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Global Diplomacy, in the Context of Global Governance

Mădălina Virginia ANTONESCU

Abstract: While attempting to define the term “global governance” in the first part of the paper and providing some general remarks about the main features of this political concept, in the other sections, we will try to briefly analyse the concept of “global society”, the concept of “harmonious global society”, as well as the global actors capable of initiating, developing and constantly following an agenda of global issues, actors perceived and self-defined as actors of global diplomacy. Neither the global society (set up through a range of global regimes in full expansion and improvement, through a range of international institutions, one of them in process of being globalized, i.e. emancipating from the mandate of the states; through principles of global sustainable governance), nor the global society can be developed outside a minimum conceptualisation of “global diplomacy”. In this paper, we will analyse the types of global diplomacy deriving from the main IR concepts and theories, each offering an interesting perspective about our world.
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1. Global Governance – Definition and General Features

According to the doctrine, the concept of “global governance” is associated with the post-Cold War period, with the creation of the Commission for Global Governance (1995) and with the personality of Willy Brandt, referring to the “objective of encouraging the creation of multilateral regulatory systems and of management methods focused on the development of global interdependencies and on sustainable development” (Smouts, Battistella & Vennesson, 2006). Concerning this aspect, the doctrine specifies the two reports issued in the ’90s, the Stockholm Initiative on Global Security and Governance (1991) and Our Global Neighbourhood: Report issued by the Global Authority Commission (1995) (Evans & Newnham, 2001, p.209).

According to the doctrine, this is a rather recent and vague concept, far from being sufficiently explored by the specialty studies, although it is widely used (Evans & Newnham, 2001, p.210). The global authority is distinguished
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from the world authority, warn the experts, as the latter refers to a “unique, supra-state authority, at world level”; in addition, it is distinguished from the interstate relations, as “being more oriented towards the movements of the non-state actors (transnational NGOs, multinational corporations, migration flows, world-level mass media and global capital markets”).

According to the doctrine, a notable aspect when attempting to draw the limits of a definition of the “global governance concept” is the emphasis on the idea of post-sovereignty, of a post-Westphalian world, of an “international system focused a level of consensus and cooperation deeper than the current level” (Evans & Newnham, 2001, p.210). Global governance focuses on a series of pillars, in the current view, according to the doctrine: the principles of democracy, free market, common heritage of the humanity, common goods of the humanity, common home-planet of the humanity, and faith in a common destiny of the humanity.

In 2003, J. Stiglitz considered that we lived in an age of modern globalization, characterized by a “world governance system without a world government, in which only a few global institutions such as OMC, the World Bank, IMF and a few state and non-state actors dominate the international scene” (Puscas, 2005, pp. 188-189).

In Kjaer’s view (2004), global governance represents the “manner in which the states, civil society and international institutions are set to function in order to observe the international regulations and the method of finding optimal solutions for global issues” (Puscas, 2005, pp. 188-189).

For authors such as Baylis and Smith (1999), global governance entails “a multitude of levels of simultaneous authority” (sub-state governance, supra-state governance, which includes for example the multilateral institutions and transnational agencies, as well as the civil society) (Puscas, 2005, pp. 188-189).

According to others (Gorner, Weiss, acc. Colas/2002), the concept entails “the lack of central authority, a multitude of levels and fulfilment of a set of common objectives on the global agenda, by strengthening the cooperation between the state and non-state actors” (Puscas, 2005, pp. 188-189).

Other authors consider that “one cannot discuss the issue of global governance, in the absence of a global managerial elite, which is interested in the implementation of a neo-liberal economic model, at global level, and of a social policy”. For David Held (1995), the term defines the cosmopolitan democratic values, which must be promoted by a global civil society(Sinclair, 2005, pp. 329-330).
The doctrine considers that global governance generally suggests “governance without governments, building the legitimacy without a representative democracy, solving conflicts without hegemony” (Smouts, Battistella & Vennesson, 2006, p. 252). In another perspective, global governance seems to be a natural answer to the question “how do you build collective rules to manage globalization” (Smouts, Battistella & Vennesson, 2006, p. 252).

2. Global society and the concept of “Harmonious Global Society”

The concept of “harmonious global society” is used by the Chinese school of international relations and in the official speeches delivered by Chinese leaders, as one of the great directions assumed by China’s foreign policy. It is a political concept closely related to other concepts and phrases, such as the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence, multi-polar order and others.

In China’s view, the concept of “harmonious global society” refers to a society of the states and peoples living in harmony, based on the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence. The vision proposed for the early 21st century global system is an extremely sophisticated and advanced vision, which has not been fully explored yet, from the perspective of global governance.

For the Chinese doctrinarians, mature authentic global governance is not possible without implementing a model of harmonious global society. It is interesting to note that, in China’s view, there is a strong globalist tendency, in terms of globalism and global governance, a tendency to plead for consolidating the role of the nations, of the states. However, at the same time, China is aware that a new type of global order is in full process of formation, through regimes, regulations, transnational actors, a world of complex interdependencies, which leads eventually to types of globalism that cannot be ignored by any state. Progressively, these forms of globalism create incipient models of global societies, which have not taken proper shape to dominate the entire international system, as “a unique form of globalism”, defined and acknowledged by all the actors (state and non-state). The early 21st century world is therefore a world of multiple interconnected orders, none completely disappearing in favour of a single order. It is a world of co-existence among orders (Westphalian order, non-state actors order, an order of commercial and capital markets, an order of large migratory flows that cross the state borders and can no longer be controlled by the states, an order of the actors involved in solving global issues – i.e. a proto-global order). All these orders create a complex web of interdependencies, rivalries and cooperation,
therefore it is difficult to categorize the current world of the early 21st century as “a world of peaceful coexistence”.

However, the concept proposed by the Chinese doctrinarians is far from utopia; instead, it tries to set a new level of maturity in the 21st century world (post-realism combined with a vision of consolidated westphalism, plus accepting the realities of a dynamic world, in full motion and transformation, therefore the level of global issues has to be managed adequately). Beside the Westphalian-inspired principles (focused on the idea of strengthening the role of the state and consolidating the Westphalian world, which great powers such as China wish to keep from declining and disappearing), the interesting and visionary concept of “harmonious society” takes shape, whence the innovating concept of “harmonious global society” can be promoted.

If in China’s view the “harmonious society” is one of state actors, therefore a reorganization of the Westphalian world depending on the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence (post-realism), we consider that this innovative principles (of post-realism) can also be applied to the emerging global order, an order which must not be abandoned to a model of ultra-realism or chaos, or to crumbling into multiple levels, unconnected among each other, or to super-centralization (up to the point of confusing it with the global authoritarian order).

From the various models highlighted when analysing the 21st century type of global order, we prefer the advanced concept of “harmonious global society”, which entails a cooperation-coordination among the global actors (state and non-state), both at the global level per se of the governance and at the lower levels (state, infra-state). A global order cannot be configured according to the model of the harmonious global society, without implementing the principles of coordination/cooperation, harmony among the actors at the lower levels of the global level of actual governance. A harmonious global order cannot be conceived without all the other levels below the actual global governance level also communicating/cooperating/working together harmoniously.

Therefore, it is a matter of enabling the implementation of an extremely sophisticated, mature model of global governance, which concerns the isolation of factors generating chaos, stress and pressure on the levels of emerging global order, as well as the maximization of the methods and policies, regimes and instruments for cooperation among actors, at all levels.

Secondly, starting from the Chinese view, which uses the paradigm of the harmonious society, we notice that implementing a global model of harmonious society goes beyond the Westphalian world, beyond the world of global governance, exercises exclusively and fully by state actors. More precisely, as soon as we accept the idea of a harmonious global society, it
entails the idea of a society observing the developing order of the early 21st century, i.e. a society marked by the pre-eminence of non-state actors before the classical, state actors, an order of the transnational commercial regimes, of a set of norms and principles universally applicable, of institutions, forums, actors globally involved and with global (sometimes self-assumed) competencies, with opinions in fields of global interest. All this emerging global order is still fluid, insecure, unshaped in a strong, firm model, which is noticed and identified as such, by all the actors (global players or otherwise).

It is therefore, an order still threatened by the risk of chaos, fragmentation or by the scenario of returning to the state model in force (rebirth of the Westphalian world). In this last scenario, we are talking about a harmonious global society, in the sense of an interstate society, based on the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence, a society returning to the values of sovereignty, of non-involvement in internal affairs, independence of the states, which also maintains an area of cooperation, working together, at global level, regarding a strict and clear set of global issues. This is a type of harmonious global society closer to the Chinese vision of the 21st century world, a world in which the states have not abandoned the world in favour of non-state actors, of the global market and the global citizens.

In the second version, we are talking about a triumph of the order of non-state actors, which will result in the triumph of a composite global order, in which the states have lost their supremacy forever and they become simple components of the global system, without the power of ascension, without real decision-making power/without any decision-making power, in relation with other fully ascending actors. Here, we are discussing about a post-Westphalian model of harmonious global society, which is decided, controlled and structured according to the interests and needs of the non-state actors, dominated by a global civil society, by global media concerns, global companies and NGOs that cooperate and work together, based on a Charter of Cooperation and Good Practices among Non-State Actors, which includes the principles of peaceful coexistence among non-state actors, as well as among non-state actors and declining state actors, in order to create the profile of a “harmonious society”, for this global, inconsistent society.

It is rather early for us to acknowledge the triumph of each of the society types (the global one, based on the idea of inter-state harmony, or the post-Westphalian global society, focused on the idea of global interdependencies, in which non-state actors are distinguished as elements of a new order, out of the states’ control and which needs urgent answers, global competencies, in a set of global issues and in global interest. This would mean more responsibility for the non-state actors, both as territorial dimension (global
responsibility, in all the states) and from the viewpoint of competencies (responsibility regarding a widened set of global issues), as well as from the viewpoint of recipients (global issues that envisage the destiny of the mankind, of entire regions on the planet, the fate of the planet Earth). To this end, the non-state actors dominating the global order should automatically lead to an increase in their responsibility before this position, from which the states joined in. A global order from which the states were removed (including the great powers, irremediably taken over by the corporations and transnational private businesses, which they can no longer control) and which would lack any responsibility to the human beings, to the peoples, to the states even (the total absence of states creating conditions for global chaos) would not be viable and it would not lead to a “harmonious global society”.

The idea of harmony of non-state actors, in the management of global order would require entire sets of strict norms and regulations, acknowledged and assumed by them, in order to render such an order functional. At the respective moment, the global responsibility of the non-state actors (particularly, transnational corporations) is insufficiently developed, they do not have a mature conscience (i.e. economically self-focused on the idea of durable development, therefore on business development in this direction); they are insufficiently controlled by the states, in order to develop their businesses in the sense of durable development and more responsibility towards the ecosystems, the people, the states, the planet Earth. An order created and dominated irresponsible or insufficiently responsible non-state actors, lacking interest in developing a Durable Development Agenda for Non-State Actors, could not be a viable order and it would lead to chaos or crumbling (at best, recreating the conditions for the re-launching of the Westphalian world).

Though focused on a Westphalian vision of the 21st century global order, the Chinese vision does not exclude the dynamic realities of the beginning of this century, considering that global economy becomes more and more interdependent and that, for this reason, it is necessary to improve the economic level of underdeveloped or third world countries, in order to prevent the creation and multiplication of points of conflict and instability in the world. The Chinese vision of the harmonious global order regards the common interest of all the countries (as identified by the Chinese doctrine) in achieving peace and prosperity, as well as common development. To this end, commercial trades should be based on the principle of mutual advantage, mutually advantageous cooperation, while the provision of assistance should not be conditioned politically (Kornberg & Faust, 2005, pp. 18-19).
According to the Third out of the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence (political phrase, closely related to that of “harmonious society”, at the same time, in China’s political doctrine), “all the nations of the world must respect and treat each other equally, share a mutually advantageous cooperation, co-exist in harmony and search for a common area of interest, in the process of solving their differences” (Kornberg & Faust, 2005, pp. 211).

Thus, here is another clue on China’s view on global order and global governance in the 21st century, it is not completely detached from the Westphalian interpretations; on the contrary, it pleads for being grounded in the realities of the inter-state world, with global governance being a consequence of globally implementing the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence, whence a Harmonious Global Society can be born. For China, this society can only be an inter-state one, even though it admits the existence of a discussion level on global issues, the idea of global common goods, of economic-commercial interdependency regimes, at global level. As a consequence, global governance as seen by China can only stem from the Westphalian principles of sovereign equality in rights of all the states, therefore a manifestation of the intention to dialogite, cooperate, negotiate multilaterally, on equal grounds, among all the nations of the world. Global governance cannot be reserved solely to a type of actors or elite, according to China, since it focuses its entire political doctrine on the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence.

At this point, we must also note the Fifth Principle of Peaceful Coexistence, i.e. the principle stating that “each country, be it small or large, strong or weak, must have the equal right to participate in consultations regarding the administration of world affairs” (Kornberg & Faust, 2005, pp. 211). This principle clearly shows that, according to China’s view on global governance, the global issues and world affairs must only be the result of cooperation and participation of all the states, from an equal standpoint. No other form of discussion (be it elitist, in a bilateral, religious, reduced format, among the great powers) is not seen by China as having the legitimacy to achieve global governance.

In the USA’s view, the phrase “world order” is used by Henry Kissinger, together with the natural questions on the future role of the US in the changing order of the 21st century. In one of his papers, Kissinger acknowledges that the world order “cannot be the result of the policy of a single country acting in isolation”, instead it must be an order in which “its components, whilst maintaining their own values, assume a second global, structural and legal culture; this concept of order goes beyond the perspective and ideals of a single region or a single nation, irrespective of the nation in question” (Kissinger, 2014, p. 300). Kissinger opts for a modernized
version of the Westphalian system, adjusted to the current realities, which he considers to be the global order adequate for the early 21st century.

According to this author, there is a contradiction in the development of today’s world: “the international economic system has become global, while the political structure of the world remains state-like” (Kissinger, 2014, p. 297), with “a gap between a global economy, which no longer takes into consideration the borders, and a policy still in an inter-state stage, based solely on the concept of state borders and state control”. The real challenge (regarding global governance) no longer regards the economic aspect (we are already discussing global, economic, financial, commercial regimes, which escape the control exercised by the state), but the international policy. According to the challenge launched by Kissinger (2014, p. 297), global governance now regards the international political act in itself. In order to achieve a synchronization between the global economy and the interstate policy, i.e. between the two worlds, in order to discuss a real manner of global governance, it is necessary to bring international politics to a distinct, superior stage of globalization (from the inter-state policy, to the global policy). Kissinger does not exclude this perspective, however, towards the last part of the paper, where he returns to assuming a moderate position; instead of recommending a step towards the stage of global policy (seen as super-state, exercised by global institutions, specialized in administrating fields of global interest, from the management of global issues, to global goods, to the common heritage of humankind, which requires the creation of special global protection regimes and special global competencies, for these new institutions), Kissinger recommends a neo-Westphalian international order, from which he does not exclude the states and maintaining their own cultures (Kissinger, 2014, p. 300).

The coexistence of two types of cultures (the one of early 21st century neo-Westphalian system components, as recommended by Kissinger, and the one of global cultural, distinct from any region and from any nation of the planet) is the true challenge for the actors in the early 21st century world.

The visions of great powers of what a true global order signifies and of the phrase “global order” are distinct; however, they do not exclude (for the time being, at the current level of evolution recorded by the international system) a global order as a neo-Westphalian order. The safe options, detached from westphalism in favour of global governance (through strong global institutions, with special competencies, superior to the states) remain isolated, with global governance currently seen mainly as a possibility for the great powers to participate in various formats in the management of global affairs, respectively as a moderate involvement of the global institutions (in
their current *non-reformed* version) in the management of global issues and of the dynamic world of the international economy.

3. **Global Diplomacy: Definition, Characteristics**

   In the context described above, trying to define the concept of “global diplomacy” becomes an extremely complicated matter, considering the fact that the very perceptions of global (state) actors regarding global governance and the global order are rather different.

   If we analyse the issue based on the heterogeneous nature of the global world (economic, as well as political), at the beginning of the 21st century, we can distinguish several meanings of the phrase “global diplomacy”:

   - Global diplomacy achieved by *global actors* (in the strict sense of states with the status of great powers or superpowers);
   - Global diplomacy achieved by *all the states*, by all the nations, great and small, rich or weak, through the effect of implementing the Principles of Peaceful Coexistence at global level and through the effect of all the states participating in the management of global affairs;
   - Global diplomacy achieved *only in the field of international economy, transnational affairs, international commerce and finances* (since a true global order applies only to this field, according to certain views, not to the field of international politics). Thus, *only non-state global actors, players in the transnational economic, financial, commercial field*, really are the ones achieving a type of post-state diplomacy (diplomacy of the great transnational affairs or global diplomacy);
   - *Combined global diplomacy*, regarding the issues of global interest or impact (achieved by *both state actors and non-state actors*, based on a set of different regulations, in different codes – legal or simply of good behaviour, freely assumed), *given the coexistence of two worlds with different rules and evolutions* (the world of the states and the world of the non-state actors);
   - Global diplomacy, achieved by the non-reformed institutions with global competencies (such as the UN, IMF, World Bank). It is a type of diplomacy superior to the states, exercised by state employees with special tasks, given either by the practice, or by the evolving regulations, applicable to such institutions and which regard not only the financial-banking or commercial field, but also the field of.
international politics (monitoring the elections in the states, through special delegates of such institutions, humanitarian interventions made by these institutions etc.);

- *Global diplomacy achieved by global institutions with new, special competencies* (either through radical reformation, in the sense of globalizing the already existing international institutions, such as the UN, IMF, WB and others, or through the creation of new institutions, with strengthened competencies, as compared to the existing ones: diplomacy executed in the 21st century, through institutions such as: the Global Peace Mediator, the Great Regional Diplomacy Houses, the Great House of Global Diplomacy, High Representatives on issues related to the protection of human rights. High Representatives on issues related to the protection of nature’s rights, sent by each state, delegated to note and penalize abuses against Nature.

- *Global diplomacy with a component of global Justice*, exercised through new and authentic global institutions, such as: the Global Tribunal for Litigations on Global Issues, with different Specialized Sections (Transnational Massive Migrations, Global Warming and Climate Issues, International Terrorism, Protection of the Humankind Cultural Goods, Global Ecosystem Protection, State threats and Unconventional war threats against the planet, Calamities and Disasters with Transnational Impact, Food Security, Protection of Human Rights at Global Level, Litigations among Global States and Citizens – accessible after all national and regional paths were eliminated from the equation, in certain fields -).

4. Global Actors, Actors of the 21st Century Global Diplomacy:
Great Regional Diplomacy Houses, the Great House of Global Diplomacy

If we see the development of 21st century global diplomacy as *a major break from the current level of diplomacy* (mainly achieved by the states), from the perspective of global governance we can hope to see *the progressive creation of new global actors, specialized in creating a type of “global diplomacy” significantly different from what this phrase currently entails, under the influence of the Westphalian world.*

Taking into account the fact that the increasing tendency of various regions of the globe to create *forms of regional integration of all types* (from
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military or commercial regional projects, to agreements and projects of economic, financial, political integration), we consider that the 21st century diplomacy will also undergo a structural transformation, according to these realities, in the context of evolving beyond the Westphalian stage of the international politics and moving on to real global politics (by consolidating the regimes and regional institutions, with supra-state regional competencies). As a consequence, given a universal evolution towards projects and forms of regional transoceanic, transcontinental integration, which intersect in various manners (for example, through participation of the same states in several forms and projects of integration), the 21st century can also witness the occurrence of regional actors capable of creating a new type of regional diplomacy (supra-state diplomacy).

The above-mentioned actors will be regional institutions, organized according to geopolitical and geostrategic perceptions, based on which their components (the states) will be interested in becoming involved in the global power plays of the 21st century:
- Great House of Eurasian Diplomacy (plus Iran)
- Great House of Pacific Diplomacy
- Great House of African Diplomacy
- Great House of Diplomacy in the Two Oceans (based on the strategic capitalization of the current concept proposed by India, that of “the Two Oceans”, the “Indo-Pacific Region”)
- Great House of European Diplomacy
- Great House of Euro-Atlantic Diplomacy
- Great House of Asia-Pacific Region Diplomacy
- Great House of South-East Asia Diplomacy
- Great House of the Near East Diplomacy
- Great House of Balkan Diplomacy (in an innovative geostrategic concept, focused on re-launching the positive image of the Balkans, as one of the civilization centres of the future world).

Each of the Great Houses of Diplomacy will develop its own regional style of understanding and achieving diplomacy; the Houses will address original contributions, proposals, projects, concepts and strategies, designed to promote the image of their region at global level and in the dialogue with other Great Houses.

Each of these Great Houses will join the dialogue on the management of global issues, adding its regional perspective to the global governance level, either in a system of regular global assembly, for Regional Houses, or
directly presenting the projects and their regional solutions before the Great House of Global Diplomacy.

In our view, the global level of governance, in an authentic version of global order (as a supra-state order, where all decisions on issues of global interest are concentrated), with authentic global institutions (uncontrolled by the states, with special competencies in the management of global issues), also entails the creation of a Great House of Global Diplomacy, with the role to coordinate and centralize proposals, strategies, in order to handle global issues received from Regional Houses, as well as of contributing to the shaping of certain actual global projects, based on analysing the projects presented by the Regional Houses, but also from the contribution of the in-house experts.

5. Types of Global Diplomacy

During the XXIst century, new types of diplomacy can appear at the global level, representing the area of competence for only global actors (state and non-state actors, as well). We are referring to a distinct kind of diplomacy that the classical Westphalian one (multilateral and inter-state diplomacy). The diplomacy we have in mind has a global character, it supposes to be formulated and played by global actors, inclusively by global new institutions (differing from the present ones, as already obsolete- as the Organization of United Nations, World Bank, IMF etc.).

Played at the global level, having on the agenda only issues with global/transnational powerful and large impact, involving global mechanisms, global special funds, global agencies of implementing the global decisions taken as a result of global actors interventions and negotiations, this kind of global diplomacy can be:
- A Realist Global diplomacy (managed only by state actors, but exclusively at the global level of governance)
- A Pure Global Diplomacy (based on dialogue among civilizations and even more, on complex interdependencies paradigm)
- A Global Environmental Diplomacy
- A Diplomacy of the Global Empire (understood in different ways, as super-state or as global informal network of state and non-state actors, under the same rules and principles)
- A Global Diplomacy of Human Rights (involving humanitarian intervention and universal protection of the human rights, countering terrorism and under-development)
- A Global Diplomacy of Non-State Actors (pontifical global diplomacy, corporatist global diplomacy, diplomacy of global institutions etc.)
- A Global Diplomacy of Nature/Planet Earth (receiving legal quality of subject of global law and having its own representatives at the level of global governance).

6. Conclusions

Global diplomacy is still consolidating, at the beginning of XXIst century; we are witnessing an universal trend of multiplying global special normative regimes, regional economic integrations and institutions, an intensified need for new regulations at the level of international law, and for new international institutions with universal role, like a reformed UN.

New types of diplomacy will appear, during XXIst century, in our opinion, once surpassed the present stage of Westphalian world of states as originary, principal and sovereign subjects of contemporary international law.

Another actors than states will be, in future, involved in global activity of regulating global issues and challenges of XXIst century postmodern world. Diplomacy of non-state actors, even diplomacy realized by High Representatives of Planet Earth (as new subject of global law, in relations with states and international/regional/global institutions), pontifical global diplomacy and other innovative forms of diplomacy will add to the classical forms of diplomacy and, at a specific moment in time, they will even challenge traditional diplomacy and they will replace it.

New regional styles of realising diplomacy, organized in new forms (surpassing obsolete forms of ministries of foreign affairs) will represent innovative instruments, capable to protect states and nations in a global world dominated by regional and transnational actors, and under the permanent danger of state dissolution.
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