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Chapter 1
Policy-Making in an Interdependent World

MICHAEL MORAN

Introduction: interdependence old and new

‘Interdependence’ poses a serious and novel challenge to policy-makers, and to our understanding of the policy process. This chapter is about understanding the nature of that challenge. We are looking at something new here. But in what does the novelty consist? I will argue in the following pages that novelty lies only partly in the changing objective character of the policy-making world, though there is indeed evidence that we are encountering new kinds of interdependence. For their effective management, these new forms of interdependence do certainly require novel institutional creations; the tools of nineteenth-century bureaucracy are no more appropriate to the twenty-first century than is nineteenth-century technology. But there is another form of novelty involved here: it is not simply that the world has changed; the way the world is discursively constructed has also altered. And at least some of the novelty of interdependence lies in the perception of its novelty. Thus, making sense of policy-making in an interdependent world has to attempt the difficult task of disentangling what is new about interdependence from what policy advocates say is new about it.

Any argument about the significance of ‘interdependence’ in policy-making has immediately to confront two considerations. First, interdependence is hardly new – indeed, it virtually defines the human condition. As a social science, political science should be uniquely sensitive to this fact. Indeed, the history of the study of politics can be conceived as a history of the study of interdependencies for, at root, it is the study of how we govern ourselves as social animals. The issue is, therefore, whether we are encountering new and more daunting forms of interdependence. Second, interdependence is a complex concept. Even
casual reflection soon demonstrates that there is no single kind or source of interdependence.

These two elementary considerations shape this chapter. Since this is a volume about where political science is going – about new problems and new directions – we have to identify what, if anything, is novel about the connection between interdependence, the practice of policy-making, and the study of policy-making. ‘If anything’, here, is more than a ritual qualifier. Interdependence has always been with us; but whether there exist new kinds of interdependence, and new problems created by interdependence, has to be an open question – one that can only be settled by appeal to evidence. It is here that our second opening consideration – the complexity of the concept – becomes relevant. If interdependence takes more than one form, we cannot assume that all its forms change – or remain constant – together. To say something about whether we live in a world of novel interdependence, we have to distinguish, if only schematically, different dimensions of interdependence, and have to say how they are changing or remaining constant.

That is part of the task attempted in this chapter. I work with three concepts of interdependence. Spatial interdependence is a fact of policy life, because policy is made in territorial domains – of which the most closely studied is the territorially delimited state. Since policy is made and implemented in territorial space, it has always has had to contend with the facts of interdependence both within and between territorial domains. The key questions now, therefore, relate to whether any new forms of spatial interdependence have developed, and what these new forms have done to the practice and the academic understanding of policy-making?

Institutional interdependence has, similarly, always been a fact of policy life. We conventionally use images such as the ‘machinery’ of policy-making to recognize the fact that policy is rarely made by a single institutional component but is, rather, the result of some kind of coordinated division of institutional labour; and the implementation of policy is virtually a study in institutional interdependencies. So, the critical question is not: Does institutional interdependence exist and does it shape the policy process? Rather, it is: Are we witnessing new kinds of institutional interdependence and new kinds of consequential problems?

Policy interdependence takes us to the heart of policy – its substance. That policy domains are interdependent is, once again, a truism: at the simplest level, we need only think of the opportunity costs involved in committing to one public spending programme over another. Once again, the critical question therefore is not: ‘Do policies interact in this fashion?’
Rather, it is: ‘Are there new forms of interdependence within the substance of policies?’

These distinctions are necessarily schematic. It will be plain, for example, that spatial interdependence can spill over into institutional interdependence. Nevertheless, the distinctions give us a vocabulary with which to examine the problems and opportunities of policy-making in an interdependent world.

Spatial interdependence: discursive construction and democratic statecraft

There is nothing novel about spatial interdependence. Indeed, the very invention and endurance of the Westphalian system may be interpreted as an attempt to solve two kinds of interdependence arising from the fact that policy is made in a world of territorial space. The image of a unitary sovereign state was designed to address the problems of internal coordination and hierarchy inside the territorial boundaries of that creation. In the academic literature, the single most influential definition of the character of the state succinctly addresses the link between territory and interdependence: ‘a state is a human community that [successfully] claims the monopoly of legitimate use of physical force within a given territory’ (Weber 1948 [1918]: 78 – emphasis in original). Moreover, the Westphalian system also functioned to delineate the rules governing what was to happen when states knocked up against each – and, in particular, against each other’s sovereign borders – in a physically interdependent world.

What then, if anything, is novel about spatial interdependence and about the problems it creates for the practice and the study of policy-making? There are three credible claims to novelty: the growth of spatial interdependence in economic life; the growth of spatial interdependence in a core sphere of state responsibility, the management of human security; and the growth of a discursive sense of interdependence.

The first of these is usually gathered under the umbrella of economic globalization. True, there is contention surrounding this subject: about the very meaning of globalization; about how far the changes that have undoubtedly occurred since the early 1970s are, indeed, historically novel, or only amounted to the recreation of an older pattern disrupted by the great wars of the twentieth century; and about just how truly ‘global’ have been the processes creating an economically interdependent world (see, for instance, Thompson et al. 2009). But one comprehensive survey
of what we know about the phenomenon concludes that ‘accelerated globalization of recent decades has left almost no one and no locale on earth completely untouched, and the pace has on the whole progressively quickened with time’ (Scholte 2005: 119). In particular, Scholte argues, the critical domain of finance ‘has shifted very substantially out of the territorialist framework that defined most banking, securities, derivatives and insurance business before the middle of the twentieth century’ (Scholte 2005: 113). The contributions to this volume by Thompson, Held and Ravenhill develop this argument further.

The realization of the extent of spatial interdependence in the entirely traditional state domain of human security might be said to have crystallized on the morning of 11 September 2001, the notorious date of the attack on the World Trade Centre in New York. As with arguments about the spatial interdependence of national economies, a case can also be made against novelty here: that the sense of shock created by the attack obscured the extent to which, over the course of the preceding century, the technologies of warfare had eroded the capacity of any single state to ensure the physical security of its population. But the world after ‘9/11’ is permeated by a very different sense of the impact of spatial interdependence on the state. In particular, a combination of population migrations, cultural change and technological innovation has contributed to the international securitization of policy: to the sense that spatial interdependence is so pervasive that no single state can any longer independently achieve the traditional state missions of ensuring internal or external security for its citizens.

As the terms of this description suggest, the sense of spatial interdependence is as important for the practice and understanding of policy-making as is any ‘objective’ evidence. Indeed, the interdependence of territorial units is so many-sided and complex that we are unlikely to be able to reduce it to a set of metrics that will allow us simply to measure change over time in an intellectually coercive way. That is why the third identified meaning – the growth of a discursive sense of spatial interdependence – is so important. The notion that concepts such as economic globalization are subject to a process of discursive construction has proved particularly influential as the study of policy-making itself has been influenced by the ‘cultural turn’ in the social sciences (Hay and Rosamond 2002; Forestor 2006; Susskind 2006).

To describe the sense of growing spatial interdependence as a discursively constructed concept is not to suggest that it is a fiction: there are limits to the extent to which ideological mystification can transcend the experiences, and the data, of social reality. On the contrary, rhetorically
to construct general accounts of the changing policy environment is the heart of the policy-maker’s art, especially when the policy-maker is a democratically elected politician. Indeed, it is the discursively constructed character of spatial interdependence that helps explain why its effects on our understanding of the policy process are so ambiguous: how it is discursively constructed determines whether it is a constraining or an enabling factor in policy-making. The early interpretations of the significance of the spatial interdependence of national economies, in particular, pictured its effects largely in the language of constraints – at the most immediate level, sometimes echoing the claims of some of the cheerleaders of globalization that the era of the territorially delimited sovereign state was at an end. But a later generation of scholarship has produced accounts that allow for a significant amount of policy creativity in the face of interdependence. The sources of this creativity are threefold. First, the exercise of the traditional powers of the Westphalian state – for instance, of physical coercion and fiscal expropriation – though complicated by spatial interdependence, is not extinguished in a spatially interdependent world (Weiss 1998). Second, spatial interdependence, precisely, strengthens relations of dependency. At an economic level, globalization involves the elaboration of a global division of labour, allowing the occupation of specialist ‘niches’ by national economies and, more importantly, allowing the elaboration of national policy strategies that, in turn, enable nations to occupy those niches (Garrett 1998). Finally, the very act of discursive construction arises because it endows policy-makers with a powerful resource in formulating and implementing policy. The most striking example is provided by the history of economic policy-making in the Anglo-American world during the second ‘long boom’, lasting from 1992 to 2007. In this era, policy elites were able to invoke images of globalization to legitimate policy strategies that involved the extensive deregulation of labour, product and financial markets. As we shall see later, the catastrophic end of the new ‘long boom’ also led to the depletion of the intellectual capital that helped legitimate this particular discursive construction.

But the impact of spatial interdependence is not only felt at the level of policy formulation and legitimation. It has also affected the way national policy-making systems are organized. The most sustained and convincing account of this set of effects is provided by Slaughter’s notion of the way the unitary (Westphalian) state is being ‘disaggregated’ (Slaughter 2004). Disaggregation at the national level is, Slaughter argues, visible in the way national policy agencies are, in effect, obliged to formulate their own distinctive ‘foreign policies’. In particular, in the most globalized
parts of the economy – such as financial services – the interdependent relations between national regulatory agencies joined in international regulatory bodies, in fields such as central banking and securities markets, are at least as important as the ‘internal’ relations between parts of the national state machine. Spatial interdependence is thus disaggregating national policy-making systems into global networks of agents along lines of specialized policy responsibilities. The general character of Slaughter’s argument is well illustrated in specific institutional terms in Braithwaite and Drahos’s classic study of global business regulation. Indeed, what they show is that it is not only national policy-making systems that are being disaggregated; the same is true of ‘private’ institutions in this interdependent world. In *Global Business Regulation* there is a revealing tabular summary of all this (Braithwaite and Drahos 2000: 476–7). It shows, to use a metaphor of which Braithwaite and Drahos are fond, a global web of organizations, individuals and social groups. The regulation of contract and property rights, for instance, encompasses major American national trade associations (such as the Motion Picture Association of America) and individual corporate giants (such as IBM). It is a web that joins individual corporate giants with national governments: the regulation of telecommunications includes the governments of both the United States and the United Kingdom and corporate actors such as Time-Warner. Some regulatory spheres are made up of segments of national governments, individual agencies often operating in highly technical spheres: for instance, the International Organization of (national) Securities Commissions for the regulation of securities markets. The web is also marked by an elaborate division of labour, even between corporate giants: they include not only producers of goods and services, but also commercial standard establishing bodies – for instance, credit and bond rating agencies such as Moody’s. Mention of Moody’s highlights the contingent character of all this interdependence for, in the wake of the global crisis after 2007, their role has been challenged, and attempts are being made to subject them to public regulation, notably by the European Union.

Slaughter’s insight concerning the impact of spatial interdependence on the institutional structure of national policy-making systems reminds us of a point with which we began: that, whilst the distinction between different forms of interdependence gives us a handy vocabulary with which to discuss this world, there can be no hard and fast distinction between spatial and institutional interdependence. But it is to the closer examination of the latter that we now turn.
Institutional interdependence: government, governance and complexity

Just as spatial interdependence lies at the traditional heart of the state and of the Westphalian state system, so institutional interdependence lies at the heart of our traditional ideas of the modern state. Weber’s notion of the state as involving a monopoly of coercion in a territorially delimited space, and his theory of bureaucracy as a hierarchy of command based on a highly elaborated division of labour, both expressed the perennial character of institutional interdependence in political life: the monopoly of coercion was supposed to be a solution to the problem of interdependence across space; the theory of bureaucracy both described complex institutional interdependencies and offered a hierarchical solution to the problems that they posed.

The most convincing argument about the contemporary significance of institutional interdependence consists, therefore, not in the claim that it is a novel condition facing the policy-maker, but that new kinds of interdependence have made obsolete or ineffective our traditional formal and hierarchical means of coping with interdependence. Much of this sort of literature is now commonly gathered under the heading of a ‘governance’ school of thought. It is striking that the rise of governance images has been influential in the formally separated sub-disciplines of international relations and the study of domestic state systems. In the former, Rosenau (1990, 1992, 2000) offered an eloquent account of the transformation of the Westphalian system: from one where sovereign states were kingpin, to a system where states were one set of actors in decentralized networks that also involved non-state actors ranging from private corporations to a multitude of NGOs. This is a world of governance that has abandoned the hierarchies of ‘government’ in place of ‘a set of regulatory mechanisms … which function effectively even though they are not endowed with formal authority’ (Rosenau 1992: 5). It is a world of ‘fragmentation’ – a neologism coined by Rosenau – where fragmentation and integration are simultaneously at work in the international state system (Rosenau 2000: 177.)

In the study of domestic politics, an even more emphatic version of the rise of a new kind of interdependence has been offered. The classic account is provided by Rhodes:

The shift from government to governance in the differentiated polity is my preferred narrative … It focuses on interdependence, disaggregation, a segmented executive, policy networks, governance and
hollowing out. Interdependence in intergovernmental relations and policy networks contradicts the authority of parliamentary sovereignty and a strong executive. Institutional differentiation and disaggregation contradict command and control by bureaucracy. Thriving functional representation contradicts territorial representation through local governments. (Rhodes 1997: 87)

One of the most attractive features of this image of a new kind of institutional interdependence is that it leads, especially in the work of Rhodes, to a confrontation with the real world of policy – especially with the real world of policy fiascos. Policy failure, in this view of the world, is due to the attempt to employ the old hierarchical solutions to problems of institutional interdependence. Relying on Weberian state and bureaucratic theory is akin to relying on the technology of steam in the age of the combustion engine and the computer. (And, indeed, much of the imagery of line bureaucracy derived from one of the first great systems of coordination in industrial society, that created by nineteenth-century railway organizations.) The solution to the new institutional interdependencies was precisely to recognize the constraints it put on hierarchical government, and to recognize that it demanded a reflexive approach to the solution of policy problems: an approach premised on an engagement with all actors, whether nominally ‘private’ or ‘public’; and an institutional arrangement designed to steer, not command, the networks that clustered around different policy areas.

The ‘governance’ version of the significance of institutional interdependence is barely two decades old, but the fundamental intellectual assumptions that guide it are not, in fact, particularly novel. The single-most influential analytical framework in political science from the 1950s to the 1970s was promoted in the work of David Easton, now a largely forgotten figure. Easton’s ‘systems framework for the analysis of political life’ was based on the premise that the territorial, bureaucratic state was an unusable fiction, and needed to be replaced by a systems framework in which societal institutions were joined to processes of authoritative decision-making in a continuous cycle of mutually adjusting steering (Easton 1957, 1965). Easton, in turn, was inspired by an older literature on cybernetics that anticipated much of the language of self-steering systems. At the more immediate level of policy analysis, the fiascos of the 1960s and 1970s produced a large literature emphasizing precisely the importance of managing complex interdependency, and the catastrophic consequences of failing to do so intelligently. Pressman and Wildavsky’s influential study of Implementation stressed the problems of
multiple clearances in the long lines of institutional relations involved in ‘the complexity of joint action’ (Pressman and Wildavsky 1973: 93). That was an early herald of a large literature on ‘overloaded government’ that argued that modern societies were characterized by ‘organised social complexity’, La Porte’s influential notion (1975). Doing anything significant involved managing a huge range of public and private actors – such a range that it threatened to make advanced industrial societies extremely difficult, or even impossible, to govern (for an application of organized social complexity in this way, see King 1976).

In sketching these antecedents of governance theory, I do not mean to diminish its worth, or to imply that it is just recycling older ideas. It would be amazing, after all, if it had no intellectual antecedents. Indeed, the most attractive feature of governance theory, especially in the hands of someone as creative and as interested in the problems of real-world policy-making as Rhodes, is that it has moved beyond the pessimism of the previous generation of analysts of complex institutional interdependence to try to think out how policy could be made intelligently and implemented effectively in these conditions of institutional interdependence. That is what lies behind the whole examination of strategies of managing self-steering networks. It is worth recalling the older tradition of writings about institutional interdependence – not for antiquarian reasons, but precisely because the process highlights what is novel and creative in contemporary accounts.

Nevertheless, there remains doubt as to whether we really do live in a new world of institutional interdependence, still less in the kind of segmented world without hierarchy that lies at the heart of much of the governance imagery. The most convincing case is probably that made by theorists of governance in the international system, such as Rosenau. It is convincing because it seems to link to two historical changes that can be verified by fairly robust evidence. The first is the kind of globalization – whatever the subtleties of debate about its meaning – that really did seem to be creating new sorts of spatial interdependence; and this new spatial interdependence really does seem to spill over into institutional interdependence. The second is that there also seems to be robust evidence that what it is conventional to call ‘global civil society’ has become much more densely populated and active in the last generation – and the institutions of global civil society have therefore joined states as significant actors in policy processes (Glasius et al. 2002).

But applying the imagery beyond the international system is more problematic, for two reasons. First, there do not seem to be any comparably
convincing measures to those that paint change in the international system that would allow us to demonstrate that we are, indeed, living in a new world of domestically disaggregated state authority. That striking examples of networked governance exist is plainly true. But there are other trends that are hard to assimilate to the thesis that we are seeing a new kind of social order of mutual interdependence being created. A considerable body of evidence demonstrates the growing juridification of numerous social spheres, involving the invasion of hitherto autonomous worlds of self-regulation by command law (Moran 2007). States similarly continue, for the purposes of regulation, to colonize new social worlds, such as the regulation of human reproduction, or they tighten their command grip over worlds hitherto lightly regulated (health and safety, financial regulation).

The reference to financial regulation brings us to the second ground for scepticism. In the work of the most eloquent and creative governance theorists, such as Rhodes, governance is a solution to pathologies of command: it offers a more intelligent mode of steering than was possible in the old hierarchical world of government, and is therefore more attuned to a new world of institutional interdependence. Policy-making based on command has provided, and continues to provide, numerous examples of policy fiascos. But the exemplification of policy-making by light-touch steering in the last two decades, across the advanced industrial world, has been the light touch regulation of financial markets, in which the state stepped back from direct command. That system delivered us, after 2007, the greatest banking crisis for a century and the most severe global depression since at least the close of the Second World War. State command has often produced stupid policy outcomes; but the evidence is that theories of light-touch steering that claim to respond to new worlds of high institutional interdependence can be just as stupid. The rhetoric of light-touch control, at least in the Anglo-American world, was not, it is now plain, the product of some functional response to the complexities of control but, rather, of the way power in financial markets lay with interests within the markets. The financiers captured the regulatory system and dignified it with the label of ‘light-touch steering’ (see also Thompson and Ravenhill, in this volume).

What this suggests is that there might be more to policy-making in an interdependent world than spatial and institutional interdependence. There might be something going on in the very substance of policy; and this brings us naturally to the third aspect of interdependence that informs this chapter.
Policy interdependence: specialization, tacit knowledge and catastrophic risk

Our discussion of spatial and institutional interdependence has established that interdependence is, in itself, nothing new, and this now familiar theme can be repeated in introducing policy interdependence. The idea that policy choices in conventionally defined different domains are interdependent is a truism – and therefore true. Think again of the example given at the start of this chapter: the way the conventional language of budgetary choices pictures decisions to spend on one programme as imposing opportunity costs that restrict freedom to spend on other programmes. If the idea of the interdependence of policy domains is to have purchase, therefore, we have to demonstrate – as we sought to do in the spatial and institutional spheres – that there is something novel at work.

There are, indeed, three credible possibilities – and they are a mix of opportunities and threats. First, new technologies of policy formulation, hard and soft, might allow the imposition of common patterns of control on the policy process. The ‘interdependence’ here is created by common traits in different domains and our novel understanding of those common traits. Second, it might be that some policies are now so uniquely complex that they cannot be dealt with by action within their own domains, but require the coordinated mobilization of actors and resources across a range of conventionally separated policy spheres. The ‘interdependence’ here lies partly in a growing perception of the existence of what it has become fashionable among some policy elites to call ‘wicked’ problems, and partly in the assertion that there does, indeed, exist in the policy world a new category of these problems (for the classic formulation of wickedness dilemmas, see Rittel and Webber 1973; see also Rein 2006). A third credible possibility is that there now exist cases of what might be called ‘catastrophic interdependence’: a category of policy problems that have consequences so vast and disastrous that they spill over into all areas of human life, and therefore demand comprehensive, coordinated solutions from the state.

One of the striking features of these three senses of interdependence, we shall discover, is that they suggest very different practical solutions.

The notion that interdependence consists in the capacity to subject different policy domains to similar technologies of control is itself not novel: it lies at the root of policy science as a generic sub-discipline linked to the managerial sciences more widely. Indeed, as the ‘governmentality’ school reminds us, it has even deeper roots – in strategies of
measurement and control that were inscribed in the Enlightenment project (Rose 1990, 1999). It is hardly contentious that a variety of well established soft technologies – the most obvious being those developed in management accounting – do, indeed, provide techniques that are patently transferable across different national jurisdictions and different policy domains.

But all this has been given a powerful impetus by two developments, one ideological and the other technological. Scott (1998) shows how an ideology of high modernism now pictures government, irrespective of policy domain, as an opportunity to employ hard and soft technologies of measurement, legibility to the centre, and control in the pursuit of common goals, such as organizational efficiency measured by some common indicators. The power of this ideology lies partly in the way it has its roots in cultural settings wider than those of government itself: in the belief in measurement, classification and standardization in the wider society. The high modernist project encompasses domains of culture (such as architecture and town planning) as well as policy. In Scott’s account, the variant examined is authoritarian in character, but high modernism describes exactly the ambitions and technologies associated with the New Public Management (NPM) that spread widely across the advanced capitalist world in the closing two decades of the twentieth century. The core of the new NPM lies in the conviction that there exist technologies of measurement and control that can be used to override the tacit, specialized knowledge of experts and specialists in particular domains (such as education or health) in the pursuit of centrally prescribed standards and goals, whose attainment can, in turn, be gauged by centrally prescribed, standardized performance indicators. This ideological innovation has been supported by innovations in hard technology, notably by the development of unprecedented computing power, which has seemed to overcome historically important restrictions on the ability of policy elites to engage in comprehensive surveillance and analysis of data.

That these high modernist ambitions exist, and that they have been powerfully reinforced in recent decades, can hardly be denied. We might note in passing that they push the policy process in a very different direction from the ‘post-modernist’ implications of much of the governance school discussed in the previous section. Not only are we looking here at an ideological novelty; we are also, as Dunleavy and his colleagues remind us, looking at the rise of important economic interests in the IT sector that lobby powerfully for this vision of comprehensive control across policy domains using the most advanced technology (Dunleavy et al. 2007).
Whether these generic technologies of control can be made to work successfully is, to put it mildly, a contentious matter. Scott’s classic is an extended argument for the supremacy of tacit knowledge: for the superiority of ‘local’, idiosyncratic knowledge of particular cultural domains and particular policy domains. In the effort to gather all policy under a single head, he traces some of the greatest recent policy disasters. But even beyond the special circumstances of authoritarian high modernism, the attempt to gather separate domains under a single technology of control has had, at best, mixed results. The technologies of the NPM are subject to well-known pathologies: evasion, circumvention, perversity, and unintended consequences. And the work of Dunleavy and of Margetts demonstrates that one of the commonest results of attempts to mobilize high technology in the pursuit of modernist control ambitions is, often, expensive policy fiasco (Dunleavy 1995; Margetts 1999).

This reference to fiasco links us to the second sense of policy interdependence: that some policy problems are problems precisely because they spill across conventionally separated domains, and that the solution to these problems requires the recognition of this fact. If we do not recognize this kind of interdependence, then we face disaster. In numerous reports of policy catastrophes there is a common trope: that disaster was foreseeable and avoidable, but was not avoided because different institutional components failed to cooperate and was not foreseen because the evidence of impending catastrophe was not shared and assembled between different parts of the policy machine. Famously, United States military authorities ‘knew’ that a Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor was imminent, but could not assemble this knowledge into a single institutional location capable of organizing defensive action.

As the reference to Pearl Harbor suggests, the failure to acknowledge this kind of interdependence is hardly new: it is part of what Seidman calls a traditional search for the ‘philosopher’s stone’ of coordination (Seidman 1979: 190). But as the proliferation of task forces, policy problem ‘czars’ and specialized regulatory agencies suggests, there is indeed a novel sensitivity to the problem. And this sensitivity has good grounds. The growth both of big government and of the policy specialisms that studied big government was accompanied by the organization of state machines into bureaucratically organized empires that ruled policy domains; academic policy specialisms ‘shadowed’ these empires, developing cadres of policy ‘wonks’ who, in part, lived off the research commissioned by them. The perception that many policy problems exist because of the interdependence of different social spheres – that, for example, penal policy or health policy cannot be addressed in the
vocabulary of these domains alone – is what lies behind the growing sensitivity to the existence of ‘wicked’ problems. But this sensitivity is best conceived not as a response to the novelty of the problems but, rather, as an enforced rediscovery of an older tradition in policy action and policy analysis. The case of health illustrates this. In the nineteenth century, the policy field of ‘public health’ produced huge improvements in the health conditions of populations by a cross-disciplinary and cross-agency mix of innovations in hard and soft technologies: discoveries in the epidemiology of some infectious diseases, education of populations in elementary rules of hygiene, engineering advances in the purification of water supply, and the application of the latest construction technologies to gather and store clean water in reservoirs and to pipe it to households. That complex cross-disciplinary mix was submerged in health policy in the twentieth century by a culture that, impressed by advances in curative medicine, elevated a scientific, laboratory based model of medical care over this older tradition (Moran 1999). The realization that modern pandemics such as AIDS require more than laboratory medicine to combat them successfully involves precisely a rediscovery of the nineteenth-century lessons from the theory and practice of public health policy.

Reference to the AIDS pandemic brings us naturally to the third possible sense of policy interdependence: to the claim that there is a category of policy problem the outcomes of which are so comprehensively catastrophic that they spill across all policy domains. The problem creates interdependence because it menaces the whole of human life. The theoretical identification of this class of problem is best associated with a variety of risk society theorists; in the world of policy practice the two commonest candidates are the threat from safety failures in nuclear power generation and the threat of global climate change. Risk theory is poised uncertainly between perception and real threat. In some accounts, such as that offered by Giddens, the emphasis is on the way a sceptical, reflexive culture of modernity produces a heightened sensitivity to the possibility of catastrophic risk, and the way this creates demands on policy elites to recognize the interdependent character of these risks (Giddens 1990, 1999). In other accounts, of which the most popular has been produced by Beck, practical problems – most obviously the safety risks of nuclear power generation – are invoked as evidence that we do, indeed, live in a society where advanced technologies menace the whole of human life as never before (Beck 1992). Risk is objectively collective – and therefore interdependent.

That such catastrophic threats exist cannot be denied; that is the lesson
of the long struggle to establish the reality of the threat of global climate change. That particular threat is of special relevance to this chapter, because it is obvious that it poses supremely difficult problems of collection action and, therefore, also involves the issues of spatial and institutional interdependence discussed earlier. But the solutions on offer demonstrate something that will be examined more closely in the next section: that the solution to this kind of catastrophic problem has implications for the ways in which we can think of the practical implications of interdependence. The point is illustrated by reflecting on two very different sets of solutions. Some ‘deep green’ solutions involve the rejection of the social apparatus and technologies of advanced industrialism, and the creation (or recreation) of small-scale economic organization in which tacit knowledge once again triumphs. At the other end of the spectrum, some official solutions show a confidence in the capacity of high modernism to solve the problem: they involve the creation of institutions – such as those designed for carbon trading – that can function at a global level; and they involve the mobilization of the highest hard technology – for instance, in ambitious barrage schemes and wind farms – to supplant the old carbon-creating technologies.

Interdependence, statecraft and rhetoric

Some of the conclusions to be drawn from this discussion of policy-making in an interdependent world are obvious, some less so. It is plainly the case that one proposition with which we began – that there are many faces of interdependence – is true, even if it is also the case that they interact with each other. It is also plainly true that the social fact of interdependence is not at all new. The act of governing – and the making of policy that governing entails – arises from the very existence of an interdependent world. It is also striking that invocations of the novelty of interdependence are nothing new, and one of the fascinating features of these invocations is that they illustrate how, in the practice of statecraft, such invocations have, at different periods, led to very different policy conclusions. A couple of examples from the preceding discussion will make the point. In the great governing crises of the 1970s that succeeded the end of the long boom, both the academic study of policy-making and practical debate about policy options came to be dominated by a language that had its origins in the recognition of the interdependence created by organized social complexity. That led academically to theories of ‘overloaded government’, and practically to a rhetoric that pictured some tasks
– such as macroeconomic management in the pursuit of full employment – as too difficult for democratic governments to attempt. Thus, the language of an interdependent world was used to legitimize a statecraft that withdrew government from a range of hitherto accepted social and economic responsibilities. Now consider the very different implications of interdependence conveyed by what we described as the high modernist image of policy-making – an image that has embedded itself in the wider culture, in the ambitions of policy-makers and in parts of the academic literature. This version of interdependence has two key features: it pictures the responsibilities of government as involving the addressing of ‘wicked’ problems that can only be solved by the coordinated use of the most advanced hard and soft technologies available to the state; and it pictures the policy process itself as interdependent – hence, the same technologies of control can be applied to, and can override the tacit knowledge present in, different substantive policy domains. This language of interdependence has created a statecraft very different from the statecraft of withdrawal: it has drawn policy-makers into hugely ambitious schemes aimed at the wholesale transformation of the social and the natural world.

These examples show how the rhetoric of interdependence can suggest policy strategies that are virtually polar opposites. But some invocations of interdependence are much more ambiguous – or, perhaps more accurately, contradictory. The best example is provided by the most commonly invoked aspect of contemporary spatial interdependence: that allegedly created by new waves of economic globalization. I have tried to argue that part of the novel power of this aspect of interdependence is that, whatever the debates that still divide students of the global economy, it really does connect to economic and social changes that have occurred in the last half century, and that the scale of these changes has been convincingly demonstrated by scholars such as Scholte. It has been possible to create globalization as a powerful discursive construct – as a resource of statecraft – precisely because, when policy-makers invoke the importance of interconnectedness in a globalizing economy, they are not constructing fictions. The rhetoric they use is powerful because it links to observable developments in social reality. But precisely because it is rhetoric – the form of discursive construction wherein lies the art of the democratic politician – it can lead in very different directions. For instance, it can be invoked to try to persuade labour market actors to submit to the dictates of spatially unrestricted markets in labour. After the great financial crisis of 2007–09 it was, by contrast, used by some democratic politicians to try to persuade financial market actors that they
needed to submit to new regimes of regulation and control. And, even in the specific field of labour market policies, it could simultaneously legitimize state withdrawal from market regulation, or Scandinavian-style active labour market policies designed to equip a national economy with a labour force suitably skilled and flexible to allow the economy to occupy a lucrative niche in the global division of labour.

It is this serpentine, ambiguous quality that gives to the idea of interdependence its great power – and its weakness. For at least a generation, the idea that we live in an interdependent world has been second nature to those responsible for the making and implementation of policy. As a kind of thought experiment, try imagining a policy-maker who denied outright the ‘fact’ of interdependence. But it is the very fact that it is second nature that is also a source of weakness. Policy-makers ‘know’ they live in an interdependent world. But this is merely the background music to the everyday world of policy, which consists in a series of immediate problems – some minor, some catastrophic – that have to be addressed. It is here that the limits of interdependence as an analytic concept become relevant. Indeed, in the academic literature it is striking how easy it is to accommodate the language of interdependence to very different analytical views of the nature of the policy process. Interdependence is meat and drink to the post-modernist governance theorists, with their view of a fragmented, disaggregated world linked by complex networks of interdependence that have to be managed by techniques that disavow the old hierarchical, coercive world of the traditional state. But interdependence is also meat and drink to those who inhabit the world of high modernism: who see a world of huge policy problems, and potential disasters that can only be solved by the universal application of similar control technologies across different policy spheres, and which demand, above all, the discovery of the philosopher’s stone of institutional coordination. A language that so comfortably accommodates very different academic orthodoxies, and very different policy preferences, is manifestly useful: it helps provide the vocabulary for both academic debate and arguments about the strategies of statecraft. But it is also manifestly of limited use, at present, in telling us something about the choices we need to make in solving real-world policy problems.

How might it be made more useful? There are surely three things we should do. First, we should recognize that interdependence has different functions in policy advocacy and policy analysis. For the policy-maker, the term is primarily useful as a rhetorical device. It is an undifferentiated concept that can be used promiscuously in the arts of persuasion. It is pointless to complain about this; digesting complex concepts and turning
them into something simpler, with rhetorical power, is part of the art of
the policy advocate, especially of the democratic politician as policy
advocate. Second, we should recognize that, when we use the term in
policy analysis, we are commonly talking about very different things –
or, at least, as I tried to show in these pages, about a single concept with a
number of different dimensions. Once we do that, then there is no option
but to struggle with messy empirical complexity: interdependence mani-
ests itself in different ways and to different degrees, whether we are
speaking of space, institutions or policy content. The great temptation to
which many policy-makers and some policy scholars succumb is that of
epochalism: the temptation to believe that the existence of new patterns
and new problems has landed us in a completely novel world – of global-
ism, or of network governance, for example. To do that, as I have tried to
show, is simultaneously to inflate and to diminish the understandings of
our present problems that we can derive from the existing literature. It is
to inflate it precisely because it exaggerates novelty; but it diminishes it
because – as is well illustrated by the governance literature – it neglects
the degree to which scholars have taken some traditional problems of
interdependence and analyzed them in newly creative ways.

The third task is the most difficult of all. Having distanced ourselves
from the necessarily simplistic rhetoric of interdependence used in the
world of policy advocacy, we need to reconnect to that world, and to feed
it into it our heightened sense of complexity and contingency. But that is
only to restate the traditional job of the policy analyst: to speak truth to
power, especially when the truth cannot be communicated in a few sound
bites. The problem of such communication, with decision-makers and the
wider public, is one of the themes of Stoker’s chapter, which follows.
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