

GLOBAL MULTI-LEVEL GOVERNANCE

European and East Asian Leadership

César de Prado

Global multi-level governance: European and East Asian leadership

César de Prado



**United Nations
University Press**

TOKYO • NEW YORK • PARIS

Endorsements

“The author presents to us an excellent contribution to our understanding of the complex development towards global multi-level governance. His very well researched case studies focus on the regional integration in the European Union and in South-East/East Asia, the interlinkages between them and their potential to effect global change. Particularly interesting, because much less studied until now, is the chapter on the “advisory factors” that are stimulating and facilitating the regionalisation process as well as the chapter on the efforts in both regions to promote a more knowledgeable civil society through changes in higher education systems. The book ends with a visionary outlook on further developments towards a better, knowledge-based multi-level world. Indeed very impressive.”

Horst Günter Krenzler, *Professor at Munich University Law Institute and former Director General for External Relations at the European Commission*

“César de Prado has written an impressive book on the growing engagement between Asia and Europe. He argues convincingly that this could motivate the US, the indispensable superpower, and other stakeholders in the international system, to join hands in offering our diminished multi-lateral institutions a much needed injection of dynamism, leadership and new directions.”

Tommy Koh, *Founding Executive Director of the Asia-Europe Foundation and Chairman of the Institute of Policy Studies*

“A rich and interesting book, crammed with an astonishing range of detail about networked governance from Europe to Asia. His theoretical framework encompasses actors from international organizations to corporations, universities to think tanks, offering a way to map the new world order.”

Anne-Marie Slaughter, *Dean of the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University*

“A carefully researched analysis of East Asian and European regionalism, their driving forces and the interaction between the regions. The study is remarkable both for its theoretical quality and its novel empirical data. A most valuable source for students of regionalism.”

Karl Kaiser, *Visiting Professor at Harvard University and former Director of the German Council on Foreign Relations*

“This timely book provides a highly comprehensive and illuminating exposition of the new fluidity of global and regional multilateral governance. César de Prado did an excellent job in providing a valuable analytical framework and persuasive cases for students of international relations and the new global order.”

Il Sa-Kong, *Chairman and CEO of the Institute for Global Economics and Chair of the ASEM Vision Group, 1998–2000*

“The demise of multilateralism has been announced prematurely. César de Prado demonstrates how increased regionalism in Europe and in Asia has assured its remarkable comeback. His book shows convincingly how this came about and why.”

Albrecht Rothacher, *Editor in Chief of the Asia-Europe Journal*

“This interesting book makes a strong case for the emergence of a multi-level global governance system that knits together regionally-based governments and non-governmental actors with specific reference to Europe’s and Asia’s knowledge systems. Interested readers will learn from de Prado’s analytical framework and some well-researched case material.”

Peter J. Katzenstein, *Walter S. Carpenter Professor, Jr. of International Studies at Cornell University*

Contents

Figures and tables	viii
Acknowledgements	xv
1 Global multi-level governance	1
2 Advancing multi-level intergovernmentalism	35
3 The crucial influence of Track-2 advisory processes	91
4 Global multi-level knowledge economies	131
5 Towards higher levels of education	177
6 Envisioning a better multi-level world	215
References	229
Index	249

6

Envisioning a better multi-level world

This book began by presenting the main contending transatlantic theories of international relations and argued that they are limited when trying to explain the post–Cold War knowledge-based hyperlinked multi-level system. The realist school ominously claim that the search for a bipolar balance of power often leads world states to engage in war. Liberal approaches nevertheless argue that international organizations and softer regimes allow international businesses and civil society to forge prosperous links peacefully. Social constructivists, the most optimistic theoretical approach, claim that a broad range of public and private links, profit and non-profit oriented, may restructure the world system by accommodating multiple identities.

The book argues that a gradual transformation towards a new world order should be theorized by a knowledge-based global multi-level governance paradigm. The knowledge revolution catalysed by information and communications technologies has given rise to many more transnational actors and regional processes that influence governance at various interrelated levels. Although the state system is still crucial in global governance, other levels below and, especially, above it are increasingly relevant, challenging and complementary. Westphalian states are in constant tension with substate levels (micro-regions, cities, etc.), but most functioning states manage to accommodate them without seriously considering partitions. Above states all kinds of world or macro-regions are emerging and many are vying for recognition and influence. And on

Global multi-level governance: European and East Asian leadership, de Prado, United Nations University Press, 2007, ISBN 978-92-808-1139-1

top of it all there are global institutions and other regimes trying to strengthen or renew their role in global governance. All levels now interact, not only within levels but also across levels.

These multi-level processes go beyond traditional trade and security concerns to include now a wide range of converging political, economic and social issues analysed in four complementary chapters. Public governments are not the only relevant actors advancing the multiplicity of issues in the world's multi-level system. Governments often use flexible Track-2 think-tanks and networks to link with selected non-governmental actors. Business firms, especially large multinational and transnational corporations, are key drivers in regional and global e-economy processes. And universities often become the preferred Track-3 platforms for knowledge workers and other independent civil society actors to connect all over the world.

The book argues that flexible macro-regional regimes are particularly crucial to current multi-level governance as they dynamically link states to a potentially more effective multilateral system. The chapters focus on the crucial European and East Asian regional processes that are largely driving this tectonic transformation. The European process is by far the most developed and the East Asian one is nowadays the most dynamic, and both are already linking with other parts of the world to help them develop their own paths towards effective global multi-level governance.

The reconstruction of Western Europe that began six decades ago led to lasting political, economic and social governance innovations. The pooling of scarce energy resources, the creation of a larger space for businesses and workers, the maintaining of social safety nets and the renunciation of military competition have created an unprecedented peace and prosperity with which many people increasingly identify. This regional governance system is largely based on the European Union, which broadened its original federalizing functional and economic communities with intergovernmental pillars addressing a fuller range of political and social issues internally and externally. The European Union is complemented by other European processes, sometimes institutionalized in the broad Council of Europe, but often driven by groups of willing countries in non-institutionalized ways. Moreover, the European Union is flexible enough to accommodate both exceptions to its agreements and the leadership of countries advancing the reinforced cooperation of core and willing member states. While the European Union is now in the middle of another cathartic process, it relentlessly increases its external projection. It is an ever more important transatlantic partner, and attracts growing interest from neighbouring countries and far-away partners, often organized in regional formations.

Regional collaboration in East Asia, globally less conspicuous as it lacks the type of permanent institutions found in Europe, nevertheless promises to lead to an innovative model of converging economic and, perhaps, social development that bridges over the region's diversities and successfully engages a re-emergent China. In East Asia there are many geographical, demographic, political, economic and social disparities, and encounters in the twentieth century did not help much to reduce them. Gradual functional and intergovernmental cooperation with a long-term vision of an East Asian Community (with a capital "C") that successfully engages a re-emerging China will not easily resolve all existing problems, but the evolving East Asian multi-level structure is overall flexible and open enough to raise hopes within and outside the region. The ASEAN+3 process formally builds on four decades of dense cooperation in South-East Asia that has recently picked up pace to the point of very probably agreeing on a substantial quasi-constitutional charter by the end of 2007. Through a mesh of links it has catalysed a tripartite co-operation between Japan, China and South Korea, three traditionally proud powers with limited common history that nevertheless seem to understand they have increasingly to work together – a position highlighted by many partners, even the United States.

The shape and depth of the regional and subregional processes within the envisioned East Asian community are clearly entangled with the external multi-level environment. Neighbours may participate in a good number of issues, including strategic ones in a nascent East Asian summit that first welcomed "Western" Australia and New Zealand and a newly active India (Russia's Putin did not make it all the way in), while other neighbouring countries may join only some of the ASEAN-led functional processes. Meanwhile, the United States bilaterally and in multilateral forums like an evolving APEC, Europe through bilateral and interregional schemes like ASEM and the rest of the world in a variety of multi-level ways are all striving to remain actively involved to make sure the East Asian regional process is generally beneficial.

Chapter 3 focused on the crucial role of advisory Track-2 mechanisms that synthesize the input of many stakeholders. It argued that, like the European Community at the beginning of its historical formation and the European Union at the current cathartic junction, the evolution towards an ASEAN+3-centred East Asia community has, at least since the 1990s, been shaped by governmental actors listening to the advice of policy-influential intellectual actors, usually sitting in think-tanks and competitively networking in a multiplicity of ways, domestically and globally.

Chapter 4 focused on the new economic dimension of the multi-level governance processes largely pioneered by Europe and East Asia. The European Union has already advanced much in creating an economic

space with increasing liberties for goods, services, workers and capital. It has been particularly successful in some info-communication sectors that remain competitively linked to the rest of the world. And East Asian countries, again confident of their partially relaxed guided reforms, are thickening their already strong trade interactions with a mesh of economic agreements touching on investment and monetary issues, while info-communication services are representative of their new multi-level common cooperation.

The final case study that formed chapter 5 focused on innovations in higher education as a crucial case of incipient knowledge-based global multi-level social governance. The European Union and neighbouring countries are building a common space where people can freely move to travel, work and, especially, learn. The EU Erasmus programme and the intergovernmental aspirations to form a pan-continental higher education area by the end of this decade are possibly the most successful efforts to consolidate a common European identity in addition to existing national and local ones already under global stress. Meanwhile, East Asian countries are also jointly exploring to develop a more innovative social space. There are fewer restrictions to travel and work in the region. And there is a commitment to advance a more common higher education space by linking developments in ASEAN and North-East Asia through the ASEAN+3 process, aided by links with the rest of the world.

New theoretical journeys

The theoretical conclusion that can be drawn from the analyses of the book is that one must link and transcend mainstream approaches into useful syntheses. The increasing visibility of the EU and East Asian summits gives plenty of evidence in favour of balance-of-power realists desperately looking for conflicting multipolarity. Yet there is also much in favour of neo-liberal institutionalists as Europe opens more service sectors and intra-East Asian economic agreements are paired with external ones. Moreover, social constructivists would rejoice when looking at the great number of multi-level exchanges not only between government businesses, but increasingly also students, tourists, migrants and less profit-oriented civil society organizations.

The rise of functional and institutional regionalism in Europe, and the paced institutionalization of functional East Asian links and beyond, allow new theoretical paradigms for the internet age. Rather than conflicting poles, flexible world regional processes are giving rise to linking nodes that rapidly diffuse information and knowledge. Rather than strong institutions, regional processes are promoting flexible, lightly insti-

tutionalized, networked regimes that link countries to global processes. Rather than promoting conflictual visions of a global citizenship or human identity, multi-level social exchanges are allowing for a multiplicity of peaceful identities in need of constant educated reassessment of their secondary values. In sum, the world is now in a multi-level network governance paradigm in which bottom-up and top-down explanations of state and regional construction are converging into a series of nodes competitively interlinking at all levels in variable geographies.

The theoretical argument of this book could be further tested and refined with the help of basic global multi-level indicators that facilitate comparisons and partial explanatory theories. That requires experts to look down a bit more from the ivory towers where polysemic terms like peace, democracy, culture or development are more or less anarchically debated in a myriad of ways that only with synthetic filters may eventually have some usefulness for most people.

Statistical indicators

One way to transcend the detached anarchy of the social sciences is to focus on the growing number of homogenized statistical indicators available in bulging databases. The simplistic material production measures used in communist states have given way to richer ways to account for economic activity based on market activities. Despite its limitations as a measure of human and social capital and happiness, GDP per capita roughly correlates with many broader indicators of desirable living standards. The Human Development Reports provided by the UN Development Programme (<http://HDR.undp.org>) show that European countries tend to top global rankings, while North America, Australia and Japan are just behind and some industrial Asian countries not far behind. More complex composite indexes measuring human development, poverty (summarizing indicators of a long and healthy life, knowledge and a decent standard of living) or inequality (Gini) are not yet in widespread use but also indicate a broad correlation between economic and social progress. A superabundance of market goods and services may not lead to people living much longer and more fulfilling lives, but their scarcity tends to be a sign of political and social despair.

Welfare and value in today's global economy are less driven by access to food, raw materials (despite the recurring troubles in obtaining oil and gas) and industrial goods than by the harnessing of information into useful knowledge. Yet a global multi-level market for knowledge-based services is much more difficult to achieve, as their added value comes less from standardized products and more from processes embedded in human resources, which are by their nature much more bound to their

social contexts. The world has even begun to aim at having a socio-economic balance sheet where all assets and liabilities are better recorded. Spurred by the creative accounts of multinationals like Enron and WorldCom in the United States and Parmalat in Europe, recurring scandals in Japan and the transition towards open market economies in China and elsewhere, governments around the world have begun to request large firms to present ever more comprehensive financial statements. Their balance sheets should reflect all the businesses' tangibles and intangibles, short-term and long-term assets and liabilities, all periodically updated with income statements resulting from recording all earnings and expenses. If those activities cannot be priced because there is not yet a widespread market, agreed proxies should be used to indicate their tentative value. A few sophisticated country accounts are even calculating and recording booming underground activities (legal and illegal), and others are exploring ways to measure in-site production (household production, often subsistence farming), barter in social networks, quality changes, often due to technology changes, or human and ecological assets and liabilities. Meanwhile, the UN Statistical Division (www.unstats.un.org) is helping to complement national accounts with more demographic, social, environmental, energy and development statistical systems. It also contributes, with the assistance of Bretton Woods international organizations and the OECD, to the construction of a Millennium Development Goal Indicators Database, based on a framework of eight developmental goals to eradicate extreme poverty and hunger; achieve universal primary education; promote gender equality and empower women; reduce child mortality; improve maternal health; combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases; ensure environmental sustainability; and develop a global partnership for development. These goals are all refined into 18 targets and 48 indicators. At the broadest level, the UN Global Compact (www.UNGlobalCompact.org) brings together a growing number of UN agencies, firms and international labour and civil society organizations to promote human rights, labour, the environment and anti-corruption through policy dialogues, learning, country and regional networks and projects.

Even the Buddhist kingdom of secluded Bhutan has joined the world race in producing new quantitative indicators; its mystical Gross National Happiness index is of course topped by its realm! Although it lacks much scientific rigour, it is surely sparking the imagination of some smiling human scientists and regulators to design better measures of human psychological states and processes. "Happiness indexes" are a reminder that although people's values and identities are ultimately ineffable, more and more persons now have to manage competitively, like complex financial capital portfolios, a multiplicity of globally interlinked layers of social

and political identities. In such an incipient world community, North America, Europe and East Asia are quite close together, according to the analysis of Golden (2005) based on Ronald Ingleheart's World Values Survey (www.WorldValuesSurvey.org) value map based on two broad variables of modernity (self-realization beyond survival, and rational-secularity).

Focusing on the basic questions

Reassessing and moving beyond existing paradigms is a slow but tectonic process, as academic investments take many years to be recouped. While epistemic communities and networks of other experts are formed to agree on methodologies to operate homogenized datasets in governance (Arndt and Oman, 2006) and other issues, more qualitative transdisciplinary research may be developed by focusing on simpler parameters that most concerned people may easily understand – the sort of questions all journalists need to answer when reporting the news.

The first question is *where*? Many research questions need be explored to increase geographical understanding of the convergence, deepening and external projection of rising macro-regions around the world, and how other levels of governance are adapting. Which other areas of governance, clearly indicated on maps, promote a plurality of dynamic public and private actors? Are multi-level foreign policies consolidated? Besides country-to-country bilateral and multilateral foreign policies, are there solid country-to-region, region-to-country and region-to-region foreign policies? How is the relative influence of each level evolving? Will world regions rise over states in global governance? What will be the role of the United States in the rise of new world regions?

Next, *who*? Besides public executives, which other government representatives engage and advance functional aspects of global multi-level governance? Are networks of legislators and judges becoming crucial in new issues? Which non-government actors are important? Are profit-oriented business groups really always the key or are they sometimes against multi-level flexible regulation? Are the broader civil society and other transnational private actors with non-profit objectives the hidden key to a global multi-level transformation? Are perhaps platforms of political parties consolidating regionally and globally. or are there new networks of religious institutions helping bridge over distinct civilizations by creating synergies among the best values? Will Track-2 advisory actors consolidate, perhaps to the point of forming a new type of democratic mechanism between rulers and the world's peoples? Will universities remain true to the goal of being universal in promoting the necessary knowledge to produce globally happy workers and citizens?

Then comes the question of *what*? Global multi-level governance processes allow discussion and cooperation in all kinds of issues broadly divided in three pillars: political, economic and socio-cultural. How is the mix evolving due to multi-level governance? Is the evolution of functional economic sectors that depend on knowledge, like energy, finance, transport or agriculture, similar to the cases analysed in this book? What are the actors' particular goals and success rates? Are many people really adapting and adopting multiple identities, or are identities at particular levels much more important?

Next is *how*? What are the means and ways to advance the issues that various actors envision within a fluid global multi-level framework? Is discussion alone enough to catalyse change, or are funding for big cooperation projects or even legal institutions necessary to advance the prioritized goals?

And finally *when*? What is the timing for actors to advance their goals? Can one more generally distinguish a macro-regional and multi-level generational path from simple functional cooperation to broader international collaboration and then external collaboration? That path largely reflects Europe's evolution, but East Asia is simultaneously promoting its internal and external multi-level dimensions.

Renewed European and East Asian leadership: Visioning knowledge to empower civil societies

Higher education institutions form the primary arena to discuss and synthesize ideas that help develop better curricula and fulfil the desire of many people to balance their expansive individual creativity with the various governance layers reaching beyond their traditional localities and nation-states. To advance a transdisciplinarity that is useful not only to broaden entrenched academic views but also to clarify the vision of the many more people willing to be engaged in global multi-level governance, the results of previous research must be easily available to the public, private and mixed actors investing in it. The last section of the book will provide some ideas to use new communication and learning technologies to promote multi-level, democratic knowledge that transcends languages.

The European project is now at a crucial juncture to adapt to new, sometimes local but often global, challenges. An internal market for industrial goods is quite consolidated, but an expensive and very protectionist common agricultural policy has long fuelled global trade frictions. Meanwhile, many economic services are still only partially liberalized. European governments manage with difficulty, through a complex web

of agreements and institutions, collaboration in a range of issues hoping to address the social expectations challenged by global economic competition and security concerns. Excessive public deficits pose strains in tuning economic cycles and in the stability and acceptance of the euro. And while nearly 500 million citizens and residents of the 27 EU member states should be able to move without border controls, Eastern Europeans and many other enthusiastic migrants still face various discriminations, more difficult to address in the wake of 9/11 since global issues related to justice and security pose increasing challenges to the consolidation of the freedom of movement of people.

European collaboration has in the past half-century advanced by finding innovative compromises among politicians, academics and business leaders. But the key challenge for élites is now to dispel the scepticism of baffled electorates by showing that an enlarging and upgrading European Union can better address both their local and their global concerns. Lack of information on Europe is not the issue; on the contrary, <http://Europa.eu> is one of the largest and most multilingual government portals in the world. Nor is lack of educational opportunities a problem, as most European countries have compulsory basic education and ample opportunities to advance into a variety of higher education institutions. The problem is to synthesize and deliver useful knowledge from an overload of atomized information. While better websites help, much more needs to be done to reach the broader public that still passively relies on traditional communication means. The European Commission has downsized the large press corps accredited in Brussels with the hope that many journalists will go back to their countries and coordinate better with national and local media. And within the European Commission there are ideas of creating a truly European audio visual media market on the model of the BBC or the Franco-German Arte channel.

A well-designed convergence of info-communications and education sectors that combines timely investments with an open-software culture would further engage civil society into the European project. Visualizing synthetic information in mass-media and education channels should breach the gap between the Atlantic countries that communicate well in English texts (Nordic countries are world leaders in internet use, and their universities often teach technical issues in English) and the Mediterranean ones that prefer oral communication in Latin languages and through visual codes (Southern Europe leads in mobile communications, and has a world-class tradition of visual culture). Then not only may Eastern Europe rapidly converge through a common, open, tolerant, communicative vision, but the external dimension of the European Union would make a real contribution to reach to the rest of the world.

East Asia has many ingredients to advance in the visions of community-

building agreed by political leaders. Mutual interdependence in the new hyperlinked economy seems inevitable, as recent intergovernmental agreements in converging info-communications are promoting collaboration among the trade and investment networks of innovative firms. And regional economic and social benefits will surely multiply with the links made possible by the rapid developments and reforms in national university systems. A growing number of people are broadening their minds in a regional fashion, thus promoting greater movements of people to work and live in other East Asian countries, all while maintaining links with the rest of the world. Yet, despite a growing number of vision and study group reports, political leaders advancing the East Asian community lack a clear roadmap to convince the average person of the feasible paths of development in today's world. As in the case of Europe, the key challenge in East Asia will be to convince the general public that having an additional, but semi-open and innovative, regional layer of governance can ease their local and global concerns.

Converging info-communication technologies provide some elements of the solution as they become localized to reach more people. The growing efforts of regional public websites, still inevitably in English (like www.ASEANsec.org), could be complemented by enhanced national ones, as well as those of think-tanks and academia, in local languages. And besides becoming multilingual (partly facilitated by Chinese ideograms and the simplicity of Bahasa), they could become more visually enticing as they profit from the increasing regional collaboration in films and video games. The East Asian countries aiming at regional cooperation are indeed beset by many challenges, including unresolved political conflicts, environmental degradation, weak governance institutions, great financial risks and terrible social disparities. Yet their dynamic, flexible and forward-looking elements give hope that they will manage to cope with the problems if well engaged with the rest of the developed world. Moreover, East Asia's incremental multi-level development model is competitively being exported to other developing regional processes. For, despite all the troubles, East Asia now lives in hope of greater prosperity and long-lasting peace, while much of the rest of the developing world still lives in fear of not being able to adapt peacefully to economic, political and cultural globalization pressures. As humanity is bound by increasing knowledge to greater interdependence, a rising multi-level East Asia is well placed to help shape it.

The innovations of European and East Asian regional processes to disseminate knowledge and engage more people may further excel by connecting their similar innovation paths through interregional and multilateral platforms. A useful mechanism is the multipillar and flexible ASEM process. In the past decade ASEM political élites have become much

more aware of each other's realities and advanced cooperation in all geographical formats. ASEAN countries usually see ASEM as a way to maintain cohesiveness and a privileged relation with the European Union as well as with North-East Asia, while North-East Asian relations with Europe as a whole have also improved dramatically. At the same time, the ASEM process has successfully promoted the fluid interconnection of a myriad of knowledge-based civil society actors.

ASEM countries and regional organizations could globally excel in global multi-level linkages by creating unique synergies between info-communications and education technologies and services. One could create a public news service that would distribute to existing media, and even broadcast on its own, public information presented through dynamic maps, like TV weather forecasts or Google Maps and Google Earth, with zooming capabilities and other visual tools that facilitate recognizing mutual synergies and the joint contribution of Europe and East Asia to the world. Public access to textual, visual and multimedia information on most supranational issues in the new age of global databases and search engines is no longer a technical problem. Public dissemination of synthetic maps with interconnected graphs and tables has become very affordable through new geographic information software. Synthesizing and delivering such broad knowledge could easily be done by a mix of think-tanks, media and academic experts developing media programmes and academic curricula that promote appreciation and cooperation among cultures and civilizations.

A first step for these knowledge services would be to present clear multi-level maps. Regional government portals in Europe (<http://Europa.eu>) East Asia (www.ASEANsec.org) and ASEM (www.ASEMvs.org, www.ASEMInfoBoard.org, etc.) should add depth by promoting general and functional visual links with relevant partners. As the visual maps become broadly useful dynamic atlases, Europe and East Asia could add interactivity and use them as the base of an online multi-level virtual lifelong university connecting all willing education institutions.

As ASEM partners successfully connect their info-communication and education innovations, other countries will want to link and enhance their own multi-level development paths. ASEM can catalyse dynamic regionalism through the growing set of flexible interregional dialogue and cooperation mechanisms that both Europe and East Asia have with other developing parts of the world. What is particularly promising is that most of Europe's and East Asia's interregional processes seek to promote economic and social development through knowledge acquisition. Thus, Europe-East Asia coordination of their own interregional processes would entice other world regions to innovate and participate successfully in global issues. This proposal for joint action could easily begin with

Latin America. The EU gatherings with the Rio Group and the Latin American and Caribbean countries have for some time emphasized education and technology. Similarly, the Forum for East Asia-Latin America Cooperation highlights education and technology, especially in information communications sectors.

It should then not prove difficult for innovative ASEM extraregionalism to reduce the digital and educational divides of other parts of the world in even greater need. The EU relations with SAARC could coordinate with the rising Asia Cooperation Dialogue and the Asia-Middle East Dialogue, reaching to regional processes in South and West Asia to discuss the diffusion of tensions and possibilities of economic and cultural cooperation. For instance, there may be ways for India to collaborate with its neighbours in its excellent software and technological education services and, more broadly, realize some of SAARC's intentions to develop its science and technology potential and its more concrete plans to have a useful information centre.

Moreover, the EU-Africa and related subregional dialogue and cooperation efforts to promote human resources might link with the Tokyo International Conference on African Development and with a renewed Asia-Africa Bandung process, and thus further help the New Economic Partnership for African Development realize its vision of generally providing basic education and breaching the digital divide. In addition, joint ASEM relations with the reviving Commonwealth of Independent States could better ensure that Russia's excellent technical education systems can benefit the promotion of Eurasian communication infrastructures. The EU efforts to create with Russia a space for science and technology could be taken into account in improving Russia's relations with East Asian neighbours. ASEM partners may even better help address the conflicts in Central and Western Asia in an extraregional fashion, as China seems keen to forge an area of peace and economic cooperation, despite occasional joint military exercises, through the Shanghai Cooperation Organization. Finally, the external projection of Europe and East Asia should take care to revitalize the information and education sectors in the United States.

Practical ASEM extraregional collaboration could happen through innovative functional projects where ASEM partners would invite dynamic representatives of other world regions to selected ASEM activities as a joint learning exercise. In addition, Europe and East Asia could speak about ASEM innovation in their parallel interregional processes. This functional approach could also be used to advance the global aspect of multi-level governance. As ASEM partners successfully connect their innovations, and through converging interregionalism broadly catalyse innovative regionalism around the world, they would also have a unique

chance to reform effectively in a multi-level fashion multilateral organizations and processes dealing with broad-based innovation.

Europe and East Asia may jointly help the UN system in its challenge of reaching to the global public through new types of mass knowledge-enhancing multimedia. A successful visual knowledge platform catalysed through ASEM would surely attract the interest of other world regions and interregional processes, whose online portals could then be interconnected with an increasingly sophisticated UN system portal (www.unsystem.org) to advance a dynamic, multi-level, encyclopaedic atlas. This UN portal started with a simple alphabetic index of multilateral organizations, but is growing fast with an incipient thematic structure and links to UN news and other resources. It may be accessed through the six UN official languages, but it could become more visual and present global and regional maps based on multi-level information categorized through the families of statistics agreed in the United Nations. Moreover, it should aim to catalyse the world media to present in timely, dynamic maps the essence of a growing number of public global datasets and reports produced by multilateral organizations. Some sort of broad-based and forward-looking Economic and Social Council could become the steering hub of such a global, multi-level visual atlas that could well serve the implementation of the Millennium Development Goals.

ASEM partners may similarly address the great limitations of the Bretton Woods organizations to liberalize and promote education services by working with the promising UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. Under the leadership of Japanese ambassador Matsuura and the return of the United States after a two-decade hiatus, UNESCO is reforming to help promote knowledge societies through its remit in education, science, culture and communications. In the new world regionalism, UNESCO could encourage advancing the vision of a global, multi-level, multimedia lifelong university specializing in sound education based on

Table 6.1 Policy recommendations for knowledge-based global multi-level governance

Level	General recommendations	Knowledge recommendations
States	Promote dynamic overlapping regional processes to solve regional needs	Liberalize education in a multi-level fashion; link media to lifelong learning
Regions	Promote new regional nodes through interregionalism	Synthesize, link and visualize knowledge
Global	Decentralize international regimes to effective regional processes	Link state and regional knowledge platforms

science, crafts and arts by connecting governments, universities and the media through innovative combinations of rapidly growing technologies (table 6.1). Perhaps the suggestion of some activists to tax speculative international info-communications to fund international organizations should be refocused to help effective global multi-level governance regimes through competitive pilot projects led by visionary leaders relying on knowledge and wisdom.

© United Nations University, 2007

The views expressed in this publication are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the United Nations University.

United Nations University Press
United Nations University, 53-70, Jingumae 5-chome,
Shibuya-ku, Tokyo 150-8925, Japan
Tel: +81-3-3499-2811 Fax: +81-3-3406-7345
E-mail: sales@hq.unu.edu general enquiries: press@hq.unu.edu
www.unu.edu

United Nations University Office at the United Nations, New York
2 United Nations Plaza, Room DC2-2062, New York, NY 10017, USA
Tel: +1-212-963-6387 Fax: +1-212-371-9454
E-mail: unuona@onu.unu.edu

United Nations University Press is the publishing division of the United Nations University.

Cover design by Rebecca S. Neimark, Twenty-Six Letters

Printed in Hong Kong

ISBN 978-92-808-1139-1

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Prado, César de.
Global multi-level governance : European and East Asian leadership / César de Prado.
p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-9280811391 (pbk.)

1. International organization. 2. European Union countries—Foreign relations.
3. East Asia—Foreign relations. I. Title.

JZ1318.P73 2007

341.2—dc22

2007012137

Global Multi-level Governance: European and East Asian Leadership

César de Prado

This timely and insightful book underscores the growing prospect of sustaining peace and prosperity through dynamic, multi-level governance in which individual states better engage in both global processes and institutions via broad and hyperlinked regional and interregional regimes. De Prado's clear vision rests on his unique theoretical framework highlighting how energetic actors sustain political, advisory, economic and social multi-level governance. He provides four detailed cases that examine governments advancing agendas through formal institutions and flexible processes, track-2 think-tanks and networks linking governments with private actors, economic innovators connecting through info-communication technologies, and human resources learning in upgraded education systems.

"This is an excellent contribution to our understanding of the complex development towards global multi-level governance."

— **Horst Günter Krenzler, Professor at Munich University Law Institute and former Director General for External Relations at the European Commission**

"César de Prado has written an impressive book on the growing engagement between Asia and Europe."

— **Tommy Koh, Founding Executive Director of the Asia-Europe Foundation and Chairman of the Institute of Policy Studies**

"The author's theoretical framework offers a way to map the new world order."

— **Anne-Marie Slaughter, Dean of the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University**

"A carefully researched analysis of East Asian and European regionalism, their driving forces and the interaction between the regions. The study is remarkable both for its theoretical quality and its novel empirical data. A most valuable source for students of regionalism."

— **Karl Kaiser, Visiting Professor at Harvard University and former Director of the German Council on Foreign Relations**

César de Prado is a Researcher at the University of Tokyo and a Visiting Professor at the University of Salamanca.

Ordering information

North America, Latin America, Asia and the Pacific:

UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

2 United Nations Plaza,
Room DC2-853, Dept 174
New York, NY 10017
Tel: 212 963-8302,
800 253-9646 (credit card orders)
Fax: 212 963-3489
E-mail: publications@un.org

Europe, Africa, and the Middle East:

UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

Sales Office and Bookshop, Bureau E4
CH-1211 Geneva 10, Switzerland
Tel: 41-22/917-2614, 41-22/917-2613
Fax: 41-22/917-0027
E-mail: unpubli@unog.ch

ISBN 978-92-808-1139-1
292pp US\$34.00



**United Nations
University Press**

53-70, Jingumae 5-chome, Shibuya-ku, Tokyo 150-8925, Japan
Tel +81-3-3499-2811; Fax +81-3-3406-7345
E-mail: sales@hq.unu.edu; <http://www.unu.edu>