

Global Governance: Differences on World Order and Reconciliations between China and the West

By Professor Gao Qiqi

Central Compilation and Translation Bureau and East China University

Abstract: currently, the mainstream Western views on world order mainly include hegemony order theory, balance of power theory, world system theory, the clash of civilizations theory, and democratic peace theory. These five theories are based on conflicting order of the evil human nature assumption. After the end of the cold war, the trends of power multi-polarization, economic globalization, political democratization, social networking, and global-wide risks have increasingly become challenges to the concept of conflicting order. In this context, the significance of a harmonious order based on China traditional views has emerged. The concept of a harmonious order based on kind human nature assumption tries to discover and promote the human moral elements. In the view of harmonious order, the world order is a harmonious state of coexisting multi-actors, the relationship between main actors is friendly relationship, and the interaction between actors is mainly in the form of mutual aid and courtesy. The western frontier theoretical progress, for example, constructivism, feminism, global governance, and international ethics studies basically fit into the harmonious order logic. Simultaneously, the advantage of the harmonious order concept is reflected in its logical similarity to and its strong applicability of an "integrated order", etc. Global governance is a kind of reconciliation idea, which is based on the harmonious order concept, and its basic logic is "weak conflict logic plus strong harmony logic", the basic framework is to establish a world-wide authoritative coordination, with country-to-country relations structure emphasizing friendship from interests, seeking common ground while reserving differences, and being multi-actors deliberative democracy in the form of interaction.

I. Western mainstream views of world order and their logic of conflict

In the western academic circles, the comprehensions and concepts of world order are very complex. I will try to condense the most influential world order concepts in the western diplomatic circle and the intellectual world into the following five summaries.

First, the hegemony order theory, i.e., a world order is the hegemony-dominated order. The main contents of the theory include the theory of hegemony stability and of power transfer.¹ The theory of hegemony stability holds that a dominant military and economic power is necessary and essential to maintain a world order. The most important examples are the United Kingdom in the late 19th century to the early 20th century, and the United States

since 1945.² The theory of power transfer argues that the transfer of power between hegemony will lead to war.³ The hegemonic stability theory emphasizes the hegemony stabilizing effect on the world order, while the transfer of power theory argues from another perspective that as the power of a dominant state is challenged by a potentially rising nation, which is likely to lead to the outbreak of war. Therefore, the author combines these two theories together into the hegemony order theory. The theory of hegemony order takes a hegemony with super military and economic strength as the cornerstone of the world order, and stresses that the function of a hegemony is to charge other countries a "guardian fee" to maintain its powerful army while providing security assurance and economic order to other

countries. After the cold war, an advocate of this theory is William Wohlforth, who points out that, after the cold war, the U.S. absolute strength interrupts the formation of a pattern of balance of power. Any country is unable to get triumph over the United States of America in war or in wide-ranging confrontation, while weak and medium-sized countries can only follow it.⁴

Second, balance of power order theory, i.e., the key of a world order is to maintain balance.⁵ The early formation of this theory is the theory of power equilibrium, i.e. when a relative balance of military and economic power is maintained, a stable world order is relatively easy to maintain. New developments of the balance of power theory include "balance of threat theory" by Stephen Walter and "balance of interest theory"⁶ by Randall Schweller. The theory of balance of power still has important influence after the cold war, for example, Kenneth N. Waltz points out that after the end of the cold war, the U.S.-led unipolar hegemony will not last long, for the advantage of a single pole will be subject to the balance by the rest of the countries in the near future.⁷

Third, the world system theory, i.e., a world order is a world system mainly composed of economic relations. The principal promoter of the theory Emanuel Wallerstein mainly argues that the world system is mainly an economic system, the modern world system is not a political entity, but an economic entity. That the world system is a world economic system is because the basic links among various parts of the system is economy.⁸ The theory believes that the world system has a center and edges, and the edges are attached to the center. The essence of the world economic system is a dependent and exploitative relationship, while there is also a periodic rotating change between the center and the edges.

Fourth, the clash of civilizations theory,

i.e., the world pattern after the cold war will show clashes among civilizations. Samuel P. Huntington points out that the post-cold war world architecture is mainly composed of the Chinese civilization, Japanese civilization, Indian civilization, Islamic civilization, Western civilization, Latin-American civilization, African civilization, etc. In the post-cold war world, the root cause of conflict is no longer ideologies, but the cultural differences, i.e. "the clash of civilizations". War and acute conflicts will emerge obviously in the rifts of the civilizations.⁹ In a book entitled *Who Are We* published in 2004, Huntington once again expresses his view of the clash of civilizations. Huntington believes that Christian conservative impact on the U.S. society and politics show a continuous rise and religion (Islam in particular) also shows a revival momentum across the world, which undoubtedly will produce further tension between the two.¹⁰

Fifth, the democratic peace theory, i.e., there will be no war between the democratic countries. The theory representative Michael Doyle concludes after studies of the major world wars for the last 300 years that although the free states involved in numerous wars with non-free states, yet, there is no war launched between free states with constitutional stability.¹¹ As for the formation mechanism of this democratic peace, some research results show that factors such as the complex political process of the democratic politics, horizontal checks and balances mechanism, and government accountability by citizens mechanism will play a restrictive role in the process, in which political leaders can launch a war.¹² Some other research results point out that democratic countries will form a political culture of negotiation, compromise and contract, which is functionally restrictive to emergence of war.¹³

These five mainstream Western theories of

world order have a strong inclination to conflict. The hegemonic stability theory emphasizes the hegemony assurance, and the hegemony maintenance will inevitably launch punishable wars to a challenger. The power transfer theory also emphasizes the inevitable hegemony war between a challenger and a hegemony in the process of the transfer of power. A key of a challenger winning a new world order is whether it is able to win a war for hegemony. The order theory logic of balance of power is to balance the strong by uniting the weak. Although its logical conflict-inclination is less than that of a hegemony order theory, however, it is also developed on the logic of checks and balances, and does not give up the war role in order to achieve the balance of power. The world from the perspective of the world system theory is still filled with exploitative elements, and this theory is not opposed to resort to a conflict action (such as actions of oil war, the nationalization of the Suez Canal) by dependent countries in revolting against the dominant-country exploitation. The conflict-inclination of the clash of civilizations is more obvious. Huntington describes a paradigm for a war between civilizations in the post-cold war. The democratic peace theory originally puts forward a peaceful world order, but this theory holds that all other countries should implement the free and democratic system of the West. An extension and inference of this theory often advocate the use of force to intervene or support anti-government forces to promote democracy in these countries with support of main western countries. This view has been reflected in the Iraq War, Afghan War and the "Spring of Arab" and other practices. Just as Waltz points out that the reason that Democracy wages wars is because they often believe that the best way to safeguard peace is to defeat those non-democratic countries, or to turn them into democratic states.¹⁴ And therefore, under this selective intervention in

the name of democracy, the democratic peace theory also evolves into a conflict theory.

The origin of the above-mentioned five world orders views can be traced back to the western modern political philosophy. The earliest comprehensive exposition of a conflict order is the British thinker Thomas Hobbes, who argues that the human nature is fighting, and the root causes are mainly the following: competition, suspicion and honor. On the basis of evil human nature hypothesis, he believes that the natural state of man is the state of war, and further points out that in the absence of a deterrent, human is in the so-called state of war. This war is personal war.¹⁵ Because people suffer in this protracted war fighting, so they would compromise some rights to form countries through mutual contracting. In this regard, Hobbes explains that if I recognize this person or this collective, and give up my own rights for management, and grant them to this person or this collective, but on condition that you do the same, and recognize all my actions in the same way. Only after this done, can a group of people unified in a person's personality be called state.¹⁶

Hobbes's thinking chain of expounding a nation state is: evil human nature – natural state of war – making mutual contracts – forming Leviathan-type state. In the entire chain of logic, conflict and mistrust are the main features. Because human nature is evil, (human will pursue interests, security and honor without limit), so the human society will be filled with mistrust. Mistrust results in indirect conflicts among human beings (natural state). Conflicts of human society crop up everywhere, so human beings have to resort to a powerful state to eliminate and resolve these conflicts. But meanwhile, people also do not have trust in nation state, so as to bind it with political forms of contracts. Hobbes's political philosophy is based on Christian theology.¹⁷ The source of evil human nature hypothesis is

the original sin in Christian theology.¹⁸ The contract logic also comes from the contract between God and human in Christian thought. This kind of conflict order view in domestic politics is reflected by the following three main aspects: Firstly, power constraint model is a power checks and balances, i.e., separation and mutual restraint of administrative power, legislative power and judicial power. This checks and balances is also the performance of mistrust, fearing any of three branches becoming too powerful. This argument is mainly completed by the French thinker C. L. Montesquieu.¹⁹ Secondly, a mode of political participation is the representation and election, i.e. citizens to participate in political affairs, but can not be directly involved, so they need representatives for their political participation. However, citizens fundamentally distrust their representatives, so they will restrict their representatives with voting and election. The election and tenure mechanisms are reflection of distrust. The main arguments of representation and election are done by the British thinker John Stuart Mill.²⁰ Thirdly, the relationship between state and society is the society versus the state, i.e. the state often leads to the concentration and abuse of power, so the society needs to restrict the state through confrontations and checks and balances. This argument is mainly worked out by the British thinker John Locke.²¹

This conflict order view is synthesized and brought to acme by German political scientist Carl Schmitt in the West, who argues that the essence of politics is to distinguish an enemy from a friend,²¹ and the main function of a state is to wage war and arrange people's livelihood.²³ Schmitt also understands the global politics in the sense of conflict and argues that human itself is unable to launch war because there is no enemy, at least on this planet.²⁴ Based on this judgment, Schmitt points out that the world is not a political entity,

but a political diversity.²⁵ His logic is internal political realignment should be based on external conflicts, so politics is the struggle between ourselves and an enemy. Schmitt's philosophy on conflict has a very important impact on the Morgenthau's traditional realism theory.²⁶ The traditional realism views power struggle as the main content of international politics.²⁷ This conflict logic based on the evil human nature has become a mainstream value of American international relations theories. The structural realism has a strong conflict theory color, and takes anarchism as the starting point of analyzing international relations theories.²⁸ The offensive realism shows a stronger character of conflict.²⁹ The conflict feature of defensive realism and the neo-classical realism is relatively weak, but these two schools still use the conflict logic. The defensive realism stresses that under the new economic and social conditions, due to the increasing cost of conflict, so the conflict intensity and form have changed.³⁰ The neo-classical realism holds that the relative power of countries has important influence on an emerging conflict.³¹ The conflict feature of a liberal system is based on the conflict of interests,³² which is distinguished from power conflict by realism. However, all these theories are based on the view of conflict order.

This conflict logic is reflected in the following 4 aspects. Firstly, the basic state of the world order is anarchism. Secondly the main subjective actors of a world order are nation states.³³ Because nation states are principal monopolies of violence, so nation states naturally become the main actors in this anarchy order of conflict.³⁴ Thirdly, the relationship between subjects is either ally or enemy. The hostile relationship reflects an acute conflict between subjects while ally relationship is relatively relaxed on conflicts. In allies relations, conflicts and restrictions still exist. Allies are cooperative partners tied up by

power and interests. The core element highlighted between main subjects is distrust. This distrust in international relations theories is reflected by a misleading cognition theory and a theory of security dilemma.³⁵ It is on this distrust that the design of the international system is also based, and the initial logic of which is not to cooperate, but to bind each other.³⁶ Fourthly, the form of interaction among main subjects is to contend for power, interests, or honor. A hard form of contention is a military conflict while a flexible form is sanctions or trade war.

The Western conflict order views also iron out some ideas to encourage cooperation after the two world wars almost having pushed global civilizations to the brink of destruction, but such cooperation is often featured by balance of terror in the wake of conflict having reached acme, such as the nuclear cooperation based on mutual destruction in the early phase of the cold war.

The Western order views are shaped on the basis of criticizing the Christian theology by political philosophers. To counter the power of theology, political scientists emancipate individuals based on new Protestants reform. While this newly liberated individualism (or liberalism in political philosophy) still adopts the Christian theology of the evil human nature hypothesis, and inherits the Christian monism and the mission spirit. The monist logic is that it is Christianity (or freedom and democracy in secular world) that is correct, and the others are wrong and even evil. The spirit of the mission calls for perishing all paganism and their followers, which is only the right way. Its contemporary performance by mission spirit is the U.S.-launched Kosovo war, Iraq war and Afghanistan war.³⁷ The way the United States of America handles world affairs is to carry out mission through the mission spirit, and to spread its ideas of monism with the logic of conflict, and retreat into isolationism after the failure.

This Western conflict order view fits into the era background of "collision order" and "segmented order". In the background of world order with fierce conflicts, it is only to adopt such a strong conflict logic that the national interests can be better protected. However, entering the period of "realigning order", the concept of conflicting order has gradually met with more and more challenges.

II. Challenge by the global new trend to conflict order theory

After the end of the cold war, human civilizations enter a new era of accelerated realignment and integration. During this period, the emerged new trend mainly includes the following five aspects.

First, power multi-polarization. Although in the early phase after the cold war, the world order appeared unipolar trend, however, since the Afghan war, Iraq war and American subprime mortgage crisis, this unipolar momentum has clearly turned into multi-polar momentum as follows. Firstly, the disintegration of the Soviet Union superficially shaped the U.S. unipolar moment, but U.S. cost of maintaining this international order greatly increased. Because in the bipolar structure, some countries due to the USSR factor had to follow the United States, but in the post-cold war pattern these countries dependence on the United States decreased, and some Latin American countries even saw significant anti-American waves. Secondly, although the U.S. unilateralism policy is proved powerfully capable, has also increased the U.S. burdens, and triggered a series of U.S. strategic mistakes. Thirdly, the high cost of the wars makes it difficult for the United States to use military power willfully. A small country can tie up a superpower in a lasting-war, the Iraq war and Afghan war are good proofs. Fourthly, the subprime mortgage crisis plunged the U.S. economy into a continuous state of depression.

Fifthly, the collective rise of emerging markets makes the forces of the world order further diversify. In overall view, several heavy conflicts after the cold war were related to the unipolar U.S.-dominated conflicts, while the development of multi-polarization helps to reduce the possibility of U.S. military action.

Second, Economic globalization. One of the most important features is development of multi-national corporations and global corporations. Multi-national corporations has growing ratio to the total national GDP in the world, and link their production with national benefits and interests. Global corporations are a new phase of globalization of multi-national corporations. Compared with the general multi-national corporations, globalization of global corporations is much upgraded, and their transnational index (overseas assets, sales and employees versus total assets, sales and employees) is often more than 50%.³⁸ Global corporation's national background is in dilution. These corporations are always registered in the Cayman Islands and other offshore centers, and listed in the stock exchange of the world's major financial centers so as to attract financial support, while their business activities are conducted throughout the world. Multi-national corporations and global corporations tend to oppose an acute conflict. An acute conflict can result in limiting or disrupting their trade activities, which is extremely detrimental to their interests.

Third, political democratization. In the national politics of the world, the means of powerful control is becoming more and more ineffective. In the Western world, political thinkers, based on reflection of electoral democracy, further promote development of new republicanism and deliberative democracy theories.³⁹

In the Western world, the breadth and quality of democracy are improving. Military regimes are gradually replaced by the civil

governments, and some traditional bureaucratic authoritarianism also promotes internal democratic transition. In addition, the democratic demand is still extending to regional and international mechanisms. For example, the EU democratic deficit has become a core issue in the process of European integration.⁴⁰ Scholars such as Joseph S. Nye and Robert O. Keohane begin deepening discussions on the issue of democracy for International mechanisms.⁴¹ While the idea of democracy does not deny conflict, which is relatively mild and soft. At the same time, both the new republicanism and the concept of deliberative democracy lay more emphasis on consensus and compromise, which is inconsistent with the conflict logic.

Fourth, social networking. The global society is gradually networked, which is mainly reflected in the following three points: Firstly, the formation of global urban network. Large-scale cities are replacing some state functions, at the same time these countries are connected, and formed the global urban network beyond nation states.⁴² Secondly, global social network. In the background of significant progress of information technology and the transport capacity, the global networked society is gradually taking shape.⁴³ In this global cyber network, the cost of human interaction is reduced, and communication frequency increases, which makes it easy for people to have interaction and communication. Thirdly, social networking has resulted in complex effects of results. Robert Jervis some time ago described complexity of action behavior effect (i.e., effect of many important actions behavior lagging behind, indirect, non-intentional and unexpected),⁴⁴ and the characteristics of a networked society amplifies this complexity. The social cyber networking makes the conflict between people relatively low, because communications between large cities are mainly economic and cultural

exchanges, so the global city cyber network ease emergence of conflicts between countries; the global social cyber networks make communications between people easier and easier, and can maximize the elimination of people's misperception, so this complex effect produces worries for those involved in a conflict to choose violence, since the violence ultimate effect may bite itself.

Fifth, world-wide risks. According to summaries by thinkers such as Ulrich Beck, human society is entering a world risky society, mainly reflected in following four aspects: One, risks of human society are highlighted more and more globe-wide and world-wide, i.e., these risks are no longer subject to geographical constraints and limitations in a certain scale and geography.⁴⁵ Two, the most threatening risks to human society are often caused by the human society itself, such as climate change, nuclear disaster, economic crisis and terrorism, etc.⁴⁶ Three, these globe-wide risks are incomputable and irreversible to certain extent.⁴⁷ Four, in the governance process of world risks, nation states are used to adoption of an organized irresponsible strategy.⁴⁸ The emerging world-wide risks make conflicting order view more and more ineffective. But, if human society continuously insists on the conflicting order view, the world-wide risks will ultimately find no solution.

These important changes are challenges to the formation of the West-led conflicting order views. As the world witnesses important changes, if we still hold fast to the previous concept of conflicting order, then the world order and its governance will run into difficulties. Currently, there are four main problems for the world governance: One is the environmental and ecological crisis. This kind of problem needs all states to work together for a solution. The conflicting logic only encourages individual interests-expansion, and

solution of this public problem needs a cooperation logic. Two is the problem of economic and social development. People of some developing countries still live under poverty line, and the development problem cannot be resolved through conflict logic. Three is the communication problem between civilizations. This covers several aspects of religion, ethnic groups, and culture, etc.. Problems pointed out by Huntington's "clash of civilizations" are thought-provoking, but he discusses the issue from the conflict logic perspective. Four is differences between systems. These differences between political systems was an important cause of the cold war, and is still one of the most important issues in the post-cold war. In overall view, the fundamental solution to these existing problems depends on changing basic views on order. .

III. The basic logic of China's world order concept

Through research on the etymology of the origin of order concept in Chinese expressions, I have discovered that the traditional Chinese order concept showed more emphasis on stability and harmony, which is different from the Western conflicting order view. The bureaucratic system helped ensure a structural stability. Meanwhile in the process to attain stability and harmony, morality and education also need to play an important role. The author here summarizes the Chinese traditional order concepts as a harmonious order concept. The starting point of the concept of harmonious order is the theory of kind nature theory, i.e. the kind human nature theory.⁴⁹ It is Mencius who made the earliest exposition on human nature, arguing that the kind human nature is just like water going downward.⁵⁰

Mencius pointed out that everyone has a heart of mercy,⁵¹ which is the source for man to become kind. Different with Mencius, the doctrine of Xunzi is often described as the "evil

human nature" scholar,⁵² But Xunzi also repeated his stress on "kind human nature". Xunzi and Mencius came to similar conclusions, believing that everyone can become Yao and Shun (Saints in the Chinese legendary) through education.⁵³ After the Qin dynasty, many thinkers further expounded "human nature getting kind."⁵⁴ Dong Zhongshu argued that only brainwashing ordinary people by teaching them, can their human nature become kind through education, which means kind human nature in the true sense of the word. Han Yu defined the composition of human nature in 5 aspects: benevolence, righteousness, propriety, wisdom and trust,⁵⁵ which describe a possibility to become kind. Zhu Xi on the basis of the Zhang Zai doctrine and Cheng Hao & Cheng Yi doctrine differentiates born nature from tempered nature.⁵⁶ Zhu Xi argues that human nature from birth is kind, but the differences between kind and evil is a result of different morality. A goal of moral rearmament is to recover the birth nature through education.

On the basis of kind human nature assumptions, persons are no longer rational ones to pursue profit and avoid evil, but become self-disciplined ones with morality. Persons with morality in the Chinese thinking traditions should have four personality characters: Firstly, try to consider for others first, put others before oneself.⁵⁷ Secondly, transform kind nature into good behavior, trying to aid someone in doing a good deed but rejecting a help for doing evil.⁵⁸ Thirdly, through continuous learning to improve morality level. Fourthly, giving consideration to interests but making no try for them, "granting sympathy without fight".⁵⁹ So a natural state based on kind human nature and moral persons is a harmonious and perfect atmosphere condition. In this situation, people would have mutual respect and amity and use negotiations to resolve the conflict of interests. The "Datong Society—Utopian Society" in

the "Book of Rites" is the description for an ideal state of affairs, i.e. "the universal truth of popularity, fairness and justice prevail under Heaven, great virtues and talents are promoted, and trust and harmony built up; capable and strong find their suitable positions and young are well-educated, all the rest are taken good care in one community; bad goods are abandoned on the ground, and personal strength hidden in himself without showing for self-interests; and a house needs no lock, which is Datong Society.⁶⁰ Interestingly, a natural state of affairs described by French thinker Rousseau is very close to the aforementioned description. Rousseau described a natural state in which there is no war and no conflict, and people free and harmonious, i.e. the natural state is the self-preservation state in which every individual cares for itself without detriment to others, and which can most probably maintain peace and is the most appropriate to mankind.⁶¹

With the theory of evil human nature assumption, people's communication logic based on a formal contract, which is still an expression of distrust. Because people do not trust each other, so they had their agreements printed on paper to prepare for a future dispute. Under the assumption of kind human nature, people are all morally self-disciplined and pursue morality and kindness. People's communications are not built on the basis of the formal contract, but on the basis of substantive justice. In reality, people concerned will get closer to the substantive justice through negotiations according to the specific situation, and not just based on the previous agreement.

This harmonious order concept in domestic politics is reflected in the following three points: Firstly, the power constraint model is self-disciplined morally. The key of national governance is to rely on virtues: "The more the state-owned virtues, the better the state governance; the less the state-owned

virtues, the weaker the state governance",⁶² and the standard for a virtue is to "bring benefit to people instead of toil, work for people while not incurring their complaints, pursue virtue without being greedy for profit, show a calm disposition without arrogance, and inspire awe without being fierce".⁶³ These virtues can help keep peace in the world through their self-cultivation.⁶⁴ Secondly, political participation is representation and consultation. Only virtues can represent people, "he who rules his state on a moral basis would be supported by his people, just like the Polar Star encircled by all other stars".⁶⁵ Virtues need to take the initiative to give consideration to people, "help other establish what oneself wishes to establish, and help other achieve something oneself wishes to achieve".⁶⁶ The interaction between ordinary people and the political elite (virtues) is to complete through political consultation and mutual-learning from each other. Moral learning in the interaction between the two sides occupies an important position, "learn from a man with virtue while meeting him, and examine oneself to see if one has the same defects as meeting a man without virtue".⁶⁷ The governance of a whole country is moral interaction, "guided by virtue and rites, people will not only have a sense of shame but also know how to correct their mistakes of their own accord".⁶⁸ Thirdly, the harmony between society and state. A leader shows loves to its people, who would obey its leadership, while the leader receives their respect and affection through moral interaction. "Hard governance is not as good as effective education. People fear of hard governance but cherish effective education, hard governance is rewarded by wealth while effective education is rewarded by support from the bottom of hearts".⁶⁹

This harmonious order concept in international politics is reflected in the following 4 aspects: One, the basic state of affairs of the world order is harmonious, which

does not mean complete disappearance of conflict, but refers to conducting communications and minimizing the use of violence based on a relatively mutual tolerance and understanding. Secondly, actors in the world order are featured by pluralism. In harmonious situation, because violence is no longer the only criteria or main criteria to measure actors, so the states are transformed from the only main actors to become one of the main actors. Beyond nation states, international governmental organizations, international non-governmental organizations, multi-national corporations, local governments, cities and other actors are involved in the operation of the world order. Thirdly, relationships between main subjects are friendship. The determinants of friends relationship are no longer interests (interests are distinguished between enemies and allies), but morality and character. The interaction between friends is built on the basis of mutual learning and moral improvement: "making friends through learning and cultivating virtue and benevolence through theses friends"⁷⁰ There is a different order sequence pattern in the relationship of friends,⁷¹ —i.e. close friend, average friend and distant friend. In friendly relations, the means to handle a dislike object is to alienate it rather than to destroy it. The principle of communications between friends should be "to repay resentment with fairness and justice, and repay virtue with virtue".⁷² The ideal form of relations between friends is "to attract to each other from afar".⁷³ Fourthly, the form of interaction between main subjects is mutual help and courtesy. Since the relationship between main actors is friendly relations, so friends should help each other. There is also a difference order pattern here, i.e., huge aid by close friends while little aid by distant friends. Beyond this, the state of emergency also decides the urgency of help, i.e. prioritize help to an urgent situation while less urgent situation

gets help later. Mutual assistance is often associated with abnormal emergency, but the relationship between friends in daily communication mainly reflected by reciprocity of courtesy. This kind of respect to guests is transformed into a glory (i.e. the face matter in Chinese cultural tradition.)

IV. Global Governance and its Pragmatic Program Blueprint

In fact, after the cold war, some frontier progress in Western international relations theories witness an obvious trend of getting close to or merging with Chinese traditional harmonious order concept. These Western theoretical progress is significantly different from the above-mentioned five conflicting order views, which mainly are reflected in the following four aspects:

First, constructivism. This school of thought emphasizes that simply describing and analyzing the physical world is meaningless, since the material world needs to be understood in a certain social background and social significance. While, constructivism argues that there is a mutually-constructing relationship between actors and structure.⁷⁴ Constructivism attempts to introduce the power concept into the material world, in an interactive way to change the conflicting structure in anarchism. Although constructivists such as Alexander Wendt accepted anarchy hypothesis, he still made distinctions among the Hobbes culture, Loake culture and Kant culture, and believes that it is possible for human society to develop toward Kant culture and construct a security community⁷⁵.

Second, feminism. This theory holds that gender bias in international relations theory should be studied with critique. Ann Tickner points out that the traditional international relationship research show concerns to those matters (in the name of high politics) such as war and military security interest to men, while

show indifference to matter such as women's traditional activities (i.e. caring offspring and housework).⁷⁶ In addition, an important concept in feminist international relations theory is "empathetic cooperation", i.e. carrying out emotional communication between equal subjects and unequal subjects, so as to achieve integration among various main subjects.⁷⁷ The feminist international relations theory has a strong inclination to pacifism. In this regard, Francis Fukuyama points out that violence is created by men to a great extent, and a world genuinely ruled by women is relatively unbound of conflict, and is relatively easier to coordinate and cooperate than the current world now.⁷⁸

Third, global governance theory. This theory emphasizes that, in the era of globalization, there is a need for a brand-new idea to respond to world-wide public problems. This theory was first promoted by scholars such as James N. Rosenau and the Commission on Global Governance.⁷⁹ In concrete terms, this theory has three important characteristics: One is emphasis on multi-subject governance; especially the role of transnational civil society. Two is emphasizing difference between governance and ruling, and advocating a non-mandatory problem-solution. Three is emphasizing importance of globalized concepts and awareness on the world-wide public problems solving.

Fourth, international moral studies. Some standard theoretical results begin critique on absence of morality in international relations theory, and try to apply justice ideas by John B. Rawls to world politics. An important achievement in this area is mainly represented by theory of world justice of Charles Beitz and Thomas Pogge. Beitz argues that Rawls's idea on justice is incomplete, the principle of distinction in domestic politics is not applied to international politics, and pointed out that since the domestic choice is based on the principle of

distinction (i.e., economic and social arrangements should satisfy the most unfavorable groups). It is the same with the world politics, various parties should also choose the principle of distinction.⁸⁰ Pogge also advocates extending Rawls's justice theory to the world. He argues that only through effective and large-scale economic system reform to eliminate various root causes of inequality, can justice be ultimately achieved in the world.⁸¹

These theoretical developments are criticizing the western mainstream views of the conflicting order, meanwhile, sharing similarities with the Chinese order concept. Constructivism is committed to research on a security community, feminism has a strong pacifist tendency, the global governance theory advocates promoting global cooperation in a non-mandatory framework, the international moral studies demand reintroduction of morality into the center of international politics, which are all compatible with the basic connotation of harmonious order. However, these theories also have some inadequacies.

Constructivism (especially liberal constructivism) intends to construct a security community based on internal morality, but facing two problems: One is the internal morality discussed now in the West is based on Western knowledge and practiced morality, so forced expansion of which will lead to clash of civilizations. Two is the standard of these morality requirements may be too high, which faces similar problems as the international morality theory.⁸² Views of Beitz and Bogge although occupy the moral high ground,⁸³ yet, their applicability is greatly reduced. Beitz is more radical, demanding rich countries in global decision-making taking poor countries interests as the starting point, which is obviously difficult to achieve. In addition, the international morality theory based on Western knowledge is easily connected with Christian

Mission spirit, show in a new form of violence, such as the war and conflict in the name of humanitarian aid.

Feminism is often placed in the ranks of critique theory, its basic logic is based on male / female dualist distinction. In terms of knowledge theory, feminist criticizes knowledge monopoly by male chauvinism, while in form of problems solving it has a strong idealist or a radical inclination, for instance, recommending discussion of family issues in international relations, or total ban on war, etc.. Besides, development of the global governance theory is currently in some kind of bottleneck, since this theory emphasizes the role of non-governmental organizations, whose representation and legitimacy are often inadequate in reality, and the street politics they are used to also help to some extent aggravate conflict in world politics. At the same time, the global governance theory emphasizes de-nationing, but nation states are still the most important actors in world politics .

Comparatively, China's harmonious order concept has the following three advantages: Firstly, the moral appeal of harmonious order concept is consistent with its moral assumption hypothesis, which constitutes a complete knowledge theory and is clearly different from the West. Western moral appeal faces an important dilemma, i.e., there is a strong conflict nature between the moral position and the evil human nature assumption. In contrast, the harmonious order concept assumes human nature is kind. Because human nature has elements of pursuing moral and improving self, so people can through good behavior help others and change the world.

Secondly, the moral pursuit by the different order sequence pattern is easier to be achieved. The Western universal and high-standard moral pursuit are difficult to be attained in practice, and contain the Christianity spirit. On the one hand, the West tends to

pursue universalist morality with rather high moral standards, which is very difficult to be achieved. So Rawls's logic grows a clear division between the domestic society and international community. While Chinese moral improvement is gradually advanced in a different order sequence pattern, Compared to the Western moral universalism, justice of the different order sequence pattern seems weaker, but more feasible. China's moral concept is a kind of multi-tier moral values, which is more feasible. In its harmonious order concept, domestic moral ethics are consistent with international moral ethics.

Thirdly, there is a kind of self-adjustment in applying harmonious order concept, i.e. make an out layer pragmatic defense. As adopting the harmonious logic, the Chinese are not blinded idealists. In the use of harmonious order view, they first make a layer of defense by pragmatism, then construct a common idea through long and friendly interactions, and finally after the identification of both sides as friends, the moral elements will become main contents of interactions between them.

On the basis of harmonious order concept, I propose some ideas for global governance, which consists of five aspects.

Firstly, the basic logic of global governance is "weak conflict logic plus strong harmony logic". As the world has not yet completed its transformation, there is a risk in diplomacy if turning the conflicting logic completely into harmony logic, i.e., it is possible to drop into an obscure diplomatic situation, so there needs to put a certain conflict logic in reservation to protect oneself. In international exchanges, it needs identifying each other's logic. If your counterpart adopts conflicting logic, then take the same logic to protect itself. The basic direction of the global politics gradually moves from the conflict logic to the harmonious logic. In the long run, the future of the global political goal is to build a

global community of destiny led by harmonious logic.

Secondly, the basic framework of global governance is to build a global authoritative coordination, the most important job of which is promote reform and development of the United Nations and other international organizations in their efficiency, responsibility-sharing, management, etc. These organizations play an important role in governance, but these governance mechanisms also include some features of the world order after World War II. It should be specially mentioned that the major countries (such as G-20 countries) should actively support the reform of the United Nations and other international organizations. Only effective and smooth operation of the global authoritative coordination framework is ensured, can global governance be carried out on a benign orbit.

Thirdly, the state-to-state relationship structure in the global governance needs to change from the interests-based relations to friendship-based relations. In a foreseeable future, it is unrealistic to completely eliminate interests of state. However, state actors can on the basis of interests relations build friends relationship of sincere exchanges. The main way of interaction between friends is mutual aid and mutual courtesy, i.e. wholeheartedly help other countries in emergency and give each other enough respect in routine activities.⁸⁴ Of course, mutual aid and courtesy are based on the national conditions and strength as the foundation, i.e. act according to one's capability. Major powers should play a demonstrative role in the process.

Fourthly, a way to respond to disagreements is "seeking common ground while reserving differences" in global governance. From the comparative point of view, even if the nature of the two things are different, their generalities and similarities still can be found, but, differences between things

are normal. The key to this is how to treat the differences between things. In global governance, diversity must be allowed, i.e. a recognition of all things developing together without harming to each other, and all roads being parallel without disruption to each other.⁸⁵ Reserving differences is against the use of force and violence toward a dissent, because conflict logic will lead to clash of civilizations and systems. The ideal result of "seeking common ground while reserving differences" is harmony without blind following.⁸⁶

Fifthly, the interaction of the global governance is a multi-subject deliberative democracy. In the western theories of international relations, the world-wide deliberative democracy is an important theoretical development.⁸⁷ which is in the right direction. However, it should further absorb connotation of China's harmonious order concept, such as more emphasis on inclusiveness, mutual understanding and consensus-reaching, which are more conducive to world order. In addition, the EU deliberative democracy can be regarded as a pilot form of the world-wide deliberative democracy,⁸⁸ the content of which can be further expanded from the perspective of the global governance. Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri propose a "multitude" concept, which also helps promote the global deliberative democracy.⁸⁹ In overall view, the connotation of global governance can be summarized as harmonious coexistence, authoritative deliberation, mutual aid and coordination, seeking common ground while

reserving differences, and multiple consultation.

V. Conclusion

Compared with the previous leading views of conflicting order in the world order, harmonious order concept is a brand new order logic. The conflicting order views are based on the evil human nature assumption, mainly from the perspective of pursuing advantages and avoiding disadvantages. While, harmonious order concept is based on kind human nature hypothesis, and tries to find and develop moral elements in humanity. In international politics guided by harmonious order concept, a world order is a state of harmonious coexistence of multi-actors (Different from state of anarchy with nation states as main actors), the relation between main subjects is friends relations (different from a relationship between ally and adversary), and the interaction among actors is displayed with mutual aid and courtesy (different from the self-aid and contention). The harmonious order concept is put forward on the basis of Chinese traditional culture and political philosophy, which is obviously different with the Western mainstream order views, but is compatible with its new theoretical development trend. At the same time, the harmonious order concept is mainly reflected in its strong feasibility. Besides, we cannot apply it simply and in general terms. Therefore, I come out with a compromised global governance concept on the basis of the harmonious order concept.

Footnotes:

1. Because the hegemonic stability theory and power transfer theory are relatively close, so I condense these two theories into the theory of hegemonic system. Before, there are also scholars discussing the two theories together. For example, Qin Yaqing in discussion of the theory of hegemonic stability, also cite views of power transfer theory represented by Organsky. See Qin Yaqing: "the Hegemony System and the International Conflict", *Chinese Social Science*, No.4,1996, p.115.

2. See Charles Kindleberger, "The World in Depression: 1929-1939", Berkeley Los Angeles: The University of

- California Press, 1973. See Robert Gilpin, *War and Change in World Politics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981, p.144.
3. See A. F. K. Organsky, *World Politics*, New York: Alfred, A. Knopf, 1958, Chapter 1. See A. F. K. Organsky and Jacek Kugler, *The War Ledger*, Alfred, A. Knopf, 1958, pp.50-52.
 4. William Wohlforth, "The Stability of a Unipolar World", *International Security*, Vol. 24, No.1, 1999, pp.5-41.
 5. Before Hegemony Stability theory became dominant order theory, the balance of power theory was the Western leading order theory, which was supported by realists such as H. Morgenthau, S. Hoffmann, K. Waltz.
 6. See Stephen Walter, "the Origin of the League", translated by Zhou Peiqi, Beijing: Peking University Press, 2007. See also Randall Schweller, "Bandwagon For Profit: Bringing the Revisionist State Back in", *International Security*, Vol. 19, No. 1, 1994, pp.72-107
 7. See K. Waltz, "The Post-Cold War Structural Realism", John Ikenberry edi., "America Unrivaled: the Future of the Balance of Power", translated by Han Zhaoying, Beijing, Peking University Press, 2005, pp.56-57.
 8. Immanuel Wallerstein, "the Modern World System", Vol. I, translated by You Laiyan, Beijing: Higher Education Press, 1998, p12.
 9. Samuel Huntington, "the Clash of Civilizations and the Reconstruction of World Order", translated by Zhou Qi, .Beijing: Xinhua Press, 2002, pp.29-33, 275-343.
 10. Samuel Huntington, "Who are we? Challenge to America National Characteristics ", translated by Cheng Kexiong, Beijing: Xinhua press, 2005, pp. 283-302.
 11. Michael Doyle, "Kant, Liberal legacies and Foreign Affairs", *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, Vol.12, No.3, 1983, pp.205-235.
 12. Zeev Maoz and Bruce Russett, "Normative and Structural Causes of Democratic Peace, 1946-1986, " *American Political Science Review*, Vol.87, No.3, 1993, pp.624-638.
 13. Michael Mousseau, "The Social Market Roots of Democratic Peace", *International Security*, Vol. 33, No. 4, 2009, pp.52-89.
 14. Kenneth Waltz, "Structural Realism after the Cold War," John Ikenberry edi, "America Unrivaled, the Future of the Balance of Power", p. 36.
 15. Hobbes, "Leviathan", translated by Li Sifu, Li Tingpi, Beijing, Commercial Press, 1986, p.94.
 16. Hobbes: "Leviathan", pp.131-132
 17. In Hobbes's "Leviathan", the third part and the fourth part are fully on discussions of theology, and the first part and the second part are also partially on theology. In short, Hobbes's "Leviathan" is based on the Christian theology.
 18. Bible refers Adam to the human ancestor. In the Genesis Story, Adam and Eve were punished by God for eating the forbidden fruit. This kind of sin exists in human beings ever since, which is the original sin.
 19. Montesquie, "The Spirit of Laws" (Vol. 1), translated by Zhang Yanshen, Beijing, Commercial Press, 1995, pp.155-160.
 20. J.S. Mill, "Representative Government", translated by Wang Xuan, Beijing, the Commercial Press, 1984, pp.37-83.
 21. J. Locke, "Second Treatise on Government", translated by Yie Qifang and Qu Junong, Beijing, the Commercial Press, 1996, pp.57-60.
 22. Carl Schmitt, "The Concept of the Political" translated by Liu Zongkun, Shanghai, Shanghai People's Press, 2004, p106.
 23. Carl Schmitt, "The Concept of the Political", p.125.
 24. Ibid. p.134
 25. Ibid. p.133.
 26. See Hans-Karl Pichler, "The Godfather of Truth: Max Weber and Carl Schmitt in Morgenthau's Theory of Power Politics," *Review of International Studies*, Vol.24, 1998, p.186.
 27. See, Hans Morgenthau, "Politics among Nations: the Struggle for Power and Peace", translated by Yang Qiming, Beijing, the Commercial Press, 1993, p.45.
 28. See Kenneth Waltz, "Theory of International Politics", translated by Xin Qiang, Shanghai: Shanghai People's Press, 2003.
 29. See John Mearsheimer, "The Tragedy of Great Power Politics", translated by Wang Yiwei, Tang Xiaosong, Shanghai, Shanghai People's Press, 2003.
 30. See Stephen Van Evera, "Primed for Peace: Europe after the Cold War", *International Security*, Vol.15, No.3, 1990/1991, pp.14-15.
 31. See Randall Schweller, "Bandwagoning for Profit, Bringing the Revisionist State Back In," pp.105-106.
 32. See Robert Keohane, "After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy", translated

by Su Changhe, Shanghai, Shanghai: People's Press, 2001.

33. Charles Tilly,: "Coercion, Capital and European States (AD 990-1992)", translated by Wei Hongzhong, Shanghai, Shanghai People's Press, 2007.

34. See Kenneth Waltz, "Theory of International Politics", p.157.

35. See Robert Jervis, "The Perception and Misperception in International Politics," translated by Qin Yaqing, Beijing, World Knowledge Press, 2003."Security dilemma "is proposed by John H. Hertz. See John H. Hertz, "International Politics in the Atomic Age", New York, Columbia University Press, 1959.

36. The origin of the international system is the best annotation of this point, for example, the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

37. See Richard Ned Lebow, "Why Nations Fight: Past and Future Motives for War," translated by Chen Dingding, Shanghai: Shanghai People's Press, 2014, pp214-215

38. Wang Zhile, "Global Corporations: A New Development Phase of Multi-National Corporations", Shanghai, Shanghai People's Press, 2014. P.1.

39 The representatives of the new republicanism include Quentin Skinner and Phillip Pettit. See Quentin Skinner, "The Republican Ideal of Political Liberty," in Gisela bock, Quentin Skinner and Maurizio Viroli, eds., "Machiavelli and Republicanism", Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990, pp.293-309; Phillip Pettit, "Republicanism : A Theory of Free and Government", Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997; Regarding deliberative democracy, see Jon Elster, " *Deliberative Democracy*", Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998; John Dryzek, "Foundations and Frontiers of Deliberative Governanc"e, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010; James Fishkin, *When the People Speak*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

40. Giandomenico Majone, "Europe's Democratic Deficit: The Question of Standards, *European Law Journal*, Vol.4, No.1, 1998, pp.5-28; Andrew Moravcsik, "In Defense of Democratic Deficit: Reassessing the Legitimacy of the European Union", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol.40, No.4, 2002, pp.606-619.

41. Joseph S. Nye, Jr., "Globalization's Democratic Deficit: How to Make International Institutions more Accountable," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol.80, No.4, 2001, pp.2-6; Allen Buchanan and Robert O. Keohane, "The Legitimacy of Global Governance Institutions," *Ethics and International Affairs*, Vol.20, No.4, 2006, pp.405-437; William D. Coleman and Tony Porter, " International Institutions, Globalism and Democracy: Assessing the Challenges," *Global Society*, Vol.14, No.3, 2000, pp.337-398.

42. Saskia Sassen, " Global Cities: New York, London, Tokyo," translated by Zhou Zhenhua, Shanghai: Shanghai Social Science Press, 2005, pp.310-325; See Neil Brenner, " Global Cities, Global States: Global City formation and State Territorial Restructuring in Contemporary Europe," *Review of International Political Economy*, Vol.5, No.1, 1998, pp.1-37.

43. Manuel Castells, "Information Theory, Network and Network Society: Theoretical Blueprint," "La societat xarxa a Catalunya", translated by Zhou Kai, Beijing: Beijing Social Science Press, 2009, pp27-45.

44. See Robert Jervis, "System Effects:Complexity in Political and Social Life," Translated by Li Shaojun, Shanghai: Shanghai People's Press, 2008, p.33.

45. Ulrich Beck, "World's Risk Society", translated by He Bowen, Nanjing: Yilin Press, 2004, p.21.

46. Beck divides the world risk society into three categories: One is ecological crisis, two is the global financial crisis, three is the Terrorism risk of transnational terrorism networks. See Ulrich Beck, "World's Risky Society: Thinking in Aphasia", contained in "Contemporary World and Socialism", No.2, 2004, p.88.

47. Elke Krahmann, "Beck and Beyond, Selling Security in the World Risky Society," *Review of International Studies*, Vol.37, 2001, pp.354-357.

48. See Ulrich Beck, "World's Risky Society," translated by Wu Yingzi, Sun Shumin, Nanjing: Nanjing University Press, 2004, pp190-193.

49. This kind nature theory does not mean that human nature is born kind, but stresses that human beings have heart toward kindness. In this sense, there is a compromise reconciliation space between China's kind human nature theory and Western evil human nature theory.

50. Mencius argues that the kind human nature is just like water flowing. See Mencius: Suiting Zi Shang.

51. See Mencius: Gonsun Chou, Mencius shares some similar views of the Western philosopher, Rousseau. See Rousseau, *The Origin of Inequality of Mankind*, translated by Li Changshan, Beijing: The Commercial Press, 1962, p.99.

52. There is a significant difference between Xunzi's evil human nature and Christian evil human nature. See Zhou Chicheng, "Discussions on Xunzi's Non-evil Human Nature", *Guangdong Social Science*, No. 2, 2009, pp.45-50. See Li Xiaoying: "Multidimensional Interpretation of Xunzi's Evil Human Nature," *Journal on Guanzi*, No.3, 2008, pp.38-42.

53. Xunzi: Zhenglun.

54. See "Chunqiu Fanlu: Real Nature. Dong Zhongshu divided the human nature is into three categories: the saints (top grade), the ordinary people (medium grade)、hooligans (bottom grade), and only the ordinary people human nature counts. See "Spring and Autumn Records: Look deep into the Name".
55. Han Yu also divided the human nature into three categories, which is similar to that of Dong Zhongshu's. See Qu Shouyuan, "Han Yu Collected Works Proofreading and Annotation", Chengdu: Sichuan University Press, 1996, p.2686.
56. Zhu Xi's inheritance of the legacy of Zhang Zai and Cheng Hao & Cheng Yi, see Zhang Kai, "On Temperament Theory of Zhu Zi Philosophy", *Oriental Forum*, No.1, 2012, pp.30-35.
57. The "Book of Rites: Fang Ji.
58. The Analects of Confucius: Yan Yuan.
59. The Analects of Confucius: Wei Ling gong.
60. The "Book of Rites: Li Yun.
61. Rousseau: "The Origin of Inequality of Mankind", p98.
62. Mo-tsu: Shang Xian.
63. The Analects of Confucius: Yao Ye.
64. Mencius: Jinxinshang.
65. The Analects of Confucius: Wei Zheng.
66. The Analects of Confucius: Yong Ye.
67. The Analects of Confucius: Li Ren.
68. The Analects of Confucius: Wei Zheng.
69. The "Mencius: Jinxinshang.
70. The Analects of Confucius:-Yan Yuan.
71. A different order pattern is a concept used by Mr. Fei Xiaotong. See Fei Xiaotong: "China's Local planning system", Beijing: Peking University Press 1998, pp.25-26. This concept is different from the hierarchical system in western international relations discussion. See David Lake, *Hierarchy in International Relations*, translated by Gao Wann, Shanghai: Shanghai People's Press, 2013, p.94.
72. The Analects of Confucius: Xian Wen
73. The Analects of Confucius: Zi Lu
74. Alexander Wendt, "The Agent-Structure Problem in International Relations theory," *International Organizations*, Vol.41, No.3, 1987, pp.356-359.
75. Alexander Wendt, "The Social Theory of International Politics", Translation by Qin Yaqing, Shanghai: Shanghai People's Press, 2001, pp.313-383.
76. Ann Tickner, "Gender in International Relations: the Feminist Perspectives on Achieving Global Security", New York, Columbia University Press, 1992, p. 23, P.137.
77. Christine Sylvester, "Feminist Theory and International Relation in a Postmodern Era", New York, Cambridge University Press, 1994, pp.96-99.
78. Francis Fukuyama, "Women and the Evolution of World Politics", *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 77, No.5, 1998, pp.24-40.
79. Regarding earlier discussion about the idea of global governance, see James N. Rosenau, "Governance, Order, and Change in World Politics", Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1992, pp.1-29; the Commission on Global Governance, "Our global Neighborhood", Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1995, pp.2-3.
80. Charles Beitz, "Political theory and International Relations", Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1999, pp.149-151.
81. Thomas Pogge, "Realizing Rawls Ithca": Cornell University Press, 1989, pp.276-1280.
82. Rawls expressed a special care for the most disadvantaged people by the difference principle, showing a very strong moral position. See John Rawls, "A Theory of Justice". Beijing: China Social Sciences Press, 1988, pp.95-96;
83. See John Rawls, "The Law of the People: with the Idea of Public Reason Revisited", translated by Zhang Xiaohui, Changchun: Jilin People's Press, 2001, pp.38-46.
84. President Xi Jinping proposed in his visit to Africa "sincerity, benefits, amity, honesty", which reflects the connotation of this mutual aid.
85. The "Book of Rites: The Golden Mean", President Xi Jinping in his speech at the Peripheral Diplomacy Conference put forward a concept of "amity, sincerity, benefits and inclusiveness", see Xi Jinping: "May the Awareness of Community of Destiny Take Roots in Neighboring Countries", <http://news.xinhuanet.com/2013/10/25/c-117878944.htm>. Feb.5, 2015
86. The Analects of Confucius: Zi Lu.
87. John Dryzek, *"Deliberative Global Politics: Discourse and Democracy in a Divided World"*, Cambridge: Policy Press, 2006: Thomas Risse, "Global Governance and Communicative Action," *Governance and Opposition*, Vol39, No.2, 2004, pp.288-313: Magdalena Bexell, Jonas Tallberg and Anders Uhlin, "Democracy in Global Governance: The Promises and Pitfalls of Transnational Actors," *Global Governance, A Review of Multilateralism and International Organizations*, Vol.14, No.1, 2010, pp.81-101.
88. Erik Oddvar Eriksen and John Erik Fossum, eds., *Democracy in the European Union: Integration Through Deliberation?* "London: Routledge, 2000; Daniel Naurin, "Most Common When Least Important: Deliberation in the European Union Council of Ministers," *British Journal of Political Science*, Vol.40, No.1, 2010, pp.31-50.
89. Hardt and Negri point out that the principal content of "multitude" refer to people and masses. See Hardt and Negri, *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*, New York: The Penguin Press, 2004, pp.99-102.