### Table 3.1. The G20 Summit Network through Plurilateral Summit Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G20</th>
<th>G8+5</th>
<th>MEM-16</th>
<th>CMW</th>
<th>FRA</th>
<th>ASEM</th>
<th>OSCE</th>
<th>APEC</th>
<th>SOA</th>
<th>SCO</th>
<th>NATO</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAP</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GER</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRI</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITA</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAN</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUS</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHI</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>Obser</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRA</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEX</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOR</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUS</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARG</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAR</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUR</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPA</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Includes only plurilateral summit institutions of trans-regional reach containing members from the developed and emerging/developing world.
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The concept of “global governance” emerged as the focus of active scientific debates mainly after the studies of Willy Brandt and his colleagues from the UN Commission on global governance. This Commission was created to discuss possibilities for solution by joint efforts of such global problems as deterioration of environment, fight against poverty, infection diseases, etc. In 1995 the Commission prepared its Report “Our global neighborhood”. The Report justifies necessity of global governance by claiming that its development is an essential part of humans’ efforts towards rational organisation of life on Earth and this process will continue forever (Our Global Neighborhood...1995). The reason for creation of global governance arises from the conviction that humankind after the era of global wars and global confrontation has a unique opportunity for adoption of the “global civil ethics”, which should be founded on the package of fundamental values, uniting people of all cultural, political, religious and philosophic beliefs. Such governance should manifest democratic principles on every level and should be exercised according to the established legal norms, which should embrace everyone.

Definition of the Global Governance

There are several definitions of the “global governance” concept. The term “global governance” was proceeded by another term “global government”, which characterized similar phenomenon of the same class but was still at different notion.

What is the difference between the two notions? James Rosenau in his works “Governance in a New Global Order” (Rosenau 2000) and “Toward an Ontology for Global Governance” studied their features in details. His point is that both English notions “government” and “governance” stand for systems of rules, regulation mechanisms for exercising power aimed at keeping specific political system united and to achieve intended goals. The distinction is that “government” is usually understood as specific structures, while “gov-
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Governance” is meant as *social functions and processes*, which are applied in different conditions and in different forms and include a large number of participants. To govern means to exercise power and to have power means to have recognition of those who is covered by this power. Hence, comes another distinction. The power of the government rests on specific constitutional provisions, directives, orders and other official documents. In governance, power arises from the processes as a result of repeated practices, which have authoritative nature, though they may not be formalized constitutionally. The main advantage of the managerial systems which have government as a guarantor is ensuring the regulation process. In case of governance there is no guarantee that obligations will be fulfilled.

Adil Najam, professor in the Boston University and Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy gives the following definition of global governance: governance of global processes without a global government. And this definition is absolutely valid, bearing in mind delimitation of notions “governance” and “government” formulated by James Rosenau.

Thomas G. Weiss defines global governance as collective efforts aiming to identify, explore further and solve global problems, which are beyond solution at the state level.

Global governance is not a normative notion, which defines qualitative assessment of its manifestation. It refers rather to the specific cooperative arrangements, oriented towards solutions of specific problems. Such arrangements could be formally fixed in the form of laws or officially recognized institutions, which could solve joint problems under support of various actors (states, international organizations, NPOs, transnational corporations and other private structures or representatives of the civil society, even single individuals). However they can also have informal nature (in the case of exercising certain fixed practices) or temporary duration (in the case of coalitions).

Thus we can agree with the definition of global governance, proposed by T.G. Weiss and R. Thakur in their book “The UN and Global Governance: An Idea and its Prospects” (Weiss, Thakur 2003):

*Global governance is a complex of formal and informal institutions, mechanisms, relations and processes, which exist among and embrace states, markets, single citizens and organizations non-governmental as well as intergovernmental through which at global level, collective interests are defined, rights and obligations are established and arguments are settled.*
Main Approaches to the Global Governance Concept

So far several different approaches to global governance architecture have been developed in the international political discourse. Some call for creation of more relevant institutions designed to better fit new global processes. Others stipulate the need to reform already existing institutions and equip them with broader range of authorities.

There is one more possible option, which is non-institutional political governance of global processes. It could take the form of unilateral global domination of the most powerful empire as well as of global consensus among democratic countries. Given recent events (unilateral decision of the U.S. to launch military operations in Iraq, despite the absence of an official mandate from the UN Security Council), the first option seemed a fact, with the U.S. on the top of this system of global governance. The idea of a unipolar world is supported by several political analysts associated with the school of political realism, such as the former U.S. National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski, who emphasized four main fields, in which the U.S. leads: military and political, economic, technological and sphere of mass culture. Supporters of “American hegemony” in global governance often operate by the theory of “hegemonic stability”.

The studies, conducted within the school of international political economy, explore interconnection between stability of economic regime and presence of a state-leader. They posit that existence of such hegemonic state leads to the creation of stable economic regimes, since the leader creates rules and norms of conduct, which are accepted by others.

The idea of “American hegemony” as well as previous approaches draws a lot of critical responses, including those, which were discussed in connection with concepts of the unipolar world. J. Nye persuasively argues the case of unrealistic nature of this approach in his book “The Paradox of American Power: Why the World’s Only Superpower Can’t Go it Alone” in 2002. The main argument stated by J.Nye is that in modern world one cannot ignore goals, interests and activities of other actors in international life.


1) Polycentric architecture of global governance, when politics is based on the collective processes of search for solutions and mutual understanding among the governments of participating states, i.e. on the system of “shared sovereignties”.
2) **Diversity of actors.** States maintain monopoly on fixing and implementing certain political courses, but private actors play more ponderable role at such stages as identifying problem, analysis of problematic connections and implementation (for example, information gathering, monitoring, work in public-private regulatory institutions).

3) **Diversity of international cooperation models.** Global governance is exercised on the basis of collective identification and solution of problems and presupposes cooperation between public and private sectors; international organizations in the global governance architecture can take upon themselves coordinating functions and contribute to the elaboration of global methods for studying and perception of problems, which could help correct national limitation of other actors.

4) **Asymmetry in global governance.** Global governance emerges at the crossroads of national interests, power relations and necessity of joint solution of problems beyond the borders of single states.

5) **Maximal multilateralism and multi-level approach.** Attraction of as many participants into the global governance processes as possible, as well as multi-level policy of the global governance architecture (local – national – regional – interregional or international – global).

6) **Decisive transformation of politics and innovative institutionalization.** Institutional and procedural reforms at different levels, which are aimed at adapting systems of governments in certain states to the new realities and transforming existing system of global governance into a sustainable and productive policy network.

Taking into consideration a diversity of approaches to the definition of the ambiguous concept of “global governance”, the studies of world politics use one or another, depending on their ability to capture realities of the transforming world political systems, processes, which come along with these transformations, as well as actions of stakeholders, participating in these processes.

**Main Theoretical Schools on Global Governance**

Global governance is a widely debated topic in world politics. Moreover, there are arguments not only on practical implementation of this idea, but also on conceptualization of this phenomenon. Hence, it is relevant to analyze interpretations of “global governance” in at least two theoretical schools – realism and international liberalism – as the most authoritative and more or less opposing to each other.
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Realism

Political realism is the oldest approach to the studies of international relations, its antecedents were Thucydides, Machiavelli and Thomas Hobbes. Among representatives of this school writing on global governance Robert Gilpin in his study “A Realist Perspective on International Governance” mentioned Hedley Bull, E.H. Carr, Hans Morgenthau, Reinhold Niebuhr, Kenneth Waltz and Martin Wight (Gilpin 2002). All those scholars, including Robert Gilpin, have similar approach to international relations. Realism itself (as well as Liberalism and Marxism), according to Robert Gilpin, is more a certain philosophical position, then scientific theory in its pure form. It means that the approach cannot be a subject for an empirical analysis, and therefore to be verified.

Realist perspective on international relations includes several key characteristics:

- international relations as a system constitute anarchy, without supreme political authority;
- state is sovereign and not subject to any higher secular authorities;
- states as major actors in international relations cooperate with each other and create international organisations but only in those spheres where their interests coincide;
- in international relations states are guided by the principle of preservation of national interest and maintainance of national security;
- one of the key notions, defining the role of state in international system is power relations (predominantly military, but also economic, cultural, psychological, etc.).

Thus, according to the school of realism, states should always be on the alert, given real and possible threats for their political and economic independence (Gilpin 2002), and the global system itself, according to the metaphor of Kenneth Waltz, could be characterized as “self-help international system” (Waltz 1979).

As for participants in international relations, realists, as it was mentioned earlier, assume that state is a major actor on global political scene, though they accept importance of other “players”, such as the WB or IMF. However this applies to neorealists, but not to the adepts of traditional paradigm in realism, who recognize states as the only actors, which can influence political process virtually. Still, domination of states remains undoubted among realists (and even neorealists).
The globalization processes, which are especially evident in economic sphere, are explained by realists not from the perspective of state-“erosion” and transformation of the world into integrated economy, but from the same perspective of national interest of every single state, which claims that currently integration policy is more advantageous, but it does not mean that such situation will remain forever.

On the other hand realists recognize influence of transnational corporations (TNCs) and non-for profit organizations (NPOs) and even assert that states will not exist forever. The idea supported by R. Gilpin, that they were created, for example, to implement certain tasks, specifically, to ensure stability and order, while citizens recognized authority of their states and obliged to obey to their laws in exchange for these benefits. In is logic if at some point states will lose capacity to fulfill the tasks determined by citizens, they will disappear. However, according to realists, such development, at least in the near future, is very unlikely.

In fact realists consider the possibility of global governance in international affairs rather skeptically. Though they recognize progress in governance of global economy, and say that if the mechanism of global governance appears, it will happen in the economic sphere.

Nevertheless, contribution of transnational corporations towards achieving a greater order in the current international economic relations remain insufficient, and according to the school of realism, they do not succeed in overcoming of the primordial anarchical structure of the world. Indeed, they have failed to create supranational authorities, which would govern behavior of egocentric states. As R. Gilpin mentions, if an effective mechanism for global governance have not been created in the economic sphere, than it is impossible to speak about establishing order in other much more complicated spheres of world politics (Gilpin 2002).

According to realists there are three major functions of governance, which belong yet exclusively to states: 1) emission of national currency, 2) fiscal function and 3) providing of state and individual security. Here simultaneously comes the question to the common currency of the European Union (EU). Realists claim that the Euro is still the only example of delegating the authority to emit currency to supranational body, and the final result of this experiment is yet unknown. Moreover the EU will need greater political integration for ensuring sufficient stability of Euro.

For realists establishing of global governance faces three insurmountable problems:
the “problem of authorities”: realists insist that every government and every system of governance needs effective mechanism of control in order to prevent atrocities of power (Bull 1977);

the “problem of peaceful transformation”: every system of governance should have social, political and economic basis, changes in the structure of existing power relations will remain and that is why it is necessary to include in the system of global governance mechanisms for promoting “peaceful change” (Carr 1951);

the “problem of the purpose for global governance”: it is necessary to define clearly social, political and economic reasons, justifying global governance.

However, despite clearly moderate approach to the global governance, it would not be easy to say, that realists entirely deny this concept. Still their skeptical approach is apparent and explained by the school of political realism predominantly by the absence of prerequisites for 1) effective, 2) fair (or democratic) global governance and 3) ambiguous purpose of global governance today.

**Liberal Internationalism**

Liberal internationalism even in its title unites two rather different schools: liberalism and internationalism. The aim of liberalism is to define conditions for exercising political freedom and liberal government, while internationalism is connected with the idea of spreading transnational (or global) solidarity and international government. One school does not presuppose another. Thus, liberals advocate limited government, while internationalists support expansion of government authorities in international sphere.

Despite all apparent contradictions within the school, liberal internationalism, which emerged in the 19th century in the works of T. Penn, I. Kant, A. Smith, J. Bentham and J. Mill, and experienced its second birth after the end of the Cold War. Today the most respected representatives of this school are M. Doyle, M. Howard, R. Keohane, V. Huntley, D. Dwewy, D. Ikkenberry, J. Rosenau, T. Weiss, N. Woods and many others.

In its essence liberal internationalism is a kind of antipode of political realism, and not only in explanation of the global order, but also in the perspective on what it should be. Achieving of maximum freedom for a person is the major goal for liberal internationalism, but it is possible only in the absence of war and premises for it. And since conflicts and wars are inherent to the current system, where sovereign states seek ways for maximization of their
power, necessary conditions for exercise of human freedom could be achieved only under condition of governance or transcendence of power politics. This statement is reinforced by four major principles (McGrew 2002):

1) rational policy is an essential precondition for effective management of international relations;

2) international cooperation from deontological as well as from rational points of view is preferable in comparison with conflict: increasing material interdependence of states creates necessity for international regulation;

3) international organizations contribute to the advancement of peace and stability, pacifying more powerful states through creation of international norms and new rules of conduct for multilateral politics, they also have necessary mechanisms for prevention and management of interstate conflicts;

4) progress in world politics is possible only when principle of power politics will not be seen as essential precondition for maintaining interstate order: importance of this principle could be significantly diminished or entirely overcome through gradual reform or “domestication” of international relations (rule of law, universal human rights and so on).

All liberals believe in the power of human mind. Wars between states are explained by shortcomings of certain intragovernmental systems. This thesis is referred to authoritarian regimes with inherent centralization of power, secrecy, absence of civil society and so on (I. Kant, T. Penn, and J. Mill). Others blame mercantile economic system, which facilitated wars with economic profit as primary goal (A. Smith, R. Cobden). Therefore classics of liberalism conclude (and this is common for both approaches): to contribute to the prevention of wars, it is necessary to reorganize states themselves and not international community of states as a whole. For example, I. Kant considered that if governments would be subjected to the will of public opinion, than it would be possible to avoid wars, given that people would hardly support unleashing of war. However though the emphasis was made on reforms within states, Kant and Bentham mentioned importance of international law, establishing “cosmopolitan law”, directed towards ensuring peace through definition of rights and obligations of citizens and states within “confederation of states”, where power politics is denied by participating states. Many scholars defined this concept of I. Kant as precursor of current systems of collective security. As far as the growing interdependence of states will emerge, democracy will strengthen as well as peace and stability will be achieved in practice,
other states, according to Kant, will also subscribe to this value, which will lead to the “eternal peace”. Nevertheless, regarding maintaining global order, another representative of liberalism J. Bentham does not consider establishing of global government or even strong international institutions as mandatory condition. On the opposite he insists, that there should be as less global government as possible (Hinsley 1967).

However since the times of Bentham, arguments on liberal internationalist vision of global governance continued to develop. Between the two World Wars the attitude to the intervention in the domestic affairs (“state intervention”) as acceptable course of action was revised. Due to the success of international organisations, created in the 19th century (International Telegraph Union and Universal Postal Union), a new school of liberalism supported creation a new form of international governance in order “to enforce peace” by delegating competencies to the specific body. Several remarkable proposals regarding the structure of this universal international body include:

a) creation of a global federation or confederation, which presuppose existence of world government with supranational authorities;
b) creation of the decentralized and pluralistic system of international governance in accordance with the functionalism theory;
c) creation of a system for a broader international cooperation and collective security (as League of Nations).

Obviously, the first two of these three concepts of global governance were impractical (at least in their pure form) because of apparent contradictions that have existed (and continue to exist) between states (and other actors in world politics). To reach an agreement of all to unite in a general confederation, and especially to create a mature democratic decentralized system of global governance at that stage (and today as well) was unreal, which was vividly demonstrated in subsiquent years.

The third proposal was more realistic. Woodrow Wilson, an ideologue of the liberalism of the first half of 20th century and an adept of this idea, believed that a just world order was possible under two conditions: 1) spread of democracy and 2) establishment of a democratic system of collective security by establishment of the League of Nations as the first experiment in contemporary global governance. The main goal of the organisation was to resolve all conflict situations through dialogue, without resorting to force and under the principle of states equality. The League of Nations included elements of the “Confederation of Republican States” proposed by Kant and of the “Com-
mon Court of Abjudication” proposed by Bentham to settle disputes between states.

Although the first experiment in the history of global governance, led by the League of Nations failed, liberal internationalism has not gone forever, and the architects of post-war world order did not lose faith in the feasibility of the global governance. It is interesting to mention a statement of Anthony McGrew that the establishment of the UN and its specialized agencies, including institutions of the Bretton-Woods system, reflected the desire of the United States as a liberal hegemony, to establish a liberal world order in which democracy and capitalism would flourish. Ironically, though this thesis undermined the basic principles of liberal internationalist school, because it virtually confirms the well-known realist argument that international governance at best can only exist with the approval of the dominant state, and at worst it would have been just a tool to promote its interests (McGrew 2002).

As it was mentioned earlier, the end of 20th century with the end of the Cold War, the third wave of democratization and the increasing pace of globalization was a real «gift» for liberal internationalists. The logic of international cooperation was revised. The current stage in development of the theoretical school under consideration is characterized by four major trends:

1. **Liberal institutionalism.** While recognizing that the United States as the hegemony of the modern world could promote international cooperation, Robert Keohane, a representative of this group, however, does not agree that the process of multilateral cooperation ongoing throughout the post-war period (and accelerated after the end of the Cold War) could be explained solely by the American influence. The real cause of international cooperation, he believes, rests in conflict, as if, there was harmony in international relations, no cooperation would be necessary. And international organisations, according to the liberal institutionalism, does not shatter the power of the states, but rather give them more power as participation in international organizations is advantageous, primarily for the states themselves (Keohane 1984).

2. **Structural liberalism.** The cause of multilateral cooperation in the post-war period is a liberal nature of the U.S. hegemony in world politics. Due to America, the current system of global governance is seen by this group as liberal. Thus there are prerequisites for achievement of a more stable world by increasing the number of democratic states.

3. **Liberal reformism.** The main objective of world politics is to address the major shortcomings in the existing system of global governance (domination of the strongest states in shaping of international institutions, “democ-
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“Democracy deficit”, lack of control over the process of shaping public opinion, etc.) (UNDP... 1999) and create the necessary conditions for creating more effective and legitimate global governance, namely, to ensure the democratic character of governance at all levels through the use of a valid law enforcement at national level and within “our entire global neighbourhood” (Commission on Global Governance... 1995).

4. Liberal cosmopolitism. The main task is to ensure justice in global governance, which in its present form seems unfair, since it reinforces existing global inequities, and, consequently, global injustice, so there is a need in redistribution from rich to poor countries (Caney 2001).

Thus the school of liberal internationalism is quite fragmented, and represents, according to Mason, “imaginary intellectual unity in the present theoretical pluralism” (Mason 2000).

Nevertheless, this does not mean that this theory is facing an imminent crisis. Of course, there are contradictions. First, over the question whether the state could be considered as a barrier for the creation of a genuine liberal world order, or regarded as one of the constituent elements of such an order (Franc-eschet 2001). Second, there is no unity in regards to the question, whether economic and political spheres should be combined or separated in the new system of liberal global order. Besides, there are even more profound contradictions over the actors in whose interests the global governance would be carried out and which goals it would pursue. And finally, there is a long-time ongoing debate within the liberal political theory on the optimal form of global governance: whether it should demonstrate maximum participation, or, just the contrary, represent a policy of “minimum control”.

It is difficult to overestimate the contribution of liberal internationalism to the theoretical understanding of the changing world. However for its ideological content and excessive modeling (and theorizing) liberal internationalism is criticized extensively, especially by representatives of the school of political realism and Marxism. It is accused at distorting data on real sources of power in world politics and even hypocrisy about possibility of democratic global governance.

Nevertheless, liberal internationalism remains an influential trend of political thought and, perhaps, the major school in studying of global governance. One should not underestimate its obvious advantages. This school was the first seriously considered the idea of conducting policy and management beyond the state, and provided in-depth analysis of the nature, form, logic and
shortcomings of contemporary global governance and the possibility of a genuine global governance.

At the same time, two serious drawbacks are obvious: a clear dissociation of the explanatory and normative aspects, as well as the inherent contradiction between ethical radicalism and institutional conservatism, or even agnosticism, keeping in mind treatment of its theory as the best institutional framework for the study of international politics (Beitz 1999).

To conclude: liberal internationalism today faces two main tasks: to reconcile the explanatory framework with a fairly radical ethical framework and to a degree to harmonize all existing trends, in a single structure.

Still most theories of European Integration draw on the liberal instrumentalist platform. It provided foundation for the functional paradigm in integration and global governance processes. Hence, the study presented in the subsequent chapters adopts a functional approach to the analysis of the EU contribution towards global governance and creating global public good within the G8 agenda.
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