

# Global Governance and Social Capital for Crisis and Emergency Management\*

Jae Eun Lee

---

---

This study searches for the approaches for securing social capital essential to manage the crisis and emergency effectively in the global society. For attaining the research goal, this essay explores these significant possibilities in three main steps: the definition and significance of crisis and emergency management under the concept of comprehensive security; the relationships between global governance and social capital and crisis/emergency management; policy implications and approaches. This paper suggested four approaches for securing social capital that have an effect on the global crisis and emergency management governance as follows: institutional approach, participatory approach, knowledge-based communication approach, and burden sharing approach.

**Key word:** global governance, social capital, crisis and emergency management

---

---

## I. Introduction

The concept of crisis relates to situations featuring severe threat, uncertainty, and sense of urgency. A wide variety of phenomena, large- as well as small-scale, may be approached from this perspective: natural and technological disasters, conflicts and riots, terrorist actions. Crisis management involves efforts to prevent crises from occurring, to prepare for a better protection against the impact of a crisis agent, to make for an effective response to an actual crisis, and to provide plans and resources for recovery and rehabilitation in the aftermath of a crisis(Rosenthal and Pijnenburg, 1991: 3).

Nowadays, the role of the governance in crisis and emergency management is growing. Partnerships among business, government, and nongovernmental organizations have emerged

---

\* This work was supported by the research grant of the Chungbuk National University in 2009.

worldwide as well as nationwide, and their growing strength, impact, and numbers point the way to increased regional cooperative efforts, both formal and informal (Anderson and Mattingly, 1991: 322–323). And in emergency management, coordination among organizations that participate in the emergency management refers to agreed-upon relationships between independent organizations – relationships that provide for the sharing of critical resources. Coordination is vitally important during all four phases of emergency management: mitigation, preparedness, response, and recovery (Gillespie, 1991: 55). So, crisis and emergency management requires coordination of a wide range of organizations and activities, both public and private. Everyone acknowledges the critical need for such coordination in an emergency, but in fact no one wants to be “coordinated,” nor is it clear just what the term means in practice. Statutory authority is not easily transformed into legitimate political authority, and emergency management agencies are very seldom given anything but statutory authority to “coordinate” in the event of an emergency or disaster—which everyone prefers to believe is unlikely. Statutory power is a necessary but insufficient condition for real power to coordinate (Schroeder, Wamsley, and Ward, 2001: 360).

Our focus here is the global level. Thus we are concerned directly with the global crisis and emergency management agenda in the perspective of social capital. In the 1990s special attention is being paid to the question of global governance. This is a term almost no-one used a decade ago, but which is now generally held to refer to the institutions for managing relations between states across a range of issues, from security to human right and the environment (Halliday, 2000: 19). And for successful crisis and emergency management in global society, this essay is interested in the concept of social capital. Perhaps social capital is another broader process that underlies the movement of trust over time. Here, trust is not a manifestation of how the public views political leaders but a result of how much the public engages in civic life and the attendant attitudes of trust and reciprocity that develop in civic activity. When citizens disengage from civic life and its lessons of social reciprocity, they are unable to trust the institutions that govern political life (Keele, 2007: 241). Without social capital of global citizens, we can not perform crisis and emergency management activity effectively for managing the global disasters and crises. It has become clear that trust is necessary for global emergency management and governance.

In this context, this paper searches for the approaches for securing social capital essential to manage the crisis and emergency effectively in the global society. And this study explores these significant possibilities in three main steps. The first section reviews the definition and significance of crisis and emergency management under the concept of comprehensive security. The second part deals with the relationships between global governance and social capital and

crisis/emergency management. The third section identifies policy implications and approaches for securing social capital that have an effect on the global crisis and emergency management.

## II. Comprehensive Security and National Crisis

Until the end of the Cold War, national security always focused on the military defense of the state(Lee, 2008: 108). The debate on expanded notions of security, which began in the late 1970s and early 1980s, entered mainstream intellectual and policy debates in the early 1990s. This was in the aftermath of the end of the Cold War and superpower confrontation, which challenged the primacy of military dogma in debates on the security of people and states. Perceptions of factors influencing state and people's security changed. Poverty, internal conflict, over-population, environmental change and competition over resources were seen increasingly as more "threatening" to the well-being of people and integrity of states. The resulting debate to expand security focused on three main dimensions(Raad, Khagram, and Clark, 2002: 4-5): expanding the threats to state security from the traditional military/political to the social, economic and environmental; expanding what is to be secured to include people as well as states; and expanding the definitions of security itself to incorporate physical safety, as well as basic needs and beyond that human dignity and capabilities<sup>1)</sup>.

Till now, we have seen a striking change in the ways in which citizens perceive and respond to sudden, urgent, destructive events and, more importantly, in citizen expectations of the government's capacity to anticipate and respond to such events. September 11, 2001 initiated a critical review of government performance, both before and after the disaster(Comfort, 2005: 335).

The meaning of comprehensive security goes far beyond requirements of military defence against a particular 'enemy', and stresses the need to take into account other aspects vital to national stability; food, energy, environment, communication and social security(Radtke and Feddema, 2000). Military insecurity is not only a threat to bilateral relations, but to regional and global stability as well. Sudden changes in exchange rates, collapse of the stock market, outbreaks of infectious disease, and many more non-military crises have increasingly drawn the attention of

---

1) In contrast to comprehensive security, the traditional concept of national security embraces two distinct characteristics(Hsiung, 2004: 3). First, security is commensurate with national survival in a system of world politics that is inherently contentious and anarchical; and the State is the central unit of analysis. Second, understanding force postures and capabilities is a key tenet of traditional security.

governments and security planners. For decades, there has been a keen awareness of the linkages between military security and social, political, and economic stability (Radtko, 2003: 501).

The concept comprehensive security stresses the need for confidence building methods as requirement for its attainment and pertains to issues such as preventive diplomacy, energy security, second order cybernetics, greater transparency of international financial markets as means to enhance overall stability. It is a notion that goes beyond simplifications such as 'us' and 'them'.

With regard to the 'security', we see benefits in a broadening of the frame of discourse to a concept of "comprehensive security". This broader view expands and reformulates more conventional views of state, human and environmental security, which combine to a notion of comprehensive security. Comprehensive security is necessary for lasting human security and should be linked to the more humanistic forms of sustainable development<sup>2)</sup> (Raad, Khagram, and Clark, 2002: 2).

The various components of comprehensive security are intertwined. Global warming may have worldwide economic implications, and epidemics may ravage the physical and economic security of the individual (and society at large). While seemingly heading in opposite directions, both the globalization shift and the opposite shift toward the individual are ultimately interrelated because the individual is the ultimate beneficiary of both environmental and economic security. In either case, the state loses its previous salience as the central focus and unit of analysis.

Four key elements distinguish human from state security (Raad, Khagram, and Clark, 2002: 3-4). The first is clearly a shift in the focus on what or who is to be secured - from political-administrative units that are territorially bounded to individual human beings no matter where they may be at any point in time. The second is an expansion of what security means, from a focus solely on the survival of states to both the survival and dignity of human beings. The third essential contrast between state and human security involves the claim that the survival and dignity of human beings requires "freedom from fear" that is associated with the survival of states. Fourth and last, the threats to human security (understood as the survival and dignity of human beings through freedom from fear and freedom from want) are far more numerous, diverse in type, and complex than the threats to state security.

In this part, we are now seeking the definition of the national crisis, which covers most of the

---

2) Raad, Khagram, and Clark (2002: 2) first sketch their understanding of the key aspects of the human security approach in relation to the more conventional state security and the more recent human development approaches.

types of crisis that threatens the people in a country. From the perspective of the national crisis, we first consider the definition of the nation. Webster’s Third New International Dictionary(1977: 1505) defines a concept of nation as a community of people composed of one or more nationalities and possessing a more or less defined territory and government. In Korea, we have accept this kind of definition of nation to some extent. This paper defines the concept of nation from the point of view of the components of nation. From such point a nation is a community composed of people, territory, sovereignty, and critical infrastructures. In this context, national crisis may be a situation which threatens the security of people, territory, sovereignty, and critical infrastructures that form a nation. It is possible for us to classify the types of national crisis on the grounds of national components; conventional security crisis, disaster crisis, critical infrastructure security crisis, and living safety crisis(Lee, 2009: 2-5). These crises come in a variety of forms, such as terrorism(New York World Trade Center and Oklahoma bombings), natural disasters(Hurricanes Hugo and Andrew in Florida, the Holland and Bangladesh flood disasters), nuclear plant accidents(Three-Mile Island and Chernovyl), riots(Los Angeles riot and the Paris riot of 1968, or periodic prison riots), business crises, and organizational crises facing life-or-death situations in a time of rapid environmental change. Some crises can be managed successfully while others lead to failures and further disasters. Some lead to new and positive changes in society, while others lead to further calamities (Farazmand, 2001: 3).

Types		Contents
Conventional security crisis		war, regional dispute, nuclear bomb and WMD development, armed strife, coup d'etat, subversive activities, etc.
Disaster crisis	Natural disaster	flood, typhoon, earthquake, drought, cold-weather damage, yellow storm, heavy snow storm, torrential rain, etc.
	Man-made disaster	conflagration, collapse, submergence, plane crash, gas explosion, etc.
Critical infrastructure crisis		(system, function, and facilities) of breakdown of banking, transportation, electric power, IT, energy, nuclear, dam, public health, and public order etc.
Living safety crisis		food, drug, traffic, disadvantaged consumer, economic security, living environmental pollution, occupational etc. crisis

source: revised from Lee(2008: 109).

<Figure 1> The Types of National Crisis

Crisis and emergency management may be the process of developing and implementing policies and programmes to avoid, and to cope with, the risks to people and property from various national crises. And crisis and emergency management can be defined as the process of developing and implementing policies that are concerned with the four stages of management;

mitigation, preparedness, response, and recovery (Cigler, 1988; Kim and Lee, 1998: 191). Zimmerman (1985: 37) has explained the process model of emergency management as follows: Mitigation or prevention sets the stage for all subsequent steps by identifying the location and type of populations at risk, the kinds, amounts and sources of chemicals that produce risks, and mitigation measures to reduce. Preparedness depends on the ability to identify an emergency, its magnitude, severity, and precursors; communicate the situation to potential victims and response agencies through notification and warning systems; and design contingency funds and management agencies to administer them in the event of an emergency. Response is as effective as the mitigation and preparedness stages are. This stage is composed of activities conducted during and just after the period of impact, assisting the affected public, and minimizing damage from secondary or repeated impact. Recovery derives its strength from the feedback mechanisms to detect deficiencies in the regulatory programs that led to an emergency in the first place.

### III. Global Crisis/Emergency Management Governance

The rise of globalization of capital and its negative consequences for both developing and more developed nations of the industrialized West has produced many concerns that embrace economics, environmental ecology, labor, culture, traditions, governance, administration, and politics. Energized by technological innovations, globalization has produced some positive effects, such as bringing more markets and products to consumers with money and facilitating communication and travel among peoples and professionals around the globe. But it has also caused many devastating adverse consequences worldwide—environment degradation, violation of human rights, and so on. In this environment of globalization, crises are therefore transformed into different forms and linger through different levels of criticality until they explode, perhaps globally all at the same time (Farazmand, 2001: 1-2). At the global level, states have the authority and responsibility to attend to the human security needs of their citizens. And global governance institutions also play a crucial role for managing the global crisis and emergency occurring in the states (Thomas, 2001: 162).

Analysts of international relations and international civil servants, in contrast, now use the term almost exclusively to describe phenomena that go beyond a synonym for 'government' and the legal authority with which such polities are vested. For instance, the Commission on Global Governance defines 'governance' as 'the sum of the many ways individuals and institutions,

public and private, manage their common affairs. It is the continuing process through which conflicting or diverse interests may be accommodated and co-operative action may be taken(Weiss, 2000: 795-796). All global organizations face a number of challenges in achieving goals since the behavior of a large number of organizations around the world must be carefully monitored.

Rosenau(1995) sums up his understanding of global governance that global governance is conceived to include systems of rule at all levels of human activity - from the family to the international organization - in which the pursuit of goals through the exercise control has transnational repercussions. This definition has four constitutive elements: systems of rule, levels of human activity, the pursuit of goals, and transnational repercussions (Dingwerth and Pattberg, 2006: 189). Global governance is quite distinct from good or bad governance at the national level. A good(that is, accountable, efficient, lawful, representative and transparent) government usually leads to good governance, while bad governance is closely correlated with a conspicuously bad government. Global governance should perhaps be seen as a heuristic device to capture and describe the confusing and seemingly ever-accelerating transformation of the international system. States are central but their authority is eroding in important ways. Their creations, intergovernmental organiza- tions, are no more in control than they ever were. Local and international NGOs are proliferating and gaining authority and resources (Weiss, 2000: 808). Increasingly, human right, environmental and other issues arise and are played out in global policy arenas. Thus the capacity of national and global non-government organizations(NGOs), networks and social movements to join governments and international agencies as global policy protagonist may be crucial in defining and deciding issues in the emerging institutions of global governance, and the interests that are served as a result(Muetzelfeldt and Smith, 2002: 56).



<Figure 2> Components of Global Crisis and Emergency Management Governance

Global crisis/emergency management governance can be defined as systems of implementing the crisis/emergency management policy through mutual cooperative coordinated networks, with sharing the equal authority of decision making, composed of states, global and national NGOs, and global organizations for making global society more safe. This definition consists of five elements: goal, subject, premise, method, and substance.

#### IV. Social Capital and Global Crisis/Emergency Management

To carry out the tasks of crisis and emergency management in the U.S.A., there are four central actors; local governments, state governments, federal governments, and private organizations. It goes without saying that these components are extremely diverse. They tend to have different organization structures, be of different sizes, have different resources available to them, have different political mandates, and they are accountable to different publics with different interests (Perry, 1985: 8). Maybe if there is no trust among the actors, they can not perform the proper crisis and emergency management function.

Perhaps social capital is another broader process that underlies the movement of trust over time. Trust is not a manifestation of how the public views political leaders but a result of how much the public engages in civic life and the attendant attitudes of trust and reciprocity that develop in civic activity. When citizens disengage from civic life and its lessons of social reciprocity, they are unable to trust the institutions that govern political life (Keele, 2007: 241). This social capital is defined as features, such as trust, norms and networks, that can improve the efficiency of society by facilitating coordinated actions. Social capital is productive, and can best be measured in its productive effects, such as through spontaneous cooperation (Putnam, 1993; Muetzelfeldt and Smith, 2002: 57). This emphasizes the importance of good neighbourliness, social trust and a high level of participation in a range of institutions, organizations and practices in civil society and the state (Fukuyama, 2001). 'Social' indicates that the phenomenon is relational, which implies that it captures interactions between people. The term 'capital' indicates that we deal with something that should be understood as an asset to the ones who have such 'capital' at their disposal. However, those who do not directly possess this kind of capital can be beneficiaries under certain conditions. At the individual level we would argue that social capital refers to two different dimensions: the number of relations that can be used as an asset by the individual, and

his or her values and attitudes. Simply put, the more social networks A is involved in and the more trust and willingness to cooperate A possesses, the more social capital A has(Turner, 2001; Rothstein and Stolle, 2003: 3).

Social capital is a broad concept thought to affect many aspects of society. Social capital refers to the social connections, networks, and interpersonal trust that occur in communities. Specifically, social capital has two aspects. The first is the level of civic engagement in a community, state, or nation, and the second is interpersonal trust, or the willingness to ascribe benign intentions to others. Citizens who participate in civic activities meet more people and learn interpersonal trust from interacting with them(Keele, 2007; Putnam, 1993). So, broadly defined, social capital is relationships of trust, norms of reciprocity, and networks among individuals that can be drawn upon for individual or collective benefit. The crux of social capital is that relationships "constitute an important asset", one that can be called on in a crisis, enjoyed for its own sake, and leveraged for material gain. Social capital can use it to acquire other resources(Coleman, 1990; Woolcock and Narayan, 2000: 226; Bourdieu, 1986; Wagner and Fernandez- Gimenez, 2008: 324). Trust has various forms that are more or less beneficial to an individual: knowledge-based trust can only emerge between actors who know each other and who have interactive experiences with each other(Uslander, 2002; Rothstein and Stolle, 2003: 4).

Social capital may act as both an input to and an outcome of collaborative processes. Social capital facilitates the cooperation necessary for collective action, and thus can be seen as an input. Because it facilitates collaboration, social capital increases the likelihood that a collaborative effort will succeed. Trust and norms of reciprocity among participants increase the willingness of parties to cooperate because people have the confidence to invest in collective activities, knowing that others will also do so. Because collective action is a mechanism that may build social capital, social capital can also be seen as a potential outcome of collaboration. In other words, social capital and collective action are mutually reinforcing and their interaction creates a positive feedback loop. It is clear that knowledge-based trust can be useful to an individual for various purposes. Particularized trust is directed at members of one's actual or imagined group and it provides the necessary fabric for achieving group goals more efficiently, whereas generalized trust is a rather encompassing value that reaches beyond the circle of known people to include those who are not necessarily known and is most beneficial in contact with strangers(Brewers, 1981; Ziegler, 1998; Putnam, 1993; Wagner and Fernandez-Gimenez, 2008: 324).

## V. Approaches for Securing Social Capital in Global Crisis and Emergency Management

### 1. Institutional Approach

Demands on governments, international organizations and other bodies of authority are increasing as public perceptions and judgements question their legitimacy and abilities to actually govern risk issues with global impacts. The differences in legal, institutional and organizational structures and processes in different countries also affect the manifestation of effective governance. Incorporating public concerns and understanding the role that governance plays in defining public concerns, is part of the risk governance framework and essential in order to leverage the roles of institutions and collaboration among them (Kyoto University and the International Risk Governance Council, 2009: 23). Although reorganization to enhance coordination and cooperation among the countries is not all the things to do for global crisis and emergency management, it is a good and nice avenue that could be followed. This has been a significant issue among those concerned about coordination and cooperation. It is possible for the global actors, such as states, global and national NGOs, and global organizations, and so on, to make an global institution for coping with the catastrophe in the global society (Lee, 2008: 111).

### 2. Participatory Approach

The notion that command and control model is appropriate for emergency management is based on several premises: massiveness of disaster impacts, weakness of victims, fragility of affected social systems, breakdown of social control, and need for a single encompassing structure to replace nonfunctioning organizations. Timely coordination is more important than hierarchical authority. Although often difficult to achieve, coordination is essential and should be maintained under local control to the extent possible. Thus, effective emergency management should not be based on a command and control model but on what might be called an emergent resource coordination model (Kreps, 1991: 44-45). For effective and efficient coordination in crisis and emergency management, it is needed that the related actors and institutions should take part in the management process, such as mitigation/ prevention, preparedness, response, recovery, and structure of decision-making of global crisis and emergency management.

### 3. Knowledge-based Communication Approach

Most global governance agencies have now devised mechanisms of one kind or another to engage with these initiatives from civil society associations. Most global regulatory institutions have developed elaborate websites and upgraded other public communications to address civil society audiences. Most have also increased their release of information to civil society circles in the name of transparency(Scholte, 2004: 215). Knowledge and information related with certain crisis or disaster should be dissipated to global governance actors and global citizens for coping with catastrophes. Outside the formal institutions of global or international governance, other actors have also increasingly sought to shape the course of world affairs, including social movements, global publics, media organizations, and even terrorist networks. International knowledge institutions represent a special case of the broader class of monitoring and verification programs, in which monitoring and verification has been institutionalized in an independent agency with specific license to collect, validate, analyze, and/or synthesize knowledge on specific aspects of global affairs, including the behavior of various actors in the international system. Knowledge-making by international knowledge institutions can include the monitoring of global systems, for example, the behavior and status of the climate system or the ozone layer or the monitoring of infectious disease outbreaks(Miller, 2007: 330, 334). This is a necessary approach of making and sending knowledge and information to the global public through the various media for securing social capital for global crisis and emergency management.

#### 4. Burden Sharing Approach

A disaster can result in severe economic consequences for an afflicted area. State and local monies deplete rapidly, costly liability demands arise in court, and insurance claims increase quickly, placing the community in an unexpected economic crisis(Settle, 1985: 101). If a country are now paying in full for protecting the global critical infrastructure, such as straits and port from external threats, it will be a heavy burden to the country and strain the budget operation. Recently, our planet has become a global market place strongly dependent on infrastructures which have also developed into globally networked systems. Their malfunction or disruption of service may cause large-area, transboundary effects and propagate to other systems. Global shipping and trade networks will clearly be as global critical infrastructures<sup>3)</sup>(Kyoto University

---

3) The Malacca Straits and Port of Singapore, both of which are vital links for trade between Asia and Europe and the Middle East, serve as eminent examples of critical corridors and hubs. The Malacca

and the International Risk Governance Council, 2009: 8). For making the global crisis and emergency management governance, it is necessary for the global actors to share the losses to expense for protecting the global critical infrastructure with a country in charge.

## VI. Conclusion

Throughout history public policy makers have sought to anticipate the unexpected in order to reduce the risk to human life and safety posed by intermittently occurring natural and man-made hazardous events. Their efforts have provided the foundation for the current focus on emergency management as an important function of federal, state, and local governments (Petak, 1985: 3). And, in the global village composed of global public (Farazmand, 2001: 2), we prefer that global society have to make a global crisis and emergency management governance with social capital.

So, this paper has tried to search for the approaches for securing social capital essential to manage the crisis and emergency effectively in the global society. So this essay explored the significant meanings of global governance, global crisis and emergency management governance, and social capital. In this article, the suggested policy implications or approaches for making the global crisis and emergency management governance and securing social capital in the global governance for crisis and emergency management are as follows; institutional approach, participatory approach, knowledge-based communication approach, and burden sharing approach.

## Bibliography

- Anderson, William A. and Shirley Mattingly. 1991. Future Directions. Thomas E. Drabek and Gerard J. Hoetmer. *Emergency Management: Principles and Practice for Local Government*. Washington, D.C.: International City Management Association.
- Bourdieu, P. 1986. The Forms of Capital. J. G. Richardson (ed.). *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. 241-258.

---

Straits are one of the busiest shipping lanes in the world and carries around 25% of all world trade and half of the world's shipped crude oil. The Port of Singapore is the world's busiest port in terms of total shipping tonnage, attracting 140,000 vessel calls annually to and from 600 ports in over 120 countries (Kyoto University and the International Risk Governance Council, 2009: 8).

- Brewer, M. B. 1981. Ethnocentrism and Its Role in Interpersonal Trust. M. B. Brewer and B. E. Collins(eds.). *Scientific Inquiry in the Social Sciences*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cigler, Beverly A. 1988. Emergency Management and Public Administration. Michael T. Charles and John Choon K. Kim(eds.). *Crisis Management: A Casebook* Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas · Publisher.
- Coleman, J. 1990. *Foundations of Social Theory*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Comfort, Louise K. 2002. Rethinking Security: Organizational Fragility in Extreme Events. *Public Administration Review*. 62(Special Issue): 98-107.
- Dingwerth, Klaus and Philipp Pattberg. 2006. Global Governance as a Perspective on World Politics. *Global Governance*. 12(2): 185-203.
- Farazmand, Ali. 2001. Introduction: Crisis and Emergency Management. Ali Farazmand(ed.). *Handbook of Crisis and Emergency Management*. New York·Basel: Marcel Dekker, Inc.
- Fukuyama, F. 2001. Social Capital, Civil Society and Development. *Third World Quarterly*. 22: 7-20.
- Gillespie, David F. 1991. Coordinating Community Resources. Thomas E. Drabek and Gerard J. Hoetmer. *Emergency Management: Principles and Practice for Local Government*. Washington, D.C.: International City Management Association.
- Halliday, Fred. 2000. Global Governance: Prospects and Problems. *Citizenship Studies*. 4(1): 19-33.
- Hsiung, James C. 2004. *Comprehensive Security: Challenge for Pacific Asia*. Indianapolis: University of Indianapolis Press.
- Keele, Luke. 2007. Social Capital and the Dynamics of Trust in Government. *American Journal of Political Science*. 51(2): 241-254.
- Kim, Pan Suk and Jae Eun Lee. 1998. Emergency Management in Korea and Its Future Directions. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*. 6(4): 189-201.
- Kreps, Gary A. 1991. Organizing for Emergency Management. Thomas E. Drabek and Gerard J. Hoetmer. *Emergency Management: Principles and Practice for Local Government*. Washington, D.C.: International City Management Association.
- Kyoto University and the International Risk Governance Council. 2009. Risk Governance of Maritime Global Critical Infrastructures: Straits of Malacca and Singapore Exposed to Extreme Hazards. *Pre-workshop Briefing Report*(26 May 2009).
- Lee, Jae Eun. 2008. Securing the National Security and Reinforcing the Cyber Crisis Management System in Asia. *Korean Review of Crisis and Emergency Management*. 4(1): 105-116.
- Lee, Jae Eun. 2009. Comprehensive Security and Crisis & Emergency Management for Protecting

- Critical Infrastructure. *Proceedings of Sino-Korea Symposium on Risk, Security and Emergency Management: New Approaches* (April 20, 2009; Chinese Academy of Sciences in Beijing, China): 2-14.
- Miller, Clark A. 2007. Democratization, International Knowledge Institutions, and Global Governance. *Governance*. 20(2): 325-357.
- Muetzelfeldt, Michael and Gary Smith. 2002. Civil Society and Global Governance: The Possibilities for Global Citizenship. *Citizenship Studies*. 6(1): 55-75.
- Perry, Ronald W. 1985. *Comprehensive Emergency Management: Evacuating Threatened Populations*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, Inc.
- Petak, William J. 1985. Emergency Management: A Challenge for Public Administration. *Public Administration Review*. 45(Special Issue): 3-7.
- Putnam, R. D. 1993. The Prosperous Community: Social Capital and Public Life. *American Prospect*. 13: 35-42.
- Raad, Firas, Sanjeev Khagram, and William Clark. 2002. From Human Security and the Environment to Comprehensive Security and Sustainable Development. *Working Draft: for Review by the the Global Commission on Human Security in Johannesburg*. Aug 2002.
- Radtke, Kurt W. and Raymond Feddema. eds. 2000. *Comprehensive Security in Asia: Views from Asia and the West on a Changing Security Environment*. Boston: Brill Academic Publishers.
- Radtke, Kurt. 2003. Sino-Indian Relations: Security Dilemma, Ideological Polarization, or Cooperation Based on 'Comprehensive Security'? *Perspectives on Global Development and Technology*. 2(3-4): 499-520.
- Rosenau, James N. 1995. Governance in the Twenty-first Century. *Global Governance*. 1(1): 13-43.
- Rosenthal, Uriel and Bert Pijenburg. 1991. Simulation-oriented Scenarios: An Alternative Approach to Crisis Decision Making and Emergency Management. Uriel Rosenthal and Bert Pijenburg(eds.). *Crisis Management and Decision Making: Simulation Oriented Scenarios*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Rothstein, Bo and Dietlind Stolle. 2003. Introduction: Social Capital in Scandinavia. *Scandinavian Political Studies*. 26(1): 1-26.
- Scholte, Jan Aart. 2004. Civil Society and Democratically Accountable Global Governance. *Government and Opposition*. 39(2): 211-233.
- Schroeder, Aaron, Gary Wamsley, and Robert Ward. 2001. The Evolution of Emergency Management in America: From a Painful Past to a Promising but Uncertain Future. Ali

- Farazmand(ed.). *Handbook of Crisis and Emergency Management*. New York-Basel: Marcel Dekker, Inc.
- Settle, Allen K. 1985. Financing Disaster Mitigation, Preparedness, Response, and Recovery. *Public Administration Review*. 45(Special Issue): 101-106.
- Thomas, Caroline. 2001. Global governance, Development and Human Security: Exploring the Links. *Third World Quarterly*. 22(2): 159-175.
- Turner, M. 2001. *Cognitive Dimensions of Social Science*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Uslaner, E. 2002. *The Moral Foundation of Trust*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Wagner, Cheryl L. and Maria E. Fernandez-Gimenez. 2008. Does Community-Based Collaborative Resource Management Increase Social Capital? *Society and Natural Resources*. 21(4): 324-344.
- Weiss, Thomas G. 2000. Governance, Good Governance and Global Governance: Conceptual and Actual Challenges. *Third World Quarterly*. 21(5): 795-814.
- Ziegler, R. 1998. Trust and the Reliability of Expectations. *Rationality and Society*. 10(4): 427-450.
- Zimmerman, Rae. 1985. The Relationship of Emergency Management to Governmental Policies on Man-Made Technological Disasters. *Public Administration Review*. 45(Special Issue): 29-39.

---

**李在恩**: 연세대학교에서 행정학 박사학위를 취득하고(논문: 한국의 위기관리정책에 관한 연구: 집행구조의 다조직적 관계 분석을 중심으로, 2000), 현재 충북대학교 행정학과 부교수로 재직중이다. 주요 관심분야는 위기관리, 조직이론, 정책집행 등이며, 시민참여와 거버넌스(공저, 2009) 등의 저서와 “국가감등관리의 효율화 방안”(2009), “지방정부 재난관리 기관의 반응 분석”(2008), “국가위기관리의 새로운 영역 설정과 추진 전략: 국민생활안전 위기영역의 분류와 운영 방안 모색”(2007), “국가 위기관리 정책의 영역별 상대적 중요도 분석: AHP 기법을 이용한 우선순위 측정을 중심으로”(2007) 등이 있다(jeunlee@chungbuk.ac.kr).

투 고 일: 2010년 2월 8일

게재확정일: 2010년 3월 2일