In the current phase of globalization, ever-changing complex interconnections across the world have led to the strengthening of global sites of authority on the one side, and greater coordination between states on the other. Arising from these processes, we can now identify more and more instances of global policy-making. By this term, I refer to policy-making that takes place on the global rather than the regional or the national scale and that is expected to affect, if not be part of, governance of all parts of the world. The global character of the policy-making involved raises particular challenges for how we conceptualize and how we research public policy. In particular, the growing importance of global policy poses challenges for theories of governance and of policy-making, respectively. These theories were often designed based on assumptions that states would be the primary and dominant sites of authority and that policies would be designed specifically for territorially delineated national communities governed by those states. In this contribution, I review attempts to reconceptualize public policy for a global scale and make some suggestions about how we might proceed analytically in order to move beyond a state-centric model of governance.

The chapter begins with a brief discussion of globalization and how the concept is defined and used in the analysis that follows. Next, I review key contributions to the conceptualization of global public policy by Wolfgang Reinicke, Diane Stone, and Phil Cerny. I draw inspiration from such ideas as vertical and horizontal subsidiarity (Reinicke), policy agoras, and global policy-making personnel (Stone), and transnational pluralism and policy pentangles (Cerny) in looking for conceptual tools that might orient the development of the field. This review is followed by a summary statement of the defining features of global policy-making. These features, in turn, are illustrated with an example of global public policy, the 2007 United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.
GLOBALIZATION

How researchers understand and study globalization varies considerably, given their disciplinary backgrounds and the varying theoretical paradigms within which they work. In addition, scholars need to take into account that, like many other concepts in the humanities and social sciences, globalization has become part of daily life in the mass media, and a common term used by politicians, corporate executives, and a wide range of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) (Brydon and Coleman 2008: 6).

As the academic literature on globalization has evolved, certain commonalities in thinking have emerged. The word global is used as a reference to scale and to phenomena that are somehow transplanetary, to use Scholte’s (2005) term. Researchers generally agree that the growth of transplanetary connections has accelerated since World War II, particularly since the late 1970s. There are various explanations for this acceleration. At the heart of most of them is the dynamism of capitalism that resulted from the rapid growth of fully global financial markets. The predominant position of finance capital has led to a type of global capitalism not seen before (Castells 1999). This change in capitalism is linked in complex ways with innovations in information and communication technologies that have permitted transplanetary connections to become more supraterritorial: these technologies are less bound by the physical location or the nation-state boundaries within which people live. As a result, these technologies have permitted more planet-wide connections to develop, and their growth has led to ever greater intrusions into the daily lives of more persons than ever before.

Drawing then from this discussion, I define globalization as follows, for the purposes of this chapter. Globalization is the transformative growth of connections among people across the planet. In the contemporary era, many of these connections take a supraterritorial form. In ever more profound ways, globalization ties together what people do, what they experience, how they perceive that experience, and how they reshape their lives.

DEFINING GLOBAL PUBLIC POLICY

Two aspects of this definition of globalization are helpful in thinking about what we might mean by "global" public policy: transplanetary connections (scale) and supraterritoriality. To explore this meaning, however, we need to bring into the discussion two other sets of terms that are often invoked: international/internationalization and trans-national/transnationalization (see Table 47.1). As a concept, "international" has the longest history of the three. The use of the term became increasingly common in the nineteenth century and was used to speak about the growing number of relationships between (mainly European) nation-states. When states felt a need to coordinate activities or to cooperate in developing new institutions, they were said to be engaging in
Table 47.1 Forms of public policy beyond the nation-state

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>International public policy</th>
<th>Transnational public policy</th>
<th>Global public policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key actors</td>
<td>States</td>
<td>States, non-governmental organizations, corporations, social movements, individuals</td>
<td>States, non-governmental organizations, corporations, social movements, individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale of activity</td>
<td>Intra-regional</td>
<td>Intra-regional</td>
<td>Global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interregional</td>
<td>Interregional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Global</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“international relations.” Setting up organizations in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries such as the World Meteorological Association or the International Telegraph Union, or signing trade agreements or even agreeing upon policies such as the “International Sanitary Regulations” were examples of this international political and policy activity.

The term “transnational” has sometimes been used as a synonym of “international” but increasingly the word has taken on a different meaning that involves the notion of supraterritoriality: relations are formed and transactions are made without being limited by the territorial boundaries of states. Transnational also refers to transactions that include not only states, but also various non-state actors such as corporations, interest groups, and social movements, as well as governance institutions whose mandate is broader than that of states. For example, the term is often used to characterize decision-making in the European Union (EU), which includes member states, but also the European Commission, the European Parliament, and varying non-state actors. Other examples might include the exercise of private authority where various non-state actors fill governance voids not covered by states. Examples here would be the regulation of over-the-counter derivatives or the employment of accounting rules or the rules for merchant shipping (Coleman 2003; Cutler 2003; Eaton and Porter 2008).

Use of the adjective “global” often overlaps with that of “transnational” in the literature in the sense that scholars employ the term to speak of processes that may involve states but also include other non-state actors. Where the term differs from “transnational” is in being more specific about the scale of the activity. “Transnational” can be used to refer to various scales including the regional scale such as the EU; arrangements involving several regions like the EU and the South American trade group, Mercosur, agreeing on trade matters, or the global scale. When I use the term “global” in relation to public policy, I am referring to policy made on a global scale that is transnational. I reserve the term “international” for those instances where policy is being made by states alone. And, of course, “international” policy-making may also take place at various scales: regional, transregional, or global. The negotiations that led to the Marrakesh agreements and the founding of the World Trade Organization (WTO) were
"international," conducted on a global scale. Subsequent negotiations in the Doha Round, however, are "global" in that they involve not only states, but also the WTO itself through the office of the director general and some limited participation by non-state actors. Finally, these terms are not mutually exclusive. At any given time, we can expect to observe global, transnational, and international processes in play. These processes may reinforce, contradict, or be independent of one another.

When speaking of policy on a global scale, the term "public" differs from its normal usage in nation-state policy-making. In this usage, the term referred generally to policies made by state actors, whether at the countrywide, subregion or province, and municipal or city/town scales. In this respect, "public" policies were different from those made by private organizations such as unions, business associations, corporations, voluntary organizations, and so on. This understanding of "public" versus "private" becomes complicated when we move to transnational global policy-making. In these realms of policy-making, as we have noted, not only are states involved, but a potentially large and rather heterogeneous number of non-state actors are also. Accordingly, for global public policy, we understand "public" to refer to policies that are directed to the whole of the global polity, however disorganized and difficult the definition of its borders might be. As Cerny (2010: 98) observes, "the constitution of the public itself is being transformed in the context of political (as well as economic and social) globalizing trends."

For example, the Framework Convention on Tobacco Control negotiated under the auspices of the World Health Organization (WHO) between 1999 and 2003 is a "public" policy in this sense. Its provisions are designed to tightly regulate the behavior of transnational tobacco corporations as well as domestic practices by individuals and governments. Its target group includes anyone in the world who uses, sells, and trades in tobacco products. Like all global public policies, pursuit of these goals requires strong participation by states but also by other non-state actors. And coming to an agreement on the Convention involved not only states, but also NGOs, professional groups such as those representing medical professions, and tobacco corporations.

**CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORKS FOR STUDYING GLOBAL PUBLIC POLICY**

Explicit conceptual reflections on what global public policy entails and how scholars might approach its study are not numerous. In this section, I review three of the more extensive attempts to wrestle with these issues and then I add another conceptual tool from my own work. I begin with the presentation of perhaps the earliest analysis in this field, Wolfgang Reinicke's (1998) book entitled *Global Public Policy*. I then consider a contribution by Diane Stone, who introduces the concept of an "agora" as a way to think about the phenomenon. I consider next Philip Cerny's (2010) concept of "transnational pluralism" and its implications for policy analysis.
Reinicke builds his approach by reflecting on the implications of intensifying economic globalization for policy-making. He begins by arguing against a common position among economists who see globalization and growing interdependence (i.e., internationalization) between states as the same thing. He counters by noting changes in the form of trade that have become more dominant in cross-border flows of goods and services: intra-firm trade and trade related to the international sourcing of intermediate inputs. Both these changes “reflect the progressive structuring of international trade around the operations of global corporations and international informal arrangements for production and supply” (1998: 24). Accompanying these changes is financial globalization: the “creation of a global pool of highly liquid capital that can move quickly and freely between countries and assets. The major actors in this landscape are a relatively small number of highly capitalized financial conglomerates operating in a range of markets across a number of locations” (1998: 29). In effect, globalization has led to the emergence of a parallel, even competing, set of linkages at the level of production that are transnational and global rather than international in form.

Reinicke analyzes the policy challenges posed by economic globalization by distinguishing between two forms of sovereignty (1998: 56–58). “External” sovereignty is the central constitutive rule of the international system: states are mutually exclusive and disjointed, follow the principle of self-help, and maintain their own security. “Internal” sovereignty refers to the ability of a government of a state to formulate, implement, and manage public policy. Globalization, he argues, poses a fundamental challenge to internal sovereignty. The reach of operational internal sovereignty extends only to the territorial borders of a given state, but the economic wellbeing of the citizens of this state is increasingly affected, if not determined, by global markets, transnational trade relations, and global corporations. The isomorphic fit between economic and political geography that had developed over the nineteenth and twentieth centuries no longer exists in many policy areas.

After considering various solutions to this conundrum, Reinicke suggests that “global public policy” is the only one that is sustainable in the long term: “the delinking of some elements of the operational aspects of internal sovereignty (governance) from its territorial foundation (the nation-state) and its institutional and legal environment (the government) and their reapplication on a sectoral—that is, functional—basis” (1998: 87). In doing so, policies could “cut across” state boundaries in order to match up political geography with economic geography.

Accordingly, Reinicke is suggesting that sovereignty is divisible both in its territorial and its legal forms. This divisibility is put into practice through subsidiarity, the idea that policy decisions should be made by lower-level jurisdictions unless there is a clear rationale and need for the decisions to be made at higher-level ones. He innovates further by suggesting that subsidiarity can also be horizontal. In the vertical form, public policy decision-making is delegated to higher or lower levels of governance; in the horizontal situation, it is delegated to non-state actors such as business associations, NGOs, and labor groups. Reinicke adds that when confronted with globalization, vertical subsidiarity is likely to involve delegations of internal sovereignty to international governance institutions.
Reinicke’s contribution has been very important but also has two limitations. First, it focuses on economic globalization only, and thus may underestimate the extent of the need for global public policy in noneconomic areas such as culture and the environment. Second, its conceptualization remains close to internationalization in seeing states as the dominant drivers of the policy process. As studies of the politics of globalization have developed since the late 1990s, when he wrote his book, scholars have looked for ways to move further away from state-centrism in conceptualizing global public policy.

In a journal article published in 2008, Diane Stone addresses both these limitations. She opens her argument by noting that nation-state institutions no longer serve as the sole organizing center for policy. Quoting Philip Cerny (to whom I return below), she postulates that it is now necessary to look at the “restructuring of the playing field itself” (2008: 20). In this respect, her advice is similar to that of Jan Aart Scholte, who argues for a move from “state-centric” to “polycentric” models of global governance (2005: ch. 6). As a starting point, Stone adapts the Ancient Athenian concept of the “agora” as an organizing tool for analysis. This concept is used to identify a growing global public space of fluid, dynamic, and intermeshed relations of politics, markets, culture, and society. This public space is shaped by the interactions of its actors—that is, multiple publics and plural institutions. Some actors are more visible, persuasive, or powerful than others. However, the global agora is a social and political space—generated by globalization—rather than a physical place. (Stone 2008: 21)

Stone suggests that the agora is a site of relative disorder and uncertainty because institutions are underdeveloped and the sources of political authority are unclear, being dispersed through increasing numbers of institutions and networks.

This conceptual starting point, therefore, departs from Reinicke by allowing for a far greater role, in some instances, by non-state actors, depending on circumstances. In addition, the agora concept leaves room for an increasingly common aspect of global policy-making: the active presence in a policy field of several international organizations, with divergent interests, leading to difficulties in coordinating policy discussions and policy development and in implementing policy outcomes. The presence of several authority structures within the global agora means “far greater time and effort is also spent convening, debating, and negotiating in arenas created by interlocutors in order to promote compliance rather than exert enforcement” (2008: 28).

Stone goes on to identify three types of political actors that are central to global public policy in the agora (2008: 30). First, there are “internationalized public officials”: public officials working for nation-state bureaucracies who are delegated responsibility for engaging in policy discussions at the global level on behalf of their country. Anne-Marie Slaughter carried out an extensive study of the varying roles (regulatory, harmonization, information sharing) of these networks of public officials in her book A New World Order (2004). Stone terms the second group “international civil servants”: persons employed by international organizations who staff their secretariats and institutional operations. These persons are not delegates of states like those in the first category, nor
do they have their first loyalty to states. They meet less regularly with one another, being quite geographically dispersed, highly reliant on information technologies, and traveling frequently. They are more likely than other actors in the agora to adopt a globalized identity and outlook (Stone 2008: 33). The third category includes “transnational policy professionals,” a diverse group that might include consultants, NGO leaders, corporate executives, and leading scientific experts, among others. Stone postulates that the policy exchanges in the global agora are dominated by interactions among actors drawn from these three categories.

Stone’s discussion of global public policy is useful not only in moving conceptually away from a state-centric perspective, but also in identifying the new types of political actors involved in policy-making. But the agora concept is a general one, looking at policy-making in a holistic way, on a global plane. It leaves open the question about whether there is one agora or different agoras for varying policy problems. Philip Cerny’s recent work moves in the latter direction and he offers some further conceptual tools for studying the variance in processes of global policy-making across different policy spaces.

Cerny observes that world politics is being “transformed into a polycentric or multi-nucleated global political system, operating within an increasingly continuous geographical space and/or set of overlapping spaces” (2010: 98). He thus opens the door to using the concept of a “policy space” as an analytical tool and notes the possibility of multiple spaces, with no single center of power. As part of this transformation, domestic political forces are no longer the dominant players. Rather, power accrues to those actors that can coordinate their activities across borders, at multiple levels, and multiple nodes of power (2010: 5). This observation is also useful because it points to the likelihood that new “spaces” will contain several centers of power. In these circumstances, circuits of power are organized more and more around issue areas, rather than states. And in these issue areas, power accrues to those actors whose interests and values allow them to build transnational coalitions (2010: 103). Such actors will also be skilled at defining their goals, interests, and values in ways that permit the building of cross-border networks, and at coordinating and organizing their actions at a variety of scales from the local to the global (2010: 106).

Cerny theorizes these developments by drawing upon a long-standing political science concept for the study of group politics: pluralism. He adapts this concept for the new world politics and terms it “transnational pluralism.” In these new, more global, spaces, “groups” need to be highly flexible in responding to political challenges. They must be able to build and rebuild coalitions and to be skilled in selecting short and long-term allies with whom they might work. And they have to develop the capacity for coordinating policy development and policy-making across borders. Traditional left–right politics and blocs of states give way to more mixed, complex, and looser coalitions (2010: 109).

Cerny also suggests building on a conceptual tool developed in US politics for studying policy-making: the iron triangle. In US policy studies, the iron triangle included the executive branch, Congress, and interest groups who entered into longer-standing, informal relationships with politicians and bureaucratic officials to perceive, adopt, and implement public policies in particular sectors. Cerny stresses that political executives
and legislatures at the nation-state level remain key participants in global public policy, as do interest groups. But, as noted above, each of these actor categories will need to build networks to be effective in global policy-making. He pushes further and suggests that the triangle concept be replaced by a “flexible pentangle” (2010: 116–117). Added to the iron triangle mix are two categories also mentioned by Stone: the transnational public sector (international public servants) and the transnational private sector (somewhat analogous to Stone’s transnational policy professionals).

**Characteristics of global public policy**

In reflecting upon these scholarly contributions, it becomes clearer that the use of the concept of “global policy spaces” becomes helpful (Coleman 2005: 94–98). The choice of the word “space” coincides with the epistemological position that borders around global policy are variable and are being created and recreated in response to globalizing processes and global problems. These spaces take form as different institutions or political groupings seek to engage in policy-making, and as various institutions and networks of actors gather at nodes in the policy space. Ultimately, a given set of global public policies may emerge as a result of interactions between these nodes. Such spaces may exist for short or longer periods of time depending on the policy problems at issue. Participants in such policy spaces will include not only states, but, as Reinicke, Stone, and Cerny all suggest, a host of other transnational actors, often working in networks, which also endure for shorter or longer times depending on the policy issue. In choosing the concept of space, I am not suggesting that “places” are unimportant. As Sassen (2006, 2007) has argued repeatedly, the material infrastructure for creating global spaces is located in places. What is changing is the multiplication of sites of power (nodes) that are contributing to the creation of spaces. And the degree of cooperation or the intensity of relationships between different place-based nodes in the policy space will be variable.

These global policy spaces will include varying international institutions, intergovernmental organizations, and non-governmental actors, which have membership bases that are more or less inclusive of the world, which uphold and manage global actions that are more or less anchored in law, and which have material and intellectual resources that give them more or less capacity for autonomous action in given policy spaces. There is no hierarchy in the usual sense structuring the activities of these varying institutions, no “executive branch” controlling them, and no meta-legal structures establishing hierarchies among given bodies of international and global law.

With this understanding of global policy spaces at hand, we are in a position to highlight several distinguishing characteristics of global public policy. In presenting these characteristics, I draw on an example of global public policy-making: the development and approval in 2007 by the United Nations General Assembly of the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. The seed for the policy was sown in 1948 when the idea of human rights was institutionalized, at least symbolically, at the United Nations (UN), in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and built upon further in the International
Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) in 1966. Indigenous peoples saw these ideas of rights as potential tools for decolonizing their oppressed lives (Battiste and Henderson 2000:1).

To get to the point of even being able to think about, let alone pursue, a policy like the Declaration, these peoples had to think beyond their existing community identities by defining what they had in common. The identities of peoples in most places in the world are very specific and place-based. Only very gradually over the twentieth century did peoples come to recognize that there were “others” like them across the planet. The use of the word “indigenous,” which means “from this place” or “native,” points to the core characteristics that these peoples have in common: they have inhabited a particular place or territory for a long time or since “time immemorial.” For example, it took a long time before those persons who see themselves as Waskapi, who speak a language called “Cree” in English, and who are located in the northwest part of the province of Québec in Canada, knew about and recognized what they have in common with the Aymara in present-day Bolivia or the “Scheduled Tribes” in India. Eventually they came to an understanding of a meaning of “indigenous” that captured what they shared with similar peoples, wherever they lived on the planet. The identity is based on an attachment that all participants share to some form of subsistence economy, to a territory or homeland that predates the arrival of settlers and surveyors, to a spiritual system that predates the arrival of missionaries, and to a language that expresses everything that is important and distinct about their place in the universe. Most importantly, they share the destruction and loss of these things (Niezen 2003: 86–93).

Some of this destruction has come at the hands of nation-state policies (2003: 87):

- assimilative state education which has led to a loss of language, culture, and traditional knowledge;
- loss of a subsistence economy due to resource development, which has undermined severely a culture and set of political institutions very closely tied to the land;
- state abrogation of treaties, which has led to further losses of land and to rapacious resource development on those lands.

With this example in front of us, we return to discuss and illustrate the distinguishing characteristics of global public policy.

First, the policy problem to be solved is global in scope, not national, nor regional, nor even interregional in scale. Stone and Cerny try to address this aspect through the use of concepts of “agora” or “policy spaces,” respectively. Such global policy problems arise in several different ways.

- The policy problems are transboundary or supraterritorial on a global scale. For indigenous peoples, the global institutionalization of the nation-state form of governance, complete with the pursuit of “national” identities and the establishment of individual property rights led everywhere to the dispossession of their lands
and the denigration of their cultures. The very definitions of “territory” and “borders” applied to their traditional lands by nation-states everywhere created a problem of dispossession on a global scale. They needed a policy instrument that would permit some overriding of these notions of national territory and boundaries. Other examples of policy problems of this type include agreeing on environmental policies to curb the emission of greenhouse gases to the point that changes in climate are arrested; finding ways to set international standards for food products such that the global trade in those products is not hindered by states using different sanitary or phytosanitary measures to block trade; and setting up rules for banks active across the world when it comes to how much core capital they must have before engaging in lending and related transactions in global markets.

- The problems relate to common global property. For example, outer space is common to all states and persons living on Earth. No one country or organization can privately own outer space. If it is agreed that there needs to be a policy limiting the weaponization of space, then by definition this policy is global in scope. A second example might be reducing levels of pollution in oceans. Because the oceans are fluid and interlinked on a global scale, solving the problem of excessive pollution in the oceans becomes a global policy problem.

- The policy problem arises independently in a number of different places in the world but cannot be systematically addressed without acting on a global scale. As indicated above, this situation relates to the experience of indigenous peoples. When the Anishinabe lost control of their lands in Canada, it was not directly linked to the dispossession of the Saami in Scandinavia or the Berber population of present-day Morocco. Gradually, various communities like these ones came to the conclusion that acting together despite their differences in culture, language, and physical location was the only avenue that could stop their disappearance from the Earth.

Another example addressed recently by the WHO is tobacco addiction. The medical evidence on the serious health problems created by tobacco addiction is incontrovertible. As a result, the cost in human lives and illness arising from tobacco is very high, putting immense strains on health care systems in every country. Although individual states can take action to reduce tobacco consumption, they still face a highly globalized and concentrated global corporate sector committed to selling the product. The problems posed by the mismatch between nation-state powers and the global tobacco industry were such that eventually the WHO was able to negotiate a Framework Convention on Tobacco Control between 1998 and 2003 (Holden and Lee 2009).

Second, decision-making is polycentric, not state-centric. As we have seen in the discussion of concepts like the “agora,” “policy spaces,” or a “multinucleated political system,” there is no single focus for the formulation and implementation of global public policies. There are likely to be various nodes of power in play. And gathering at these nodes will be nation-state politicians, nation-state bureaucratic officials, NGOs operating at national, regional, and global scales, transnational public officials, and transnational private actors, whether corporations, consultants, scientific experts, or
professional managers. The solution of the given policy problem will almost invariably involve states and they may have an important role in implementing any policy agreed upon. But they will not be able to act on their own. In situations of polycentric decision-making, lines between public and private become blurred. In many instances, private authority and public authority become enmeshed and work together in any policy outcome.

The movement toward the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples also illustrates well these characteristics of global public policy. In 1982, the UN responded to increasing pressure from the growing cognitive and social justice networks of indigenous persons by setting up a "Working Group on Indigenous Populations" as a subgroup of the UN Commission on Human Rights Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities (Battiste and Henderson 2000: 3). This Working Group and its activities marked the beginning of the building of a "global policy space" where the notion of indigenous rights could be discussed on a global scale. Using this platform, indigenous peoples were able to push for new standards in UN law, the most comprehensive being the 1989 International Labour Organization (ILO) Convention on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples. They lobbied successfully for a special chapter for indigenous peoples' programs in Agenda 21, which was adopted by the UN Conference on the Environment in 1992, and for the inclusion of traditional ecological knowledge of indigenous peoples in the UN Convention on Biological Diversity in 1993. The same year was proclaimed the International Year of the World's Indigenous Peoples in 1993. Two years later, an International Decade for Indigenous Peoples was declared by the UN.

These events culminated in the formalization of a global policy space, with the setting up of a Permanent Forum for Indigenous Peoples in 2000. The policy problem at issue had taken on a global scope because it involved the mobilization of indigenous communities across the world who had experienced the kind of losses noted above, which ultimately provided the basis for an indigenous identity. The actions of indigenous peoples and their allies had led to the pushing out of a policy space in which conceptions of indigenous peoples' rights could be debated and ultimately translated into legal terms. Clearly, states were present and very active in the policy space but they were not alone. Consistent with the definition of global policy-making, decision-making was polycentric not state-centric. NGOs of indigenous peoples from all parts of the world participated, as did transnational organizations devoted to promoting human rights such as Amnesty International. UN officials who worked in the human rights area, whom Stone termed "international civil servants," also participated. Similarly, the boundaries of the policy area were blurred because of the mixing of issues of rights, economic development, cultural preservation, and language revitalization, among other issues. The complexity of such a space is anticipated in Stone's agora concept and in Cerny's notion of multiscalar processes involving policy "pentangles": nation-state bureaucrats; nation-state politicians; indigenous peoples' organizations operating on local, national, regional, and global scales; transnational officials from the UN, the ILO, and the World Bank (WB); transnational private actors including representatives of transnational corporations "developing" natural resource sites; and experts in international law.
Third, like nation-state level policy-making, the boundaries between policy areas are often blurred in global policy-making to the point that it is difficult to determine which agency, organization, or department is responsible for addressing a given problem. At the nation-state level, this situation involves bureaucratic competition but that competition can be mitigated by the intervention of executive authorities. In global policy-making, however, no such overall executive authority exists with these kinds of powers.

The complexity of the Indigenous Peoples declaration illustrates this dimension of global public policy-making. The issues addressed included: human rights, culture, religion, education, communication technologies, social welfare provisions, health care, and language use. The scope of the issues involved required participation by nation-state officials from a range of departments and agencies with different relations with indigenous peoples and often competing policy objectives. Another example is illustrated by the regulation of genetically modified organisms (Coleman 2005). Nation-state ministries of agriculture, health, environment, and industry ministries all could plausibly claim to be responsible for defining regulations. In these circumstances, the central executive can intervene by naming one of these agencies to be responsible or, more commonly, by creating a special agency to deal with the problem. In the absence of this kind of executive power, global policy-making becomes more protracted in being defined as competing sites of authority come into play. Reaching agreement on the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples took over five years, and even then a number of key countries refused to sign.

**Conclusion**

From the standpoint of nation-states or smaller units like provinces and cities, global public policy-making is messy, often incomprehensible, and seldom satisfactory. But from the same standpoint, such policy-making is ever more essential. The intensification of globalizing processes and their impacts on more and more aspects of the lives of humans and nonhumans alike characterize our present world. Academic study is just beginning to wrestle with the normative questions arising from the need to decide on more important matters at a planetary scale. Similarly, scholars studying global public policy face the challenge of thinking outside the analytical box of concepts honed and refined during the nation-state era. This analytical frame assumes that nation-states are solely responsible for conceiving, formulating, bringing into law, implementing, and evaluating public policies. This assumption also dominates other social science disciplines—when sociologists speak about "society," they are referring to nation-state societies; when economists speak about "the economy," they are thinking about a given national economy. Globalization scholars like Scholte (2005) and Beck (2005) refer to this epistemological position as "methodological nationalism." They argue that a full understanding of global phenomena requires scholars to reframe their epistemologies and their approaches to theory.
The analysis of global public policy is at its very early stages. Breaking out of methodological nationalism thinking is immensely difficult because nation-states have been the center of our analytical universe since the inception of policy studies. Copernicus challenged the world by asking that we think of a solar system where the Earth was not at its center. Global public policy challenges the social sciences to think of a political world where the nation-state is no longer the standpoint from which we begin our studies. Can we meet this challenge?
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