# GLOBALIZATION AND GLOBAL GOVERNANCE: PROSPECTS FOR INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION POST 9/11

**Emily B. Mawhinney**
*Department of Political Science*
*St. John's College, Annapolis*

**Abstract –** When the twin towers of the World Trade Center fell September 11, 2001, a domino effect was triggered that has transformed the nature of the security dilemma, redefined intervention, and has begun to unravel the thread of the United Nations. In the post 9/11 world, it would appear that multilateralism and sovereignty have lost their appeal, according to some, and general effectiveness, according to many. How did this happen? While US unilateral action in Iraq could be considered to be the final turning point in the transformation of how security threats are perceived and responded too, is this really the end of multilateral intervention?

In order to understand the nature and implications of the transformation of the international security dilemma, intervention, and multilateralism post 9/11, it is necessary to examine the behaviour that led to the US intervention in Iraq. What explains the US decision to take unilateral action against Iraq? Were decision-makers constrained by psychological factors, misperception, organizational routines? Can the American actions be classified as 'intervention' according to the pre-9/11 definition? How is intervention defined post-9/11? What are the implications of the differences in those definitions? Is this really the 'end of history' for multilateralism, humanitarianism? What are the implications for the security dilemma, future interventions, multilateral institutions? The United States' pre-emptive action against Iraq was constrained and falsely justified by organizational routines and misperception in the Bush administration, and ultimately seriously undermined the legitimacy of intervention, as well as the capabilities of multilateral institutions.

## Introduction

The transition from the 20th to the 21st Century can be characterized in broad terms by the synthesis of the global and the local. Simultaneously occurring on the systemic, national, and individual levels, the emerging trend of globalization has challenged traditional notions of state behaviour and institutions with significant and far-reaching effects. Limitations restricting international cooperation have been lessened, as the global economy and previously divergent identities have been institutionalized into a collective, dynamic entity. Evidence of transnational interactions reveals a significant correlation between instances of international cooperation, and the economic, social and political effects of globalization. Indeed, it would appear that globalization has created the transnational identities, supranational institutions and networks of interaction that facilitate international cooperation and global governance. However, the fragmentation of transnational identities and institutions triggered by the events of September 11, 2001 (9/11) may have significantly undermined the capacity and willingness of the international community to engage in cooperative behaviour, and adhere to a system of global governance.

The purpose of this paper is to analyze the prospects for international cooperation and global governance post 9/11. The first section will discuss the emergence of the phenomenon of globalization, evidence of globalized interactions, and the implications of a global identity and global institutions for cooperation and governance. The second section will test prospects for

cooperation and global governance post 9/11, in order to determine the extent of the impact of 9/11 on identity, collective action, and governance. Finally, the third section will attempt to reconcile identity, institutions, and cooperation post 9/11 in order to determine whether global governance is possible beyond 9/11.

**The Emergence of Globalization**

The exact definition and utility of globalization are highly contentious issues among scholars and policy makers, leading to significant difficulties in identifying precisely what globalization is, when it occurs, and the subsequent results. Globalization is best defined in postmodern terms, as a dynamic entity comprising multiple dimensions, incorporating the economic, social and political realms, and facilitating interactive relationships between those realms. "The process and results of globalization are changing the wary we live our lives on a personal basis, and the institutions which we use to give form to our economic, social and political relationships."[1] Most significantly, globalization can be characterized as a movement towards transnational integration and cooperation that is not without its dissidents, but nevertheless offers a necessary step towards global governance. While much scholarship on the subject of global governance has focused on the regimes, rules and decision-making procedures that states have created to govern international life, the nuances of the micro-management of international affairs at the local as well as global levels are often overlooked.[2] Therefore, an assessment of global governance requires consideration of relationship patterns between countries, institutions and peoples in light of growing poverty, environmental degradation, social violence and political alienation.[3] The phenomenon of globalization offers an indispensable tool for accounting for the range of actors interacting in a system of global governance, as well as the ways in which those actors are interconnected. Evidence of the capacity of globalization to account for interaction is evident in the evolution of patterns of cooperation in the areas of finance and development, identity and civil society, and political involvement at the global and local levels.

As a result of the triumph of capitalism at the end of the twentieth century, the role of global markets, economic policy and international economic institutions has become a primary determinant of prospects for future governance.[4] Globalization has been defined broadly as "a self-consolidating homogeneous 'thing' created and regulated by the 'invisible hand' of the market economy."[5] Scholars such as Paul Cammack and Randall Germain would agree that globalization is primarily an economic phenomenon, creating international monetary networks and institutions such as the World Trade Organization (WTO), the International Monetary Fund (IMF) as well as economic agreements such as the North American Free Trade Agreement

---

[1] Richard Langhorne, *The Coming of Globalization: Its Evolution and Contemporary Consequences.* (New York: Palgrave) 2001. Pg. 1.

[2] Steve Hughes, Rorden Wilkinson, Eds. *Global Governance: Critical Perspectives.* (New York: Routeledge) 2002. Pg. 2.

[3] Maximo T. Kalaw, *Civil Society's Emerging Role in Global Governance.* Presented at "WE THE PEOPLES... The Role Of Civil Society In The History And Future Of The United Nations: A Citizens Conference Exploring NGO-UN Relations", San Francisco California, June 21-24, 1995. Published by Philippine Institute of Alternative Futures, Makati, Philippines. July 1995. http://www.ecouncil.ac.cr/about/speech/secretar/Mkalaw.htm

[4] Richard Langhorne, *The Coming of Globalization: Its Evolution and Contemporary Consequences.* (New York: Palgrave) 2001. Pg. 16.

[5] Yildiz Atasoy, William K. Carroll, Eds. *Global Shaping and its Alternatives.* (Aurora, Ontario: Garamond Press Ltd.) 2003. Pg. 3.

(NAFTA).[6]  James Wolfenshon, the president of the WTO, provides further support for the vision of globalization in economic terms by citing the cooperation and partnership generated by the structural and social development work of the WTO and IMF.[7]  It would appear that the technological developments facilitating the flow of global capital, as well as the efforts of the WTO and IMF to integrate global economies have facilitated dynamic international economic cooperation, and therefore represent a step towards global governance.  However, there is serious doubt among many critics and anti-globalization activists such as Naomi Kline, as to whether global economic integration and the policies of international economic institutions are in fact able to address the broad spectrum of issues relevant to global governance.[8]  Indeed, in ideal terms, logic suggests that a system of global governance will have to address a multiplicity of issues including, but not limited to the economic, social and political realms. Issues relating to poverty, sustainable development and the environment, health and social welfare, and human security are essential elements of a successful agenda for global governance.

Evidence of volatile markets, continued unsustainable development, poverty, and insecurity suggests that international monetary institutions were largely unsuccessful in stabilizing the world economy prior to 9/11, and may face even greater challenges to economic integration post 9/11.[9]  Despite development efforts, the WTO and IMF have thus far failed to reconcile the uneasy combination of sophisticated computerized trading systems with the faltering economies of emerging markets, leading to sudden exchange rate collapses causing loses for less developed and advanced industrialized countries alike.[10]  In other words, global economic institutions have also failed to bring about the social and political development essential to a system of global governance, causing critics to question the capacity of such institutions to govern effectively.  The World Bank's Comprehensive Development Framework and its corresponding system of governance has for the most part failed to account for the obstacles facing developing countries as they strive to embody the social and structural dimensions of neo-liberalism.[11]  Similarly, while NAFTA has succeeded in increasing exports and investments throughout North America, the effects promised as the incentive for deregulation, including a cleaner environment, higher wages, better working conditions and less poverty have either been pitifully incremental or non-existent, as shown by the increase in poverty in Mexico from 49% to 75% between 1981 and 2002.[12]  Further evidence of the failure of international economic institutions to act effectively as components of a system of global governance is revealed by Canada's refusal to ratify the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of all Migrant Workers and Members of their Families.[13]  That agreement would protect the roughly 200,000 migrant workers who enter Canada every year,

---

[6] Steve Hughes, Rorden Wilkinson, Eds. *Global Governance: Critical Perspectives.* (New York: Routledge) 2002.
[7] Ibid. Pg. 36-37.
[8] Naomi Klein, *Fences and Windows: Dispatches from the Front Lines of the Globalization Debate.* (Toronto: Vintage Canada) 2002.
[9] The sources of this disenfranchisement stems largely from a renewed trend towards regionalism, as well as a growing lack of collective political will.
[10] Barbara Harriss-White, *Globalization and Insecurity: Political, Economic and Physical Challenges.* (New York: Palgrave) 2002. Pg. 149.
[11] Steve Hughes, Rorden Wilkinson, Eds. *Global Governance: Critical Perspectives.* (New York: Routledge) 2002. Pg. 5.
[12] Naomi Klein, *Fences and Windows: Dispatches from the Front Lines of the Globalization Debate.* (Toronto: Vintage Canada) 2002. Pg. 65.
[13] Naomi Klein, *Fences and Windows: Dispatches from the Front Lines of the Globalization Debate.* (Toronto: Vintage Canada) 2002. Pg. 75

trading their labour as a commodity according to free trade agreements, but without rights to protect them from exploitation.[14]

What does this evidence suggest about the capacity of international monetary institutions, and the trend towards the globalization of market economies to facilitate international cooperation and effective global governance? The utility of globalized relations in contributing to international cooperation should not be dismissed simply because of the challenges facing the implementation of WTO, IMF policies. Critics of capitalist market economies do raise valid arguments about the problems of implementing global economic policies, the suitability of a global system for all economies, as well as the imperial undertones of attempting to coercively control and manipulate the development of less developed countries. However, the WTO and IMF do undoubtedly represent transnational, supranational institutions with a mandate to manage the global community. Most importantly for the purpose of this paper, they also represent instances of transnational cooperation resulting from globalization, and thereby serve to illustrate the correlation between trends towards globalization, and international cooperation. Therefore, regardless of the significant challenges facing institutions, states and individuals alike in the process of globalization, evidence does suggest that international economic institutions do facilitate international cooperation and global governance. Critics may be appeased by a continued examination of the correlation between globalization and international cooperation that reveals economic integration is not the sole dimension of globalization. The social and political realms of interactions are also central to globalization and subsequently prospects for global governance.

Indeed, the second dimension of globalization that contributes to international cooperation is the social realm, which includes notions of identity, civil society and social consciousness. Scholars such as Bruce Cronin classifies identity as central to international politics as "all relationships involve interaction between oneself and an other, or group of selves, thus leading the way one defines the self and the other to define the nature of the relationship."[15] In the context of global governance, identity plays an essential role in uniting multiple actors with pluralistic goals under a common identity, which subsequently facilitates transnational cooperation. Scholars such as Anne Clunan agree, arguing that how actors conceive of their own identities will fundamentally shape the creation of social order and societal interests.[16] Bruce Cronin expands further upon the role of identity, offering a dialectical model within which social identities are shaped by transnational interaction, and concluding that states will act cohesively when transnational identities are considered more salient.[17] Cronin's conclusion is particularly relevant to a discussion about prospects for global governance, as it purports to identify the conditions under which transnational interaction and cooperation are likely to occur. Similarly, the logic of Democratic Peace theory also reasons that like identities will facilitate cooperation, or at least deter hostilities,[18] and will be considered in an ensuing discussion of the prospects for global governance.

---

[14] Ibid Pg. 75

[15] Bruce Cronin, *Community under Anarchy: Transnational Identity and the Evolution of Cooperation.* (New York: Columbia University Press) 1999. Pg. 18.

[16] Rudra Sil and Eileen M. Doherty, Eds. *Beyond Boundaries? Disciplines, Paradigms, and Theoretical Integration in International Studies.* (Albany: State University of New York Press) 2000. Pg. 90.

[17] Bruce Cronin, *Community under Anarchy: Transnational Identity and the Evolution of Cooperation.* (New York: Columbia University Press) 1999. Pg. 19.

[18] J. L. Ray, 'Democracy: On the level(s), does democracy correlate with peace? In John Vasquez, Ed. *What do we Know about War?* (Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield) 2000. Ch. 14.

However, before applying transnational identities to a discussion of cooperation, it is first necessary to determine precisely what identity is, and what role it plays in the social realm of global interactions. The Constructivist school of thought is a key nexus of support for identity politics, and addresses a significant oversight of Realist, and rationalist theory by examining the sources of actors' interests within the context of norms, culture and identity, rather than the parsimonious assumptions of Rational Choice theory.[19] In other words, in order to understand the nature of international cooperation and prospects for global governance, it is essential to understand not only what identities are, but also from where those identities are derived. The source of identity is a central factor determining whether cooperation is feasible, but may also present an insurmountable obstacle to cooperation in terms of the 'otherness' inherent in any constructed identity. Scholars such as Huntington,[20] and Hegel,[21] among others, identify a notion of the self in opposition to the other as central to identity on both the individual and state levels. "To be conscious of what one is is to be conscious of what one is not."[22] Otherness is further exacerbated by ethnicity, religion, and language, which combine to create a significant obstacle for the creation of a globalized identity, and therefore may undermine prospects for international cooperation.

Proponents of globalization counter that through the internationalization of civil society, pluralistic identities are merged into a single, transnational identity with the capacity to erase, or at least minimize difference, and therefore facilitate cooperation. Speculation abounds of the existence of a transnational identity within the globalization debate, however concrete evidence remains illusive. Although technology, migration, international economic interactions, international norms and institutions all support the trend towards a global identity, defining that identity in precise terms is not possible. Proponents of globalization would respond to this potentially significant drawback of their logic by arguing that evidence of increasing transnational interactions is sufficient to prove the existence of a collective identity. The inherent fluidity and plurality of the global identity is precisely what defines it, as it exists primarily in postmodern terms.

However, the global identity has been challenged in recent years, due to the growing emergence of multiple identities, such as ethnic, religious, cultural, environmental, and feminist identities, among others.[23] Critics argue that globalization therefore faces a significant challenge in reconciling the multiplicity of identities endemic in the international community before global governance can become a reality. Prior to 9/11, evidence of transnational economic flows and labour migration, as previously cited, supported the claim that globalization was indeed facilitating international cooperation, thus making global identity based on a shared global economy was possible. However, post 9/11, proponents of globalization are faced with events

---

[19] Rudra Sil and Eileen M. Doherty, Eds. *Beyond Boundaries? Disciplines, Paradigms, and Theoretical Integration in International Studies.* (Albany: State University of New York Press) 2000. Pg. 89.

[20] Samuel Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of the World Order.* (New York: Touchstone) 1997.

[21] G. W.F. Hegel, Translated by T.M. Knox. *Early Theological Writings.* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press) 1975.

[22] Bruce Cronin, *Community under Anarchy: Transnational Identity and the Evolution of Cooperation.* (New York: Columbia University Press) 1999. Pg. 25.

[23] Maximo T. Kalaw, *Civil Society's Emerging Role in Global Governance.* Presented at "WE THE PEOPLES... The Role Of Civil Society In The History And Future Of The United Nations: A Citizens Conference Exploring NGO-UN Relations", San Francisco California, June 21-24, 1995. Published by Philippine Institute of Alternative Futures, Makati, Philippines. July 1995.

that fragmented identity along religious, cultural, and ideological lines, as well as evidence of uncooperative international behaviour. Furthermore, President George Bush's exclusive rhetoric regarding the war on terror, reminiscent of Huntington's 'us' versus 'them' dichotomy has created yet another obstacle for the reconciliation of identities and prospects for global governance.[24] Prospects for cooperation and global governance post 9/11 in light of the fragmentation of identity will be discussed in a forthcoming section

Undeterred by critics, globalization scholars argue that the source and manifestation of global identity is derived from the civil society that mobilizes collective action at the local and global levels within the social and political spheres. Notions of personal identity and political belonging, citizenship and participation comprise civil society, which is considered by many scholars, including Robert Putnam, to be the essential requirement of global governance.[25] Without the networks of civil society synthesizing interactions in multiple realms, and facilitating participation, governance in both democratic terms would not be possible at the state or system level. Following the same logic, civil society and participation but can only be productive in the context of governance when issues of citizenship, belonging, migration and porous boundaries are resolved within the globalization debate.

The strength and capacity of civil society to facilitate cooperation is derived from the shift in focus, big 'P' Politics, to the mobilization of grassroots, often non-governmental networks, organizations and participation. According to democratic theory and Rousseau's Social Contract, consent is the necessary foundation of democracy, whether tacit or explicit, thus implying the centrality of participation for democratic government.[26] In the context of governance at both the national and global levels, the participation and active involvement of the population being governed is essential, particularly if democratic governance is the goal. Kofi Annan provides further support for the role of civil society in a democratically based system of global governance in a statement he made in May 1999. "We have entered a new era of ever-greater partnership…as NGO's, international organizations and governments come together to pursue their [collective] objectives…and it is clear that there are few limits to what civil society can achieve."[27] Indeed, as globalization transforms transnational relations from Realist, 'hard-power' interactions to include 'soft-power' and complex multilateralism, the role of civil society will be essential in building relations between non-states entities, and facilitating cooperation beyond the limits of the Realist paradigm.[28] Evidence of the proliferation of NGO's, as well as a variety of community-based organizations around the world illustrates the existence, extent of influence, and therefore the capacity of global civil society. "The number of international NGO's has quadrupled to over 20,000 in less that two decades (since the end of the Cold War), as UN sponsored conferences provided the vehicle for emerging civil alliances to implement their mandates."[29] Coinciding with the progress of globalization, this proliferation suggests that

---

[24] George W. Bush, *President declares Freedom at war with Fear.* Address to a Joint Session of Congress and the American People. Sept. 20, 2001. Washington D.C. www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/

[25] Robert D. Putnam, *Bowling Alone: The collapse and revival of American community.* (New York: Simon & Schuster) 2000.

[26] Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *On the Social Contract.* Edited by Roger D. Masters, Translated by Judith R. Masters. (New York: St. Martin's Press) 1978. Book III, chapter I, IX, XVI.

[27] Ramesh Thakur, Edward Newman, Eds. *New Millennium, New Perspectives: The United Nations, Security and Governance.* (Tokyo: United Nations University Press) 2000. Pg. 205.

[28] Ibid. Pg. 205-206.

[29] Ibid. Pg. 209.

there is indeed a correlation between the cooperative networks of civil society, and the social effects of globalization.

Despite these apparent gains, and increasing capacity of civic organizations to address issues of global governance, civil society and other manifestations of global participation are still faced with significant obstacles to overcome. Most significantly, as traditional boundaries are dissolved by globalization, and large population transfers occur, notions of citizenship and belonging are necessarily transformed to meet the new requirements of identity and political participation. Through the free trade agreements of globalization such as NAFTA, national borders become porous, and flows of migrants are produced as workers seek more lucrative employment than is available to them in their home countries.[30] As of 2000, approximately "150 million people were living temporarily or permanently outside their countries of origin, of which 80-97 million were estimated to be migrant workers."[31] The implications of such extensive migration for citizenship, identity, and belonging are significant indeed. Prior to the peak of globalization in recent years, identity and citizenship could be clearly defined in singular terms. However, within the context of the new global community, characterized by pluralistic identities and multiple citizenships, dimensions of political participation become necessarily nuanced. Critics may argue that under such complex circumstances, the transfer of social, political and cultural barriers from the traditional state level to a heterogeneous pool representing global society diminishes prospects for participation and therefore global governance. However, proponents of globalization counter that the transnational transfer of populations and resources across porous borders establishes a transnational identity that fuels civil society, facilitates participation at the local and global levels, and subsequently leads to international cooperation.

Further evidence of the transnational identity produced by globalization can also been seen in the emergence of a collective social consciousness manifested in the actions of the United Nations to protect human rights and international security. Article 1 of the United Nations Charter outlines the role of the UN in "maintaining international peace and security, and to that end taking collective measures for the prevention and removal of the threat to peace…"[32] The collective social consciousness of the global identity is also exemplified by the respect for human rights that is fundamental to the United Nations mandate, provides the logic and motivation for humanitarian interventions. Cases of UN intervention including Bosnia 1992-1995, Somalia 1992-1993, Rwanda 1994, Haiti 1994, Kosovo 1998-1999, East-Timor 1999, and Sierra Leone 1999-2000[33] illustrate both the presence of the collective social consciousness of the global identity, as well as instances of international cooperation. In other words, the correlation between the social and political effects of globalization and instances of international cooperation is further supported by the mandate and actions of the United Nations. In relation to a discussion about global governance, this correlation suggests that human rights can therefore be seen to be a central issue of the post- Cold War era, and must subsequently be addressed by actions and policy within all realms of global interactions and governance.[34]

---

[30] Patrick Taran, 'Human Rights of Migrants: Challenges of the New Decade.' In *International Migration*; Quarterly Review Vol. 38 No. 6 Special Issue 2/2000. www.migrantwatch.org

[31] Ibid. (online)

[32] Clive Jones, Caroline Kennedy-Pipe, *International Security in a Global Age: Securing the Twenty-first Century.* (Portland: Frank Cass Publishers) 2000. Pg. 119.

[33] Simon Cherterman, Ed. *Civilians in War.* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers) 2001. Pg. 180-184.

[34] Steve Hughes, Rorden Wilkinson, Eds. *Global Governance: Critical Perspectives.* (New York: Routeledge) 2002. Pg. 75.

To reiterate the argument of this paper thus far, in order to provide conclusive evidence of the correlation between the economic, social and political effects of globalization and instances international cooperation, it was necessary to identify specific cases of international cooperation pre 9/11. The economic, social and political effects of globalization have been identified as economic integration characterized by free-trade agreements, the proliferation of civil society infrastructure and corresponding trends of increasing participation, as well as the emergence of a collective social consciousness. Evidence from the NAFTA agreement[35], as well as UN sponsored collective action to protect human rights[36] both support the correlation between globalization and international cooperation. Definitive proof of the expansion of global networks of civil society is harder to find, although evidence of participation and the engagement of multiple populations does suggest that globalization has far-reaching political effects.[37] However, a forum for truly global political participation remains illusive, indicating that despite evidence of past instances of international cooperation, the foundation of civic engagement and political participation required for necessary for effective, democratically based global governance has yet to be established by the phenomenon of globalization.

**The Effects of 9/11**

The aforementioned evidence suggests that pre 9/11 it would appear that globalization created the transnational identities, supranational institutions and networks of interaction that facilitate international cooperation and represent necessary conditions global governance. However, post 9/11, the fragmentation of transnational identities and institutions may have significantly undermined the capacity and willingness of the international community to engage in cooperative behaviour, and adhere to a system of global governance. The following section will test prospects for cooperation global governance post 9/11 in order to determine the extent of the impact of 9/11 on identity, collective action, and governance.

In order to evaluate prospects for global governance post 9/11, it is necessary to recognize the paradoxical impact the events of 9/11 have had on issues relevant to globalization, and therefore global governance. Economic openness and trade which was previously considered crucial for a global economy is now subject to new restrictions which may hamper economic globalization and further transnational economic cooperation.[38] In addition, the fragile global identity constructed by transnational flows of population, civic cooperation and participation has been once again fragmented into absolute categories of 'us' versus 'them' reminiscent of the Cold War.[39] Global identity post 9/11 has been further complicated by the emergence of non-state actors such as terrorists, with the capacity to challenge global security, but without allegiance to a national or global identity. However, the truly paradoxical impact of 9/11 is embodied in the emergence of new types of cross-border government coalitions according to

---

[35] Previously cited in Naomi Klein, *Fences and Windows: Dispatches from the Front Lines of the Globalization Debate.* (Toronto: Vintage Canada) 2002.

[36] Previously cited in Simon Cherterman, Ed. *Civilians in War.* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers) 2001. Pg. 180-184.

[37] Robert D. Putnam, *Bowling Alone: The collapse and revival of American community.* (New York: Simon & Schuster) 2000.

[38] Saskia Sassen, *Governance Hotspots: Challenges we must confront in the post September 11 world.* (New York: Social Science Research Council). http://www.ssrc.org/sept11/essays/sassen.htm

[39] George W. Bush, *President declares Freedom at war with Fear.* Address to a Joint Session of Congress and the American People. Sept. 20, 2001. Washington D.C. www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/

scholars such as Saskia Sassen[40], while the United States simultaneously pursues unilateral actions in the war on terror, and most recently in the war in Iraq. Lastly, 9/11 also represents the solidification of the American role as the global hegemon, which may pose the most significant challenge to continued globalization and future prospects for global governance.

Many scholars agree that the end of the Cold War brought about the reshaping of the geopolitical ordering, as well as the triumph of global capitalism.[41] During the 1990s, Clinton adopted economic policies aimed at redefining the role of the US in managing the global economy in terms of strategic cooperation in both the economic and political realms.[42] When the attacks on the World Trace Centers occurred, there was speculation as to whether the attacks on the heart of the American financial infrastructure would destabilize the global economy. Indeed, as Bush's actions post-9/11 have become increasingly unilateral, there is concern as to whether the strategic cooperation, encouraged by the Clinton administrations policies fostering economic integration, will survive. However, the evidence thus far indicates that the global economy is not in fact faltering. "Bush's unilateralism does not obliterate the trend towards an open market economy…the capitalist market economy is broadening and deepening in most parts of the world, including the Muslim world."[43] In addition, collective economic institutions such as the WTO and IMF as well as Multinational Corporations continue to develop transnational networks of production and capital flow, signifying continued international cooperation, at least in the economic realm. The effects of economic collapse post 9/11 have also likely been minimized by the solidification of the US role as global hegemon, which implies continued economic integration of the capitalist market economy, but also restricts international cooperation in non-economic terms.

The attacks of 9/11 also challenged notions of a global identity that globalization had fostered, with significant implications for both security and cooperation. Before proceeding with analysis, it is first necessary to assume that a global identity, defined in terms of a collective social consciousness, and entrenched by transnational migration patterns, did indeed exist prior to 9/11. Following the attacks and the subsequent US actions in Afghanistan and Iraq, identity has been fragmented along the fault lines of Huntington's civilizations.[44] Although Huntington's absolute categories of the 'West' versus the 'Rest', specifically Islam, are problematic in relativist terms, they do represent the current state of the international community. Bush's rhetoric further exemplifies the fragmentation of the global identity into 'us versus them' in a 'permanent crusade' of 'divine justice' with the aim of reordering the world around American power.[45] The notion of a global identity has been further challenged post 9/11 by the emergence of non-state actors, specifically terrorists, with few allegiances, except to their cause. Although it is unlikely that the unitary terrorist actor did not exist prior to 9/11, the effects of identity unaffiliated with a nation-state or territory have come to be widely illustrated by the challenges,

---

[40] Saskia Sassen, *Governance Hotspots: Challenges we must confront in the post September 11 world.* (New York: Social Science Research Council). http://www.ssrc.org/sept11/essays/sassen.htm

[41] Yildiz Atasoy, William K. Carroll, Eds. *Global Shaping and its Alternatives.* (Aurora, Ontario: Garamond Press Ltd.) 2003. Pg. 200.

[42] Ibid. Pg. 200.

[43] Yildiz Atasoy, William K. Carroll, Eds. *Global Shaping and its Alternatives.* (Aurora, Ontario: Garamond Press Ltd.) 2003. Pg. 200.

[44] Samuel Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of the World Order.* (New York: Touchstone) 1997.

[45] Yildiz Atasoy, William K. Carroll, Eds. *Global Shaping and its Alternatives.* (Aurora, Ontario: Garamond Press Ltd.) 2003. Pg. 201.

and lack of success facing the United States in fighting the war on terror in Afghanistan and Iraq. It is beyond the scope of this paper to discuss the details of those engagements, however they do illustrate the difficulties of trying to 'hunt' down terrorists without a clear national affiliation or identity. Most significantly, the fragmentation of global identity along civilizational lines post 9/11 has seriously undermined prospect for future cooperation, exacerbated by binary division of the 'West' versus 'Islam, as well as the continued entrenchment of American hegemonic power.

Within a discussion of the effects of globalization on international cooperation, the events of 9/11 represent a turning point in international cooperation. Prior to 9/11, the United States was placated into a role as 'sheriff' rather than the 'Lone Ranger' according to scholars such as Joseph Nye[46], however following 9/11, American actions in the war on terror can be characterized as the substantively unilateral behaviour of a hegemonic power. Journalist Charles Krauthammer provides further support for this claim, referring to the American withdrawal from the ABM treaty in December 2001 when he characterized the Bush Administration's foreign policy as unashamedly unilateral.[47] Despite a cacophony of opposition from scholars including Nye, critics, and citizens alike calling for the US to make use of international institutions such as the United Nations and adopt a multilateral strategy, the United States employed largely unilateral force in Iraq, although supplemented by British cooperation. One explanation for this unilateral action can be derived from the logic of hegemonic stability theory.

According to scholars such as Gilpin, a hegemon will emerge when the power base on which governance of a system rests has been eroded, and hegemonic war will occur when the hegemon is challenged by a rising state.[48] American economic and political dominance of the international community both pre and especially post 9/11 suggests that the United States is indeed a hegemonic power, although preponderance does not necessarily justify unilateral behaviour. However, it is a particularly interesting to note that in the context of globalization, it appears that preponderance does not preclude cooperation even post 9/11. The phenomenon of globalization has increased interdependence, and subsequently the benefits of cooperation, particularly in economic terms, through the proliferation of international institutions such as the WTO, the UN, the EU (European Union), OAS (Organization of American States) and the OAU (Organization of African Unity). Subsequently, scholars such as Nye argue that even as a hegemonic power, the United States cannot afford to 'go it alone,' citing membership in the aforementioned institutions as evidence that few states, even hegemons, perceive value in categorically avoiding cooperative interactions.[49] In other words, globalization has led "global society to become increasingly institutionalized [leading to] greater interdependence and manifestations of transnational harm [resulting] in intensified efforts to coordinate outcomes at the global level."[50]

Therefore, the events of 9/11 represent a challenging paradox. It is clear that the effects of globalization in terms of transnational economic institutions and interdependence, as well as the existence of international institutions such as the United Nations with a mandate to act in a political capacity were not diminished post 9/11. Although, American hegemony and

---

[46] J. Martin Rochester, *Between Two Epochs: What's ahead for America, the world and global politics in the Twenty-First century?* (New Jersey: Prentice Hall) 2002. Pg. 247.

[47] Rosemary Foot et al. Eds. *US Hegemony and International Organizations.* (Oxford: Oxford University Press) 2003. Pg. 2.

[48] Robert Gilpin, *War and Change in World Politics.* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) 1981. Pg. 186-210.

[49] Rosemary Foot et al. Eds. *US Hegemony and International Organizations.* (Oxford: Oxford University Press) 2003. Pg. 3.

[50] Ibid. Pg. 2.

preponderance does appears to have been further entrenched and clearly manifested in response to the challenge of terrorist actors.  Thus, post 9/11 it appears that the temptation for the United States to act unilaterally remains, while the influence of globalization remains undiminished.  In light of this paradox as well as the continued effects of globalization and American retaliatory actions, what then are the prospects for global governance?

**Global Governance beyond 9/11**

Perhaps the most significant effect of 9/11 has been in the realm of human security, which forms the motivation for a system of global governance.  However, before the dimensions of human security post 9/11 can be addressed, it is first necessary to determine precisely what global governance is.  In the broadest terms, global governance implies an integrated system of cooperation based on shared goals and interests and producing collective benefits.  Robert Keohane further articulates the logic, and necessity of global governance and the implicit institutionalization of cooperation.  "Without cooperation, we will be lost.  Without institutions there will be little cooperation.  And without knowledge of how institutions work, and what makes them work well, there are likely to be fewer, and worse institutions."[51]  Indeed, it is the purpose of global governance to inspire cooperation through supranational institutions such as the UN, EU, and WTO among others.  According to Keohane, those institutions and international regimes can be defined in terms of principles, norms, rules and decision-making procedures, all of which are encoded with injunctions about behaviour.[52]  The practices of institutions are further constrained by both codified legal rules, as well as the more loosely determined acceptable standards of practice.  Keohanes' conception of international regimes and cooperation marks an invaluable leap from ad-hoc, status quo-preserving alliances, to the neo-liberal institutionalism that is more representative of the age of globalization, as illustrated by the carefully constructed economic and political regimes.[53]

In addition to Keohanes' institutionalized norms and rules of behaviour, a system of global governance in the context of globalization also denotes the necessity of global participation.  However, there is considerable debate among scholars as to whether global governance in fact represents a system of global democracy, or whether it can more appropriately be classified as a state-less society governed by a Hobsian Leviathan.  Proponents of global governance argue that the abolition of traditional state governments is unnecessary. Rather, a system of governance is characterized by the incorporation of those governments into a transnational network of institutions or regimes with the broadly defined legitimacy to act in the name of the collective good.  Following that logic, global governance can thus be defined in utilitarian terms, as a system of interconnected institutions existing in unison with traditional nation-state based governments, requiring consent and participation of members, but not incompatible with the goals and functions of nation-states.  The transnational institutions manifested during the age of globalization, including the WTO, IMF, UN, EU, OAS, and NATO among others, offer proof of the existence of a loosely defined system of global governance, although most institutions, with the exception of the WTO, IMF and UN, remain regionally based.  Ultimately, regardless of the persistent challenge posed by regionalism, globalization can

---

[51] Lloyd Gruber, *Ruling the World: Power politics and the rise of supranational institutions.* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press) 2000. Pg. 3.

[52] Robert Keohane,  *After Hegemony.* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press) 1984. Pg. 59.

[53] Lloyd Gruber, *Ruling the World: Power politics and the rise of supranational institutions.* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press) 2000. Pg. 16.

therefore be understood to have produced a system of global governance by creating economic interdependence, and building the capacity for participation and a collective social consciousness and political will through the development of transnational networks of civil society.

Critics counter that the loosely defined system of global governance generated through globalization is largely ineffectual, as any state with a preponderance of power may be able to override the lose transnational networks in favor of national interests over mutual benefit. Indeed, this appears to have been the case in light of American unilateral action post 9/11. However, it is doubtful that the failure of the United States to adhere to the norms and practices of international cooperation in response to the terrorist attacks of 9/11 fundamentally undermines all prospects for future cooperation and global governance.

An evaluation of the positive correlation between the economic, social and political effects of globalization on international cooperation reveals that continuing trends of globalization will not permit unilateral behaviour, even in the case of hegemonic power, from becoming the norm of international interaction. It is possible that the tragic nature of the terrorist attacks of 9/11 provided the logic and perceived necessity of unilateral action in the Bush administration. However, it is precisely the effect of the new security threat posed by the non-state actors of 9/11 that illustrates the necessity of international cooperation, as well as the benefits of a system of globally integrated identities and collective allegiances, rather than the exclusionary politics of 'us versus them.'

## Conclusion

Post 9/11, the prospects for global governance are faced with many challenges. Although globalization has indeed generated the transnational identity, supranational institutions, and networks of interaction necessary for a system of global governance to emerge, the events of 9/11 and the subsequent materialization of new actors and security threats pose a significant challenge to the conception and manifestation of inclusive, coherent responses to global issues. In the context of 9/11, it would appear that:

> The peculiar difficulty of government, whether political or industrial, in Western democracies at present is clearly due to the rise to power of organized minorities, each with an effective power to veto the others, and thus to curtail the area within which the system which they constitute can in fact act as a whole, despite the fact that it has the authority and the resources to do so.[54]

The paradox of 9/11 implies that despite the utility of a system of global governance, as well as the continuing trend towards globalization that would facilitate such a system, international cooperation will likely continue on an ad hoc basis based on the strategic or economic interests at stake. Ultimately, post 9/11 a cooperative system of global governance remains attainable, but will be considerable more difficult to implement in material, permanent terms.

---

[54] Jim Whitman, 'Global Governance as the Friendly Face of Unaccountable Power.' In *Security Dialogue*. SAGE Publications, 2002. Vol. 33(1): Pg. 55.

**Bibliography**

Atasoy, Y., Carroll, W. K., Eds. Global Shaping and its Alternatives. (Aurora, Ontario: Garamond Press Ltd.) 2003.

Bush, G.W., President declares Freedom at war with Fear. Address to a Joint Session of Congress and the American People. Sept. 20, 2001. Washington D.C. www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/

Cherterman, S., Ed. Civilians in War. (Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers) 2001.

Cronin, B., Community under Anarchy: Transnational Identity and the Evolution of Cooperation. (New York: Columbia University Press) 1999.

Foot, R., et al. Eds. US Hegemony and International Organizations. (Oxford: Oxford University Press) 2003.

Gilpin, R., War and Change in World Politics. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) 1981.

Harriss-White, B., Globalization and Insecurity: Political, Economic and Physical Challenges. (New York: Palgrave) 2002.

Hegel, G.W.F., Translated by T.M. Knox. Early Theological Writings. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press) 1975.

Hughes, S., Wilkinson, R., Eds. Global Governance: Critical Perspectives. (New York: Routeledge) 2002.

Huntington, S., The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of the World Order. (New York: Touchstone) 1997.

Jones, C., Kennedy-Pipe, C., International Security in a Global Age: Securing the Twenty-first Century. (Portland: Frank Cass Publishers) 2000.

Kalaw, M. T., Civil Society's Emerging Role in Global Governance. Presented at "WE THE PEOPLES... The Role Of Civil Society In The History And Future Of The United Nations: A Citizens Conference Exploring NGO-UN Relations", San Francisco California, June 21-24, 1995. Published by Philippine Institute of Alternative Futures, Makati, Philippines. July 1995. http://www.ecouncil.ac.cr/about/speech/secretar/Mkalaw.htm

Klein, N., Fences and Windows: Dispatches from the Front Lines of the Globalization Debate. (Toronto: Vintage Canada) 2002.

Langhorne, R., The Coming of Globalization: Its Evolution and Contemporary Consequences. (New York: Palgrave) 2001.

Putnam, R.D., Bowling Alone: The collapse and revival of American community. (New York: Simon & Schuster) 2000.

Ray, J. L., 'Democracy: On the level(s), does democracy correlate with peace? In John Vasquez, Ed. What do we Know about War? (Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield) 2000.

Rochester, J.M., Between Two Epochs: What's ahead for America, the world and global politics in the Twenty-First century? (New Jersey: Prentice Hall) 2002.

Rousseau, J.J., On the Social Contract. Edited by Roger D. Masters, Translated by Judith R. Masters. (New York: St. Martin's Press) 1978.

Sassen, S., Governance Hotspots: Challenges we must confront in the post September 11 world. (New York: Social Science Research Council). http://www.ssrc.org/sept11/essays/sassen.htm

Sil, R., Doherty, E. M., Eds. Beyond Boundaries? Disciplines, Paradigms, and Theoretical Integration in International Studies. (Albany: State University of New York Press) 2000.

Taran, P., 'Human Rights of Migrants: Challenges of the New Decade.' In International Migration; Quarterly Review Vol. 38 No. 6 Special Issue 2/2000. www.migrantwatch.org

Thakur, R., Newman, E., Eds. New Millennium, New Perspectives: The United Nations, Security and Governance. (Tokyo: United Nations University Press) 2000.

Whitman, J., 'Global Governance as the Friendly Face of Unaccountable Power.' In Security Dialogue. SAGE Publications, 2002. Vol. 33(1).