

## Chapter 2

# Governance in the Age of Globalization: Challenges and Opportunities for South and Southeast Asia

Ali Farazmand

### Introduction

Governance and public administration are as old as human civilizations, which originated in this old continent of Asia. Both concepts have evolved significantly, from government and public administration to governance and administration or management today. Indeed, replacing or substituting governance for public administration has become a fashionable trend in academic as well as practitioner' circles worldwide. This begs a key research question: "why 'governance' now, what about public administration, and why they have become so important today in the process of governance now?" This is a question in need of serious investigation and analysis, a task beyond the scope of this chapter—I have addressed it in another paper, "Globalization and Governance" (see Farazmand 2007, 2009), in which it is hypothesized that the concept of 'governance is directly related to the rise of contemporary globalization', "a process through which worldwide integration is taking place" (Farazmand 1999, p. 209), with public administration as a central moderator (see Farazmand 2004, 2007, 2009, 2014).

The role of government has been changing rapidly in the last two-three decades. As one of the central issues of our time, this change as well as the process of governance and administration has become the hallmark of the age of accelerated globalization, however defined. The traditional and historical role of state and government has been altered, and the changed nature of government has also altered the nature of governance and administration processes; it has resulted in a profound transformation of the philosophy, functions, and institutional foundations of governments almost everywhere in the world.

Globalization of capitalism, "a process through which worldwide transformation taking place," seems to be playing as the central driving force behind these multiple changes and transformation. Globalization of corporate capitalism is a process that

---

A. Farazmand (✉)

School of Public Administration, Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, USA  
e-mail: afarazma@fau.edu

© Springer International Publishing Switzerland 2015

I. Jamil et al. (eds.), *Governance in South, Southeast, and East Asia*,  
Public Administration, Governance and Globalization 15,  
DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-15218-9\_2

transcends nation-states, economies, markets, institutions, and cultures. While nothing totally new, the process of globalization is accelerated by a number of contributing factors or forces that include: technological innovations; declining domestic economies of powerful industrialized countries of the North; the military and political pressures as well as wars of the latter nations on the third world countries of the South; the fall of the former Soviet Union as an alternative world system power; the role of western ideological propaganda; the role of the United Nations' agencies such as International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank (WB), and World Trade Organization (WTO); international donors, including the USAID; the rising citizen expectations, including labor demands for sharing power in management and organizational democracy; and availability of new cheap labor force across gender and racial groups worldwide (see Farazmand 1999, 2007; Hoffman 2006; Huntington 1996).

The rise and acceleration of this global phenomenon has not been without its counter phenomenon. After all, the law of dialectical process always works one way or the other and catches up with history. About half a decade ago (Farazmand 2004, p. 1), I observed: "with the acceleration of globalization process has also developed a worldwide grass-roots movement of counter-globalization. This is a global movement that aims at reducing the adverse impacts of globalizing corporate capital, containing and reducing the massive fall-outs of globalization such as environmental degradation, economic pillage, poverty, forced labor, child labor, and wage slavery." In 2012, the world witnessed this global movement of anti-capitalism dubbed 99% v. 1%, embracing a much broader concept of protest against the political and economic orders of the day—this global movement will likely continue in the future as the crisis of capitalism deepens worldwide. The transformation of government and administration has deeply challenged governance and public administration processes, structures, and values everywhere, and the need for capacity building, enhancement, and innovation in policy and management has become more urgent than ever if governments are to meet and manage the challenges of globalization. What is needed is application of a new concept of "sound governance," not good governance.

This chapter addresses governance and offers a novel concept of "sound governance" in the age of increasing global complexities, challenges, threats, and opportunities that affect nation-states, local governments, citizens, organizations, and administrative systems, with implications for south and southeast Asia.. It argues for innovations in policy, governance, and administration as part of capacity building for the twenty-first century. Although the focus is on governance, it is administration that makes or breaks governance. The discussion in the paper is framed in four major sections, followed by a brief conclusion with several suggestions or lessons: (1) key concepts of governance with a multitude of diverse notions of the term; (2) "sound governance" with major dimensions, key issues, and characteristics; (3) challenges and opportunities, with implications for South and Southeast Asia; and (4) a brief conclusion outlining some suggested lessons for effective governance and development in the South.

## **Governance: Good, Bad, and Ugly?**

The concept of governance has met at least three faces: the good, the bad, and the ugly, none of which offers a thorough and comprehensive perspective. More on the latter later, but diversity and confusion over what governance means abound. Diversity and confusion in concepts have characterized government and governance for several decades, as different conceptual and ideological perspectives on governance and administration offer meanings of their own. These concepts provide opportunities as well as constraints or challenges: Opportunities are presented by the creativity and innovation in conceptualizing the notions of governance and administration, and contributed to a fresh body of new knowledge on the subject. This is a healthy discourse that can lead to better solutions to public policy and organizational problems, but the diversity of concepts also produces new challenges and constraints that add new dimensions to the theory and practice of government and administration. First, confusion reigns with different viewpoints, especially when there is no consensus as to what for example governance and administration means or should be. Second, adoption of certain specific concepts or notions may lead to their prominence and dominance while this may not necessarily prove their superiority over alternative models overlooked or ignored. An example of this problem is the worldwide adoption of the corporate sponsored concept of the new public management (NPM) with the prescription of sweeping privatization imposed at home and on developing nations—the opportunity cost of adopting alternative models (as opposed to NPM) was ignored. Third, constraints and challenges arise when the search becomes endless and self-serving. reform for the sake of reform may be senseless, costly, and wasteful. Yet, concepts are worth examining.

## **Concepts and Confusions**

Some of the most commonly known concepts of governance or government appeared in the literature include good governance, entrepreneurial government, competitive government, market-based governance, economic governance, meta-governance, social and political governance, enabling governance, participatory governance, regulatory governance, interventionist governance or government, and steering government versus rowing government. Central to all these concepts is a claim to rejecting the traditional forms of authoritarian, bureaucratic government with unilateral decision making and implementation. These models or concepts of governance and government present “new” ways of thinking, governing, and administration, with new philosophies, and new approaches that claim to broaden citizen involvements, their feedbacks, and bringing in the playing field the civil society and nongovernmental organizations. For example, the entrepreneurial models of government or governance focus on market approaches with emphasis on market-like competition among public organizations, results-oriented outputs, performance

measurements, empowering managers to fire and hire temporary employees, privatization, efficiency, steering government versus rowing government, and getting rid of bureaucratic rules and regulations. Osborne and Gaebler's popular book, *Reinventing Government* (1992) set the tone for the sweeping changes and reforms that have characterized much of the changing character and role of governments for the last two decades; governments have been spending lots of time and money to reinvent themselves.

A corollary of this globalized reinvention business—government that reinvents itself, or is reinvented—has been the British born ideological movement of the “new public management,” which should be viewed as an intellectual arm of the globalization of corporate capitalism. I have detailed this issue elsewhere (see, for example, Farazmand 1999, 2001, 2002a, b, 2007, 2009, 2010). The key tenets of the “new public management” (NPM) emanate directly from its intellectual source of the conservative, neoclassical economic theory of ‘public choice’ (Buchanan and Tolluck 1962; Niskanen 1971; Downs 1962; Williamson 1985), which prescribes against bureaucracy, public service delivery through government organizations, and social capital expenditures, and in favor of sweeping privatization, consumerism, individualism, and larger military-security expenditures to promote the system of corporate capitalism.

What the proponents of NPM ignore or avoid is the debatable issues of equity, fairness, accountability, monopolistic or oligopolistic nature of runaway globalizing corporations, and other political economy questions that public choice theory is criticized for. They follow the same argument in favor of transforming governance and government into a market-like organizational arrangement in which the business corporate sector takes over the business of government and public service delivery while avoiding the social and externality costs of such business, therefore dumping the unprofitable and social-cost operations on the government to pay for, and with citizens paying double taxations (See for example, Hood 1991; Barzelay 2001; Behn 2001). Who will pay for these costs, and how should these costs be assessed in the overall calculus? Will the end of the day governments be more efficient and effective, or democratic and responsible? These questions are lost in the perfect storm of corporate capitalism that has swept the nation states. However, the concept of new public management has already met its severe critics, whose reports worldwide show how flawed this new idea of the old bottle is—its defect in addressing such issues as effectiveness, accountability, quality, fairness, representation, and the like (see, for example, the Final Report of the IASIA-IIAS 2001 conference in Athens, Argyriades 2001).

A second group of concepts on governance has appeared in the writings of social scientists as well as by the UN sponsored projects, seminars, and workshops world-wide. For example, Peters (1996) keenly detects four conceptualized models of governance that have appeared in the body of literature: market model, participatory model, flexible government, and deregulatory government, each of which has significant structural, managerial, policy making, and public interest implications distinct from others, yet overlapping on many features. Another example is the concept “social and political governance” and “mega governance” as distinct models

that purport to emphasize interactions between government and society in a so-called chaotic, changing world characterized by diversity, complexity, and dynamics (see the collection of essays in Kooiman 1993), or “governing as governance” (Kooiman 2003), which reshuffles old ideas into configuration with emphasis on governing. Public management, administration, and governance are not neutral concepts; they embody ‘normative values’ and carry consequential outcomes (Wamsely 1996). In a similar fashion, the United Nations Development Program espoused, through numerous seminars, workshops, and working papers, extended the notions of economic governance, political governance, social governance, and administrative governance. These notions constituted, it was claimed, the elements of systemic governance, an idea that “encompasses the processes and structures of society that guide political and economic relationships” for multiple purposes, including the promotion of ‘good governance’ (see, for example, UNDP 1997a, b, pp. 9–10).

Following this trend, the notion of “good governance” entered the jargon group. The concept of “good governance” as espoused and promoted by the United Nations agencies such as the World Bank, International Monetary Fund, UNDP, and UNDESD as well as by most global corporations and Western governments through their international organizations like AID, became one of the most pressing requirements on third world countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin/Central America as a condition for international assistance (Amsden 2007; Hamilton 1989). Developing and less developed nations were required to implement, as part of the structural adjustment programs (SAPs) the idea of good governance. Under the instructions and pressures of donor institutions of the North (western governments and corporations), the United Nations enforced the demand and required countries on the South to adopt the notion of “good governance” by implementing a number of structural and policy reforms in their governments and society as a condition for international aid. Seminars, workshops, and conferences were held worldwide that stressed the concept and demanded results for market-based sustainable development (see, for example, UNDP 1997a, b, 2000). However, the concept of “good governance” evoked serious criticisms as well as praises worldwide—it met its own enemies at the front doors. Good governance for whom, and bad for whom? And still “ugly governance” too? These are key questions raised by social scientists and critical politicians. For example, the former president of Tanzania, Julius K. Nyerere, in delivering the keynote address at the UN Conference on Governance in Africa in 1998, severely criticized the notion of “good governance” as an imperialistic and colonizing concept. He viewed it as an imposing concept developed and forced upon developing and underdeveloped countries of Africa by the industrialized Western colonial powers and transnational globalizing corporations. According to him, these donor corporations and governments as well as their UN instrumental organizations had viewed that governance in Africa was “bad” and decided that they should be reformed into “good” by expanding the private business sector through privatization and paving the ways for globalizing corporate capitalism that seeks high profits in an integrated global market system at any cost (see the UNDESA [Department of Economic and Social Affairs] 1998).

Hence, the words Bad and Ugly also entered the lexicon of governance. Good governance and Bad governance for whom? If these nations refuse—well, most cannot due to their deep dependency on the Western powers—then they would be dubbed ‘bad’ governments, and they embrace and implement the dictated from top would be viewed as practicing ‘good’ governance? But then, would such a practice be viewed by indigenous people as ‘bad’ governance? They should, as history has repeatedly shown the last 200 years of colonialism and neocolonialism and imperialism. The three historical examples of 1953 Iran, 1964 Indonesia, and 1973 Chile clearly illustrate the true nature of ‘ugly governance’ in modern history—all three ushered a prolonged process of ‘deadly, fascist type, and ugly governance’ that were affront to humanity, history, governance, and civilization; and all three were organized, supplied, supported by the formally self-declared civilized ‘democratic governments’ of the West through their violent instruments of blood-stained military coups that toppled democratically elected and legitimate ‘good governments’. Their new dictators like the Shah of Iran, Suharto of Indonesia, and Pinochet of Chile served their Western masters well by practicing ‘ugly governance’ at its best and at the expense of their own people’s blood, poverty, repression, indignity, and plunder of national wealth—hence governance nonetheless.

It is this deficiency and other problems of good governance, bad and ugly governance, as well as of other notions of governance, that has encouraged adoption of an alternative concept of “sound governance” in this chapter and elsewhere (Farazmand 2004).

## Defining Governance

The concept of governance has also received different definitions. For example, UNDP (1997a) defines governance as “the exercise of political, economic, and administrative authority to manage a nation’s affairs. It is the complex mechanisms, processes, relationships, and institutions through which citizens and groups articulate their interests, exercise their rights and obligations and mediate their differences” (p. 9). Accordingly, “governance transcends the state to include civil society organizations and the private sector, because all are involved in most activities promoting sustainable human development” (UNDP 1997a, b, p. 11). This definition identifies three key components of governance: the state and its institutions, the civil society organizations that were traditionally left out in the past governing systems, and the private sector supposedly not involved in the governing process or dynamics before. Scholars as well as supra-governmental institutional organizations such as the UNDP, WB, IMF, WTO, and others have followed the concept ‘governance’ to the point that it became a buzzword subject of the national and international conferences, seminars, and workshops, as well as a key word for grant writers seeking research and conference funding for papers, seminars, reports, and books. Conferences organized by UN and affluent governments, often sponsored by global corporations, promoted this notion cognitively and disseminated it worldwide (See, for example, Farazmand 1999).



While the concept “good governance” has faded as recently, the concept “governance” has gained more popularity worldwide, and this attention is also noticed in the public administration literature around the globe. Governance has come to supplant the concepts administration, or public administration. The two concepts have also been used in companion and in many cases as a replacement for public administration. The 2012 ASPA conference also adopted ‘governance’ as a major theme. Similarly, “governance” has been used in the public administration scholarly literature in a growing fashion. Examples include Kettl (1993), Osborne and Gaebler (1992), Peters and Savoie (1995), Peters (1996), Frederickson (1997), Farazmand (1997), Kooiman (2001), Salaman (1989) and others—governance has also come to display an “increasing negative attitude toward public administration” (Wamsely 1996, p. 368), to cover for the negative connotations often associated with public bureaucracy and red tape in public administration. These points are presented by perspectives on this shifting trend in use of governance and public administration, albeit with different purpose in mind. For example, Osborne and Gaebler write that “this is a book about governance, not politics” (1992, p. 247). Here a dichotomy of politic and administration or rather governance is presented and it is a problem. Also, the authors confuse readers by misapplication of the term governance with administration by assuming the two being the same, or assuming it as a concept that subsumes both politics and administration (Frederickson 1997). The contemporary shying away from, or hesitation with, the use of the traditional public administration concept, and the more inclusivity of governance may have some advantages, but they also raise problems of confusion—for example, like management, governance applies to corporate and business governance. Should we not use the prefixes of ‘public’ or ‘private’ governance—we should.

The deficiency with the concept “good governance” stems from at least two factors. One is that interaction of only three forces or elements are considered to constitute good governance—the interaction among the state, civil society, and the private sector. This triadic interaction ignores perhaps the most important force affecting governance in developing and less developed nations, that is the international/global power structures, the globalizing state power and the transworld corporate elites that dictated policies on other nations. This international or global power structure has had a firm grip over and dominated the politics and economics of the developing and less developed nations and their cultures for over two centuries. As a neo-colonial global power force, it has replaced the nineteenth century colonialism with new imperialism, and has through technological, political, economic, and military interventions interfered and replaced independent, legitimate, sovereign governments in the third world nations over and over throughout the twentieth century and in the twenty-first century, as the regime change by wars and violence continue in the Middle East to this day. Governance in developing nations is more dominated by these global forces, and less domestic dynamics. Similarly, in advanced nations of the North, corporate elites dominate the governance process at macro levels. It is the “logic of force and coercion” rather than mutual respect and tolerance that rules international/global as well as domestic governance processes (Korten 2001; Hoffman 2006). This is a potentially dangerous epochal era of global politics and administration that tends to return humanity and civilizations back to the ancient and

even barbaric ages. Even the UN has become an instrument of this logic in global governance. The second problem with “good governance” is its heavily loaded normative values—what is good and what is bad and for whom?—as defined by global power elites (Hardt and Negri 2000; Hauffman 2006; Parenti 2010). The concept is also misleading because of the double standards often applied by the more powerful in global arena—dictators serving our interests are praised and their atrocities are ignored, while unfriendly democrats (elected by the will of their own people) determined to stay free and independent are threatened with sanctions, violence, and even wars of invasion.

## Sound Governance

“Sound governance” is offered as an alternative to the term ‘good governance’ for several reasons. First, it is more comprehensive than any other concept reviewed earlier, and includes the important global or international force of governance. Second, it includes the normative as well as technical and rational features of good governance, but it presents a balanced view of governance that is less biased and takes into consideration the genuine features of indigenous governance systems that may be at odd or conflict with the globally dominant neo-colonialist power structures and their prescribed models of governance. In other words, a government or governance may be sound and yet its value system in conflict or at odd with foreign, globally domineering interests and their interventionist policies. Third, the concept ‘sound governance’ has all the quality characteristics of governance that is superior to good governance and is sound technically, professionally, organizationally, managerially, politically, democratically, and economically. It is also sound in terms of capacity, anticipatory behavior, democratic in character, responsiveness and competence, and cultural values embedded in societal values and structures. Fourth, sound governance is in accord with the constitutional values and responsive to international norms, rules, and regimes. Good governance as defined by its proponents overlooks this important constitutional feature that bounds nation-states and sovereign governments. Sixth, the concept sound governance has an ancient origin in the First World-State Achaemenid Empire of Persia with a highly efficient and effective administrative system (Ghirshman 1954; Olmstead 1948; Cameron 1968; Frye 1975; Cook 1983; Farazmand 1998). According to Darius the Great, successor to Cyrus the Great, “no empire can survive much less prosper without a ‘sound economy and sound governing and administrative system’.” Darius the Great has gained a high reputation among historians as also a Great Administrator (Cameron 1968; Cook 1983; Frye 1975; Olmstead 1948).

As a broader and comprehensive notion of government and administration, sound governance means more than the terms government and governing, and good governance. It includes the state as an enabling institution, the constitutional framework, the civil society, the private sector, the engaged citizens, and the international/global institutional structure within limits. “Sound governance”



is therefore inclusive and promotes participation and interaction in an increasingly complex, diverse, and dynamic national and international environment. Hence, the concept “soundness” is used to characterize governance with superior qualities in functions, structures, processes, values, dimensions, and elements that are necessary in governing and administration. Governing refers to the function of governance by whatever actors or authorities or institutions, including nongovernmental ones, whereas governance consists of process, structure, value, management, policy, and administration. Hence, the concept sound governance is used here to denote a systemic process of government that is not only domestically sound, but is also sound internationally/globally in its interaction with other nation-states on an independent and self-determining fashion. Sound governance here reflects both governing and administrative functions with sound organizational and managerial performance that is not only current and competent but also anticipatory, responsive, accountable and transparent, and self-corrective.

## Dimensions of Sound Governance

Several elements or dimensions characterize sound governance with diversity and complexity. Diversity provides sound governance systems with opportunity to receive feedback from opposing dialectical forces that serve as mechanisms of checks and balances; it also injects new bloods into the system and promotes innovation and creativity. Complexity develops as a result of dynamic operation of diversity and increasingly entering number of external and peripheral forces that challenge the operation of the governance system. Complexity is a by-product of increasing interactions among dialectical forces that keep the energy field of governance system busily active. This process leads to varying degrees of intensity within the governance system, in its international operation, and in its dynamic responses to the external environmental pressures, opportunities, and constraints, locally and globally. Conversely, the more the externally received pressures, the more challenges and constraints. External constraints can also stimulate internal strength by pushing systems to develop self-generating capacities that contribute to system’s antibody—they turn constraints into opportunities. Elaborate discussion of the key dimensions or elements of sound governance is avoided here due to space limitation; they are only outlined here and readers interested in more details of the concept are referred to the author’s two earlier works provided in the reference (see Farazmand 2004, 2012a, b).

Accordingly, the dimensions of sound governance include (1) process that involves governing with the interaction of all elements or stakeholders involved; (2) structure with a body of constitutive elements, actors, rules, regulations, procedures, decision-making frameworks, and authoritative sources that sanction or legitimate the governance process; (3) cognitive and value dimension that represents the unique or deviant value system of the governance structure or process; (4) constitution as perhaps the blueprint and most important structural dimension of sound

governance, with the challenge of “formalism” so prevalent in both developed and developing nations’ governance systems (see Riggs 1994, 1966 on this); (5) organizations and institutions as the key instrumental back-bone properties of sound governance (Scott 2008; Farazmand 2014); (6) management and performance serving as the engine of that backbone in governance; (7) policy—both macro strategic and micro operational policies—that gives the elements or dimensions of process, structure, and management sound guidance, direction, and steering; (8) international or globalization forces forming a formidable dimension of sound governance, especially in the age of predatory globalization (examples being not only the United Nations and its various agencies and organizations scattered worldwide, such as International Labor Office, World Food Organization, World Health Organization, World Bank, International Monetary Fund, and World Trade Organization, but also a multitude of governmental such as the USAID and OECD, and non-governmental and grassroots global movement organizations concerned with environment, poverty, health and hunger, and human rights and injustice, ones that may be part of the global movements of “counter-globalization” and “glocalism” and represent the antithesis of globalization); (9) ethics, accountability, and transparency as the cardinal principles of sound governance; and (10) participation and citizen engagement that serve as the essential requirement for practicing sound governance—no governance can survive long enough without the consent of its people, and citizen participation provides that essential requirement that can be secured through various collaborative organizational forms with various degrees (see Farazmand 2012a, b for more detail).

## **Challenges and Opportunities for South and South East Asia**

There is a multitude of challenges facing ‘governance’ and sound governance in the twenty-first century. This is very true for most developing nations, especially in Asia. These challenges emanate from all sources, locally, nationally, regionally, and internationally or globally. While many challenges have local solutions because they involve local issues (e.g., flood control, population density, urban–rural divide, urban governance and administration, or public management), others have multiple sources involved, especially regional and global ones and demand national and international solutions. This means an imperative for regional and global cooperation.

The current world is in deep crisis with multiple dimensions. One is urban population explosion—a global challenge in need of global attention and help. Another is the rising poverty and increasing urbanization, with consequences of poor health, environmental degradation, child and human trafficking, and exploitation. Wars and exacerbated ethnic and racial conflicts constitute another challenge of the twenty-first century. Predatory globalization—of corporate capitalism or otherwise—has more than doubled the challenges already in place. Still another is the issue of “governability crisis,” a crisis that has eclipsed most countries of the Western world,

with many negative consequences for developing and less developed countries in the age of globalization. This global crisis of governability is mostly a result of the North South divide, and the global crisis of capitalism which is intensifying as we speak (see for more details on these global crises, Farazmand 2007, 2009, 2012a, b, 2015). These and other related crises have massive implications for governance in poor and less developed nations of Asia and Africa, and Latin America, where globalization—with a power of the North over the South—has deeply penetrated and affected.

Therefore, a new “governance dilemma” has emerged—governing in an age of massive dissent and global uprising trying to reclaim power from the 1% ruling elites, rising citizen expectations, massive migration crises, ethnic and regional conflicts or wars, and doing impossible things with little or no resources. This new challenge raises a big problem of ‘contradiction’ between ‘capitalism and democratic or good governance,’ hence another case for “sound governance,” which would serve people/citizens better if engaged directly or indirectly. The contradiction is born out of the imbalance between too much emphasis in governance and governing on the need for order and social control and coercion, cheap labor, exploitation of human and environmental resources for absolute rates of profit and surplus values, on the one hand, and the need for creating employment and providing a healthy society to legitimize ‘governing’.

This irreconcilable contradiction is inherent in the nature of capitalism and has been exacerbated by the rise of “predatory capitalism” in the age of rapid globalization dominated by the key Northern powers (see Farazmand 2012a). This logic of collective action—corporate globalization of the world for absolute profit and power—has eclipsed much of the progress in governance and sound governance during the last 30 years or so. In this process, many institutional barriers have also made the challenges more severe. Unfortunately, the role of UN, WB, IM, WTO, and other international organizations have not helped much as most of these and similar organizations have agenda of their own or are influenced heavily by the global power structures that characterize the global hegemony in all fronts (Agnew 2005). Further, unfortunately, many new problems (AIDS, double standards in global conflict resolutions, wars, and more) have increased rather than decreased—contrary to the optimist proponents of corporate globalization of the world (see Friedman 1999; also Farazmand 1999, 2012a, b). In fact, we may have entered a new phase of predatory globalization—an age of “madness, intolerance, and global tyranny” (Farazmand 2012a, b). To survive in this age of madness, intolerance, ideological sickness, and global tyranny is a whole new set of challenges that require building individual human and organizational as well as national capacities.

Are there any solutions to these problems or challenges? Yes, there are, but they are too many to discuss in this short essay. To be brief, two strategies can deal with these challenges: one is sticking to the local issues, thinking locally while being globally minded, by engaging people and citizens directly in communities, locally and nationally—people are the most important assets in governance and governing. Second, engaging national and regional issues of governance challenges at regional

Governance in South, Southeast, and East Asia  
Trends, Issues and Challenges

Jamil, I.; Aminuzzaman, S.M.; Haque, S.T.M. (Eds.)

2015, X, 258 p. 4 illus., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-3-319-15217-2