POWER OF GLOBAL TRANSNATIONAL NETWORKS:
CIVILIZING OF WORLD ORDER

*Armando Aliu**

*Dorian Aliu***

ABSTRACT

Can be a world order shaped by equivalents in the framework of the supranational model of Europe with the same legitimacy and with the same effectiveness? In this study was argued that Civilizing World Order (CWO) by Transnational Norm-Building Networks (TNNs) should have the legitimacy and effectiveness of the European Union supranational order. In this context, the concept of decentration (supra: centralization and infra: decentralization) which includes the nexus of voice (democratic participation) and entitlement (legal-social rights and duties) was examined. In this study as methodology published secondary data, online resources were used in order to reinforce the hypothesis.

Keywords: *TNNs, CWO, Legitimacy, Effectiveness, Sovereignty*

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

Kann eine Weltordnung durch Äquivalente, die im Rahmen der supranationalen Modell von Europa mit der gleichen Legitimität und Effektivität geprägt sein? In dieser Studie wurde argumentiert, dass Zivilizierung Welt Ordnung durch Transnationale Norm-bildung Netzwerke (TNNs) sollte die Legitimität und Effizienz der Europäischen Union supranationalen Ordnung haben. In diesem Zusammenhang den Begriff der Dezentrierung (supra: Zentralisierung und Infra: Dezentralisierung) wurde die Verknüpfung von Voice-(demokratischer Beteiligung) und Berechtigung/Verpflichtung (hinsichtlich sozialer und rechtlicher Rechten und Pflichten) umfasst untersucht. In dieser Studie als Methodik veröffentlicht sekundäre Daten und Online-Ressourcen wurden verwendet, um die Hypothese zu stärken.

Stichwort: *TNN, ZWO, Legitimität, Effektivität, Souveränität*

PËRMBLEDHJE

A mund të ketë një rendi botëror të që është krijuar nga Ekuivalentet me modelin mbikombëtare të Evropës me të njëjtin legjitimitet dhe me të njëjtin efektivitet? Në këtë studim është argumentuar se Civilizues së Rendit Botëror sipas Rrjetave Norm-ndertuese Ndërkombëtare duhet të kenë legjitimitetin dhe efektivitetin e rendit të Bashkimit Evropian që është mbikombëtare. Në këtë shikim, nocioni i decentrimit (supra: centralizimi dhe infra: decentralizimi) e cila përfshin lidhjen e zërit (pjesëmarrje demokratike) dhe e drejta (të drejtat ligjore – sociale dhe detyrat) janë shqyrtuar. Në këtë studim si metodologji janë përdorur dhënat të publikuara dhe burimet linjore në mënyrë që të përforcoj hipotezën.

Fjalëkyçe: *RNN, CRB, Legjitimitet, Efektivitet, Sovranitet*

---

* Mr. Armando Aliu is a postgraduate Scholar at Heidelberg University (Heidelberg, Germany). He is an independent investigator at Max-Planck-Institute for Comparative Public Law and International Law in Heidelberg. He holds an M.A. degree in European Studies from Hamburg University and Akdeniz University. He is the Co-Principal Investigator (CPI) of "*The National Hybridity Project: Innovative Governance, Judicial and Sociological Approaches in Turkey.*" E-mail: <Aliu@stud.uni-heidelberg.de>.

** Mr. Dorian Aliu holds a B.A. degree from Uludağ University and an M.B.A. degree from Akdeniz University. He is the Co-Principal Investigator (CPI) of "*The National Hybridity Project: Innovative Governance, Judicial and Sociological Approaches in Turkey*." E-mail: <dorianaliu@albaniaonline.com>.

INTRODUCTION

Transnational Norm-building Networks (TNNs) influence the power of political, economic and social structures at a global level. After the global financial crisis in 2008, non-state actors understood the huge multidimensional changes in the world. Many paradigms such as; colonialism, emperialism and so forth lost their meanings and forces. The last paradigm 'globalization' which is the most important propellent power of capitalism ideology is in a transformation process. This process will allow the restructuring of the nation-states in this post-modern century. Therefore, the supporters of capitalism are sceptic about recent developments in the world.

World trade flows and economic relations among the triangle which is composed of the USA, the European Union and the East Asian Countries (China, India, and Japan) created regional powers and raised the number of transnational actors. In the past, the USA was the superpower and the most important transnational actor. The created norm-building networks by the USA had the most effective role in the world. However, regionalization and the rise of new regional powers have created a new multipolar world. This world seems to be more civilized than ever before.

There is a serious threat that exists against sovereignty. Sovereign nation-states are forced to choose a side where they are creating their political, economic, social and cultural relations and operations and therefore regionalism ruined the center-base world order. These new structurings increased the level of competitiveness among regional powers and nation-states needed to think '*strategic deepness*' (Davutoğlu, 2001) of theirselves. Today, there are a lot of sovereign states which want to make improvement on relations with regional powers via international agreements.

The enlargement policy of the European Union has increased the number of the member states and sovereignty has become a problematic factor for the new member states. The decisions which are legaly binding of the European Commission are obligations for the new members in order to implement at supranational level. Therefore, shifting of sovereignty on the one hand strengthen the EU in different aspects. On the other, nation-states are weakened with shifting sovereignty because they lose the rights that contain sovereignty.

Transnational Norm-building Networks affect the sovereignty of states because nation-states transfer their parts to non-state actors. This is not a hybrid structure (Anheier and Siebel 1990; Anheier and Toepler 1999; Evers 2005; Mückenberger 2008; Bills 2010; Aliu 2011; Herrmann 2011; Aliu 2012; Aliu 2013) in which both state and non-state actors are involved; conversely, this is a structure that covers only non-state actors. Initially, these actors will take into consideration their interest. The nation-states might achieve short-term gains with privatization policies; however, the long-term gains will not be beneficial for states. As a result of the privatization policy, many states that performed the IMF economic programs confront serious problems. The states always should be the highest authority for attaining incremental economic development. States should take care of the people who are living in, and should hear the voice of all citizens (i.e. both collective and individual).

Sovereignty and democratic legitimacy are two main factors for balancing the governance of states. In a way, this balance should be created at national level. The progressive undermining of national sovereignty should necessitate the founding and expansion of political institutions on the supranational level. Therefore, the European Union supranational order should supervise non-state actors more effectively and should enhance democratic legitimacy at transnational level.

At transnational level, decentration (according to some scientist denationalization) which is against the existance of a center emerges at global governance level. In this framework, there is a prerequisite of a center and we may call this center – the state, to which voice will be addressed and that can effectively grant entitlement. Likewise, the voice and entitlement nexus (under conditions of the prevailing nation-state) can guarantee the legitimacy and effectiveness of norm-building and norm implementation. With this we assume that legitimacy and effectiveness at the EU supranational level can be achieved with civilizing global order by the TNNs within the EU.

1.1. The Concepts of International, Supranational and Transnational[1]

International, supranational and transnational terms should be respectively distinguished and assessed in order to understand them more precisely.

International means a mode of interaction between sovereign states. International Labor Organization (ILO), World Trade Organization (WTO), World Health Organization (WHO) and so forth, all of these are organizations which exist between sovereign states. All decisions that are taken by sovereign states are in the context of international law or international regulations.

Supranational means parts of sovereignty of states have been shifted to an agent which is another actor beyond the state. The only supranational case which is unique in the world is the European Union. Supranationalism in the European Union is a real and exceptional case. The European Union may pass regulations which are immediately binding in the member states. This is a clear inequivalent of shift of sovereignty because this restricts sovereignty rights of the member states. The supranational agent has part of sovereignty shifted from the member states.

Zürn argued that supranationality refers to a certain degree of autonomy of the international institutions vis-à-vis the nation-states involved. International norms are thus given a certain priority over national regulations. The European Court of Justice is the best example of a supranational component within the overall institutional concept of the EU (Zürn, 2004, p.270). There is also an important point that many scholars are discussing – the comparison of the European Court of Justice and the International Court of Justice.

ECJ is a supranational institution of the EU like the Commission and the Parliament. However, the ICJ is a principle organ of the United Nations. The main question which should be addressed to the ICJ is how legitimate and effective are the cases that announced by the Court in Hague. There is a factor that affects the Court advisory decisions – politicization. Nevertheless, we can say that the ECJ Cases of the EU are legitimate and legally binding for the member states of the European Union.

Transnational means that not only states collaborate on cross-border level but either other actors collaborate. For instance; enterprises operate transnationally cross-border and/or civil societies, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), Lobby Groups are called transnational as well. According to Oxford English dictionary we can make a general definition of transnational networks with combining the terms as connections of actors who build standards for actors with a given identity in a multinational level.

---

[1] These explanations are compiled from an in-depth interview and discussion with Prof. Dr. Ulrich Mückenberger (Bremen University) on 22-26 October 2010.

Mückenberger provided a comprehensive conceptual definition of Transnational Norm-building Networks. According to this definition TNNs are; *"purposeful connections of current or formerly novel actor constellations between and within politics, economy and civil society. These purposeful connections are to be regarded as being linked to decentration, are not primarily governmental, reach beyond the nation-state level toward the supra- or intranational, and show a certain longevity. They attempt to set up and standardise behavioral imperatives, norms and/or conventions in their particular field that either reduce the transaction costs among the parties involved and/or are supposed to bind outsiders who are not involved. With the help of these norms, transnational nexus comparable to the nation-state voice-entitlement nexus challenged by decentration may be reconstructed"* (Mückenberger, 2008, p.23). Mückenberger explained all of these with extending the meaning in his study. In this context, analyzing the relationships of governance types and linking these with the current governance development will be beneficial.

1.2. Type and Grade of Institutionalization in Transnational Norm-building Networks

According to the mode of institutionalization, there are three types of governance; 'governance by governments', 'governance with governments' and 'governance without governments'.

Table 1: Governance by/with/without Government(s)

Type of Governance	Mode of Institutionalization	Norm Building	Norm Implementing
Governance by government(s)	International/governmental cooperation	Without self-organization	Via nation-states
Governance with government(s)	Global policy networks	With self-organization	With nation-states
Governance without government(s)	Transnational network organizations	Via self-organization	Without nation-states

Source: Mückenberger, 2008, p.27

Table 1 illustrates the types of governance with comparing modes of institutionalization and how can norms be built and implemented. At the level of *governance by governments*, states are presented by their own governments. The governments of states might create international global relations with other sovereign states or international organizations. This type of governance does not let non-state actors to build norms and it exists only on nation-state level. Classical nation-state model still exists and norms can be built without self-organization.

Governance with governments means among others also governments take place, however there are also civil society actors, commercial actors etc. ISO 26000 is a typical structure of governance with governments. ISO 26000 processes is made by national organizations which help for standardization. In spite of the fact that these organizations are private organizations, in France these organizations are public actors. Furthermore, in Germany, standardization organization is a private enterprise which had been endowed and given to public powers by the state with a contract. These kinds of structures are called 'Hybrid'. Hybrids are typically related to Governance with Governments because public actors and private actors are equally participating.

With 'Hybrid Model', states are embedded with non-state actors in actor constellations in which they do not act on the basis of sovereignty, but of equal order, and at least of the plurality of opinion development processes. This is the reason why many cases of hybrid development situated among that which is categorised as sovereign within the state and that

which is categorised as pertaining to private law (Mückenberger, 2008, p.28). Therefore, distinguishing these cases is very complicated because these can become an amalgam which is not only a part of private law but also it is a part of public law. Hence, the argument which should be considered is 'how can the nexus of voice and entitlement on the one hand and legitimacy and effectiveness on the other can be clarified in the context of these hybrid complex structures?

In governance without government perspective, this is entirely about transnational norm-building networks. At this level nation-states transfer their parts of norm-building to non-state actors. In this framework, privatization is a key term to be considered. TNNs affect the sovereignty of states because norm-building is made via self-organization and norm-implementing is made without nation-states. This is a huge challenge in the new century because the concept of sovereignty is degenerated.

Hudson discussed this challenge that non-state actors or sovereignty-free actors influence deeply the inter-state system's monopoly of authority. Some commentators assessed a powershift from state to non-state actors, as sovereignty-free actors link up and operate across state borders as part of transnational networks (Hudson, 2001, p.334). We can assume that the current transformation of governance for political concepts such as authority, sovereignty, and democratic legitimacy is to balance the tendency toward theoretical complexity with the need for simplicity to avoid replicating the multidimensional and multicausal nature of current world politics (Dingwerth and Pattberg, 2006, p.200).

1.3. Globalization, Sovereignty and Nation-State

Anthony Giddens defined globalization as "*the intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa. This is a dialectical process because such local happenings may move in an obverse direction from the very distanciated relations that shape them*" (Giddens, 1990, p.64). Seeking the meaning of globalization depends on consideration of many factors/indicators.

For understanding of globalization, Hamburg University Professor Jürgen Hoffmann specified the factors that are listed as follows; development of trade, development of foreign direct investment (FDI), development of international financial markets, development of international production networks and competing nation-states (the losing of sovereignty). According to Hoffmann *ambivalence* which mean the state of having mixed feelings or contradictory ideas is other factor which should be considered in order to analyze the theory of globalization. Additionally, globalization is also related to cross-border transactions.

Cross-border transactions consist of the operations and policies of specific subcomponents of the state and private non-state actors. These are transactions that cut across the private-public divide and across national borders in that they concern the standards and regulations imposed on firms and markets operating globally. In so doing these transactions push toward convergence at the level of national regulations and law aimed at creating the requisite conditions for globalization (Sassen, 2006, p.264).

Currency competition is shaping trade relations at national and international level. BRIC states which are Brazil, Russia India and China are in development process and this process reinforces the reconstruction of world economic networks. BRIC states are creating new markets in various regions and they are signing trade agreements with sovereign states. On the other side, high income countries had already created many trade agreements via international financial institutions and they are still keeping on their hand the largest part of markets.

Trade agreements and activities of the international financial institutions (the WTO, the World Bank and the IMF) have generated controversy and political struggle, because while their benefits to business are clear, their costs are borne heavily by workers forced to compete in a global job market. Thus, globalization and trade agreements strengthen the political as well as the economic power of the corporate community, in part because they shift decision – making authority from democratic polities to bankers and technocrats who more reliably serve the transnational corporate interest (Herman and Chomsky, 1988, p.xlii). These inter-relations imbalanced the economic developments of states and increased the importance of non-state actors. After the financial crisis in 2008 the efforts of the international financial institutions were inadequate. For instance, the USA made some mistakes about rescuing global firms instead of supporting and rescuing mortgage victims deliberately.

The globalization of commerce, economic production and finance, the spread of technology and weapons poses problems that can not be solved within the framework of nation-states or by the traditional method of agreements between sovereign states. Therefore, the progressive undermining of national sovereignty should necessitate the founding and expansion of political institutions on the supranational level, a process whose beginnings can already be observed (Habermas, 1998, p.398). In this context, the European Union should continue being an effective supranational power in the world. The EU enlargement process and integration of other countries to the EU will improve this objective. Actually, this will affect sovereignty of the member states. For the evaluation of effects, we will argue conceptual expansion of sovereignty.

There are two types of sovereignty; pooled and delegated. Pooled sovereignty means the governments aim to make future decisions by majority within the context of an international institution. Delegated sovereignty means supranational actors are authorized to make certain decisions themselves, regardless of inter-state objections or unilateral vetos" (Zürn, 2004, p.270). The epistemological embeddedness of sovereignty is not just about how the world is, which means how the plausible claim to sovereignty can generate a self-fulfilling complex of institutional facts which order the world in accordance with that claim. It is about how it ought to be, which means something more has to be said about the normative case for sovereignty and for the constitutional pluralism which in an age of multidimensionality sovereignty anchors (Walker, 2003, p.31).

The shifting of the sovereignty in the EU is a dilemma because national constitutions of the member states still exsist. Therefore, in many ECJ cases sovereignty is a very delicate factor which should be taken into consideration seriously. There is also a significant correlation between sovereignty and nation-state model. To be more precise, sovereignty symbolizes the image of nation-state model.

The historical success of the nation-state is due in large part to the advantages of the modern state apparatus as such. Evidently, the territorial state, with its monopoly on the legitimate use of violence and its differentiated administrative apparatus financed by taxation, was better able to cope with the functional imperatives of social, cultural, and economic modernization than older political formations. For our purposes it will suffice to recall the '*ideal-typical model*' worked out by Karl Marx and Max Weber (Habermas, 1998, p.399). The theory of Karl Marx is objectivism. Max Weber's theory is subjectivism. Anthony Giddens threw out the "Theory of Structuration" which was an interaction of objectivism and subjectivism.

A state is sovereign only if it can both maintain law and order internally and protect its borders against external threats. The status of a subject of international law is contingent on achieving international recognition as an "equal" and "independent" member of the system of

states. Internal sovereignty presupposes the ability to maintain law and order, external sovereignty the ability to assert oneself in the "anarchistic" competition for power among states (Habermas, 1998, p.400). This is also one of the most effective factors that are tested in our research. Additionally, it should be noted that equality and independency are criticized by many scholars. These can be analyzed at supranational and transnational levels. Equality and independency are also about how are respecting from a moral perspective supranational and transnational actors each other.

From the point of view of traditional state theories, the delegation of decision-making authority to supranational institutions and non-state, transnational actors should lead to resistance on the part of national governments or the national executives, who one would expect to be reluctant to lose their sovereignty (Zürn, 2004, p.283).

The interaction between states and non-state actors composes the core part of our argument. Of course, to understand the main structure of these inter-relations and trans-relations, first I wish to mention about the revised concept of civil society. As proposed by Cohen and Arato or Habermas – differs from the traditional concept which was proposed by John Locke and Alexis-Charles-Henri Clérel de Tocqueville in one fundamental respect. The latter had conceived civil society within the dichotomy 'civil society – state'. As against that, the former replaced the old dichotomy with a new triangle 'state – economy – civil society'. We can also improve this triangle as; state – economy – civil society => power (politics) – money (economics) – communication (life world).

Economy is dealt with as a subsystem – whereas civil society remains a sphere which is controlled by discursive rationality and voice rather than by media power and money. The problem with Tocqueville's argument is that the human competence, and capacity of participating and building associations is from both a quantitative and a qualitative point of view limited (Boulin and Mückenberger, 2005, p.444). Transnational Norm-building Networks have effective roles at building norms and norm implementation. Thus, norms with full respect to democratic legitimacy include voice (democratic participation) and entitlement (obligations – legal and social rights, duties) and the nexus of them. These refer to a center as we call 'the state'.

1.4. The Nexus of Voice and Entitlement and Civilizing World Order

The nexus of voice and entitlement constitutes a founding element of an emerging worldwide polity, under conditions where a world society cannot be imagined. This nexus is crucial to the quest of civilizing globalization, which we understand as governing globalization by means of democratically legitimate and effective rules. Furthermore, non-governmental actors (business as well as non-profit actors and organizations) are networking (with governmental actors) with the aim of civilizing globalization (Mückenberger and Jastram, 2010, p.236). In this framework, there is a requirement of a center (the state) as we mentioned already above, to which voice will be addressed and which can effectively grant entitlement. Likewise, an assumption is that legitimacy and effectiveness at the EU supranational level can be achieved with civilizing global order by the TNNs within the EU.

Social scientists have long given lip service to the presumption that social systems cannot persist without a sheltering canopy of shared values and norms. But we are still far from an adequate understanding of the values and norms that transcend national social systems and legitimate the larger world order. Karl Polanyi and Albert O. Hirschman wrote books that help to show us the way (Wuthnow, 1979, p.424). Polanyi's book which is entitled 'The Great Transformation' indicates how capitalism disembedded. Initially, we should understand Thomas Samuel Kuhn supported Polanyi with his ideas. His famous book 'The Structure of

Scientific Revolutions' examined paradigm models and understanding the deepness of paradigms from a theoretical perspective.

TNNs may be seen as being paradigmatic that focuses on the voice and entitlement nexus under conditions of decentration (Mückenberger, 2008, p.7). The descriptions of these terms were provided by Albert O. Hirschman – Harvard University Professor. In his popular book 'Exit, Voice and Loyalty' he specified the definition of 'Exit' and 'Voice'.

According to Hirschman 'Exit' and 'Voice' were defined as two contrasting responses of actors to what they sense as deterioration in the quality of the goods they buy or the services and benefits they receive. Exit is the act of simply leaving. Indirectly and unintentionally exit can cause the deteriorating organization to improve its performance. Voice is the act of complaining or of organizing to complain or to protest, with the intent of achieving directly a recuperation of the quality that has been impaired. The recurring theme of his book was the assertion that there is no preestablished harmony between exit and voice. Contrariwise, they often work at cross-purposes and tend to undermine each other, in particular with exit undermining voice (Hirschman, 1993, p.175-176). Hirschman enlightened us with his arguments from social sciences perspective and this is the best starting point to analyze exit and voice.

According to John Locke, the voluntary and consensual building of the state – "voice" had been linked from the very beginning to the securing of "properties" - "entitlement" (Mückenberger, 2008, p.10). This linkage is very important because there appears the nexus between participation democratically and duties, legal-social rights. Therefore, this nexus shows that governing globalization requires voice-entitlement interaction in order to create democratically legitimate and effective rules at the EU supranational level. Conceptually, all of these discussions refer to the Civilizing World Order.

The term of "Civilizing the World (Global) Order" refers to Karl Polanyi (1944- *The Great Transformation* – his well-known book). In his book Polanyi developed several new concepts, including fictitious commodities and the embedded economy that led in new directions. Likewise, Polanyi glimpses the concept of the always embedded market economy (Block, 2003, p.275). The logical starting point for explaining Polanyi's thinking is his concept of embeddedness. The term "embeddedness" expresses the idea that the economy is not autonomous, as it must be in economic theory, but subordinated to politics, religion, and social relations. Polanyi's use of the term suggests more than the now familiar idea that market transactions depend on trust, mutual understanding, and legal enforcement of contracts (Polanyi, 2001, p.xxiii-xxiv). Polanyi said that the classical economists wanted to create a society in which the economy had been effectively disembedded, and they encouraged politicians to pursue this objective (p.xxiv).

As he writes at the beginning of his first chapter: "*Our thesis is that the idea of a self-adjusting market implied a stark utopia. Such an institution could not exist for any length of time without annihilating the human and natural substance of society. It would have physically destroyed man and transformed his surroundings into a wilderness*" (Polanyi, 2001, p.3). Polanyi pointed to one very strong generalization regarding the state-market dialectics. He referred to the 'double movement' of market expansion and political interventionism in defence of society. This implied a restoration of 'moral society', which Polanyi thought he could see in pre-market society and which he contrasted to materialist self-interest: 'The true criticism of market society is not that it was based on economics – in a sense, every and any society must be based on it - but that its economy was based on self-interest' (Hettne, 2004, p.2).

Competition conditions pushed people to act only for achieving their self-interest-oriented achievements and this ctreated-situation of course is about post-modernism and historical materialism. Self-interest-oriented and materialist approach can be analyzed at both macro and micro levels. This is the main point of the antipodal idea - 'a new world order' which means governing globalization for a unipolar world. What falsified this argument was that the moral values and human rights should be in harmony in order to civilize globalization. In the case of financial crisis in 2008 many banks bankrupted and in the EU this financial crisis was widely spreaded. Greece, Spain and Portugal declared budget deficit. The most dramatical scenes were seen at the case of Greece.

Many Anglo-American global firms and economists made a lot of speculations about Greece and then the state turned to a battle area where demonstrations, crimes and assaults etc were. At this point, on my point of view, scientific world needs many other paradigms for supporting the civilizing global order. The rising of new regional powers brought 'multipolarity' however self-interest thinker capitalist states still exist in the world. In this context, to support the workers' rights in the EU and for prevention from possible financial crisis syndicates, non-governmental actors and civil society organizations should be more active. We can call this as a process of transformation.

The Great Transformation centers on an analysis of Karl Polanyi's shifting relation to the Marxist tradition. Polanyi had his second encounter with Marxism in which he developed his own Hegelianized Marxist position that had distinct commonalities to arguments developed by Lukacs in "History and Class Consciousness" (Block, 2003, p.276). Polanyi's position can be understood in relation to the tradition of Western Marxism. The key figures of this tradition were Continental European thinkers including Georg Lukacs, Karl Korsch, Antonio Gramsci, Walter Benjamin, and the writers of the Frankfurt School in Germany. There were important figures in the United States who belong to this tradition, including Kenneth Burke, Sidney Hook, and the Caribbean theorist C. L. R. James (p.278).

Concept of 'world order' is commonly used both positively and normatively; describe the actually existing order or desirable models (i.e. ideal-typical models). A non-normative definition of world order can be with taking into consideration of structure, mode of governance, and form of legitimization. Structure is the way the units of the system are related. Mode of governance refers to avenues of influence on desicion-making and policy making. Legitimization is the basis on which the system is made acceptable to the constituent units. In terms of legitimization, there is a declining scale from the universally accepted rule of international law, over hegemony, exercized by one great power, to dominance, relying on coercion and preemption in the service of 'national interest'(Hettne, 2004, p.8).

Theoretically, a democratically civilized global order requires that decisions made at the global level regarding rights and duties need to be more strongly linked to the desires and voice of those affected by these rights and duties. Practically, the validation, encouragement, and support of civil society actors and networks that are striving at the transnational level for universal regulations regarding rights and duties and their implementation; and, second, the linking of such non-state norm-building networks with national and international state entities that are democratically legitimate (Jakobeit, Kappel and Mückenberger, 2010, p.5). These are extended below.

1.5. Legitimacy and Effectiveness

The globalization-driven norm-building and integration processes exhibit two fundamental problems. The citizens affected no longer perceive them as being traceable to their desires and their voice, and they thus lack democratic legitimacy. Additionally, they do not measure up to expectations in terms of their reach and practical implementation, and are thus lacking in practical effectiveness (Jakobeit, Kappel and Mückenberger, 2010, p.4). Legitimacy and effectiveness are two crucial impact factors that illustrate at which level and how norm-building processes are functioning.

Legitimacy is taken in principle from an a priori point of view. According to Max Weber's terminology it is '*wertorientiert*', oriented by values, not '*zweckorientiert*', oriented by aims (La Torre, 2002, p.64). There are two sides to the concept of 'legitimacy'. From a normative perspective it refers to the validity of political decisions and political orders and their claim to legitimacy. From a descriptive perspective, in contrast, the focus is on the societal acceptance of political decisions and political orders as well as the belief of the subjects of rule in legitimacy (Zürn, 2004, p.260).

The term effectiveness refers to "norm compliance". This does not necessarily have to do with their legal character and the existence of sanctions. Compliance for moral or even purely economic reasons may in some cases be more effective. However, if morals lose their uniformity and their effectiveness when economic reasons provide arguments for as well as against compliance, the legal character with sanctions may become necessary (Mückenberger, 2008, p.38).

Supranationalization in the European Union enhances national legitimacy in functional, political and administrative terms. It helps member states to produce outputs they otherwise could not and by embedding within national political and administrative systems legally enforceable obligations to respect the interests of actors whose voice is excluded or muffled (de jure or de facto) within purely national political processes (Menon and Weatherill, 2008, p.397).

Without an improvement of the legitimacy of decision-making processes, i.e. the incorporation of affected societal actors into the decision-making process, there is a danger that the effectiveness of international institutions will weaken. In order to avoid an acceptance crisis, and consequently an effectiveness crisis, it therefore appears that some kind of societally backed multilateralism with full multimedia coverage is necessary to save multilateralism by putting an end to executive exclusiveness (Zürn, 2004, p.286). Multilateralism has different aspects; for instance, incorporation of non-state actors can create distance among transnational norm-building actors. This distance decelerates the civilizing globalization and creates obstacles in front of legitimacy and effeveness processes. The created-situations also uncover inadequacies.

Most commentators agree that the democratic legitimacy of international institutions is clearly inadequate. There are claims which say the EU and other international institutions cannot meet the social prerequisites for democracy. In this view, democratic legitimacy is only possible within the framework of demos – i.e. a political community with some sense of common identity (Zürn and Checkel, 2005, p.1074).

Transnational legitimacy, rooted in a perspective that takes full account of the contribution of the EU law to legitimacy provided at both state and European level. Actually, it is a method for accepting that legitimation comes from both levels; however, the very process of integration, by confining state choices while not assuming their replacement at European

level, changes the balance between public and private power (Menon and Weatherill, 2008, p.409).

The EU supranational agents such as the European Court of Justice and the European Commission do have almost a monopoly in interpreting given norms and rules. To the extent that norm interpretation also involves an element of rule setting, European institutions have the power to decide against the will of a given state. Does the functioning of international institutions such as the EU, but also the World Trade Organization (WTO) and other organizations, still meet democratic standards? (Zürn and Checkel, 2005, p.1073). In this context, the European Union has to do a lot for improvement of democratic standards and to contribute with full legitimacy and effectiveness at transnational level.

1.6. The Triangle (US, EU and East Asian Countries) and Civilized Global Order

There are three major differences between the EU and the USA as regards external relations: First is the EU prefers long term multidimensional, horizontal, institutional arrangements, whereas the USA prefers more temporary 'coalitions of the willing' under its own leadership. The second difference is Europeans prefer to live in the ideal world of 'permanent peace' of Immanuel Kant, whereas the Americans live in the real world of Thomas Hobbes. Third is the US religious approach to foreign policy, whereas the European approach is supposed to be rationalist and secular. Europe has a tradition of making a political analysis of conflict, pragmatically looking for compromises (Hettne, 2004, p.13).

These major differences indicate that they are completely different from each other. People in the European Union are accustomed to behave collectively, whereas the people in the USA are accustomed to act individually. On our point of view, this individuality can be called 'singularity'. Singularity is the reason of self-interest, singular development, monopolity, unipolarity and so on. The civilizing globalization will help transforming all of these notions because the European Union has adequate accumulated scientific and philosophical knowledge to realize this grand radical reformation.

German scientist Jürgen Habermas claimed that individual nation-states find themselves compelled to form regional alliances or at any rate forms of closer cooperation (APEC, ASEAN, NAFTA, AU, ECOWAS, etc.). Habermas argued that the nation-states must grow beyond intergovernmental forms of cooperation if they are at the transnational level to assume the role of carriers of global domestic politics and deliver the democratic legitimacy for their transnational agreements (Habermas, 2007, p.337).

The US and the EU have bilateral relations. Transregional links within the Triad are constituted by APEC and by the Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM), as well as various transatlantic agreements linking the US and Europe. Relations between the EU and Mercosur and between the EU and the grouping of African, Caribbean and Pacific countries further extend the global web that has the EU at its center. There is thus a clear pattern in the EU's external policy, namely, to shape the world order in accordance with Europe's experience of solving conflicts through respect for 'the other', dialogue, multilateralism based on international law, and institutionalized relations (Hettne, 2005, p.563).

Civilization in this context means governing globalization with democratically legitimate and effective rules. Voice-entitlement nexus, in this context, means a simplified but basic condition of a democratically legitimate and effective mechanism for norm-building and norm implementation which can be thought of as a worldwide policy (Mückenberger, 2008, p.40).

By civilization one can quite simply mean the supreme level of aggregation for a complex but nonetheless uniform cultural identity. In Europe it was possible to combine this macrocultural complex with a decentralized political order (Hettne, 2005, p.565). Civilization will provide a globalization mentality which contains democratically legitimate and effective rules.

Trubek, Mosher and Rothstein argued that prospects for an effective and sustainable system of transnational multi-level regulation are greater when regional integration pacts such as the EU create transnational norms (Trubek, Mosher and Rothstein, 2000, p.1189). When we consider networks at transnational level we should specify that networks are voluntary and horizontal, actors participate in them to the degree that they perceive mutual learning, respect and benefits.

Modern networks are not conveyor belts of liberal ideals, but vehicles for communicative and political exchange, with the potential for mutual transformation of participants (Keck and Sikkink, 1999, p.100). As a consequence, the alternative world orders will not appear in their pure 'ideal' form, but rather in various hybrid forms. One form of world order could be the notion of a 'neo-Westphalian order', governed either by a reconstituted UN system, the major powers of the world have a strong influence; another alternative would be a more loosely organised global 'concert' of great powers and the marginalization of the UN. The relevant powers in both models will be the regional powers of the world. Regionalism will suffer from imposed or hegemonic regionalism, and the regions as such will be far from the ideal of security communities. It will thus be a multipolar and plurilateral world, but the concert model will be lacking in legitimacy (Hettne, 2005, p.562).

CONCLUSION

'All that is real is rational, and all that is rational is real'. This sentence of Hegel is a clue for thinking for a Civilized Order. We fully agree with the philosophy of Hegel and wish to add that the world which we are creating is the world where we live. In sum, all explanations and arguments that we take up above illustrate and underline the fact that 'the world is changing extremely fast multidimensionally'. However, the fundamental ideas are stable and these ideas are very effective at shaping the future world.

In this study, the European Union role as a supranational and transnational actor was highlighted and argued as a fundamental issue in great transformation process. The answer of the question which we posed at the beginning of the research is positive. Yes, that can be a world order shaped by equivalents in the framework of supranational model of Europe with the same legitimacy and with the same effectiveness. This world can be fairer not only for their citizens but also for the minorities, migrants and the others. This is a civilized world where people can defend their rights and freedoms. This is a civilized world where people can participate democratically and where they are represented equitably and effectively.

Civilizing World Order by Transnational Norm-Building Networks (TNNs) should have the legitimacy and effectiveness of the European Union supranational order because this strengthens the role and image of the EU and of the institutions of EU. Likewise, the nexus of voice – entitlement and the linkage with legitimacy – effectiveness bring an active Civilized World with multi-actors at transnational level.

To achive a more Civilized World, non-governmental actors should effectively attach considerable attention to networking with governmental actors with the aim of civilizing globalization. Moreover, governing globalization requires voice-entitlement interaction in

order to create democratically legitimate and effective rules at the EU supranational level so that voice and entitlement will be more strongly.

Multilateralism, regionalization and multipolarity are very effective at strengthening of new powers in the world. Monopol powers are oligopolized and these balance global powers with rising competitiveness level both international and transnational level. Therefore, Hybrids in various countries are proliferating. It seems that the cooperation between nation-state actors and non-state actors will continue in a stronger hybrid form. There is a fact that in this age binary relations are becoming more advantageous both for state actors and non-state actors. Thus hybridity at multilevel governance is indispensable because of the incline trend of reciprocal collaboration need among state and non-state actors and more importantly putting these relationships into well structured sovereign bases.

REFERENCES

Aliu, A. (2011). 'Proyección y Planificación Estratégica en la Industria Turística: Enfoque comparativo y Modelo Híbrido.' *Estudios y Perspectivas en Turismo*, **20**(6): 1324-1344.

Aliu, A. (2012). 'International Migration and the European Union Relations in the Context of a Comparison of Western Balkans and North African Countries: Controlling Migration and Hybrid Model.' *MPRA Paper No. 41102*, Ludwig Maximilians Universität München, Retrieved from: <http://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/41102/>.

Aliu, A. (2013). 'The Theory of Interhybridity: Socio-political Dimensions and Migration Experiences of Post-communist Western Balkan States.' *MPRA Paper No. 44056*, Ludwig Maximilians Universität München, Retrieved from: <http://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/44056/>.

Anheier, H. K. and Seibel, W. (Eds.) (1990). The Third Sector: Comparative Studies of Nonprofit Organisations. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Anheier, H. K. and Toepler, S. (Eds.) (1999). Private Funds, Public Purpose: Philanthropic Foundations in International Perspective. New York: Kluwer.

Bills, D. (Ed.) (2010). Hybrid Organisations and the Third Sector: Challenges for Practice, Theory and Policy. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Block, F. (2003). 'Karl Polanyi and the Writing of the Great Transformation.' *Theory and Society*, **32** (3): 275-306.

Boulin, J. Y., and Mückenberger, U. (2005). 'Is the Societal Dialogue at the Local Level the Future of Social Dialogue?' *European Review of Labour and Research*, **11** (3): 439-448.

Davutoğlu, A. (2001). Stratejik Derinlik: Türkiye'nin Uluslararası Konumu. İstanbul: Küre Yayınları.

Dingwerth, K., and Pattberg, P. (2006). 'Global Governance as a Perspective on World Politics.' *Global Governance*, **12**: 185-203.

Evers, A. (2005). 'Mixed Welfare Systems and Hybrid Organisations: Changes in the Governance and Provision of Social Services.' *International Journal of Public Administration*, **28**(9/10): 737-748.

Giddens, A. (1990). The Consequences of Modernity. (1st ed.) Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Habermas, J. (2007). 'A Political Constitution For the Pluralist World Society?' Journal *of Chinese Philosophy*, **34** (3): 331-343.

Habermas, J. (1998). 'The European Nation-State: On the Past and Future of Sovereignty and Citizenship.' Translated by: Ciaran Cronin, Public Culture, **10** (2): 397-416.

Herman, E. S. and Chomsky, N. (1988). 'Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media.' (1st ed.) New York: Pantheon Books.

Herrmann, P. (2011). 'Multilevel Governance: Participatory Democracy and Civil Society's Role in Governance in the Perspective of the Lisbon Treaty.' *Current Politics and Economics of Europe*, **22**(1): 27-42.

Hettne, B. (2005). 'Beyond the "New" Regionalism.' *New Political Economy*, **10** (4): 543-571.

Hettne, B. (2004). 'Karl Polanyi and the Search for World Order.' *Karl Polanyi Institute of Political Economy*, Retrieved from: <http://polanyi.concordia.ca/pdfs/Hettne-2004.pdf>.

Hirschman, A. O. (1993). 'Exit, Voice, and the Fate of the German Democratic Republic: An Essay in Conceptual History.' *World Politics*, **45** (2): 173-202.

Hudson, A. (2001). 'NGOs' Transnational Advocacy Networks: from Legitimacy to Political Responsibility?' *Global Networks*, **1** (4): 331-352.

Jakobeit, C., Kappel, R., and Mückenberger, U. (2010). 'Civilizing the World Order? The Scope and Potential of Transnational Norm-building Networks.' *GIGA Working Paper Nr.1*, Retrieved from: < http://www.giga-hamburg.de/dl/download.php?d=/content/publikationen/pdf/gf_international_1001.pdf >.

Keck, M. E., and Sikkink, K. (1999). 'Transnational Advocacy Networks in International and Regional Politics.' *International Social Science Journal*, **51** (159): 89-101.

La Torre, M. (2002). 'Legitimacy for a Supranational European Political Order: Derivative, Regulatory or Deliberative.' *Ratio Juris*, **15** (1): 63-83.

Menon, A., and Weatherill, S. (2008). 'Transnational Legitimacy in a Globalising World: How the European Union Rescues its States.' *West European Politics*, **31** (3): 397-416.

Mückenberger, U. (2008). 'Civilising Globalism: Transnational Norm-Building Networks - A Research Programme.' *GIGA Working Paper Nr.90*, Retrieved from: <http://www.giga-hamburg.de/dl/download. php?d=/content/publikationen/pdf/wp90_mueckenberger .pdf >.

Mückenberger, U., and Jastram, S. (2010). 'Transnational Norm-Building Networks and the Legitimacy of Corporate Social Responsibility Standards.' *Journal of Business Ethics*, **97**: 223-239.

Oxford English Dictionary (2009). (2nd ed.) Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Polanyi, K. (2001). The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time. (2nd Beacon Paperback ed.) Boston: Beacon Press.

Sassen, S. (2006). Territory, Authority, Rights: From Medieval to Global Assemblages. (1st ed.) New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Trubek, D. M., Mosher, J., and Rothstein, J. R. (2000). 'Transnationalism in the Regulation of Labor Relations: International Regimes and Transnational Advocacy Networks.' *Law and Social Inquiry*, **25** (4): 1187-1211.

Walker, N. (Ed.) (2003). Sovereignty in Transition. (1st ed.) Oxford: Hart Publishing.

Wuthnow, R. (1979). 'Legitimating the Capitalist World Order.' *The American Journal of Sociology*, **85** (2): 424-430.

Zürn, M., and Checkel, J. T. (2005). 'Getting Socialized to Build Bridges: Constructivism and Rationalism, Europe and the Nation-State.' *International Organisation*, **59** (4): 1045-1079.

Zürn, M. (2004). 'Global Governance and Legitimacy Problems.' *Government and Opposition*, **39** (2): 260-287.