

ORIGINAL ARTICLES

Cooperation Among Countries Facing a Global Crisis from Public Administration's Perspective

Sjamsiar Sjamsuddin

Public Administration Department, FIA, Brawijaya University, Malang, Indonesia.

ABSTRACT

Study the problem of global crisis has been around since the '70s, the world has been reminded of the emergence of a more severe crisis than the economic crisis the world has ever happened in the 1920s. Five key variables into his study, namely population, capital investment, natural resources, fraction of capital devoted to agriculture, and pollution. At the Millennium Summit in 2000, more than 150 heads of state as members of the UN declared Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), namely world development together for a better 21st century. Togetherness is expected to reduce the crisis experienced by each State, which at its mouth to the global state of repair. In the perspective of public administration, the concept of governance has long been known as one of the grounds in the approach or perspective as well as public administrative development. Starting from this point, this paper tries to analyse one of the perspectives in public administrative science which is a governance perspective in trying to analyse the global crisis. In the phase of public administrative science perspective, cooperation among countries in facing global crisis is not only parallel in an *inter-governmental relationship* phase but it will also include the domains of *governance* concept. Discussions about globalization is actually associated with the expansion of political forms and manifestations of State individual in daily life, which now includes also the regulation of labor relations or environmental protection.

Key words: global crisis, public administration, governance, inter-governmental relationship.

Introduction

Global Crisis, which was started by environmental problems, food, all of which were rooted from economic crisis, has been a specific review in a wide range of scientific points of view (Holton, 1987; Schwartzman, 1998; Brucan, 1984; Newman, 2007; Shin, 2007; Heap, 2008). In A World Economic Forum Report: Global Risks, 2008, it was even focused specifically on the risk which the world will face in the future.

In Global Risks 2008, the Global Risk Network has focused on four emerging issues which may fundamentally shape not only the year ahead, but the decades to come. These issues - systemic financial risk, food security, supply chains and the role of energy - are all central to the functioning of the world economy and to the well-being of global society. The risks associated with them cannot be eliminated. But they can be better understood and better managed.

There has been a global crisis's problem review, since the 70's. The world actually had been reminded of the appearing of a worse crisis compared to the world economic crisis that happened in the 1920's. Several approaches have been tried to be analysed, one of which that was a primary guide around the year 70's, the appearing of the approach of the limits to Growth. 5 key variables have been the analysis, which are population, capital investment, natural resources, fraction of capital devoted to agriculture, and pollution, as if it became the trade mark for the development in many parts of the world. But unfortunately, this approach experienced obstacles in its application (Brucan, 1984). Social and political factor that were the active doers of a system, unfortunately, were ignored. "Yet these early approaches tended to ignore those variables or forces which make the world function as a system".

Then in a 2000 Millennium Summit, more than 150 state heads of United Nation members declared MDGs which stands for Millennium Development Goals which had the same goal to build a better world in this 21st century. This has also the same meaning as any other countries dealing with their political factors to overcome the world problems. This was then formulated in 8 shared goals which are expected to be realized in 2015. This togetherness is expected to be able to decline the crisis which a country experienced which root is heading to a global improvement. The shared values have then been continued with some active programs by Global Forum from 1999 in Washington to 2007 in Wina, Austria. The governance concept emerged as the primary analysis in that meeting.

In the perspective of public administration, the concept of governance has long been known as one of the grounds in the approach or perspective as well as public administrative development. Starting from this point, this paper tries to analyse one of the perspectives in public administrative science which is a governance perspective in trying to analyse the global crisis.

Results and Discussion

Public Administration's Perspective:

Their Improvements Analysis:

Intellectual improvement in the history of public administration (Gullick, 1990; Dobuzinski, 1997; Box 2005; Lanham, 2006), as well as the most current tendency in public administrative literature, which is part of public administrative intellectual revision, emerged a wide range of perspectives. Beginning with *Old Public Administration* (1855-1887) argued for its role and existence (Islamy, 2004), it was then followed by the perspective of *new public management* (during the 80's and 90's). During the 1990's, the intellectual debate toward the perspective of *new public management* came out particularly with anything regarding the citizen's position and status.

As a movement of technological administrative, some principles prioritized in the perspective of *new public management* are seen as an opposition with the values of public interest and democracy. The intellectual debates emerged an orientation alteration toward the role of citizen by the emergence of the third perspective in administrative science which is a *new public service* in which every citizen is primarily positioned and the emphasis should not have distinguished between the leading and paddling role, but more than how to set up a public institution based on integrity and response (Denhardt, 2004). As a response toward the development of governance paradigm, World international Fund such as IMF, World Bank set up an agreement comprising a series of steps to minimize the state's interference in economic problems. From this point, World Bank and UNDP started to introduce the governance concept and its variant including *good governance and good corporate governance*. This era is what is known by King and Stivers (1998) as *Anti Government Era*, a jargon describing the decreased level of public trust to government and the *governance* concept regarded as a "treatment" in healing the drawbacks existing in a bureaucracy institution.

The term "*governance*" as coined by United Nations: *is not new. It is as old as human civilization*. In an administrative literature and political science, this concept had long been known for almost 120 years since Woodrow Wilson, the 27th President of United States, introduced this field of study around 125 years ago.

However, the word governance was merely used in a political literature only in a narrow perspective (Sofian Efendi, 2005; Wagener, 2004) added with the emergence of the paradigm which separated administration and public (*The Politics-Administration Dichotomy, 1900-1926*). Dwight Waldo expressed *politics and administration. Publics do not mix each other. It must be free from value and possess economical and efficient mission*.

The governance concept then came out again in 1990's, which resulted from globalization era in which government was expected to react actively toward the positive opportunities in the existing economic and political conditions (Bovaird, T. and Loffler, E., 2001) This is caused by the governance concept stating that authority is assumed not to be arbitrarily applied, but it is a kind of consensus from the different doers. The involvement of parties which do not work/function based on government domination need the expertise from those working out of the government to form, control and obey the authorities which were collectively formed (Krina, 2003). Osborne and Gaebler (1992) defined governance as *the process by which we collectively solve problems and meet our society needs-government is the instrument that we use*.

Pieere and Guy Peters (2000) identified a number of issues and phenomenon causing the increased attention to *governance*, which was a financial crisis facing the country, ideological shift to market, globalization, country failure, the emergence of new public management, social changes and the increased complexity, *governance's* new sources and the heritage of traditionally political responsibilities.

There are 3 domains believed by the governance perspective in analysing the existing problems which comprise *government, civil society and corporate governance itself* as expressed by United nations when identifying 8 characteristics including *participatory, consensus oriented, accountable, transparent, responsive, effective and efficient, equitable and inclusive and follows the rule of law* as described as follow:



In a *governance* principle, those three domains are cooperative in criticising all problems existing. Nevertheless, in each domain, there must be a solid unity in the first place and well cooperated. This, in turn, emerges the concept of *good governance, good society and good corporate*. This means that in the intended domain none is dominating. It works in a system which completes each other. In the language of Mahbub ul Haq (1999), *No proposal can be successful unless the state and civil society act in a transparent way, are accountable for their actions, are closer to people*.

It is unfortunate fact that the domains of governance principles which include *state, private, sector and civil society* even cause a drastically decreased capacity of public institutions leading to weakness. This idea is finally prominently applied. Evans (1989) explained this as a predatory behaviour in which most natural resources were stolen by one or a group of individuals, which are *state-private sectors* (Sudjarwoto, 2007).

Due to this fact, several public senior officers, particularly when meeting in a *round table* in a global forum in Seoul Korean, 2005, proposed the idea to humanize/civilize the paradigm of *governance*, one of the officers was Mario Baggini, a minister of public administration (Italy) with his *human governance* idea. There were 4 fundamental grounds encouraging the needs of human governance which consist of:

1. The needs to create the better service of governance.
2. The needs to have more investments in technological and communication fields.
3. The needs to created better regulations.
4. The needs to have more transparent and fairer human resource trainings.

In one hand, the principles of human governance declaration were as follows:

1. **Social Accountability:** This principle must be widely applied by public administration as it does not oppose with rights and responsibilities owned by citizens to fulfil their welfare. This can come into practice in every responsibility account.
2. **Education for the Citizen:** This principle is a part of learning process. With this principle, it will enhance the sense of belonging of local, national and international framework as well as strengthen the awareness consolidation for each individual toward right and responsibilities attached to belonging sense.
3. **Equality and Freedom:** Equality and Freedom for all to get education and training in developing professionalism as well as the involvement to participate in association and active participation in democracy.
4. **Participation:** It is a chance for public administration and citizens to exchange the information and dialogues excluding the involvement of private sectors. This principle is possibly applied by public administration to encourage the establishment of democratic and well governed system.
5. **Sustainability:** It is a series of interventions which aim to develop the welfare of the citizen in accordance with his own profession. Those series of interventions are synergic and relevant to the environmental condition, local and cultural condition.
6. **Subsidiary Aid:** This principle is understandable as an aid to treat and provide services addressed to the user of the governmental administrative services.
7. **Global Competition:** It is an effort to simplify and conduct some transparency of constitution system. In addition, it also provides the optimal condition of assurance toward the gains of productivity and competence in relation to economic and social gains.
8. **Adaptive Governmental Administrative Working Performance:** Information exchange and well-serviced-practices are constantly implemented and improved, not to mention the assessment of working performance that needs developing.
9. **Reliability:** It needs a standardized service in every governmental administrative activity.

In short, the perspective of *human governance* attempts to humanize the concept of governance. A citizen becoming the integral part of *governance* domain is positioned equally with the other domains. This results from the domination of several forms of liberal democratic institutions and techno- bureaucracy which have outperformed and aligned the involvement of the citizens in making some decisions in government (Fung and Wright, 2001). However, in some literatures, we also find that the growing participation can be an entrance door for the reestablishment of the existing political and social imbalance rather than increasing the influence of low

social and economic class and marginal one in the making decision process as demanded previously (Schonwalder, 1997). Regarding that point, it needs the construction of popular democracy and accountability addressed to local government. The government on a local area will be more responsive to its citizen's demands and will in turn be more effective in implementing its public services. According to Blair (2001), either a democratic local government or not depends on accountability aspects from its selected/chosen representatives. This means that it encourages the more active roles of the citizens through their active participation of public activities. This approach is more *concerned* with the knowledge of transformation which exceeds the *public sphere* knowledge and representative democracy and opposes some limitations between *public and private* which allow the more direct forms of the democratic relationships (Gaventa and Valderrama, 1999).

Therefore, it also needs equal distribution in each local stages in the correction/remedial of its authority. Here, it finally emerges the significance of decentralized process in the area of local, regional and international scope within the government. The starting point to understand this the concept of governance more widely emerges the perspective of *Global Governance* in which the governance organization is understood no longer taking place in a social framework termed territoriality and an organized political institution within that framework, a state. A contemporary *global governance* in this 21st century is such a governance occurring in several layers, characterized by cross cutting and diffusion (Muhadi Sugiono, 2004). As a result, *Global Governance* is governing. Global Governance is doing international what government do at home (Fingkelstein, 1995).

Governance Perspective in Global Transformation:

The development of *governance perspective* with its variant, *good governance* is considered successful to decline the gap in local levels. The next emerging question is, if *good governance* manages to balance the authority distribution in a local stage, does it also apply in a global level?? Will the cooperation among countries in solving the global crisis not result in a wider and deeper gap among countries which may even emerge the more severe global crisis among them???

Ali Farazmand (2004) opened the above question in the concept of *Sound Governance* which is, at one time, a new global development in the future. He claimed that after *good governance* phase, it will be followed by the inclusion of the relationship between poor countries and modern ones through the agenda. The basic formula of *Sound Governance* is the 4 aspect/doers of five components. Four aspects have already been identified which are the establishment of political relationship inclusion, *civil society*, business and international power. The last aspect will include global cooperation, organization and international agreement while the other components include the structural reformation, process, value, policy and management (Fadilah Putra, 2009).

Conclusion:

Consequently, in the phase of public administrative science perspective, cooperation among countries in facing global crisis is not only parallel in an *inter-governmental relationship* phase but it will also include the domains of *governance* concept. This means that in the local stage, there must be correction in the other three *governance* principles, while in a global one, it needs variation of global crisis identity. This is caused by deregulation, liberalization, privatization which are synonymous to globalization (Altvater, 1986), among advanced countries, and developing ones that have different interpretations. In the context owned by developed countries, there have been different discussions regarding homogeneities of both political forms and the lost of political superiorities toward other aspects which involve the discussions concerning with the entire meaning of globalization. This is, in fact, related with the *enlargement/widening* of the country's political forms and their manifestations in individual's daily lives. This currently includes the regulation of working relationship or environmental preservation. In the context of third world countries, on the other hand, globalization has a different interpretation, which is obviously not the expansion of state's political forms (Muhadi Sugiono, 2004). As a result, the understanding of the cooperation among countries in facing global crisis seen from a *governance* perspective requires paying more attention to its superiority/strength and drawback of each country/state. By this, it means that starting the cooperation among those countries, it needs local improvement in those countries. With no balanced power among countries, it may result in more severe imbalance which may lead to a more complex global crisis.

References

- Beme Initiative Studies, 2005. *Interstate Cooperation and Migration, International Organization for Migration (IOM) and the Federal Office for Migration (FOM)*. Switzerland.
- Bovaird, T. and E. Loffer, 2001. *Emerging Trends in Public Management and Governance*. BBS Teaching and Research Review, pp: 5.

- Brucan, Silviu, 1984. *The Global Crisis, International Studies*. Quartely, 28(1): 97-109.
- Denhardt, Janer Vinzant and Robert B. Denhardt, 2007. *The New Public Serving, not Steering: Expanded edition*. M.E.Sharpe, Armonk: New York.
- Farazmand, Ali, 2007. *Sound Governance: Policy and Administrative Innovations*. Westport, Conentud: London.
- Finkelstein, Lawrence S., 1995. *What is Global Governance ?*. Global Governance, 1: 367-372.
- Global Governance, 2006. *Understanding Pathways Through Financial Crises and the Impact of the IMF*. Lynne Rienner Publisher, 1800 30th Street, Ste.314, Boulder, CO 80301, USA, 12(4).
- Heap, Petre C., 2008. *Globalization and Summit Reform: An Experiment in International Governance* International Development Research Centre. P.O.Bax 8500, ON, Canada K1G 3H9.
- Holton, R.J., 1987. *The Idea of Crisis in Modern Society*. The British Journal of Sociology, 38(4): 502-520.
- Krina P., Loina Lalolo, Agustus, 2003. *Indikator dan Alat Ukur, Prinsip akutabilitas, Transparansi and Partisipasi, Sekretariat Good Pub;ic Governance*. Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional: Jakarta.
- Mahbub Ul Haq, 1999. *Human Development in South Asia 1999: The Crisis of Governance*, Oxford University Press.
- Muhadi, Sugiono, 2004. *Globalisasi, Global Governance dan Prospek Governance di Dunia Ketiga*. disampaikan dalam seminar "Democratic Governance in Theory: Sebuah gugatan atas konsep Good Governance di Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik, Universitas Gajah Mada, Yogyakarta, 16 September 2004.
- Newman, Edward, 2007. *A Crisis of Global Institutions, Multirateralism an International Security*. Routledge, 270 Madison Ave, New York, N.Y. pp: 10016.
- Piere, Jon and Guy Peters, 2000. *Governance, Politics and the State*. Palgrave Macmillan, September.
- Schwartzman, Kathleen C., 1998. *Globalization and Democracy*. Annual Review of Sociology, 24: 159-161.
- Shin, Jang-Sup. 2007. *Global Challenges and Local Resposes: The East Asian Experience*. Routledge, 270 Madison Ave, New York, NY., pp: 10016.
- Wagner, Hans-Jurgen, 2004. *Good Governance, Welfare, and Transformation*. The European Journal of Comparative Economics, 1(1): 127-143. Available Online at <http://eaces.liuc.it>