

GLOBALIZATION, DEMOCRACY, AND DEVELOPMENT

Joxel García
Hiram R. Morales Lugo
Jesús Nieves Mitayne

I. Introduction

The fourth issue of *Ethos Gubernamental* is dedicated to the study of globalization, public health, and contemporary governance, as well as to exploring the emerging public ethics challenges that are proliferating in current development policies. In its most basic sense, this topic suggests examining the relationships between the different global processes, emphasizing human physical and social well-being within the context of democratic governance, whose priority is clearly development, although in practice, policy-making often goes beyond its simplest referents and systems. At its most complex levels, this topic raises profound questions on how to interpret and organize its variables so as to support public policies and ensure that they satisfy the demands associated with them. This task becomes even more daunting when factoring in the controversies in play over what direction current public policy should take. At the same time, policy-making is also subject to changing scenarios, where local, regional, and global events are both interrelated and interdependent. The introduction of a topic with these characteristics requires a broad initial context in order to discuss and relate concepts, and point out problems and questions whose consideration will contribute to the discussion on the prevailing public cultures and challenges that emerge when they are viewed in the light of the demands of today's global processes.

Historical changes at the global level are marked by a multitude of asymmetries, such as those between traditional public understandings and the material conditions of the population. Here, we are referring to the disparities that become especially palpable on examining the depth

The authors wish to acknowledge the contributions of Dr. Bjarne Melkevik at the Faculty of Law, Université Laval, Quebec, and Dr. Manuel Ángel Morales, a retired professor of the School of Public Administration, University of Puerto Rico and an organizational development consultant. The authors are solely responsible for the content of this article.

and breadth of the problems and their overwhelming interconnectedness. An honest examination of these problems underscores the need to revisit the assumptions governing life in human society. It therefore bears mentioning that the difficulty lies not only in the nature of these problems or the interplay between them, but also in the way they are perceived, their frames of reference, the criteria used to interpret them, the will to solve them, and access to the resources available to act on them in a timely manner.

As we human beings grapple with the most serious of problems, we are also forced to face ourselves, our conflicts, and our insecurities, as well as the scenarios in which the latter of these become public and contradictory. Public administrators are faced with constraints. Their sphere of action is limited by the constraints on their authority, their needs, and resources. Accordingly, managers must be able to put controversies into context, weigh the differences of opinion, and take the pulse of opposing interests. This exercise will yield relevant information that can be used to evaluate the underlying assumptions of policy-making. An analysis of this type, then, could shed light on the stubborn cultural fixations that block our ability to envision new ways of responding to society's multitude of voices. The profound needs and expectations inherent in the world today are creating an extraordinary diversity of legitimate voices; and while it is true that some ring louder than others—although all are important in that they reflect the vast array of human experience—there can be little doubt that each merits careful consideration in its own right.

If the cornerstone of ethics is really the diversity of experiences that human beings must cultivate in order to live together, then we must listen carefully to the voices in society regarding those issues attributable to the differences that make up our contemporary world. The issues confronting a democratizing world foster the development of an important global public sphere that will ultimately shape the quality of democracy worldwide. Unquestionably, this is a narrow and changing sphere, in which credibility becomes a global attribute that each society wants for itself. This sphere must either validate or neglect human demands, and if it can satisfy these demands on the basis of their merits, it will enhance global democratic legitimacy. A priority in a scenario of this type is giving priority to public administration, particularly during the stage of identifying merits, and creating, promoting, and ensuring that standards of legitimacy that inspire confidence at the international level are developed.

From this perspective, a preliminary analysis of globalization, democracy, and development targeting a variety of sectors, each with its

own ideological profile in different locations, requires an examination of issues within their global contexts—issues in which the current needs, expectations, and experiences of the world’s population converge. Our analysis draws on data from contemporary literature on global problems. Accordingly, a methodological exercise was conducted to develop the topics for the initial frame of reference. The framework was then used to explore relevant guidelines and identify work areas to encourage public analyses to address the urgent issues of today’s world at the local level.

As a starting point, it bears mentioning that the literature on global problems cuts across many different academic disciplines. With respect to economic policy and development studies, for example, we note that the assumptions governing the strategic relationship between government and the markets have been changing since the 1990s. The objective of our research is to shed light on the dynamics that affect the design of economic policies to address pressing problems at the local and global levels.

Human geography and sociocultural anthropology are advancing research on world populations based on the spatial organization of territory, with a view to comparing the patterns observed in human experience, discourse, movements, and impact on a variety of scales. Some geopolitical trends suggest the need to revisit the relationship between the design of current global systems and the material conditions of the population, through interpretations of their location and their historical and political development as societies.

Research from the fields of international relations, comparative policy, and international law are providing insight into the complexities at work in the institutional, cultural, and legal development of contemporary government. For example, new perspectives on global security have been emerging since the 1980s that have transcended conventional reality-based judgments—limited to military threats—by classifying conditions that adversely impact humankind as “security threats;” these latter include such variables as health, environmental and socioeconomic factors, government political stability, and the quality of the cultural dynamics in play in a national territory. This in turn has underscored the need to examine the conditions that promote human security as a function of harmony within a society and with the environment. Today, it would be nothing short of irresponsible to ignore the global threats to health (or security) posed by the AIDS epidemic, SARS, and avian flu, to name but a few. In a globalizing world, a consistently less-than-perfect process, one person’s insecurity can potentially lead to the vulnerability of all. Our reference here to imperfection is not meant as a justification of acceptance but underscores

the need to take stock of the prevailing material conditions which point to the recurrent crumbling of the many boundaries that human beings erect to demarcate their territory and create their identity.

Gender and women's studies help to demystify the social, political, and economic assumptions operating in specific parts of the globe. This literature acquires different subtleties of meaning in different situations. It is often associated with a pro-democracy and rights discourse. Here, the preponderance of research geared to determining class formation in a globalizing world should be noted, together with the social and economic conflicts that are emerging at the local level with respect to identity, both cultural and racial. Action to link globalization and public health—with an emphasis on clarifying the ethical challenges that occur as a result of development decisions and projects—should not fail to consider the conditions of specific groups of women, girls, boys, and the elderly in a particular locality; on the contrary, these groups deserve initiatives that take such differences into account.

By approaching the literature from the perspective of differences it is possible to compare the problems dealt with, determine how they arise, and identify converging themes. Likewise, by examining how the content of the literature is organized, we can highlight the key role of health issues. Given the magnitude of problems and the fact that most of the world is underdeveloped and highly populated, there is an urgent need to study poverty and inequality.

With regard to health, and mindful of poverty, the role of how education is organized in democratic and economically competitive systems should also be explored. This issue focuses on specifying content to promote employment opportunities, as well as developing the necessary skills to optimize the potential of individuals and groups to access those opportunities. On this point, policy proposals tend to reveal high expectations about the performance and responsibility of global capital in the fight against poverty. In turn, these expectations give rise to disappointments that question the availability and capacity of the pertinent economic actors, who, when faced with market fluctuations, find themselves unable to make any significant changes in the conditions associated with poverty.

Development policies emphasize the urgency of taking decisive positions on the organization and behavior of the markets, as well as on global consumption patterns. Moreover, these policies prioritize the need to address global warming in a constructive manner and arrest its impact at the local and global levels through intelligent, forward-thinking initiatives that share responsibilities and implement sustainable measures for managing natural and environmental resources. Specifically, global

conversations have once again emerged in the hydrocarbons market, aimed at promoting new energy sources: wind, sunlight, and different organic materials are being posited as alternatives. Nuclear power projects have also been proposed as a means of addressing the energy needs of different world populations.

In the sphere of human geography, population movements, world population growth, and consumption patterns are all linked, focusing attention on the needs of minority groups in developed and developing countries alike. With respect to criminal activity, the world has witnessed the “globalization” of organized crime, the spread of international terrorism, and the violation of basic rights—especially those of children, women, the elderly, and minorities. Efforts are desperately needed to address conflicts related to identity and territorial control. Moreover, fundamental controversies are observed with respect to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the future of the nonproliferation culture.

Although basic, this preliminary overview of selected disciplines, their relationships, and the identification of various world problems enables us to make several important points. First, the overall picture that we present here reveals matters of global concern with important subtleties at the local level that need to be addressed proportionately. Second, the proposed analyses for these are both controversial and changing. Thus, we wish to emphasize that the knowledge generated about the world’s problems is a basic component of the changes currently under way. This fact increases the degree of public responsibility in managing this knowledge and organizing the frameworks used to interpret and intervene in local and global trends, as well as in designing and evaluating the resulting public policy decisions. While we acknowledge the impossibility of having all the information necessary for decision-making at all times, the most elementary criteria of democratic governance demand the publication of standards governing the scope and efficiency of public decision-making.

Third, because problems are interrelated and interdependent, great care should be taken to avoid the temptation to base decision-making on transient perceptions of or momentary changes in situations, which have proven inadequate strategies, but instead, to base decisions on standards of responsibility that facilitate optimal degrees of democratic quality. Fourth, it is important to recognize that problems have a direct impact on the formation of culture, which in turn determines how human beings live together in society. Consequently, contemporary global processes call into question the basic assumptions of public administration. Fifth, globalization, democracy, and development form a core focus of the

policy arenas in which major decisions on the world stage are made. Consequently, it could be argued that they constitute an equation with interdependent variables whose global breadth and scope form a critical reference for reviewing, evaluating, and reflecting on the necessary theoretical frameworks, as well as the issues that need to be revisited in order to chart courses of action for dealing with contemporary global problems.

Based on this brief initial discussion, our next section focuses on an examination of the global processes that makes it possible to identify some of the characteristics of contemporary globalization. One such area is economics, and we go on to identify some of the trends associated with cultural globalization. We will point out global processes associated with the environment and natural resources. We will briefly identify global economic and political conditions that shed light on current global emergencies and highlight issues regarding the State, its structure, and its situation in the current global environment.

In the third section, we focus on some core areas of debate regarding the State and draw attention to the situation of “weak states.” We will examine the challenges facing the State in the areas of economic development and democracy and the respective challenges in public ethics. We will analyze the current trends that are guiding State institutional and programmatic reform and argue that the issue of the design of this reform is be proportional to public administrators’ references and capacity to interpret global and local processes.

In our conclusion, we will show the need for greater democracy as necessary for globalization at the local level, based on the specific conditions of each political unit. This will require development strategies that effectively include the population. Moreover, we will argue that this priority should be expressed as part of an ethics of inclusion that facilitates the design of visionary public policies, in which the State is directly involved in decision-making and in fostering the well-being and competitiveness of society.

II. Global Processes

During the 20th century, studies of economic, political, and social processes with the potential to transform the world through global synergies have revealed significant similarities that should not go unnoticed. The work of Norman Angell, an analyst who explored the military ramifications of an economically interdependent world (Keohane and Nye 1998), is one example. Several decades later, the literature of the 1960s and 1970s brought to light the importance of events that were part of global trends. Specifically, it emphasized the

dynamics of interdependence attributable to the intensification and scope of international trade at the time. Moreover, it pointed to the need to prioritize global responsibility for the environment, a movement that continued to gain momentum, consolidating in the early of 1970s. This movement underscored the reach and importance of non-state actors, including multinational actors and groups associated with the politics of terror. Moreover, priority was placed on reducing the usefulness of military forces (Hurrell 2003: 222-225). The global political situation of the time—e.g., the energy crisis, and regional conflicts associated with the geopolitics of the Cold War of the 1970s—diminished the importance of old assumptions.

Contemporary Globalization: Technology and Capital Reorganization

The origins of the most recent globalization can be traced back to the changes driven by advances in science and technology, which began in the 1960s (Arystanbekova 2004: 7). This period was marked by the influence of satellite technology on relations between the superpowers—technology whose development facilitated the transmission of images around the globe. Sophisticated technologies helped to develop cultures that fostered telecommunications and trade relations through the design and creation of innovative platforms and the production of new sources of knowledge (McLuhan 2001). It has been argued that the instruments and multiform content of global communications epitomize a world in which economies, societies, and cultures are intertwined through myriad processes that include the development of a global financial system characterized by the speed of its transactions.

The economic implications of globalization are the expansion and reorganization of capital, administered by sectors associated what has been dubbed the “Davos culture,” referring to an annual meeting held in the Swiss city of the same name, which brings together representatives from the international business community and high-ranking political leaders (Berger 2002: 3). The analysis of finance and trade theory as it relates to contemporary globalization was one of a priority focus in the work of Levitt. According to one of his writings, globalization is construed as an analytical framework for describing a market converging at the world level through business units he dubs “global enterprises,” characterized by a cultural vision that informed the decision-making of such enterprises at the highest levels of management (Arystanbekova 2004: 7-8).

In *The Marketing Imagination*, Levitt also states that technology is a determinant in the production of business intelligence, aimed at

maximizing the business community's influence, with a view to creating a new commercial order. Accordingly, this new reality is coordinated through global markets, with production quality geared to global standards (Arystanbekova 2004: 7-8). Nevertheless, it bears mentioning that this component of globalization is targeted primarily to the developed world and certain developing countries, without effectively including the majority of the world's population.

Globalization and Culture

Globalization is also an everyday phenomenon, whose focus is primarily urban and is manifested differently in the places where it occurs. Differences can be observed in the emphases of human expressions and relationships in different places; in the place of individual and group identity in global processes. According to Claval (2001: 38), globalization has a direct impact on the foundations of identity, as it has the potential to bring about a rapid uniformity in the material conditions of life, and, by the same token, prompt the disappearance of the conventional markers that form the basis of a common identity. Thus, conflicts arise between the multiple actors with different interests and needs (Keohane and Nye 1998: 77), who organize themselves and are strengthened by ideologies—systems of thought or beliefs that motivate social, economic, or political practices (Thompson 1993: 409)—, and promote lifestyles and ways of being and living together that groups and sectors adopt and promote.

In this sense, globalization creates local situations in which the vast array of human expression is reviewed and differentiated, and which in turn come to form part of global differentiations. With respect to material conditions, globalization transforms local communities, and these communities in turn potentially acquire the ability to globalize. In the realm of ideas, globalization becomes a common ideological referent, in which many ideologies are defined, become integrated, and compete (Huang and Hsiao 2002: 48-49).

From this perspective, globalization also includes many diverse human processes at the micro level, where people address the needs, hopes, and emergencies that they experience in day-to-day community life. Relevant methodological questions arise on how to relate macro processes with micro processes, and vice versa; but in the final analysis, the decisions and action are central.

According to Rosenau (2003: 8), globalization is not an abstract force guiding the world toward a predestined end, but the result of decisions that individuals, groups, and institutions make for the situations in which they operate—choices that one way or another will

have an impact on the individual, social, and institutional experience. As mentioned earlier, people make decisions about ideas, beliefs, and lifestyles according to the frames of reference operating in their environments and their resources. Here we underscore the importance of decisions about migration, whether because individuals or groups have been displaced in their territories of origin or because local or external factors encourage them to move. The fact is that people are moving all over the planet.

Globalization, Migration, and World Population Growth

Migration has been a key factor in the history of globalization. It refers to a long-distance move that result in relocation. Migration may take the form of emigration (a move from a particular place), immigration (a move to another place), an internal movement (within a country or region) or international movement (from one country to another) (Knox and Marston 1998: 127). Held, McGrew, Goldblatt, and Perraton (1999: 3-4) briefly summarize the migration of human populations during the modern era. The compactness of the authors' summary merits its full inclusion here:

Human beings have been migrating, journeying and travelling for millennia, across great distances... The first great wave of early modern migrations involved the forced movements of the transatlantic slave trade which shifted around 9-12 million people by the mid-nineteenth century.

From the mid nineteenth century onwards, the slave trade was dwarfed in extent by an extraordinary outpouring of Europe's poor to the New World, overwhelmingly the USA. This was accompanied, beginning in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, by a series of Asian migrations (predominantly of indentured laborers) to the USA, Canada, and European colonies. Over 40 million people moved in this way in the quarter century before the First World War.

The bitter struggles and ethnic violence of the Second World War led to unprecedented levels of forced migrations, refugee and asylum movements. Ethnic Germans fled the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, Jews headed for Israel, Pakistan and India exchanged millions and Koreans flooded south.

Economic migration and the rebirth of Western European economies in the 1950s and 1960s drove a renewed epoch of global migration... Western Europe's foreign population and ethnic mix have grown as family reunions, unpoliceable borders and sheer demand for labour have driven migration from the European peripheries (Turkey, North Africa) as well as the most distant outposts of Old European empires (Southern Asia, East and West Africa etc.) to the continent.

In the 1970s these waves of migration were accompanied by a take-off in legal and illegal migration to the USA and Australasia, enormous flows to the oil-rich and labour-scarce Middle East and new patterns of regional migration within Africa, Latin America, Oceania, and East Asia. In the late 1990s, the USA in particular has been experiencing levels of migration that are comparable to the great transatlantic push of the late nineteenth century.

The history of migration is intertwined with the consolidation of the different globalization movements and encompasses rich and poor alike. These movements are the result of personal, local, regional, and global situations, and their conditions and objectives can be as diverse as the specific variables of the processes themselves. Current migration is one of the most profound human variables of recent globalization. Each year, some 100 million people either attempt or manage to move from their birthplace to locations that they have not previously thought about (Stavrou, Ndumbe, and Ewing 2005).

In this sense, the globalization experience links communities, families, and individuals in different parts of the world through formal and informal systems: it integrates and changes the makeup of geographic areas; markets are born; communications are established and restructures; the flow of remittances and their derivatives impact the economies of different places; new labor geographies emerge; health becomes “globalized”; educational cultures are transformed; and profound human desires and aspirations are projected and linked with different parts of the world, both near and far (Blake and Risse 2006: 1-4).

In addition to the diversity of its migrations around the globe, the human population has also been growing. During the second half of the 20th century, the world population increased from 2.6 to nearly 6 billion (Klare 2001: 15). Moreover, the developing countries have shown a rather widespread pattern, doubling their populations every 30 years. The world population is currently growing at a rate of approximately 80 million per year. If this trend continues, the planet’s population will reach 8 billion by 2020 (Klare 2001: 17). Population growth is seen as a basic determinant in the formation of behavioral patterns between human groups and the environment.

Globalization and the Environment: the Priority of Water Resources

The intensity of migration and the growth of the world population are related to global patterns of natural resource consumption. By way of example, real prospects for the supply of water, oil, natural gas, and lumber, to name but a few, are variables that pose critical questions for human consumption patterns and the structure of world markets. Recent

studies by Clark, Crutzen, and Schellnhuber (2005: 3-4) on the role of science and technology in global public policy-making have compiled data on the levels of consumption, the exploitation of resources, and environmental behaviors that reveal important situations and trends with respect to the global environment. On this point, the authors note:

Drawing from the works of hundreds of researchers, the “Global Change” study (Steffen et al. 2004; Chapter 3) concluded that perhaps 50% of the world’s ice-free land surface has been transformed by human action; the land under cropping has doubled during the past century at the expense of forests, which declined by 20% over the same period. More than half of all accessible freshwater resources have come to be used by humankind. Fisheries remove more than 25% of the primary production of the oceans in the upwelling regions and 35% in the temperate continental shelf regions (Pauly and Christensen 1995).

Humanity’s exploitation of fossil fuels that were generated over several hundred million years has resulted in a large pulse of air pollutants. The release of SO₂ to the atmosphere by coal and oil burning is at least two times larger than the sum of all natural emissions.... Due to fossil-fuel burning, agricultural activities, deforestation, and intensive animal husbandry, several climatically important “greenhouse” gases have substantially increased in the atmosphere over the past two centuries:...contributing substantially to the observed global average temperature increase by about 0.6° C, which has been observed during the past century.

The interaction among the identified environmental conditions creates greater difficulties as the situation in many of the poor countries of the world is highly dependent on access to water and the quality of water resources: to support livestock production, irrigate crops, and generate energy, and for industry, fisheries, water transport, and tourism. Water shortages are caused, among other things, by the cumulative dynamics of numerous interrelated factors: cultural practices that affect consumption habits; increased demand for water from a growing population; the steady growth of energy consumption; and the global adoption of development models with an urban focus.

With respect to cities, up to 50% of the population is losing access to urban water (Davis and Hirji 2005:118-119). This situation will no doubt become increasingly complex when the fact that greater migration to the cities is expected during this century is factored in. According to projected indicators, the demand for water will continue to increase: by 2025, 50 countries and nearly 1 billion people will experience serious water shortages, whereas nearly 3 billion will live in areas where water resources are under stress (Davis and Hirji 2005: 117), which includes a

considerable portion of the extended Middle East. Significant in this regard is the fact that many of the planet's most extensive bodies of water cut across country borders.

Global Economic and Political Conditions

In terms of global economic policy development, the global capital structure, cultural transformation, population movements, environmental patterns, and the spread of democracy occur against the historical backdrop of a world marked by critical poverty. Eighty-three percent of the world's population lives in so-called developing countries. More than 20% of the global population lives in conditions of extreme poverty on an income of less than a dollar a day, while nearly 50% live on less than two dollars per day. Infant mortality among the approximately 2.5 billion people living in low-income societies is upwards of 100 per 1,000 live births, in contrast to 6 per 1,000 in the high-income countries, and 25% of the world's population suffers the social ravages caused by illiteracy (Risse 2003 A: 1). However, the last 60 years of world history have revealed signs of economic growth. In this regard, Risse (2003 B: 30) points out:

While for many indicators we lack data from before 1950 in developing countries, a fair amount is known. We know that per capita incomes around 1820 were similar worldwide, and low, ranging from around \$500.00 in China and South Asia to 1,000-1,500 in the richest countries of Europe. So the gap between rich and poor was 3:1, whereas in 1960 it was 60:1, and in 1997, 74:1. Seventy-five percent of the world's people lived on less than a dollar a day in 1820. Today, in Europe, almost nobody does, in China less than 20%, in South Asia around 40%, and altogether 20% of the world population does. The share of people living on less than \$1.00 a day fell from 42% in 1950 to 17% in 1992... Between 1960 and 2000, real per-capita income in the developing world grew at an average of 2.3. At this rate, living standards double in 30 years... The average income per capita in 1950 worldwide was \$2,114, and in 1999 \$5,709, in 1990 PPP dollars; for developing countries this increase was from \$1,093 to \$3,100. Longevity rose from 49 years to 66 worldwide, and from 44 to 64 in developing countries... The literacy rate rose from 54% in 1950 to 79 in 1999. Infant mortality fell from 156 in 1000 to 54.

Global Questions

In terms of creating an information and telecommunications culture, the international capital system is a powerful global force. Nevertheless, its capacity to effectively include the majority of the world's population is limited. Because its focus is on specific urban poles, the system's

operational infrastructure reproduces development patterns that are limited to its connectivity with the hubs comprising its global networks. While economic growth has been achieved in recent decades, it is due in large measure to the urban development efforts of China and India over the past 30 years. However, the overwhelming majority of both countries' populations reside in rural areas. In fact, approximately one quarter of the world's population lives in rural areas. The global roles and means determining the access of rural areas and agriculture to globalization have yet to be defined and are thus the province of the State, as the entity responsible for organizing its territory.

Migration is movement whose potential for success will be commensurate with the profile of the individual or group in question, its linkages, and the prevailing needs and fluctuations in the workforce and markets of the receiving territory. Critical questions arise with respect to the health, housing, and education needs of these segments of the world's population, found on the periphery of diverse developed and developing urban poles, where they often live under deplorable conditions. What kinds of government initiatives are needed to safeguard the basic rights of these groups within the framework of expanding global democracy?

Globalization includes cultural processes whose expansion and influence can be even more widespread than its economic components. Specific variations will be proportional to place, the global networks operating in them, and the access of individuals and groups to them. Accordingly, an assessment of shifts in cultural hopes and expectations at the world level is in order, in terms of the material, local, and global conditions that can satisfy them. Here, questions arise concerning the types of local initiatives that are needed to expand access to and participation in the cultural benefits—economic, social, and political—of globalization, which certainly include the design of educational policies that make the benefits of multiculturalism promoted by the various modalities of cultural globalization a reality and provide direction for them. Otherwise, its beneficiaries will continue to be few in number, technically specialized, and linked to the powerful socioeconomic sectors, in contrast to the great masses of the population that will continue to be excluded from exposure to the various types of global experience and the opportunities they generate in terms of social mobility, employment, and economic equality.

While there is no doubt that environmental initiatives such as the Kyoto Protocol of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change are critical, questions arise as to whether these alone are enough. Unquestionably, the highly industrialized countries have a

primary responsibility to assume, yet this does not exclude the need for developing countries to intensify measures at the local level to address the problem in a timely manner. One important question is how do we go about balancing environmental protection with increasing the level of global development in a planet that is exhausting its resources and whose population density shows no signs of decreasing, without anticipating the drastic changes in our consumption patterns needed to bring them into line with reasonably sustainable criteria?

The global processes briefly outlined above pose basic questions in areas of vital public importance. We have raised issues about the behavior, structure, and even regulation of local and global markets, the status of the recognition and strengthening of basic rights at the global and local levels, and the design of inclusive, long-term international environmental policies. On this point, Ocampo (2004: 11) observes:

“We believe that the central challenge we face today is to ensure that globalization becomes a positive force for all the world’s people,” reads the fifth paragraph of the United Nations Millenium Declaration (United Nations, 2000). Although globalization reflects technological advances and economic forces, it can be molded by society and, particularly, by democratic political institutions...

According to Rosenau, we have observed that globalization is not a metaphysical force but a process requiring interpretation and decision-making. Ocampo stresses that globalization requires the participation of society and an operational system of competitive democratic institutions, and that the interventions of the two should be geared to molding processes at the local level. These views again underscore the need to center the analysis on identifying information relevant to local and global processes requiring action. Not only does this “molding” require good information, it must also be employed for intelligent decision-making and adapted to the particular needs that apply. Specifically, it demands that the knowledge and decisions embodied in public policies chart the course of action to advance inclusive economic development that meets the most competitive democratic standards. This focuses attention on the territorial State, its formation, current situation, and the dynamics underlying its current behavior (Taylor 1994: 151, 160-161; Risse 2006: 1-2).

III. The State

The origins of the State have been traced back to human groups organized around agriculture—a period considered a type of globalization—in Mesopotamia some 10,000 years ago. Also noted is the

degree of bureaucratic formality of the State in ancient China (Fukuyama 2004: 1). From its legal origins in the work of Jean Bodin, the concept of the State evolved through economic political and territorial changes. The State partially achieved global status in the 14th century, spread culturally in the 19th century, and became a universal phenomenon following the end of World War II (Wallerstein 1991: 185). One of the most influential theoretical positions of the last century defines it as “a human community that (successfully) claims the monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force within a given territory” (Weber 1946).

Although widespread and influential, Weber’s position has been questioned on several fronts. During the 20th century, the debate on the State, its structures, and policies has included ideological polemics on dependency and development (Gilpin 1987: 263-303; Lievesley 2003: 145-146; Burnell 2003: 148-149); decolonization and the corresponding territorial configurations of the states in questions (Coggins 2003: 136-137); the levels of vulnerability attributable to the Cold War, the formation of a bipolar world and the policies associated with nuclear deterrence (Freedman 1981: 372-392); social action toward progress in civil rights, and the impact of social movements on public policy-making (Bradbury 2003: 78-80), among many others.

The history of the State is associated with the social, economic, and political transformations that have shaped human history. Unquestionably, the State is an organizational and administrative construct with the necessary flexibility to adapt to the historical changes required of it; in the name of its legitimacy, the State adopts the means necessary to continue to operate and exercise its steering role in the organization of public administration. However, recent positions question the conventional limits of its territory, citing the emergence of populations that transcend the typical public constructs and warrant consideration under broader, more inclusive frames of reference.

The State and Cosmopolitan Processes

Over the past two decades, the debate on this issue has involved a wide range of empirical, interdisciplinary, and theoretical perspectives. One such focus worthy of mention is the debate on the viability or legitimacy of development achieved through the globalization of liberal democracy and the market economy, calling into question contemporary understandings that have served as a frame of reference for differentiating between the public and the private and determining the formation of cultural identities and the status of minorities, as well as the relations and rank among territories (Dijkink and Knippenberg 2001).

Among the most influential perspectives is Held's view of the modern democratic state, which centers on the emergence of cosmopolitan public spheres. According to Held, these spheres require democratic governance models based on accountability in the exercise of power. This power should no longer be viewed through a fragmented approach, but rather in an interrelated way, owing to the dynamics and overlapping that characterize the relationships between the economic and policy spheres of the contemporary world. According to Held, the possibility of democracy today must be linked to an expanding framework of democratic institutions and procedures, with what he dubs the "cosmopolitan concept of democracy." This entails at least three requirements. The first is the reformulation of the territorial boundaries of accountability systems, so that issues beyond the control of the nation-state—e.g., global financial flows, the debt burden of the developing countries, ecological crises, certain aspects of security and defense, new forms of communication, and so on—can be placed under democratic control; the second is a rethinking of the role and place of regional and global regulatory agencies, to make them more coherent and sensitive foci in public affairs; and the third is the restructuring of political institutions' coordination with the groups, agencies, associations, and organizations of the market economy and civil society, both domestic and international, in order to make them part of the democratic process—adopting a structure of rules and principles that are compatible with democracy (Held 1997: 317-318).

In this context, in Held's perspective on contemporary democracy there is a decisive role for a public sphere whose jurisdiction includes a degree of sovereignty over the political units that comprise it, yet does not cancel them out. These units retain an important operational role, which includes domestic action that is closely attuned to the day-to-day matters affecting the population. However, it should also be borne in mind that states represent a wide variety of specific cases, with different needs, problems, and scenarios. By way of example, it is a fact that a state's institutional operations, regulatory effectiveness, stability, and even the continuity of its structures vary significantly at the global level. There are many reasons for this, including problems associated with the legitimacy of control over territory; regulatory and institutional inefficiency, and the coexistence of formal and informal economic cultures. Why do states fail? How do weak and failed states contribute to the structure of the processes associated with globalization, democracy, and development?

Weak States, Failed States, and Collapsed States

As an area of research, the issue of *weak statehood* has been gaining ground over the current decade. Here, we refer the generation of a body of knowledge on problems of particular concern to developing states, with emphasis on weak states, failed states, and collapsed states. Fukuyama (2004: 6-7) argues that meeting the needs of the so-called “weak states” is a matter of pressing concern. He describes these states as the single most important problem facing the international order (2004: 92). Accordingly, he underscores the need to reevaluate the institutional, organizational, and administrative principles underlying the modern State. Fukuyama accords priority to differentiating between the State’s sphere of action—that is, the functions and objectives assumed by governments—and its strength—that is, the ability of a State to plan and carry out public policy initiatives to transparently implement a legal framework. The difference here is his interest in clarifying that the public policy processes associated with globalization do not exclude the central role of the well-governed political unit, from which one can infer the need for clarifying the role of the State in terms of the contemporary globalization agenda.

Clément (2005: 1-2), in turn, recognizes that research on these political bodies is a work in progress. Consequently, limited access to the information needed to prepare exhaustive theoretical models has hindered systematic implementation of the theoretical constructs operating in the field. She notes that the research has identified structural factors in these states which, in the long term, reveal a tendency toward failure but also states that far fewer studies are available on the factors that precipitate failure in the medium term. In her study, she offers some conceptual distinctions for classifying the characteristics of these states. The functional performance of the State is the variable that establishes the operational frame of reference for analysis.

Although state failure and state collapse both refer to extreme instances of weak statehood, they each have a specific meaning whereby a collapsed state is a more acute version of failure. A failed state is one where all core functions have ceased to be performed (on a continuous base and over the entire territory), but where some institutional structures may still exist. It is a case of functional failure without institutional failure. A collapsed state involves both a functional failure (inability to perform core functions) and an institutional failure (the political superstructure has ceased to exist on a continuous base and as a part of an overarching integrative framework). In practice, the state rarely completely disappears. Bits and pieces will suddenly reappear (e.g., a government, a parliament, a police force, road infrastructure), but never over the entire territory or

for long periods of time leading to what some have called a *dotted state*.

Patrick (2006: 27-28) adds that poorly governed states have been linked to transnational threats with the potential to threaten global security. The author explores the argument that views these political bodies as geographical entities in which the most feared global problems proliferate: human disasters; mass migrations; environmental problems; international crime; energy insecurity; global pandemics; and the spread of weapons of mass destruction and transnational terrorism. Identifying state initiatives aimed at managing the problem, he points out the role played by the United Kingdom, Canada, and Australia, and cites numerous international agencies that have put this issue on their agendas, which include the United Nations, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, and the area of the World Bank that supports low-income countries under stress due to armed conflicts of varying degrees of intensity, and structural problems affecting the states' capacity for governance.

Patrick (2006: 29) points to the lack of empirical evidence needed to associate individual states with specific problems and threats, and warns against strategic initiatives aimed at intervening in a situation absent the necessary knowledge base for differentiating the situation and restoring order. While conceding the point that weak states generate global threats, the author also points out that generalizing this statement is not helpful for identifying and formulating problems, an exercise that would make it possible to clarify the profound shortcomings that lead to declining governance and failure on the part of these states. He questions the factors at work in the lack of consensus on the number of states that could be included under this approach. Patrick (2006: 29) defines weak and failing states as follows:

There is no consensus on the precise number of weak and failing states. The Commission on Weak States and U.S. National Security estimates that there are between 50 and 60; the United Kingdom's Department for International Development classifies 46 nations with 870 million inhabitants as "fragile"; and the World Bank treats 30 countries as LICUS. These divergent estimates reflect differences in the criteria used to define state weakness, the indicators used to gauge it, and the relative weighting of various aspects of governance...

State strength is relative and can be measured by the state's ability and willingness to provide the fundamental political goods associated with statehood: physical security, legitimate political institutions, economic management, and social welfare. In effect, they possess legal but not actual sovereignty. In the security realm, they struggle to maintain a monopoly on the use of force, control border

and territory, ensure public order, and provide safety from crime. In the political sphere, they lack legitimate governing institutions that provide effective administration, ensure checks on power, protect basic rights and freedoms, hold leaders accountable, deliver impartial justice, and permit broad citizen participation. In the economic arena, they strain to carry out basic macroeconomics and fiscal policies or establish a legal and regulatory climate conducive to entrepreneurship, private enterprise, open trade, natural resource management, foreign investment, and economic growth. Finally, in the social domain, they fail to meet the basic needs of their populations by making even minimal investments in health, education, and other social services.

The point to underscore here is that not all weak states have the same problems. Some collapse, as has been the case in certain regions of Africa, while others reveal weak indicators yet manage to maintain significant degrees of functionality. Patrick (2006: 30) emphasizes—and on this point disagrees with Fukuyama—that state weakness is not solely attributable to variables associated with institutional operating capacity, but is also a matter of will. This is an interesting point in that it suggests the existence of a real source of public responsibility that remains operative—even in the face of those situations and events most adverse to public administration. Moreover, on distinguishing between capacity and will, Patrick (2006: 30) suggests that it is possible to distinguish between four types of weak states: relatively good performers; states that are weak but willing; states that have the means but not the will; and those with neither the will nor the way to perform the basic functions of statehood. The author (2006: 30) notes that the populations of these states are poor, lack access to health and education, live with chronic illnesses and die young, lack access to technology, and are foci of threats to health.

On examination, a significant number of contemporary states reveal radically different conditions, from their historical paths to their physical and cultural geography, which should not be dissociated from their real development potential in the social, economic, and political spheres. There is a pressing need to bring the development models promoted by globalization and democracy into line with the conditions on the ground in these political units. Specifically, more study is needed on the variables that prevent the governments of these units from achieving the level of performance and stability necessary to boost their capacity and potential for participation in the global community. In certain territories, a rethinking of the viability of the conventional state model is in order, perhaps even exploring the possibility of creating alternative models of government. As to the redesign of government

structures and processes, it is important to recognize that government reform models should be adapted to the real conditions and needs of each political unit. This suggests access to and optimal use of the body of knowledge on the problems of specific states, their relations, and the public measures necessary to help them.

The State and Government Reforms

An important activity of the contemporary State is the reform of its administrative, organizational, and institutional systems. Strictly speaking, the democratic quality of this activity depends on the models and criteria employed by each government to reform its structures, with a view to reorganizing public systems, redefining its relations with the markets, and reorienting its role at the local, regional, and global levels. An important technical phase in this process is assessing public administration, which involves a review of current operations as well as previous changes to the regulatory, administrative, human, and institutional components in each case. In this assessment, it becomes necessary to make the population's needs and aspirations a democratic standard, since these determine the priorities that the State should address in a responsible manner.

Consequently, this assessment should be able to formulate and classify problems and alternatives from a standpoint that makes it possible to evaluate, identify, and relate responsibilities: the responsibilities of government managers; the responsibilities associated with the behavior of the markets; and the responsibilities that give various sectors a leading role. The quality of decisions and action, according to the standards for public responsibility operating within the jurisdiction, is important for identifying public-sector problems and shortcomings.

Based on the relationships between and differentiation of these latter, common factors can be identified that can help uncover trends and patterns that, in turn, will make it possible to explore the successes and failures that implementation of the equation has produced at the local level. In this regard, we can posit that one of the sources of instability and inadequacy operating in the implementation of the equation is the absence of verifiable standards for the exercise of responsibility on the part of institutions, economic sectors, and the population, as well as a lack of effective alternatives to ensure that stakeholders and sectors act within the cultural framework of the recognized standards in place.

Over the past 20 years, 49 of the 123 largest countries in the world undertook a major reform of their organizational and governmental operations; more than 30 instituted reforms over different

administrations; and at least 18 attempted more basic reforms focused on changing specific areas of their administrative culture (Kamarck 2004: 14). The interpretation of the cumulative effect of this trend on contemporary state behavior is that reforms in the areas of governance and market liberalization have become a critical phase in the design of development strategies (Rodrik 2002: 1).

In the era of globalization, democratic governments are seeking to optimize the efficiency of their administrative models, productivity standards, human resources training, and quality of public policy-making—especially with respect to the use of funds and property and the structure of the government budget, based on tax collection and the corresponding public revenues. Moreover, they are closely studying the behavior of their markets—both local markets and those with which they maintain strategic relationships. From this perspective, the most widespread competitive trend is that governments do not undertake reform solely in response to domestic crises. The usefulness of government reform is a determining factor in the public face of a government convinced that current international economic policy demands ongoing innovative initiatives that contribute to development and to the adaptation of the public sphere to changing domestic and external conditions and dynamics. Here, we will briefly outline some characteristics of the most recent reforms.

Kamarck (2004: 3) credits the 1979 electoral victory of Margaret Thatcher in the United Kingdom for ushering in what we could call the beginning of the contemporary era in the history of worldwide government reform. The author also points to the election of Ronald Reagan in the United States in 1980, and of Brian Mulroney in Canada in 1984. While these leaders had rather different leadership styles, they coincided on the need for aggressive reform of the bureaucratic structures of their governments.

With regard to the developing countries, Kamarck also notes that government reform efforts have emerged in response to critical economic problems and/or the conditions imposed by international lending institutions. She points out the structural adjustment model that these states must conform to in reorganizing their structure and operations to bring them into line with the requirements of that model.

According to Kamarck, government reforms at the world level can be divided into two basic stages. As we have already suggested, the first of these began in the 1980s and is closely linked with the United Kingdom, the United States, and Canada. The most widespread trends that decade direct our attention to economic liberalization and the privatization of state industries, which constitute one of the basic phases

of contemporary reform processes. Clearly, there were differences in design and implementation of these reforms in each country. Kamarck notes that in Latin America, reforms tended toward privatization and a distancing of the State from economic processes. At best, each government had to identify its situation, problems, and specific needs in terms of its organizational structure, government infrastructure, and economic policy relations and aspirations against the backdrop of a rapidly changing world.

The second phase began in the 1990s, with the disintegration of the Soviet block (Kamarck 2004: 10). The former Soviet republics became transitional political and economic units, moving toward models of democratic governance and a market-based economy. Each will face problems tied to their specific historical, geographical, ethnic, and political development—processes that are still under way.

The emphasis of this second stage, according to Kamarck, will no longer be on privatization so much, but on the reform of government administrative processes to transform and optimize basic state functions, with a view to building state capacity. In the current decade, states have focused on modifying the administrative concepts underlying their public institutions, the practices shaping the interpretation of standards and regulations, and cultural and demographic aspects of human resources education, especially training, performance, and development. In principle, the goal has been to clarify the relationship between governance and administration, identifying the fixations and assumptions of each, with a view to focusing efforts on molding a more streamlined and intelligent government that is responsive to its citizens.

Kamarck points out that the focus of the highly industrialized countries has been on optimizing efficiency and boosting their potential in the areas of high-tech production, management, and development as a means for restructuring their administrative operations and diversifying the goods and services for societal consumption. In the developing countries, in contrast, public action has focused instead on building state capacity to assume the task of decentralization and the ethical challenges facing government through models incorporating standards, institutions, procedures, and at best, projects aimed at evaluating the predefined objectives that guide reform tasks.

Kamarck explores the differences in these approaches to reform and points out that some of the highly developed countries have been interested in designing effective initiatives to address the ethical challenges of governance. Likewise, developing countries such as Mexico, Colombia, and Chile, have already shown a high degree of interest in boosting government efficiency with the implementation of

information, organizational, and management systems, as well as systems for evaluating public policies—the objective being to advance democratic governance in a globalized system with ever-greater levels of competitiveness.

With respect to the developing countries, Kamarck recognizes that the international lending institutions and development agencies have played a pivotal role in the decisions of state actors in this second stage. By way of example, during this second stage, the developing world gave priority to reconstructing the State to ensure the continued viability of the new market economies by contributing to development projects that made economic growth feasible in a highly complex situation.

Kamarck also points to the initiatives of the development banks, whose priority it was to identify the levels of governance present in the countries as part of their assessment for providing access to funding. This point is evidenced in the design of the international development organizations' assistance programs, which were geared to helping countries interested in boosting their capacity. This practice is currently intensifying as a measure to support public sector management at the local level. Kamarck supports the international component of the initiative because it operationally advances the relevance of a structural development model for the State.

However, it also bears mentioning that structurally reducing development projects at the expense of public administration, although an important and necessary exercise, is not enough in itself. Development projects touch on delicate areas, and though they include the capacity, scope, and functioning of public management, they are not limited to these alone. Contemporary economic development models must include components that buttress the self-esteem and confidence of the population, encourage access to and management of health care, raise current levels of education, widen professional diversity, promote access to technology and the ability to use it, improve the skills and reach of labor, and ensure the consistency and quality of production.

Without question, development models must identify and answer difficult questions. Consequently, information regarding the specific resources of the populations and territories in question must be obtained beforehand, given the current conditions and the contingencies looming on the horizon as the global future approaches. Specifically, contemporary development requires that public administrators have access to the most state-of-the-art frames of reference available if they are to perform their duties responsibly amid global processes whose imponderable fluctuations and unforeseen consequences seem to

increasing rather than decreasing with the passing years. What are the priorities of the State in so intense and diverse a global dynamic?

The State, Interstate Trade, and Economic Development

The guiding criteria in development have changed significantly (Cooper 2005: 1-6). In the 1950s and 1960s, government planning was the central priority, whereas in the 1970s the emphasis shifted to the interpretation of market concepts and ideology. Since that time, priority has been given to the key role of fiscal discipline in market liberalization, which includes privatization and the need for safeguarding property rights to ensure optimal security for the finances and goods of global investors. Recently, quality models have been put in place in institutions, independent central banks, and social security networks, as well as in efforts to reduce poverty and address ethical shortcomings in government (Risse 2003: 31).

However, debate on this model remains open. The regulatory framework governing international trade is under scrutiny to identify asymmetries in market access, raising questions as to the influence of economic power on trade relations and the double standard that undermines the potential for equality between the rich and poor countries. It has been suggested that such practices act as a barrier to the advancement of equity in contemporary international trade relations, but which could be overcome by adopting perspectives that are not reduced simply to economic power, in order to build trade relations grounded in principles (Stiglitz and Charlton 2006; Miles 2006).

Currently, economic growth in the developing countries has sparked debate on the role of the market, the right time for market opening and integration, and the role of self-management in project design (Fréchette 2003). Hypotheses are offered regarding the relationship between the transition to democracy and the impact of the economic processes of each political unit (Rodrik and Romain 2005: 3-5). In fact, it is expressly questioned whether the transition to democracy might create adverse economic outcomes. Moreover, it is emphasized that each political unit has its own specific characteristics that public administrators must be thoroughly familiar with to organize decision-making around the contingencies that will undoubtedly emerge in the interplay between global and local processes. Another area of debate is the relationship between democracy and development and the functions of the State in terms of encouraging, organizing, and sustaining economic development (Hausman 2006; Rodrik 2006; Summers 2003). Also recognized is the need to resolve key issues such as managing the value of currency and wage levels, the participation and regulation of banking sectors, and the role of state-owned banks in development projects. Inherent in such

decisions is the design of policies that determine economic activity and integration to raise the standard of living through democratic initiatives that generate public responsibility to the citizenry in the context of the State (Rodrik 2002: 1).

It has been argued that economic growth has not always delivered the anticipated benefits; that the market economy is not an independent variable capable of automatically guaranteeing the desired growth within a framework of social justice and economic efficiency (Stiglitz 2005: 128-129). Stiglitz has evaluated globalization with a critical eye (2002: 25-40). In his view, policies that advance this project do not adequately consider the sensitivity of market performance in the public sphere. He points to the worldwide economic, political, social, and cultural dissatisfaction, owing to the lack of representation and sharing in the benefits of economic globalization. Although Stiglitz asserts that the free market is the alternative to follow, he raises serious questions about the global market's potential for delivering equity and underscores the need to reform the global financial system, which includes but is not limited to rethinking the debt of developing countries (Stiglitz 2003).

Debate on this issue continues to emphasize the need to control globalization through effective public policies, tempered to the real conditions of political units (Rodrik 2003). Inherent in the formulation of such policies is addressing complex, far-reaching problems in a manner consistent with the vision, capacity, and roles of the State itself, which among other variables include its degree of market intervention and in the quality of its public administration.

Research on the economic impact of development policies over the past 30 years has helped facilitate a better understanding of the dynamics and issues faced by governments in this operational area. Important in this area are the quality of decision-making by public administrators, the role of ideas and leadership in the process of change, the objectives of the new institutions and their capacity to capability to evolve, with a view to achieving the necessary organizational depth for implementing the public policies required at the local level and the contemporary world (Grindle 1999: 1-2).

IV. Conclusion: The Ethos of Inclusion and the State

Inherent to development in a globalizing world is the stability and well-being of populations living an interdependent global existence. The needs of populations thus connected should be met through the design of policies that interpret the locality through filter of the global environments and processes under way. Naturally, the creation of such initiatives calls for decision-making under multidimensional, diverse,

and changing scenarios. We might expect that the most difficult decision-making occurs on the periphery—along the mental and territorial operational limits, which continue to serve as the reference for abolishing the current geographical world order and constructing a profoundly different reality, one that often leads to tensions, owing to the changes it imposes on each locality and the global community.

Taking action in public scenarios significantly influenced by intangibles often leads to inconsistencies in the way in which public administrators imagine the scenarios and generate and assimilate information for decision-making. We doubt that any inconsistencies can be more vulnerable than the ones preventing populations from participating intelligently by publicly voicing their local and/or global needs and demands. Policy-making at present requires decision-makers who are willing to reflect on the references that influence their discourse and shape their viewpoints—decision-makers willing to recognize new interpreters and put themselves in highly competitive scenarios in which their previous experiences and assumptions may well prove inadequate if they pass up opportunities to acquire the knowledge necessary to take on the dynamic events of the present.

There is an urgent need for policymakers involved in the creation and local implementation of legitimate public standards that foster the development of a democratic global public sphere capable of adapting to the varying degrees of difficulty of problems that are both interrelated and interdependent. Moreover, public administrators not only face problems at the individual and collective level, but at the institutional level as well. These problems, in turn, raise questions that turn attention to the need to carefully evaluate the real situation facing governments at present in order to sort out their differences, identify their real capabilities, and create strategies for developing policies with the potential to competitively orient and sustain populations at the world level.

Unquestionably, states need to give priority to civil society participation in public decision-making, as well as to clarify, choose, and integrate sectors, knowledge, problems, and alternatives to optimize the governance of democratic governments, as social exclusion is an indicator of vulnerability. Regarding the ethics of globalization, Robinson (2002: 4) aptly cites an observation by former U.N. Secretary-General, Kofi Anan:

Whether it is the area of crime, health, the environment or the fight against terrorism, interdependence has ceased to be an abstract concept. This poses a real challenge, not only to political leaders, but to civil society, non-governmental organizations, businesses, labor

unions, thinkers and citizens of every nation. We need to rethink what belonging means, and what community means, in order to be able to embrace the fate of distant peoples, and realize that globalization's glass house must be open to all.

The trends observed in the global democratic experience of the present underscore the need for broad participation in the public arena. Here we emphasize that governments, economic actors, interest groups, and society in general determine the development and transformation of local and global public spheres (Held 2005: 15). However, broad participation does not guarantee equity, since the economic, political, and social experiences of the world's populations reveal major differences and contradictions.

States have an important role to play in strategic decisions that will have to balance the most social objectives of democracy with the economic development needs of populations. For this to happen, based on the development of the populations themselves, they will have to adopt a competitive and visionary interpretation of the processes of global change. Whether the legitimacy of the content and application of such interpretations will ultimately be determined democratically at the global level is a question that will be answered by the course that democracy takes in the 21st century.

REFERENCES

- Addison, Tony and Rahman, Aminur. (2003, October). Capacities to Globalize: Why Are Some Countries More Globalize than Others? Paper presented at a conference on Globalization and Social Stress, in Warsaw, organized by the TIGER at the Yale University Center for International and Area Studies.
- Aman, Alfred, C. 2004. *The Democracy Deficit, Taming Globalization Through Law Reform*. New York and London: New York University Press.
- Arystanbekova, A. 2004. "Globalization: Objective Logic and New Challenges". *International Affairs* 50, No. 4:7-15.
- Berger, Peter L. 2002. Introduction: The Cultural Dynamics of Globalization. In: Berger, Peter L. y Huntington, Samuel P. (Eds.), *Many Globalizations, Cultural Diversity in the Contemporary World*, (1-20). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Blake, Michael and Risse, Mathias. 2006. Is There a Human Right to Free Movement? Immigration and Original Ownership of the Earth. Harvard University, John F. Kennedy School of Government, (April, Working Paper 06-012).
- Bloom, David E. and Canning, David. 2005. Health and Economic Growth: Reconciling the Micro and Macro Evidence. Stanford University, Center on Democracy, Development, and the Rule of Law, Institute on International Studies, (February, Working Paper, No. 42).
- Bradbury, Jonathan. 2003. Civil Rights. In Mclean, Ian and McMillan, Alistair (Eds.), *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Politics*, (78-80). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Burnell, Peter. 2003. Development. In: Mclean, Ian and McMillan, Alistair (Eds.), *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Politics*, (148-149). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Clark, Paul, Crutzen, Paul J. and Schellnhuber, Hans J. 2005. Science for Global Sustainability: Toward a New Paradigm. Center for International Development at Harvard University, (March, CID Working Paper No. 120).
- Claval, Paul. 2001. Identity and Politics in a Globalising World. In: Gertjan Dijkink and Hans Knippenberg (Eds.), *The Territorial Factor, Political Geography in a Globalizing World*, (31-48). Amsterdam: Vossiuspers UVA.
- Clément, Caty. 2005. The Nuts and Bolts of State Collapse. Harvard University, John F. Kennedy School of Government, (Working Paper 2005-32).
- Coggins, Richard. 2003. Decolonization. In: Mclean, Ian and McMillan, Alistair (Eds.), *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Politics*, (136-137). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cooper, Richard N. 2005. A Half-Century of Development. Harvard University, Center for International Development, (March, Working Paper No. 118).
- Davis, James R. and Hirji, Rafik. 2005. "The Myth of Water Wars". *Georgetown Journal of International Affairs*, Winter/Spring, Vol. VI, No. 1:115-124. Washington, D.C.: Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service.
- Diamond, Larry and Morlino, Leonardo. 2004. The Quality of Democracy. Stanford University, Center on Democracy, Development, and the Rule of Law, Institute on International Studies, (September, Working Paper, No. 20).
- Dijkink, Gertjan and Hans Knippenberg. 2001. The Territorial Factor: an Introduction. In Gertjan Dijkink and Hans (Eds.), *The Territorial Factor, Political Geography in a Globalizing World*, (11-26). Amsterdam: Vossiuspers UVA.
- Eisenberg, Jeffrey. 2004. "Ethics, Morality & Globalization". *A World Connected*. www.aworldconnected.org/article. Accessed 20 October 2004.

- Fréchette, Louise. 2003. "A New Development Agenda: Outlining the Challenges to Development in the 21st Century". *Harvard International Review*, Spring.
- Fernández, Demetrio. 2005. "La formación de la política pública". *Ethos Gubernamental*, No. 3:3-23.
- Freedman, Lawrence. 1981. *The Evolution of Nuclear Strategy*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Frost, Randall. 2004. "Corporate Social Responsibility and Globalization: A Reassessment". *A World Connected*. www.aworldconnected.org/article. Accessed 20 October 2004.
- Fukuyama, Francis. 2004. *State Building: Governance and World Order in the 21st Century*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.
- Gilpin, Robert. 1987. *The Political Economy of International Relations*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Grindle, Merilee. 1999. In Quest of the Political: The Political Economy of Development Policy Making. Harvard University, Center for International Development, (June, CID Working Paper No. 17).
- Grindle, Merilee. 2000. Designing Reforms: Problems, Solutions and Politics. Harvard University, John F. Kennedy School of Government, (November, Working Paper 01-020).
- Held, David. 1997. *La democracia y el orden global: del Estado moderno al gobierno cosmopolita*. Barcelona: Paidós.
- Held, David, McGrew, Anthony, Goldblatt, David and Perraton, Jonathan. 1999. "What is Globalization?" *Global Transformations*. www.polity.co.uk/global/executive.htm. Accessed 14 April 2005.
- Held, David. 2005. "Toward a New Consensus, Answering the Dangers of Globalization". *Harvard International Review*, Vol. 27, No. 2:14-17.
- Hausman, Ricardo. 2006. Economic Growth: Shared Beliefs, Share Disappointments? Harvard University, John F. Kennedy School of Government, (July, Working Paper 06-030).
- Hausman, Ricardo and Rodrik, Dani. 2002. Economic Development as Self Discovery. Harvard University, John F. Kennedy School of Government, (March, Working Paper 02-023).
- Huang, Hsin and Hsiao, Michael. 2002. Coexistence and Synthesis, Cultural Globalization and Localization in Contemporary Taiwan. In Berger, Peter L. and Huntington, Samuel P. (Eds.), *Many Globalizations, Cultural Diversity in the Contemporary World*, (48-67). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hurrell, Andrew. 2003. Globalization. In: Mclean, Ian y McMillan, Allistair (Eds.), *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Politics*, (222-225). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kamarck, Elaine. 2004. Government Innovation around the World. Harvard University, John F. Kennedy School of Government, (April, Working Paper 04-010).
- Keohane, Robert O., Nye, Joseph S. 1998. "Power and Interdependence in the Information Age". *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 77, No. 5.
- Klare, Michael T. 2002. *Resource Wars, the New Landscape of Global Conflict*. New York: Owl Books.
- Knox, Paul L., Marston, Sallie A. 1998. *Places and Regions in Global Context, Human Geography*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Kolodko, Grzegorz W. (2003, October). Globalization, Transition, and Development Prospects. Paper presented at a conference on Globalization and Social Stress, in

- Warsaw, organized by the TIGER at the Yale University Center for International and Area Studies.
- Lievesley, Geraldine. 2003. Dependency. In McLean, Iain and McMillan, Alistair (Eds.), *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Politics*, (145-146). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mazo, Eugene. 2005. What Causes Democracy? Stanford University, Center on Democracy, Development, and the Rule of Law, Institute on International Studies, (February, Working Paper, No. 38).
- McLuhan M. and Flore Q. 2001. *War and Peace in the Global Village*. Corte Madera, California: Ginkgo Press.
- Miles, Marc A. 2006. "Trade and Justice". *Harvard International Review*, Vol. 28, No. 2:78-79.
- Ocampo, José A. 2004. Globalization, Development and Democracy. *Items and Issues* 5, No. 3.
- Ofer, Gur. (2003, October). Globalization and the Welfare State: Developed, Developing and Transition Countries. Paper presented at a conference on Globalization and Social Stress, in Warsaw, organized by the TIGER at the Yale University Center for International and Area Studies.
- Patrick, Stewart. 2006. "Weak States and Global Treats: Fact or Fiction?" *The Washington Quarterly* 2, Vol. 29:27-53.
- Putzel, James. 2004. The Politics of 'Participation': Civil Society, the State and Development Assistance. Development Research Centre, (January, Discussion Paper)
- Putzel, James. 2004. The Political Impact of Globalization and Liberalisation: Evidence Emerging from Crisis States Research. Development Research Centre, (November, Discussion Paper)
- Rippon, Matthew J. 2004. "What is Globalization? *A World Connected*. www.aworldconnected.org/article. Accessed 20 October 2004.
- Risse, Mathias. 2003 (A). What we Owe to the Global Poor: Political Philosophy Meets Development Economics. Harvard University, John F. Kennedy School of Government, (August, Working Paper 03-032).
- Risse, Mathias. 2003 (B). Do We Live in an Unjust World? Harvard University, John F. Kennedy School of Government, (December, Working Paper 03-049).
- Risse, Mathias. 2006. What to say about the State. Harvard University, John F. Kennedy School of Government, (February, Working Paper 06-008).
- Robinson, Mary. 2002. Building an Ethical Globalization. Coca Cola World Fund Lecture. Oct. 08.
- Rodrik, Dani. 2003. Growth Strategies. Harvard University, Bureau for Research in Economic Analysis of Development, (October, Working Paper, No. 050). Working draft for eventual publication in the Handbook of Economic Growth.
- Rodrik, Dani and Wacziarg, Romain. 2005. Do Democratic Transitions Produce Bad Economic Outcomes? Stanford University, Center on Democracy, Development, and the Rule of Law, Institute on International Studies, (January, Working Paper, No. 29).
- Rodrik, Dani. 2006. "An Interview with Dani Rodrik, Home-Grown Growth Problems and Solutions to Economic Growth". *Harvard International Review*, Vol. 27, No. 4:74-77.
- Rosenau, James N. 2003. *Distant Proximities: Dynamics Beyond Globalization*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Ruggie, John Gerard. 2004. Reconstituting the Global Public Domain: Issues, Actors and Practices. Harvard University, John F. Kennedy School of Government, (July, Working Paper 04-031).
- Sen, Amartya. 2006. Contrary India. *The Economist*, The World in 2006, (51). London.
- Shapiro, Ian. 2005. "The State of Democratic Theory: A Replay to James Fishkin". *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy* 8, No. 1:79-83.
- Stavrou, Nikolas A., Ndumbe, Julius A., Ewing, Raymond C. 2005 (Special Eds.), People on the Move: The Nature and Scope of a Global Phenomenon. *Mediterranean Quarterly*, Vol. 15, No. 4.
- Stiglitz, Joseph E. 2002. *Globalization and its Discontents*. New York: Norton.
- Stiglitz, Joseph E. 2003. "Dealing with Debt: How to Reform the Global Financial System". *Harvard International Review*, Spring.
- Stiglitz, Joseph E. 2005. The Ethical Economist, Growth may be Everything, but it's Not the Only Thing (Review Essay). *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 84, No. 6:128-132.
- Stiglitz, Joseph E. and Charlton, Andrew. 2006. Fair Trade for All: How Trade can Promote Development. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Taylor, Peter J. 1994. The State as Container: Territoriality in the Modern World-System, *Progress in Human Geography*, Vol. 18, No. 2:151-162.
- Taylor, Peter J. 1995. Beyond Containers: Internationality, Interstateness, Interterritoriality, *Progress in Human Geography*, Vol. 19, No. 1:1-15.
- The Institute on Governace. 2002. Governance Principles for Protected Areas in the 21 st. Century. (April, Discussion Paper).
- Thompson, John B. 1993. Ideology. In: Krieger, Joel (Editor principal), Joseph, William A., Kahler, M., Nzongola-Ntalaja, G., Stallings, B., Weir, M., (Eds.), Paul, James A. (Editor consultor). *The Oxford Companion to the Politics of the World, (409-410)* New York: Oxford University Press.
- Thrift, Nigel. 1995. A hyperactive World. In Johnston, R. J., Watts, Michael, J. Geographies of Global Change, 18-35, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, LTD.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1991. *Geopolitics and Geoculture*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Weber, Max. 1946. *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. New York: Oxford University Press.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Joxel García was appointed Deputy Director of the Pan American Health Organization (PAHO) on 1 August 2003. As Deputy Director, Dr. García was responsible for setting the general direction and strategy of the Organization, alongside the Director, providing leadership and advice on all policy decisions. He was also responsible for managing relations between the Organization and the governments of the United States, Canada, and Puerto Rico. A resident of Connecticut since 1988, Dr. García was named Commissioner of the Connecticut Department of Public Health in 1999. He is a nationally recognized gynecological surgeon and a certified diplomate of the American Board of Obstetrics & Gynecology. Dr. García also served as Associate Clinical Professor at the University of Connecticut's School of Medicine. Dr. García holds a medical degree from the Ponce School of Medicine in Ponce, Puerto Rico, and a Master's in Business Administration from the University of Hartford, Connecticut. He completed his OB/GYN residency at Mount Sinai Hospital in Hartford. During his career at PAHO, his work has centered on health and globalization, health in border areas, and ethics and leadership in health. He is currently a Senior Vice President and

Senior Medical Adviser at Maximus, Inc., in Virginia. Dr. García was born in Arecibo, Puerto Rico. He is married and has two children.

Hiram R. Morales Lugo is a graduate of the University of Puerto Rico (UPR), where he obtained a B.A. in Social Sciences with a major in Labor Relations. He continued his studies at the UPR School of Law, where he earned the degree of *Juris Doctor*. While studying law, he authored several articles, including: “Analysis and Observations Regarding the to Prevent and Stop Domestic Violence in Puerto Rico;” and “Rehabilitation of the Impugned Witness: An Overview.” In 1997, he assumed the post of Executive Director of Puerto Rico’s Office of Governmental Ethics (OEG) where he served for a term of 10 years. In 2001, he was certified as a fraud examiner of the U.S. Association of Certified Fraud Examiners. That same year, he was appointed to the Follow-up Mechanism Expert Committee of the Inter-American Convention against Corruption. Mr. Morales Lugo has been a lecturer at various international forums and one of the professors that offer courses at the Center for the Development of Ethical Thinking of the OEG.

Jesús E. Nieves Mitaynez earned a B.A. in Philosophy and Linguistics at Evangel University in Springfield, Missouri. He went on to pursue graduate studies in Moral and Political Philosophy at Fordham University, Rose Hill Campus. He is a graduate of the UPR School of Law. He continued his law studies at the Laval University School of Law, Quebec, and pursued doctoral studies in Regional Geopolitics and Geostrategy, also at Laval. In 1999, he participated as a bilateral observer and lecturer at meetings between the Israeli and PLO governments at the University of Oklahoma-Norman Center for Peace Studies aimed at reactivating the peace process. In October 2000, he was named Special Adviser to the Executive Director of the Office of Governmental Ethics, Hiram R. Morales Lugo. Since August 2001, he has served as an Alternate Director in the Area of Academic Affairs of the Center for the Development of the Ethical Thinking, where he oversees the academic journal *Ethos Gubernamental*.