Protocol marked an important shift in the ... arrangements for dealing with global ... It overcame the usual soft approaches char... by loose and largely undefined targets and ... a regulatory framework under which coun... committed to implementing quantified targets ... reducing emissions by around 5.2 percent below ... levels from 2008 to 2012).

... long process of negotiating the Kyoto Protocol ... the difficulties of establishing governance ... in which individual countries share res... for dealing with global problems, in a ... characterized by inequity between South and ... and strong political economy implications ... developed countries. Its proponents argue that ... of negotiation might contribute to addressing ... environmental problems while alleviating ... inequities—for instance, through the clean ... mechanisms included in the Kyoto ... in which developed countries will pay for ... achieved in developing countries.

... 2000, the governments of Australia and ... States (the largest emitter of greenhouse gases) ... consistently resisted the efforts to bring into force ... binding agreement for combating global ... Initially, U.S. President George W. Bush's ... denied the existence of global warming ... of the overwhelming scientific consensus. ... second mandate, the Bush administration opted ... acknowledging the existence of anthropogenic ... change, but instead of joining the Kyoto ..., the United States is promoting bilateral ... multilateral agreements for technology transfer ... high emitting countries. In particular, a new ... known as the Asia-Pacific Partnership for Clean ... and Climate has been announced as a ... flexible (non-enforcing) and supposedly more ... effective mechanism than the Kyoto Protocol.

Global Warming and Global Action

... politics of the Kyoto Protocol illustrate the ... of power, equity, and efficiency in the ... of global governance regimes for prevent... global warming and protecting humanity from climate change. Global warming prevention and adaptation require actions with a global reach, including close cooperation between North and South, as well as national initiatives.

General consensus is that global warming must be mitigated and adapted to its already inevitable consequences. This consensus is strengthening the formation of a global governance regime for climate change policy. However, economic concerns reduce the effectiveness of this new regime. Any action has inevitable costs as well as benefits, and the right balance between short- and long-term interests is not always evident. So far, only a few countries, such as Denmark, Germany, and the United Kingdom, have been (modestly) successful in translating its aspirations into substantive reductions in emissions, and post-2012 international governance regime is a "hot" issue.

—David Manuel-Navarrete and Joseluis Samaniego

See also Climate Change; Environmental Governance; Kyoto Protocol; Sustainable Development; United Nations

Further Readings and References

Baumert, K. A., Blanchard, O., Llosa, S., & Perkaus, J. (Eds.). (2002). *Building on the Kyoto Protocol: Options for protecting the climate.* Washington, DC: World Resources Institute.

Firor, J., & Jacobsen, J. E. (2002). *The crowded greenhouse: Population, climate change, and creating a sustainable world.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Fisher, D. R. (2004). *National governance and the global climate change regime.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Kok, M., Vermeulen, W., Faaij, A., & de Jager, D. (Eds.). (2002). *Global warming and social innovation: The challenge of a climate-neutral society.* London: Earthscan.

Oreskes, N. (2004). Beyond the ivory tower: The scientific consensus on climate change. *Science, 306*(5702), 1686–1689.

Glocalization

The neologism glocalization highlights the simultaneity of both universalizing and particularizing tendencies in contemporary social, political, and economic systems. The term is used in the social sciences to challenge simplistic notions of globalization processes as linear expansions of territorial scales. Glocalization indicates that the growing importance of the continental and global levels is occurring together with the increasing salience of the local and regional levels. Tendencies toward homogeneity and centralization appear alongside tendencies toward heterogeneity and decentralization. But the term *glocalization* entails an even more radical change in perspective. It points to the simultaneity of globalizing and localizing processes, and to the interconnectedness of the global and local levels. Local spaces are shaped and local identities are created by globalized contacts as well as by local circumstances. Globalization entails neither the end of geography nor declining heterogeneity.

Glocalization is a linguistic hybrid of globalization and localization. Not surprisingly, most users of the term assume a two-level system (global and local) and point to phenomena such as hybridization as the result of growing interconnectedness. But a more specific use of the term starts with a three-level system (supranational, national, and subnational) and analyzes primarily the consequences of growing contacts among supranational and subnational actors.

Glocalization in a Two-Level System

Sociologist Roland Robertson, who has popularized the term *glocalization,* believes Japanese economists invented it to explain Japanese global marketing strategies. In the marketing context, glocalization means the creation of products or services for the global market by adapting them to local cultures. For example, in France, McDonald's replaced its familiar Ronald McDonald mascot with Asterix the Gaul, a popular French cartoon character.

Robertson rejects essentialist polarities between the global and the local, such as between economic globalization and local culture. Traditionally, local identities have been invented and nurtured mainly through contacts with others. They have been stimulated and shaped primarily by translocal interaction, comparison, and trends. There are two typical reactions and results of this interplay of global and local forces—both encourage diversity. The opportunistic reaction is the creation of hybrids. Especially in world cities where immigrants and elites must adjust to each other and maintain ties abroad, mixed cultures and identities arise. The rebellious reaction is to foster a resistance identity defending local history, traditions, and authentic cultures.

The local is fundamentally shaped by the global, but the opposite is also true. Location has never been as important for economic life as now, when free trade regimes have opened national boundaries to trade and investment. Similarly, the expanding information economy has not dispersed production and consumption across geographic space. The new economy is instead characterized by the clustering of companies in specific city-regions and by geographic concentration. The most popular examples are the financial districts in London and New York, or the Silicon Valley computer industry in the 1990s. Thus, globalization increases territorial differentiation in both cultural and economic terms. Local milieus play an important role in a networked economy and society by providing content and contextual support for innovations. Furthermore, there is leeway for local agency—there are many divergent scales and flows linking places and people. Certainly, the economy is at the forefront of glocalizing processes, but beyond the dynamics of capital accumulation, there are further motives. Culture and environment, for example, provide other focal points and perspectives for glocalized networking and innovation.

Glocalization in a Three-Level System

Glocalizing processes can also be understood in a three-level system containing subnational/local, national, and supranational/global levels. The modern political system has been fundamentally shaped by the norm of national sovereignty. National executives occupy a gatekeeper position between the international and the domestic political spheres because they are the only legitimate actors in both spheres. In this context, glocalization points to increasing transnational interactions among subnational entities from different countries and to contacts among subnational and supranational entities—both generally circumventing the national level and undermining the gatekeeper position of national executives. In political science, these phenomena have been labeled paradiplomacy or studied as multilevel governance.

That subnational political entities such as states, provinces, and cities are getting involved in international activities can be interpreted as a reaction to the socioeconomic processes of glocalization. City regions that serve as nodal points for the information and network economy are becoming disembedded from the national context because their fates depend more on their international contacts than on their national ones. Diverging interests and autonomous activities in the international field are the consequences.

There is another line of argument for explaining the stronger involvement of subnational political entities in international activities. The starting point of this line of reasoning is the assumption that transnational socioeconomic integration has strengthened the roles of national executives. To regulate socioeconomic interactions on a larger scale, national executives have successfully acquired more competencies and have managed to reduce the restrictions and controls they usually face in purely domestic political processes. From this viewpoint, the transnational activities of subnational actors are strategies to either defend autonomy and competences or to compensate for the loss of regulatory leeway using nonregulatory means of governance.

—Joachim K. Blatter

See also Antiglobalization; City-Region; Devolution; Global Civil Society; Globalization; Localization; Nongovernmental Organization; Space; Territoriality; Transnational Urbanism

Further Readings and References

Hocking, B. (1993). *Localizing foreign policy.* New York: St. Martin's.

Robertson, R. (1995). Glocalization: Time-space and homogeneity-heterogeneity. In M. Featherstone, S. Lash, & R. Robertson (Eds.), *Global modernities* (pp. 25–44). London: Sage Ltd.

Swyngedouw, E. (1997). Neither global nor local: "Glocalization" and the politics of scale. In K. R. Cox (Ed.), *Spaces of globalization: Reasserting the power of the local* (pp. 137–166). New York and London: Guilford Press.

Good Governance

There are various definitions of the term *good governance*. These definitions are based on normative assumptions about how decisions should be made within organizations and the functioning of formal and informal structures for implementing such decisions. The United Nations' Commission on Human Rights identifies transparency, responsibility, accountability, participation, and responsiveness as key attributes of good governance. By linking good governance specifically to human rights and sustainable human development, the UN explicitly recognizes that governance issues are global in nature and consequently require a more nuanced and integrated approach. The Canadian International Development Agency defines good governance as the exercise of power by an organization (or government) in an effective, equitable, honest, transparent, and accountable way. This definition is consonant with a shift among member countries of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development to respond to increasing pressure ushered in by fiscal crises, a globally coordinated economy, and dissatisfied citizens. Some of the trends that flow from this changing governance context include downsizing the public service, undertaking regulatory reforms, measuring performance, benchmarking progress, and linking more explicitly actions and outcomes. This approach to governance focuses on how organizations are directed, controlled, and shown to be acting responsibly.

Good governance is increasingly seen as essential for ensuring national prosperity by increasing the accountability, reliability, and predictability of decision making in governments, corporations, and nongovernmental organizations. Furthermore, this concept is being used in the development and management literature because "bad" governance is often identified as a root cause of social inequality, development failures, and corporate scandals.

The UN Development Program (1997) articulates eight principles of good governance. First, good governance involves equality of participation in decision making. All people, irrespective of sex, class, or race should be heard and allowed to participate in deliberations that affect them directly or indirectly. In