoto,Takehiko and Amako, Satoshi(eds.). *Higashi-ajiakyoudoutai no Kouchiku 1; Aratana Chiikikeisei* (*Construction of an East Asian Community 1 A new regional formation)*, Iwanami Shoten.

Moori, Satoko (2008). "Oruta-Gurobarizeishon Undou no yukue―Tenki wo mukaeta Sekai Shakai Fouramu―" (The whereabouts of the Alternative Globalization Movement – The turning point of the World Social Forum), *Ajia-Taiheiyou Rebyu (Asia Pacific Review)*.

Parayil, Govindan ed. (2000). *Kerala: The Development Experience.* London, Zed Books.

Santos, Boaventura de Sousa (1998). "Participatory Budgeting in Porto Alegre: Toward a Redistributive Democracy", *Politics and Society,* 26(4).

―――― (eds.) (2005). Democratizing Democracy: Beyond the Liberal Democratic Canon, London, Verso.

―――― (2005a). "General Introduction – Reinventing Social Emancipation: Toward New Manifestors" in Santos (ed.). *Democratizing Democracy: Beyond the Liberal Democratic Canon*, London, Verso.

Santos, Boaventura de Sousa and Avritzer, Leonardo (2005). "INTRODUCTION: Opening Up the Canon of Democracy" in Santos (ed.). *Democratizing Democracy: Beyond the Liberal Democratic Canon*, London, Verso.

Söderbaum, Fredrik (2003). "Introduction: Theories of New Regionalism", in Söderbaum, Fredrik and Shaw, Timothy M. (eds.). *Theories of New Regionalism*, Palgrave.

Söderbaum, Fredrik and Shaw, Timothy M. (eds.) (2003). *Theories of New Regionalism*, Palgrave.

Söderbaum, Fredrik and Shaw, Timothy M. (2003). "Conclusion: What Futures for New Regionalism ?", in Söderbaum and Shaw (eds.). *Theories of New Regionalism*, Palgrave.

Thakur, Ramesh and Langenhove, Luk Van (2008). "Enhancing Global Governance through Regional Integration", in Andrew F. Cooper , Christopher W. Hughes and Philippe De Lombaerde (eds.). *Regionalisation and Global Governance: The taming of globalization?*, Routledge.

Tussie, Diana (2003). "Regionalism: Providing a Substance to Multilateralism?" in Söderbaum and Shaw (eds.). *Theories of New Regionalism*, Palgrave.

Waltzer, Michael (1995). "The Concept of Civil Society", in Michael Waltzer (ed.). *Towards a Global Civil Society*, Berghahn Books.

(MATSUSHITA, Kiyoshi, Professor, College of International Relations, Ritsumaikan University)

新自由主義型グローバル化を超えて：
民主主義の民主化と重層的ガヴァナンス構築への省察

　　新自由主義型グローバル化のもとで，グローバルなレベルからローカルなレベルまでの複雑で重層的な負の連鎖が明らかになってきた現在，グローバル化を「飼い馴らす」必要性と要求が強まっている。本稿は，新自由主義型グローバル化の暴走を統制し，飼い馴らし，そしてそれを市民社会に埋め込む可能性を探ることにある。

　　その際，グローバルなレベルからローカルなレベルまでの民主的なガヴァナンスの連携が実践的にも，理論的にも要請されている。それは，ローカルな視点（ガヴァナンス）と同時に，リージョナリズムの新たな可能性に関わっている。すなわち，新自由主義的グローバル化を市民の立場から統制する視点，グローバル化を「市民社会」に埋め込む視点とともに，新自由主義型再構造化に対する対抗力としてのリージョナリズの役割に注目することになる。

　　また，近年のグローバルな民衆レベルの運動と空間の拡がりに，特に世界社会フォーラム（WSF）も注目したい。市民社会が複合的，多元的，重層的な空間であり，アソシエーションの「論争領域」であるならば，WSFは国境を超える市民社会を形成する可能性を持つ「新しい公共空間」となっていると言えよう。支配的な新自由主義型世界秩序はローカルとナショナルなレベルだけでは変えられない。すなわち，グローバルな社会変容に向けた効果的闘争は，ローカルな抵抗からトランスナショナルな協調まで，多様で重層的な運動の結合を必要とする。公共空間のすべての次元で参加過程を必要とする。そのためには，市民社会の基盤にしたローカルな抵抗や運動，そして，ローカルからグローバルに至る重層的なガヴァナンスの連携・協調が理想的なことは言うまでもない。そのための道筋や条件はまだ充分に示されていない。しかし，WSFで提示され，議論されている課題は，ローカル／リージョナル／グローバルな重層的なガヴァナンスの可能性を探求し，具体化する論点となろう。

（松下　冽，立命館大学国際関係学部教授）