



**3rd International Conference
on Public Policy (ICPP3)
June 28-30, 2017 – Singapore**

Panel T03P01 Session 3 Transnational Governance

Innovative Governance and the Governance of Change

Title of the paper

Dynamic Multilevel Governance as Global Governance of Change

Author

Andreas Klinke, Memorial University of Newfoundland, Canada,

aklinke@grenfell.mun.ca

Date of presentation

Thursday, June 29th, 2017

PLEASE DO NOT QUOTE WITHOUT THE PERMISSION OF THE AUTHOR

Abstract: Modern societies are increasingly having to cope with profound socio-political transformations. Transformations ignite dynamics, processes, and forces, which induce new challenges for traditional structures and orders because major changes in society and politics are shifting from established manners, customs, and modes of behavior to new norms and values. Transformations cause epistemological uncertainty and complexity and challenge ontological fundamentals and ethical convictions. National structures alone are not adequate to the task of handling the corresponding challenges because the capacity of domestic politics and regulations is too weak to achieve eligible political outcomes that can guide and structure transformations. In this light, I argue for a form of dynamic multilevel governance as global governance of change that has the capability and power to reform and transfigure institutions, structure and agency, hierarchies, cultural fabrics, socio-technical systems, and infrastructures towards new social and political orders. I theoretically and normatively conceptualize and justify three major governance framework conditions as hallmarks of dynamic multilevel governance, namely inclusiveness, network structure and self-governing. These capabilities produce reflexive authority with transformative and structuring power to tackle transformation issues. My notion of dynamic multilevel governance relies on thoughts in new institutionalism, network theory, democracy theory, discourse ethics, and different concepts of governance. I combine theory, normative justification, and institutional feasibility.

Keywords: dynamic multilevel governance, transformation, problem-solving capability, inclusiveness, network, self-governing, global governance

Introduction

An infinite number of changes occurred in history and effect our daily lives, but there are also predominant beliefs and world views and corresponding patterns that for extended periods define our modes of thought and action. However, this can also change dramatically and then we develop new paradigms and orders. Each period is distinguished by several common features that determine elements and mechanisms in society, politics, economy, and culture. Scholars distinguish three great transformations in human history. The first was the Neolithic revolution in which hunters and gatherers changed to an agricultural society. The second was the Industrial Revolution, which has been expounded on by Karl Polanyi in his classic work *The Great Transformation* (1944). Undeniably, we are presently in a transition from one period to another. Ulrich Beck argues in his last book that the world is going to metamorphose drastically. “Social change allows us to turn towards the same, but does not allow us to understand that things are becoming

different ... social change is about the reproduction of the social and political order, while metamorphosis is about the transfiguration of the social and political order” (Beck 2016, 77). He distinguishes between transitions that only reproduce the existing status quo and transformation as metamorphosis that has the quality to change orders into completely different ones—a Promethean revolution in the form of a new great transformation.

Contemporary social theories, such as Ronald Inglehart’s theory of value change and culture shift in advanced societies (1977, 1990), the theory of reflexive modernization (Beck et al., 1994), the theory of major democratic transformations (Dahl, 1989), or the theory of scientific paradigm change (Kuhn, 1962), lay out how modern societies and prevailing thought go through profound structural transformations. Because established manners, customs, and generally accepted modes of behavior are shifting to new norms and values, dynamics, processes, and forces are ignited. This produces new challenges for traditional structures, such as society, politics, economy, and culture. These issues of transformation arise from the complex, multilayered, ambiguous, and open nature of societal and political change. This may affect all levels and spheres of political activities and social organization and may bring with it social upheaval and structural change that “is inevitably a value-laden, contested and context-dependent process, which typically throws up unanticipated outcomes” (Lowndes and Wilson, 2003, 281).

Transformations cause epistemological uncertainty and complexity and challenge ontological fundamentals and ethical convictions. National structure alone are not adequate to the task of handling the corresponding issues because the capacity of domestic politics and regulations is too weak to achieve political outcomes that can guide and structure transformations (cf. Zürn and Leibfried 2005). Yet while the world is dominated by nation-states, it is transitioning to a postnational world society (Habermas, 2001; Zürn, 2002).

Ineluctably, the critical question arises what we can do, in the sense of a constructive and sustainable collective navigation of transformation from established to new orders. In addressing this question, the paper’s primary intent is to argue by systematic reasoning that the conventional approaches of public policy making and regulatory governance are lacking institutional structures and procedures that can adequately address issues of a profound transformation. Therefore, governance for transformation needs to be rethought and changed towards an innovative configu-

ration of a dynamic multilevel governance that adheres to a different rationale and goes beyond methodological nationalism. Such an approach is capable of leading and structuring formal and informal activities of common interest to transnationalized and globalized societies that are necessary to prospectively steer transformation towards new orders. The underlying assumption is that specific conditions of governance framework help direct the thrust of dynamic transformations and enable societies, politics, and culture to reconfigure social orders.

The governance literature of the day does not sufficiently explore the framework conditions of how global governance configurations could set up capabilities to navigate and steer a sustainable transformation. Drawing on Burns and Hall (2012), I link the collective production of transformative and structuring power as a dynamic factor with the notion of multilevel governance. It yields the capability to re-establish, reform and transfigure institutions, structures and agency, hierarchies, cultural fabrics, socio-technical systems, and infrastructures. How can societies develop dynamic multilevel governance with reflexive authority that produces transformative and structuring power? Hence the following questions are of particular interest: What kind of governance enables an adequate common authority that can steer and navigate us in times of transformation? What governance framework conditions are indispensable to handle a transfiguration of social and political orders? How can state capacity, stakeholder and public deliberation, and the involvement of expert organizations reinforce each other in order to achieve a socially and publicly acceptable productivity to plan and direct the course of transformation? How can institutions and processes of such a governance framework sustain democratic principles?

My approach to these questions favors a design method. That is a focus on redefining specifications of governance framework conditions in order to gain key insights and essential understanding that lead to a more holistic perspective on a governance form that is capable of addressing transformation. However, my approach is not an abstract, ideal design. Rather, my methodology is to normative-theoretically reason the feasibility of dynamic multilevel governance as an attempt “to make sense of practice, and guides to the actions by which we forge practices” (Bevir, 2011, 7). To this end, I combine instrumental and procedural considerations. The instrumental view shapes institutional structures in such a way that fundamental principles are realized, and the procedural perspective designs institutions so that people are entitled to participate in decision making. I argue from a governance perspective that fits with theories of new institutionalism, in particular discursive institutionalism (Schmidt, 2008) that is inspired by discourse ethics

and deliberative democracy theory. The institutionalist view conceptualizes institutions as familiarized and habitual patterns and processes of socio-political interaction within a societal and organizational context of governance. Discursive institutionalism provides a logic of discursive rationality that relies on the explanatory power of ideas, discourse, and deliberation as vehicles to produce problem-solving capability.

I reconstruct and interpret three explanatory factors that establish a form of dynamic multilevel governance as global governance in order to master transformations and navigate periods of change. I argue that inclusiveness, network structure and self-governing are explanatory variables that explain how dynamic multilevel governance can produce problem-solving capability with respect to transformation. To this end, I combine the challenges of steering and navigating a transformation with questions of normative justification and a reconstruction and interpretation of the socio-political conditions necessary for the realization of processes and institutions of dynamic multilevel governance. To do so, I draw on theoretical approaches of new institutionalism, network theory, democracy theories, discourse ethics, as well as concepts of governance.

The notion of dynamic multilevel governance

I take up Jürgen Habermas' (2001) argument that we will only be able to meet the challenges of structural transformation across borders in a reasonable manner if we succeed in developing new forms of democratic self-determination and self-rule in a postnational configuration. The diagnosis of the demand to steer and control transformation, admittedly abbreviated, explains the rationalization of governance configurations through the logic of a discursive generation of problem-solving capability as the product of reflexive modernity. Governance concepts would become reflexive to some degree if they abandoned their self-evident validity and opened up to critique and realignment. Capabilities of institutional self-control and self-ruling that do not follow traditional forms of governing are the responses to expectations of autonomous decisions on profound transformation. The purpose of this article is to make a substantive contribution to governance research as I attempt to grasp more thoroughly the normative-theoretical conditions of a distinctive governance mode in order to demonstrate how normative presumptions about power are troubled when addressing transformation.

Habermas' argument has implications for how governance framework conditions play a role in addressing transformation, as it raises the question of how power, authority, and legitimacy can be enacted in the frame of a postnational governance configuration. Nation-states abandon autonomy to the extent they enlase in horizontal networks of international relations in a global society. Based on today's structures, we could envisage a political configuration in a decentralized world society that relies on a multilevel system. In this light, I argue for dynamic multilevel governance that is capable of steering transformation by enabling and channeling various responses in a harmonized and coordinated way across national societies in a postnational configuration. This rationale sets the stage for the article. My goal is to elaborate on framework conditions of dynamic multilevel governance that are capable of mastering the challenges of transformation and navigating through periods of transition and the transfiguration of orders. This notion addresses the need for an approach to normative-theoretical advances and institutional feasibility that devolves authority beyond the nation-state and fosters multilayered, polycentric, network and deliberative attributes.

Research on contemporary governance frameworks and their conditions reveal that governmentally driven and hierarchically enforced policies and regulations, that is, governmental authority, is increasingly repelled by new forms of governance that are characterized by a new interplay and collaboration between the state, science, economy, civil society, and the public (see Ansell and Torfing, 2016). A key feature of the new interplay is the emergence of multilevel horizontal forms of cooperative and coordinated interaction. Here, state actors are one group among others and no longer possess the prerogative of developing and setting regulations unilaterally; government adapts to a new role as co-policy maker and ensures basic institutional conditions. These new horizontal modes of governance are increasingly employed because they are deemed to be more efficient, respond to the shortcomings of the centralized, command-and-control approach, and involve society in designing political regulations.

The term "dynamic" in my conception of dynamic multilevel governance references the Greek word *dynamis* or *dynamikos*, which means "power" or "powerful." Dynamic multilevel governance gains prominence as a decentralized and nonhierarchical structure that forms a new sovereign entity and transcends territorial and political borders. Its political organization is based on a postnational network configuration with nodes and nuclei that serve as momentum for organizing discourse, communication, dialogue, and cooperation. It is a network facilitating differentiated

and distributed deliberation “that link[s] individuals and groups discursively on matters of common concern” (Mansbridge et al., 2012, 8) about transformation. A decentralized network structure bestows free and open access to all forms of discourse, communication, dialogue, and cooperation. These dispositive factors and their dynamic activities and conjunctions constitute the network itself. Hence, dynamic multilevel governance changes the socio-political topography that represents the hierarchies of traditional power systems, moving them towards the logic of the topology of a network in a postnational configuration of horizontal and vertical intersecting lines. The nature of profound transformation requires collective productivity, creativity, and self-governing through those who are affected. Such an authority distributed in a network enables various nodes to pursue the differences independent of their relationships in the network. It also ensures that the margins of the network are open so that new nodes, relations, and momentum can develop. It is an open network structure of public and private actors where concrete communication and cooperation take place, ties are established between actors based on commonalities, socialization takes place, common issues and interests are addressed, and common ground for problem solving is collectively produced. It is the construction of a socio-political entity that does not depend on national models and does not pose power and sovereignty in terms of the domestic topology of a nation-state or intergovernmentalism.

Dynamic multilevel governance does not refer to territorial unity, but it emphasizes the social and political capability of peoples across borders who share the common character and quality of being affected by the challenges arising from transformation and a common interest in addressing these issues. This new entity is vested with core capabilities as governance framework conditions shaping a reflexive authority that is enabled to exercise transformative and structuring power to steer and navigate the transformation. Thus, it forms a kind of political style and culture that gives order and meaning to governance processes and institutions that rely on the politicization of public opinion and will in the form of deliberation. The needs of individuals and collective actor groups that are affected by transformation legitimize new forms of governance and power, especially when traditional systems fail. Political action by means of dynamic multilevel governance can only hark back to affected actors, irrespective of their roles and functions as political, social, cultural, and/or economic subjects. These governing subjects of dynamic multilevel governance are diverse and differentiated but act on a common democratic foundation.

Dynamic multilevel governance replaces the static focus on the formal institutions of states and governments with a dynamic and innovative approach to governance institutions and processes that fade the boundaries between states and societies. In this regard, dynamic multilevel governance is established with government and society as a self-regulatory network, in which state, economy, and civil society actors communicate and cooperate horizontally; they are not arranged in order of rank, function, or power. Processes and institutions are organized across numerous socio-political levels, sectors, and domains. The organizational structure is characterized by the devolution of decision making to flexible polycentric units that do not follow the nested hierarchical structure of the federalism of nation-states. Dynamic multilevel governance creates a multilevel vibrant constellation of various spheres of authority that exert transformative, structuring power. Its network nature means that traditional hierarchy, with lower and higher levels and dominant actor groups, does not have a place. Rather, the interplay of top-down or bottom-up activities is embraced. Such a governance configuration also transcends the traditionally detached realms of domestic politics and the intergovernmental politics beyond the nation-state. It thus refers to the increasingly blurred distinction between these realms, especially in the context of the European Union, but also with regard to interactions between domestic and international structures. It creates a multilevel system that is characterized by the interplay and coordination of institutions and processes within domestic politics and between domestic, supra- and global levels.

Cardinal values and principles of liberal and deliberative democracy enlighten the notion of dynamic multilevel governance by providing affected peoples the opportunity to self-determine and self-rule wherever the journey of transformation leads them. The key capabilities—inclusiveness, adaptiveness, and distributed and differentiated deliberation—form the governance framework conditions. They are the primary hallmarks of dynamic multilevel governance and facilitate the formation and conveyance of transformative, structuring power. By so doing, they address the imponderability and insecurity of change and direct collective efforts in periods of transformation. These key capabilities refer to the development of competences, mechanisms, and rule that help create collective problem-solving capability in a multilevel configuration, help people recognize and accept decisions, and provide normative justification for the new rule and authority. Hence, these key capabilities constitute the normative legitimacy of dynamic multilevel governance. They facilitate processes and institutions to guide and control the handling of problems,

risks and conflicts arising from transformation and to intentionally steer transformation in a desired direction. The institutionalization of the three capabilities enables a new governance mode with a new logic and structure of rule from which better outcomes are expected.

I see dynamic multilevel governance as global governance of change with a decentralized network structure as an alternative to those notions put forward by scholars who favor a domestic analogy and intergovernmentalism when conceptualizing governance beyond the state. My understanding for dynamic multilevel governance is a departure from the comparison to domestic hierarchies and relations, from a realist tradition, which focuses on states as the primary actors, and from the concept of a centralized international structure headed by world organizations. Dynamic multilevel governance epitomizes the dynamics between the singularity of unprecedented subjects and the multiplicity and diversity of a collective without producing a contradiction between individual actors and collective actor groups. While the EU and current global organizations constantly depend on nation-states and their political productivity, dynamic multilevel governance is potentially autonomous and has the capacity to discretely create a transnationalized society on its own. Dynamic multilevel governance is instrumental in innumerable fields of transformation that are opened domestically and internationally to solve and regulate local and regional conflicts through negotiation and mediation by means of deliberation. I define dynamic multilevel governance as a flexible and pluralistic form which builds from below and above and constitutes itself in form of a network configuration of variable, multilayered and polycentric geometry. This model conceives processes and institutions as distributed mechanisms of self-governing to exchange interests that are empowered by individual and collective actors who consent to a plural and polyarchic network structure of authority and decision making in order to produce shared norms and rules. Various nodes, focal points and nuclei at numerous vertical and horizontal lines become stronger interconnected which results in a stronger sharing of information and a more intensive communication and cooperation with one another in the network—a densification that does not normally emerge within a traditional multilevel governance structure. This growing interconnectedness is responsible for the production of higher cognition in the network.

I am not aware of a real-world, advanced framework of dynamic multilevel governance that deals with transformation in a postnational configuration. However, there are examples of such approaches developing in delimited territorial spaces. An example might be the governing of

technical infrastructures in Europe, even if they are dominated by a hierarchical style of regulation (Grande, 2011). In Germany, new governance approaches are being adopted at all territorial levels from local to national as a result of the complex processes that have come along with the transformation of energy. Although planning and regulation are still largely bureaucratic in style, the withdrawal of the state from the delivery of some services has led to the emergence of governance approaches that include more market mechanisms and economic competition, new policy networks, quasi-autonomous collaborations and organizations, corporatist arrangements, as well as increased stakeholder and public deliberation in order to coordinate and regulate the transition towards more renewable energy. While these changes are neither general and comprehensive nor consistent across the sectors that are involved, on the whole, the governance of this energy transformation reflects a more decentralized and nonhierarchical cooperation. State agencies control key functions through more inclusive arrangements that are self-organized and self-determined to some extent and that represent the plurality of stakeholders—bureaucrats, private enterprise, non-profit agencies, community organizations, and even citizens themselves. However, it is not yet a European or transnationalized phenomenon.

Inclusiveness

Issues arising from profound transformation and corresponding societal and cultural conversion affect peoples across traditional jurisdictions and transcends territorial, organizational, and sectoral boundaries. No subnational, national, or international structure or agency can cope with the emerging dilemmas on their own. The monopoly of power over and regulation of resources and capacities in modern states that is claimed by the central tier of government and shared between the national state and constituent state tiers in the varying forms of federal states needs to be untied and then reconfigured in a new multitiered governance entity. Such a governance framework leaves methodological nationalism behind. It is better suited to embrace innovative institutions and collaborative processes producing and sharing knowledge, coupling science, policy, and the public, and establishing a systematic learning and interplay across multiple levels among actors with conflicting objectives, cultural perspectives, and social values.

The scope and profoundness of a sustainable transformation concern all subjects and sections of society and politics. The needs of individual actors and collective actor groups that are affected by such a transformation legitimize a form of governance that emphasizes inclusiveness, espe-

cially when facing failures of traditional representative systems. Each person or group ought to be able to address transformation issues. It secures more equality in terms of agency, participation and membership and provides a tolerably fair distribution of opportunities. The term “inclusiveness” refers to a breadth of institutionalized mechanisms and processes of communication, coordination, interplay, and socialization that can be associated, on a very general level, with concepts of unity, cohesion, affiliation, mutual embeddedness, etc. In turn, people apply socio-cultural and moral values, norms, and rules to this. It may be worthwhile to note that theories of democracy and new institutionalism have defined inclusiveness broadly as the capability to involve a variety of actors (individual and collective), processes, and interactions, integrate a plurality of modes of coordination and communication between public and private actors, enable and facilitate political equality, clarify issues of representation, pay attention to civic organizing and engagement, attend to social and political differences, accommodate diversity, bridge gaps between levels of organization, and (re)arrange matters of borders and levels of political jurisdiction (Christiano, 1996; Dahl, 2006; Habermas, 1998; Held, 2006; Koikkalainen, 2011; Parkinson, 2006; Young, 2000). Inclusiveness also emphasizes sensitivity to cultural differences and calls for political institutions to facilitate the acquisition and development of new qualities and skills in order to be able to adapt socio-cultural self-conceptions and self-perception when undergoing transformation. Under the umbrella of inclusiveness, cultural and political differences will not lead to uncontrollable conflicts. Rather, dynamic multilevel governance makes use of differences as a force of regional identification and sectoral representation of common interests. Inclusiveness extends beyond the vertical relationship between the single citizen and the state and brings in the horizontal relationship among citizens and other public and private actors in order to facilitate and coordinate a collective forming of public opinion and political will. Embedding discursive processes of opinion and will formation in a political culture of dynamic multilevel governance would create an inclusivity with regard to self-governing that all affected actors could incorporate equally.

Dynamic multilevel governance also incorporates the domestic and supranational vertical and horizontal interplay of institutions and processes in a way that goes beyond the assumption that the state and society are the natural social and political forms and units of governing. The vertical interplay develops communication and cooperation across levels of social and territorial organization, that is, coordination between distinct governance institutions that deal with the same

or corresponding issues of transformation. The horizontal institutional interplay coordinates collaboration “at the same level of social organization from local or regional interactions on up to national interactions and international or global interactions” (Young, 2013, 79). The vertical and horizontal interplay also alludes to the emerging transnationalization of public spheres in the sense that public communication and discourse exceed national boundaries (see Fraser, 2007; Habermas, 2008; Klinke, 2014; Risse, 2010). The capability of inclusiveness enables the nascent spaces and arenas of public communication and discourse that share public agendas and frames of reference to integrate horizontally.

There are different understandings of multilevel governance in scholarly literature (see the handbook by Enderlein, Wälti, and Zürn, 2010) that correspond to the two basic types of multilevel governance (Hooghe and Marks, 2003, 2010). The first type is the sharing and hierarchical coordination of governing power in a federalist structure between national and sub-national governments. This classical approach of a federalist system often lacks the ability to handle the challenges of transformation because it remains the shadow of classical power and hierarchy that has repeatedly failed to effectively steer transformations.

The second type, and the one, I argue, that aligns with dynamic multilevel governance, emphasizes the reallocation of political authority to a non-hierarchical and polycentric structure involving a wide range of public and private actors (Hooghe and Marks, 2003, 2010; see also Bache, Bartle, and Flinders, 2016). Hence, dynamic governance delineates a multilevel configuration that evolves across and beyond sub-national and national boundaries, but not in the form of the first type of multilevel governance.

Network structure

My notion of dynamic multilevel governance as a postnational configuration engages all actors (individual and collective) as singular subjects in an open network who share affectedness and common interests. In order to assure dynamicism in multilevel governance in terms of transformative and structuring power, and thus the capability of society to steer changes, this kind of multilevel governance relies on a polycentric and plural network structure with relatively autonomous units. The major axes of such a structure are composed of the exchange of information and knowledge, equitable communication towards mutual understanding, and self-determined and self-organized cooperation. Multiple units at multiple levels can act relatively independent of

each other and so create a polycentric structure with horizontal relationships among actors and institutions, in contrast to the vertical, hierarchical, and centralized structure of a traditional federal system of the first type.

The emergence of dynamic multilevel governance can be seen as transformation itself, namely, as progression from a simple, star-like network, where all communication emanates from the center through predetermined channels, as in clusters of multilevel systems of the first type, towards a more complex kind of plural and distributed network of dynamic multilevel governance. Classical centers of power no longer play the decisive role as they did in hierarchical, centralized systems. In a multilevel governance network configuration, all nodes and nuclei can communicate and cooperate with all other units. Authority is variable and multiple, non-uniform and distributed. Another feature of such a network structure is the permanent dissolution of a demarcation of internal and external. This does not mean that the network structure is always and everywhere existing in a specific place. Although its profile is elusive, operatively it can be all-encompassing. Democratic momentum is produced by means of distributed and differentiated deliberation that is invigorated by the network form. This kind of deliberation will be explained later. For now, it is sufficient to illustrate this point simply by referring to the fact that assortative points of common coupling and intersection are seen as locations and processes of distributed and differentiated deliberation where communication and decision making are channelized and aggregated. Thus, processes and institutions of dynamic multilevel governance incorporate distinct issues that intensify interrelationships and coupling and engage a diversity of affected public and private actors who may have intersecting memberships and who may collaborate in varying alliances and partnerships.

Drawing on network theory and using the analogy of swarm intelligence (Bonabeau, Dorigo, and Theraulaz, 1999; Enroth, 2011; Kennedy, Eberhart, and Shi, 2001; Thacker, 2004) helps explain a network model for dynamic multilevel governance. Such a network has a steering logic without a center and is an alternative approach to the hierarchical logic of traditional political systems. It includes various horizontal and vertical channels of communication and cooperation among multiple subjects and thus engages actors across political borders and pre-determined sovereignties. Such a network is a collective entity without a central power structure as we know it from conventional political organization; it is a political body that produces relationships between subjectivity and commonality—in this sense a postmodern form of governance. The inclusionary

commonality is affectedness and the common interest to navigate transformation and master its challenges. This common interest is not administered and controlled by the nation-state and thus it is not a public interest in the classic sense. It is a common interest that is democratically (re)produced and managed by means of distributed and differentiated mechanisms and processes of deliberative democracy.

The components, institutions, and specified functions of the internal structure of the network in dynamic multilevel governance are well organized, rational, and creative as are their interactions with each other. This large and dense complex of connected actors, units, nodes, and locations forms an independent and intelligent system without central control, and its intersecting horizontal and vertical—but not hierarchical—lines of communication and cooperation produce distributed and differentiated capabilities of acquiring and applying knowledge, competences, and skills. Thus, the architecture and political fundament of dynamic multilevel governance depends on a polycentric and plural network that enhances information and knowledge processing and creates locations that produce self-governing capability and collective decision making by means of distributed and differentiated deliberation. The advantage is that such a governance configuration is more flexible and adaptive and thus more robust, especially in times of profound transformation. The point is that collective intelligence, in the sense of collective problem-solving capability, arises from the deliberative communication and cooperation in a network encompassing socio-political and cultural diversity.

During the transition to dynamic multilevel governance, the horizontal forces have a dynamic relationship with the vertical axes of traditional organizations of political steering. The newly emerging network structures are embedded in a contradictory context of traditional centralized and hierarchical structures. Though dynamic multilevel governance aims at dismantling traditional hierarchical structures, in fact, it upgrades and transfigures the current federalist and supranational structures through autonomous, independent, and functionally differentiated entities that are, however, embedded in legalized frameworks and in accordance with the rule of law. It is able to tackle the problem of location by establishing institutional focal points of agency that coordinate the variety of inherent policies and regulations. Dynamic governance in a multilevel configuration interlocks issue-specific, functional, and overlapping jurisdictions that operate on various territorial scales. The jurisdictions of dynamic multilevel governance represent flexible processes and institutional arrangements and links, which are established when addressing prob-

lems and are discontinued when a task has been accomplished. Coordinating processes, institutions, and jurisdictions vary in size and layout and adjust to the demands emerging from transformation, in this way minimizing spillover and undesired consequences (cf. Hooghe and Marks, 2010, 21). The necessity of a network structure in dynamic multilevel governance is not an idealistic claim but the recognition of a substantive framework condition that moves towards a more democratic production of transformative and structuring power.

Self-governing

Self-governing relates to the fundamental democratic principle of political equality (Christiano, 1996; Dahl, 2006) and self-reflexivity where processes of investigation take account of and refer back to the social and political order, the governance entity itself, and its societal and cultural effects when instigating examination, political action, and change. Although we decouple dynamic multilevel governance from the classic democratic processes of the nation-state, we do not suspend democratic self-determination, that is, the addressees of regulation are entitled to be the creators of these regulations at the same time. Thus, the legitimacy of democratic decision making within multilevel dynamic governance depends on the degree to which affected citizens have been included in the political process and institutions via a coupling of majority decisions and deliberative opinion formation (cf. Habermas, 2011, 49–55; Young, 2000, 5–6). Here, I argue in line with a procedural perspective theorized in political philosophy that asserts a relationship claim and a procedural demand (cf. Caney, 2005). Two perspectives are relevant for us in terms of the inclusiveness of dynamic multilevel governance as an approach that transcends national borders. According to the first perspective, those who are affected by transformations are entitled to be represented by or directly engaged in governance institutions and processes.ⁱ The second perspective emphasizes that the addressees of regulations of a governance system are entitled to be represented or directly engaged.ⁱⁱ For this reason, dynamic governance ought to provide and safeguard fair opportunities of access to political influence in governance processes and institutions for those who are affected that go beyond mere voting, which is theorized in deliberative democracy theories (cf. Bohman, 1999; Knight and Johnson, 1997; Mansbridge et al., 2012).

Though we can see only the dawn of a possible transformation in global climate governance and energy systems, I use it as an example to illustrate an approximation of a multilevel governance approach. Some scholars argue that the intergovernmental regime approach to global climate

policy failed prior to the 2009 UN conference in Copenhagen. In the aftermath there has been a shift towards a more decentralized, hybrid, and dispersed governance order involving multiple actors, arenas and locations at all geographical levels (Bäckstrand and Lövbrand, 2015). Numerous diplomatic endeavors and prenegotiations culminated in the 2015 UN summit in Paris and a new global climate accord. It includes, for example, incentives for more innovation and diffusion of low-carbon energy technologies, but it remains to be seen whether this can trigger a fundamental transformation of the global energy system (Linnér and Rayner, 2015), which largely depends on its ratification and implementation in traditional multilevel federal systems. I would argue for a transformation that enhances dynamicism by strengthening the polycentric network structure of global climate governance, by including more affected individuals and collective actor groups, and by decentralizing the production of problem-solving capability through distributed and differentiated deliberation. Some scholars propose an overall institutional architecture of climate governance that centralizes decision making and focuses on a power hierarchy through a world environment organization as a new sovereign entity (Biermann, 2015).

Dynamic multilevel governance affords openness to a plurality of modes of communication and coordination between public and private actors and a flexibility in how jurisdictions respond to changes, varying preferences and new functional requirements. In an institutional structure of a multilevel, polycentric configuration, manifold opportunities, by which actors can engage and express their opinions and interests in heterogeneous arenas of policymaking and jurisdictions, become possible. Inclusiveness in dynamic multilevel governance points toward a new transnational form of community after the traditional structures of power and authority have fractured. The seeds of such a transnational community lie in taking notice of the locality of culture and political identity, having the capability to occupy a variety of positions and interests, and being able not be adversely affected by traditional socio-political hierarchies.

The reflexive nature of dynamic multilevel governance abandons the exogenously generated reference to substantial rationality created by traditional socio-culturally determined paradigms and value systems and characterizes the trust in procedural rationality that is capable of producing commonly shared views about epistemology, ontology, and ethics (cf. Habermas, 2009). It develops its own levels of quality and goals of innovative self-steering, it originates normative standards from itself, and does not reproduce idealized traditions and an unsustainable paradigm. The self-conception of dynamic multilevel governance is characterized by a self-critical ap-

proach and the moral and ethical notion of self-governing in the sense of self-determination and self-rule. It creates authority through reason by means of communication, discourse, and cooperation. Hence, the mode of communication and discourse when following the procedural rationality of self-governing is the capability of self-critical reasoning and competent judgment. Actors pay deference to the self-established rules and norms because it is judicious, and thus they gain autonomy.

Actors can only be self-governing if they are capable of independent judgment, opinion formation, and action because of an equally secured autonomy. Actors involved in dynamic multilevel governance only know the true promise of their autonomy and liberty, if they make use of self-ruling in an adequate way, that is, they do not exclusively act self-interested but also on common interest. Although the addressees of self-governing are also the authors of self-reliance, they do not possess a free pass in the decision making. They are supposed to decide only on those rules and norms that would gain legitimacy because they would be approved by deliberation. Therefore, the notion of equal liberty for everyone assumes a reflexive form in the process of self-governing in dynamic multilevel governance. It ensures that the participating actors in a reflexive-democratic process are induced to grant everyone equal rights in the process of mutually adopting the points of view of others and the collective generalization of interests (cf. Habermas, 2009). The various activities and the realms of deliberations of dynamic multilevel governance, as elaborated later, create circuits of self-valorization that constitute a transnational public community and enables its relative self-governing.

Self-governing relies on differentiated and distributed responsibilities. The articulation and forming of public opinion about transformation is the most important vehicle of representation in dynamic multilevel governance as postnational configuration. Public opinion reflects the voices of affectedness and interests, making it possible to address corresponding challenges and issues. Public opinion is a form of mediation between numerous individual and group specific articulations of interests and claims and the societal whole. If singular subjects enter into a transnationalized communication and discourse about social, economic, political, or cultural issues of common concern and interest with regard to transformation, then a transnational public sphere becomes socially constructed. Such a communication relates to common contextual frames of reference in terms of observation, perception, action, and interdependence. Speakers who comment on issues or react to other speakers help to shape discursive arenas with a communicative pro-

duction of the formation of public opinion and will. Thomas Risse identified such transnational communicative spaces within the EU as well as the transnationalization of public spheres emerging, especially in Western and Southern Europe. These transnational public spheres emerge “whenever European issues are debated as questions of common concern” (Risse, 2010, 6).

The active actor’s engagement in arenas of articulation, communication, and formation of public opinion and will can lead to a transnational community of continuing discourse. If such transnationalized discourses demand transnational collective efforts and action as the best means for handling transformation, then the keystone for the creation and institutionalization of an action frame for dynamic multilevel governance is given. Thus, the transnational community of discourse segues into playing a new, more powerful and active role in a transnational public community. This is a body that designates a transnationalized democratic demos (Klinke, 2014) that is defined by its base of peoples across hierarchies and national boundaries without predestined (territorial) jurisdictions (Bohman, 2007). They are the primary figures of the production of transformative and structuring power, based on communication and cooperation, in the sense that the transnationalized public community tends to produce as a collaborative entity. The aggregation and channeling of the articulation and communication of public opinion is facilitated through a reflexive network of distributed and differentiated deliberation. This network gives a legitimizing form to and provides the common frame in dynamic multilevel governance by developing new common ground, defining the ways of understanding and shaping a new paradigm, and acting in the new order that it creates and constitutes.

Dynamic multilevel governance equalizes the asymmetry of public opinion in the transnational public community and provides “*equal opportunity of access to political influence*” (Knight and Johnson, 1997, 280; italics in original) by means of deliberation. Opportunities of deliberation at nodes and intersections in the network are the locations and interactions of producing transformative and structuring power. These deliberative processes are representative of the transnational public community to some extent, but do not draw upon statistical representativeness or electoral or proportional representation (cf. Goodin and Dryzek, 2006). However, the reflexive network system of deliberation ensures that social diversity, plurality of interpretations, and the underlying beliefs and values of the transnational public community are represented and shared through direct involvement of those who are affected. This descriptive representation serves as a vehicle for a kind of democratic representation (cf. Parkinson, 2006, 154–55). Hence dynamic multilevel

governance supplants the traditional territorial representation principle but not the democratic principle of majority rule.

The importance of human reflection is essential for the nature of institutionalized processes in the network of differentiated and distributed deliberation. Agents of dynamic multilevel governance are able to recognize forces of socialization and internalization, the cultivation of habits and mentality, and the institutionalization of analogous processes. They are also able to alter their place and role in the socio-cultural structure. Thus, reflexive processes of deliberation refer to the capability of discerning what and how people think, understand and communicate knowledge, rules, norms, social and cultural values and moral principles by means of self-reference, self-interrogation, self-assessment, rethinking, and collective learning (cf. Bäckstrand, 2003; Goodin, 2003). Here the historical and current socio-political context gains in importance, how actor behavior, institutions, norms, and practices evolve and become apparent. Hence, problem-solving capability is produced in collaboration with the past and present considerations of affected actors that enables the development of new ideas and the creation of new means of cooperation.

For this reason, the mechanisms and forms of communication devolve to a central role in decision making. They do not only organize the discourse on the transfiguration of the social and political order and endow the new space with an adequate structure, but they also produce an intrinsic justification. Public and private actors coordinate activities by producing communicative and deliberative processes of decision making. By means of organizing and facilitating these institutionalized processes, dynamic multilevel governance constitutes itself as a reflexive authority that generates subjectivity, correlates units with each other and conveys a new steering order. The legitimacy of a postnational configuration of dynamic multilevel governance emanates from communication and cooperation, that is, the transformation of decision making into a subject that produces its own conception and performance as authority. This kind of authority relies on itself; it reformulates itself and proves to be reasonable by developing its distinct communication of self-reflection and self-justification in the light of transformation.

Dynamic multilevel governance creates a new public space and a new sphere of influence with discursive arenas and deliberative processes as well as institutions where transnational communities dealing with transformation are empowered to affect developments. Classical national processes of forming public opinion and political will segue into a transnationalized process of public and political discourse (cf. Habermas, 2008; Risse, 2010) that is aggregated and channeled

through deliberation. Differentiated and distributed deliberation generates the capability and mechanism to legitimize a new social and political order by means of communicative mediation. The singular subjects that are affected and entitled to participate comprise the body that designates a transnationalized society in all its generality as a postnational whole that is defined by its base.

Democratic theory has illuminated and inspired the brave new world of governance (Klinke, 2016). Deliberative democracy and discourse ethics infuse the conceptualization of dynamic multilevel governance with the notion that the formation of public opinion and political will succeeds through reflexive processes of rational discourse and ideal proceduralism. However, ideal democratic discourse and deliberation may not occur in a pure form in a new governance approach because the real-world formation of public opinion and will in a transnationalized space is not as coherent and logic as theories avow. More likely, an expansion of more pragmatic and feasible deliberative ideals, which rely on basic rules of communication and procedural legitimacy, would enable communicative agreements beyond that of consensus. Arguably, the participation of societal actors provides new avenues to legitimize and produce accountability in a dynamic multilevel governance arrangement, but not in the form of traditional modes of electoral accountability and constitutional representation. Deliberative processes and institutions in dynamic multilevel governance expand the classic ideals of deliberative democracy and enable various forms of communicative agreement, including reasoned convergence and consensus, incomplete agreement, negotiated compromise, and agreement upon dissent (Mansbridge et al., 2012; Parkinson, 2006). When deliberative processes are not able to end in any kind of agreement but the fundamental conflicts have been acknowledged, the decision making may end with the negotiation of a fair bargain or “adopt[ion of] some procedure such as proportional outcomes or majority rule to reach an authoritative decision” (Mansbridge, 2006, 117).

The idea of distributed and differentiated deliberation refers to a functional differentiation in order to handle epistemological, ontological, ethical, and teleological challenges arising in the course of transformation when social and political orders are reformed, transfigured, and elevated to a new and more luminous quality and standard. It operationalizes a functional division of deliberative labor by assigning tasks and responsibilities to specific actors because they possess issue-specific expertise and experience with regard to the emerging challenges. Such a deliberative system establishes a democratic-discursive interplay and coordination between state actors,

experts, societal stakeholders, and the public.ⁱⁱⁱ Thus it relies on the assumption that the actors involved communicate in ways that facilitate the discursive exchange of reasons and in ways that eschew coercive power. In what follows, I distinguish between epistemic, associational, and public deliberation as the third framework condition in dynamic multilevel governance.

Epistemic institutions

Scientific experts of epistemic institutions address the cognitive and evaluative problems and conflicts arising from the epistemological challenges of profound transformations. They ascertain the most cogent cognitive explanation of the phenomena in question as well as clarify dissenting views with regard to causal beliefs. Epistemic institutions facilitate deliberation among experts of formally acknowledged research institutions with relevant expertise, competences, and consultative skills. Expert advisory bodies, institutes of higher education, independent and neutral research institutes, impartial think tanks, and state-run research agencies are able to facilitate the state of the art in respected knowledge domains. It is important that they are recognized as representatives of the respective epistemic community, providing professional expertise and resources that generate cognitive knowledge and estimations, as well as evaluative understandings relevant for reference frames and meaning structures. They can also validate ideas and concepts about and criteria for the characterization and evaluation of desired transformation paths. These research units possess substantial authority because they operate through a sense of credible obligation when it comes to the objective and unprejudiced production of expert knowledge and systematic information that is generally accepted by the public. The overall goal is to establish consensual knowledge about cause-and-effect relationships, uncertainties and ambiguities, and policy-relevant criteria for judging societal acceptability and tolerability. Since truth seeking motivates scientific experts, communication in the deliberation process aims at an agreement in the form of a cognitive convergence.

Although the epistemic status of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) is disputed, I use it as an example to illustrate how an expert deliberation system has been established as a focal point of a global epistemological discourse. In the framework of the IPCC and the associated epistemic community, the multifaceted complexity of the causes and effects of climate change has been addressed, and a reasoned and internationally accepted consensus of the causality of human behavior, for example, the relation of fossil energy production and consumption and

increased global warming, has been established, even though considerable scientific uncertainty remains about the consequences. The IPCC's mission and goal is to provide cognitive and evaluative frames of reference and meaning that help inform and guide public and political opinion formation and decision making. Inter alia, the IPCC frames and evaluates pathways for transformation, including sustainable energy transformation (IPCC, 2014).

Associational policy-making

Associational processes of deliberation deal with the ontological and ethical challenges of transformation. Associational deliberation creates a space for reflexive communication in which relevant collective actor groups of the state, society, and economy exchange issues and lessons learned from their worlds of experiences in a narrative way. These agents of change critically scrutinize the limits of established paradigms and produce a new narrative that can gain common acceptability. The cognitive and evaluative reference frames and meaning structures produced through epistemic institutions enter the associational deliberation as valid scientific substance. At this point, stakeholder groups add their experiences as well as perceptions and attitudes, gleaned from social life and discuss commonalities and conflicts associated with transformation. The goal of associational deliberation is to evaluate the possible courses of action by judging the acceptability and tolerability of associated risks and opportunities that emerge in the course of the transfiguration of social and political orders. To what extent are the risks and opportunities that come along with transformation deemed socially and publicly adequate and reasonable, and how much uncertainty is acceptable? Associational deliberation is the process whereby representatives of collective actor groups communicate and reason their self-interests, which results in the emergence of conflicts of interests and competing norms and values. It is important that this deliberation focuses on mutual justification and acceptance of considerations that are compelling and persuasive even for those who disagree. Such an expanded understanding of deliberation "opens the door to storytelling and the non-cognitive evocation of meanings and symbols that can appeal to actual or imagined shared experiences" (Mansbridge et al., 2012, 67), which is essential if questions that imply moral judgments justified by cultural values and reflect ontological and ethical convictions are to be raised. A narrative form of communication can establish credibility and mutual respect and create sympathy among the participants, which allows attendance to commonalities and differences. Thus, the amalgamation of scientific and experiential sub-

stance creates an epistemic and moral surplus that enables the interpretation and evaluation of transformation on the large scale of a transnational public community of peoples across borders—an essential process for dynamic multilevel governance.

The Ethics Council on Energy Transition in Germany serves as an example of an intermediary and moral authority in a larger context of governance arrangements. It acted as communicator and facilitator between the state and society in a pluralistic and corporate manner, although its scope was limited to domestic politics. The Council was established by the German federal government in 2012 in the aftermath of the Fukushima disaster and comprised representatives from the scientific community, government, the economic sector, and civil society. The Council was associative and self-dependent in nature. Council members appraised the risks, benefits, and challenges of phasing out nuclear energy and achieved a communicative agreement based on a commonly reasoned policy outcome. They recommended transitioning to more renewable forms of energy. This recommendation has been unanimously approved by the German parliament.

Public deliberation

Public deliberation produces a direct democratic practice. It establishes a space where the forming of public opinion and will of peoples across borders is channeled and aggregated. Non-organized affected individuals are entitled to assert their experiences and desires; they are also authorized to co-influence the political decision making. Such a democratic practice in dynamic multilevel governance makes use of mini-publics in the form of consensus-conferences, citizen juries or panels, and deliberative opinion polls that are composed of ordinary citizens (cf. Fishkin, 2009; Goodin, 2008; Goodin and Dryzek, 2006; MacKenzie and Warren, 2012; National Research Council, 2008). Citizens in mini-publics reason together about decisions by exchanging narratives about and making claims on the same topics (cf. Parkinson, 2012, 154). The goal of public deliberation is that individuals have an equal opportunity to exchange their subjective perspectives and collectively debate practical questions with regard to the steering and control of transformation. “The best discussions clarify both conflict and commonality, and perhaps forge genuine commonality where it had not existed before” (Mansbridge, 2006, 118). The participants legitimize standards and margins for the handling of transformation by explaining the claim that the new norms and rules deserve recognition because they are right and good and regulate the behavior of all in the sense of common interests. Experiences with mini-publics reveal that citi-

zens develop well considered and reasoned valuations that can solidify the public opinion at large, complement expert judgments, and formulate politically relevant policy options (MacKenzie and Warren, 2012, 95). Hence, outcomes of public deliberation would determine the precepts and strategies for action that would shape specific public policies and instruments needed to address transformation. Mini-publics strengthen dynamic multilevel governance by creating trust relationships with the transnational public sphere and executive agencies of governments (cf. MacKenzie and Warren, 2012, 96–97). The transitional public sphere would trust the mini-publics because they would serve as faithful custodians of the information and experience that guides peoples' political judgment. Governments might trust mini-publics to help guide decision making because they could anticipate public opinion on phenomena that had not yet been attached or could not be grasped at all, especially with regard to contentious issues arising from uncertainties and socio-political ambiguities.

In dynamic multilevel governance, the three varying forms of discourse and deliberation among experts, stakeholders, and the public are distinctive, yet intertwined and complementary; they adopt different means of solidifying postnational communication and decision making through deliberation and adjust to the epistemological, ontological, ethical, and teleological challenges of profound transformation.

Conclusion

In this article, I have configured a notion and conceptual framework of dynamic multilevel governance and theoretically and normatively justified my assertion that fundamental capabilities are indispensable framework conditions needed to steer and navigate profound transformations. I have expounded the three capabilities—inclusiveness, network structure and self-governing—and their peculiar features as hallmarks of dynamic multilevel governance. Thereupon, I argued that there is a causal link between these capabilities and a reflexive authority: these capabilities, conveyed by governance processes and institutions, produce transformative and structuring power needed in the handling of transformation. In directing the attention to fundamental capabilities of governance for the transfiguration of social and political orders, I made a stab at forming and justifying a concept of dynamic multilevel governance that constitutes three framework condi-

tions in order to meet the challenges arising from transformations. To distinguish these capabilities is thus to place them in a fragile position, because they are distinctive yet interlacing and interdependent. In so doing, I theorized the variation in the explanatory power of dynamic multilevel governance as a concept that produces a new reflexive authority with transformative and structuring power. This article contributes to the debate about conceptual frameworks and normative reference frames to establish new governance processes and institutions that self-determine and self-organize the authority and rule when facing transformations.

One might think that “dynamic” as a major attribute of a multilevel governance conception would produce instability and hold in disregard the firmly established structures, institutions, and processes that seem to be necessary to master the dynamic nature of transformations. However, dynamic multilevel governance is conceived as the stabilization of instability, which sounds contradictory at first, but it is possible. Drawing on a metaphor of daily life, when we stand on one foot, we are unstable, statically speaking. Why do we choose this precarious situation? It provides us more freedom of action. Standing on one foot, initially, only produces the risk of falling over. But when we walk—changing from one unstable situation to another in a coordinated manner—we accomplish a dynamic, stabilized motion without falling over. In the same way, dynamic multilevel governance strengthens governance configurations through dynamic processes and institutions by means of capabilities that allow openness, flexibility, and sensitivity to change and uncertainty in terms of the outcome. The notion of “dynamic” epitomizes a force that stimulates these capabilities within a multilevel governance framework. This is the nature of dynamic multilevel governance because it produces autonomous decisions and not determination through specific predefined hierarchical and static logics.

Dynamic multilevel governance refers to an alternative positive source of sovereignty in order to produce the legitimate capability to steer and control transformations in a global configuration. It is noteworthy that such an alternative sovereignty does not resemble traditional notion of modern sovereignty, but nor does it necessarily oppose it. The sovereignty of dynamic multilevel governance is a dynamic interdependence between politics, society, economy, and culture. The forming of public opinion and the production of communication and cooperation in a network of differentiated and distributed deliberation are the lifelines that create and legitimize a transformative and structuring power, but there is no center of power that imposes directives. Decision making and thus problem-solving capability rely on the configuration and the common disposi-

tion of the entire network and its communication and cooperation with its subjects and the entity as a whole. The nature of dynamic multilevel governance is defined by the differences of its elements and subjects to each other and yet it functions in its entirety. The production of problem-solving capability through communication and cooperation reveals in what way commonalities represent both the precondition and the outcome. The reciprocal exchange between subjects and the entity as a whole is a kind of constitutive impetus and momentum that affects both. The network cooperative production demonstrates the institutional logic of dynamic multilevel governance and the transnational public community. There is no communication without the common ground of perceiving oneself as being affected by transformation, and the result of communication is a new form of expression aiming for problem solving. There is no cooperation without common interests, and the outcome of the cooperative production of problem solving capability is a new commonality.

The new legitimacy includes new forms and articulations when the reflexive authority exerts legitimate transformative and structuring power. While the reflexive authority evolves, the transformative and structuring power must simultaneously demonstrate its capability to effectively steer and navigate transformations in order to produce the foundation of its own legitimacy. As a matter of fact, the legitimacy of the new authority is based upon its effectiveness in periods of transformation. A governance mode with the reflexive authority of normative self-determination and self-rule could play a sovereign role with regard to juridification and constitutionalization. It might serve as a hinge in the genealogy of governance approaches as a globalized world emerges and a world society evolves. On the one hand, the overall conception and structure of dynamic multilevel governance relies on the recognition and legitimation of the right of autonomous self-governing by affected actors. Therefore, the nature of dynamic multilevel governance is subject to conditions that are determined and normatively justified within the frame of collective processes and agreements beyond methodological nationalism. On the other hand, this process of legitimization is thus only operative because the right of an autonomous self-determination of authority is relocated to a postnational configuration.

Dynamic multilevel governance also refers to a new epistemological, ontological, and ethical dimension in terms of self-reference, self-reflection, self-determination, and self-rule. Peoples' thinking, behaviour, and actions are immanent matters of epistemic knowledge production and deduction of collective activities within the sphere of dynamic multilevel governance configura-

tions. Thus the intellectual exercise of conceptualizing dynamic multilevel governance and its political realization would be an integral part in the course of the transfiguration of social and political orders. Dynamic multilevel governance provides fair opportunities for peoples across borders to politically influence the transfiguration of social and political orders when they are affected by transformation and transition. The deliberative processes and procedures provide the basic means of democratic aggregation, collection, and channeling of public opinion and will, and thus produce democratic problem-solving capability and socio-political cohesion in a postnational configuration. Hence, the deduced reflexive authority of transformative and structuring power relies on fact that affected peoples are both subjects and objects of the course through the maelstrom of transformation. Dynamic multilevel governance does not stand above the transnational community of peoples; it gains its sovereignty and power from this community. Thus, dynamic multilevel governance becomes an immanent part of a globalized society. It grasps the relationship between subjectivity and commonality in a transnational community that shares affectedness and common interests. Dynamic multilevel governance as a new entity with agency in a global configuration emerges from the dynamic of singular subjects and the commonality of shared interests in transformations that are aggregated and channeled by means of distributed and differentiated deliberation in a network structure. The logic of dynamic multilevel governance is based on the organization of the freedom of singular subjects to converge in the production of transformative and structuring power and thus constitute a new subject of sovereignty in a postnational constellation.

An important aspect of real-world politics is the question in which parts of the world could dynamic multilevel governance evolve. To meet objections that the concept is only applicable within and across modern democracies of the OECD world, I argue that we can observe a development in non-OECD countries towards more communication and cooperation beyond the nation-state. I am conscious that situations throughout the world are different in terms of democratic development and power hierarchies. The notion of dynamic multilevel governance is not unrealistic; it is not merely some abstract, impossible theoretical idea detached from present reality. Rather, concrete governance framework conditions are being formed in our political and social world, and thus, the possibility of dynamic multilevel governance is emerging; the challenge is to organize it politically.

I want to conclude by highlighting two questions for future research. First, to what democratically inspired level do we need to raise the notion of multilevel governance in order to be able to transfigure our existing, often failing, approaches to intentionally steering transformations. Secondly, we ought to elicit discussion within the context of dynamic multilevel governance on the fundamental issues of what the epistemologically, ontologically, and ethically desirable paths and goals in the transfiguration of social and political orders should look like and ask whether this self-reflection and self-determination is within reach. We need more theoretical and empirical exploration at the meta-level that explores implications, convergences, and divergences with regard to governance approaches emerging in the light of transformations.

References

- Ansell, Christopher, and Jakob Torfing, eds. 2016. *Handbook on Theories of Governance*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Bache, Ian, Ian Bartle, and Matthew Flinders. 2016. "Multi-level Governance." In *Handbook on Theories of Governance*, edited by Christopher Ansell and Jakob Torfing, 486-98. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Bäckstrand, Karin. 2003. "Civic Science for Sustainability: Reframing the Role of Experts, Policy-Makers and Citizens in Environmental Governance." *Global Environmental Politics* 3 (4): 24-41.
- Bäckstrand, Karin, and Eva Lövbrand, eds. 2015. *Research Handbook on Climate Governance*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Beck, Ulrich. 2016. *The Metamorphosis of the World*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Beck, Ulrich, Anthony Giddens, and Scott Lash. 1994. *Reflexive Modernization: Politics, Tradition and Aesthetics in the Modern Social Order*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Bevir, Marc. 2011. "Governance as Theory, Practice and Dilemma." In *The Sage Handbook of Governance*, edited by Marc Bevir, 1-16. London: Sage.
- Biermann, Frank. 2015. "Reform Options." In *Research Handbook on Climate Governance*, edited by Karin Bäckstrand and Eva Lövbrand, 516-525. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Bohman, James. 1999. "International Regimes and Democratic Governance: Political Equality and Influence in Global Institutions." *International Affairs* 75 (3): 499-513.
- Bohman, James. 2007. *Democracy across Borders. From Dêmos to Dêmoi*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Bonabeau, Eric, Marco Dorigo, and Guy Theraulaz. 1999. *Swarm Intelligence: From Natural to Artificial Systems*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Burns, Tom R., and Peter M. Hall, eds. 2012. *The Meta-Power Paradigm: Impacts and Transformations of Agents, Institutions, and Social Systems*. Frankfurt a.M: Peter Lang.
- Caney, Simon. 2005. *Justice beyond Borders: A Global Political Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Christiano, Thomas. 1996. *The Rule of the Many: Fundamental Issues in Democratic Theory*. Boulder: Westview.
- Cohen, Joshua. 1997. "Procedure and Substance in Deliberative Democracy." In *Deliberative Democracy: Essays on Reason and Politics*, edited by James Bohman and William Rehg, 407-415. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Dahl, Robert A. 1989. *Democracy and Its Critics*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Dahl, Robert A. 2006. *On Political Equality*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Enderlein, Henrik, Sonja Wälti, and Michael Zürn, eds. 2010. *Handbook on Multi-level Governance*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Enroth, Henrik. 2011. "Policy Network Theory." In *The Sage Handbook of Governance*, edited by Mark Bevir, 19-35. London: Sage.

- Fishkin, James S. 2009. *When the People Speak: Deliberative Democracy and Public Consultation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fraser, Nancy. 2007. "Transnationalizing the Public Sphere: On the Legitimacy and Efficacy of Public Opinion in a Post-Westphalian World." *Theory, Culture & Society* 24 (4): 7–30.
- Goodin, Robert. 2003. *Reflective Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goodin, Robert. 2007. "Enfranchising All Affected Interests, and its Alternatives." *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 35 (1), 40–68.
- Goodin, Robert. 2008. *Innovating Democracy: Democratic Theory and Practice after the Deliberative Turn*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goodin, Robert E., and John S. Dryzek. 2006. "Deliberative Impacts: The Macro-Political Uptake of Mini-Publics." *Politics & Society* 34 (2): 219–244.
- Grande, Edgar. 2011. "De-Regulation and Re-Regulation of Public Utilities: The New Regulatory State in the European System of Multi-Level Governance." In *The New Regulatory State: Regulating Pensions in Germany and the UK*, edited by Lutz Leisering, 57–79. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Habermas, Jürgen. 1996. *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory*. London: Polity Press.
- Habermas, Jürgen. 1998. *The Inclusion of the Other: Studies in Political Thought*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Habermas, Jürgen. 2001. *The Postnational Constellation: Political Essays*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Habermas, Jürgen. 2008. *Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Habermas, Jürgen. 2009. *Politische Theorie: Philosophische Texte Band 4*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.
- Habermas, Jürgen. 2011. *Zur Verfassung Europas: Ein Essay*. Berlin: Suhrkamp.
- Held, David. 2006. *Models of Democracy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hooghe, Liesbeth, and Gary Marks. 2003. "Unraveling the Central State, But How? Types of Multi-Level Governance." *American Political Science Review* 97 (2): 233–243.
- Hooghe, Liesbeth and Gary Marks. 2010. "Types of Multi-Level Governance. In *Handbook on Multi-Level Governance*, edited by Henrik Enderlein, Sonja Wälti, and Michael Zürn, 17–31. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Inglehart, Ronald. 1977. *The Silent Revolution*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Inglehart, Ronald. 1990. *Culture Shift in Advanced Industrial Society*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change). 2014. *Fifth Assessment Report*. IPCC: Geneva.
- Kennedy, James, Russell Eberhart, and Yuhai Shi. 2001. *Swarm Intelligence*. San Francisco: Morgan Kaufmann.
- Klinke, Andreas. 2016. "Democratic Theory." In *Handbook on Theories of Governance*, edited by Christopher Ansell and Jakob Torfing, 86–101. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

- Klinke, Andreas. 2014. "Postnational Discourse, Deliberation and Participation toward Global Risk Governance." *Review of International Studies* 40 (2): 247-75.
- Klinke, Andreas, and Ortwin Renn. 2014. "Expertise and Experience: A Deliberative System of a Functional Division of Labor for Post-Normal Risk Governance." *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research* 27 (4): 442-65.
- Knight Jack, and James Johnson. 1997. What Sort of Equality Does Deliberative Democracy Require? In *Deliberative Democracy: Essays on Reason and Politics*, edited by James Bohman and William Rehg, 279–319. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Koikkalainen, Petri. 2011. "Social Inclusion." In *The Sage Handbook of Governance*, edited by Marc Bevir, 454–468. London: Sage.
- Kuhn, Thomas S. 1962. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Linnér, Björn-Ola, and Steve Rayner. 2015. "Innovation Investments." In *Research Handbook on Climate Governance*, edited by Karin Bäckstrand and Eva Lövbrand, 547–554. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Lowndes, Vivien, and David Wilson. 2003. "Balancing Revisability and Robustness? A New Institutionalist Perspective on Local Government Modernization." *Public Administration* 81: 275–298.
- MacKenzie, Michael K., and Mark E. Warren. 2012. "Two Trust-Based Uses of Minipublics in Democratic Systems." In *Deliberative Systems: Deliberative Democracy at a Larger Scale*, edited by John Parkinson and Jane Mansbridge, 95–124. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mansbridge, Jane. 2006. "Conflict and Self-Interest in Deliberation." In *Deliberative Democracy and Its Discontent*, edited by Samantha Besson and Jose Luis Marti, 107–132. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Mansbridge, Jane, James Bohman, Simone Chambers, Thomas Christiano, Archon Fung, John Parkinson, Dennis F. Thompson, and Mark E. Warren. 2012. "A Systemic Approach to Deliberative Democracy." In *Deliberative Systems: Deliberative Democracy at a Larger Scale*, edited by John Parkinson and Jane Mansbridge, 1–26. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- National Research Council. 2008. *Public Participation in Environmental Assessment and Decision Making*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- Osterhammel, Jürgen. 2009. *Die Verwandlung der Welt: Eine Geschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts*. Munich: Beck.
- Parkinson, John. 2012. "Democratizing Deliberative Systems." In *Deliberative Systems. Deliberative Democracy at a Larger Scale*, edited by Jane Mansbridge and John Parkinson, 151-72. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Parkinson, John. 2006. *Deliberating in the Real World: Problems of Legitimacy in Deliberative Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Polanyi, Karl. 1944. *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*. New York: Farrar & Rinehart.
- Risse, Thomas. 2010. *A Community of Europeans? Transnational Identities and Public Spheres*. Ithaca: Cornell University.

- Schaffer, Johan Karlsson. 2008. *Democrats without Borders: A Critique of Transnational Democracy*. Gothenburg: University of Gothenburg.
- Schmidt, Vivien A. 2008. "Discursive Institutionalism: The Explanatory Power of Ideas and Discourse." *Annual Review of Political Science* 11: 303–326.
- Thacker, Eugene. 2004. "Networks, Swarms and Multitude." In *Life in the Wires: The CTheory Reader*, edited by Arthur Kroker and Marilouise Kroker, 165–177. Victoria: New World Perspectives.
- Thompson, Dennis F. 2010. "Representing Future Generations: Political Presentism and Democratic Trusteeship." *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy* 13 (1): 17–37.
- Young, Marion Iris. 2000. *Inclusion and Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Young, Oran. 2013. *On Environmental Governance: Sustainability, Efficiency, and Equity*. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers.
- Zürn, Michael. 2002. "Zu den Merkmalen postnationaler Politik." In *Regieren in internationalen Institutionen*, edited by Markus Jachtenfuchs and Michele Knodt, 215–234. Opladen: Leske & Budrich.
- Zürn, Michael, and Stephan Leibfried. 2005. "Reconfiguring the National Constellation." In *Transformations of the State?* edited by Stephan Leibfried and Michael Zürn, 1–36. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Notes

ⁱ For the perspective on affectedness, see Goodin (2007, 2008) and Habermas (1996).

ⁱⁱ This perspective is derived from "the subject-to-the-law principle," discussed by Schaffer (2008, 80). See also Cohen (1997) and Thompson (2010).

ⁱⁱⁱ For a similar proposal of differentiated and distributed deliberation in the context of domestic and global risk governance, see Klinke (2014) and Klinke and Renn (2014).