Chapter Two

Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

The topic of global cooperation for disaster management encompasses two theoretical areas, disaster management and international cooperation. With the emergence of global governance, however, some phenomena have challenged the existent theories. In this chapter, the literature of disaster management and international cooperation will be reviewed. This study reviews the literature on the origins of disaster management in contemporary government, and the contents and elements of disaster management. First I review the development of international cooperation theories, which include functionalism, realism, liberalism, and social constructivism. The emergence of global governance and its influence on disaster management and international cooperation theories are also discussed in this chapter.

2.2 Theories of Disaster Management

2.2.1 The Origins of Disaster Management

Early society viewed disasters as preordained, however, by the 20th century, the idea of providing disaster preparedness and relief was gradually forming within governments. In the case of the United States (US), a crisis administrative department has functioned since 1933. The National Emergency Council (NEC) was directly subordinate to the President and served as the President's personal crisis and management consultants at the time. In 1939, the NEC was reconfigured into the
Office of Emergency Management (OEM), which is one unit within the Executive Office of the President (Jan, Chung-yuang, 2004a). During the Cold War in the 1950s, the National Research Council carried out a series of crisis management studies to address the nuclear threat and artificial disaster scenarios. Natural disaster research became interdisciplinary after the publication of White’s *Natural Hazards Research* in 1973, and White and Haas’ book, *Assessment of Research on Natural Hazards* in 1975. The integration and coordination of crisis management in the US became more comprehensive after the establishment of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) in 1979.

During the development of the theoretical analytical framework, this study first examined the work of Nudell and Antokol (1988) and Alexander (2000: 7-22). Nudell and Antokol define five major crises types. They include: 1. natural hazards, such as windstorms, earthquakes, floods, etc.; 2. accidents, such as transportation accidents; 3. technological accidents, such as chemical or nuclear disasters; 4. induced catastrophes, such as kidnappings and crime; and 5. war-related emergencies involving civilians. Alexander (2000) discusses the relationships among crisis, risk, vulnerability, and disasters. He defines a catastrophe is an extreme geophysical event that is sufficient to cause a disaster. The threshold for declaring that a disaster has occurred depends on the people, society, and the vulnerability of the environment. He also contends that risk can be defined through probability, which can be explained with the following formulae:

\[
\text{Total Risk} = (\Sigma \text{elements at risk}) \ast (\text{hazard} \ast \text{vulnerability})
\]

The major elements include population, community, the artificial and natural environment, economic activity and service.
In other words, natural disaster management can be viewed as one category of crisis management, and the natural disasters may also occur other artificial crisis. For example, the Indian Ocean tsunami in 2004 and Hurricane Katrina also caused numerous artificial accidents. Emergencies or disasters not only cause casualties and property loss in the disaster area, but may also lead to the disorganization of society and breakdown of institutional operations. Scholars have viewed disasters as “agents of chaos” (Harris, 1990) and as catalysts of societal changes (Kreps, 1998).

With the development of industrialization and scientific technology, the relationships between the human environment and the natural environment have become more sensitive and each may be more vulnerable. In fact, according to the United Nations Disaster Relief Organization (UNDRO), an experienced organization in disaster management, the present disaster situation has merged human activities and physical phenomena. Therefore, UNDRO currently uses the term “complex disaster” to describe disaster situations (Aptekar, 1994: 22). The definition of a disaster according to the International Strategy of Disaster Reduction (ISDR), or more specifically a “purely” natural calamity, includes storms, drought, volcanic eruptions etc., and these may not result in a disaster. For example, torrential rain in the middle of the ocean will not necessarily cause any damage. However, if the same torrential rain falls on a community, it could easily cause injury (ISDR, visited in 4/10/2007). Varley (1994: 1-2) suggests that if someone wants to understand disasters better, he/she must pay close attention to the social course, that is, the degree of human vulnerability. Figure 2.1 displays what Cannon (1994) treats as a natural disaster through vulnerability analysis.
2.2.2 Disaster Management Cycle

To improve disaster management, Public Administration Review (PAR) issued a special volume entitled of *Emergency Management: A Challenge for Public Administration* in 1985. It has been shown that more attention is paid to crisis
management in contemporary public administration. Being a public problem, natural disasters have become one critical policy issue in modern government. Schneider (1992, 1995) points out that there are two systems that are important in disaster management: “bureaucratic norms” and “emergent norms.” The former promotes the mobilization of public organizations while providing disaster relief, and organizes and implements performance. The latter are contingent through the collective action of people influenced by the disaster. Successful disaster relief depends on the gap between these two norms.

Bureaucratic systems typically play an important role in crisis management in governments around the world. The following are a few examples. Japan passed the Disaster Countermeasures Basic Act in 1961, and Germany passed the Act of Increasing Disaster Preparedness and Relief (Gesetz über die Erweiterung des Katastrophenschutzes) in 1968. The establishment of FEMA by the US government in 1979 also reflects how many disaster management concerns the government has. In terms of the structural perspective of organizational theory, in order to have an effective response within the golden first 24 hours of any crisis (Jan, Chung-yuang, 2004a), the ideal type of bureaucracy and centralized authority is one which contributes to efficiency. Thus the role of government acting in crisis management will be similar in both Western and developing countries, (Rosenthal and Kouzmin, 1997: 287).

Crises resemble diseases with different stages: the prodromal crisis stage, acute crisis stage, chronic crisis stage, and crisis resolution stage. The prodromal crisis stage is the so-called “warning stage”, also known as the “pre-happening” stage. Finding the key point in an issue and dealing with it before the problems contribute to create a severe crisis is often the key to an organization’s success in a crisis. Dealing with a
crisis at the prodromal stage is not only easy-to-do but also effective. Further, it can generate preventive results, which explains why “prevention is better than a cure.” Once we enter the acute crisis stage, which is what people perceive as the “crisis stage”, the key to coping at this particular stage is to work as hard as one can to get the crisis under control, and to prevent the crisis from exploding rapidly. After the explosion of a crisis there are many complications—this is what we call the “aftermath stage.” This is also the stage of recovery and alleviating pain. At this particular time the government should analyze the key point of the issue. Some crises do not occur suddenly but have incubated for a long time. (Jan, Chung-yuang, 1999: 17-18)

With the coming of globalization, modern disaster management becomes more flexible and complicated. Rosenthal and Kouzmin (1997: 287) think the role and authority of government in disaster management is no longer unchallenged today. In other words, contemporary disaster management will rely on diverse relationships and participants, such as intergovernmental relations, non-governmental organizations, and civil organizations (Benson, Twigg and Myers, 2001; Mushkatel and Weschler, 1985; Rubin and Barbee, 1985). After reviewing the research on disaster management, Birkland (2006) concluded that the critical factor in successful disaster management is not merely having enough resources, but resource coordination. In short, how the resources are utilized by different actors and organizations is the major factor in successful disaster management.

With the onset of globalization, more international disasters have appeared. The concept of global governance has again challenged international cooperation in disaster management. Given the formation of a global public policy network (Reinicke, 1999) and the high interdependence of the global political economy, more
emphasis should be placed on the essentials of global crisis management and international cooperation.

2.2.3 The Functional and Policy-Making Approach to Disaster Management

By means of the functional approach to understand disaster management, Integrated Emergency Management Systems (IEMS) are designed to address multiple objectives, and assumes that all kinds of crises share common crisis characteristics. Thus FEMA defines IEMS as a “single flexible system capable of adjusting to many kinds of hazards.” IEMS divides crisis management into the following four-stages of policy-making and execution (Jan, Chung-yuang, 1990; 2004a; 2004b):

a.) Mitigation policy:

The policy at this stage includes planning to take preventive measures which alleviate the damage of the crisis. Mitigation policy in crisis management can be categorized into two types: 1. Structured (e.g. flood prevention plans, improving anti-riot equipment and techniques, etc); 2. Unstructured (e.g. drafting construction codes/laws to strengthen anti-seismic measures, agreeing on disaster-insurance regulations and land allocation regulations, and establishing tax incentives and dis-incentives).

b.) Preparedness policy:

Such policy improves operational ability when faced with a crisis, and includes: 1. Designing crisis operation plans; 2. Establishing a crisis communication network; 3. Establishing an emergency operation center; 4. Setting up a crisis alarm system; 5. Designing emergency operation team training and practice; and 6. Resource
management.

c.) Response policy:

The policy stresses what actions to take when a crisis will inevitably be converted into
a disaster. This includes a medical care system, operation of an emergency center,
rescue and evacuation, shelters for disaster victims, and preventive measures to avert
second-round disasters.

d.) Recovery policy:

Short-term recovery policy includes rebuilding the basics of a rescue system, for
example, restoring water and electricity. In terms of long-term recovery policy,
rebuilding public transportation, controlling radiative pollution, and controlling
disease and improving sanitation are all important.

Allison (1971) suggests three models to analyze international crisis management.
They are rational actors, organizational processes and governmental politics model.
The rational actor (model I) emphasizes that in international crisis management,
government actions are determined by maximization of national strategy objectives.
Thus nations or governments are viewed as only one rational actor, reacting to the
crisis faced by the nation. Therefore the so-called “action as rational choice” is
determined by concern for the national security and benefits. Rational actors take their
actions by abiding by such principles as maximizing values of the result among
different choices of plans. The dominant inference pattern of the rational actor (model
I) is that behind any government crisis action plans, we are sure to synthesize the
objectives reached. Such actions are reached through a maximizing means. The
common presumptive principle of the rational actor (model I) is the substitution effect:
the cost of the plan increases, and the possibility of taking the action decreases, and
vice versa. Some of the questions that bear further consideration include:

1. What is the problem that the nation is now facing?

2. What are some of the solution plans?

3. What is the benefit of such solution plans?

4. What are the evident common values and principles of the nation?

5. What is the pressure of the international community?

Organizational process (model II) proclaims that government actions are not at all determined by sense, but are mainly a product of the function of the organization. Standard operation procedures (SOPs) include:

1. Standard operation procedures of the organization.

2. Physical capabilities of the organization.

3. Presumptive stance taken by the organization.

In organizational process model, the key analytical roles are those government branches linked to the international crises. In the inference model, the optimal grounds to be taken to interpret the policymaking behaviors by the government organization at “t” moment are the routine performance of “t” moment. The decision to predict the government’s behavior toward risk management during t+1 is the output by the organization at “t” moment. The hypotheses of the organizational process theories won’t become more flexible or more farsighted because of an extraordinary situation. On the contrary, either the contents of policymaking and measures of enforcement are limited flexibility and incremental change. Thus government international crisis management should consider such questions as:
1. What are some of the crisis-affiliated governmental organizations?

2. What are some of the operational conventions of the organizations? And what are the effects?

3. Through what plans/SOPs do the organizations acquire necessary information when dealing with problems?

4. What plans/SOPs do the organizations take to establish policy?

5. Do the organizations have related plans/SOPs to execute that policy?

When a government adopts the political model (model III) vis-à-vis international crisis management, it will focus on different games inside the government and different game participants (players). These different participants (players) take into account not only the sole event of the crisis. Instead, they will take individuals, different countries, organizations and personal goals into overall and simultaneous consideration. These interested parties involved in the crises should do something about the pushing and pulling of politics in an attempt to affect the orientation of crisis management. Such a policymaking process is not the result of choice, but is the output of compromise, conflict, and negotiations for different interests. In the political model, the government assumes that international crisis management will be resolved by the prime participants (including branches of the government, interested entities, and the mass media) which have influence on the government. The policymaking process of those participants (players) is also subject to the influence of their positions and interests. The powers will affect the government policymaking process and result in influencing and affecting the results of the different participants (players). Meanwhile, the actions of different participants (players) will result in variations in the policymaking results because of different channels of participation. The fundamental hypothesis in government political models is that the governments
attempts at crisis management do not necessarily suggest the final action of the government. Since where you stand depends on where you sit, different participants (players) tend to have different views of the same crises. The issues stressed will differ as well because of different positions. The key issues to be taken into account include (Allison, 1971; Jan, Chung-yuang, 2004a):

1. Will firm policies come into being, aiming at communications, negotiations on the issues with, or without interacting channels regarding whether the government has established in response to countermeasures against crises?

2. Who are the key participants (players); what are the positions they take?

3. What are the pressures upon the participants (players), the costs they previously invested, and what are the characteristics of their personalities?

4. What is the time pressure of the crisis (on the process of negotiation)?

5. What turmoil or chaos might possibly come into being as a result of negotiation/bargaining?

2.2.4 International Disaster Management?

Disaster management has developed over several decades. Another factor in addition to the literature is the practical experience concerning domestic disaster. “Bureaucratic norms” (Schneider, 1992, 1995) still play an important role in disaster management. On the other hand, the related acts or regulations of disaster management in Germany, Japan, the US, and Taiwan demonstrate the varying roles of governments in disaster management.

During the period of the Cold War, international crisis management has become a critical issue in crisis management. In 1978, Frei published *International Crises and*
Crisis Management, an early work in which the topic of international crisis management was discussed. In that book, however, the major issues were international conflicts and world political crises.

Development of disaster management in the world took a large step in the 1990s when The General Assembly of the UN declared the 1990’s the International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction (IDNDR). Allinson and others also contributed to the literature on the issues of international and global disaster management beginning in the early 1990s (Allinson, 1993; Coppola, 2007; Pelling, 2003). Since contemporary disasters are more influential, lethal, and cross-boundary, how we can improve cooperation to mitigate the social and economic damage through disaster management in the globalization era has become a critical issue.
2.3 The Development of International Cooperation Theories

Looking back on the major international crises of recent decades (e.g. the Asian financial crisis (1997-1998), the M2 crash (2000), Sept. 11 terrorism (2001), the SARS crisis (2003), the Indian Ocean Tsunami (2004), Avian Flu (Bird Flu) (2005)) ---all were conquered through global coordination and cooperation. What theoretical approach best enables us to understand the underlying international relations? This study considers both theory and practice below.

2.3.1. Functionalism and Neo-Functionalism

Literature related to international cooperation can be traced back to The Progress of International Government by Mitrany (1933), in which the author expressed his concerns regarding international cooperation. He was of the opinion that due to ever-growing complexity in mutual economic dependency and technical advances, world development was running head-on into a steel wall; ironically, global political differences were creating very conspicuous divisions and contradictions. The situation actually worsened, with non-stop technological evolution. International organizations were thus born, under pressure to resolve the issues at hand. Although the forerunner of international cooperation, the League of Nations emphasized individual sovereignty, and there also were many technical and economic hurdles, so no effective solutions resulted from that organization.

During World War II, Mitrany also published A Working Peace System: An Argument for the Functional Development of International Organization (1943), establishing the basic theoretical foundation for the “functionalism” of international cooperation. According to the “doctrine of ramification” he proposed, cooperation
between two nations in one particular field, would bring about similar fruitful results in other fields; namely, the instigation of bi-lateral assistance in one department, would become the motivational force for successful cooperation in another department. Such cooperation would form a sort of functional organizational network, potentially infiltrating internal political affairs, gradually reducing the mobility of each democratic country, which would ultimately transfer its power to international organizations (on a silver platter). As far as Mitrany was concerned, cross-border cooperation should only be an untraditional global assistance module; the real aim and purpose is to solve problems, not to create new political units (and thus even more problems). In other words, through functional cooperation, more flexible and broader mechanisms would be born within cross-border cooperation, and this will also be without losing overall control. There could also be a common authoritative power in certain fields, in order to live in global harmony (Mitrany, 1975: 124).

Functionalism in international cooperation should be “from the bottom to the top”. All efforts must spring from concepts of economic benefit and societal needs; there should be consensus based on aggressive cooperation, via clustered global economic and social power to reach a cross-boarder synthesis (Haas and Schmitter; 1964). These basic concepts were continuously challenged in actual practice; especially since the 50s, the “Cold War” led to the gradual downfall of this definition of functionalism.

The Uniting of Europe, published by Haas in 1958, provided an addition to the terminology of “functionalism”. “Neo-functionalism”, for which the author was partially responsible, aided in the synthesis which became the European Union (EU). Haas induced two main concepts of Mitrany’s functionalism ideal: “Achieve world peace through economic synthesizing” and “economic synthesizing with fixed
parameters”, in order to conduct study of the EU (1950-1957). The Haas version (1958) stressed that the greatest benefits of functional cooperation won’t just happen; they are derivatives of three main factors: the economy, politics, and a cultivated environment (Chryssochoou, et al., 1999). The process is interpreted as the “overflowing of linkages”; once a synthesizing process is initiated in one economic field, it will lead to initiatives in other economic fields. By the same token of linkage, without the former field synthesizing, later ones won’t take place. The term for this phenomenon is “spillover”.

Besides emphasizing the importance of cross-border organizations (Hass, 1964: 47-49), Hass went on to distinguish the “politics of high-level” from the “politics of welfare”. The former represents political involvements; in high-level political relations, power struggles among nations remains the core focus. The latter is relevant purely to social welfare matters; in these politics, the people of the world contest one another for more common benefits, and are more apt to achieve a synthesis in international cooperation. In other words, synthesizing has two aspects: The first is “functional spillover”, as proposed in Mitrany’s doctrine of ramification to explain functional economic cooperation. The second is “political spillover”, institutionalization of cooperation functionalism derived from bureaucratic national strategies, which brings a better understanding to the country’s “elites” of the benefits of cooperation (Haas, 1964: 10-11). Schmitter (1969) thinks the spillover will continue on the basis of bi-lateral dependency within set functionalism parameters, but there is a potential for crisis during the process. He also talked about different reactions from decision makers, when faced with various circumstances, such as: spill-around, build-up, entrenchment, and spill-back. In addition, as far as neo-functionalism is concerned, the existence of an ultra-nationalistic system has
great relevance for promoting overall synthesizing. Mitrany is of the opinion that, unlike traditional functionalism, neo-functionalism is a mere interface, to alter nationalistic ideals. The basic outlook and mood won’t be changed, only the degree of citizen patriotism will be transformed through international alliances (Haas, 1958; Taylor, 1990: 133).

In summary, traditional functionalism, emphasizing more the appearance of collaboration among international governments while overlooking more solid structures of the “hybrid” system, loses functions through the gradual diminishment of individual sovereign power. In the end, it is a non-politicized clustering of mere organizational parts. On the other hand, neo-functionalism supersedes nationalistic ideals, stretching the spillover effect from technical to political fields and ultimately establishing systematic regional and ultra-nationalistic organizations. That is, the traditional functionalistic hybrid is a mere cooperative agency between governments, but a neo-functionalistic hybrid is an organization possessing ultra-nationalistic and political characteristics (Kao Hwa, 2003).

Mitrany’s functionalist cooperation becomes a deeper explanation with the appearance of neo-functionalism (Haas, 1958; 1964.) and the new concepts of spillover and spillback. However, since the 1960s, realism and neo-realism advocates such as S. Hoffmann (1970) and A. Moravcsik (1993) have held opposing views of neo-functionalism vis-à-vis the EU. They criticized it as completely ignoring the leadership role taken by nations’ leaders, as well as the catalyzing effect which the global community had exercised on Europe as an entity. More detailed discussions are provided in the next chapters.
2.3.2. Realism and Neo-Realism

After World War II, global politics’ main operating mode was political power, based on the tradition of realism. In *Politics among Nations*, Morgenthau and Thompson (1985: 5) noted: “…main conceptual tool which aided realism finding a way out in global politics is “profitable gain”; the definitive word is power.”

Traditional realism can be traced to writers such as Niccolo Machiavelli, Thomas Hobbes, and Carl von Chausewitz; their political and philosophical thoughts concerning the development of realism was based on the idea that man would follow pre-determined suppositions. Their ideas included:

(a) A negative view of human nature: human nature is evil; (b) The global village is anarchic: the non-existence of a “central government”\(^1\); (c) For international relations, the only reasonable and primary behaviorist is the “state”, possessing total sovereignty over internal and external affairs; (d) Under the presumption that each nation is seeking maximal power and security, when encountering conflicts of interest, they simply would not cooperate, even if a common interest were present; (e) The very nature of international relations is contradictory, only “relative gains” matters\(^2\); (f) Politics predominates over economy; all economic activities must be subjected to national (political) goals, for the sake of national security (Grieco, 1988: 488; Lynn-Jones, 1999: 54-55; Jiang, Qi-Chen, 2005: 135-136).

\(^1\) Milner (1993: 145-153) questioned the global anarchy assumption; he pointed out that anarchism should possess two types of definition: [a] Lack of order, meaning chaos or disorder. Nevertheless, there are some systematic and regulatory mechanisms, setting behavioral boundaries for individual nations within the international environment; for example, the prevention of war, to show balance of international power struggle. [b] Lack of an ultra-nationalistic entity, to implement or execute authoritative power. Again, there exist international organizations and international laws/courts; there is at least the appearance of order in the international environment.

\(^2\) Neo-realism practitioners assert that the decisive factor in international cooperation is relative gain. For example: Waltz (1979: 105) noted: “…if nations feel unsettled vis-à-vis the possibility of bi-lateral cooperation, unavoidably, questions on how to split potential benefits will be present; what’s taken into consideration then is “who’s getting more out of the deal?” and not “will we all be winners?”…”
In other words, in the “international system”, the main actor is the state, the main factor is power. A country is an egocentric entity, seeking private interest through selective screening; maximal power and security for oneself. Thus, international cooperation is a difficult task; its rare existence is sometimes derived through temporary alliances for a balance of power (Zhang, Yun-Yien; 2005: 37). From the perspective of “game theory”, cross-border cooperation will be beneficial to participants in the long run; but once it is influenced by competitive pressure or non-reciprocity, incentives for relative gains will be far more compelling than absolute gains, adding more obstacles and hurdles. This type of global phenomenon, refusing to cooperate even when an obvious advantage is present, is termed the “prisoner’s dilemma”. Such factors as this in international relations are often the main culprit when countries fail to assist each other (Grieco, 1988; Hsieh, Yi-Shu, 2003).

Relative to “power” and “bi-lateral relations” which are emphasized in traditional realism, Waltz (1979; 1986) expanded realism’s focus to the “system”; he developed neo-realism, expanding the analytical level from “states” in realism. Waltz employed hierarchy and anarchy as paring factors, to provide explanations for both domestic and international political systems. Domestically, different governmental agencies will step in under hierarchy, and make cooperative efforts based on mutual trust in order to accomplish their individual task. However, in the international environment, due to the lack of a “world government” thus making assurances for national security unobtainable, individual governments can only adapt to global political structures and remain competitive through “self-help”. Further observation reveals there are two main obstacles: international uncertainty, as well as a decreasing reliance of nations on each other in international politics (Waltz, 1986: 101-104).

Neo-realism began emphasizing economic issues; it focused attention on
economic reliance, because such matters are closely tied to individual sovereignty and national security. During the 70s, Kindleberger (1973: 289-291) proposed a stabilized global economic system. It requires a strong nation to take the leadership role, namely a hegemonic entity. It should be willing and able to maintain a steady supply and operation of public assets, in order to ensure stable and long term development of world economies. This is the basic theoretical principle of the hegemony. Gilpin (1987), influenced by the oil crisis of 1973, began investigating the dynamics between countries and markets; he had identified such interconnectivity as the key factor in international relations. Through the hegemony theoretic, Gilpin provided explanations for its current international embodiment, and pointed out that the hegemonic nation must be a strong country, with sufficient authoritative power over other member nations in the global village. Being the “dominant leader”, it must be powerful enough, as well as sufficiently willing, to regulate and maintain the basic game rules of international relation (Gilpin, 1981: 29). Possessing not only military superiority, but also financial strength, it must be able to “amend” the game rules, if the old ones are deemed to be no longer valid (Keohane and Nye, 1977: 44). Gilpin (1987: 72-75) described the “theory of hegemonic stability”. He asserted that the hegemonic nation will undertake the dual roles of “the provider” and “the beneficiary” simultaneously, vis-à-vis international security and public assets for the international regime.

It is then true that both realism and neo-realism will operate by individual countries, through an international regime. Unfortunately, the so-called “international systems”, only reflect member states’ own interests and benefits. Thus, international relations is defined more in terms of competition, rather than cooperation. Only if hegemonic states grow in dominance and the cost of mutual exchange is decreased will conflict be minimized, cooperative willingness increased, global stability
solidified, and international uncertainty diminished (Martin, 1992). Nevertheless, international cooperation achieved through hegemony, is nothing more than inter-dynamics and a nationalistic protection mechanism, between the hegemonic nation and other strong countries. No consideration was given to the long term benefits of advocacy for an international regime.

In 1993, the Harvard University scholar Moravcsik introduced the “liberal intergovernmentalism” doctrine, in an attempt to interpret the synthesizing process of the EU; one can regard it as a re-amendment of realism. It puts aside the assumption of traditional realism that an individual nation’s preference and benefits are pre-set. Instead, he proposed that such partiality is actually derived through competition among domestic interest groups. In addition, inter-dynamics and cooperation between world governments, as explained by Moravcsik, can be examined through credible commitments provided under a negotiation theoretic, by member states in the new system. This is the reason why individual nations grant authorization to an ultra-nationalistic entity, to represent, implement, and execute agreements and policies achieved through consensus.

There are three pre-requisites for liberal intergovernmentalism: [a] Autonomous individuals (or groups) behaving in a reasonable fashion, make strategic decisions based on self-interest and risk avoidance; [b] Governmental partiality is the clustering of domestic societal partiality, under circumstances of ensuing domestic welfare, national benefits will be limited in the global realm; [c] Conflicts in international cooperation are related to each individual nation’s essence and structure (Moravcsik, 1993: 480-482). As far as international cooperation is concerned, liberal intergovernmentalism represents total sovereignty and autonomy displayed throughout the global synthesizing process.
During the EU synthesis, nationalistic benefits and preference were formed by competition among member states’ domestic industrial groups. The degree of influence which these special interest groups exercise depends on the characteristics of the policy in question. Nevertheless, even if a synthesis is instigated through the preference of special interest groups, this does not guarantee a successful merger. The reason is simply that each nation displays a different degree of necessity, as well as persistence in certain preference (Moravcsik, 1993: 483-484).

In fact, based on the rationality consideration, each country is enticed to hitch a “free ride”. They only want to share in the external benefits of other member states’ domestic policies. Or they want to shift the external cost of their own domestic policies, while being unwilling to shoulder their part of responsibility burden. Only if external effects created between member states put forth common problems which can’t be solve unilaterally, will there be any incentive for member states to sit down and negotiate. Even so, negotiation and compromise “on-the-table” does not necessarily reflect true original preference (Moravcsik, 1993: 485-486). Once an individual nation’s preference is formed, that member state puts itself on the negotiation table. The sole aim and objective then is defining the exact terms/conditions of the cooperative venture. At this stage, there could be two types of obstacles to overcome: (a) negotiation efficiency; e.g. data recognition, as well as the cost of compromising and executing the agreement; (b) how each member state intends to get what it wants from the negotiation rounds. Different hypotheses are provided: (a) all cooperation and negotiation are conducted under free will; the EU operates with the prerequisite that it be a “democracy”\(^3\). Instances are rare where

\(^{3}\) In order to bring forth application for the validation of being a new member state in the EU, Article VI of the “Treaty on European Union” must be strictly adhered to. The original text reads: “The Union is founded on the principles of liberty, democracy, respect for human rights and fundamental
tactics of warfare or economic sanctions would be employed to reach an agreement. (b) all participating countries possess equal amount of available data, minimizing the cost incurred during individual preference analysis. (c) the cost of trade agreements reached during the negotiations have very limited space for increases, mainly because EU member states have known and “dealt” with each other for a long time already (Moravcsik, 1993: 496-507).

The analytical structure provided by Moravcsik was helpful in supplementing the aforementioned “theory overlooking domestic politics” criticism, and through comprehensive data, linking tightly practical experience with theory. However, when autonomous nations engage in collective actions, this poses difficulty in principle. The main culprits (again) were: individual preference, intention, and the uncertainty in predicting others’ behaviors. In order to maintain a smooth negotiation process and its execution, an international regime can contribute favorably to: raising the cost to infringing upon others’ needs, provision of dependable data to member states, and altering effective trade costs (Keohane, 1984: 97).

Moravcsik (1993: 475-476) further pointed out that throughout the synthesizing process of the EU, there lacked persuasion for “empirical” development. There weren’t comprehensive “research programs”, fully explaining the “theoretical core” based on documented practical experience. In contrast, Peterson (2001) is of the opinion that the interpretations of neo-realism and intergovernmentalism vis-à-vis the EU only differ “at the level of analysis”. For him, the most powerful evidence that Moravcsik provided was still the case study of the interpretation of historical determination. Furthermore, Peterson thinks that for a more appropriate interpretation of the daily decisions at the main and secondary levels of the EU, employing a freedoms, and the rule of law, principles which are common to the Member States.”
neo-realism or “policy network” framework would be more fruitful.

International cooperation, as described in the above paragraphs, was influenced by overlooking domestic politics. In other words, the emphasis on neo-realism over the “international system” was in itself an obstacle, i.e. that “a unitary and rational actor” could actually conjure up effective cooperation in strategy, ability, and benefit (Yuan, Yi, 1996: 7). In addition, during the construction of a global disaster management, the roles undertaken by “non-state actors” surpass the definitional boundaries set by the traditional international cooperation theories.

2.3.3. Liberalism and Neo-Liberalism

Traditional liberalism is the term for the “idealism” that arose after World War I. It believed that human nature is basically “good”, and wars and conflicts are caused by deficiencies in domestic or international political bodies. It shouldn’t be the destiny of mankind (or global society) to put one another at gun point; avoiding warfare must be coordinated through mutually beneficial negotiations. The ideal of traditional liberalism is creating an international organization and controlling anarchy with collective security. At the same time, traditional liberals believed that international laws and treaties should be able to regulate individual nations’ behavior (Chen, Xin-Zhi, 2003: 11-12). Though holding rather positive views of human nature, neo-liberalism abandoned the less practical elements of idealism; it emphasized “interdependence” and “institutions” (Jiang, Qi-Chen, 2005: 140).

There are many differences between neo-realism and neo-liberalism; however, both are based on a theoretic of “rationalism”. Keohane (1989: 158-179) labels both of these “rationalistic theories”. At discussion forums concerning neo-realism and
neo-liberalism, scholars from both sides still differ among themselves, mainly on the interpretation of the following six concepts: nature and the consequences of anarchy, international cooperation, relative and absolute gains, the priority of state goals, state intention vs. capability, and international institutions and regimes (Baldwin, 1993).

For example, as far as neo-realism is concerned, international organizations (or systems) only represent institutionalized dominant interests, or reflections thereof per global societal arrangements. In other words, neo-realism doesn’t assert that independent roles could be undertaken by these worldwide structures, either for overall security or for overall peace. The balancing of power is the key difference between war and peace; the organizations are only tools for hegemonic extension to obtain interests. The only possible ultimate role for these organizations to play would be as a “coordinator”, but in international matters which are considered less controversial, or in others considered to be of common benefit (Jiang, Qi-Chen, 2005: 137-138).

Nevertheless, for practitioners of this school, neo-realism does demonstrate the prominence of international regimes and the “multilateralism” effect, pushing cooperation under the hardship of decadent international security (Keohane, 1990; Keohane and Nye, 1985; Ruggie, 1993). There are only a few important thematic topics within so-called neo-realism. They are: [a] opposition to regarding the nation as the core (as proposed by realism); more essential roles should be allocated to elements like specialists/experts, unions, cross-party corporations, etc. [b] opposition to regarding the nation as a unitary and rational actor; participation channels in decision making should be open to groups, institutions, agencies, etc. [c] opposition to overzealous focus by the nation on power and security; other subject matters (such as growth and unemployment) should become elements in the dynamics between global
economies; [d] opposition to pessimistic views of international systems; on the contrary, the establishment of global institutions, groups, and alliances should instigate and fortify international cooperation (Grieco, 1988: 488-490).

Neo-liberalism as proposed by Keohane bridges the gap between liberalism and realism. While acknowledging the basic assumptions of neo-realism, it melds the viewpoints of liberalism and realism into a foundation for the school of neo-liberalism. This is regarded as a major development of liberalism within the realm of the international relations theoretic. “Power and Interdependence: World Politics in Transition” by Keohane and Nye (1977) refuted previous assumptions of the “nation as center”, as well as the “basic military power” of realism. It became the master work on the doctrine of “trans-nationalism”. It asserts that “mutual reliance” between nations actually points to direct influences derived from various activities between global acting entities. The determining factors for such exchanges are: finance, commodity, data, and capital assets, etc. The simply fact of merely satisfying a particular nation’s interests does not qualify as mutual reliance. While upholding individual sovereignty, it is forced to take into consideration other countries’ choices, and then mutual reliance takes form. Thus, no cooperative efforts mean no gains, or that both sides had suffered losses pressuring them to end the “relationship” (Milner, 1993: 163).

From the viewpoint of inter-dynamics among global actors, Keohane and Nye (1977) offered their interpretation of “interdependence” by segmenting it into two categories: sensitivity and vulnerability. Sensitivity is the reciprocity created under political structures; under the pretext that such structures remain unchanged, the regulating module is therefore adapted to new circumstances. Inclusive of domestic and international codes, adaptation is reflected in terms of exchange volume and the
consequence thereof between players. Vulnerability, on the other hand, indicates the ability of an actor to adapt to changes; potential damages were probably already present, even before the new policies went into effect. The perspective of adaptability is a national issue; the stronger the nation, the less vulnerable it is. In contrast, the weaker the nation, the more vulnerable it is. As far as vulnerability is concerned, once interdependence is established, it will not be altered; the consequences for alternation could mean greater losses than profits for both sides. Such interdependence should be protected and maintained, in consideration of national interests. In other words, unlike neo-realism, neo-liberalism asserts that through interdependence, cooperation between nations is quite predictable and anticipated.

Unlike realism’s emphasis on the State as the most important actor within international regimes, Keohane and Nye (1977) look at international regimes on a variety of levels. The quantity of international actors (on various scales) is multiplying exponentially and forming ever tighter knit units. Good examples are multi-national conglomerates and non-governmental organizations (NGOs), taking on crucial roles which excise more powerful influences. Thus, on the subject of global economies, interdependence relationships have become a brand new mechanism for international cooperation.

In addition, in the book *International Cooperation in Economic and Security Affairs*, Lipson (1984) pointed out that security issues have the power to cause immediate and potential damages, more so than economic issues. If earnest efforts from one side do not elicit the necessary reciprocal responses, especially when coupled with a lack of effective control mechanisms, then making joint global security efforts will seem unfeasible unless an efficient systematic arrangement aimed at minimizing the degree of damage can be set up. Thus was born the concept of an
international regime at a historical moment. Keohane (1984: 12-14) in his masterpiece “After Hegemony” (which employed the methodology and concepts of economics) provided the following argument on international regimes. During the formation and maintenance of international cooperation, besides being founded on a basis of mutual interest among state actors, involves other key factors: differentiation in behaviorism, unsymmetrical data obtainment restricted by the diversity of subject matter parameters, as well as proficiency at the level of trade cost cutting.

When they re-issued their book “Power and Interdependence: World Politics in Transition”, Keohane and Nye (2001, 3rd edition: 24-29) changed their emphasis to the transformation of international systems at the beginning of the latter half of the 20th century, which was no longer viewed as a temporary, superficial phenomenon. It had become a long term quality amelioration and developmental trend with three major characteristics: 1. the importance of using military tactics as the diplomatic mean had decreased; 2. diplomatic aims and objectives no longer predominated over levels or priorities. 3. non-state actors’ behaviors had expanded and been re-vitalized, forming an enlarged cross-border network system.

2.3.4. Social Constructivism

The origins of the Western theoretic on international cooperation can be traced back to the early 1970s with the advent of neo-realism, neo-liberalism, and social constructivism. Each possessed its own unique argument, namely, hegemony theory, systematic cooperative theory, and cultural cooperative theory. Differentiation of these three schools of thought is based on their individual political assumptions (Song, Hsio-Ju, 2005). As mentioned above, the core of the theoretical departure of “rationalism” is shared by neo-realism and liberalism; recognition and benefit for the
actor are exogenous and given. The real focus should be fixed on an actor’s behavioral patterns, as well as on an analysis of the eventual consequences (Song, Xin-Zho, 1997: 34).

Taking an alternate route, constructivism places more emphasis on “identification and norms”, as well as on the cause-and-effect which cultural differences play in international relations, including an identification process for individuals, states, and global communities (Bloom, 1990; Wendt, 1994). Wendt (1992) raised doubts concerning anarchy, which generally has been recognized as a core concept for conducting research relevant to the mainstream international relations theoretic. By emphasizing the social structural characteristics of anarchy, he could challenge the assumption that international communities operate under the logics of a single anarchy. Wendt (1994: 384-396) went further in stating that the conceptual ideals of “corporate identity”, “social identity”, and “societal collective identity” were formed, via actors’ collective actions within social “contexts”, “systematic processing”, as well as a “strategic implementation” mechanism, creating its own rights and group benefits and finally gaining a societal collective identity. Constructivism shifts attention to rules and norms; it believes that international norms possess realistic social content, completely outside of any power distribution, and are the common basis for identification of states and interests. (Nadelmann, 1990; Finnemore, 1993; Katzenstein, 1996).

Other major viewpoints of constructivism, demonstrating equal amounts of reflection and criticism vis-à-vis mainstream rationalism, include (a). an emphasis on constitutive rules relevant to the importance of regulating norms; different scenarios appear under different contents, similar actions (or incidents) generate variant meanings (i.e.: X counts as Y in context C). At the same time, defining
authoritativeness as encompassed in systems, it grants more leniency and convenience for the actor; (b) constructivism’s end results must be dawned? with open-mindedness and latitude; emphasize is placed on “historical contingency” rather than “unintended consequences”; (c) phenomena such as “power politics”, “security dilemmas”, and “self-help” are not unavoidable historical destinies in international relations; (d) interests and identification are not exogenously given or pre-fixed; only via willingly granting (by the actor) to filter them through an inter-subjective and reciprocal identification process, undergoing rebirth, fortification, or transformation, could such end results be obtained. In order to be effective, the enforcement of power must be executed through theoretical systemizing and network nesting. These characteristics display extreme opposition, when compared to the usual basic assumption of the “given a priori ” emphasis on interests and powers brought forth by rationalism (Wu, De-Yuan, 2003: 9).

According to constructivism, international cooperation should be crafted according to a process. First of all, identity confirmation of the individual (or group), category, role, and collectiveness is relevant to inter-dynamics typing within a global structure. Not only does each identity represents a single script (or pattern), but also due to various levels created by cultural differences, questions are raised on such issues as “who we are” and “what we should do”. Besides, “interest” is predetermined by individual identity; without clear identity, benefits would have no direction. During the formation of a cooperative culture, it is exactly because shared knowledge is extremely crucial, plus the fact that shared knowledge attaches itself with the birth of collective identity, that the main formation parameter of collective identity becomes the rudimentary key factor (Song, Hsio-Ju, 2005).
2.4 The Emergence of Global Governance

2.4.1 The Age of Globalization

Currently, the expansion of capitalism and development of information and communication technology (ICT) have radically transformed the political and economic society of the entire world (Harlow, 2001). Since the 1980s, the term “globalization” has become widespread. Today, things new and popular are generally termed “globalization”. Longworth (1998) pointed out that globalization suggests formation of a global economic system, as a sort of revolution, enabling entrepreneurs to raise working capital anywhere in the world. By means of such working capital, one may sell technology, communications, management and human resources from anywhere of the world to customers in any corner of the world. In the eyes of the neo-liberalists, the term “globalization” as set forth herein primarily denotes the integration of the global economy and markets. The results might not necessarily be the “zero-sum game” where either you die or I survive (Hung, Chao-Hui, 2000: 75-76). Instead, it is the very symbol of humans being technologically advanced. Meanwhile, as information and communication technology (ICT) advance rapidly, the concept of time and spaces is compressed. This very concept, therefore, emerges and flourishes amidst a flow of capital. With rapid communication among countries throughout the world, information and communication technology (ICT) plays a pivotal role, and thus came into being the idea of the so-called “global village”, “bringing people afar as close as the next-door neighbor”. The scholar Kobrin (1996: 367) pointed out that the newly emerging economic entities are electronically-based and are integrated through information systems and technology.
How is “globalization” defined? Beck (2000a) queried many scholars about their stance toward globalization. I present some of those definitions below:

Table 2.1 Quotes of globalization defined by scholars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholars</th>
<th>Viewpoints about globalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wallerstein</td>
<td>An effort of a single social image which abandons its isolation and which adopts an entire-world system instead. During the process, all societies, governments, enterprises, cultures should position themselves in a job assignment system. Through such efforts, the logic which contains capitalization can be realized. Such empiricism is in “single cause and consequence” and “being economic”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosenau</td>
<td>The term “globalization” as set forth herein denotes: Where people already bid farewell to international politics (where nationalism dominates the international realm). Today, the doers in the nations should share the stage and power with multinational groups and multinational societies. There exist two global social amphitheatres—Nations (duly organized) and the multinational sub-political world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilpin</td>
<td>Starting from the orthodox viewpoint of international politics, they believe that globalization would come into being only under the specific conditions of international politics. Namely, the tacit permit of nations is the very premise of globalization. In the development of international room and doers, the premise is hegemonic structure and international politics. In case of any lack of such advantages, e.g. liberal and hegemonic powers, the market expansion of the integrated society can’t possibly come into being.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Held</strong></td>
<td>In the globalization process, “there generates complicated conditions and deployment of powers”, restricting a government and nation from freedom of action. Currently the power itself should be looked into and we should study the division of powers. Such divided powers could be taken as the context for national, regional and international actors and, as a result, subject to multiple restrictions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Robertson</strong></td>
<td>The current globalization represents two aspects of the same process from globalization which is recognized and reflected through mass media. What is to be looked into and studied is: How is the significance of world vision opened amidst cross-cultural characteristics Local and global characteristics do not exclude each other. On the contrary, local characteristics should be taken as an aspect of global characteristics. Globalization characteristics suggest as well: Where the local cultures are assembled and touch, the two must exist among the local impacts. The contents should be defined anew. It is suggested that “global localization” should be used in place of the concept of globalization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appadurei</strong></td>
<td>The concept of global localization enables people of imagination to obtain a sort of unique power in their daily routines. More and more people of the world dream and consider “possible” lives. One of the sources of such change is the mass media, providing enriched, continual options. Such trends create suspicion about the center and peripheral areas, when both are structural elements of the “world of imagination”. In the world, there are different people and entities, different significances and dreams, exchanges and experiences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bauman

In fact, globalization and localization represent two elements and two aspects. With globalization, poverty and wealth are combined into a whole and bring globalization into nonexistence. The concept of globalization divides the world into global wealthy people who successfully overcome space but have no time, and the local poverty-stricken people who are bound to spaces and must deal with their useless time. Among the winners and losers of globalization, there is no uniformity or inter-reliability. The bonds of unity are broken.

Source: Summarized from Beck (2000a).

Held et al. (1999) offered a relatively concrete definition of globalization: The behaviors including various social relationship and measures of actions (to be assessed based on the range, strength and speed of expansion, influence and impact) to generate cross-continent and cross-region actions, a sort of process of interaction and action of powers as well as networks (or a context for the process). Through which aspects is globalization expressed Former President Yeltsin of Russia courageously spoke to the Moscow populace on a tank. When his speech was disseminated via a CNN satellite, the information plus nationalism turned into invalidity. This is a concrete case of “information globalization”. In 1992 when the Environmental Protection Summit was convened in Rio de Janeiro, the “development with sustainability” became the worldwide standard and, in turn, affected political performance in many nations of the world. This is a sort of “ecological globalization”. In the Berlin Airport, a staff member from California was hired to speak through the broadcasting system in order to cut manpower costs. This is a sort of “production/labor globalization” (Beck, 2000a).
As noted by D. Waldo (1985: 2), civilization and progress came into being because of efforts to deal with environments. In line with the development of civilization, a society tends to turn into ordered complexity which calls for administrative method in order to operate. The globalized development tends to bring up the supposed transition. Administrative systems play a pivotal role in the process of globalization as well, and are even required to adjust the role to deal with more rigid challenge. To put this idea into more understandable terms, national mechanisms must redefine their roles and positions in international politics and economics and make a corresponding adjustment of their functions and performance among the domestic social interactions (Kuttner, 200; Turner and Corbacho, 200).

2.4.2 From Government to Governance

Where citizens of all nations tend to increasingly appeal to government systems for reform, the more common reflections include financial problems, democratic and legitimacy problems, wicked issues (Peters and Savoie, 1995: 5-11; Clarke and Stewart, 1997: 32-36) which commonly lead to suspicion on the part of the public about whether their government’s functions and methods of operation can deal with the transition. Next, where the public shows declining trust toward government, the government must maintain its criteria of operation by means of control over expenditures and tax-cuts, with an increasing focus on professionalism, government performance and a performance-based public management model.(Lynn, Heinrich, and Hill, 2001:3). The former American president Clinton adopted three policies during government remodeling: 1. privatization of public services; 2. utilization of non-governmental organizations; and 3. partnerships between the public and private organs. Namely, the American government reform gradually turned into a new form
of governance (Gonzalez III and Bhatta, 1998: 5-6). In the trend and inclination toward administrative reform, the original “government” functions are gradually replaced by “governance” which is more extensive (Rhodes, 1996: 652).

In other words, the roles played by the government and the interrelationship between the government and society have undergone changes in line with the model of governance. The birth of this concept of “governance” suggests that the government authorities have adopted a different mode of thought. This term “governance” has enlivened the mode of thought of the government toward reform. Observing the government, scholars study the new modes of formation and enforcement of public policies. Public policies are not necessarily enacted by the central government alone. All policies come into being only as a result of the interaction between the government and other divisions. The central government should share power with other departments. In other words, the government shoulders the responsibilities primarily to prompt interaction by and between the society and politics, so as to set up more systems to solve problems and to render public services (Rhodes, 1997: 50-51).

Among governance related theses, some are state-centric and others are society-centric. Those who believe in the former hold that during the governance process, although the government roles and functions have been transferred, a government can still dominate such transformations (Pierre and Peters, 2000). Others who believe in the latter point out that in terms of governance, society is a sort of self-dominated system (Kooiman, 1996). In summation, governance is intended to create terms which benefit from the maintenance of order and collective actions. Such actions further affect the setup of systems. On the other hand, the systems are the rules of games that regulate or ban actions (Stocker, 1998: 30). The facts of
governance could be examined via three aspects. In terms of overall society, governance is a sort of process for socialization. Both public and private departments play a role in it. (Kooiman, 2000: 138). For the political context alone, governance indicates administering amidst the politic context as well as the competence to induce into the maximum possible public interests (Green and Hubbell, 1996: 38-39). Judging from the positioning of the government and the external world, when governance takes the place of government, it determines the relationship between the government and a citizen society which is no longer in conflict, but which instead is in development toward a new type of political negotiation, interaction. (Bang and Sorensen, 1999: 329).

Furthermore, governance represents a sort of collective action in an organization. Under the tool-oriented concept, governance involves establishment of systems. Systems are the criteria or rules of games to ban actions. Through incentives for change, a governance system encourages doers to adopt collective actions against any bottleneck. Successful collective actions enable doers to launch cooperation while striving for their goals. If the interests and costs of the doers are unbalanced, the evolution and transition of systems might be in conflict. Even if the losers’ losses exceed the winners’ benefits, the system would still be established. When the collective actions incurred by the systems cannot increase efficiency, it is very important to look into how governance has evolved and how governance affects human behavior. Governance may be viewed as a sort of network relationship. (Goldsmith and Eggers, 2004; Haden, 2004; Kenis and Provan, 2006).

Pierre and Peters (2000) argue that governance concept-oriented literatures tend toward confusion. That is because governance is both a phenomenon and a framework for theories or analyses. Governance differs from other major frameworks in
traditional political science. Political science is only intended to be concerned about political systems and governing power. It is this surface appearance which is unacceptable to governance theories. Pierre and Peters specifically stress that the governance concept should be thought of as a sort of analytical framework. It inter-links the enactment process of interaction and public policies. At the same time, it points to the interrelationship between society and governance actions. Meanwhile, the concept of governance links the society through the political process and the process to strive for specific goals in a context. To put it in more understandable terms, if we put the concept of governance onto the level of globalization, we can further observe the entire world, the development status of doers in the interaction relationship, and the issues of such policies as the global economy, international security, and global environmental protection. We also can observe how the process of globalization influences the formation or adjustment of global governance, and how the governance structure and mobile processes influence globalization under the global governance system.

2.4.3 Global Governance as a New Approach to International Relations?

The aforementioned discussion enables us to see that governance and globalization have held the limelight in the realm of international relationships. Previously, scholars used to focus on how countries, organizations, corporations and other actors accurately position themselves. After the Cold War era came to a close, the number of ultra-national organizations increased significantly in Europe. The worsening environment and mounting concern about other external affairs led to more extensive probes into “global governance”. Scholars have studied how economic flows, population relocations and other means of interactions shape international politics. Over the past decade, the growing activities of
multinationals have stimulated new concerns about globalization (Lake, 1999: 31). Globalization comes into being through the vicissitudes of technology, the expansion of market systems, and competition in domestic politics and internal government, and also pushes governance toward reform. Governance reforms will affect technological transitions, the expansion of markets, and competition in domestic politics and within governments, which once more leads to globalization. (Prakash and Hart, 1999)

International relations scholars J. N. Rosenau and E. O. Czempeil, in their book entitled Governance Without Government: Order and Change In World Politics published in 1992, used the concept of governance to review the new international relationship. They believe “governance” is a broader concept than “government” and it can better interpret the phenomena of international politics. They defined the term “governance”: “governance is order plus intentionality”. This means that among the actors in international relationships, the policymaking behaviors are interacting and inter-dependent. Those doers would try to dispose and form certain order to solve the issues in common (Rosenau and Czempeil, 1992: 5).

Global governance represents a trend in the development of international public affairs in the era of globalization, and bears the enriched connotation of international public management. First of all, global governance is intended to look into public affairs management in the international community. There are several core characteristics of the breakthrough to country-based globalization. Currently many of the theories could not possibly work at the level of nations and countries. They launch effective studies on a single country and the related international relationships. Instead, those issues should be viewed in terms of globalization. Next, as the inter-dependence of countries grows, this calls for an interaction-based model for international public affairs based on cooperation and negotiation. The concept of global governance
exactly satisfies this need. In line with the globalization development, all countries
virtually share their inter-dependent fate only because of the global issues. Many
countries realize that many domestic issues can no longer be able to be solved through
domestic efforts alone, but instead call for cooperation and coordination with
neighboring nations (Wang, Le-Fu and Liu, Ya-Ping, 2003).

Weiss and Gordenker (1996) have argued that global governance aims at the
society and the political issues beyond a government’s competence and range, to offer
a more orderly and more reliable response. Young (1994) pointed out that global
governance is the establishment and operation of a social mechanism/regime which is
capable of solving conflicts that exist in the world to boost cooperation or alleviate the
problems incurred by collection action. The emergence of global governance leads to
a structured transition under public administration (Farazmand, 1999):

1. Adjust anew the relationship between the public and private sectors. Market and
privatization-oriented global movements change the range and state of public
sector functions and activities. Many countries, while recognizing the sector of
private markets, must undergo the process to define anew and adjust anew the
relationship between the public and private sectors. The most fundamental
principles are to gain added efficiency in the management of government
functions and to increase economic productivity. Unless the government intends
to release the areas of public policies to back privatized entities which stress
productivity and services, the responsibilities of public organizations would not
cease to exist.

2. Restructure and redesign organizations. When the government organizations are
adjusted, numerous problems regarding organizational design will surface,
including an increasingly complicated environmental context, centralization and
decentralization of power, change in the government’s roles, orientation toward the organization, the influence of flexibility, efforts to coordinate with multiple organizations while transmitting services, issues of overlapped organizations, issues related to the responsibilities of public and private departments. In restructuring the globalization context, we must take into account management, politics, economics, organization and other features of global environments.

3. Administrative reform. The government will launch reform of the administrative systems in an attempt to gain legitimacy, enhance administrative performance, boost management efficiency and boost organizational flexibility. The administrative reform has goals consistent with market-orientation, privatization and democratization, including power centralization and decentralization, variation of personnel and budgeting systems, changing and lifting laws and regulations. Critics pointed out that some developing countries tend to follow their advanced Western counterparts in administrative reform. As a result of such practices, the developing countries are very likely to become the “new colonies” of their developed counterparts.

4. Global bureaucratic systems. Adjustment of the new global administrative systems calls for large-scale bureaucratic systems which are divided, diverse, complex and inter-related. Such bureaucratic systems can be classified into concealed bureaucratic systems and substantial bureaucratic systems. The former refers to completely mature organizations linked to the economy, politics and military, e.g., the World Bank, the American government, the Immigration Act. The latter refers to the United Nations and membership and non-membership organizations thereunder, established for various purposes. Multiple international issues, global issues and conflicts are managed through the latter.
Pierre and Peters (2000: 83-91) have pointed out that global governance will transfer national powers into three levels. 1. Moving-up governance. This refers to a situation in which a nation’s sovereignty is penetrated or replaced by international organizations. 2. Moving-down governance. This refers to the decentralized powers of a country. Sovereignty is transferred to the local level, to the local government or community governance and 3. Moving out governance. The power of a nation is transferred from the political elite to social organizations or mechanisms, and is taken to boost public services or to enforce government policies by means of non-government organizations (NGOs).

Global governance suggests that among the citizen societies throughout the world, nonprofit and non-government organizations play roles not only as the superintendent, but also as a doer, capable of teaming up with the government at huge scales, to provide public services which are supposed to be borne by the government but which the government is unwilling to provide. Non-government organizations carry out activities in a manner which might be helpful to shaping the roles they are supposed to play in the country and in the citizen society. Non-government organizations carry out two major tasks. The first task is intended to solidify the citizen society. The second one is to reform the nation and its policies, demanding that public servants and political leaders assure more efficient assumption of their public responsibilities (Turne and Hulmer, 1997).

International enterprises are also dubbed multinational companies (MNCs) or multinational enterprises (MNEs). They can register themselves in a certain “parent country” and with the range operated by other “subsidiary countries”. But very often their powers go beyond the range regulated by the “parent country” and their “subsidiary countries”. Their powers originate in their economic power, which can be
as gigantic as the entire nation’s. The top 300 of the world, for instance, almost dominate as much as a quarter of the entire world’s production resources. Those multinationals minimize their production costs and investment risks by taking advantage of the international division of labor and free flow of their capital (Hirst and Thompson, 1996).

In summation, under the trend of globalization, the uniformity of national and country-oriented societies are no longer binding as strictly as previously, coming into being are new style powers and a competition relationship, as well as the role as the “organs and doers” of nations and countries, amidst the conflicts with “multinational doers, multinational recognition, multinational societies and room, multinational trends and processes (Beck, 2000a). Certainly nations and countries remain powerful. The political leaders still play important roles in the world. The nations and countries will, nevertheless, be restructured. The policies that take a single country as the range are no longer as effective as previously. The previous “geopolitics” is far less important. Nations and countries should reconsider their prospects (Giddens, 2000).
2.5 Summary

This chapter reviews the literature of disaster management and international cooperation. In disaster management, the origins of disaster management, the cycle of disasters, and the functions and policy-making approach of disaster management are discussed. With the coming of globalization, the issue of international disaster management has also been noticed. In order to pursue the better outcomes in global disaster management, the international cooperation is inevitable. The theories of functionalism, realism, liberalism, and social constructivism suggest different approaches to explore the natural of international cooperation. In the era of globalization, however, the states have not been the only authorized actors in global issues. Besides, the responsibility of disaster reduction does not only belong to the states in the shared-risk society (Comfort, 1999). In other words, the emergence of global governance has challenged the traditional views of international cooperation.